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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The development of physical education in the United States has had to overcome much opposition. Many educational leaders were not willing to accept physical education as a part of education. It is the intent of this study to analyze the manner in which a major leader in American education, President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University, related physical education to education.

On October 19, 1869, Charles W. Eliot was inaugurated as president of Harvard. According to a leading historian of American higher education, this event announced that a new era in American higher education was truly at hand. The post Civil War era was a significant period in the development of American higher education. Prior to the Civil War, there were indications that American higher education was entering a period of transition. In 1861, through the leadership of Matthew Vassar and John Raymond, Vassar College was founded, and the founding of this institution of higher education established the first institution of higher learning for women.

Another significant event that occurred in 1861 was the establishment of graduate studies at Yale, and this established Yale as the first American institution of higher learning to offer a Ph.D. in the arts and sciences. One of the most important factors contributing to the growth of American higher education was adoption in 1862 of the Morrill Act. Under this legislation the federal government provided land for states to develop institutions with a popular and practical orientation, the land-grant colleges. These were early indications of reforms that were to modify the conduct of American higher education in the post Civil War period. The emergence of the American university during this period has been treated as a significant movement in several informative general histories of American higher education.2

To change the sectarianism of American higher learning, President Eliot was joined by other reform-minded leaders such as President Andrew D. White of Cornell, President James B. Angell of the University of Michigan, and President Daniel C. Gilman of Johns Hopkins. These reform-minded leaders were pioneers of the university movement in the United States.

"Theirs was a conscious effort to break with the past. During their administrations, their institutions unmistakably left the fold of colleges and emerged as the dominant pacesetters

among institutions that would call themselves universities."\(^3\)

These reformers aspired to develop the new university which displayed the land-grant idea of practical vocationalism, the spirit of scholarship, scientific research, and technology.\(^4\)

Charles W. Eliot's contributions to the development of American education were enormous. He was responsible for upgrading the standards at Harvard by establishing a liberal arts program, creating graduate studies in the arts and sciences, encouraging research, and establishing an elective program of study. Through the innovative reforms established by Eliot, Harvard became a modern university approaching the standards of the European universities. Before becoming president of Harvard, Eliot journeyed to Europe, and for three years he studied the pedagogical practices of major European educational systems. He discovered that European systems were more advanced in the arts and sciences than American institutions of education. It was Eliot's intent to apply several aspects of the European curriculum to American education. In 1869, his innovative ideas concerning the reformation of American education were published in a two part article entitled "The New Education" in the February and March issues of the *Atlantic*

\(^3\)Jennings L. Wagoner, "From In Loco Parentis Toward Lernfreiheit: An Examination of the Attitudes of Four Early University Presidents Regarding Student Freedom and Character Development" (Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1968), p. 6.

Monthly. In order for American higher learning to advance, Eliot contended that reforms had to be made in elementary and secondary levels of education as well; therefore, Eliot was concerned with reforming all levels of American education. Eliot exerted his influence on lower levels of education by taking an active part in the meetings and discussions of the National Education Association. In 1892 the National Education Association's National Council of Education nominated Eliot as chairman of a committee to bring about uniformity in college admission requirements. This was the famous Committee of Ten which established national uniformity of secondary education. Eliot was active with other associations dealing with lower levels of education: Massachusetts Classical and High School Teachers' Association, New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, and the Harvard Teachers' Association.

The thrust of his reforms was to liberalize the American curriculum of education from the narrow study of Latin, Greek, and mathematics. Eliot declared that education should be as broad as man, and he called for schools and colleges to broaden their curricula.

During Eliot's administration, several significant events in physical education and intercollegiate athletics occurred at Harvard. In 1879 Dr. Dudley A. Sargent began his work in establishing a program of physical education at the new Hemenway Gymnasium. Dr. Sargent's work at Harvard extended
over a period of forty years. He was responsible for establishing a scientific foundation for the practice of physical education which influenced the conduct of American physical education. In 1887 under the supervision of Dr. Sargent and with the support of President Eliot, the Harvard Summer School of Physical Training was started. The summer program in physical training fulfilled an urgent need for teacher training in physical education. In 1892 Dr. George W. Fitz, professor of physiology at Harvard, founded the first research laboratory in the United States dealing with physiological experiments on physical exercise. In 1891 Dr. Sargent and Dr. Fitz collaborated to establish the nation's first degree program in physical education at the Lawrence Scientific School of Harvard University.

Athletics at Harvard burgeoned considerably during Eliot's forty year tenure. Participation in athletics at Harvard was originally conceived of as a pleasant diversion from studies. Athletic contests consisted of inter-class competition among Harvard students. However, by the 1880's athletics had proliferated to a level where contests were conducted between colleges. Several problems emerged with the rise of intercollegiate athletics—professionalism, commercialism, fanaticism, and injuries. The Eliot administration became concerned with these problems and felt it was necessary to do something about them. To deal with the problems associated with intercollegiate athletics, Harvard established the first athletic committee which consisted of three faculty members
in 1882. Soon after many other colleges followed the example of Harvard's athletic committee.

The conduct of intercollegiate football became a national concern when several deaths were attributed to the brutality of the game. President Eliot spoke out against football, and called for abolishing the game if immediate reforms were not taken. President Theodore Roosevelt, alumnus of Harvard and an avid football fan, argued against Eliot's suggestion of abolishment. In 1905 President Roosevelt held a conference at the White House to discuss possibilities for reforming the conduct of intercollegiate football. Roosevelt called together coaches and athletic directors from several universities to hear their suggestions on reforming football.

In light of the significant work carried out at Harvard in the areas of education, physical education, and intercollegiate athletics during Eliot's years of influence, it is the intent of this dissertation to present the views of President Eliot as to the role of physical education and athletics in the American educational process. The following objectives will serve as a guide in this study: (1) to present a biographical account of Charles W. Eliot; (2) to present Eliot's major contributions to the development of American education; (3) to provide insight into how a leading educational reformer related physical education and athletics to education; (4) to enhance the understanding of the development of physical education and athletics at Harvard during Eliot's administration; and (5) to contribute to the body of knowledge concerned with
the history of physical education and athletics in the United States.

The procedure carried out for this study consisted of a thorough review of pertinent primary and secondary sources. In several of his works Eliot presents his views on physical education and athletics. Eliot's biographers have included information concerning his attitude toward physical education and athletics. Several histories of Harvard mention Eliot's concern for the problems associated with athletics at Harvard. These accounts, however, are very limited, and they do not include information on President Eliot's working relationship with Dr. Sargent, Dr. Fitz, the Harvard Summer School of Physical Training, and specific details surrounding Eliot's evaluation of athletics. To broaden the understanding of Eliot's views on physical education and athletics other sources were consulted.

5See, for example, The Durable Satisfactions of Life (New York: T.Y. Crowell and Co., 1910); More Money for the Public Schools (New York: Doubleday, Page, and Co., 1903); The Tendency to the Concrete and Practical in Modern Education (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1913); and The Training for an Effective Life (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1915).


The material available at Widener and Pusey libraries located at Harvard University provided the most important sources for this study. Housed in Widener Library are several Harvard journals that include many articles written by Eliot: the Harvard Graduates' Magazine, Harvard Monthly, and the Harvard Illustrated Magazine. These journals also include articles dealing with physical education and athletics at Harvard. Past issues of Harvard newspapers, the Harvard Advocate, Harvard Bulletin, Harvard Crimson, Harvard Echo, and the Harvard Register, are also available at Widener Library. The Harvard newspapers provide information concerning physical education and athletics and the measures taken by President Eliot in the various situations. Widener Library also contains a complete collection of works by Eliot and written works about Eliot.

Another essential source for this study was the Harvard University archives located in Pusey Library. The archives include the Eliot Papers which contain primary sources of Eliot's correspondences, lectures, notes, annual reports, and other personal material.

The Roosevelt Collection located in the Library of Congress served as an important source for gathering information concerning President Roosevelt's role in reforming intercollegiate football. This collection includes the correspondence between Eliot and Roosevelt during the controversy over intercollegiate football practices in 1905. It was a critical period for intercollegiate football because, if reform measures
were not taken, the game might have been abolished in American colleges. The correspondence between Eliot and Roosevelt reveals two opposing views on the nature of intercollegiate football.

Certain limitations must be observed in a study of this sort. No attempt has been made to present a comprehensive biographical study of Charles W. Eliot. An attempt has been made to enter biographical information which sheds light on the views and actions of President Eliot. The study is primarily concerned with President Eliot's forty year tenure, and events preceding and following this period is presented to provide a background for Eliot's views.

In order to appreciate the significance of this study, it is necessary to realize that physical education and athletics are part of the educational environment. Since physical education is situated in the curriculum of education, it is imperative for the field of physical education to establish a meaningful rationale concerning the relationship between physical education and education. The continuation of physical education as an integral part of education is determined by sound reasoning, i.e., giving meaning to physical education. To develop a meaningful understanding of physical education and education, it is essential to understand the historical development of this relationship. The significance of understanding the historical development of physical education provides knowledge that is needed to criticize, accept, reject, or modify the cultural inheritance of physical education and education.
The scope of studies dealing with the historical development of physical education is very broad. The following twelve categories were compiled to illustrate the wide range of topical categories in studying the history of physical education:

1. General Histories of Physical Education in Colleges and Universities.
2. Histories of Physical Education in Individual Colleges or Universities.
3. Histories of Professional Preparation in Physical Education.
4. Histories of Elementary School Physical Education.
6. Histories of Physical Education in City or County School Systems.
7. Histories of State Physical Education.
8. Histories of Associations, Organizations, and Projects Related to Physical Education.
9. Histories of Trends, Objectives, and Attitudes Related to Physical Education.
10. Histories of Physical Education in Foreign Countries.
12. General Histories Related to Physical Education.8

All of these categories in one way or another contribute to provide some insight into acquiring a meaningful relationship between physical education and education. In an interesting way this study touches on three topical categories. It deals with the history of physical education at Harvard; it is concerned with the development of the Harvard Summer School of

Physical Training, which involved professional preparation in physical education; and it deals in part with the career of Dr. Dudley A. Sargent.

The attempt of this study is to focus on a notable educator and determine his actions and attitudes as they relate to physical education. Notable educators throughout history have dealt with physical education and their views have been considered in the history of physical education. They have been responsible for setting trends and establishing attitudes, and in some cases their views have been critical toward physical education. In order to come to a meaningful interpretation of the nature of physical education in the educational process, their views have to be evaluated and criticized effectively. It is the hope of the writer that the study of Charles W. Eliot will contribute something of value to a fuller understanding of the relationship between physical education and education.

CHAPTER II

FAMILY BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION

Charles W. Eliot came from a long line of distinguished New England Eliots. It is believed that the first of Charles W. Eliot's forebears in the United States was Andrew Eliot (1683-1749) who was a cordwainer in Beverly, Massachusetts.¹ Andrew Eliot had two sons, Samuel (1713-1745) and Andrew (1718-1778). Samuel Eliot established himself as a Boston bookseller. Andrew Eliot became the first of Charles W. Eliot's ancestors to be associated with Harvard College. Andrew Eliot attended Harvard and received his baccalaureate degree in 1737.² Upon graduating from Harvard, Andrew Eliot began a career in the ministry. In 1758 he became the secretary of the Board of Overseers at Harvard; he held this position, with a brief interruption for his studies at the University of Edinburgh where he received the Doctor of Sacred Theology degree


²Information concerning degrees conferred on Eliots was found in Historical Register of Harvard University 1636-1936, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1937), 194-95.
in 1767, until 1778. He was a member of the Corporation from May, 1765 to September, 1778, and in 1774 he was elected for the presidency of Harvard; but, he declined the offer so as not to leave his parish work. According to Quincy Rev. Andrew Eliot "was distinguished by zeal, activity, and laborious endeavors to promote the prosperity of the College."  

Rev. Andrew Eliot had two sons, Andrew (1743-1805) and John (1754-1813). Samuel Eliot had one son, Samuel (1739-1820). All three members of this generation of Eliots contributed significantly to the activities of Harvard College. Andrew Eliot received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Harvard in 1762. He served as Harvard's Librarian from 1763-1767. In 1767 he became Tutor of Greek and held this position until 1774. He was a Fellow of Harvard from 1772-1774. John Eliot graduated from Harvard in 1772 with a Bachelor of Arts degree. He carried out his graduate work at the University of Edinburgh where he received the Master of Arts degree and the Doctor of Sacred Theology degree in 1797. Rev. John Eliot was an active and influential member of Harvard's Corporation from 1804 until his death in 1813. Samuel Eliot was the founder of the family fortune. He received his education from the Boston Latin School and then became an apprentice at the mercantile house of Jonathan and John Amory. By the age of thirty, he had taken over the retail branch of the business. Before

long Samuel Eliot became well known as a businessman in the Colonies and in England. He made frequent business journeys to England before and after the Revolution. Samuel Eliot became one of the wealthiest men in Boston, and he was charitable with his wealth. In 1814 he donated $20,000.00 to Harvard for the founding of a Professorship of Greek Literature; this foundation became known as the Eliot Professorship of Greek Literature after his death so as to acknowledge Samuel Eliot's act of munificence. At that time Samuel Eliot's endowment was the largest ever received by Harvard. Quincy mentioned, "The donation bestowed by Samuel Eliot, in the foundation of the Greek Professorship, was the largest sum ever bestowed on the College by any benefactor in his lifetime."^4

Samuel Eliot was not the type of individual who made it known to everyone that he was generous. According to James, "Samuel Eliot liked to conceal his charities, it may be assumed that they were more numerous than they are known to have been."^5 Quincy wrote, "The bounty of no individual flowed from a higher or purer source. It was unsolicited and unavowed."^6 Quincy elaborated on the qualities of Samuel Eliot:

In the life of Samuel Eliot, charity went hand in hand with success. As a merchant he was prosperous and without reproach. Amid the active

^4Ibid., p. 315.
^5James, op.cit., I, p. 7.
^6Quincy, op.cit., II, p. 315.
pursuits of business he cultivated a taste for literature and the arts; to the severity of ancient morals he united the faith of a liberal Christian; and joined a thorough knowledge of the world with a predilection for retirement and domestic life.\(^7\)

In 1786 Samuel Eliot married Miss Catherine Atkins, the great-granddaughter of Governor Joseph Dudley. It was during this time that Samuel Eliot moved into a large house on the corner of Beacon and Tremont Streets in Boston.

Samuel Eliot and Catherine Atkins Eliot brought up eight children, five daughters and three sons. Their eldest son Charles (1791-1813) graduated from Harvard's Divinity School in 1809, but in 1813 he fell ill and died at the age of twenty-two. The other children survived their father's death in 1820. Samuel Eliot left an estate valued at $1,200,000 to his widow and children. According to James, Eliot's estate was "probably the largest fortune in Boston at that time. Thus he left his widow and all his children rich according to the standards of those days."\(^8\)

Two of Samuel Eliot's daughters married prominent Harvard men. Catherine, who was the eldest daughter, married Andrews Norton. In 1811 Andrews Norton served as tutor in the Divinity School, and from 1813-1821 he was Harvard's Librarian. In 1813 Andrews Norton became Dexter Lecturer on Biblical Literature; he held this position until 1819 when he became Dexter Professor

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 316.

\(^8\)James, \textit{op.cit.}, I, p. 8.
of Sacred Literature. Their son, Charles Eliot Norton,\(^9\)
Charles W. Eliot's cousin, continued the family's affiliation with Harvard as lecturer, professor, and overseer.
Samuel Eliot's second daughter, Anna, married George Ticknor.
Ticknor was Smith Professor of the French and Spanish Languages and Literatures and Professor of Belles Lettres from 1817-1835.
Ticknor, along with Edward Everett, George Bancroft, and Joseph Cogswell, were the first four American scholars to go to Europe for advanced study.\(^10\) He found that American institutions of higher learning lagged behind the more advanced European universities. It was Ticknor's hope to reform American standards of higher learning by instituting some of the European practices of education. Ticknor, however, was ahead of his time. After his retirement in 1835, another thirty years would elapse before reform was carried out.

Samuel Eliot's second son, William Havard Eliot (1795-1831), married Miss Margaret Bradford, the daughter of Alden Bradford who was the author of a History of Massachusetts. Their son Samuel Eliot\(^11\) (1821-1898), cousin to Charles W. Eliot, became a very influential figure in the doings of Trinity College, in

\(^9\) Charles Eliot Norton graduated from Harvard College in 1846. From 1874-1898 he was lecturer and later professor on the history of the fine arts. He was a member of the Board of Overseers from 1899 to 1908.


Hartford, Connecticut. He served as Trinity's Brownell Professor of History and Political Science from 1856 until 1860 when he was chosen president of the college. He resigned from the presidency in 1864, and returned to Boston to serve on Harvard's Board of Overseers from 1866 to 1872. Samuel Eliot's third son, Samuel Atkins, (1798-1962) graduated from Harvard's Divinity School in 1817. He was to become a minister, but during the year of his graduation his father died and Samuel Atkins stopped short of taking a pulpit. Instead, he decided to travel and study in Europe for two years. He became interested in music, especially singing; he also acquired an interest in gardens, parks, and playgrounds. Samuel A. Eliot was interested in popularizing good music. He served as president of the Boston Academy of Music from 1834 to 1847, and succeeded in introducing music into the public schools of Boston.

For a brief period, Samuel A. Eliot held a position in public office. He served as mayor of Boston for three years from 1847 to 1839. In 1850 he was sent to Congress to serve out another man's unfinished term.

As was the case with his father, Samuel A. Eliot contributed to the activities of Harvard. In 1823 he donated Warden's extensive collection of books on American history, consisting of nearly twelve hundred volumes at a cost of over five thousand dollars. From 1842 to 1853 Samuel A. Eliot was Harvard's treasurer and member of its governing board. He was quite influential at Harvard; he conferred with Josiah Quincy,
Edward Everett, and Jared Sparks all of whom became presidents of Harvard.

It is indeed evident that the policies and affairs of Harvard were of concern to the forebears of Charles W. Eliot. Quincy remarked that "The name of Eliot deservedly runs high among the friends and patrons of Harvard College."\(^{12}\)

In 1826 Samuel A. Eliot married Miss Mary Lyman. Mary Lyman came from a very distinguished Boston family.\(^{13}\) She was born on October 9, 1802 to Theodore and Lydia Lyman. Her mother was the daughter of George Williams of Salem who was a successful businessman, and a niece of Colonel Timothy Pickering who was a member of President Washington's and President Adams's cabinet. Her father was a descendant of Richard Lyman who emigrated to New England in 1631 from England, and one of the early settlers of Hartford, Connecticut.\(^{14}\)

\(^{12}\)Quincy, op.cit., II, p. 313.


\(^{14}\)In 1631 Richard Lyman and his family set sail for New England on the ship "Lion" from England. Among the passengers making the trip were Martha Winthrop, third wife of Governor Winthrop, the governor's eldest son and his family; also abroad was John Eliot (no relation to Charles W. Eliot's ancestry), the celebrated apostle to the Indians. After landing in Boston they settled in Charlestown, Massachusetts, and from there they journeyed to Hartford, Connecticut.
Theodore Lyman was born in 1755 to Rev. Isaac Lyman (1724-1810) and Ruth Plummer Lyman (1730-1824) of York, Maine. Isaac Lyman graduated from Yale in 1747, and then he served for over sixty years as a Congregational minister of the First Church in York, Maine. In the latter part of the 18th century their son, Theodore, moved to Boston. Theodore Lyman became an apprentice in a Boston trade company, and he soon became acquainted with the numerous business opportunities in New England. As the textile companies were building mills along the New England rivers, Theodore Lyman invested a portion of his capital in these new business opportunities. He became wealthy through his business association with the Northwest fur trade and the East India trade companies. He was very successful in all his business affairs, and he laid the foundations of the family fortunes. Soon after he acquired his wealth Theodore Lyman married Lydia Williams in 1786. He purchased a place in Waltham which was praised as one of the finest in Massachusetts. He had a great deal of consideration for landscaping and surrounding his Waltham house with a variety of trees. James described the manner in which Theodore Lyman constructed his place in Waltham: "He built the mansion house, changed roads, laid out a long avenue, set out box hedges, damned the brook so that its surface reflected more sky,

and erected greenhouses.¹⁶ During their leisure time the Lymans enjoyed horseback riding and hiking through their vast estate.

Theodore Lyman's formal education had been scant, but he became a well informed man through his wise business conduct, expanding family life, social life, and reading. He made sure to provide a proper education to his children. Mary Lyman and her two brothers grew up in an environment that emphasized reading, music, and exercise (horseback riding and nature hikes).

Mary Lyman's older brother Theodore (1792-1849) became a man of considerable note in the Boston community. General Lyman, as he was called because of the rank he had held in the Massachusetts militia, was elected as Boston's mayor in 1833 and served that office until 1835. The later years of his life were devoted to philanthropy. He became involved with the Boston Farm School, a private charity school devoted to reforming delinquent children. In 1846 the Massachusetts legislature appropriated some funds for the founding of a state reformatory school for juvenile offenders in Westborough, Massachusetts. Theodore Lyman bequeathed a total of $72,500 for the founding of this institution. He also contributed $10,000 to the Boston Farm School and a similar sum to the Horticultural Society of Boston.

¹⁶James, op. cit., I, p. 10.
In 1820 General Lyman married Miss Mary Henderson of New York. The marriage resulted in three daughters and a son; one daughter and the son alone survived their parents. Their son, who happened to be named Theodore (1833-1897) and Mary Lyman's nephew and Charles W. Eliot's cousin, became a prominent figure within the Harvard community. A graduate of Harvard (1855), he was elected one of the original trustees of Harvard's Museum of Comparative Zoology in 1859. In 1868 Theodore Lyman became a member of the Board of Overseers. He was active outside the Harvard community as well. In 1866 he was nominated as chairman of the Fisheries Commission of Massachusetts and in 1884 president of the American Fish Cultural Association. He was elected to a term in Congress in 1882, but he was defeated in his attempt for re-election.

The marriage of Samuel A. Eliot and Mary Lyman brought together two of the wealthiest and distinguished families in Massachusetts. They were distinguished not merely by their wealth, but by their service and philanthropic contributions to society. The Harvard community especially was well aware of the contributions made by Eliots and Lymans. A combination of these two families would indeed provide a suitable environment for the cultivation of a future contributor to society.

On March 20, 1834, in the Beacon Street house of Samuel and Mary Eliot, Charles William Eliot was born. He was the third of five children born to the Eliots. He was named after his two Eliot uncles: Charles, who had died after graduation from the Harvard Divinity School, and William, who had died
in 1831. Charles William was the only boy born to the Eliots. He was born with an unconcealable dark colored birth mark that covered most of the right side of his face. Charles's mother was concerned with the effect the birth mark would have on her son. James mentioned the concern of the birth mark and how his mother dealt with it:

"It would make him the butt of the gibes of other children; it would tend to isolate him, and so might easily turn his thoughts in upon himself; almost of necessity it would make him reserved, and it might perhaps cause him to be fearful among his fellows. In short, it was a cross which he must carry to his grave, and which she must teach him early to bear manfully. Fortunately, she was a person for whom it was natural to take things in a matter-of-fact sort of way."

**Boyhood**

As a youngster Charles had to frequently contend with insults regarding his birth mark. He had to develop a deafness to insults and a blindness to the stares that he received. This was one of the first things that Charles had to learn. James mentioned the effect the birth mark had on Charles's personality: "He developed a callous protective shell and accustomed himself, too young, to discourage familiarity."  

Charles's parents instilled in him the precept that one should look outward and not inward, forward and not

back. This early discovery remained with him throughout his life as a recipe for a happy life.

His principal playmates during his childhood were his four sisters and his Lyman cousins. Basically, his childhood companions were within his family circle. However, once young Charles was able to deal with his birth-mark he began to associate with neighborhood boys more frequently. Across the street from his father's house was the Boston Common where a play area was set up for the youngsters of the town. The Boston Common was the scene of many boyish activities; one activity involved rowdy combat between the well to do boys and the boys from poorer households from the North End.

Charles W. Eliot recalled his youthful physical activities that were carried out in his neighborhood:

We lived in the heart of a small city, but had some of the advantages of country life. We played there the simple games of ball then in vogue, and hopscotch and marbles in their season; and there we had admirable coasting in winter... One of our sports was running races around the Common on the outer brick sidewalk. The circuit was something over a mile in length, and the competition for the run in the shortest time was keen.

This remained with him throughout his life. In 1912 he presented a speech to the incoming freshman class entitled "Look Forward." In a speech delivered on his 90th birthday Eliot stated, "I was eager to do something in the future. It was that part of my nature which enabled me to look forward and not back to look out and not in." The Ninetieth Birthday of Charles W. Eliot, Proceedings in Sanders Theatre and the Yard, March 20, 1924 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1925), p. 24.

Charles W. Eliot, A Late Harvest (Boston: The Atlantic Press, 1924), p. 4.
Charles's parents made sure that he received daily physical activity. Eliot recalled his family habits during his childhood:

Looking back on the family habits in my childhood, I perceive that the family diet was simple, that the children kept early hours, that our parents took care that we should have exercise in the open air everyday, and that we should spend two months in the country or by the seaside every summer.\(^1\)

The two months during the summer vacation were usually spent in Nahant, Massachusetts. When Charles was young, his father secured a summer house at Nahant. Nahant provided opportunities for hiking and horseback riding, and a short distance away the shores washed by the Atlantic afforded Charles with pleasures in swimming and boating with his father. During the months of July and August Charles engaged in many outdoor activities. Concerning these he recalled:

In my boyhood the family spent July and August at Nahant. There I was outdoors nearly all the time. There I learned to find mushrooms on the rough pasture lands, to row a boat, and to fish for perch and tautog off the rocks. But the summer experience which I remember with the greatest pleasure was roaming about on horseback, a privilege secured on terms which well illustrate my parents' views concerning my physical education.\(^2\)

Charles W. Eliot developed a love for the out of doors which remained with him throughout his life.

Another activity that Charles was encouraged to do was to attend dancing school. "Like all my sisters I was sent

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 3.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 5.
to dancing school, taught to ride on horseback, and encouraged to accompany my father on his daily walk."

The Eliot children were subjected to Spartan elements. Every evening a tub of cold water was placed in Charles's room to be ready for him to step into when he hopped out of bed in the morning. Charles was brought up to follow a code of manners; he was taught to observe certain rules about form and behavior while in the presence of company. Proper form included posture, to sit up straight and not to cross legs while sitting, not to fidget or move about aimlessly, and not to put your hand to your face. Since the family entertained many dinner parties and had frequent visits from friends, it was important for the children to exhibit proper manners.

Charles was brought up in the Unitarian faith. On Sundays, the family attended two services in King's Chapel in Boston. During Charles's school days, it was improper to carry out any kind of recreation on Sundays. Eliot recalled that "Sunday was not a day for recreation. It was improper to run in the street on Sunday, or to whistle." Charles did not find too much enjoyment on Sundays. "Church was attended both morning and afternoon; so that my most cheerful

---
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moments on Sunday were during the family singing of hymns and anthems in the evening, and certain short periods of illegitimate reading in the library or other retired spot, when Scott, Dickens, and Cooper could be clandestinely enjoyed."

Charles W. Eliot's first exposure to education was given to him by Miss Sumner in his father's house. Charles was tutored along with his cousins Arthur and Sarah Lyman. When Charles was five he was sent off to a private school operated by Miss Cushing. It was a school for both boys and girls with a curriculum consisting of spelling, reading, writing, arithmetic, and geography. Eliot's recollections of this school was not to his liking:

The little house was not well adapted to school uses, and the only places for the children to play during recesses were the brick sidewalk and the graveled street. Since there was nothing in the school work which could possibly interest a natural small boy, I never enjoyed going to this school, and every day should distinctly have preferred to stay at home.

At the age of seven, Charles became a student in a private school for boys conducted by Reverend Thomas Russell Sullivan in the basement of the Park Street Church. The curriculum consisted of lessons in spelling, grammar, arithmetic, and Latin. Eliot was very critical of the school's narrow curriculum:

In the entire program of the school there was no subject which trained the powers of
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observation or of reasoning; but the memory was strongly cultivated, together with the power to discriminate among the different meanings of the same word, the different parts of speech, and the different moods and tenses.

Eliot's educational experience at the Park Street Church was not an enjoyable one: "I do not remember that I enjoyed any study in this school, or any part of the school life except the daily recess."  

The Park Street Church was situated next to the Boston Common. The Boston Common provided the students with a play area, and during their twenty minute recess there were many activities conducted. Some of these activities were recollected by Eliot:

For twenty minutes we carried on in their several seasons all the field sports then known, and we added walking and running races on the brick sidewalk round the Common, ...Snowballing, hopscotch, tag, and marbles were then allowed at the corner of Park and Tremont Streets.

At the age of ten, Charles entered the Boston Latin School under the direction of Epes Sargent Dixwell. The Boston Latin School was a preparatory school for those who were planning to enter Harvard College, and a large proportion of its graduates went on to Harvard. The school's curriculum consisted of Latin, Greek, mathematics, and some attention was given to

27 Ibid., p. 347.
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29 Eliot, loc. cit. Eliot did not elaborate on what type of sports were carried out.
ancient history, composition, and declamation.

Mr. Dixwell, the headmaster, was a very able scholar. He had entered Harvard at the age of sixteen and received his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1827, being fourth scholar in a class of forty-four. As an instructor, "he was erect in carriage, alert in body and mind, and produced on boys the effect of a refined but vigorous gentleman."\(^{30}\)

The Boston Latin School was situated near a grammar school; this circumstance produced many battles between the boys from Beacon Hill, who had to walk by the grammar school, and boys attending the grammar school. Eliot remembered that "there was chronic war between grammar school boys and Latin school boys. Accordingly, the Latin school boys coming from Beacon Hill took pains to get together in a considerable group before they approached the grammar school."\(^{31}\)

Eliot was a very successful student at the Boston Latin School. However, his five year experience at the school was not a satisfying one. The only subject that he enjoyed was declamation. "During the years in the Boston Latin School I was quite unable to take pleasure in any of the studies there pursued, with the possible exception of declamation."\(^{32}\) Eliot was not satisfied with the method of education used at the school, which consisted primarily of memorization. He criticized

\(^{30}\)Eliot, *A Late Harvest*, p. 17.


\(^{32}\)Ibid., p. 349.
such a practice: "This study amounted to nothing but practice in committing to memory, often without any real comprehension of the rules and paradigms committed."

Eliot found the curriculum of the school to be too narrow and devoid of many subjects that he felt were essential. Concerning the narrowness of the school's curriculum Eliot commented:

No attempt whatever was made to familiarize us with English literature; and no modern language was taught in the school... No music, or drawing, or manual work of any sort was taught in the school. No science was taught, and no art practiced there.

Samuel A. Eliot realized some of the deficiencies in his son's formal education. He believed it was necessary to supplement his son's education with some of the activities that were lacking in the school's curriculum. One deficiency of the curriculum was the lack of training provided in the manual arts. In order to have his son receive training in manual arts, Charles's father secured carpentry lessons for his son and installed a bench and lathe for Charles to work on at home. Charles W. Eliot recalled his father's concern for his education:

In my case the narrow programme of the school was supplemented by excellent lessons in carpentry and woodturning which my father--whose ideas about education were much in advance of the times--was at pains to procure for me.
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Another activity that Charles was encouraged to pursue was music. His father urged Charles to expose himself to music by singing along with his sisters during their family evening sing-a-longs. James acknowledged that "it may be right to infer that his father encouraged him to sing for the pleasure of it, but did not make him work at music."  

The Boston Latin School's neglect for providing physical education was supplemented by Charles's attendance at the Boston gymnasium. Eliot recalled, "While still a pupil in the Latin School I attended the Boston gymnasium, where I learned to use the common gymnastic apparatus, such as ladders, parallel bars, the vaulting-horse, and swings."  

Charles W. Eliot was very fortunate to have had parents who insisted on providing a well rounded education for their son. His father's endeavors in providing a well rounded education were mentioned by Eliot:

If it had not been for the wisdom of my father, who took care to supplement the school program with private lessons for me in riding, swimming, carpentry, I should have gone to college without having had the least chance to develop the accurate use of my senses, or to acquire any serviceable art.

Although his parents took many measures to assure that Charles would be healthy and well educated, they overlooked one

36 James, op.cit., I, p. 19.
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important consideration, his eyesight. Young Charles developed extreme problems with his vision. He stated:

Neither of my parents took enough thought for their children's eyes. The lamp by which I worked winter evenings and mornings used whale oil and had two round wicks, each about as large as an ordinary pencil. Over the flame was a tin shade, painted white inside. I was congenitally nearsighted, and the difficulty increased considerably during my childhood and youth, perhaps because of the hard use I gave my eyes on grammars and dictionaries and much ordinary reading.

His defective vision was a hindrance throughout Eliot's life, for it kept him from participating in many activities. Eliot mentioned the difficulties that were caused by his poor vision:

This defective vision cut me off from some desirable sports and entertainments, and prevented me from recognizing my friends on the street, unless they had a characteristic figure, walk, or clothing. It has been a serious obstacle all my life, for no oculist has ever been able to procure for me full vision.  

Charles W. Eliot graduated from the Boston Latin School in 1849 at the age of fifteen. Along with the other boys in his graduating class, he took the Harvard entrance examination, administered in July, 1849. This was an eight hour examination consisting of Latin, Greek, and mathematics of which the greater part was an oral exam in Latin and Greek. The examination began at six in the morning and by five o'clock the verdict in each individual case was announced. President Jared Sparks, who had in February 1849 entered the presidency

39 Eliot, _A Late Harvest_, p. 6.  
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of Harvard, told Charles the good news regarding his acceptance to Harvard.

The Boston Latin School did indeed serve its function as a preparatory school for college. Since the curriculum of the school was devoted to Latin, Greek, and mathematics, the graduate of the school would be well equipped for Harvard's entrance examination. Eliot stated that the intention of the program and curriculum of the Boston Latin School "was at that time well adapted to the end in view, which was the admission to Harvard College of as large a proportion of its pupils as possible." Eliot presented an interesting relationship between the conduct of the Boston Latin School and Harvard College: if any reforms were to take place in the preparatory schools it would have to come from the colleges, because, the preparatory school's curriculum was affected by the activities of the colleges.

Undergraduate at Harvard

Charles W. Eliot began his studies at Harvard in September, 1849. During his first two years at Harvard he roomed in a private house owned by Mr. Farwell. It was a common practice for freshmen and sophomores to find lodgings outside the college. In his junior year, Eliot moved into Stoughton Hall

which was one of the four college dormitories.

Since Eliot was dissatisfied with the narrow curriculum that he had experienced in his schooling, he wasn't going to find things much different at Harvard. In 1849 all the studies of the freshman year in Harvard College were required, namely, Greek, Latin, mathematics, a little ancient history of Rome, and elementary chemistry. Since the Boston Latin School boys had an excellent foundation in Greek, Latin, and mathematics, the principal studies of the freshman year presented little difficulty for them. Eliot concentrated most of his time on chemistry, for it was a new study for him and one which he became quite interested in.

The studies of the sophomore year were also required. There were two required courses which Eliot found enjoyable, French and natural history. These courses were well received by Eliot: "I welcomed these novelties in the college course, and then enjoyed my first opportunities to study a modern language and the elements of natural history."^42

The greater part of the studies of the junior and senior years were also required of all students. However, there was a limited choice which could be made with the consent of parents or guardians of undergraduates among the following studies: mathematics, Greek, Latin, German, Spanish, and Italian. Eliot elected to study mathematics during his junior and senior terms. "I availed myself of the limited option in the junior and senior

^42 Ibid., p. 355.
year to give up Greek and pursue mathematics."  

Harvard College was limited in its facilities during Eliot's attendance as an undergraduate. One facility that the college lacked during this time was a gymnasium. Eliot recalled the lack of recreative facilities that existed at Harvard during his undergraduate experience:

The college at that time possessed no gymnasium whatever, and there was no organized athletic sport. Football, baseball, tennis, and golf were unheard of, and boating tended to be rowdy, and was practiced by few.  

According to Eliot, "Walking was the only form of exercise used by large numbers of students." To supplement the lack of physical education at Harvard, Eliot took lessons in boxing, while he was an undergraduate.

Another facility that was not available at Harvard was a student laboratory. In 1849 Harvard College did not possess a single laboratory accessible to its students. Eliot was fortunate in that his interest in chemistry brought him into contact with the private laboratory of the young Professor Josiah Cooke and his assistant Francis H. Storer. Eliot's

46 Eliot, A Late Harvest, p. 7.
interest in chemistry impressed Cooke, and Eliot was permitted to study in his laboratory. Eliot remarked that "To the best of my knowledge and belief I was the only undergraduate in Harvard College who had the privilege of studying a science by the laboratory method."\textsuperscript{48}

Eliot began his association with Professor Cooke during his sophomore year and continued to study in his laboratory until his graduation. His devotion and interest in chemistry was expressed by Eliot:

I studied general chemistry and qualitative and quantitative analysis in my leisure hours during the rest of my college course. I had the advantage also of assisting Professor Cooke--Instructor Cooke became Professor Cooke in 1851--in the preparation of his college lectures.\textsuperscript{49}

After his sophomore year Eliot concentrated his studies on chemistry and mathematics.

Professor Cooke, who was responsible for teaching chemistry and mineralogy, had charge of the college's mineral cabinet, which contained a large number of valuable specimens. Eliot had the opportunity of using the samples in the cabinet and assisting Cooke in rearranging the cabinet when new samples were obtained.

During several summer vacations, which lasted six weeks, Eliot accompanied Professor Cooke on his scientific field trips.

\textsuperscript{48}Eliot, \textit{A Late Harvest}, p. 9.

These field trips took them to many parts of the northeastern section of the United States. These trips were recollected by Eliot:

For several summers I went on walking-journeys with Professor Cooke, visiting mineral localities, mines, and metallurgical works. These journeys took us over many parts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and gave me my first experience in collecting specimens, in studying factories, mines, iron furnaces, foundries, and zinc works in operation, and in observing topography and the forces which have molded the crust of the earth.50

The means of transportation during these field trips included hiking, boating, and train. These summer experiences consisted of activities that Eliot enjoyed--travel, exercise, and learning.

As a student, Eliot did not indulge in the escapades that other students participated in. In many respects he was atypical of the average Harvard student. His avoidance of typical student indulgences was mentioned by James:

He seemed to feel no temptation to get drunk or to engage in pranks or escapades, although there was a good deal of drinking and rowdiness among the undergraduates. He liked to work diligently and already knew how to do his work so promptly and well that he was ranked among the four first scholars of his class during several months of his junior year when his eyes failed him completely and he had to have all his textbooks read aloud to him.51

Eliot was not socially active. He associated only with a few friends and most of his time was spent in Professor

50 Eliot, A Late Harvest, pp. 9-10.
51 James, op.cit., I, p. 41.
Cooke's laboratory. His poor eyesight and birth mark contributed to his recluse existence. James acknowledged that Eliot was a shy student: "He was aware that he lacked the qualities that invite and reward good-fellowship, was conscious of the scar on his face, and was shy. It was a handicap, socially, not to be able to recognize an acquaintance ten to fifteen feet away."  

In a letter to his friend Theodore Tebbets, Eliot exposed his feelings concerning the relationship between intellectual cultivation and happiness, and wrote:

The other day I came to the conclusion that this eternal cultivation of the intellect is not the source of all the happiness in the world, nor even of a large part of it, that this continual effort to improve one's mind is too selfish and unfruitful to be very satisfactory, and that this everlasting digging can at best produce but a fruit with a stone at its heart... You are so different from me in this respect that you won't understand the first doubtful attempts of a stiff, pokerish, glum, unattractive young man, who is just waking up to the great truth that the proper study and the true happiness of mankind is to be found in the intercourse with man, and I may add, woman.  

He wasn't satisfied with his social life, and his realization of his shyness created a degree of unhappiness in his personality. He displayed himself as a serious and studious individual, and seldom did he behave in a humorous or joyful manner.

52 Ibid.

Second in his class, Eliot graduated from Harvard in 1853. During the Commencement Day exercises, which were held on July 20, 1853, Eliot was given the honor of reciting an oration on "The Last Hours of Copernicus."

**Teacher of Mathematics and Science**

Once graduated, Eliot had to decide what to do in life; he was uncertain about his future direction. His father had hopes of his son entering business, but Charles was hesitant. He spent the winter of 1853-54 thinking things over. Meanwhile he studied German, French, and accounting, and taught a night class of working men and boys in the Pitts Street School. He found his teaching experience to be enjoyable. Eliot indicated this in his correspondence to Theodore Tebbets: "One thing I am clear about, I do like teaching--the pleasantest evenings for me are Pitts Street Nights."\(^{54}\)

Eliot decided to become a student and teacher of science. He wrote to his mother of his intentions of becoming an educator: "I have chosen the profession of a student and teacher of science, and it is you who should first know my choice."\(^{55}\) He chose teaching because he believed it was a useful profession and one that would give him satisfaction. Eliot elaborated on

---


A successful teacher is a good and useful citizen...The very maintenance of our free institutions depends on the education of the people. Surely he holds an honorable and responsible post, who labors in the cause of education, to diffuse that knowledge, and to stimulate that intellectual progress of the people, which alone can make safe the possession of national power and wealth, which alone can successfully contend against the monstrous vices which follow in the train of liberty and luxury.

During his teaching at the Pitts Street School Eliot found that communicating ideas to others was a fulfilling experience. Throughout his life, he was hesitant in interacting with others; but teaching required communication and he found it to be enjoyable. Eliot wrote: "I enjoy communicating ideas to others; it is a pleasure to see the light of a bright idea breaking in on the recipient mind." 57

In the autumn of 1854 Eliot accepted a teaching position at Harvard College. He was appointed tutor in mathematics. Although he received a teaching position, which was what he desired, he would have preferred a teaching position in chemistry.

As an unmarried tutor, Eliot was required to live in one of the college dormitories and serve the duties of a parietal officer. The duties of a parietal officer consisted of maintaining order in the dormitories and college yard. Being in such an authoritative position, he was not well liked by the

56 Ibid.
57 Ibid.
undergraduates. James mentioned the reason why a parietal officer would not fare well with students:

The undergraduates thought he was too wooden, too strict, and sometimes meddlesome. While the ancient system of petty disciplinary regulations was maintained at Harvard, a conscientious parietal officer could hardly hope to be popular with the student body.

As a teacher Eliot fared better. "Certainly he was both efficient and respected as a teacher, and, considering his youth, that is all one could ask." 59

One of the first reforms ever initiated by Eliot occurred during his second year as tutor. Charles W. Eliot and James Mills Peirce, the two tutors in mathematics, in 1855 urged the faculty and Board of Overseers to change the grading system in their department. Eliot claimed that the present grading system did not accurately examine the student's knowledge. The grading system was based on two factors: (1) a student received a mark from the teacher every time that he recited in class; (2) at the end of a term oral examinations were administered to students by visiting committees appointed by the Board of Overseers. The exams were oral and were very brief, and often failed to exhibit a student's knowledge in the subject. Eliot commented that the oral examinations and recitals were not an accurate means of evaluating students. He declared that the system of examination "made rank depend on the power

58 James, op.cit., I, p. 67.
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to recite memoriter with tolerable accuracy short passages from the textbooks, without necessarily obtaining any consecutive knowledge or real mastery of the subject. Eliot advocated written examinations to be administered at the end of the first half of a term and one at the end of a term:

Long written examinations two times a year involve more consecutive study of the subjects of the examinations and a longer holding of a line of thought or a developed argument than were needed for the brief oral recitations. Moreover, the same questions are asked of every student—the only fair way in competitive examinations. These were the first semi-annual written examinations ever held in Harvard College, soon the method was adopted in all departments.

Another reform that Eliot initiated concerned the physical arrangement of his dormitory. He negotiated and made arrangements with the Cambridge Gas Company to install gas lights and meters. Before long, all the dormitories had gas lighting. Another action taken by Eliot was ordering foreign books in the sciences for the College Library. And when the college was trying to erect Appleton Chapel and the building of the structure was making slow progress, Eliot was requested to take charge. Eliot proved to be quite able as an administrator and reformer.

Eliot was very critical of the faculty's snail pace in dealing with reforms. Eliot expressed this in his correspondence
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to Theodore Tebbets:

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

The head-quarters of Conservatism are in the Colleges and other Institutions for teaching. The conservative spirit in politics is not nearly as stiff and invincible as literary conservatism.  

In the time that he could spare from teaching and other academic duties Eliot worked at chemistry in Cooke's laboratory. As there was no regular provision for the registration of advanced students, his relation to Cooke and Storer was that of a volunteer pupil, and as he progressed, volunteer assistant. Harvard at that time did not have a formal provision for advanced studies. Eliot commented on the lack of advanced studies: "In 1853 not a single one of the teachers in Harvard College had any advanced students--that is, students who had mastered the elements of a subject and were capable of advancing into its larger fields." Later, when Eliot became president of Harvard the area of graduate studies was given a great deal of attention.

In 1856 Eliot was given his first opportunity to teach a chemistry class of his own when he was called in to substitute for Professor Cooke. Cooke, who had been giving instruction

---


in the Medical School as well as in the college, quarreled with the Medical Faculty and Eliot was put in charge of his class at the Medical School for the remainder of the year. Eliot found that the Medical School was in a feeble condition and was tolerating a deplorably low average level of attainment among its students. His exposure to the low standards of the Medical School convinced him that the school needed reform:

I became acquainted with the quality of the medical students of that day, with the nature of the medical course, and with the small qualifications for medical and surgical practise with which most of the young graduates of the Harvard Medical School were discharged upon the community. The medical class in 1856-57 was made up of men whose previous education had been extremely various. There were a few college graduates and a considerable percentage who could barely read and write, while perhaps half of the class ranged along between these two extremes...the degree was given to any candidate who passed in a majority of nine subjects at an oral examination which lasted in each subject five minutes for each candidate. 64

In 1857 a family crisis emerged: Charles W. Eliot's father found himself bankrupt. A firm of cotton producers in which Samuel A. Eliot had become a silent partner was forced into insolvency by the rapid tightening of credit that attended the panic of that year. His wife's property, as the law stood then, was liable for his legal debts, and what Mrs. Eliot had received from her father, including their home on Beacon Street, went into liquidation with her husband's
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The fate of Charles W. Eliot's family rested on his shoulders. He had only his teaching salary and a legacy left to him by his grandfather Lyman. He had to support his mother and father and his three unmarried sisters. Financially, it would have made a great deal of sense for him to leave college and enter business. He refused, however, to abandon his chosen career. One may think that for a family which had enjoyed more than modest wealth throughout their lives that this would be a great trauma. Apparently this was not the case as, according to James:

The old gentleman went to bed and slept as soundly as ever the night after the failure, and Charles simply went on with his College work while stiffening his back to the new burdens that fell upon his shoulders...Yet not to be discouraged when a fortune is swept away is surely to give proof that one has learned to live for ends towards which money does not so greatly count. 65

Charles W. Eliot was able to make a substantial contribution to the family, for his grandfather's legacy had grown to the sum of forty thousand dollars. He transferred twelve thousand dollars to his mother, and put eighteen thousand dollars into the construction of a double home in Cambridge. Eliot was responsible for drawing up the plans for the building of the house. The western end of the house was occupied by his parents and three sisters, and the eastern end of the double house became his own home.

65 James, op.cit., I, p. 74.
During the family's financial crisis of 1857 Eliot fell in love with Miss Ellen Derby Peabody. Miss Peabody was the eldest daughter of Rev. Ephriam Peabody, who was the minister of King's Chapel in Boston from 1845 until his death in 1856. Eliot was first introduced to Miss Peabody as a friend of his younger sisters when he was eleven years old, but now she had become something special for him. On March 30, 1858 Eliot proposed to Miss Peabody. On October 27, 1858, the Reverend George Putnam performed the marriage ceremony at King's Chapel in the presence of fifty relatives and friends.

During his tutorship at Harvard Eliot did not neglect his physical well being. Even with his busy schedule, he found time to be an active member of a rowing crew. Eliot recalled his participation in rowing:

> In 1855-56, when I was working very hard as tutor in mathematics, I gladly became a member of a boat club which was made up of Divinity, Law, and Scientific students, with a few college officers, and contained no College undergraduates. This club, the expenses of which were borne exclusively by its members, afforded opportunity for these older men to take vigorous exercise in rowing both spring and fall without aspiring to any great excellence, or taking part in races.

In the rowing season of 1858 Eliot was recruited to row for the Harvard crew. Eliot described his involvement with the Harvard rowing crew:

In the rowing season of 1857 the recognized Harvard eight-oared crew was heavily defeated by a Boston amateur crew which contained some graduates of Harvard, Yale, and other colleges who were employed in Boston; and the accepted reason for the defeat was that certain members of the crew had violated all the rules of the day concerning training, and had in consequence given out during the race. Harvard undergraduates were so much discouraged and disgusted by this event that it turned out to be impossible to get together even a six-oared crew for the ensuing year without calling upon graduates. Two or three undergraduates enlisted Alexander Agassiz, who had graduated in 1855, in the effort to get ready a six-oared crew for the season of 1858. Benjamin W. Crowninshield of the Senior Class and Agassiz enlisted me in the crew.

Eliot rowed in two regattas for the Harvard crew, the first on June 19th and the second on July 5, 1858. In both races the Harvard crew was victorious.

The first race is memorable for another reason other than that Eliot was a member of the Harvard crew. It was during the Boston City Regatta of June 19, 1858 that crimson was first used as the Harvard color. Prior to the race, the members of the Harvard crew agreed that they should wear something to distinguish them from other competing crews. Eliot and Benjamin W. Crowninshield, captain of the 1858 crew, went to the C.F. Hovey and Co. department store in Boston and

---
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purchased six crimson colored handkerchiefs. The crew members tied the handkerchiefs round their heads as a distinguishing mark during the race. Before this event, a color representing a university was not conceived of yet. According to Eliot the founding of university colors can be linked to those crimson handkerchiefs:

A color for each college had not then been thought of. No college President or Professor ever wore a hood. The gay colors which nowadays decorate the Commencement stage, or any public meeting of university Professors, had not been adopted; indeed that was a much later enthusiasm.

The crew was successful in their race, which consisted of a distance of three miles. Eliot expressed his enthusiasm about the victory to Miss Peabody:

We've beaten the entire crowd tremendously—and made the quickest time ever made round the course. 19 min. 22 sec. was our time; 21 min. 20 the time of the next boat; we therefore beat by 1 m. 58 s. which is a very large difference. Ellen, it was perfectly splendid—we had the sympathy of the entire crowd, and what a crowd it was!

Another rowing meet, which Eliot participated, was conducted on July 5, 1858. The second race consisted of a course covering six miles. The Harvard crew, wearing their crimson handkerchiefs, again emerged victorious. The winning prize was a purse of one hundred dollars. It can be said that Eliot was a professional athlete. James humorously remarked: "Later

71 Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Ellen Peabody, June 20, 1858, printed in James, op. cit., I, p. 81.
when questions of amateur standing came to be sharply argued between the colleges, Eliot used to enjoy explaining that he could not speak as an amateur oarsman, because he appeared to have been a professional."^72

Eliot regarded his rowing as enjoyable recreation, and he stated:

My rowing, far from being my business at the time, was merely an enjoyable byplay. It never did me the slightest harm either at the time or afterward. I was, however, twenty-four years of age, had learned to row when I was a mere boy, and had always been fond of strenuous bodily exercise. ^73

His reasons for rowing were included in a letter to Ellen Peabody: "I had rather win than not, but it is mighty little matter whether we beat or are beaten--rowing is not my profession, neither is it my love,--it is only recreation, fun, and health."^74

In the spring of 1858 the college made Eliot an assistant professor in mathematics and chemistry. During the ensuing three years he taught regularly in both departments.

During his appointment as assistant professor Eliot was given the opportunity to conduct laboratory classes. This was Eliot's first experience in teaching laboratory courses:

In the first term of 1858-59, when I had become Assistant Professor of Mathematics and

^72 Ibid., p. 85.
^74 Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Ellen Peabody, June 19, 1858, printed in James, op. cit., I, pp. 80-81.
Chemistry, I had the advantage of giving an elective course in mineralogy and crystallography which was open to those college juniors who elected chemistry, and during the second term of that year a course of instruction in qualitative analysis to the same students. This was my first experience in the laboratory teaching of chemistry.  

By being elective, Eliot found these courses to be rewarding to both teacher and student. He approved of an elective system:

I had, by the favor of Professor Cooke and with the encouragement of President Walker, some opportunities to teach chemistry and mineralogy to small elective classes, and I fully appreciated the stimulating effect of those attempts on myself, and the much greater satisfaction to be obtained in teaching a small class of young men who had chosen to study the subject, than in teaching a large class, most of the members of which had been driven against their will to some slight contact with the subject.

By 1859, Cooke's laboratory became too small to hold Eliot and Cooke happily. Eliot applied for, and obtained, permission to fit up a small room in the basement of University Hall at his own expense in order that he might work privately and independently.

In July 1861, Eliot's title was changed to assistant professor of chemistry in the Lawrence Scientific School.  


77 The Lawrence Scientific School was opened with an initial donation of fifty thousand dollars from Abbott Lawrence in 1847. The intent of the Lawrence Scientific School was to provide a graduate program of study in the arts and sciences. However, it only succeeded in developing an undergraduate program in science leading to a Bachelor of Science degree.
Eliot was brought in to replace the school's chemist, Professor Eben Horsford, who had resigned.

During the winter of 1861-62 Eliot prepared a "Plan for the Lawrence Scientific School" for its faculty. The memorandum proposed that the school should institute a broader preparatory training before specialization. The preparatory training proposed by Eliot should consist of required recitations and exercises in mathematics, chemistry, physics, physiology, botany, zoology, physical geography, rhetoric, French, German, and drawing. Eliot contended that the student should be exposed to several areas of study prior to specializing in one area. Although the preparatory studies were to be required, there were allowances for students to elect courses in their interest. Eliot's plan was discussed favorably at first, but then skeptically. It was a challenge to the existing order and nothing came of it.

The winter of 1861-62 was a bitter one for Eliot. Both of his parents became severely ill, and he had to conduct night vigils between two sick beds. His mother recovered from her illness, but on January 29, 1862 his father died. Since his father's bankruptcy, Eliot had to contribute to the well being of his parents and sisters, but now he had to assume the role of sole provider for his own family, as well as his mother and sisters.

It was during this time that the national situation became very dark when Fort Sumter was fired on and the War of Secession began. Eliot applied himself to any war-work that
could be done in Cambridge, such as volunteering for guard
duty at the Arsenal, computing town quotas when the Common-
wealth began to put the draft into effect, and instructing
students in the rudiments of military drill.\textsuperscript{78}

When the Civil War was entering on its third year,
Governor Andrew of Massachusetts offered Eliot a commission
as Lieutenant Colonel of the Cavalry. Eliot took the commis-
sion into serious consideration, but due to his poor vision
and family situation he was unable to accept the commission.
Eliot stated, "I came to fear that I could not command cavalry
successfully, because I could not see well enough to direct
the rapid movements that are expected of mounted troops."\textsuperscript{79}
Eliot also considered his family's welfare:

\begin{quote}
I had declined the offer on the ground
that I was the only son of my mother--who was
a widow--and that I was the only available
man in the family of my wife's mother, who
was also a widow. This decision cost me much
distress; for I felt strongly the call of the
country--a call which many of my friends
had eagerly obeyed.
\end{quote}

Indeed, Eliot had legitimate grounds for declining the mili-
tary commission.

As several faculty members of the Lawrence Scientific
School left to join the army, Eliot's responsibilities in the

\textsuperscript{78}James, \textit{op.cit.}, I, p. 89.

\textsuperscript{79}Written account of Eliot's decision, printed in James,\textit{ Ibid.}, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{80}Eliot,"President Eliot's Own Story," \textit{op.cit.}, p. 231.
school were expanded. In 1862 Eliot was entrusted with the general supervision over the engineering department when Professor Eustis, who was a West Point graduate, left to join the army, and throughout the year (1862-63) Eliot served as acting dean of the school. These activities were in addition to his involvement with the school's chemistry laboratory.

In March, 1863 Eliot's five-year appointment as assistant professor was about to expire. Professor Horsford, who had previously given up the direction of the chemical laboratory, had resigned from the Rumford Professorship on the Application of Science to the Useful Arts. Eliot had hoped to be appointed Rumford Professor. In January, 1863 Eliot received disappointing news from the newly installed president of Harvard, Reverend Thomas Hill, that he would not be given the Rumford Professorship. Harvard was interested in appointing Wolcott Gibbs from New York to fill the Rumford Professorship. James mentioned that "The President had become convinced that Gibbs would bring something to the University that Eliot could not contribute."81 Gibbs had better credentials for the position than Eliot. His education was superior to Eliot's, for after finishing his medical school course, Gibbs had spent three years studying chemistry in Germany and Paris. Gibbs had made significant achievements in the field of chemistry, and Eliot lacked the research background and the education that Gibbs possessed. Eliot's lack of qualifications to fill the

81 James, op.cit., I, p. 102.
Rumford Professorship made him aware of the lack of advanced training in the sciences in American institutions of higher learning. It was evident that one had to study in Europe to acquire advanced training. Eliot viewed this as a serious deficiency in American higher education.

Since Eliot had proven his capabilities as an able teacher and administrator, President Hill did not want to lose Eliot's services. President Hill was faced with a complicated problem: how was he going to keep Eliot without offering the Rumford appointment to him; there was only enough funds for one position. James presented the poor manner in which Hill went about in trying to keep Eliot:

> It would seem that nobody wanted to push Eliot out of the University; certainly Hill did not. But there was money in hand for only one salary,...A skillful president might have overcome the financial difficulty. But unfortunately the Reverend Thomas Hill was as feeble an executive and as little a man of the world as any who ever presided over Harvard's affairs...His problem being to provide for a Professor of Chemistry who should not occupy the Rumford Chair, he began by making the mistake of inviting wealthy members of Eliot's family connection to subscribe enough to guarantee a salary for him for a few years. This naturally roused Eliot's pride and indignation, and he notified his relatives promptly that he would have nothing of such an arrangement.

**Travels to Europe**

Eliot's affiliation with Harvard had come to a brief end. It was during this time that his investments from his grandfather's

\[82\text{Ibid.}, pp. 107-08.\]
legacy declared a hundred percent dividend. He considered taking his family abroad to spend some time visiting European institutions of learning and understanding their educational methods. Eliot also considered studying chemistry in Germany and France. Eliot's uncle by marriage, George Ticknor, had been one of the early American educators to visit Europe and study their educational methods. Ticknor was convinced of their superiority over American institutions of education and had convinced others to go to Europe to study European educational practices. Eliot stated his intentions: "In the early summer I decided to stick to the profession of education; and the better to prepare myself for it I resolved to spend two years in Europe, studying educational institutions and pursuing my studies in chemistry and technology."^83

The busy schedule that Eliot was confronted with during his affiliation with Harvard did not keep him from raising a family. By 1863 the Eliots had three sons: their first son Charles was born on November 1, 1859; their second son Francis was born on May 18, 1861, but he became severely ill and died on October 9, 1861; Samuel Atkins, their third son was born on August 24, 1862. Along with his wife, a nursemaid, and his two sons—Charles who was five years old and two year old Samuel—Charles W. Eliot sailed for England in September 1863. They spent the following two years in England, France, and Germany, making long stays in London, Paris, and Marburg.

After arriving in England, Eliot's little party paused in London for a few days and then crossed the Channel. They reached Paris on October 20th and remained there until May 31 of the following year, 1864.

Immediately after Eliot had secured living quarters for his family, he set himself to the task of visiting institutions of learning. He wanted to inquire into every aspect of their organization and methods. He was also interested in investigating how France supports a large body of scholars who not only teach but also find funds to conduct research.

Eliot acquired authorization from the Minister of Instruction to visit all the Lycees and Colleges of Paris and gather information about salaries, expenditures, and administrative details. Eliot's purpose was to study every aspect of French education. An account of the various details of education that Eliot observed was included in a letter to his mother. After he had been introduced to the Proviseur (school principal) of a lycee, Eliot was given a tour of the operations of the school. The following is that account:

The Proviseur asked what I wanted to see particularly.—Everything, I said—the whole system in its details. After some general conversation about the Lycee and about America he sent for a man to accompany me about the establishment. This individual was a sort of headclerk in the money department who had been 15 years in the Lycee and was familiar with all the details. He was with me nearly three hours—showed me the buildings—the dormitories, dining rooms, studies, class rooms, play-grounds, kitchen, laundry, store-rooms, offices—gave me copies of the printed forms which are used to facilitate the business of the Lycee—told me
about the food, the washing, the linen, the hours of study and meals, showed me the bills of fare, the wine, the hospital, the laboratories, the library, the collections; gave me many details about the discipline and presented me with copies of the printed permits which are used, showed me the records which are kept by the Proviseur, the doctor, the professors, the maitres d'etudes. A large Lycee, like this one, is a complicated affair—there are 700 pupils from 8 to 18 years old, of whom 500 are fed, slept, washed, dressed, exercised, taught within the Lycee. 84

Eliot was interested to know how the professors live, what salaries they have, how much leisure time they have, and how funds are provided for them to conduct scientific research. Eliot found that chemists, engineers, economists, geographers, naturalists, and others who engaged in scientific activity had their own societies and usually their own periodical publications. Eliot wanted to know how these societies were organized, funded, and in what manner did they promote scientific activity.

Eliot contended that one can understand how a nation operates by studying a nation's educational institutions. Concerning this Eliot wrote:

From these institutions, well understood, you may learn whether a nation is aristocratic or republican, bound or free, old or new, lively or stagnant, whether the professions and industries are free or hampered, what is the religious faith of the people, and what are its social habits. I believe I have learned what kind of an education a French laborer, shopkeeper, merchant, lawyer, doctor, professor, engineer, mid-wife, school-master, apothecary may be expected to

84 Letter from Charles W. Eliot to his mother, March 11, 1864, printed in James, op.cit., I, p. 122.
In an interesting way, Eliot believed that education related significantly to social, political, and economic aspects of a nation. Eliot's rationale for education was based on this relationship, i.e., education must contribute to a nation's social, political, and economic outlook.

Eliot's party left Paris in June, 1864. For the next four months they traveled through Switzerland, the Rhineland, Belgium, Holland, and ended up in London. They stayed in London for three weeks and then took off for Germany. They settled in the German state of Hesse for the winter. Eliot thus began his observations of the German system of education. At the nearby University of Marburg, Eliot was afforded the opportunity to work in the laboratory of the eminent chemist Hermann Kolbe. This was an excellent opportunity for Eliot to gain a first hand understanding of the practices of a German university and laboratory.

Toward the end of the winter, Eliot went off on short trips to visit institutions in Karlsruhe, Heidelberg, Hohenheim, Stuttgart, and Tubingen.

When spring came the Eliot party journeyed south to Italy. In April, 1865 Eliot settled in Rome. The trip to Italy was basically a vacation journey. While in Italy, they visited the various places of interest in Rome, Venice, Florence, and Milan.

85 Letter from Charles W. Eliot to his mother, April 20, 1864, printed in James, Ibid., I, p. 129.
During his stay in Rome, Eliot received an offer from Francis B. Crowninshield, who was familiar with Eliot's work at Harvard and at the Lawrence Scientific School, to become superintendent of the Merrimack Company's textile mills in Lowell, Massachusetts. Eliot was offered a salary of $5,000, far more than he could get as a professor. The appointment also included the occupancy of a home. Acceptance of the offer, however, would mean the abandonment of education. After a week of deliberation Eliot came to a conclusion: "I declined Mr. Crowninshield's proposal, with the entire approval of my wife."\(^{86}\)

A few weeks later, while the family was staying in Vienna, Eliot received an offer from William B. Rogers, the president of the newly founded Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to become professor of chemistry. Eliot accepted the position:

The salary proposed was two thousand dollars. No students had yet been enrolled, and the whole undertaking was novel and evidently depended for success on the wisdom and personal influence of its head, Professor Rogers. I gladly accepted Professor Rogers' proposal, and returned to my house in Cambridge in season to join the new Faculty of the Institute of Technology in the last weeks of September.\(^{87}\)

Eliot's European experience proved to be very valuable to his understanding of the deficiencies of American education. His intent was not to go abroad and select the best European system for importation to the United States. Eliot was an


\(^{87}\) Ibid.
educational comparativist; his intent was to analyze the similarities and differences between European and American educational systems so as to establish a reasonable basis for educational reform in the United States. James stated that "He wanted his own country to emulate the quality and variety of instruction offered in the Continental universities, rather than to imitate their constitutions and adopt their rules."  

Later, when Eliot began to draft his educational reforms, he referred to European practices quite frequently to substantiate his reform measures. In a speech given by Eliot in 1888, he compared French school programs with American school programs. His purpose for the comparison was to illustrate the inferiority of the American program to the French. It wasn't an attempt to import the French system, but rather to present the deficiencies of the American system. Eliot presented reasons why importation of foreign systems would not work:

Everybody knows that foreign institutions of education cannot be imported; that a nation's educational institutions are strongly influenced by its political, ethical, and industrial conditions, and that the improvement of schools and colleges must necessarily be slow.

88 James, op.cit., I, p. 138.

He continued to state the utilitarian features of comparing systems of education:

It may, however, be justly inferred from this comparison of programmes that the condition of secondary schools in the United States is at present one of inferiority; that the country ought not to be satisfied with that condition, and indeed should strenuously exert itself to improve it, there being opportunity in American programmes for both condensation and enrichment.

Eliot selected the French system for comparison because:

It is the best of foreign programmes as a term of comparison, because France is socially a democratic country, politically a republic, and industrially a country whose chief reliance, in the strenuous competition to which its population is exposed within and without, is the intelligence and skill of its producing classes.

One reason for selecting the French system for comparison was its social and political similarities to the United States. Another reason was the quality of the French program of education. Eliot considered the French system to be more stimulating to students than the American system. Eliot presented an example to illustrate the qualities of the French system in stimulating a student's intelligence:

The French programme is decidedly the more substantial; that is to say, it calls for greater exertion on the part of the pupil than the American, introduces the children earlier to serious subjects, and is generally more interesting and more stimulating to the intelligence. For example, at eight years of age the French boy begins to study a foreign

90 Ibid.
91 Ibid., p. 234.
language, either English or German; the American boy begins to study a modern language five years later, at thirteen, when the best period for learning a foreign tongue is already past.

Eliot seemed to have been more impressed with the French system of education than the German system. He preferred the French system over the German system because the teachers in France were better qualified.93

Another practical application of Eliot's comparative analysis was to understand the mistakes made by European educational practices, so as not to repeat similar mistakes in the United States. For example, Eliot took the position that classical and scientific courses of study cannot coexist within the same institution of education. To substantiate his position Eliot cited two European failures:

Such a combination has been thoroughly tried in the Lycees of France, and has completely failed and been abandoned. In Germany it has seemed expedient to separate the two courses even during the school-boy period; and for the higher instruction of both systems entirely separate institutions have been found necessary.94

Eliot's study of European educational systems did indeed contribute to his understanding of pedagogy. By comparing European and American educational practices Eliot became more cognizant of the imperfections of American education. Soon

92Ibid.
93Ibid., p. 235.
after his return from Europe, Eliot began to draft reform measures for American education.

Professor of Chemistry at M.I.T.

Upon his return to the United States, Charles W. Eliot embarked on his new position as professor of chemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. M.I.T. was an institution of higher learning created to provide an education for those who were interested in the scientific professions. The curriculum was founded upon mathematics, physics, natural science, English, modern languages, and political science. The mission of the Institute was to prepare men for the scientific professions by giving them a broad grounding plus a certain technical proficiency.

M.I.T.'s original faculty consisted of ten members. Francis Storer, whom Eliot had worked with at Harvard, became Eliot's colleague in the chemistry department. President Rogers requested that Eliot and Storer establish a course of instruction in laboratory methods for teachers of chemistry so they could utilize laboratory techniques in their teaching of chemistry. To help them in their work, Eliot and Storer published two textbooks. One text was on general chemistry and the other on qualitative analysis, which was entitled Inorganic Chemistry. The text on qualitative analysis was a manual for teachers to aid them in preparing lessons for laboratory instruction. The text was a precedent in teaching chemistry in that it introduced
a more meaningful approach to teaching chemistry other than
the former method of memorizing rules and descriptions of
principles and processes. James stated that "The textbook
of 'Inorganic Chemistry' which he and Storer got out caused
a revolution in the teaching of elementary chemistry by
making it a laboratory subject in the United States." Eliot
was interested in reforming the methods of teaching chemistry,
in fact, he had turned from research in chemistry to work in
the teaching of the subject. During the next four years Eliot's
professional labors were given entirely to the new Institute,
organizing and building up the chemical department of M.I.T.

Eliot's work at M.I.T. kept him very busy, perhaps too
busy to notice his wife's tiring condition. However, in the
summer of 1866 Eliot became very concerned over his wife's
health after her collapse. Ellen Eliot's symptoms were diag­
nosed as tuberculosis. The situation was hopeless, for the
medical profession at that time did not know how to treat tuber­
culosis. It was assumed that a mild climate would be helpful;
therefore, for the next two years the family was constantly
changing residence to provide a suitable environment. The
family traveled to many places:

In the summer of 1866 my wife developed
symptoms of tuberculosis, and for two years
and a half a series of changes of residence
took place in the hope of finding a more
favorable climate than that of Cambridge...
During this interval the family spent a
year in Europe, trying the prescriptions of

95 James, op.cit., I, p. 164.
health-resort physicians; but the summer of 1868 found us in Brookline, and the winter of 1868-69 was passed in Boston.

It was during the summer of 1866 that the Eliots had their fourth child; Robert Eliot was born on July 8, 1866. Robert was the fourth son born into the Eliot household, of which one son, Francis, did not survive his first birthday.

In June, 1867 the whole family sailed for Europe. During their stay in southern France, Robert, the youngest of the Eliots fell ill and died on December 14, 1867. Indeed, these were difficult times for Eliot. James recalled this period in Eliot's life:

Those were heart-breaking weeks—for the mother, who was not strong enough to support the strain, and for the father, who had to watch his child go and his wife's strength decline.

The family returned home in the spring of 1868. There was nothing for Charles W. Eliot to do except arrange for his wife's comfort and resume his work. Upon returning to Boston, Eliot was elected to Harvard's Board of Overseers in July, 1868. Theodore Lyman, Eliot's cousin and intimate personal friend from childhood, was also elected to the Board of Overseers.

---

97 James, op.cit., I, p. 173.
98 The Board of Overseers and the Corporation comprised the governing bodies of Harvard College. The Board of Overseers consisted of Harvard's alumni. Membership to the Board of Overseers was based on electing those who had achieved recognition in their profession--business, law, medicine, politics, religion, or education. The Corporation consisted of the Board of Trustees and the president of the college.
As Eliot was beginning another year of teaching at M.I.T. in the autumn of 1868, the presidency of Harvard College was vacated by the resignation of Thomas Hill in September 30, 1868. Dr. Andrew P. Peabody became the acting president of Harvard. The procedure for electing a new president involved the two governing boards, the Board of Overseers and the Corporation, agreeing on one candidate. Since Eliot was an overseer, he would be involved in the election proceedings.

Throughout its history Harvard had two traditional requirements for election to the presidency. One was that the candidate be a clergyman or of a clerical mind, and the other was that he be an elderly person. However, many members of the Harvard community believed that traditions had to be overlooked for the sake of progress. What Harvard needed was not a conservative president, but an individual who possessed new ideas and who would be able to lead Harvard into the 20th century. Since other American universities were making advances, Harvard did not want to be left behind. American universities were witnessing new times, and Morison stated:

There were plenty of rival universities ready to carry the caduceus, if Harvard slowed up or stumbled. Yale already had a graduate school, and better scientific instruction than Harvard; James McCosh, that energetic Scots metaphysician, had just been made President of Princeton; Frederick A.P. Barnard was ready to make Columbia into a great university... and of the newer universities, Cornell under Andrew D. White and the state universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, and California were coming along rapidly, unhampered by age, tradition, and vested interests in making themselves serviceable to the new era.

99 Morison, op.cit., p. 323.
The election of Harvard's president was indeed a crucial one for the future of Harvard College. Since traditions were being considered to be put aside, there developed a great deal of controversy among the traditional sector. Thus, the election proceedings extended over half a year.

During the interim Eliot's articles on "The New Education; Its Organization" were published in the February and March, 1869 issues of the Atlantic Monthly. The articles expressed Eliot's desire to reorganize American education. He wanted to expand education into preparing individuals for practical and useful pursuits, and he believed that the classical curriculum was too limited in scope to offer training in practical fields. Eliot called for a scientific curriculum which should be separate from the classical curriculum. Eliot commented that colleges which had carried on a scientific and classical course within the same institution had failed. According to Eliot the most promising method of providing scientific education was that of an independent institution such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Eliot's articles coincided with the publication of a report prepared by a committee of the Board of Overseers. The committee report expressed several reforms that were similar to the reforms that Eliot advocated in his articles. In both publications there was a call for expanding the scientific

---

curriculum, broadening the elective system, and doing away with the prescribed course of studies. Eliot's reform measures appeared to have impressed the governing boards, for during a Board of Overseers meeting, Eliot was called out of the conference room by the Reverend George Putnam, one of the Harvard Fellows, who had come to inform Eliot that the Corporation had elected him for the presidency. William A. Richardson, member of the Board of Overseers during the election proceedings, remarked that the Atlantic Monthly articles "unmistakingly marked their author as the man for the presidency."\(^{101}\) Richardson added that "I have always thought that those articles contributed largely, if not to his nomination, at least to his ultimate confirmation by the Board of Overseers."\(^{102}\) By having his articles published at such an appropriate time it appeared that Eliot was seeking the presidency. However, the content of the articles were such a radical departure from Harvard tradition, and if Eliot was seeking the presidency, he was doing it with a low percentage attempt. James commented on this:

> It has been said that the articles brought Eliot into prominence as a candidate; per contra, that they were a proof of his courage because they nearly ruined his chances of election. The only thing that is certain is that he offered the articles to the Atlantic shortly before November 11, 1868. President Hill's resignation had been announced six

\(^{101}\)William A. Richardson, "How President Eliot was Elected," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, VII (June 1899), 536.  
\(^{102}\)Ibid.
weeks before. But I am advised that the old correspondence files of the Atlantic indicate that the articles were already partly if not wholly written out. If such was the fact, there seems little reason to suppose that Eliot wrote them with any thought of their improving or hurting his chances of being elected to the Presidency. In November it was to have been expected that a president would be chosen before "The New Education" appeared in print. The articles dealt with a subject that was of vital interest at the "Tech," namely, technical education. Had Eliot wanted to impress the Harvard world by publishing an educational paper, he should have chosen a different subject.\footnote{James, op.cit., I, pp. 196-197.}

Eliot stated that "I had published in the Atlantic Monthly two articles entitled 'The New Education'; so that my opinions about education, which were at that time rather novel in eastern Massachusetts, were accessible in print to all the members of the Board."\footnote{Eliot, "President Eliot's Own Story," op.cit., p. 233.} Eliot did not mention whether his intent was to acquaint the members of the governing boards with his educational ideas so as to impress them for the presidency; or, since he had recently become a member of the Board of Overseers, it was his duty to let others know of his educational intentions. To spread more light on Eliot's intentions, James presented a discussion between Eliot and Francis Parkman, one of the members of the Board of Overseers:

Eliot met Francis Parkman on the street one day. The historian was an old family friend, also a fellow member of the Board. Their talk ran thus: "I suppose you ought to understand that I was in favor of another candidate for the Presidency"--and Parkman named his candidate (Ephriam Gurney). Mr. Eliot at once said: "He
was my candidate; he is my friend and I wanted him to be President. I have never sought the nomination; I don't want it. I was too near President James Walker during his administration, I saw enough of the troubles of Dr. Hill during his presidency, not to be aware of the burdens of that office, and I don't care to assume them. I am content with my present position and in the saddened state of my household I have no thought of seeking another."\textsuperscript{105}

After conferring with President Emeritus James Walker and his close friend, Theodore Lyman, Eliot accepted the Corporation's decision. On March 12, 1869, Eliot was formally elected by the Corporation.

By this time Ellen Eliot's condition had worsened. James described the final moments of her life: "His wife was conscious and could still be spoken to. When he told her what had happened, she understood and whispered, 'that is a big hole for my boy's boots to fill.' Then--the next day--she was gone."\textsuperscript{106} In the midst of Eliot becoming president of Harvard, his wife died on March 13, 1869.

The Corporation's decision was sent to the overseers for their consent.\textsuperscript{107} The overseers, however, did not confirm the Corporation's decision by the necessary two-thirds vote. On April 21 the Board of Overseers returned Eliot's nomination to the Corporation. The opposition to Eliot's nomination

\textsuperscript{105}James, op.cit., I, pp. 198-99.  
\textsuperscript{106}Ibid., p. 195.  
\textsuperscript{107}The finalization for electing Harvard's president had to meet the approval of both the governing boards. The Board of Overseers had to approve by a two-thirds majority.
stemmed from those members of the faculty who feared his reform ideas. Faculty members who opposed Eliot believed that he would abandon the classics for the sciences. Morison mentioned the opposing viewpoints:

The fact that Eliot was not a clergyman troubled nobody, for the clerical tradition had been broken by Quincy's election; and although Everett, Sparks, Walker, and Hill had been Unitarian ministers at one time in their lives, no one since Kirkland had been called from the pulpit to Harvard. Yet there was consternation in the College Faculty (as the last surviving member of it told me) at the thought of Eliot; the classicists feared him...Others represented that Eliot would turn Harvard into a rival institute of technology.

In 1906 Adams recalled the nomination of Eliot to have been a new departure for the university. Strange as it may appear in 1906, supporters of Eliot had to gather all the assistance possible to get him elected. One of his supporters on the Board of Overseers was Theodore Lyman who was well aware of his cousin's administrative capabilities, and he "contributed efficiently towards securing favorable action on the nomination." The following is Adams's recollection of Eliot's nomination:

His [Theodore Lyman] assistance, too, was needed; for, strange as it now seems in view of what has since occurred, the choice of President Eliot was at the time by no means unopposed. It constituted in fact a new departure for the University, entered upon with hesitation and, at the time, viewed in many

108 Morison, op.cit., p. 327.
and influential quarters with grave distrust. The nomination was ventured upon by the Corporation only as a last resort, and in a spirit close approaching desperation,—the result of an instinctive conviction, slowly and reluctantly reached, that the old order of things was gone,—a radical organic change had come about in the community and body politic.  

**Appointed as President of Harvard**

At first, the overseers were responsive to the concerns of the faculty; but after reviewing Eliot's articles, the overseers were convinced that Eliot's intention was not for the abolishment of classical learning. The Corporation remained unanimous on Eliot's nomination, and once again ventured to submit Eliot's nomination to the overseers. On May 19 the overseers finally voted to accept the Corporation's decision, and Eliot became the twenty-second president of Harvard.

Once Eliot's appointment to the presidency was finalized, he immediately commenced on carrying out his duties. "When my election as President had been completed—unexpectedly to me— I turned at once to the study of the functions of the President and of the needs of Harvard University, and in a few weeks had become absorbed in the new duties."  

---
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At the age of thirty-five, Eliot was embarking on a new life cycle. He had been through a great deal of anxiety. He had married, and there had been four children. He had sat by the deathbeds of two of his children, and then with a broken heart, he had watched his wife's long illness and had lost her too. Several years prior he was turned down for the Rumford Professorship, which he really wanted, and uncertain of his future Eliot journeyed to Europe. He was convinced of pursuing a career in education, even in light of the extra burdens he had to carry when his parents went bankrupt. He was dedicated to education; and if situations arose that beckoned him away from education, he persevered that much harder. Eliot was not going to surrender his chosen profession of education.

James analyzed Eliot's life during 1869:

It is seldom that the path of a man's life crosses so steep and rough a ridge as did Eliot's in 1869. His thirty-fifth birthday fell on the 20th of March, a week after his wife's death and at the moment when the opposition to his election was becoming apparent. If he reviewed his situation on that day, it must have seemed to him as though he had lived through a full cycle of one existence and as if whatever might be ahead would be like another life entirely, with its own difficult beginning and its own unpredictable course and end.

Eliot commenced on a long tenure as president of Harvard, and he was destined to become one of the leading educational reformers in the United States.

Charles W. Eliot was formally inaugurated as president of Harvard on October 19, 1869. In September he had moved with his two sons into the president's house on Quincy Street, where he subsequently lived for forty years. Since his election to the presidency in May, he worked day and evening steadily and intensely. His long working hours could have resulted in physical collapse, but he was saved from physical breakdown by two practices. Eliot recalled these two practices:

As I look back on the years which succeeded my election to the Presidency of Harvard, I see that I was probably saved from physical breakdown by two practices, one of which I set up immediately in the summer of 1869, and the other of which I adopted in the summer of 1871. The first was the practice of riding horseback every day, usually in the afternoon; and the second was cruising in summer along the coast of New England in a small sloop of my own, and camping in tents during a part of each summer on the seashore.

---

Higher Education During the Post Civil War Era

Higher education at the time of Eliot's nomination had already witnessed several significant changes. In 1861, through the leadership of Matthew Vassar and John Howard Raymond, Vassar College was founded. The founding of this institution of higher learning for women established the collegiate rights of American women. Another significant event that occurred in 1861 was the establishment of graduate studies at Yale. Yale became the first American institution of higher learning to offer a Ph.D. in the arts and sciences. Perhaps the most important factor contributing to the growth of American higher learning occurred in 1862 when the Morrill Act was legislated. Under this legislation the federal government provided land for states to develop institutions with a popular and practical orientation, the land-grant colleges. These were early indications of reforms that were to fully change the conduct of American higher education in the post Civil War period.

It was during the post Civil War period that American higher learning embarked on a new era. Many new institutions of higher learning were founded during the new era. The founding of many of these new institutions was made possible

---

2Rudolph, *op.cit.*, p. 244.

3Rudolph and Veysey refer to the period between 1865-1900 as the "new era" in American higher education.
by funds from government, which was the case with the land-grant colleges, and endowments from philanthropists such as Ezra Cornell, Johns Hopkins, John Purdue, and John D. Rockefeller. The newly established state and private institutions "responded to the needs and the demands of a society that was experiencing an increase in material wealth, in the standard of living, in industrialization and urbanization... They recognized that a new society needed new agencies of instruction, cohesion, and control." One of the most fundamental principles of higher education during the new era was utilitarianism, i.e., how can institutions of higher education make themselves serviceable to America's growth. Veysey stated that "During the ten years after 1865, almost every visible change in the pattern of American higher education lay in the directions of concessions to the utilitarian type of demand for reform." As for the traditional institutions of higher learning, it became evident that "the time had come when the old-time colleges would have to decide whether they would be instruments of the past or of the future, and how they would meet the new imperative needs of an expanding industrial nation and of a developing national power."

4 Rudolph, op. cit., p. 245.
5 Veysey, op. cit., p. 60.
6 Ibid., pp. 241-42.
To bring about reform, new institutions as well as traditional institutions of higher learning hired the services of energetic and innovative administrators. To be sure, Eliot was not an isolated figure in bringing about a transformation of American higher education. Eliot, however, more than any other leader stood out as the most influential reformer of the new era. Veysey stated: "When Eliot was chosen president of Harvard in 1869, the event announced that a new era in American higher education was truly at hand." 7 Eliot was among a group of young university presidents who were destined to reform American higher education. Other than Eliot, the most notable reformer was Andrew D. White who in 1868 was installed as president of Cornell. In his inaugural address, White called for a union between liberal and practical instruction and resistance to any denominational controls. Eliot's views were similarly nonsectarian, and Hawkins mentioned how Eliot's nonsectarian views contributed to Harvard's national prominence:

Eliot's nonsectarian ideal helped win for Harvard a national stature and constituency suitable to its position as the country's oldest and richest university. Catholics, Jews, Mormons, Swedenborgians, agnostics, and atheists studied at Harvard, certain that no official creed would hinder their religious or intellectual pursuits. 8

7 Ibid., p. 248.
Cornell and Harvard became model institutions for others to follow. Veysey acknowledged that these institutions "served as two pilot models for the transformation of American undergraduate education. Reform-minded individuals on other campuses looked to Eliot and to White for guidance and inspiration." Leaders such as James B. Angell of the University of Michigan, Daniel C. Gilman of Johns Hopkins, Frederick A.P. Barnard of Columbia, and Clark University's G. Stanley Hall played major roles in reforming American higher education. Brubacher cited several common attributes of these leaders:

All of these men had their basic con­ceptions shaped in one way or another by firsthand experience with European universi­ties. All of them were stimulated by this experience to advocate a "New Education" for America. And all of them were agreed upon the vital necessity of building real univer­sities in America which would offer better facilities for professional training and for advanced graduate instruction in the arts and sciences.

According to James the most contributing factor to the reform of American higher learning during the new era was the work of great leaders:

The inauguration of an American experiment in university-building in some one of the older and richer communities awaited only the men to direct it. It was not the place that mattered most. The right leaders might have done the work in any one of several institutions. If somebody like the Reverend Andrew

---

9Veysey, op.cit., p. 81.
10Brubacher and Rudy, op.cit., p. 178.
Peabody had presided over Harvard during the seventies in place of young C.W. Eliot, and if D.C. Gilman had been made President of Yale instead of Noah Porter in 1871, the first American university would have grown up in New Haven instead of in Cambridge.

These reformers aspired to develop the new university which displayed the land-grant idea of practical vocationalism, the spirit of scholarship, science, and technology. The new movement incorporated vocational and technical training as legitimate features of higher learning. Rudolph expressed the new collegiate appearance:

Vocational and technical education had become a legitimate function of American higher education, and everywhere the idea of going to college was being liberated from the classbound, classical-bound traditions which for so long had defined the American collegiate experience.

When Eliot took office as Harvard's president in 1869, the college had not changed much from his days as tutor in the 1850's. The curriculum had not changed from its classical tradition, and students were still shackled to a required system of courses. There was no graduate school to speak of, nor was there any unification between the medical, law, mining, and divinity schools. An article in the Harvard Advocate reviewed the condition of Harvard before Eliot's administration:

In 1869, Harvard was a New England parson. The pride of its laughable and admirable stock honestly blinded it, so it stuck close to the faults and virtues of good old colony times... It was elegant, godly, bigoted, and thoroughly

11 James, op.cit., I, p. 224.
12 Rudolph, op.cit., p. 263.
learned in the intellectual trinity, Greek, Latin, and mathematics.

Reforms at Harvard

Eliot went to work immediately to improve Harvard's appearance. Eliot's first action was to strengthen the faculty. He strengthened the faculty by increasing salaries, by setting scholars free from the traditional dull routine, and by seeking unusual men from all over America and even in Europe. By utilizing new endowments and newly increased tuition fees, the salaries of professors were raised from $3,000 to $4,000. By raising the salary to $4,000, which was very generous at a time when other major institutions were paying well below $3,000, Eliot had placed Harvard in a position to get almost any man it wanted in America. The increase in salary "contributed greatly to the dramatic rise of Harvard to its eminent position." Seven new

13"The Week" President Eliot, Harvard Advocate, March 6, 1894, 82.


15The significant raise in pay for professors was not felt by assistant professors whose salary was raised to $2,000 (a rise of only $150), and tutors didn't fare well at all for their salary remained at $1,000. Tuition fees were hiked from $104 to $150.

16Earnest, loc. cit.

professorships were immediately created, and by the time Eliot submitted his second annual report, in the fall of 1871, a total of thirteen new professorships had been created. The men appointed by Eliot during his first five years included John Trowbridge, William James, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., Charles Eliot Norton, and George Herbert Palmer, and all of them became prominent scholars.

By 1888 Harvard consisted of a very distinguished faculty. In his autobiography W.E.B. DuBois, who attended Harvard during the late nineteenth century, praised Harvard's faculty: "Seldom, if ever has any American university had such a galaxy of great men and fine teachers as Harvard in the decade between 1885 and 1895."

In terms of intellectual achievement Eliot's Harvard received high recognition:

A variety of statistical indicators confirmed the general impression that Eliot's Harvard had become "the foremost of American universities." A detailed study of the relative position of different American universities as reflected by the numbers listed in American Men of Science as significant figures in their fields placed Harvard far ahead of any other school when judged both by the absolute number of faculty so listed, and also, by the criterion

---

18 James, op. cit., pp. 252-57. James reviewed the new professorships that were initiated by Eliot.

of department standing. 20

The aspect of Harvard to which Eliot turned his most persistent attention during the first years of his presidency was the quality of the established professional schools. He criticized the inadequate training that was given to the preparation of lawyers, physicians, and ministers. 21 Eliot felt that the professional schools lacked proper standards. One point of criticism was the lack of requiring a preliminary degree for entrance to the professional schools. Thus, Eliot set out to elevate the three main professional schools until they all required a bachelor's degree for admission. The new standard served two purposes: it provided society with better-educated practitioners, and it strengthened the college by channeling through it those who planned to enter the professions.

Another aspect that Eliot was concerned with was the lack of adequate preparation and testing within the professional schools. In his Annual Report of 1869-70 President Eliot asserted that the medical school was the worst equipped

---


The medical school provided a two year preparatory course for its students, and at the termination of a student's medical training he underwent an oral examination covering nine subjects which lasted for an hour and a half. If he passed five of the subjects, he was graduated. Eliot found this procedure to be inadequate for training medical practitioners, and he called for higher standards of medical education. The following reforms were established: 1) baccalaureate degree was required for entrance; 2) a progressive course of three, and eventually four years was adopted; 3) students had to pass an examination each year in order to move to the next year's studies; and, 4) clinical work was made the rule.

To rejuvenate the law school Eliot brought in a brilliant former student as dean, Christopher Columbus Langdell. Langdell was instrumental in implementing new teaching methodologies in preparing lawyers such as the case method of study.

An important consideration of Eliot's involvement with the professional schools was his desire to organize and knit together the different schools to form a modern university. Eliot praised the organizational aspects of other societal institutions, and he called for importing some of these practices into the university. In his inaugural address Eliot stated that "The principle of divided and subordinate responsibilities, which rules in government bureaus, in manufactories,
and all great companies, which makes a modern army a possibility, must be applied in the University."\textsuperscript{23}

Among the actions taken for reorganizing Harvard was the appointment of deanships. In February, 1870 the office of Dean of the College was created; the purpose of this office was to lighten the president's burdens. Ephriam Gurney was appointed to fill this office, and he assumed all disciplinary duties and some others which, together, had previously consumed over half of the president's time. Deanships were also established in every department of the university, and it allowed more time for the president to work on administrative duties. The selecting of deans was completely in the hands of the president. Eliot had established a power hierarchy where he maintained control. Along with his obedient deans, the president was able to keep a firm grip on the doings of the professional schools. Other organizational developments that Eliot initiated included the establishment of a university calendar governing all departments, and an overhauling of the university statutes—a revision that gradually cut forty pages of rules down to a booklet of five pages. Perhaps Eliot's most important administrative change was his practice of presiding over the meetings of the faculties of every department. During his first year he

presided at thirty-four meetings of the Corporation, forty-five of the college faculty, and thirty-eight of those held by the smaller faculties of the various professional schools. It was through this means that he unified the heterogenous units into a university and brought his influence to bear on each of them.

From the first year of his presidency Eliot sought to promote graduate work. Eliot criticized the poor condition of graduate studies in American institutions of higher learning, and the thought of Harvard not having the facilities for advanced training in the arts and sciences disturbed Eliot. After receiving their first degree, Harvard men who wanted further training had to study abroad. He believed that there was a demand for instruction that was higher than that of the ordinary college course, and yet different from that of the law, medical, and theological schools. Thus, in 1872 the graduate department was organized with courses leading to the degrees of Master of Arts, Doctor of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy. In 1890 the graduate department became a separate Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The graduate school was Eliot's creation, and Morison acknowledged that "The establishment of the Graduate School was one of Eliot's most vital and far-reaching reforms."  


25 Morison, op.cit., p. 335.
Harvard, however, was not the premier center for graduate studies in the United States. Since Yale and Johns Hopkins had more funds and a head start on Harvard, they were leading the way in graduate studies. It took some time for Harvard to outrival its competitors, but by 1900 Harvard became the premier American Ph.D. mill. Rudolph contended that "under Eliot's leadership Harvard became a university, in the end surpassing even Johns Hopkins in the strength of its graduate work in the arts and sciences."  

Eliot's contributions to the reform of Harvard was enormous. He was responsible for "the transformation of an old-fashioned college loosely affiliated with some professional schools into a modern university." By the end of Eliot's administration every side of the university had blossomed. The student body had increased from 1,000 to 4,000 students; the faculty was enlarged from 60 to 600; the university was offering four times as many courses as had been offered in 1870; Harvard's endowment had grown from $2,500,000 to $20,000,000. These quantitative terms hardly do justice to the scope of Harvard's internal changes, the improvements in

26 Ibid., p. 336.
27 Rudolph, op.cit., p. 291.
28 Earnest, op.cit., p. 158.
29 Other areas of growth within the university included the significant advances made by the college, as well as the schools of law, medicine, dentistry, and theology; the museums of comparative zoology, geology, and ethnology came into being under Eliot's administration; other successes included the Bussey Institution of agriculture and horticulture, the Arnold Arboretum, Botanic Garden, and the Astronomical Observatory.
The Nation praised Eliot for his efforts in liberalizing Harvard's environment:

Harvard has been converted from a sort of high school devoted largely to preparing men for the ministry into a modern university in which almost everything teachable is taught, and in which the real student is allowed to pick and choose among the now so numerous sources of human knowledge.

Charles Dunbar, the distinguished Harvard economist, mentioned how Eliot would be remembered in the history of Harvard: "But after all is said, in the long list of the makers and benefactors of Harvard, no name after that of the Founder is yet engraved so deeply on this enduring monument as that of Charles William Eliot." 31

Influence on American Education

Eliot's impact on the conduct of American higher education became evident soon after his inauguration as Harvard's president. Earnest stated that "The Harvard of Eliot's first decade as president became probably the most vital force in American college education." 32 Arthur T. Hadley, president

30 "President Eliot," Nation, LVIII (June 14, 1894), 442.
32 Earnest, op. cit., p. 159.
of Yale, also mentioned Eliot's immediate influence on American higher education: "It was President Eliot who in the decade from 1870 to 1880, gave the strongest impulse to a general forward movement, not at Harvard alone, but everywhere else."\(^{33}\)

Eliot's Harvard became a showcase for American institutions of higher learning. Harvard's influence on other institutions of higher learning in the United States was mentioned by Morison:

One after the other, the greater universities of the country followed the reforms that Harvard had adopted; it was clear by the middle nineties that the Harvard of Eliot, instead of striking off on an individual line toward Germany, had set new standards for higher education in America.\(^{33}\)

In the history of American education Eliot stands out as a monumental figure. The Nation reported: "no history of American university education will ever be written in which Mr. Eliot will not figure as its real founder, as the man to whom it owed its renaissance after two centuries of mediaeval bondage."\(^{35}\) The Outlook stated: "President Eliot is probably the most potent personal force that has ever affected American education."\(^{36}\)


\(^{34}\) Morison, op. cit., p. 397.

\(^{35}\) "President Eliot," Nation, LVIII (June 14, 1894), 442.

\(^{36}\) "President Eliot on Educational Reform," Outlook LX (October 29, 1898), 535.
The American public became acquainted with Eliot's intentions for American education through his Atlantic Monthly articles, his inaugural address,\(^{37}\) and his numerous educational essays that appeared in national journals. The writings by Eliot on education proved to be very influential. He was credited with being one of the pioneers in making literary work on education worthy. The Outlook praised Eliot's literary achievements on education:

> The literature of education is rapidly becoming worthy of its subject. The dull, jejune, homiletic treatises of former days have now given way to scholarly, virile, and practical discussions of this great phase of human interest and activity. Americans may well be proud of the fact that the writings of their countrymen are just now the most effective contributions to clearness of educational thought and to improvement of educational practice. In the forefront of students and administration of education stands the dignified and courageous figure of the President of our oldest university.\(^{38}\)

An important concern of Eliot's educational writings was to establish a philosophical foundation for the American university. Eliot contended that higher learning in the United States must relate to the American social order. In several of his educational essays Eliot compared European practices with American educational practices. Eliot stated in his inaugural address that "This University,[Harvard], though rich among

\(^{37}\)Nathan Pusey, Harvard's president emeritus, stated, "President Eliot's inaugural is surely one of the very great addresses in the literature of American higher education." In A Turning Point in Higher Education, p. xii.

\(^{38}\)"President Eliot on Educational Reform," loc.cit.
American colleges, is very poor in comparison with the
great universities of Europe."\(^{39}\) This did not mean that
Eliot advocated importation of European systems. He made
it perfectly clear that the cultivation of an American
system of higher learning must be an outgrowth of American
social and political concerns. The problem of creating a
ture American university was elaborated by Eliot in his
Atlantic Monthly article:

> The American university has not yet
grown out of the soil....A university, in
any worthy sense of the term, must grow
from seed. It cannot be transplanted
from England or Germany in full leaf and
bearing. It cannot be run up, like a
cotton-mill, in six months, to meet a
quick demand. Neither can it be created
by an energetic use of the inspired edi­
torial, the advertising circular, and the
frequent telegram. Numbers do not consti­
tute it, and no money can make it before
its time....When the American university
appears, it will not be a copy of foreign
institutions, or a hot-bed plant, but the
slow and natural outgrowth of American
social and political habits, and an ex­
pression of the average aims and ambitions
of the better educated classes. The
American college is an institution without
a parallel; the American university will be
equally original.\(^{40}\)

Eliot believed that American universities should be re­
lated to the normal life of the American nation. He set out
to inform the American public of the relationship between
higher learning and American democratic life. He proposed an

\(^{39}\)Fusey, op. cit., p. 28.
aristocracy, not of family, class, or inherited wealth, but of the able and educated. An important function of the American university was to cultivate an intellectual aristocracy to serve democracy. Pusey pointed out the democratic concern of Eliot:

The purpose of education, he held, was to prepare men for the service of democracy. He believed in enterprise and education, a high level of general education for all and a superior—and later specialized—education to prepare the informed experts needed as an indispensable ingredient in a democratic society.41

The university that Eliot advocated was to provide the community with two functions: "First, it will make a rich return of learning, poetry, and piety. Secondly, it will foster the sense of public duty,—that great virtue which makes republics possible."42 Thus, one of Eliot's concerns was to bring the American university closer to the community. Eliot's achievement in this area was praised by Arthur T. Hadley:

To him more than any other man... America owes it that her system of higher education is no longer a thing apart by itself, a sort of "Ark of the Covenant" too sacred to be touched, but a normal part of the life of the nation as a whole.43

41 Pusey, op.cit., introduction, p.x.
42 Ibid., p. 29.
43 Quoted in James, op.cit., II, pp. 172-73.
A reoccurring item in Eliot's educational treatises was the relationship between the American university and utilitarianism. In "The New Education" Eliot commenced by describing the perplexity of a father looking about for a practical education for his son, one that would prepare the young man for a resource-laden country. Eliot distinguished between two types of learning that must be provided in American institutions of higher learning. To provide for utilitarian purposes Eliot prescribed a polytechnic school:

The student in a polytechnic school has a practical end constantly in view; he is training his faculties with the express object of making himself a better manufacturer, engineer, or teacher; he is studying the processes of nature, in order afterwards to turn them to human uses and his own profit.

To be sure, Eliot did not contend that a university should only serve utilitarian goals. This becomes clear when Eliot presented the function of the university college. He argued that one thing the college was not: it was not practical or utilitarian. The college should be the center of higher learning in society and should not be dictated by society's practical needs. Eliot made the distinction between the polytechnic school and the college:

The fact is, that the whole tone and spirit of a good college ought to be different in kind from that of a good polytechnic or scientific school. In the college, the

desire for the broadest culture, for the best formation and information of the mind, the enthusiastic study of subjects for the love of learning and research for their own sake, should be the dominant ideas. 

For both technical schools and colleges, Eliot's ideal curriculum combined an initial core of required studies with freedom in the later years for the student to choose a specialty.

To several members of the Harvard community, especially the classicists, Eliot represented a threat. They were critical of his radical ideas, and were under the impression that he intended to replace the classics with science. Eliot's inaugural address, however, extinguished such thoughts. His opening remarks were aimed at doing away with academic antagonisms:

The endless controversies whether language, philosophy, mathematics, or science supplies the best mental training, whether general education should be chiefly literary or chiefly scientific, have no practical lesson for us today. This University recognizes no real antagonism between literature and science, and consents to no such narrow alternatives as mathematics or classics, science or metaphysics. We would have them all, and at their best.

A university to Eliot was an inclusive, elevated teaching institution, which also preserved and increased knowledge. The university was to serve and cultivate every possible form of learning. Eliot remarked that "no subject of human inquiry can be out of place in the programme of a real

\[46\] Ibid., p. 214.
\[47\] Pusey, op. cit., p. 1.
In his essay, "The Aims of the Higher Education," Eliot quoted Cornell's dictum, "I would found an institution in which any one may study anything. Nothing short of this is the true aim of a university in teaching. It should cover the whole field of human knowledge." There were some limitations to Eliot's "anyone may study anything." Eliot mentioned in his inaugural address that anyone should have the opportunity to attend Harvard, both rich and poor. However, this did not include women:

The Corporation will not receive women as students into the College proper, nor into any school whose discipline requires residence near the school. The difficulties involved in a common residence of hundreds of young men and women of immature character and marriageable age are very grave.

The idea of studying anything also had its limitations. Eliot considered studies in manual training and athletics as being out of place in the program of a real university. Eliot contended that manual labor should be genuine; it should be practical "on a farm, or in a shop, where the

---


49 Andrew D. White who was the president of Cornell stated "I would found an institution where any person can find instruction in any study." In Walter P. Rogers, Andrew D. White and the Modern University (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1942), p. 47.


51 Pusey, op. cit., p. 17.

52 Eliot's views concerning athletics will be taken up in Chapter V.
primary object is to produce profitably and make money, not to teach." A strong argument can be made against Eliot's reasoning. If manual training should be made genuine, then why not have scientific and professional training be genuine as well. To be consistent with Eliot's reasoning, it would be appropriate to have students of engineering, medicine, and law practice in an office, hospital, and court. Eliot was not too clear on what constitutes university studies and what doesn't.

Eliot was criticized for his domineering manner. At times he was very dogmatic and did things as he saw fit. When it came to appointing new faculty members Eliot took it upon himself to select candidates without conferring with the faculty. When Eliot was attempting to reform the medical school, he came up against Dr. Henry J. Bigelow, the chief power at the medical school. A very interesting confrontation developed between Eliot and Bigelow. Hawkins reported this confrontation in his text:

> How was it, Bigelow asked one evening, "that this Faculty has gone on for eighty years managing its own affairs and doing it well, ... and now, within three or four months, it is proposed to change all our modes of carrying on the School...?" Eliot's bland reply has been immortalized in academic lore: "I can answer Dr. Bigelow's question very easily: there is a new President."

---


In any case, Eliot's dogmatism was very practical at the time, for it got things done. Eliot wanted to establish a liberal academic environment at Harvard as quickly as possible, even if it meant being dictatorial; and indeed, Eliot's Harvard became to be regarded as the most liberal institution of higher learning in the United States. Earnest extolled Harvard's liberal environment and attributed it to Eliot's influence: "When he retired in 1909, Harvard was the great, indigenous university he [Eliot] had envisioned; it was rich and, to a degree unknown elsewhere in America, it was free."\(^{55}\)

Eliot's conception of liberty in education was to provide an atmosphere of academic freedom of individual interests. Eliot remarked that a university of liberal arts and sciences must give its students three things:

1. Freedom in choice of studies.
2. Opportunity to win academic distinction in single subjects or special lines of study.
3. A discipline which distinctly imposes on each individual the responsibility of forming his own habits and guiding his own conduct.\(^{56}\)

Eliot declared that American higher learning had not given sufficient account to individual traits. According to Eliot, the highest development of one's own peculiar faculty was the only prudent course for the individual. The main thrust behind Harvard's liberation from the classical


curriculum of required courses was Eliot's accomplishment in establishing an elective program of studies.\textsuperscript{57} The elective program was designed to allow the student to choose a course of study that suited his individual capabilities. The elective system was to liberate the teacher as well as the student. This was emphasized in Eliot's inaugural address:

\begin{quote}
The elective system fosters scholarship, because it gives free play to natural preferences and inborn aptitudes, makes possible enthusiasm for a chosen work, relieves the professor and the ardent disciple of the pressure of a body of students who are compelled to an unwelcome task.
\end{quote}

The intent of the elective system was to stimulate and motivate the student to aspire to his individual interests.

The elective system did not come into being all at once; it was accomplished slowly, step by step. In 1872 all subject requirements for seniors were abolished, and in 1879 all subject requirements for juniors were eliminated. The sophomores were liberated from required courses in 1884, and in 1885 subject requirements were reduced for freshmen. By 1894 a Harvard freshman's only required courses were rhetoric and

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{57}Charles F. Dunbar, "President Eliot's Administration," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, II (June 1894), 451: The development of the elective system was seriously undertaken in 1865, and since 1867 not far from one half of the work of the three upper classes had been elective; but the income of the College was scanty, and the reform, if it were to be complete, must be costly. The advance was slow, therefore, and Harvard plainly waited for some event which should enable her to pursue confidently the path on which she had entered.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{58}Pusey, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 11.
\end{quote}
modern language; in 1895 the modern language requirement was dropped.

A result of the elective system was a broader curriculum. New courses were offered in the social sciences and natural sciences to enhance intellectual pursuits. In 1874 courses in the fine arts were introduced for the first time, and the college became a center for the arts with the construction of the Fogg Art Museum and the Sanders Theatre.

The elective system contributed enormously to Harvard's growth and success. In his address delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge, Massachusetts on June 25, 1891, William W. Goodwin, Eliot Professor of Greek Literature acknowledged the great change and progress that Harvard had made in the past forty years; Goodwin believed that the elective system was responsible for Harvard's progress:

This great change in the College is chiefly the result of the elective system of studies...It gave a great, even an unexpected, stimulus to freedom of every kind both in teaching and in studying.

Goodwin went on to mention that the chief merit of the elective system was "not that it lets students study what they like and avoid what they dislike, but that it opens to all a higher and wider range of study in every field; in short it has made really high scholarship possible."  


60Ibid., p. 14.
Other than the abolishment of required courses, another liberating feature of the elective system was the elimination of compulsory class attendance. Students were no longer held to compulsory attendance. Eliot believed that by the age of eighteen a student should be responsible enough to choose and attend classes without imposing restrictions. Eliot's liberalism regarding attendance proved to be too euphoric for some students. Many students neglected to attend classes and waited until the end of the term to cram for final examinations. This aspect of liberalism came under heavy criticism when a student's father discovered that his son was vacationing in Havana while being registered at Harvard.\(^6^1\) Shortly after this incident daily attendance checks were conducted in classes.

Harvard's experiment with the elective system attracted national attention. A determined Old Guard, consisting of leaders of the smaller denominational colleges, but including presidents of larger institutions as well, fought a vigorous battle in defence of the old order. Clergymen-presidents of an evangelical frame of mind fought hard against Eliot's system as making for impiety, secularism, and excessive scientism.\(^6^2\) They saw the emerging American university as a menace to all the values they held dear. Traditionalists such as Presidents Noah Porter of Yale and James McCosh of Princeton defended the old order against Eliot's electivism. Presidents Franklin

\(^{6^1}\)Morison, op.cit., pp. 368-69.

Carter of Williams and Alexander Winchell of Syracuse joined in to criticize Eliot's position.

Even with its critics, the elective system had an enormous influence on the conduct of American higher learning. James mentioned that the elective system "was being applied in other colleges all over the country. In fact, it was becoming the fashion of the day in higher education." According to Morison, "no principle in American higher education has ever spread so rapidly or gone so deep as did the elective principle."

By 1895 Harvard with its year of required rhetoric and Cornell with its year of required physical training and hygiene were the most elective institutions of higher learning. Columbia, Stanford, William and Mary, and many of the state universities were close behind with offering courses that were about seventy percent elective. Rudolph categorized institutions of higher learning according to their degree of accepting the elective principle:

The large state universities of the Midwest and West, with their commitment to public service and to learning, were more friendly than any other group of institutions to the elective principle. Next were the large, privately endowed universities, which were both wealthy enough and sufficiently oriented to larger national purposes to recognize election as essential to the spirit of a dynamic institution of learning. The women's colleges were perhaps marginal;

---
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...The least elective institutions of all were the state universities of the South, which were in the grasp of poverty, and the small colleges of New England and their counterparts elsewhere, which were in the grasp of the past and of social, economic, and religious interests for whom the past was useful.

Practically every institution of higher learning in the United States was affected by the elective principle to some degree. Even McCosh's Princeton instituted several elective courses; and, the traditional New England colleges and Jesuit colleges, who were adamantly opposed to the elective idea, finally incorporated some aspects of electivism. Brubacher stated:

A great number of institutions tried to follow in Eliot's footsteps, some more closely than others. The smaller liberal-arts colleges, together with practically all of the Jesuit colleges, hung back, but after 1890 they began to incorporate in their courses aspects of the elective system.66

The elective system was a significant contribution to the advancement of American higher learning. The significance of the elective system to American higher education was stated by Rudolph:

The elective principle was the instrument by which departments of knowledge were built, by which areas of scholarly interest were enlarged, and therefore it was the instrument that enabled colleges to become universities. In the end, it was the instrument, secular and democratic, that permitted the

65 Rudolph, op.cit., p. 303.
66 Brubacher and Rudy, op.cit., p. 114.
American university to enter into a vital partnership with the society of which it was a part.

For the elective system to be effective in higher learning, Eliot called for uniformity of programs of studies in the lower schools with those in institutions of higher learning. Eliot contended that the school should provide a variety of subjects from which pupils might choose. Originally identified with electives in the college, Eliot extended his advocacy of the idea to the high schools and even in part to the elementary schools. Certain subjects might be required of pupils in the early years for the purpose of exploring interests and talents, but electives should be introduced at age ten and largely prevail from age fifteen and beyond. According to Eliot the reformation of the university would not be complete until the lower schools underwent similar reforms. If improvement of lower levels of education was to be neglected, Eliot described the result it would have on higher learning:

Whatever elementary instruction the schools fail to give, the college must supply. The improvement of the schools has of late years permitted the college to advance the

---

67 Rudolph, op.cit., p. 305.

grade of its teaching...This improvement of the college reacts upon the schools to their advantage; and this action and reaction will be continuous.

The task of the lower levels of education was to provide a certain specified range of subjects that students must take. By the time the student enters college he would have had a general core of required knowledge. Thus in college the student will be able to elect courses without having to be prescribed to a general required core of courses. According to Eliot, colleges should require that lower schools provide the general core work, rather than preserve part of this core work in the early collegiate years. Such an arrangement would elevate the character of the work done at both levels. Eliot's main objective for the improvement of the relationship between lower schools and colleges was to secure a sound program of elective studies in the colleges. The elective system will not work well unless the preparatory training of the young men who are to be subjected to it is good. If a young man wanted to enjoy university freedom, he should have already received at school a substantial training, in which the four subdivisions of knowledge--languages, history, mathematics, and natural science--were all adequately represented. Eliot commented:

It must be admitted that this desirable training is now given in very few schools,

69 Pusey, op. cit., p. 3.
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and that in many parts of the country there are not secondary schools enough of even tolerable quality.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 129-30.}

The total reform of American education depended on the conduct of the universities. Eliot illustrated how the influence of the changes made in the universities would alter the conduct of the lower schools:

\begin{quote}
Shall we stop trying to create a university because the condition of secondary education in the country at large is unsatisfactory? The difficulty with that policy of inaction is that the reform and development of secondary education depend upon the right organization and conduct of universities.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}
\end{quote}

Eliot's views on incorporating elements of the elective system in lower schools was unique during his days, and Hawkins acknowledged:

\begin{quote}
Free election of subjects was probably never more than a minority view among high school leaders of Eliot's day, but from 1900 to 1905 that minority was riding high and Eliot was its hero.\footnote{Hawkins, \textit{Between Harvard and America}, p. 241.}
\end{quote}

Eliot was concerned with all levels of education, for he did not confine his written and spoken word only to higher education. His first two books of collected articles and addresses, \textit{American Contributions to Civilization} (1897) and \textit{Educational Reform} (1898), covered the entire field of education from the kindergarten to the university. The distinguished Harvard economist and educator Frank Taussig wrote that Eliot's
"interest in the kindergarten and the primary and grammar schools has been as strong and as farsighted as in the university." Rudolph also commended Eliot's leadership in raising the standards of secondary education.

Eliot's interest in all levels of education was evident prior to his appointment to the presidency. During his trip to Europe he was concerned with observing all levels of education in England, France, and Germany. He spent a considerable amount of time observing and understanding the activities of lycees in France and the gymnasiums in Germany. Eliot's interest in lower levels of education was also evident during his teaching days at the Pitts Street School, and it was during this time that he became involved with the Boston Primary School Committee. Perhaps his concern for all levels of education stemmed from his own experiences as a student. He was very critical of the narrow training that he received in his formal education. In his inaugural address Eliot called for the reformation of primary and secondary schools. He stated:

What has been said of needed reformation in methods of teaching the subjects which have already been nominally admitted to the American curriculum applies not only to the University, but to the preparatory schools of every grade down to the primary.
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With the numerous burdens of a university president, Eliot found time to maintain an interest in reforming the lower schools. During the 1870's when Eliot was much occupied by his duties at Harvard, he gave part of his attention to the problems of the lower schools both public and private. In 1872 he joined the National Education Association and took active part in some of its meetings and discussions. Eliot did not confine his outside educational association to the NEA, but joined and took part in the work of the Massachusetts Classical and High School Teachers' Association where he came to know principals and teachers in public and private secondary schools. According to the president of this association in 1892, Eliot had started attending its meetings in 1870, the year after his appointment to the presidency. Since that time, the president said, Eliot "has been almost constantly with us, a most original, stimulating, inspiring, and, I may almost say, provoking force. It is no small distinction to this body that President Eliot, by all odds the leader in American education to-day, got some portion of his training in the arena of debate which we provided him." It was Eliot's work with this group, as well as with the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, organized in 1885, that moved him toward his role of leadership in public education.

77 Samuel Thurber, "Opening Remarks by the President," The Academy, VII (May 1892), 190-91.

Between 1888 and 1892 Eliot presented three major addresses to the NEA Department of Superintendence, calling for a lowering of the average age of college entrance from nineteen to eighteen, for more and better high schools, and for the reduction of the grammar school period from nine years to eight. These addresses brought Eliot into a position of prominence in the NEA, and he was drawn into the widespread discussion concerning the relationship between colleges and high schools. The NEA was demanding uniformity in college admission requirements. An important aspect for this demand was to make the high school a better means of access to reputable colleges for thousands of American youth who could not attend the special college preparatory schools. Prominent leaders joining Eliot in this discussion included President James H. Baker of the University of Colorado and Professor Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University. Butler became interested in this topic through his own experiences, for after graduating from the Paterson, New Jersey, High School in 1875, he had to spend two years in private study

---


of the classics for admission to Columbia. 82

To bring about uniformity in college admission requirements, the NEA's National Council of Education in 1892 adopted a resolution appointing an executive committee to call together teachers in colleges and secondary schools. Eliot was nominated as chairman of this committee which included nine other members (Appendix A). Thus was born the famous Committee of Ten.

The subject the committee was to study was uniformity in secondary school programs and in requirements for admission to college. At its initial meeting in November, 1892, the committee's first task was to decide which departments of instruction should be represented. The committee organized conferences of school and college teachers of each principal subject which entered into the program of secondary schools in the United States and into the requirements for admission to college. Each conference was to consider the proper limits of its subject, the best methods of instruction, the most desirable allotment of time for the subject, and the best method of testing the pupil's attainments in the subject. Conferences were organized on the following subjects: Latin; Greek; English; modern languages; mathematics; physics, astronomy, and chemistry; natural history; history, civil government, and political economy; and geography. Each conference

82 Nicholas Murray Butler, Across the Busy Years (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), I, pp. 52-58.
consisted of ten members. These nine conferences convened 
on December 28, 1892, at eight different sites. The ninety 
apPOINTED members of the conferences included forty-seven 
College and university teachers, forty-two secondary school 
teachers, and one government official. The conferences 
met for three days, December 28-31, 1892. Each conference, 
in accordance with a recommendation of the Committee of Ten, 
chose its own chairman and secretary; and these two officers 
Prepared the report of each conference. The Committee of Ten 
requested that the reports of the conferences be sent to their 
chairman by the 1st of April, 1893—three months being thus 
allowed for the preparation of the reports. Seven conferences 
substantially conformed to this request of the Committee, but 
three conferences did not submit their reports until July, 
1893. When all the reports of the conferences were received 
by Eliot, he proceeded to prepare an overall report. This 
report was circulated among the members of the Committee of 
Ten. To draw up a final report, the Committee of Ten held a 
meeting at Columbia University from the 8th to the 11th of 
November, 1893. Eliot's part in preparing the report was para-
mount. Oscar Robinson, one of the members of the committee, 
had this to say regarding Eliot's participation:

The major part of the work outside 
the committee meetings was done by the 
chairman, President Eliot. We might also 
speak of this report as "Dr. Eliot's report," 
and yet this would be far from the truth, 
for I suppose no member of the committee 
conceded more than he—perhaps no one so 
much as he—in the various compromises
reached.\textsuperscript{83} Krug reacted to Robinson's statement in the following manner: "This statement, coming from the man who frequently disagreed with Eliot throughout the Committee's existence and who later opposed the report, suggests that Eliot did not ride herd on the members."\textsuperscript{84}

The general report was designed to summarize and interpret the results of the conferences. Prior to the conference meetings the Committee of Ten suggested a list of questions for discussion and requested the members in each conference to respond to them (Appendix B). Question seven was of particular interest to the committee: "Should the subject be treated differently for pupils who are going to college, for those who are going to a scientific school, and for those who presumably, are going to neither?"\textsuperscript{85} The conferences answered negatively to this question, and the Committee of Ten unanimously agreed with the conferences. The members of the conferences and Committee of Ten unanimously declared that:

\begin{quote}
Every subject which is taught at all in the secondary schools should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of
\end{quote}


the pupil may be, or at what point his education is to cease.

Occupying a good deal of space in the report was the presentation of four programs of study that were to be accepted by colleges. The programs were: Classical, Scientific, Modern Languages, and English; and the committee members said of these programs:

> The Committee are of opinion that the satisfactory completion of any one of the four years' courses of study embodied in the foregoing programmes should admit to corresponding courses in colleges and scientific schools. They believe that this close articulation between the secondary schools and the higher institutions would be advantageous alike for the schools, the colleges, and the country.\(^7\)

The Committee of Ten resolved the problem of college entrance requirements by calling for the institution of four programs of study on the secondary school level. Uniformity of studies in the public secondary schools would provide equal access to colleges and scientific schools of all those who complete the secondary school course.\(^8\) The report concluded:

> In order that any successful graduate of a good secondary school should be free to present himself at the gates of the college or scientific school of his choice, it is necessary that the colleges and scientific school of the country should accept for admission to appropriate courses of their instruction the attainments of any youth who has passed creditably through a

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 17.
\(^7\)Ibid., p. 53.
\(^8\)Ibid., p. 52.
good secondary school course, no matter to what group of subjects he may have mainly devoted himself in the secondary school. As secondary school courses are now too often arranged, this is not a reasonable request to prefer to the colleges and scientific schools; because the pupil may now go through a secondary school course of a very feeble and scrappy nature--studying a little of many subjects and not much of any one, getting, perhaps, a little information in a variety of fields, but nothing which can be called a thorough training.

The Committee's report received considerable controversy. Educational journals of this period included numerous articles reflecting the controversy over the report. The American Journal of Education of St. Louis and Nicholas Murray Butler's Educational Review defended the report, while Education and the Journal of Education attacked it. Educators of many persuasions found in the report much material for speeches at local, state, and national meetings, some in defense and some in attack.  

One of the most persistent critics of the report was G. Stanley Hall. In his two volume text on adolescence, Hall criticized the Committee's position on teaching a given subject the same way to all pupils regardless of destination. Hall announced that the Committee had disregarded "the great army of incapables,...for whose mental development heredity decrees a slow pace and early arrest, and for whom by general
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consent both studies and methods should be different."91

Eliot responded to Hall's comments at the July, 1905, meeting of the American Institute of Instruction. He defended the Committee's position on teaching a given subject the same way to all pupils regardless of destination, contending that early classification of children into "future peasants, mechanics, trades-people, merchants, and professional people," although "common in Europe," was unacceptable in "a democratic society like ours."92

Although G. Stanley Hall had many critical statements concerning the Report of the Committee of Ten, he did conclude by stating the following:

The last decade has witnessed a remarkable new movement on the part of colleges to influence high schools, which began with the Report of the Committee of Ten,...That this movement did good for a time no one can deny. It has made many junctions between secondary and higher education;...made school courses richer, given them better logical sequence; detected many weak points; closed many gaps; defined standards of what education means; brought great advantages from uniformity and cooperation, and no doubt, on the whole, has improved the conditions of college entrance examinations and aided in continuity. 93


93 Hall, op. cit., II, p. 513.
Throughout the decade from 1895 to 1905, Eliot maintained very close relationships with many groups involved in public education, such as the NEA, of which he served as president in 1903; the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools; and the Harvard Teachers' Association. It was during this period that Eliot began to turn his attention toward specific matters regarding public school administration. Eliot believed the education provided by many private schools to be superior to public education, simply because they had more money to spend, some of them having a teacher for every eight to ten pupils.  

Eliot called for spending more money for public education.

Eliot did not limit his ideas about administrative matters to the services provided for children and youth in schools, but extended them to include the use of public school buildings as community centers. An example of utilizing the school's facilities for community use was the school playground. Instead of closing off the school playground at the end of the school day, it was Eliot's suggestion that "the school yard or playground ought to be utilized by the neighborhood whenever the school is not in session."  

In 1906 the report of the Massachusetts Commission of Industrial and Technical Education and the organization of the


National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education ushered in a powerful movement for industrial education.

In 1908 Eliot appeared as a speaker at the annual meeting of this society to advocate trade schools for children "who are unfortunately obliged to leave the regular public school system by the time they are fourteen or even earlier." In this address Eliot declared that teachers in elementary schools should sort pupils by their evident or probable destinies, some for the industrial and technical schools, and others for ordinary high schools. Eliot had shifted away from his earlier views about delaying such decisions until after high school. Eliot was now in agreement with G. Stanley Hall's position, which he had earlier criticized. Krug analyzed Eliot's change of view, and stated:

> It is possible that Eliot, like many others, was blown along here by the storm whipped up in the industrial-education movement, and that he did not see the inconsistency between this statement and those he had made before on the same question.97

Nevertheless, Eliot was an influential force in shaping American education. His active participation as chairman of the Committee of Ten allowed him to exhibit his influence in reforming secondary education. Eliot's major reforms for

---


secondary education included the following: (1) increasing the number of high schools, (2) introducing college preparatory courses, and (3) standardizing programs through state inspection. The high schools of 1890 needed the reforming attention that Eliot offered.

Eliot was credited with the following changes that occurred in American education:

Many of the things Eliot proposed did become part of educational thought and practice. Among these were the expansion of public high schools; the development of the modern subjects; the enrichment of the elementary-school curriculum; the critical examination of traditional college-entrance requirements...

Perhaps no one else on the national scene during the period between 1880 to 1905 spoke and wrote so much on secondary schooling or aroused so many rejoinders and challenges as did Eliot who had never taught in a secondary school.

Much of Eliot's work on reforming secondary schools was conducted outside the confines of Harvard. Harvard was not an institution for preparing teachers, but some gestures were made to provide for teacher training. In 1871 Harvard's

---

scientific school established a one-year teacher training course under the leadership of Professors Gray and Agassiz. This was the beginning of the Harvard Summer School which provided training for teachers to improve their skills. Every year thereafter the Harvard Summer School added on new courses. As the summer courses increased there was a need for a committee to organize the summer program. Thus, in 1886 Professor Nathaniel Shaler was appointed chairman of the Harvard Summer School Committee. At first these courses were taught by members of the Harvard faculty, but gradually teachers from other institutions were invited to instruct.

To provide pedagogical instruction at Harvard Eliot hired G. Stanley Hall and Paul H. Hanus. From 1881 to 1883 G. Stanley Hall conducted pedagogical lectures to teachers in Boston. Paul H. Hanus had just become professor of pedagogy at the Colorado State Normal School when Eliot invited him to come to Harvard as instructor in the history and art of teaching. Hanus had been a principal of a Denver high school, and he probably appealed to Eliot as a practical schoolman without formal training in pedagogy and without allegiance to any pedagogical system. Eliot outlined the following five functions that would embrace Hanus's position:

102 In 1887 Dr. Dudley A. Sargent created a course in physical training at Harvard's Summer School, which will be discussed in the following chapter.

(1) The delivery of lectures on the art of teaching and on the history of teaching. (2) The visiting of schools which feed the University, with a view to establish and maintain cordial and helpful relations with them. (3) The conduct of a summer school for teachers at Cambridge, giving instruction in your own subjects, and being at the service of the considerable number of teachers who come to Cambridge in summer. (4) Taking part in teachers' association in New England. (5) Acting as general agent for the new 'Normal' department established within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Essentially, Hanus was to serve as Harvard's educationist, and be Harvard's ambassador to lower schools. He would keep Eliot informed about educational circumstances in the lower schools. Hanus responded successfully to his role:

Hanus responded creatively to the public pressures that had opened the way for an educationist at Harvard. As a frequent lecturer to educational associations, a member of the NEA's Committee on College-Entrance Requirements, and chairman of the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, Hanus gained recognition and moved beyond the good relations with feeder schools that Eliot had imagined for him.

In an effort to improve the quality of teaching in the United States Eliot urged for Harvard alumni associations throughout the country to look into their community schools and provide information that would elevate the quality of teaching. The Harvard clubs in various cities were to serve as direct links in spreading Eliot's gospel of school reform.
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Eliot presented to club members a check-list for judging and reforming a city school system. In 1908, at the meeting of the Associated Harvard Clubs, ten clubs presented reports on public education in their cities. The Buffalo Harvard Club had investigated its local high school's athletic rules. After their investigation, they successfully insisted on the adoption of eligibility standards that were similar to those at Harvard.

Another way in which Harvard contributed to improving the quality of teaching was the founding of the Harvard Teachers' Association in 1891. It was open to all teachers who had studied at Harvard, including summer school students. The organization held annual meetings and printed its proceedings in the *Educational Review*. Eliot was usually present at the annual meetings where topics such as the Committee of Ten Report, the financing of education, and the elective system were discussed.

Eliot's proposals for improving public education reflected his broad democratic convictions. He shared the belief expressed by Jefferson, Franklin, Mann, and others who believed that education was virtually indispensable for the well-being and survival of a democratic society. Eliot's ideal for education in a democracy was interpreted in the following manner:

While Eliot did not regard education as a miracle to solve all problems, he had great faith in what might be done by educated individuals working together for the common welfare. His great goal was public and private happiness achieved through the free action of
free citizens.  

Relationship Between Democracy and Education

Eliot's interpretation concerning the nature of a democracy was complicated by the dilemma of individualism and collectivism in a democracy. He wrestled with this dilemma and came to the conclusion that democracy in some way must account for and provide for both. He defended individual rights against the encroachments of government, schools, business, and labor. Eliot believed in individualism, but not to the extent of the social Darwinists who called for government to stay clear of the affairs of industry. In light of the inhumane practices of industrial enterprises Eliot was not ready to accept the laissez-faire principle. He was very critical of the industrial practice of child labor, and felt that government should intervene to curtail such conduct. According to Eliot, government interference can be justified as long as it doesn't interfere with the rights of the individual.

Eliot grew comfortable with the term democratic collectivism. He advocated a "collectivism which does not suppress individualism."  


and individualism can function together:

The collectivism which has developed so effectively since the middle of the nineteenth century maintains private property, the inheritance of property, the family as the unit of society, and the liberty of the individual as a fundamental right; and it relies for the progress of society on the personal virtues rightly called 'homely,' because they have to do with the maintenance of a home—namely, industry, frugality, prudence, domestic affection, independence, emulation, and energy. 108

Although Eliot advocated strongly for individualism, he called for an education that teaches the child to conduct in a communal manner. He expressed that:

Democratic education should inculcate on every child the essential unity of a democratic community, in spite of the endless diversities of function, capacity and achievement among the individuals who compose the community. 109

Eliot believed that the function of education in a democratic society is to lift the whole population to a higher plane of intelligence, conduct, and happiness. Since a democracy provides individuals with the right to vote, Eliot contended that the function of lower education is to produce intelligent voters of a democratic frame of mind. Eliot viewed this mission of lower education as essential for the preservation of a democracy. 110

108 Ibid., p. 5.
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The funding of education was to come from government, but Eliot was opposed to government financing of higher education. In 1873, during a National Education Association meeting concerning the founding of a national university, Eliot openly criticized the national university plan. Eliot contended that politics should remain clear of higher learning. The founding of a national university would be an enemy of the ideals of republicanism, and Eliot elaborated:

I venture to state one broad reason why our government should not establish and maintain a university. If the people of the United States have any special destiny, any peculiar functions in the world, it is to try and work out, under extraordinarily favorable circumstances, the problem of free institutions for a heterogenous, rich, multitudinous population spread over a vast territory. We indeed want to breed scholars, artists, poets, historians, novelists, engineers, physicians, theologians and orators; but, first of all, we want to breed a race of independent, self-reliant freemen, capable of helping, guiding and governing themselves. Now the habit of being helped by the government, even if it be to things good in themselves—to churches, universities, and railroads—is a most insidious and irresistible enemy of republicanism; for the very essence of republicanism is self-reliance.\footnote{Charles W. Eliot, "National University," National Education Association Journal of Proceedings and Addresses (1873), 118.}

Eliot called for support of "the genuine American method." in which he stated:

Let us cling fast to the genuine American method—the old Massachusetts method—in the matter of public instruction. The essential features of that system are local taxes for
universal elementary education voted by the citizens themselves, local elective boards to spend the money raised by taxation and control the schools, and for the higher grades of instruction permanent endowments administered by incorporated bodies of trustees. This is the American voluntary system, in sharp contrast with the military, despotic organization of public instruction which prevails in Prussia and most other states of continental Europe. Both systems have peculiar advantages, the crowning advantage of the American method being that it breeds freemen. Our ancestors well understood the principle that, to make a people free and self-reliant, it is necessary to let them take care of themselves, even if they do not take quite as good care of themselves as some superior power might.\textsuperscript{112}

Eliot was opposed to government involvement in higher education, because he viewed the meshing of politics with higher learning as a corrupting influence on the mission of a university; the mission of a university being that of preserving and perpetuating the purity of knowledge. A free university, Eliot declared, was one that seeks truth and higher learning without being influenced by government. However, this was not the case with lower levels of education, because the mission of lower education was to prepare youth for democratic living, and tax dollars were needed to support public education.

Eliot's belief in freedom of choice of studies has been attributed to Unitarianism, democracy, and utilitarianism. Morison stated that "Eliot was a Unitarian (of the Channing and Parker rather than the Norton and Walker shade), and a

\textsuperscript{112}Ibid., p. 119.
Eliot believed that the essence of democracy was not in equality of attainment or station, but in a social mobility that enabled each man to discover and realize his own special capacities. His social and educational philosophy was shaped by the writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Locke, Milton, Montaigne, Kant, Franklin, Mann, Emerson, Spencer, Froebel, Pestalozzi, Seguin, and John Stuart Mill. The writings of Herbert Spencer was of particular interest to Eliot because of his concern for science. In a prefatory essay to Spencer's Essays on Education Eliot reviewed Spencer's influence on education:

> Many schools, both public and private, have now adopted—in most cases unconsciously—many of Spencer's more detailed suggestions. The laboratory method of instruction, for example, now common for scientific subjects in good schools, is an application of his doctrines of concrete illustration, training in the accurate use of the senses, and subordination of book-work.

Eliot's educational thoughts were very similar to the views expressed by Spencer in his educational essays. Both of their educational doctrines were extremely repulsive to the established profession of education, where Latin, Greek, and
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mathematics had been the staple of education for many generations, and were believed to afford the only suitable preparation for the learned professions, public life, and cultivated society. Another aspect of Spencer's writings that Eliot admired was his concern for individual interests. To this concern Eliot remarked:

The profession of teaching has long been characterized by certain habitual convictions, which Spencer undertook to shake rudely, and even to deride. The first of these convictions is that all education, physical, intellectual, and moral, must be authoritative, and need take no account of the natural wishes, tendencies, and motives of the ignorant and undeveloped child. The second dominating conviction is that to teach means to tell, or show, children what they ought to see, believe and utter.

Eliot also shared Spencer's views on the doctrine that all instruction should be pleasurable and interesting. In his essay, "On Education," Spencer remarked that "a pleasurable state of feeling is far more favorable to intellectual action than a state of indifference or disgust,..." One of Eliot's intentions in establishing electives was to create a pleasurable learning environment.

The writer that Eliot relied on most of all was Ralph Waldo Emerson. Eliot referred to Emerson as "the greatest of American thinkers." Eliot was said to have "kept a complete
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set of Emerson in the house at Northeast Harbor as well as in his library in Cambridge. He knew Emerson's essays almost as well as he knew the Bible." 120

Eliot was not always attracted to Emerson's writings, but when he became more involved with education he began to view his writings in a different light. In an address he delivered at Boston's Symphony Hall in 1903, Eliot stated:

As a young man I found the writings of Emerson unattractive, and not seldom unintelligible. I was concerned with physical science, and with routine teaching and discipline; and Emerson's thinking seemed to me speculative and visionary. In regard to religious belief, I was brought up in the old-fashioned Unitarian conservatism by Emerson's excursions beyond its well-fenced precincts. But when I had got at what proved to be my lifework for education, I discovered in Emerson's poems and essays all the fundamental motives and principles of my own hourly struggle against educational routine and tradition, and against the prevailing notions of discipline for the young. 121

In a letter to Theodore Tebbets Eliot recorded one of his first encounters with Emerson. He wrote in 1852 that he was not inspired with Emerson's lectures. While attending a lecture entitled "Worship," Eliot wrote that it "completely disgusted me." 122 Eliot's later associations with Emerson were much more pleasant.
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Eliot called Emerson "a prophet and inspirer of reform." Although Emerson "was not a reformer," he "laid down principles which, when applied, would inevitably lead to progress and reform." Eliot acknowledged that the elective system was influenced by Emersonian philosophy. "Emerson laid down in plain terms the fundamental doctrine on which this elective system rests."

In a similar fashion, Emerson and Eliot condemned the faults of nineteenth-century American education. As was the case with Eliot, Emerson's formal education was received in the Boston Latin School and Harvard College; he graduated from Harvard in 1821. Emerson was very critical of the rigidity of the curriculum that he experienced in his formal education. In his essay, "New England Reformers," Emerson referred to the study of Greek and Latin as "our scholastic devotion to the dead languages." Emerson commented that Greek and Latin "contain wonderful remains of genius, which draw, and always will draw, certain like-minded men,—Greek men, and Roman men,—in all countries, to their study; but by a wonderful drowsiness of usage they had exacted the study of all men." His condemnation of the classical curriculum was illustrated in the
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following passage:

Four, or six, or ten years, the pupil is parsing Greek and Latin, and as soon as he leaves the University, as it is ludicrously styled, he shuts those books for the last time. Some thousands of young men are graduated at our colleges in this country every year, and the persons, who, at forty years, still read Greek, can all be counted on your hand. 127

Classical learning was criticized by Emerson for its narrow and irrelevant content. Emerson asked:

Is it not manifest that our academic institutions should have a wider scope; that they should not be timid and keep the ruts of the last generation, but that wise men thinking for themselves and heartily seeking the good of mankind, and counting the cost of innovation, should dare to arouse the young to a just and heroic life; that the moral nature should be addressed in the school-room, and children should be treated as the high-born candidates of truth and virtue? 128

Emerson was not optimistic of the state of education. He commented that the conduct of the present educational scheme "does not make us brave or free." He elaborated:

We teach boys to be such men as we are. We do not teach them to spire to be all they can. We do not give them a training as if we believed in their noble nature. We scarce educate their bodies. We do not train the eye and the hand. We exercise their understandings to the apprehension and comparison of some facts, to a skill in numbers, in words; we aim to make accountants, attorneys, engineers; but not to make able, earnest, great
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hearted men.129

Many of the reforms that were suggested by Emerson in his educational doctrines were later put into practice by Eliot. One of Eliot's immediate concerns was the broadening of the college curriculum. In 1864 Emerson emphasized the need for the college to broaden its curriculum to include:

Language, Rhetoric, Logic, Ethics, Intellectual Philosophy, Poetry, Natural History, Civil History, Political Economy, Technology, Chemistry, Agriculture, Literary History, as, the genius of Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, and Goethe; Music and Drawing, even,—all there may rightly enter into the curriculum.130

According to Emerson any subject which brings man into "a finer life, what educates his eye, or ear, or hand, whatever purifies and enlarges him"131 has a place in education. Emerson endorsed Milton's broad definition of the object of formal education, where perfections of body and mind are sought.132 Emerson viewed man as having many interests, and he declared, "Education should be as broad as man. Whatever elements are in him that should foster and demonstrate."133

129 Ibid., pp. 134-35.
When Eliot reformed the entrance requirements of the professional schools, he specifically urged for students to have a liberal education prior to specializing in a specific field of study. Eliot was convinced that a liberal education preceding specialization would be the best procedure for preparing intelligent lawyers, doctors, ministers, and other professional men. In a similar vein Emerson remarked, "our student must have a style and determination, and be a master in his own specialty. But having this, he must put it behind him. He must have a catholicity, a power to see with a free and disengaged look on every object."

The fundamental texture of Emerson's thinking was the doctrine of self-reliance. Concerning self-reliance and education Emerson wrote:

There is a time in every man's education when he arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance; that imitation is suicide; that he must take himself for better for worse as his portion; that though the wide universe is full of good, no kernel of nourishing corn can come to him but through his toil bestowed on that plot of ground which is given to him to till.

Self-reliance emphasized man to seek his nature so as "to believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart is true for all men,—that is genius."
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Emerson stated that "a greater self-reliance must work a revolution in all the offices and relations of men; in their religion; in their education; in their pursuits; their modes of living; their association; in their property; in their speculative views."\textsuperscript{138}

It was Emerson's contention that education should teach self-trust. In his essay entitled "Education" Emerson wrote:

\begin{quote}
The great object of Education should be commensurate with the object of life. It should be a moral one; to teach self-trust: to inspire the youthful man with an interest in himself; with a curiosity touching his own nature; to acquaint him with the resources of his mind, and to teach him that there is all his strength, and to inflame him with a piety towards the Grand Mind in which he lives.\textsuperscript{139}
\end{quote}

Emerson was of the conviction that the student should be respected, and that it was not necessary to force the student to learn. To this view he stated:

\begin{quote}
I believe that our own experience instructs us that the secret of Education lies in respecting the pupil. It is not for you to choose what he shall know, what he shall do. It is chosen and foreordained, and he only holds the key to his own secret. By your tampering and thwarting and too much governing he may be hindered from his end and kept out of his own. Respect the child. Wait and see the new product of Nature. Nature loves analogies, but not repetitions. Respect the child. Be not too much his parent. Trespass not on his solitude.\textsuperscript{140}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., p. 77.
\textsuperscript{139} Ibid., X, "Education," p. 135.
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., p. 143.
Emerson insisted that the student should be given liberty to seek his natural tendencies. In his Journals Emerson recorded:

There is in every man a determination of character to a peculiar end, counteracted often by unfavorable fortune, but more apparent, the more he is left at liberty. This is called his genius, or his nature, or his turn of mind. The object of Education should be to remove all obstructions, and let this natural force have free play and exhibit its peculiar product. It seems to be true that no man in this is deluded. 141

Emerson remarked that "education often wastes its effort in attempts to thwart and balks this natural magnetism..." 142 He declared that these difficulties could "solve themselves when we leave institutions and address individuals." 143 Emerson expressed the desire that students might have "access to instruction in such departments as he prefers..." 144 In a similar manner Eliot also advocated student freedom. The elective system was created to provide students with the opportunity to pursue their interests without having courses forced upon them. Eliot hoped to create a learning environment where students would find learning as an enjoyable activity free of coerciveness.

The following passage concerning Eliot's biography illustrates the analogy between Emerson's self-reliance and Eliot's elective system:

Eliot believed in giving the individual student a wide latitude of choice in order that he might acquire self-reliance, discover his own bent, rise to higher stages of attainment in his chosen field, and be governed in his work by interest rather than compulsion.

Emerson's views concerning education and individual traits were repeated by Eliot in numerous occasions. Eliot stated in his inaugural address that "In education, the individual traits of different minds have not been sufficiently attended to." In another address delivered in 1897 Eliot remarked that one of the most important functions of education is the "discovery and development of the gift or capacity of each individual child."

Eliot quoted and referred to Emerson in many of his writings and addresses. In an address entitled "The New Definition of the Cultivated Man," delivered before the National Education Association, Eliot proposed to use the
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term "cultivated man' in only its good sense—in Emerson's sense."\textsuperscript{149} Eliot described the cultivated man as "a man of quick perceptions, broad sympathies, and wide affinities; responsive, but independent; self-reliant."\textsuperscript{150}

In 1867 Emerson was elected as a Harvard overseer, and served on the Board of Overseers until 1879. In 1868, prior to Eliot's election to the presidency, Emerson listed the following as:

Evils of the College—It does not justify itself to the pupil. It does not open its doors to him. Balks him with petty delays and refusals. The instructors are in false relations to the student. Instead of an avenue, it is a barrier.\textsuperscript{151}

In a later journal entry of the same year Emerson wrote about the complex issues of the university:

In the perplexity which the literary public now stands with regard to university education, whether studies shall be compulsory or elective; whether by lectures of professors, or whether by private tutors; whether the stress shall be on Latin and Greek, or on modern sciences,...\textsuperscript{152}

Emerson believed that the university needed reform, and he was probably one of the majority of the overseers voting to approve the selection of Eliot as the reforming president.\textsuperscript{153}


\textsuperscript{150}Ibid., p. 190.

\textsuperscript{151}Emerson, The Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson, X, pp. 258-59.

\textsuperscript{152}Ibid., p. 263.

Prior to his election, Eliot wrote that "Ralph Waldo Emerson is, I believe, the youngest and least imposing of the members of the said committee." A month after Eliot's nomination Emerson noted that he was satisfied with the direction that Harvard was taking. Emerson wrote: "At present, the friends of Harvard are possessed in greater or less degree by the idea of making it a University for men, instead of a College for boys."

On October 19, 1869, Emerson was present at Eliot's inauguration, "listening and smiling and asserting...." Emerson and Eliot must have met frequently, during the period Emerson served on the Board of Overseers. Emerson served on several committees, and voted on the appointment of faculty members. The relationship between Eliot and Emerson was quite compatible. They shared similar views on education, and they were reform minded educators. Emerson seemed to have favored Eliot's appointment, and he believed that Eliot's election was for the betterment of Harvard. Cabot mentioned that during the years when he was helping Emerson prepare his last volumes for the press, the conversation of Emerson would often turn to "the college, and what a godsend President Eliot
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was, what an all-accomplished man...."  

On Eliot's ninetieth birthday, Eliot delivered a speech where he reviewed his career, and one of the many things that he touched upon was Emerson's influence on his career. Eliot stated:

Consider now the sources of my career as a teacher. Those sources were in the times, in that wonderful period of human history, in which my whole educational career lay. Think of it! When I was coming on as a teacher in Harvard,...the philosophers of the world were preaching attention to the individual and proclaiming the immense variety of human nature.... Think how Emerson came into power in the days of my youth....Out of that extraordinary period have come the ideals and the lessons which I followed all through my active career.

Emerson was the prophet and inspirer that Eliot relied on to carry out his reforms.

In spite of the liberal standards set by Eliot, the students at Harvard disliked him. This was indeed a paradox, for one might think that he would be popular among students. Eliot swept away the petty disciplinary rules which students despised, and he gave them more liberty and better opportunities to study what interested them. The students "should have appreciated his treating them like men and free agents instead of like unreasonable boys. Yet they did not like him." The reason for this, according to James, was the nature of
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students. The situation indicated how "undiscerning and trivial-minded they were, and how wrong were Eliot's fundamental assumptions about their capacities." The students soon forgot how many annoying regulations Eliot had abolished, and "perceived only that he was strict about the enforcement of those that remained." Morison mentioned the ingratitude of the students: "All that he had done to make their studies more varied and pleasant and their life more free, they took for granted." Eliot's relationship with undergraduates was summed up by a Harvard junior:

He has not been a president who came into intimate relations with the students; very few knew him personally, but all were familiar with his figure, and nearly all knew the kindly recognition which was always forthcoming when one greeted him first. To the students President Eliot has stood as the embodiment of the official hostility to athletics; so it is all the more remarkable that none regards him otherwise than with respect and admiration. Not all agree with his ideas on student affairs; but all honor his fearless stand on every question brought before him.

Eliot appeared as a rather grim person to the undergraduates. He came across as a cold individual, and as James remarked:
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...he did not recognize the students or seem to see them when they passed him in the Yard. If they touched their hats to him, they did it out of respect for their own code of manners rather than because they hoped for a response, and they were apt to feel a bit foolish afterwards. He looked to them as unsympathetic as a creature of the zodiac at the head of a calendar and loomed above them as altogether the most incomprehensibly superhuman of College officials. 165

Eliot was, however, sympathetic and concerned for the welfare of students. There were several occasions when Eliot personally extended aid to students, for instance, in 1873 Eliot moved out of his house in order that a student who had smallpox might be moved in with his nurses instead of being sent to a wretched pesthouse. 166 Eliot proved that he kept himself informed about the welfare of students, but even this did not alter the view that students had of him.

**Political and Social Thought**

Eliot was a university president who extended his activities beyond the confines of his university. This was exhibited by Eliot when he became involved with primary and secondary education reform, and took up such causes as kindergartens, schools as community centers, and park settings for city schools. Toward the latter half of the 1890's he became

165 James, op. cit., I, p. 313.

166 Ibid. James mentioned several other occasions where Eliot extended his personal aid for the welfare of students.
more involved with social and political concerns of the nation. Eliot was more willing than most university presidents to take a stand on public issues. Part of his justification for expressing political and social views was that he thus provided Harvard students a proper example of an educated man's social involvement.167

Many of Eliot's essays during the 1890's were concerned with the nation's democracy. The following essays, "The Forgotten Millions" (1890); "Family Stocks in a Democracy" (1890); "The Present Disadvantages of Rich Men" (1893); "The Happy Life" (1895); "Equality in a Republic" (1896), centered upon the soundness and justification of the democratic order. Eliot was interested in the welfare of future American generations, and he did not conceive of that future in terms of dollars, or trade, but in terms of character, and opportunity for the exercise of courage, talent, and taste.168

Eliot was not a stranger to politics. His father and his mother's brother had been mayors of Boston and members of the state legislature, and his father had gone to Congress. Eliot served as the vice president of the Cambridge Civil Service Reform Association, and he was informally involved as friend and advisor to William E. Russell, mayor of Cambridge. Eliot remained as advisor to Russell during his three term tenure as Massachusetts' governor.
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Eliot took part in seventeen presidential elections, having missed the second election of Lincoln. He had been on the winning side thirteen times, and there were four occasions when he was on the losing side. He voted on the losing side in 1856 when James Buchanan defeated John C. Fremont. In 1888 Eliot supported Grover Cleveland when Benjamin Harrison won, and the other two occasions when Eliot voted on the losing side occurred in 1920 when he supported James M. Cox rather than Warren G. Harding and in 1924 when Eliot endorsed John W. Davis instead of Calvin Coolidge.

Eliot was a Republican, and he had endorsed all of the party's presidential candidates until 1884. Eliot began to question his allegiance to the Republican party when it was discovered that members of the party were dishonest. This came about in 1884 when the Republican party nominated for its presidential candidate a former congressman from Maine and secretary of state, James G. Blaine. Blaine had been linked to political dishonesty, and Republican reformers, dubbed the "Mugwumps," refused to support Blaine. Eliot was convinced that Blaine was a dishonest politician, and in 1884 Eliot became a confirmed liberal distinctly of the mugwump stripe. 169 Eliot spoke the language of the mugwump, "I will stay in a political party only so long as that party stands for the political principles which I believe in." 170
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Eliot's interest in presidential elections was mentioned by James: "A presidential election was an event of unfailing interest to Eliot. From 1884 until 1916 he made a 'public' declaration of his own position in advance of each election."\textsuperscript{171}

The Democrats nominated a reform candidate, Grover Cleveland. As mayor of Buffalo and governor of New York, Cleveland had won a reputation for integrity. His honest reputation, opposition to free silver, and support of lower tariffs convinced Eliot to support Cleveland in 1884.

Eliot continued his support for Cleveland in 1888, when Benjamin Harrison prevailed. In 1892 Cleveland was nominated as the Democrat's candidate, and Eliot endorsed Cleveland's nomination.

In 1896 Eliot found the Democratic ticket insupportable. Eliot was disappointed with the way Cleveland antagonized labor by using troops in the Pullman strike. He supported McKinley and the Republican ticket.

In 1900 Eliot continued his support for McKinley, but Eliot was not satisfied with McKinley's handling of the Philippine issue. When the United States withdrew its forces from the island colony, Eliot felt that such a move left the impression that the United States was afraid of them.\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{171}James, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 226.
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remarked that McKinley will be remembered as a feeble minded administrator because of the Philippine withdrawal. According to Eliot, the Philippino government would be unable to set up a republican government without American assistance.173 Nevertheless, in 1900 he supported McKinley because Eliot doubted whether Bryan would handle foreign affairs any better.

In 1901, after McKinley was shot, Eliot expressed hope that McKinley would be able to live out his term because "Roosevelt as President would be dangerous."174 Eliot felt that Roosevelt's "egotism, self-confidence, and personal ambition overwhelm his judgment and even his benevolence."175 Eliot outlined two serious defects in Roosevelt's nature:

...his love of risky adventure, which often carried him and his companions quite beyond the limits prescribed by good sense or good judgment, and his lawlessness when existing law stood in the way of his accomplishing objects which seemed to him, not only righteous, but indispensable to the progress of his country or of civilization.

However, in 1904 Eliot supported Roosevelt. Eliot found Roosevelt's concern for civil service reform worthy, and he
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shared some of the university's pride in the new Harvard-trained president.

Eliot's account of a visit by Roosevelt in the spring of 1905 reveals his sympathetic and amused astonishment of the younger man's informality:

That year was the twenty-fifth anniversary of his class and as he was President I invited him to stay at my house. He appeared very early in the morning, a very warm day in June. He said he was dirty, and he looked dirty, I showed him to his room. The first thing he did was to pull off his coat, roll it up with his hands, and flung it across the bed so violently it sent a pillow to the floor beyond. The next thing he did was to take a great pistol from his trousers pocket and slam it down on the dresser. After awhile he came rushing downstairs, as if his life depended on it, and as I stood at the foot of the stairs I said, "Now, you are taking breakfast with me?" "Oh, no," came the reply, "I promised Bishop Lawrence I would breakfast with him,--and good gracious! (clapping his right hand to his side) I've forgotten my gun!" Now he knew it was against the law in Massachusetts to carry that pistol, and yet he carried it. Very lawless; a very lawless mind!

In 1907 a New York World editorial suggested that either Eliot or Woodrow Wilson run as a scholar candidate for the presidency on the Democratic ticket. Eliot did not consider running for the presidency; he voted for Taft in 1908. Taft offered Eliot the ambassadorship to Great Britain, but Eliot
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turned the offer down. In 1912, Eliot was again offered the position of ambassador to Great Britain, this time by Wilson. Eliot declined the offer feeling that he had better work in familiar fields for the rest of his life. In 1912 as well as in 1916.

In 1920 Eliot voted for Governor James Cox of Ohio, and in 1924, his last presidential election, he supported John Davis. In both elections his candidates were unsuccessful.

Eliot became a spokesman for progressivism after the accession of Theodore Roosevelt to the presidency. During the early 1900's Eliot elaborated on a theory of government that was far from the individualism of his earlier years. The rapid increase in urbanization and industrialization posed a threat to public health, and this prompted Eliot to advocate more government control of industrial practices. Eliot declared that the individual was no longer able to control the destiny of his own health, and he stated:

The necessity of collective measures and the impotency of individualistic methods are vividly exhibited wherever population concentrates itself in large cities or in closely built towns about mines or factories, ...when thousands of men, women, and children are crowded into small areas with only a few cubic feet of space for each individual, close attention to the collective welfare is the only way to make the individual reasonably safe; and this principle applies not only to physical, or bodily, welfare, but
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also to moral welfare. Concentration of population is therefore responsible in large measure for the rapid gain of collectivism on individualism.\(^{180}\)

The impending effects of industrialization on public health was described by Eliot:

> The factory system with its noise and hurry, and the quick dispatch of business with its nervous strain work their injurious effects on the public health wherever population is concentrated, and nothing can offset these effects except collective measures to secure a tolerable supply of light and air, reasonable hours of labor, wholesome food, and the means and opportunities of recreation.\(^{181}\)

Eliot supported the formation of associations that would deal with the conditions of labor, promote public health, prevent the employment of women and children in factories, provide wholesome tenement houses and numerous playgrounds in crowded cities, and diminish the ravages of tuberculosis.\(^{182}\)

Eliot disapproved of associations that attempt to monopolize, such as the trade-unions. Eliot declared that monopolization in "Trades-unions, corporations, and trusts alike tend to suppress competition, and therefore to stop industrial progress--for competition is not only the life of trade, but the source of continuous improvement, since it supplies an urgent motive for
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improvement."\textsuperscript{183} Eliot was in favor of "both legislatures and courts to discriminate between good and bad competition, and to study the means of maintaining in the interest of the consumer all reasonable competition."\textsuperscript{184}

During the turn of the century, many social reformers initiated a movement that called for using school buildings as social centers. Eliot supported this movement, and he considered it as one of the most important educational movements in the United States. The movement urged youth and grown-ups of a neighborhood to engage in wholesome activities during the evening. Eliot recognized two important benefits of utilizing schools as evening centers: "First, that education should not be an affair of childhood only, but a continuous process throughout life; and secondly, that the provision of the means and opportunities for good play and refined entertainment is an important collective function in modern society."\textsuperscript{185}

In 1891 Harvard students and instructors organized the Prospect Union. The Union was created as a university extension to provide evening classes for wage earners. Eliot played a minor part in organizing the Union, but he was a member of its corporation, gave it books and money, and occasionally talked to the participants. Eliot discouraged the use of the
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name of Harvard in the titles of settlement projects. 186

Eliot favored social settlement work and collective efforts which were not confounded with socialism. The ownership of all the means of production, including the land, by society as a whole was viewed by Eliot as destructive to the family as the unit of social organization. He stated that such a procedure "would take away from the individual man or woman most of the motives which now prompts to industry, frugality, foresight, conjugal fidelity, and loving devotion to those members of the family who are either too young or too old for productive labor. The state would become a vast charitable institution, exercising a universal despotic benevolence." 187

A movement which Eliot gave considerable attention to was conservation. Eliot had become concerned with the exploitation of natural resources. To utilize existing natural resources wisely, Eliot recommended government intervention:

...only the national government can protect the rights of the whole people against private monopoly, preserve for future generations control over mines, water powers, and forests, irrigate the dry lands, drain the swamps, and so promote the health, wealth, and general well-being of future generations. 188


188 Ibid., pp. 119-20.
The change between the Eliot of the Gilded Age and Eliot of the Progressive Era was in his views concerning government involvement. The threatening influence of industrialization and urbanization to public health convinced Eliot that government control was inevitable. Eliot was no longer able to present a reasonable theory of individualism in a society where the individual had become helpless in controlling his own destiny. To secure decent living and working conditions, Eliot prescribed a theory of collectivism which didn't impinge on individualism.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries several attempts were made to restrict immigration. The Eugenics Movement, founded by Darwin's nephew Francis Galton, sought to restrict immigration. In 1894 three Harvard brahmins of the class of 1889—Charles Warren, Robert DeCourcy Ward, and Prescott Fransworth Hall—organized the Immigration Restriction League. The members of this organization believed that immigration was responsible for many of the problems in America, and they contended that "these matters would remain insoluble, 'so long as our ports are open to all nations.'" 189 The Immigration Restriction League attracted leading social scientists:

From the 1890's to the 1920's social scientists—especially Edward Bemis, Thomas N. Carver, John R. Commons, Davis R. Dewey, Richard Ely, Franklin Giddings, Jeremiah

---

Jenks, William Z. Ripley, Edward A. Ross, and Richmond Mayo Smith--either directly or indirectly gave aid, counsel, or moral support to the work of the Immigration Restriction League.190

Eliot became an active foe of the Immigration Restriction League. In 1906, as a member of the Immigration Department of the National Civic Federation, he worked with opponents of restriction. As a supporter of the National Liberal Immigration League in 1911, he was the mouthpiece for the most active opposition to Boston restrictionists. Eliot stated that "I do not think immigration should be restricted at all, except to prevent the coming in of criminals, paupers, and diseased persons."191 Eliot contended that restriction was not a rational view, "because these present occupants are all themselves descendants from immigrants."192 Thus, Eliot viewed that restriction was not a logical pursuit for solving the problems of industrialization and urbanization.

In the spring of 1909 Eliot made a journey through several Southern states. His seven week excursion took him to cities where he had never been before. Eliot's influence on the South was summarized in an article in the South Atlantic Quarterly:

President Eliot's speeches through the South have not been confined to educational topics; they have dealt sanely
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and wisely with almost every phase of our life. From the teaching and example of such a man there are some valuable lessons that Southern people ought to learn, in the first place, the value in our democracy of the right kind of education. Our ideal must be to give every youth the opportunity to develop himself to the full limit of his capacity. All money properly expended for education is a good investment, from a mere business as well as from a humanitarian standpoint.

Eliot had also left the impression that he favored the social segregation of the races in the Southern states, and the elimination of illiterate voters, so long as the unfit of all races are treated alike.194 Regarding racial segregation Eliot stated:

The Whites and the Negroes had better live beside each other in entire amity, but separate, under equal laws, equally applied as regards education, property, admittance to trades and professions, civil and religious liberty, and security of life. The segregation of the colored people implies to my mind that they should have access to all trades and all professions; that they should be in due proportion not only laborers, farmers, and mechanics, but builders, bankers, lawyers, physicians, preachers, and teachers.195

Eliot favored segregating the races in Southern schools, and he even predicted that separate schools would be needed in the North if, "the proportion of Negroes should become large,
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I should approve of separate schools for Negro children.\textsuperscript{196} He believed that there could exist race distinction in law without race discrimination. Eliot viewed the black race as possessing "savage" traits, and that it would take at least four generations before they could acquire the virtues of civilization. Because of these differences, Eliot declared that a separate system of education and up-bringing should be instituted. He stated this in the following manner:

\begin{quote}
\ldots it seems to me that it would take four or five generations more to teach the mass of the negro population that civilization is built on willingness to work hard six days in the week, and to be frugal all the time. It seems to me very unreasonable to expect that people who had so recently been savages and slaves should all acquire in forty years the primary virtues of civilization. Savages are never either frugal or steadily industrious.\textsuperscript{197}
\end{quote}

Eliot was in favor of separate but equal opportunities for blacks. He sincerely believed that he was fighting for the cause of racial equality. At the time, Eliot's views concerning racial equality were liberal, and when he conferred an honorary A.M. degree and invited Booker T. Washington to an alumni dinner, Eliot received criticism for his actions from the Cambridge community.\textsuperscript{198}
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Eliot had become involved in many areas other than education. By the turn of the century he was one of the leading public figures of the country; his opinion and support was sought on every variety of public question.  

**Family Life and Retirement**

During his presidency, Eliot's private life underwent several changes. In 1875, Eliot's summer on Calf Island (across from Mount Desert and overlooking Bar Harbor) was interrupted by his mother's death; she was 73 years of age. The decade between 1865 and 1875 Eliot and his mother did not live under the same roof. The relationship between mother and son during this period was summarized by James:

Although his home and hers had not been under the same roof since he left the Kirkland Street house in 1865, he had seen her regularly and frequently whenever he was near Boston, and when he was abroad he sent her a full chronology of his engagements and doings by every post. She, on her side, followed his activities with intense pride.

In 1877 Eliot's social life witnessed a joyful event, for romance had crept into his busy life. Eliot had met and was courting Miss Grace Mellen Hopkinson. The circumstances that brought the two together are not known for certain, but according to a family story: Eliot, during a

visit to Saint John's Church in Cambridge, was charmed by
a singer in the choir who happened to be Miss Grace Hopkinson.
In addition to singing charmingly, Eliot discovered that
she took parts in the plays of an amateur theatrical society
which used to give three or four entertainments a winter.
It was observed before long that Eliot would let nothing
prevent him from attending the performances in which she
appeared, and their acquaintance progressed.201

Miss Grace Hopkinson was the daughter of Thomas Hopkinson
and Corinna Prentiss Hopkinson. Thomas Hopkinson had been
a lawyer and then Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. He
then became president of the Boston and Worcester Railroad
where he accumulated his wealth. Eliot described Miss
Hopkinson as "simple, straightforward, courageous and devoted—
also good-looking, though short."202 She was twelve years
younger than Eliot, who was forty-three.

In July 1877 Eliot became engaged to Miss Hopkinson.
On October 30, 1877, they were married in Mrs. Hopkinson's
house (Mr. Hopkinson had died in 1872) in Cambridge, by the
Reverend Francis G. Peabody.

Eliot's life had been saddened several times by untimely
deaths in his family. He had lost two sons, Francis in 1861
and Robert in 1867, and he had lost his first wife Ellen in
1869. He had his share of grief, but in 1897, his eldest son,
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Charles, contracted cerebrospinal meningitis and died within a few days; he was thirty-seven. Eliot was deeply grieved by this, as James stated:

The shock of this blow which fell without warning was almost prostrating to Eliot....his relation to Charles was closer than that which ordinarily subsists between grown-up sons and the most devoted parents.\textsuperscript{203}

His son was rapidly advancing in his profession of landscape architecture when he became ill. What made his father particularly proud of his son was his work in public service; young Charles had established the Board of Trustees of Public Reservations, and he helped to organize and plan the new Metropolitan Park System of Boston.

In a letter to Daniel Coit Gilman, written to acknowledge his condolence, Eliot expressed his loss: "No death which has occurred in my family or in the circle of my intimate friends, since I was old enough to know what death is, has seemed to me such a heavy loss as this one."\textsuperscript{204}

Eliot received sympathy from people around him in Cambridge and others from farther distances away. He received sympathy from people he had never counted upon for friendship.

The death of his son affected Eliot's behavior. He became softer, kinder, and nearer after that, and it was after 1897 that he arrived at a truly cordial personal relationship.

\textsuperscript{203}Ibid., II, p. 89.

\textsuperscript{204}Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Daniel Coit Gilman, April 23, 1897, in James, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 91.
with his associates at Harvard.\textsuperscript{205}

On October 26, 1908, Eliot presented his resignation from the presidency to the Harvard Corporation. He asked to have the resignation take effect not later than May 19, 1909, the fortieth anniversary of his election. His reasons for retirement were not due to poor health or a loss of interest in his work, but as Eliot stated, "when a man has reached the age of seventy-four it is time to look for rest and retirement."\textsuperscript{206} He officially retired from the presidency on May 19, 1909.

Eliot continued to live in Cambridge. His summers were spent at his summer house at Northeast Harbor, on the coast of Maine. Along with his wife, the summer household included Mrs. Charles Eliot, Eliot's daughter in law, who had moved into the house with her four daughters. Eliot's son, Samuel, visited his father frequently, and there were many occasions when friends dropped in to visit. The summer activity that Eliot enjoyed most was cruising along the Maine coast in his yacht, which he had purchased in 1871. Eliot maintained a fondness for outdoor recreation throughout his life. When in Cambridge, Eliot and his wife enjoyed riding their bicycles, an activity that Eliot was introduced to during the bicycle craze of the late 1890's.

\textsuperscript{205}Ibid., pp. 90-92.
\textsuperscript{206}Ibid., p. 169.
Although retired, it was impossible for Eliot to sever himself completely from Harvard University. By residing in Cambridge, he was easily accessible to those who wanted to seek out his views concerning Harvard's past and present activities. In 1910 Eliot consented to let himself be elected for a six-year term on the Board of Overseers.

Eliot continued to devote himself to a broad range of educational and civic affairs. He presented speeches and published, often in popular journals, on such diverse matters as world peace, public health, family life, labor relations, prohibition, and religion. He continued to exert his influence on educational and social issues through various organizations which he actively participated in. As a trustee of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts since 1870, Eliot continued to serve this position throughout his retirement. From 1910 to 1919 Eliot served as a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Eliot had been chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching from the inauguration of the foundation in 1905 until 1909. When he retired from active academic service he automatically became one of the foundation's pensioners, and as a matter of propriety, he was thereby disqualified from sitting on its board, he resigned. Other associations that Eliot participated in: in 1908 he joined the General Education Board; in the same year he became president of the Civil Service Reform League, and served this position until 1913; he served on the International Health Board from its inception.
in 1913; from 1911 to 1913, Eliot acted as president of the General Conference of Unitarian Churches; in 1913 he became vice president of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene; and in 1917 he was elected a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. During the last six and a half years of his life Eliot was affiliated with over 200 leagues, associations, and committees.207

On April 4, 1919, the Association for the Advancement of Progressive Education was founded in Washington, D.C. The leading figure in organizing this association was Stanwood Cobb, a New Englander then teaching at the United States Naval Academy. In 1920 the association's name was changed to the Progressive Education Association, and Arthur E. Morgan, president of Antioch College, became the association's first president. Cobb had originally wanted Eliot to be the active president of the association, but Eliot, who was eighty-five years old when Cobb approached him in 1919, declined that position. Eliot did, however, consent to serve as honorary president, thus giving the new association considerable prestige.208 There was nothing incompatible about this relationship, either for the association or for him. The association's declaration of principles was fully
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in accordance with many of Eliot's own views, particularly on such points as the freedom of the pupil to develop naturally, interest as the motive of all work, and the teacher as a guide, not a taskmaster. In 1922, Eliot testified to his admiration of progressive minded educators:

...the advocates of progressive schools and colleges are today attacking their formidable problems...these pioneers are acting on the principles which alone can make elementary and secondary education in the United States the firm support of political and industrial freedom, and the true safeguard of democracy.\(^\text{209}\)

Two years later, Stanwood Cobb hailed Eliot as one who "throughout his life has been consistently a progressive."\(^\text{210}\)

The position of honorary president of the Progressive Education Association was vacated after Eliot's death in 1926. The association commenced on searching for Eliot's successor, one who would be of comparable prestige. The man they selected was John Dewey. Dewey accepted the invitation and assumed the honorary presidency, thus cementing his most formal tie to the progressive education movement.\(^\text{211}\)

A few weeks after Eliot's resignation had been announced he was approached by Norman Hapgood and William Patten of the


\(^{211}\) Graham, op. cit., p. 41.
Collier publishing company, with a proposal for him to assume the editorship of a library of the world's best literature. The idea for this project developed from a talk that Eliot made before an audience of working people. Eliot had said that a five foot shelf could hold enough books to give, in the course of years, a good substitute for a liberal education to any one who would read them with devotion, even if one could spare only fifteen minutes a day for reading. Eliot was asked to compile a series of books that would fill the five foot shelf. Fifty volumes were selected by Eliot which consisted of works in history, philosophy, literature, and science. The fifty volume set was entitled the Harvard Classics, with a sub title, "Dr. Eliot's Five-Foot Shelf of Books." The Harvard Classics appeared in 1909, and proved to meet a popular demand, for 350,000 sets, consisting of 17,500,00 volumes, were sold in the first few years of its publication.

In November, 1911, Eliot embarked on a trip around the world on behalf of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace promoted international visits by representative men of influence and standing. The trip was to take Eliot to Ceylon, India, Java, the Philippines, China, Japan, and Hawaii. After arriving in Ceylon Eliot was seized with an acute attack of appendicitis and was operated on. This illness caused Eliot to shorten his

---

plans and only visit China and Japan.

Eliot's trip to the Orient exposed him to the colonization practices of Western nations. He realized that the object of colonization has always been for extension of trade and increase of wealth. These objects, Eliot declared, "can be best accomplished by increasing the intelligence, skill, and wealth of the population controlled, raising their standards of living, relieving them from superstitious terror, social bondages, and industrial handicaps, and creating among them new wants and new ambitions." As a means of conforming the Asiatic peoples to Western standards Eliot recommended for colonial powers to establish sound educational practices in their colonies.

As Europe went to war in 1914, Eliot expressed himself on the subject of world war in about a dozen articles and communications to the press. Eliot favored isolation, but he believed that a decisive defeat of the central powers, at the hands of the allies, would establish a better world order. However, as the European war burgeoned, Eliot's newspaper editorials urged Americans to prepare for war. In 1916, Eliot wrote that American intervention was inevitable:

The present war has revealed dangers for public liberty in Europe and the
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Americas which were not realized by the freer European nations or by the American peoples until 1914 and 1915. All persons who observe and reflect can now perceive that the immense military power of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey skilfully combined, scientifically directed by Prussia, and ruthlessly used, threatens the public liberties of the rest of Europe—and indeed, of all the world.  

Eliot declared that America's alliance with France and Great Britain would be for the best interest of American ideals, and he stated:

"By taking active part with France, Belgium, and Great Britain in support of their ideals, America would effectively support her own, and defend herself against possible future attack on her territory or her institutions."

In 1919, with the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, World War I came to a close. To settle future international hostilities many nations supported the formation of an international court. President Wilson believed that the single most important step toward world peace was the League of Nations. Wilson succeeded in placing the League Covenant into the Treaty of Versailles. The aims of the League were to settle international disputes peacefully through a world organization, to prevent war by encouraging disarmament, and to solve economic and social problems through international


cooperation.

The League of Nations was established, but it did not include all major nations. The United States never joined. Russia entered the League in 1934 but was expelled in 1939. Germany and Japan withdrew in 1933, as did Italy four years later.

In the United States the League of Nations was met with considerable opposition and eventual defeat. The Republican dominated Senate, consisting of a small group of extreme isolationists, notably William Borah, Hiram Johnson, and Robert LaFollette, and a large group of more moderate senators, most of whom supported the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., turned down the League of Nations proposal.

To secure world peace, Eliot supported the formation of an international court which might have an international police force placed at its disposal. When the League of Nations was conceived, Eliot felt that it was a step in the right direction of securing international peace. He advocated the entry of the United States into the League of Nations.

After World War I Eliot resigned himself from almost every board and committee in which he had served. His resignation from active committee membership was not that his interest in their work was abating, but because he deemed it wise that younger men should be enlisted, and because the physical
fatigue of journeying to meetings was becoming demanding.\textsuperscript{218}

On March 20, 1924, Harvard University celebrated Eliot's ninetieth birthday. The ceremony was arranged by the Harvard Alumni Association and the Associated Harvard Clubs with the cooperation of an honorary committee of citizens formed under the patronage of the president of the United States, the chief justice of the United States, the governor of Massachusetts, and the premier of Canada. An academic procession formed in Memorial Hall and then moved into Sanders Theatre where the ceremonial exercises took place. The Boston Symphony Orchestra and the Harvard Glee Club provided music. After an invocation by Dr. Francis G. Peabody and an address of welcome by the president of the Alumni Association, Justice E.T. Sanford of the Supreme Court, brief speeches of salutation were made by Harvard's President Lowell, George Wigglesworth, president of the Board of Overseers, Dean L.B. Briggs of the faculty of arts and sciences, Charlton McVeagh of the senior class, and C.T. Greve of the Associated Harvard Clubs. President Angell of Yale spoke for other colleges, universities, and learned societies; Massachusetts Governor Cox spoke for the Commonwealth; and Chief Justice Taft on behalf of the American public. Following these speeches Eliot rose and delivered a short speech of acknowledgement. The ceremony was truly a national celebration.

\textsuperscript{218}James, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 287.
of Eliot's achievements.\footnote{219}

In 1913 Grace Hopkinson Eliot developed symptoms of arterial and cardiac distress, and as a result, her movement became greatly restricted. She was confined to her room and her easy-chair most of the time. She was able to make the summer journeys to their house on the Maine coast and the return trip to Cambridge each autumn, but after arriving in Maine in 1924 her condition worsened. On August 16, 1924 Grace Hopkinson Eliot died.

To alleviate his loneliness Eliot immersed himself in long hours of correspondence. He remained active by appearing as a speaker in and around the Cambridge area. He continued to spend his summers in Northeast Harbor where he was kept company by his daughter in law, grandchildren and his son, Samuel. Eliot's fondness for sailing remained with him throughout his life, and although he was not able to carry out the responsibilities of the skipper, he continued to be a participant on sailing excursions.

Indications of Eliot's declining health became noticeable in 1925. In April, after giving a talk at the Boston

\footnote{219 The celebration of Eliot's ninetieth birthday was commemorated in a volume which contains a complete record of the proceedings: \textit{The Ninetieth Birthday of Charles William Eliot, Proceedings in Sanders Theatre and the Yard, March 20, 1924} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1925). This volume contains, in addition to the program and verbatim reports of the proceedings, the messages that were delivered unread from ninety-nine Harvard clubs in different parts of the world, 148 colleges and universities, fourteen learned societies, and congratulatory letters from leading American statesmen.}
Latin School, Eliot had a slight case of paralysis causing him pains in his legs and arms. In August of the same year he was prostrated by an attack of shingles that lasted more than three months. At the end of three months the pain suddenly ceased, but it left a disability in his right hand, which thereafter prevented him from using it to write. By 1926 Eliot's strength had declined considerably. His ardent wish, throughout the spring months of 1926, was that he might be strong enough to reach the coast of Maine again. He was able to gather enough strength to spend his last days in Maine, but he was confined to a wheelchair, and in August he was ordered to remain in bed by his doctor. Eliot's final days were expressed by James:

On the 15th or 16th of August, he suddenly and quite simply informed his son, Samuel, that he was going to die on the following Saturday....Saturday dawned and passed without change. Sunday morning, August 22, he recognized members of the family and spoke to them lucidly, then sank again into a doze. After lunch, a nurse being alone with him at the moment, and he being propped up with pillows in bed, he exclaimed, "I see Father!" The nurse, astonished, stepped to his side and asked whether he wanted anything. A shadow passed over his face as he made an effort of attention and murmured, "No nothing." Then after a pause, "I see Mother." A moment later, his head sank upon his breast--.

A simple ceremony in the Union Church at Northeast Harbor preceded a larger funeral service which was conducted

---
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at Harvard's Appleton Chapel. Eliot was put to rest at the Mount Auburn cemetery.

In the August 30, 1926 issue of *Time*, two obituaries appeared under the heading of "Heroes." One was Eliot's and the other was that of Rudolph Valentino, who had died a day after Eliot. Eliot's portrayal as hero was for his work in educational reforms and his many years of devotion to political, social, and economic concerns. The account of Valentino's life touched on the millions of hysterical fans that he influenced, and the million dollar life insurance policy that his producer had taken out on his star. In an interesting way Hawkins contrasted these two heroes:

> The juxtaposition of the two lives provided an effective contrast of American values. But the paragon of old-fashioned virtues, though he never listened to the radio or saw films, had himself sought a mass audience, first through oratory and travel, then through the printed word. Perhaps Eliot, even more than the motion picture idol, had volunteered to be a national hero. In him Americans had wanted to embody their faith in progress, in the efficacy of work, and in human educability. He had accepted the call to be America's President Eliot.

Eliot lived for ninety-two years. Forty years were spent as Harvard's president, and during this period he was very influential in reforming all levels of education in the United States. His resignation from Harvard's presidency was


followed with seventeen years of service in political, social, economic, as well as educational affairs of the American nation. During these years he became America's sage. All together, Eliot devoted fifty-seven years as a significant contributor to American education as well as American social and political causes.
CHAPTER IV

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The long and healthy life that Eliot experienced was attributed to his lifestyle, and one characteristic of his lifestyle was his life long participation in physical exercise. Eliot's lifestyle was mentioned by James: "His good health and his great capacity for work were due in part to his ability to rest whenever he needed to, as well as to his moderate diet and regular exercise."¹ Similarly, Sullivan commented that Eliot had always nourished his physique with exercise.² An article in Harper's Weekly had this to say about Eliot's involvement in physical exercise:

In school and college he was a good scholar, duly chastening his will and disciplining his wits, and an athlete of note according to his athletic standards of the time. They were moderate standards, college athletics being in their infancy then, and not yet risen from the status of a diversion to that of an occupation; but Eliot got out of them what there was to get,...Ever since he has always showed respect to his body and given it due exercise and diversion, and in return for

¹James, op. cit., II, p. 162.

²Mark Sullivan, "The Personality of President Eliot," Outlook, LXXVII (August 6, 1904), 833.
considerate treatment has stood him in wonderfully good stead. In his own words Eliot stated, "I imagine that my good health has been largely owing to my moderation in eating and drinking and to the habit of daily exercise." 4

**Physical Exercise and a Durable Life**

Eliot had been involved with physical exercise, which included organized sport, throughout his life, and, he had many views concerning the nature of physical education and athletics. In several occasions, Eliot offered his views concerning the standards necessary for leading a durable and satisfying life. In presenting standards for a life of satisfaction, Eliot was not of the common opinion that material objects result in satisfaction. The common goals of human pursuit—wealth, power, and fame—were only achieved by a select few, and these pursuits were not practical in Eliot's scheme of thought. He was concerned with the majority of the population and the means available for them to achieve happiness, and he stated: "I invite you to consider only those means of happiness which the humble and obscure millions


may possess."\(^5\) One of the most important criteria for a life of satisfaction was health:

> For educated men what are the sources of the solid and durable satisfactions of life?...So far as I have seen, there is one indispensible foundation for the satisfactions of life—health. A young man ought to be a clean, wholesome, vigorous animal...We have to build everything in this world of domestic joy and professional success, everything of a useful, honorable career, on bodily wholesomeness and vitality.\(^6\)

In fulfilling an effective and happy life Eliot claimed that a strong and healthy body was necessary: "None of us can have an effective life without a strong, healthy, cheerful servant in the body.\(^7\)

The reason why satisfaction accrued from physical exercise was due to the exhilaration of bodily exertion, and on this Eliot elaborated:

> I turn now to the satisfactions which comes from physical exertion, including brain-work. Everybody knows some form of activity which gives him satisfaction. Perhaps it is riding on a horse, or rowing a boat, or tramping all day through woods, or climbing a mountain, or wrestling...There is real pleasure and exhilaration in bodily exertion, particularly with companionship (of men or animals) and competition. There is pleasure in the exertion even when it is pushed to the point of fatigue, as many a sportsmen knows, and


\(^6\)Ibid., p. 3.

this pleasure is in good measure, independent of the attainment of any practical end.

However, the satisfactions gained from physical exercise may dwindle if the activity is taken as the main object of life. According to Eliot play must be incidental in life:

It is a wholesome thing to enjoy for a time, or for a time each day all through life, sports and active bodily exercise. These are legitimate enjoyments, but if made the main object of life, they tire. They cease to be a source of durable satisfaction. Play must be incidental in a satisfactory life.

Eliot's position on the nature of bodily activities and mental activities was one which did not classify one above the other. His position was stated in the following manner:

All attempts to draw a line between bodily satisfactions on the one hand, and mental or spiritual satisfactions on the other, and to distinguish the first as beastly indulgences and the second as the only pleasures worthy of a rational being, have failed and must fail; for it is manifestly impossible to draw a sharp line of division between pleasures, and to say that these are bodily, and those are intellectual or moral. Are the pleasures of sight and hearing bodily or mental?

According to Eliot the mind and body work together. To illustrate the relationship between physical and mental features of an individual, Eliot presented the following example:

---
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I remember saying in some previous address that it is through practice with eye, ear, nose, and touch, and the same nerves and ganglia that transmit and record our sensations, and set going our movements, that we all get our minds at work in childhood, and acquire not only skill with eye and hand but also skill in thinking.

Eliot contended that the general consensus concerning the subservient position of body to mind was due to the Puritan interpretation of the Bible. According to Eliot, this interpretation was one sided and neglected to include passages from the Bible that extol the body:

That the attention of a community once Puritan or Calvinistic should be withdrawn from those Bible passages which express a deep sense of the vileness of the body, and should be turned toward those passages of opposite temper which extol the holiness of our bodies.

When he presented the qualities necessary for what he termed the "cultivated man," Eliot idealized the harmony of mind and body. The cultivated man was to be a well rounded individual, and "the bookworm, the monk, the isolated student, has never been the type of the cultivated man."

To draw the qualities of cultivation, Eliot referred to Emersonian doctrine. This was not new, for many of Eliot's

11 Eliot, The Durable Satisfactions of Life, p. 11.
educational reforms were inspired by Emerson. Eliot mentioned the significance of Emerson in shaping his understanding of the nature of body:

...Ralph Waldo Emerson. It was he who first in this country declared that the possession of some manual skill, some power to do work with his body, with his eyes, with his ears, his hands, was essential to the right quality of a cultivated man.  

Emerson felt that acquisition of some form of manual skill was an essential element of culture. Eliot interpreted this into his ideal of the cultivated man:

This idea has more and more become accepted in the systematic education of youth; and if we include athletic sports among the desirable forms of manual skill and labor we may say that during the last thirty years this element of excellence of body in the ideal of education has had a rapid, even an exaggerated development. The idea of some sort of bodily excellence was, to be sure, not absent in the old conception of the cultivated man. The gentleman could ride well, dance gracefully and fence with skill but the modern conception of bodily skill as an element in cultivation is more comprehensive, and includes that habitual contact with the external world which Emerson deemed essential to real culture.

Another individual who influenced Eliot's views on the education of the body was Herbert Spencer. In the introductory

14 Eliot, The Tendency to the Concrete and Practical in Modern Education, p. 10.
15 Emerson, Journals, pp. 36, 197.
essay to Spencer's *Essays on Education* Eliot remarked:

Modern society as yet hardly approaches the putting into effective practice of the sound views which Spencer set forth with great detail in his essay on "Physical Education." The instruction given in schools and colleges on the care of the body and the laws of health is still very meagre; and in certain subjects of the utmost importance no instruction whatever is given, as, for example, in the normal methods of reproduction in plants and animals, in eugenics, and in the ruinous consequences of disregarding sexual purity and honour. In one respect his fundamental doctrine of freedom, carried into the domain of physical exercise, has been extensively adopted in England, on the Continent, and in America. He taught that although gymnastics, military drill, and formal exercises of the limbs are better than nothing, they can never serve in place of the plays prompted by nature.  

Spencer maintained that "for girls, as well as boys, the sportive activities to which the instincts impel, are essential to bodily welfare. Whoever forbids them, forbids the divinely-appointed means to physical development."  

Eliot admired Spencer's position on physical education, and believed that the practice of physical education should not only be for school-children, but for factory workers, clerks, and others whose occupations are sedentary and monotonous.  

With regard to education, Eliot announced that one of the standards in education was the cultivation of the

---

The goal of education was the development of the whole individual, and as Eliot stated: "education is properly the development and training of the individual body, mind, and will,...".

In a speech delivered to new Harvard students in 1912, Eliot recommended that they look ahead with regard to their development. One recommendation was to take care of their bodies, and Eliot remarked: "Therefore, gentlemen, look ahead in regard to the care of your bodies." He advised students to achieve a sound mind in a sound body, and he urged the new students to get involved with sports:

With this same object of preserving a sound mind in a sound body, look ahead with regard to athletic sports. It may make some difference to you in the next four years, perhaps, if you look ahead with regard to athletic sports. Under modern stresses athletic sports are an indispensable part of young life and, indeed, of sound national life.

The sports recommended by Eliot were those that can be pursued throughout one's life. He advised, "By looking ahead in regard to athletic sports, I mean, give preference to those sports that last, and that you can pursue at thirty,

---
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forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, and I am beginning to hope, eighty years of age." Eliot advocated lifetime sports. He considered activities such as walking, rowing, sailing, tennis, golf, and horseback riding as excellent lifetime pursuits. Essentially, Eliot favored sports which were of the non-team variety, and he presented his reasons for this:

Any outdoor sport which does not require a team, so to speak, is valuable through life, such as horseback riding, sailing, skating, and hill-climbing. Those which require a combination of many players, of course, cannot be kept up through life; because they are merely temporary. They cannot be carried on through mature life to age. Give preference every time to those bodily accomplishments and to those aesthetic intellectual delights which can be practiced all through life. That is as good a rule for the intellectual accomplishments as it is for the bodily.

To illustrate his presentation of lifetime sports, Eliot presented two living examples of lifetime sports in action:

May I ask your attention to the different values of sports and bodily accomplishments, according as they are temporary or lasting? There are many of the athletic sports which really last through life, or till advanced age. I have a friend in Boston, now seventy-five years of age, who still plays tennis with great activity. I heard of a farmer down in Maine a week ago, who, being

---
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seventy-two years of age, danced the entire evening at a ball. And, by the way, I may mention that that is one of the accomplishments that every educated youth should acquire—dancing. It is a first-rate physical exercise, and there is great fun in it, and it lasts. 27

The image of the scholar as an isolated bookworm was changed by Eliot. He viewed the scholar as an active and thinking individual. To him the goal of the scholar was to obtain the characteristics that were similar to the ancient Athenian citizen, the man of wisdom and the man of action. This ideal was presented in a speech delivered in 1905:

Nowadays a scholar is not a recluse, or a weakling incapable of the strenuous pursuits. He is not a bookworm, although he masters some books. He studies something thoroughly, learns all there is to know about it, and then pushes beyond. . . . He must use strenuously a tough and alert body, and possess a large vitality and a sober courage. 28

Physical Education as a Part of American Education

Eliot was concerned with the deficiency of physical education in American schools, and he advocated the introduction of physical education programs for all levels of education. With regard to this Eliot remarked:

27 Ibid., pp. 70-71.
28 Eliot, Address delivered at the Dinner of the New England Society in New York City on October 25, 1905. Addresses and Articles in Eliot Papers, Box 103, Harvard University Archives.
The first step in the improvement of the American schools is the introduction of universal physical training for both boys and girls from six to eighteen years of age. The programme should be comprehensive and flexible, so that the needs of different types of children and different individual pupils can be met. It should include the means of remedying defects and malformations as well as of developing normal bodies. It should include exercises which might fairly be called drills, but many more which would properly be called games or sports. Except in extreme weather most of the exercises should be conducted in the open air. Carriage, posture, gait, rhythmical movements, and team-play should be covered.

One aspect of Eliot's recommendation for physical education in schools was that it substitutes for activities which no longer are carried out by the majority of the population, for example, agricultural pursuits. Agricultural pursuits which were once a necessity and vital for the training of the senses became obsolete with the introduction of automation. Thus, it was necessary to provide activities that will substitute for the training lost from agricultural activities:

Hence the school system is under obligation to provide as many substitutes as possible for the training lost when agriculture ceased to be the main occupation of all the civilized peoples, machines replaced men in many of the principal industries, men, women, and children by the millions have become almost automatic tenders and feeders of machines.

With the abandonment of farm life, Eliot contended that schools

29 Eliot, A Late Harvest, p. 112.
must provide sense training and outdoor sports to defend individuals against bodily degeneration.  

The inclusion of sense and physical training in education was what Eliot termed as "education for efficiency." The concern of education for efficiency was to provide the student with an awareness of his senses and body, and the first consideration regarding education for efficiency was the training of the body:

I take up first the training of the bodily senses and the care of the body. The training of sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch has been neglected in education to a most extraordinary degree.  

In providing activities for sense training, Eliot mentioned that the natural tendencies of children, namely play and games, should be utilized. Eliot emphasized this in the following manner:

In the training of children, whether boys or girls, the effort should always be to train their senses to accurate observation, but to do this through play and work which interest the children. Those games or sports are always to be preferred which cultivate the accurate use of eye, ear, and hand, rather than those which rely on chance or luck for their interests.  

---

31 Eliot, More Money for the Public Schools, p. 122.


33 Eliot, "Bringing Up a Boy," Delineator, LXXXV (October 1914), 1.
Eliot advocated individual sports for lifetime purposes, but he did call for team activities in schools. One objective of the schools was to train students in cooperative behavior, and Eliot felt that team sports would be ideal for developing such behavior. To this objective Eliot stated:

> It should be made a special object in all schools to develop among the children and youth what is called in sports 'team play'; to impress all the pupils with the high value of cooperative discipline... There should be many opportunities during school life to learn this enjoyable acquiescence in the strict, cooperative discipline necessary when many persons have to combine in prompt and accurate production of a given effect or result. Some of the familiar means to this end are singing in parts, producing music in a band or orchestra, folk-dancing, combining in groups to perform gymnastic feats,...

Another practical aspect of physical education, which Eliot touched on, was the appeal that workers possessing good physical qualities would produce a more efficient industrial environment. This aspect of physical efficiency also extended into the armed forces. According to Eliot, the armed forces would be more efficient if the draftees were in good physical condition. The time consumed in preparing men for war was increased due to conditioning them, and Eliot cited that the draftees during World War I were in poor

---


condition. This was due to the fact that many of the draftees never had physical education during their schooling, and to this Eliot declared that if physical training had been offered to these men, the armed forces would have experienced a more efficient training program:

When the results were published of the physical examinations of the men drafted for the army and navy, the whole American public were much disappointed at the large percentage of rejections. Men in large numbers proved to have physical defects which incapacitated them for the work of either a soldier or sailor. When the accepted men were brought together in camp a large proportion of them seemed deficient in muscular power and the majority of them seemed never to have been trained to a good carriage of the body or a vigorous and graceful bearing...These physical qualities are not only desirable and even necessary in a soldier or a sailor, but they are equally desirable for all industrial workers and, indeed, for the entire people. If every American child, boy or girl, receives an adequate course of physical training while at school, the industrial efficiency of the nation will be greatly increased in the normal times of peace; and if war came again, the necessary military training would be made shorter than it was in 1917 and 1918.  

The sports and games carried out by youth were considered to be very practical by Eliot, for these activities can serve as training for later work in industry and in the military. Since sports and games develop reaction time, this would be a necessary quality in industrial work where quick decisions must be made. This quality was stated by Eliot in the following manner:

When we consider the extreme lack of concrete and practical teaching for children in countries which, like the United States and Great Britain, have become intensely industrial on the factory system, we realize that another potent influence in Anglo-Saxon schools and colleges has had strong effect in reducing the losses and injuries caused by inadequate development of concrete teaching and the laboratory method in the school system of those countries. That influence has come from sports, both out-of-door and indoor. These generally give children and youth some rather strenuous training in quick observation and prompt and accurate use of arms and legs in active motion. Most out-of-door sports require some form of quick decision, so that those who excel in them are found to possess a short time-reaction.  

Essentially, Eliot believed that physical education contributed to the development of a student in three ways: (1) lifetime sports for an individual to lead a long, healthy, and happy life; (2) team sports for training in cooperative behavior; and (3) physical development for productive efficiency and military preparedness. Since physical education contributed in these ways, Eliot was in favor of having physical education adopted as part of the curriculum of American schools.  

Eliot contended that private schools were ahead of public schools in providing their students with physical education, because public schools were unable to afford programs of physical education. This disturbed Eliot, for he was always of the opinion that educational opportunities should be equal.

---

37 Eliot, The Tendency to the Concrete and Practical in Modern Education, pp. 31-32.
and not based on socio-economic status. This was expressed by Eliot:

It is fair to state that some of the more expensively endowed schools make an elaborate and costly provision for the physical training of their pupils and their outdoor sports. For the public school child no such provision is ordinarily made.  

During a visit to a private school in Buffalo, New York, Eliot witnessed an exhibition of the Dalcroze method of physical education. He was very impressed with this method, and he commented:

I lately witnessed in a private school in Buffalo an exhibition of the Dalcroze method of physical training, where young children and adolescents make rhythmical movements of the limbs, head, and body in time with music; no apparatus was used, and no implements of any sort. The movements were slow or quick, grave or gay, and were highly enjoyable; but they always required on the part of the child two mental exertions of high value. First, a concentrated attention to any change of rhythm therein; and second, complete inhibition of irrelevant sights and sounds. The attention given by the children, moment by moment, and the concentration of their wills on the spot were most remarkable. The immediate physical result of this training is the improvement the children exhibit in agility, alertness, grace, and cooperative skill, but the most important result is the strenuous training of mind and will; for the mental power and the self-control acquired in these exercises are the best results of any education, since they are applicable anywhere to any subject. An agreeable and useful outcome of the Dalcroze method is a strong case of teaching

38 Eliot, More Money for the Public Schools, pp. 16-17.
through action on the part of the pupil.\textsuperscript{39}

One problem with securing courses such as the Dalcroze method of physical education in the public schools was the lack of qualified teachers. To facilitate such programs, Eliot recommended a national administration of physical training to be organized. Physical education can be introduced into all public schools more efficiently by having a national administering body, and to this Eliot recommended:

\begin{quote}
The faithful and intelligent administration of a sound programme of physical training in all American schools, public and private, elementary and secondary, is so intensely a national as distinguished from a local interest, that the programme should be prescribed by the national Bureau of Education, or some analogous Bureau or Commission; and the execution of the programme should be incessantly supervised by inspectors appointed and paid by the National Government. Further, the National Government might properly and wisely pay to State, county, or municipal educational authorities, or to the trustees or owners of private schools, a small sum— a dollar perhaps—annually for each pupil well trained under the prescribed programme for one year, as determined by the national inspectors. When universal physical training has been well carried on for twenty years, an immense improvement will be seen not only in the aspect of the population as respects posture, relation of weight to height, and muscular development, but also in their comfort, health, and productiveness at daily labor.\textsuperscript{40}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{39}Eliot, Address delivered at the inauguration of John H. Finley as President of the University of the State of New York and State Commissioner of Education, January 2, 1914. Eliot Papers, Box 103, Harvard University Archives.

\textsuperscript{40}Eliot, \textit{A Late Harvest}, p. 112.
The Swiss national government operated in a manner where a national program of physical education was carried out, and Eliot pointed to the Swiss program as an example of national supervision of physical education:

The Swiss Federal Council prescribes a program of physical training for every school in Switzerland, and appoints and pays the national inspectors who see that this program is carried out. The federation also makes a small contribution to the cost of this physical training throughout the republic. The Congress of the United States should immediately provide for some national aid to the states and municipalities in putting into force in all schools a course of physical training planned and watched by the national government. 41

The construction of school buildings, especially in urban areas, was of particular concern to Eliot. As set forth by Eliot, the construction of school buildings should include the following improvements:

There are some large improvements for which we hope; we hope for more fresh air within the buildings; for moderate temperature and abundance of light. These are necessary conditions for healthful mental activity: good air, good light, and every hour or two, out-of-door exercises. 42

Urban areas with their lack of open spaces for play was no place for children to grow up, and Eliot declared that grammar schoolhouses should be constructed away from crowded urban areas. Eliot's plan called for the construction of

42 Eliot, Educational Reform Essays and Addresses, p. 303.
country day schools at the edge of urban areas where students would be transported from congested city areas to wholesome surroundings:

...grammar school houses for the children who live in congested districts be placed on the edge of one or more of the city parks, and that the pupils be carried out to the school-houses so situated in the morning and brought home again at night in streetcars, at the public expense, five days in the week, the schools to supervise the children's play and study periods, so that on school days the children shall no longer play in the streets or study at home...These country public schools should have facilities for exercise, or games under cover in stormy weather; in good weather the children's games and exercise should take place in the open air, partly in the park, and partly in the large school yard. 43

Eliot did not limit his discussion of physical education to students in schools and colleges, but emphasized the need for physical education for adults as well. He proposed developing programs of continuing education, and he mentioned the purpose for such a program:

In general, it is for men and women whose education in the narrower sense, that is, in youth, was too early interrupted, and who have in later life wished to continue their training,—the training of their bodies, the training of their minds. 44

This was consistent with Eliot's view on education, that is,


the object of education was not only during youth but throughout the entire life of an individual. Since one purpose of continuing education was for developing sounder, stronger, better bodies, physical education played a contributive role. 45

The relationship of physical education and elementary, secondary, higher, and continuing levels of education was a topic that Eliot dealt with. His educational objective was the "harmonious, general development of body, mind, and will together." 46 It was Eliot's belief that physical education contributed to an individual's development. At a Pan American Scientific Congress, Ernesto Nelson a visiting educator from Argentina had this to say about Eliot's position on education: "Dr. Charles W. Eliot has shown that the most vital need of education is that of enlarging the pupil's opportunities to attain bodily skill and to train his habits of reasoning." 47 And on Eliot's ninetieth birthday the Graduate School of Education delivered the following message concerning Eliot's work in education:

You have urged the value of music, of drawing, and of work with the hands as important elements in general education.

45 Ibid.
You have insisted on the need of physical training in the public schools.

One of the prevailing effects of urbanization was a dwindling of available opportunities for urban dwellers to engage in wholesome recreation, and this became a concern for the outdoor minded Eliot. Something had to be done to secure recreation for the urban masses. The problem of urban congestion prompted Eliot to make the following comment:

The children and youth have themselves found and developed in their sports and games some first-rate educational forces. But now, owing to the concentration of population in cities, the opportunities for out-of-door sports are very scanty for the larger part of the population. Have the children of Boston a good chance for out-of-door sports? Have the people of Boston as a community opportunity for the training of their senses, such as hunting and fishing supply to the savage or semicivilized man, and to some small fraction of a civilized people?

Thus, Eliot supported the playground movement which called for developing playgrounds in urban areas, and he stated:

The absolute inadequacy of the present provision of opportunities for sport among city children is good reason for giving prompt and vigorous support to the present playground movement.

Eliot criticized the American democratic government for the lack of concern for the healthful enjoyments of an urban

49 Eliot, The Tendency to the Concrete and Practical, p. 33.
50 Ibid., p. 34.
population. Eliot was optimistic however, for he believed that through communal efforts facilities for recreation could be secured. One viable source for providing recreation in the communities was the schoolhouse, and Eliot urged schoolhouses to open their doors in the evening as community centers; he joined many social reformers in this effort.

Eliot was concerned with the lack of attention the American public was giving to recreation. He felt that many Americans were overemphasizing work and production, but he was optimistic that Americans would become more attentive to recreation:

In our democratic society, which at first thought only of work and production, it is now to be seen that public attention is directed more and more to the means of preserving and increasing health and vigor. Some of these means are country schools for city children, country or seaside houses for families, public parks and gardens, out-of-door sports, systematic physical training in schools and colleges.

Physical Education at Harvard

Several significant events in physical education occurred at Harvard University during Eliot's forty year tenure as

president. With the construction of the Hemenway Gymnasium and the acquisition of Dr. Dudley Allen Sargent, Harvard University became the site of several contributions to the development of physical education in the United States. The founding of the Harvard Summer School of Physical Training, the efforts of Dr. George Fitz in applying physiological research to physical exercise, and the collaboration of Drs. Sargent and Fitz in securing a Bachelor of Science degree in physical training also signified the contributions made at Harvard under President Eliot's administration.

Harvard and its surrounding area provided several opportunities for students to engage in recreation and sports. Since the seventeenth century, the Charles River and Fresh Pond were used by students for swimming and ice skating. In the nineteenth century Harvard students used the Charles River for rowing, which became a popular activity among the students.

As early as 1712 a field was set aside for purposes of carrying out field sports. This play area was known as

55 Sibley's Harvard Graduates 1690-1700 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936), IV, p. 480 reports that on November 30, 1696 two students drowned while ice skating on Fresh Pond. Samuel E. Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936), p. 112 mentions that students used the Charles River and Fresh Pond for recreation, and President Increase Mather encouraged students to engage in ice skating.


Spencer's Orchard, but in 1744 the land was annexed for the construction of Holden Chapel. A new playing field was founded and referred to as the Delta; in 1870 the construction of Memorial Hall was initiated and the Delta became the foundation for this construction. In exchange for the Delta the students were given Jarvis Field, which provided ample space for sports. In 1890 Major Henry L. Higginson presented Harvard with a stretch of real estate that became Soldiers Field.

As for indoor facilities, the first gymnasium at Harvard was opened in 1859 when a donation of $8,000 was received by an anonymous donor for the construction of a gymnasium. The gymnasium was constructed of brick and octagonal in shape, and it was named the octagonal gymnasium. The building displaced 74 feet in diameter and 40 feet high. In June 2, 1859, Harvard secured the services of A. Molineaux Hewlett as director of the gymnasium and instructor in gymnastics. Hewlett, a black physical educator, has been credited as being the first recognized director of college physical education; he remained at this position until 1871. The gymnasium was used by the rowing team during the winter months, and it proved to be insufficient in meeting the needs of Harvard students. To alleviate the overcrowding of the gymnasium, Augustus Hemenway, son of Mrs. Mary Hemenway of Boston and a graduate

---

of Harvard in 1875, sent a letter to the Harvard Corporation in June, 1878, indicating the desire to construct a new gymnasium. Hemenway contributed $110,000 for the erection of the gymnasium. The construction began immediately and was completed in 1879. The new structure was 125 feet long by 113 feet wide and 93 feet high. As the completion of the gymnasium approached, the Harvard Advocate reported the need for a director for the gymnasium:

We ought to have a superintendent who is an accomplished gymnast, and can devote his whole time to the wants of those who are exercising, without being troubled with the smaller matters of management...Moreover, there is a desire in the College for something more than a mere superintendent; for a Professor of Hygiene, who may give instruction in that department.

William Blaikie, a New York attorney who had been on Harvard's rowing team in 1865 and 1866, wrote a letter to Allen Danforth, bursar of Harvard, on June 17, 1879. In his letter, Blaikie expressed his concern for hiring an instructor for the new Hemenway Gymnasium. According to Blaikie there were only two individuals qualified; one was Archibald MacLaren of the University gymnasium at Oxford, England; and the other was Dudley Allen Sargent of New York.


60 Blaikie was a popular lecturer on temperance and physical exercise. He was the author of the well known book, How to Grow Strong and How to Stay So, and he became the second president of the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education, from 1887-1890.
Sargent was operating his Hygienic Institute and School of Physical Culture in New York City.  

President Eliot was informed of Sargent's interest in the position, and he wrote a letter to Sargent outlining the conditions for the appointment. The letter was dated September 4, 1879, and the following information was included:

If you accept the directorship of our new gymnasium, it will be, therefore, upon the following terms:-- 1) An appointment as assistant professor of physical culture (or some like phrase) and director of the gymnasium, with a salary of $2,000 a year, the appointment covering five years beginning Sept. 1, 1879 and terminating Sept. 1, 1884. 2) In addition to this salary the Corporation will pay to you each year the amount received in payment for the use of the dressing room boxes; but the amount of the tax, or charge, for each box shall be fixed by the Corporation after consultation with you. 3) All instruction given in the gymnasium in boxing, fencing, wrestling, etc. shall be under your direction; but you will not give lessons in these arts yourself. 4) You will patent no apparatus and seek no income from that source. 5) You are to be at liberty to devote one hour a day to private practice in Boston. 6) Subordinates in the gymnasium are to be selected by you and to be under your control. 7) Like all other professors you will be subject to the votes of the faculty in matters relating to undergraduates and to the orders of the Corporation in matters relating to expenditure.

Sargent accepted the position, and he felt that Harvard's offer

---

61 Letter from William Blaikie to Allen Danforth, June 17, 1879, Eliot Papers, Box 260, Harvard University Archives.

was his best chance to progress in his profession.\textsuperscript{63}

Sargent\textsuperscript{64} was born in Belfast, Maine in 1849, and during his boyhood he joined the circus to become an acrobat. By the age of fifteen, due to his laborious work with the circus, he was a fairly muscular individual. In 1869 Sargent attended Bowdoin College and simultaneously served as the college's gymnasium director. After graduation from Bowdoin, Sargent started his work in pursuit of a medical degree at Yale in 1875. Since there was no training for physical educators at that time, the medical degree was the only preparation for a person who wanted to become a physical educator and gain faculty rank. Three years later Sargent received his medical degree. Unable to find a position in physical education, Sargent went to New York City to open a private gymnasium. The following year he was appointed as assistant professor of physical training and director of the Hemenway Gymnasium at Harvard. Harvard became the second American college to hire a physical educator with faculty status as a professor; Amherst College established the precedent in 1860 when Dr. John W. Hooker was hired, but his health failed and he resigned at the end of his initial year. Dr. Edward Hitchcock was appointed to the professorship, and he served Amherst College

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{64} For a complete biography of Dudley A. Sargent refer to Bruce L. Bennett, "The Life of Dudley Allen Sargent, M.D., and His Contributions to Physical Education" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1947).
\end{footnotesize}
for the next fifty years.

Sargent's medical education was indeed a factor in securing the appointment, as the Harvard Register reported:

> It was the purpose of the Corporation, in making this appointment, to put the department—fore the accommodation [sic] of which Mr. Hemenway had so superbly provided—into the hands of a man of medical education, who was also practically familiar with every kind of bodily exercise and athletic sport. 65

With the construction of the Hemenway Gymnasium and the hiring of Dr. Sargent, along with the support of President Eliot, Harvard provided the greatest impetus to the cause of physical education in the United States. 66

On September 22, 1879, Sargent was officially appointed assistant professor of physical training and director of the Hemenway Gymnasium for five years. Sargent's tenure at Harvard, as was Eliot's, extended over a period of forty years.

In describing the condition of students entering Harvard, Eliot stated that they have undeveloped muscles, a bad carriage, an impaired digestion, without skill in out-of-door games, and unable to ride, row, or swim. 67 According to Eliot's description, it was apparent that students were not receiving proper physical education in their preparatory education.

---


Sargent's program of physical education included four aims to correct these deficiencies: hygienic, educative, recreative, and remedial. The hygienic aim considered the individual's growth and development. It focused on the study of anatomy and physiology with regard to the effects of the ordinary agents of health such as exercise, diet, sleep, bathing, and clothing. The educative aim concerned the cultivation of those powers of mind and body which are essential for the acquisition of some form of physical skill. The intent of this aim was for the student to develop skill in physical activity. The recreative aim was concerned with the rejuvenation of the individual so that he may return to his daily work with vigor and accomplish his tasks with ease. The remedial aim was directed at the restoration of disturbed functions and the correction of physical defects and deformities. In an interesting way, Sargent's aims in physical education were directed to eliminate those deficiencies which Eliot described.

The Sargent program of physical education was scientifically oriented. With the utilization of tests and measurements, Sargent recorded various physical components such as weight, height, strength, and the general condition of the student under examination. The results of this examination were compared to a standard established for that age, and after a careful physical diagnosis, a program of exercise, diet, and

---

other agents of health were prescribed to each individual. Tests were regularly conducted to determine an individual's development. The program of physical education at Harvard was described in the Harvard catalog (Appendix C):

The attendance is voluntary, and the system adopted is one designed to meet the special wants of each individual. Realizing the great diversity in age, size, and strength, as well as in health, of the students who attend the University, the Director makes no attempt to group them into classes which pursue the same course of exercises. The program of physical education at Harvard differed from traditional programs of physical education, for it liberated the student from a rigid plan of group calisthenics and catered to his individual needs. Individual development was further facilitated by Sargent's construction of physical appliances which were developed to train specific physical deficiencies. Sargent's program of individual development was in accordance with the general educational plan at Harvard, which emphasized offering the individual a broad area of study to fulfill his interests. With regard to physical education, the emphasis on broadness was expressed by Sargent:

Every student who attends Harvard University should have the opportunity of taking some systematic form of physical exercise. The exercises offered for selection should cover the broadest possible range, including every kind of

69 Harvard Catalog, 1888-1890, p. 349.
athletic sport and gymnastic game.  

Views of Eliot and Sargent on Physical Education

In many ways, President Eliot and Dr. Sargent shared similar views on health and physical education. They were both in favor of preventive medicine. Sargent's position on preventive medicine was stated in the following:

He made a vigorous presentation of his conception of preventive medicine and deplored a society which compelled a doctor to sit in his office and wait for people to come to him after they are sick.

The question concerning mind and body was treated in a similar manner by Eliot and Sargent. They believed that the greatest achievements accomplished in the world are carried out by men who have the best brains in the best bodies. Eliot's ideal of the cultivated and scholarly man was to possess a sound mind in a sound body. The following passage stated by Sargent was similar to Eliot's position on the relationship of mind and body:

Both classes have ideals and aims which are essentially different. Both classes are naturally antagonistic, and both classes are pursuing the means of


71 Eliot, The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism, pp. 101-103; and A Late Harvest, pp. 195-209.

72 Bennett, op. cit., p. 32.
education and training as though they were ends in themselves. The consequence is superior physiques with mediocre mental ability according to the college rank-book in one class, and inferior physiques with fine mental attainments in the other. Moreover, this want of harmony or sense of proportion between mental and physical efforts on the part of our students, which we all recognize is greatly intensified by that crying evil of the age, the spirit of competition. Competition is to-day the arch-enemy of all true culture, mental as well as physical...If there is any truth in statistics the world's work and greatest achievements are to be attained by the men as a class who have the best brains in the best bodies.

The concern for physical education in all phases of education—elementary, secondary, and higher—was shared by Eliot and Sargent. They agreed that physical education was an essential part of an individual's education and that sports and games should be taken up as a lifetime pursuit. Sargent's interest in promoting physical fitness for the total population paralleled Eliot's concern for lifetime sport. Sargent's book, Health, Strength, and Power, was directed to the public at large and he wrote a number of articles which appeared in popular magazines.

---


74 Eliot, A Late Harvest, pp. 112-13.


The concept of the greatest good to the greatest number was applied to physical education by Eliot and Sargent. The rising interest in intercollegiate athletics produced an increase in spectatorship, and to Eliot and Sargent, this was not the direction that sports and games should pursue. To this Sargent commented:

"The aim of many of us for years has been to have gymnastics and athletics largely for the benefit of the performer, rather than for the amusement of the spectator. The real benefit to the individual from exercise and sport comes from actual participation in them, not simply from witnessing the effort of others."

Similarly, Eliot mentioned that the success of an athletic program is determined by the number of participants:

"From the educational point of view, the value of any sport is to be tested chiefly by the number of persons who habitually take active part in it for pleasure during the educational period, and enjoy it in after-life."

Sargent was determined to have the gymnasium available to all students and not only the athletes, and he stated: "I was determined that the new gymnasium should not attract the rowers and boxers alone, but that it should draw the whole student body, and interest large numbers in physical exercise."

In 1884 Sargent's appointment as assistant professor of physical training and director of the Hemenway Gymnasium was

---

77 Sargent, "Gymnastics," Harper's Weekly, XLV (January 26, 1901), 82.


renewed for another five years. In the fall of 1889, when Sargent's renewal came up again, things did not turn out too well. Dr. Sargent hoped to be appointed as full professor in 1889, and on September 25, 1889, President Eliot notified the Board of Overseers that the Corporation has elected to promote Dr. Sargent as professor of physical training. The Board of Overseers did not approve the appointment which was accepted by the Corporation, and the final outcome was that Dr. Sargent was reappointed as director of the Hemenway Gymnasium without faculty status. The reason for this was not given, but it may have been due to Sargent's work on the athletic committee. Sargent was on the committee when it banned football for the 1885 season at Harvard, and this was not taken well by the alumni. Since the Board of Overseers consisted of alumni, they had the power to turn down Sargent's faculty status and thusly eliminate him from the athletic committee which consisted of faculty members at that time. The outcome of the strategy used by the overseers to eliminate Sargent from the committee was stated in the following passage:

Without faculty status, Dr. Sargent could not serve on the nine-man athletic committee and he was effectively eliminated from the varsity athletic scene. After this time, Dr. Sargent was never again consulted about Harvard athletics and the divorce of Hemenway Gymnasium from

---

80 Bennett, op. cit., p. 68.
intercollegiate athletics was complete and final. 81

One of the outstanding educational accomplishments undertaken at Harvard was the creation of the Harvard Summer School. 82 In July 1887 physical training became part of the Harvard Summer School curriculum. It wasn't an easy task for Sargent to get physical training established in the summer program, for it was not regarded equally with the other courses. The college authorities weren't supportive of his efforts in establishing a summer course in physical training:

The college authorities, nameless potentates who in this anonymous capacity sway the collegiate world, worried greatly. First, the use of the college building and the granting of certificates at the end of the course gave quasi-recognition to that bugbear, that spectre, that goblin, the nonacademic subject. Secondly, they shook their heads dubiously at the coeducational freedom, necessary in the practice of gymnastics and athletics. And in the third place, the more conservative, and most of them were more rather than less conservative, did not approve of the scandalously abbreviated costumes which physical exercises required for safety and comfort. 83

When Sargent mentioned college authorities he did not intend to include President Eliot. Clarence Van Wyck, Dr. Sargent's secretary at Harvard for twenty-four years from 1896 to 1919,

81 Ibid., p. 69.
82 Refer to Chapter III, p. 114.
inferred: "To prevent any mistaken conclusions which might result from this quotation it should be understood that it was not the intent of Dr. Sargent to include President Eliot in his reference to 'the college authorities,'..."  

The Harvard Corporation permitted Sargent to conduct a summer course in physical training, but the Corporation did not assume any responsibility concerning the course. Sargent mentioned the manner in which he had to initiate the program:

The Corporation, consequently, declined to take any responsibility for carrying on a course in Physical Training, further than to grant the use of the Hemenway Gymnasium. All the advertising, organization, and administration was placed in the hands of the Director, exactly as if it were a private venture. I became therefore responsible for the mental, moral, and physical welfare of the summer school as well as for the financial outcome.

Once the program was launched in 1887 it was an instant success. The course lasted five weeks and was attended by fifty-seven men and women (Appendix D). This was a significant turnout, in fact it was the second largest drawing course out of all the summer school courses. The participants of the course came from diverse backgrounds which included officers of the army and navy, school superintendents, college professors, physicians, and administrators from public and private schools, as well as school teachers, athletes, and

\^Ibid., p. 206.

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., p. 206.

gymnasts. Participants received a certificate of completion, and beginning in 1899, two summers were required for a full certificate. To prepare better qualified physical educators, President Eliot urged that the certificate requirement be extended to four summers, and he approved special funds for this expansion. The summer course in physical training consisted of lectures on anthropometry, applied anatomy, physiology, hygiene, and the theory and practice of physical education. The first several years of the course offering were highly attended (Appendix E). However, in 1893 the turnout declined by fifty percent, and President Eliot inquired whether the course should be continued. Sargent informed President Eliot the reasons for the decline:

In reply to your enquiry as to the probable cause of the falling off in the attendance at our Summer School this year—I would say that I think it is largely due to the counter attraction at the Worlds Fair. The Educational Congresses, the meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education, and the German Gymnastic Contests were all held in July during the session of our Summer School. There were several schools of Physical Training held this summer in Chicago and the immediate vicinity, some of which were largely attended. That these attractions effected us may be inferred from the falling off of our attendance from the

---

86 Letter from Jerome D. Greene (Eliot's Secretary) to Dudley A. Sargent, October 27, 1902, Eliot Papers, Box 106, Harvard University Archives. This letter notified Dr. Sargent that President Eliot had approved extra funding for the expansion of the summer course in physical training.

87 The Chicago Worlds Fair of 1893 included an exhibit on physical education which was organized by Sargent.
There was a great falling off in the attendance this year at the Chautauqua school, which is our greatest rival in point of members.

The following year the attendance increased, and from 1895 to 1897 Sargent's summer course attracted more students than any other courses offered in the summer school curriculum. Sargent reported that in 1896 there were twenty-five courses offered in the summer school, and the department of physical training had one fifth of the number of students and turned into the college treasury one fourth of the revenue. From 1887 until its termination in 1932, the physical training course attracted a total of 5,086 individuals, and they came from all the forty-eight states and from sixteen foreign countries (Appendix F). The summer course in physical training brought together men and women from many different areas with a broad range of backgrounds. The significance of the program cannot only be determined by quantitative means, because the program did strive for quality. This was stated by Sargent in a letter to President Eliot:

> You will be pleased to learn that the experiment of raising the standard and classifying the pupils at our Summer School of Physical Training this year has worked admirably. It has reduced our total number compared with last year by some half dozen or more, but it has improved the quality and given us a greater proportion of men

---

88. Letter from Dr. Sargent to President Eliot, August 29, 1893, Eliot Papers, Box 260, Harvard University Archives.

89. Letter from Dr. Sargent to President Eliot, September 18, 1896, Eliot Papers, Box 260, Harvard University Archives.
than we have ever had before.\textsuperscript{90}

Thus, the summer program was not merely interested in drawing as many students as possible, but was aimed at providing a qualified teacher preparation program.

Harvard's summer course in physical training was a significant contribution to the preparation of qualified physical educators. During the 1880's there was a tremendous demand for physical educators, and many poorly trained individuals were being hired to fulfill the demand. By offering courses in the summer, those who were poorly qualified were able to receive proper preparation. This contribution to teacher preparation in physical education was stated in the following:

The scarcity of qualified teachers during the early eighties forced school and college authorities to place their gymnasiums in charge of directors who had received little technical training, and when these teachers found themselves settled in well-paying positions they naturally were reluctant to make the financial sacrifice required by a year of attendance at a teacher-training school. Careful consideration of all the factors involved convinced Dr. Sargent that the only practical way to meet the needs of the situation was through some kind of a summer school which students might attend without sacrificing the profitable positions they were holding during the academic year.\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{90} Letter from Dr. Sargent to President Eliot, August 17, 1899, Eliot Papers, Box 245, Harvard University Archives.

\textsuperscript{91} Van Wyck, "The Harvard Summer School of Physical Education 1887-1932," op. cit., p. 405.
Harvard University was not known as a center for teacher preparation, but it did contribute to the cause of improving teaching. This was achieved through its summer school courses which included physical education.

**Issue Concerning Compulsory Physical Education**

A university issue emerged at Harvard in the 1890's which concerned physical education. The issue concerned whether to reward college credit for physical education and whether a program of compulsory physical education should be instituted. Sargent was in a difficult position to propose a required course in physical education because Harvard's pedagogical philosophy was based on the elective principle. He stated his rationale for a required course in the following manner:

> If a requirement of physical fitness and efficiency is not introduced and maintained in our colleges we shall have a continuance of the conditions that prevail today where one class of pupils carries bodily training in athletics to excess, a few exhaust their vitality through excessive mental application, while the largest class does not get enough bodily training to keep in good physical condition, or to permit the realization of half their mental and physical possibilities.  

Sargent had earlier acknowledged that "In an institution where attendance at chapel and lectures is optional, it has

---

92 Sargent, "Physical Training as a Compulsory Subject," *School Review*, XVI (January 1908), 52.
not seemed advisable to require attendance at physical exercises."\(^{93}\)

Articles concerning compulsory physical education began to appear in Harvard publications. In 1898 an article entitled "Required Gymnastics at Harvard" was published in favor of compulsory physical education:

> Being a fundamental and nearly universal need, physical training should not be the subject of election, but should be required of all except invalids and cripples, with election only as to the kind and form of exercise in the large field from which choice can be made.... It seems idle to expect that any systematic physical training worthy of the name will be taken up by the mass of students on the voluntary system. Diffidence, inadvertence, love of ease, distraction in many directions, excessive and morbid devotions to study in some, ignorance of how to begin, and natural sluggishness and inertia in others, will prevent it unless the work is laid out and required. It ought of course to be a part of their education, not an accident of their recreation or a passing incident of their feverish and overwrought thirst for glory.\(^{94}\)

Later the same year another article was published in favor of a physical education requirement:

> The question whether a certain practice of physical exercise should be required has during the past year been brought to an issue. The Faculty, it is understood, hesitate to adopt the suggestion that this certain practice


of physical exercise should be required, and regarded as a prerequisite to a degree, but I see no reason in the nature of things why it should not be made such a prerequisite.  

The article concluded that the faculty was not in favor of a required course in physical education, but this was not the case with the students:

So far as the feelings of the students on the suggested prescribed course in physical training have been sounded, they are distinctly favorable, as was shown, for instance, by the interest taken in a mass meeting held last year to consider this subject, and by the opinions expressed in a large number of themes.

Putnam reported that Harvard lagged behind other colleges and universities in having a required course in physical education:

It will probably be a surprise to many graduates,--it certainly was to the writer until Dr. Sargent's report last winter to the Overseer's Visiting Committee on Physical Training brought out the fact in strong relief,--that Harvard College stands nearly alone among the larger American universities and colleges in having in its curriculum no required physical training whatever for its students.

Putnam referred to the advances Yale had taken in devising a required physical education program:

Since Dr. Sargent's report and the Visiting Committee's recommendation were made public about a year ago, Yale has

95 William A. Bancroft, "To Train Sound Bodies," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, VII (December 1898), 178-79.

96 Ibid.

taken the first step, in a very practical and sensible way, for the Freshmen year,—dividing the class into three divisions according to the students' physical capabilities to insure even progress in their work, giving two hours a week through the winter months, and marking the men according to fidelity and progress,—so that when the President, Fellows, Overseers, and Faculty of Harvard shall have got good and ready we can now at best only follow in the wake of our ancient rival.

In opposition to a required course in physical education the Harvard Advocate reported:

In spite of the large majority of themes in favor of prescribed physical training, we hope that the Faculty will not make gymnastic exercise compulsory, or even allow physical culture to count toward a degree.

The Advocate not only opposed compulsory physical education, but it also declared physical education to be unworthy of receiving college credit. The article presented its reason for taking such a position:

It is well to remember that every study offered in college at present is either an Art or a Science, and really helps to entitle a man to the degree, Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science. We cannot see how the manipulation of chest-weights contributes at all to a man's right to a degree.

Exercise to develop the body is a valuable thing; so are dancing, and going to the theatre, and brushing the hair. We hope no self respecting student will neglect any of these admirable practices, but how any one of them can

98 Ibid., pp. 310-11.

be justly required by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and allowed to count for a course is hard to understand.

Sargent believed that physical education should deserve college credit:

After the student has made his choice of exercises, if he devotes an amount of time to their practice equivalent to at least four hours per week, throughout the college year, he should receive some sort of credit for this work from the highest authorities of the University.

In 1898 the faculty turned down the request of having physical education as a compulsory or a creditable subject, and writing in 1906 Sargent mentioned his dissatisfaction with the faculty decision:

...in 1898 through the recommendation of the Committee on Physical Training from the Overseers the Faculty were asked to consider a plan of systematic physical training for the Freshmen and Sophomores in the college. Mr. Hemenway offered to pay for the three extra instructors needed, and five hundred of six hundred students to whom the plan was submitted heartily approved of it. The scheme was to establish a department of physical education and put it on the same basis as any other department of instruction...After discussing the plan for two seasons the Faculty voted not to accept it.

Sargent concluded that Harvard was in a primitive stage with regard to physical education. He contended that seventy-five

---

100 Ibid.
102 Letter from Dr. Sargent to Jerome D. Green (President Eliot's secretary), April 26, 1906, Eliot Papers, Box 260, Harvard University Archives.
percent of the major American colleges had adopted programs of required physical education and one third of these colleges rewarded credit toward a diploma.\textsuperscript{103} Sargent was not pleased with Harvard's efforts in establishing physical education as an integral aspect of education, and he wrote:

\begin{quote}
It is no exaggeration\textsuperscript{56} to say that Harvard has exerted a wider influence towards establishing the science of physical education in America than any other institution. I regret very much that Harvard's efforts in this direction have been confined largely to the Summer School which has been attended principally by the students and graduates of other institutions. The Harvard Overseers, Faculty and graduates as a body have felt little interest in or sympathy with the educational side of physical training, simply because they have felt no pressure for it from parents and pupils that they were willing to interpret that way.\textsuperscript{164}
\end{quote}

Sargent criticized the lack of financial support the physical education department received, and he compared Harvard with other institutions:

\begin{quote}
Although Harvard has many more students than Yale, Columbia, University of Pennsylvania, or Princeton, Harvard has expended for her gymnasium nearly one half that of each of three of these institutions, and nearly $5000 per year less than Princeton. While Harvard is entitled to expend $4 a year on each student for gymnasium expenses, she really assesses the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{103} Compulsory physical education did not come into being at Harvard until July 3, 1919 when the president and fellows of Harvard University voted, on the recommendation of the faculty of arts and sciences, to approve the report of the committee on the regulation of athletic sports on compulsory physical training for freshmen.

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid.
different departments only about $2.25 per man, while Yale collects $5, and Columbia, Princeton, and the University of Pennsylvania each collects $7 a year per student...The salaries and wages paid in connection with the gymnasiums at these institutions exceed those paid at Harvard.\textsuperscript{105}

In criticizing the lack of financial support for physical education, it was not Sargent's intention to strive for a higher salary for himself. His concern was with losing qualified instructors to other institutions which offered higher salaries. If Sargent's intention was for a higher salary for himself, he could have easily taken a position elsewhere. He chose to stay in Cambridge, and he gave his reasons:

I have received two offers of $5000 per year to leave Harvard...but aside from a feeling of loyalty for the institution, and the combined position as Director of the Hemenway Gymnasium and originator and manager of a school of my own, was a much more attractive one.\textsuperscript{106}

Although President Eliot and Dr. Sargent expressed similar views concerning physical education, Eliot did not feel that physical education should be compulsory at Harvard, nor did he approve of rewarding physical education with college credit.\textsuperscript{107} Eliot was in a position where the faculty opposed compulsory physical education or rewarding it with credit; but

\textsuperscript{105}Letter from Dr. Sargent to President Eliot, July 28, 1907, Eliot Papers, Box 206, Harvard University Archives.

\textsuperscript{106}Ibid. In 1881 Sargent established a private school of physical education in Cambridge.

\textsuperscript{107}President Eliot's Annual Report, 1873-74, pp. 24-25.
more severely, he was confronted with a faculty that questioned having a department of physical education at all. The faculty believed that the money being used for physical education could be put to better use in other departments. Considering the opposition of Harvard's faculty toward physical education, Eliot deserves credit for supporting the establishment of a program of physical education and acquiring the services of a very able physical educator. President Eliot was, for the most part, sympathetic with Dr. Sargent's efforts, and the following passage written by Dr. Sargent's secretary alluded to this:

Anyone who seeks to render service in an educational institution will find that his efforts are likely to be more effective when he enjoys the sympathetic understanding of his superior; it matters not whether that superior be the head of a department or the president of the institution. In this respect Dr. Sargent was fortunate. Through the influence of President Eliot he had been brought to Harvard and given an appointment as Director of the Gymnasium and Assistant Professor of Physical Education. President Eliot was fully aware of the prejudice then prevalent in the academic world against granting educational recognition to physical training and probably understood even more clearly than Dr. Sargent the difficulty of the struggle which lay ahead. He was keenly interested in the pioneer work which was being done in the summer courses and repeatedly urged the wisdom of strengthening these courses by raising standards.

The editor of Sargent's autobiography contended that Dr. Sargent held the greatest admiration for President Eliot and valued highly Eliot's support.109

In 1881 Sargent opened his own school of physical education in Cambridge, the Sanatory Gymnasium.110 The school served several purposes: (1) provided a program of physical education to female students attending the Harvard Annex (now called Radcliffe College); (2) provided instruction in physical education to women and children living in the Cambridge vicinity; and (3) provided teacher training for men and women in physical education.111

In 1907 President Eliot inquired into Sargent's double role as director of the Hemenway Gymnasium and director of a private school. Eliot questioned whether such a dual practice was taking away anything from his obligation to Harvard, and whether Sargent would want to consider resigning his directorship of the Hemenway Gymnasium:

The Corporation fully recognize that you have built up both your own gymnasium


110 The name of the school was changed several times: in 1894 the school became known as the Normal School of Physical Training; in 1904 it was referred to as the Sargent School of Physical Education; in 1929 as the Sargent School of Physical Education of Boston University School of Education; in 1932 as the Boston University Sargent School; in 1935 as the Boston University Sargent College; and in 1966 as the Boston University Sargent College of Allied Health Professions.

111 Prospectus of the Sargent School of Physical Education, Eliot Papers, Box 106, Harvard University Archives.
and the course on physical training in the Harvard Summer School, and that you are entitled to the credit for these achievements, and also to the pecuniary income which they yield you. On the other hand, they are apprehensive about the very unusual combination of your two functions in one person--one function being the director of the Hemenway Gymnasium, the other the carrying on of a private school for physical training. They would like to bring this complicated situation to an end in some manner which you would consider equitable and expedient both for the University and yourself.

Dr. Sargent replied to Eliot's inquiry:

My position as Director of the Hemenway Gymnasium and conductor of a private school may be 'unique.' If so, it has continued for twenty-eight years, and was the result of an agreement to which the President and Corporation were a party, in which I was to have certain time during the forenoon for private work. The combination of two functions in one person is not unique at this or other universities.

Sargent went on to cite individuals in other institutions who have served as gymnasium directors and simultaneously coordinated private interests. Sargent presented examples of Professor Maclaren, Dr. Savage, Dr. Meylan, Dr. Gulick, and Dr. McKenzie, all of whom were involved in private practices while being involved with positions in schools and colleges. Sargent went on to draw examples from the Harvard

112 Letter from President Eliot to Dr. Sargent, July 6, 1907, Eliot Papers, Box 206, Harvard University Archives.

113 Letter from Dr. Sargent to President Eliot, July 28, 1907, Eliot Papers, Box 206, Harvard University Archives.
community and indicated that the faculty contained many who had private interests. Concerning this he wrote:

Many members of the Medical and Law School Faculties have taught at Harvard and engaged in private practice at the same time, in fact there are a score or more of instructors who combine two or three functions in the same person.\textsuperscript{114}

Thus, Sargent rationalized that his combination of two functions in one person was not unique at all.

This incident affected the working relationship between Sargent and Eliot. This was evident in Sargent's concluding remark in a letter to Eliot:

I cannot help feeling, President Eliot, in view of all the facts connected with my work at Harvard, some of which I have endeavored to set forth, that to approach me now, after twenty-eight years of absolutely uninterrupted service, within two years of the time when I would be entitled to retire with a pension, with a proposition to relinquish my position as Director of the Hemenway Gymnasium is, to say the least, unjust.\textsuperscript{115}

In 1919, at the age of seventy, Dr. Sargent retired from his position at Harvard. He continued to teach for five more years at his private school. Dudley A. Sargent died on July 21, 1924, and two days later the New York Times referred to him as America's pre-eminent leader in the field of physical education.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{116} New York Times, July 23, 1924, 14.
The Contributions of Dr. George W. Fitz

Another figure who emerged during President Eliot's administration to contribute to the conduct of American physical education was Dr. George W. Fitz. Dr. Fitz was interested in applying physiological research to understand the effects of physical activity, and for the re-examination of the foundations of the theory and practice of physical education.117

Dr. Fitz earned his medical degree from Harvard in 1891. In 1892 he was appointed as instructor of physiology and hygiene at Harvard University, and in 1894 he was promoted to an assistant professor. He started teaching anatomy and physiology in 1890 at Sargent's school and the Harvard Summer School.

An outstanding contribution by Dr. Fitz to the development of physical education occurred in 1892 when he founded the first research laboratory in the United States concerned with physiological experiments on physical exercise. During this time there were many injuries and questionable training methods being used in athletics, and it was Dr. Fitz' intention to scientifically study training procedures so as to minimize athletic injuries. President Eliot, who was concerned with some of the practices in athletics, supported the intentions

of Dr. Fitz. President Eliot allocated the necessary funds for Dr. Fitz to start a laboratory to carry out research in exercise physiology. Fitz mentioned the significance of the founding of the laboratory: "Harvard's establishment of a laboratory for the experimental study of the physiology of exercise is a clear acknowledgment of the high educational claims of physical training."118

At the 1892 convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education, Fitz stated the purpose for conducting scientific research in physical education:

As physiologists, we should study the conditions under which the exercises are done, and the results of these exercises upon the system. What we need is scientific work, not the assumption that certain laws require certain exercises.... What we want is the clear scientific study of the physiology; the exercise, whether presented in one form or another. Let us see just what each exercise does for the human body, and just what portion of the body it affects and how much in justice we shall be able to say what exercises are best, and what are not so good.119

Another interest of Dr. Fitz was in growth and development. He was interested in finding out how the human has taken to the transition from a savage lifestyle to a contemporary lifestyle which is basically devoid of physical activities. He stated this interest in the following manner:


If the Greeks had left us statues of an average youth and maiden in addition to the beautiful ideal figures, our debt to them would be much increased, for we could then estimate with confidence, by comparison with Dr. Sargent's figures, the changes which have resulted from our changed life, and the lesson drawn would be invaluable.120

Dr. Fitz was active in the professional activities of physical education. He participated in the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education meetings, and from 1895 to 1901 he served as corresponding secretary of the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education. Fitz became the editor of the American Physical Education Review when it was founded in 1896, and in 1904 he was instrumental in founding the American Society for Research in Physical Education. However, in 1906 Fitz resigned from the editorship of the American Physical Education Review and published his last article for the journal, and he reported that he had become dissatisfied with the efforts of the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education.121 It was during this time that Fitz disappeared from the activities of American physical education.

In 1891 the nation's first degree program in physical education was established at the Lawrence Scientific School of Harvard University. A four year program was created within the

120 Fitz, "Problems of Physical Education," op. cit., p. 28.

121 Fitz, "Editorial Note and Comment," American Physical Education Review, XI (March 1906), 36.
departments of anatomy, physiology, and physical training. The purpose of the program was to fulfill the needs of those who expected to become physical educators and for those who wanted to get preparatory training for medical school. The courses of study included English, French or German, physiology, anatomy, botany, geology, zoology, and other sciences. For those aspiring to become physical educators, there were specific courses in anthropometry, applied anatomy, physiology of exercise, remedial exercises, and the history of physical education. The faculty consisted of Dr. Fitz, Dr. Sargent, and James Lathrop, instructor in athletics. At the time there was no real demand for such a program; therefore, it was short lived and only nine students graduated from the physical education concentration.156

One of the interesting features of the degree requirement was for students to pursue some line of research in exercise physiology. The hundreds of men using the gymnasium and belonging to athletic teams provided suitable subjects for research. Many studies of interest were conducted, for example, what will give the best muscular development—heavy or light exercise, quick or slow, Swedish or German gymnastics; is neuromuscular development better cultivated through a command system such as the Ling gymnastics, or through sports and

156 Walter Kroll and Guy Lewis, "The First Academic Degree in Physical Education," Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, XL (June 1969), 73-74. The first individual to receive the B.S. degree from the Harvard program was James F. Jones in 1893.
games; what are the effects of alcohol and tobacco on strength gains and performance.¹⁵⁷ Other studies conducted in the exercise physiology laboratory included environmental effects on exercise, cardiac responses to various exercise intensities, and muscular changes through exercise. Many of the research topics carried out by Dr. Fitz are still relevant today in exercise physiology.

Indeed, during President Eliot's administration, Harvard made several outstanding contributions to the development of physical education in the United States. The construction of the Hemenway Gymnasium, the acquisition of Dr. Sargent as director of the gymnasium, the Harvard Summer School of Physical Training, and the scientific work conducted by Dr. Fitz were significant events in physical education. These events occurred under a president who was sympathetic to the cause of raising the status of physical education. On numerous occasions President Eliot expressed the need for required courses in physical education for lower levels of education, and he urged the preparation of qualified teachers in physical education. With regard to higher education, Eliot did not favor compulsory physical education or rewarding college credit for physical education.

CHAPTER V

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Eliot presided at Harvard during an era when intercollegiate athletics emerged as a pervasive influence in American colleges and universities. The first sport to be contested between colleges was rowing in the 1850's, and this was followed with baseball in the 1860's; however, it was the emergence of intercollegiate football in the 1870's that became the major intercollegiate athletic spectacle in the United States. It influenced the whole college, from freshman to college president, and beyond to alumni, townspeople, and the nation itself. During the early years students exercised control in all phases of intercollegiate athletics from organizing to coaching the teams. The burgeoning of intercollegiate athletics introduced several problems which aroused the attention of college administrators. College and university administrators were confronted with the problems of controlling fanaticism, commercialism, professionalism, and other undesirable elements which accompanied intercollegiate athletics. To exert some control over athletics, many colleges and universities organized athletic committees with faculty members presiding over the practices of
athletic teams. Athletic committees were not able to resolve all the problems associated with athletics, and thus, many college administrators considered the abolishment of intercollegiate athletics. The question of abolishing intercollegiate athletics received national attention, and President Eliot played a significant role in dealing with this issue.

**Development of Athletics at Harvard**

Harvard University played an active role in the development of intercollegiate athletics in the United States. As early as 1840 Harvard students had formed several boat clubs within the university, and it was competitive rowing that emerged as the first intercollegiate spectacle. In the spring of 1852, Yale boatmen invited Harvard students to engage in a rowing contest on Lake Winnipesaukee, New Hampshire. Thus, on August 3, 1852, the first intercollegiate athletic event in the United States took place, and it resulted in a victory for Harvard. The event was brought on by commercial interests, for it was James N. Elkins, the superintendent of the Boston, Concord, and Montreal Railroad, who had suggested to James Whiton, a Yale student, that he would defray all

---

expenses for a Harvard-Yale crew contest, and he recommended the site for the event to be located at an area which was serviced by his railroad line.²

To promote and organize intercollegiate rowing, the Harvard University Boat Club, in 1858, sent out letters to several colleges calling for a meeting to establish an intercollegiate rowing conference. Replies were received from Yale, Brown, and Trinity, and on May 26, 1858, delegates from these institutions met in New Haven, Connecticut. The meeting resulted in the formation of the College Union, the first intercollegiate athletic conference. The delegates drafted rules and regulations that would govern intercollegiate rowing between conference members (Appendix G). By 1875, the conference had expanded to include thirteen institutions.

One of the articles drafted by the College Union called for an annual intercollegiate rowing event to be held in the summer. The first College Union Regatta was held on July 26, 1859, on Lake Quinsigamond, Worcester, Massachusetts, and it resulted in a Harvard victory over Yale and Brown.

Indications of faculty disapproval over intercollegiate athletics emerged after the second College Union Regatta, held on July 24, 1860. The contest resulted in a Harvard victory, and Harvard students displayed their exuberance of the victory.

over Yale in a manner which provoked a lot of attention. The hotel in Worcester where the students were staying was a scene of continuous celebration into the late hours of the night. The students honored their oarsmen with singing, cheering, and parading through the streets of Worcester, which finally resulted in the police being called to quell the overzealous students. When news of this reached Harvard and Yale, the faculty of both institutions decided to ban their rowing teams from further competition. Because of this, Yale and Harvard did not compete in intercollegiate rowing until 1864 when the ban was revoked. From 1864 to 1871 Harvard and Yale were the only participants.

In August, 1869, three months after Eliot was inaugurated as president, Harvard became the first American university to compete in an international collegiate athletic event. On July 10, 1869, a ship set sail from New York to England, and on board was Harvard's rowing crew. The Harvard crew was invited to compete against Oxford University in fours with coxswains on the Thames River. ³

The betting on the Oxford-Harvard contest was very heavy in England. The early odds on Oxford stood at 3-1, but they

³As early as 1867 a plan for an international contest between Oxford and Harvard was in the making. Correspondences between the Oxford University Boat Club and the Harvard University Boat Club were published in the Harvard Advocate: "The Proposed International Boat-Race," January 21, 1868, 136-137; January 28, 1868, 152-53; March 11, 1868, 9-13.
dropped to 5-2, and finally at 2-1 on the day of the race. The rowing contest between Harvard and Oxford was held on August 27, 1869. According to the reports, the crowd was the largest ever gathered on the banks of the Thames, and it aggregated a million people, while business in London was at a standstill. The race which consisted of a four and one-quarter mile course was won by Oxford by four lengths.

The popularity of the race was evident by the number of spectators, the heavy betting, and the news coverage which followed the event. British and American newspapers gave considerable attention to the results of the race. The *Echo*, the first British newspaper to carry an account of the race, sold 25,000 copies of its "extra" in three-quarters of an hour. The *London Times* devoted three columns to the event in addition to a column-long editorial. The *New York Times*, August 28, 1869, gave all except one column of its front page to the race, while the *Chicago Tribune* considered the event sufficiently newsworthy to give four of its six front-page columns to a description of the event. The press boat that followed the racing crews had representatives from at least fifteen American newspapers.

---


An international collegiate athletic contest between England and the United States did not occur again until July 16, 1894, when Yale and Oxford competed in a track and field event in London. In 1899 the first of a series of four quadrangular track and field meets was organized between Yale, Harvard, Cambridge, and Oxford universities. In 1899 Harvard and Yale sent track and field teams to London; in 1901 Cambridge and Oxford journeyed to New York; in 1904 Harvard and Yale returned to London; and in 1911 the four universities met in London. The scoring consisted of a combined Harvard and Yale score versus a combined Oxford and Cambridge score (Appendix H).

A second rowing contest between Harvard and a British university occurred on September 8, 1906, when Harvard competed against Cambridge University. The contest consisted of eight-oared crews and was competed over the same four and one-quarter mile course as in 1869. Harvard lost by two lengths, and thus suffered a fate similar to Cornell, Yale, and the University of Pennsylvania, which sent losing crews to England in 1894, 1896, and 1901, respectively.

The next intercollegiate sport that Harvard students became involved with was baseball. Between 1845 and 1861 there emerged from the playing fields of America two distinct modes of baseball, commonly known at that time as the New York
and the Massachusetts games. Neither game was played at Harvard during these sixteen years, but in 1862, a group of boys entering Harvard from Phillips Exeter Academy brought the New York game to Cambridge. As a result, the first Harvard baseball club was organized in December, 1862. The young club was interested in intercollegiate competition, and they arranged a match with Brown's baseball club. On June 27, 1863, Harvard defeated Brown by a score of 27 to 17, and thus, intercollegiate baseball was inaugurated at Cambridge. This was not, however, the first intercollegiate baseball game in the United States, for that precedent was established in 1859 when Amherst defeated Williams by a score of 73 to 32.

Since many colleges had not yet formed baseball clubs, Harvard played most of its games against professional and non-collegiate clubs. On July 15, 1865, the Harvard University Base-Ball Club defeated the Lowell Club of Boston which was considered as the best baseball team in New England at that time. In the following year, the Harvard baseball team journeyed to New York for four days. The purpose of the trip was to gain experience in baseball by playing against professional

7 The distinguishing characteristics between the two games was the manner in which a player was put out. In the Massachusetts game it was necessary to put a player out by hitting him with the ball as he ran between the bases whereas in the New York game it was necessary to tag the base runner.

teams. The team played four games in total against the New York Atlantics, Newark Eurekas, Bedford Excelsiors, and the Hoboken Actives, losing all four games. In 1870 the team went on the road for forty-three days to play teams as far west as Milwaukee and Chicago. They began the trip with a game against Yale in New Haven on July 4th, and from New Haven the team continued to compete against several teams in New York state. Their trip took them to cities such as Cleveland, Louisville, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Chicago, Indianapolis, Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, New York City, and Brooklyn. They won most of their games, winning eighteen and losing eight, and they nearly defeated the great Cincinnati Red Stockings, losing to them 20 to 17 on July 18th. All but one of the teams that Harvard played were professional teams.

In 1882, the faculty at Harvard did not approve of the number of games the baseball team played away from Cambridge and against professional teams. As a result of this, a committee was appointed to consider the subject of athletic sports.

The emergence of intercollegiate football at Harvard occurred during the 1870's, but one of the earliest accounts of football at Harvard can be traced back to the early 1800's.

9 For scores and details of all the games refer to H-Book of Harvard Athletics, pp. 172-82.

10 Eliot, Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer of Harvard College, 1881-82, p. 17.
In 1827, the Harvard Register reported an epic entitled "The Battle of the Delta," which described an annual contest between freshman and sophomore classes, and it was referred to by students of those days as "football." The Delta was the playing field where football proliferated at Harvard, and crowds of students regularly assembled there to engage in recreation and enjoyment. By the 1850's, the annual clash between freshmen and sophomores came under scrutiny by the faculty. The event which was contested on the first Monday of every new school year became so rough and brutal that the occasion elicited for itself the name of "Bloody Monday." On July 2, 1860, the faculty voted, "that the present Freshmen class be informed before the end of this term that the football match between the classes that has been customary at the beginning of the autumn term is strictly prohibited for the future."


12 The following articles refer to football at Harvard during the 1830's, 40's, and 50's: T.W. Higginson, "Harvard Athletic Exercises Thirty Years Ago," Harvard Advocate, June 12, 1874, 130-31; R.S. Minot, "Football Forty Years Ago," Advocate, May 26, 1876, 92.


Football was not resumed at Harvard until 1871 when a group of Harvard students, who for years had played football in their preparatory schools and were so enthusiastic about the game, conceived the idea of reviving the game. One afternoon, late in October, a number of boys from the classes of 1873 and 1874 assembled on Cambridge Common; they chose sides and a game was played. The faculty took no action, thus they repeated the performance every afternoon, and before winter came, the class of 1874 had organized a team and challenged the other classes to games. Among the students who were instrumental in this revival were several future distinguished individuals: Arthur T. Cabot, who became a well known surgeon, and a member of Harvard's Corporation; Robert Grant, who became a Massachusetts Judge, and a member of the Board of Overseers; William G. Sanger, who became Assistant Secretary of War under President Theodore Roosevelt; and George Wigglesworth, who became a member of the Board of Overseers and president of the Alumni Association.

During the spring and fall of 1873 class teams were formed and many games were played. Football generated a considerable amount of interest, and on December 3, 1872, a meeting was called to consider the formation of a university football club, the meeting resulted in the creation of the Harvard University Foot-Ball Club. The purpose of the club was to encourage an interest in the sport and bring out a greater number of students. The club elected officers and codified a set of rules for a style of football which became
known as the Harvard game.\footnote{15}

Prior to the formation of the Harvard University Football Club, there had been several intercollegiate football contests that had taken place between Columbia, Yale, Princeton, and Rutgers.\footnote{16} The original intention of the H.U.F.B.C. was not for the purpose of organizing intercollegiate competition, but simply to provide an opportunity for Harvard students to engage in football within the college. Columbia, Yale, Princeton, and Rutgers played a style of football that resembled soccer, and it differed from Harvard's style of football which allowed for picking up, carrying, or throwing the ball, and holding or pushing with the hands.

In October, 1873, Yale sent an invitation to the H.U.F.B.C. to attend a meeting in New York to discuss the possibility of organizing an intercollegiate football association. Invitations were also sent out to Columbia, Rutgers, and Princeton. A major objective of the meeting was to establish a common code of rules for intercollegiate football. Since Harvard played under rules which were completely different from those of the other institutions, it was obvious that their rules would be voted down. Thus, Harvard declined to send


\footnote{16}The following contests had taken place: Princeton-Rutgers, November 6, 1869; Columbia-Rutgers, November 12, 1870; and Yale-Columbia, November 16, 1872.
representatives to the meeting.

In the spring of 1874, the Harvard University Foot-Ball Club received a challenge from the McGill University Rugby team. It was proposed that two matches be played; one game was to be played in Cambridge under the Harvard rules, and another game would be contested in Montreal under the Rugby rules. However, the Harvard faculty disallowed students to travel to Montreal; therefore, it was decided that both contests would be played in Cambridge.

The first match was played on May 14, 1874, and it was won by Harvard. There were about 500 spectators who had paid fifty cents to see the match, the proceeds went to providing the McGill team with a banquet. The second match was played the following day, and it was governed by the Rugby rules. The contest resulted in a tie, and this was the first intercollegiate game of Rugby played in the United States. ¹⁷

Harvard students responded with a great deal of enthusiasm for the two contests. The Rugby style of football was particularly well received, and the Harvard Advocate reported, "Football will be a popular game here in the future. The Rugby game is in much better favor than the somewhat sleepy game now played by our men." ¹⁸ The Magenta stated, "On the whole, it was a very successful contest, and it is to be hoped that next year several games may be played between the teams.

¹⁷Harvard Magenta, May 22, 1874, 93-94.
¹⁸Harvard Advocate, May 29, 1874, 113.
of McGill and Harvard."\textsuperscript{19}

The following autumn, October 23, 1874, Harvard's football team journeyed to Montreal for a rematch with McGill under the Rugby rules. The Harvard team stunned the 1,500 spectators as they defeated McGill in Rugby.\textsuperscript{20}

The games contested between Harvard and McGill introduced the Rugby style of football to American colleges and universities, and this style influenced many collegiate football teams to modify the existing soccer style of football.\textsuperscript{21} The first American college to challenge Harvard in Rugby was Tufts College on June 4, 1875, and surprisingly Tufts defeated Harvard. It was inevitable that Harvard and Yale would meet in a football contest. In October of 1875 two delegates from Harvard met two from Yale at Springfield, Massachusetts to draw up a set of rules that would govern their first match. The rules established, the "Concessionary Rules", were very similar to the Rugby rules (Appendix I). Thus, a new mode of intercollegiate football was developed.\textsuperscript{22}

The first Harvard-Yale football match was contested on November 13, 1875, at Hamilton Park, New Haven, Connecticut.

\textsuperscript{19}Harvard Magenta, May 22, 1874, 94.

\textsuperscript{20}"Foot-Ball," Advocate, October 30, 1874, 35-36.


\textsuperscript{22}If Harvard had not been reluctant, and conformed to the soccer style of football in the early 1870's, the changes that modified American intercollegiate football might have never developed.
Since Harvard was more familiar with the new rules, Harvard won the first game very easily. However, in 1878, Yale began a series of victories over Harvard that wasn't broken until 1890 (there was no game in 1885, and Harvard forfeited in 1888). With the innovative leadership of Walter Camp, Yale became the dominant intercollegiate football power in the eighties and nineties. In the eighteen years between 1883 and 1901, Yale teams went through nine undefeated seasons. The teams of 1888, 1891, and 1892 were not even scored on. In the thirteen games played in 1888, Yale ran up the fantastic total of 700 points against 0 for their opponents.

To reorganize the Intercollegiate Football Association and adopt the Rugby rules, Princeton called a meeting at Springfield, Massachusetts on November 23, 1876. The meeting resulted in a new Intercollegiate Football Association with Princeton, Harvard, and Columbia as charter members, and Rugby rules were codified. During the late 1870's several modifications of the Rugby game were undertaken. These modifications included blocking, the manner in which the ball was put into play, and the method of scoring. The transformation of British Rugby to American football had taken place.

Track and field sports were first contested between colleges in July, 1873. To add interest to the annual rowing

regatta at Saratoga, New York, James Gordan Bennett, the race promoter, offered a cup for an intercollegiate two-mile run. The event was held on the 17th of July, the day before the boat race. The event only attracted three starters, and it was won by a student from McGill University. The track and field event was held again the following year, and on July 20, 1874, the event attracted participants from eight colleges. There were five events on the track program—one mile race, three mile race, 100 yard dash, 120 yard high hurdles, and the seven mile walk. Harvard's four entries in this meet were unsuccessful, and their showing was reflected in the comment of the Advocate: "The results clearly demonstrate that we are in need of an active athletic association, which, by frequent contests at home under proper organization, may send, next summer, trained and picked men to bear our colors into each branch of battle."

This proposed association soon became a reality, for on October 7, 1874, a meeting of the undergraduates was called to order, and as a result the Harvard Athletic Association was formed. This association consisted of undergraduates and took general control of track and field sports at Harvard.

---

24 D.E. Bowie of McGill University won the event, with Phillips of Cornell second, and Benton of Amherst not finishing.
25 "The Intercollegiate Athletic Contests," Advocate, October 1, 1874, 11.
26 Magenta, October 9, 1874, 20.
In July, 1875, still as an offshoot of the regatta, intercollegiate track events were again held at Saratoga. Additional events were added to the program, and as a result, the event took an entire day to complete. This time Harvard was successful in two events, winning the seven and three mile walking races.

To stimulate interest in collegiate track sports, the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America was formed in the winter of 1876. The association assumed the responsibility of organizing an annual intercollegiate track and field meet. The first meet was held at Saratoga in 1876; from 1877 to 1881 the meets were held at Mott Haven, New York, and from 1882 until 1888 at Manhattan Field, New York City. In 1889, the meet was contested at Berkeley Oval, New York City, and thereafter the games were held either at Manhattan Field or Berkeley Oval until 1904, when they were transferred to Franklin Field, Philadelphia.

Despite the formation of the Harvard Athletic Association, interest in track sports at Cambridge remained at a low ebb. Contributing to this lack of interest was the poor facility for track, for in the period between 1874-1876, the facility consisted merely of a dirt track on Jarvis Field.

Enthusiasm for track sports at Harvard was heightened by the construction of a five lap cinder track on Jarvis Field in 1879, and in 1880, the Harvard track team came into its own. The team was successful in winning the intercollegiate games held at Mott Haven with the overwhelming score of six
firsts, five seconds, and three thirds. The Harvard track team continued to win for the next six years in succession, thereby creating a kind of "golden age" in the history of Harvard track sports.

In 1881, a professional trainer, James Robinson, was engaged by some of the undergraduates to take charge of the team, but the time for coaching by professionals was not yet ripe, the feeling of the college authorities being so strongly against the association of anything professional with amateur sport that Robinson's stay at Cambridge was limited to a single season. However, it became increasingly evident to the students that their attempts to train themselves were unsatisfactory, and in 1885 they won over the faculty Athletic Committee to their way of thinking and secured the services of James G. Lathrop, a runner and trainer of reputation, as coach of the track team.27

In 1891, Harvard and Yale commenced on holding annual dual meets in track sports. In the 1890's, Harvard also held dual meets against Columbia, Princeton, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Rowing, baseball, football, and track were considered as the "major" intercollegiate athletic attractions at Harvard.28


28 The following historians of Harvard report that these sports were designated as major sports: John H. Gardiner, Harvard (New York: Oxford University Press, 1914), p. 136; Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, p. 408.
Harvard students were also active in organizing clubs in other sports for purposes of intercollegiate competition. In 1878 Harvard students formed the Harvard University Lacrosse Club. Since no other college Lacrosse teams existed at that time, Harvard's competition was confined to neighboring Boston teams. By the early 1880's Princeton, New York University, and Columbia had organized teams. In 1882 the Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association was formed with Harvard, Princeton, New York University, and Columbia as members. In 1905 a new intercollegiate league was formed which included two divisions. In its northern division were Harvard, Cornell, Columbia, and Hobart, while the southern was composed of Johns Hopkins, Lehigh, Stevens Institute, and Swarthmore.

Ice polo was first played by an organized team at Harvard in 1895-96, when the Harvard Ice Polo Association was formed. This game was played with a short stick rounded at one end and a hard rubber ball. Annual contests in ice polo were conducted with Brown University. In February, 1896, Harvard defeated Brown in ice polo on Spy Pond, Arlington, Massachusetts, by a score of 5 to 4, and the following year the Harvard team went to Providence and defeated Brown 5 to 0 in Roger Williams Park.

In 1895 a native of Montreal studying at Johns Hopkins formed an ice hockey club, and soon after ice hockey was introduced to other American colleges and universities. After the Canadian game of ice hockey was tried at Cambridge in 1897
it soon took the place of polo, and in 1898 the name of the association was changed to the Harvard Ice Hockey Association.

In 1898 Harvard joined Brown, Yale, Columbia, and Princeton in forming an intercollegiate ice hockey league. The sport was sporadic for ice skating rinks and playing talent was sparse, and Harvard's competition for the years of 1898 and 1899 consisted of an annual contest with Brown. On February 26, 1900, Harvard played its first game with Yale in the St. Nicholas Rink, New York, which Yale won 5 to 4.

Ice hockey wasn't the only winter sport that was contested intercollegiately at Harvard. In 1900 Harvard organized a basketball club, and it joined a conference that included Columbia, Cornell, Princeton, and Yale.

A soccer club was organized at Harvard in 1904, and in the same year Harvard played the first intercollegiate soccer match in the United States against Haverford College. A year later the Intercollegiate Association Football League was formed with Harvard, Haverford, Columbia, Cornell, and the University of Pennsylvania as charter members.

Dual sports such as lawn tennis and fencing were conducted at Harvard as early as the 1880s. Lawn tennis was contested at Harvard as an intramural sport in 1882. In 1883, Trinity, Brown, Amherst, and Yale formed the Intercollegiate Lawn Tennis Association, but Harvard did not organize a lawn tennis club until 1913. In 1890 Harvard organized a fencing club, and four years later Harvard and Columbia established intercollegiate competition upon a formal basis. Within a short time,
competition was extended to include Cornell, West Point, Yale, Annapolis, Princeton, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Eliot's Views on Athletics

President Eliot believed that sports provided many positive qualities to an individual's development. He contended that sports infuse respect for bodily excellence and a desire to attain it, and that sports supply a new and effective motive for resisting all sins which weaken or corrupt the body. The positive qualities that Eliot referred to included courage, fortitude, and presence of mind in emergencies and under difficulties, and Eliot stated other qualities achieved through athletics:

They have cultivated in a few the habit of command, and in many the habit of quick obedience and intelligent subordination; and finally they have set before young men prizes and distinctions which are uncontaminated by any commercial value, and which no one can win who does not possess much patience, perseverance, and self-control in addition to rare bodily endowments.29

If properly conducted, Eliot recognized the contributions of athletics to moral as well as physical health, and in 1882 he stated that throughout the university it was generally agreed that:

The increased attention given to physical exercise and athletic sports within the past twenty-five years has been, on the whole, of great advantage to the University; that the average physique of the mass of students has been sensibly improved, the discipline of the College has been made easier and more effective, the work of many zealous students been done with greater safety, and the ideal student been transformed from a stooping, weak, and sickly youth into one well-formed, robust, and healthy. 30

Eliot also agreed that "The perseverance, resolution and self-denial necessary to success in athletic sports turn out to be qualities valuable in business and other active occupations of after college." 31

Eliot gained a reputation of being an advocate of athletics. He pushed for the construction of a gymnasium and for athletic fields and encouraged all Harvard students to take part in games and athletic events. The following passage presents an example of his concern for procuring athletic facilities:

While he was an overseer in 1868 the College concluded to erect Memorial Hall on the Delta, where the undergraduates for a century had held their sports. What would they do now for a playing field? As it happened there was a vacant lot, a collection of gardens, pasture land and orchards, where, it was discovered, a field for sports might be laid out. But who would volunteer for the thankless task of straightening the tangle of claims, since the property was controlled by different litigants? The youthful member

31 Ibid.
of the governing boards interested in sports above most of his colleagues, undertook the task. It was a wearying and prolonged one, but it was thoroughly carried through, and in the end, procured Jarvis Field.  

Eliot was convinced that the positive qualities of athletics can only be obtained when the athletic activities were properly carried out. He viewed athletics as being serviceable for the intellectual life and contributing to moral development. For athletics to function in a college environment, Eliot established the following criteria:

From the college or university point of view, athletic sports are to be promoted either as wholesome pleasures which do not interfere with work, or as means of maintaining healthy and vigorous bodies in serviceable condition for the intellectual and moral life. With athletics considered as an end in themselves, pursued either for pecuniary profit or for popular applause, a college has nothing to do.

The conduct of intercollegiate athletics in the late nineteenth century did not coincide with the athletic ideals expressed by Eliot. By the 1890's, intercollegiate athletics had burgeoned to levels where fanaticism, professionalism, and commercialism were paramount, and intercollegiate athletics attracted the attention of the entire nation. Edward Godkin, the editor of the Nation, commented


that America was caught up in an "athletic craze," and the leading colleges were becoming "huge training grounds for young gladiators, around whom as many spectators roar as roared in the Flavian amphitheatre."\(^{34}\)

During his forty years as Harvard's president, Eliot witnessed the rise of intercollegiate athletics from a modest activity conducted informally among students to an activity that established itself as a pervasive element in American society. At the time, collegiate football attracted more attention than any other sport. Intercollegiate football contests began on modest budgets, and they were chiefly organized by students. The Harvard-Columbia game of 1881, played before two thousand spectators, brought in gate receipts of $342. A decade later Ivy League games drew crowds of twenty to thirty thousand spectators, and in 1905 the Harvard-Yale football spectacle attracted 43,000 people, and at that time, was the largest crowd ever to have gathered for a football match.\(^{35}\) Football was not only dominated by eastern colleges. In 1901 the University of Michigan broke through the hegemony of the Ivy League to become the national champions, and four years later it was the University of Chicago.

\(^{34}\) Edward Godkin, "The Athletic Craze," Nation, LVII (December 7, 1893), 422-23.

In the mid eighties newspapers adopted big business practices in an effort to draw in more revenue. To generate more revenue, newspapers adopted the practice of publishing advertisements. In an effort to attract more readers, newspapers developed the sport section. Extensive coverage was given to intercollegiate athletics, and the increase in newspaper publicity given to college sports contributed enormously to the rise of intercollegiate athletics.

As the popularity increased, the commercial aspect of intercollegiate athletics became more pronounced. In 1893, Harvard spent $18,754.65 on football. Part of the expenditures included $3,226.76 for coaches, $1,887.39 on summer practice, and $3,469.87 for the training table. Total gate receipts for the year amounted to $32,092.01, including $15,409.15 from the Yale game. It was evident that intercollegiate football was becoming big business when colleges invested in constructing huge stadiums. In 1903 Harvard opened its stadium seating 27,000; by 1906 Michigan had stands seating 25,000; in 1914 the Yale bowl was inaugurated with a seating capacity of 75,000. College alumni became more involved with intercollegiate athletics, and they were willing


37"Athletics," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, III (December 1894), 251.
to invest large sums of money to produce winning teams.

As commercialism and newspaper publicity became part of intercollegiate athletics a greater emphasis was placed on producing winning teams. Winning national championships and being invited to the annual Thanksgiving day game in New York City were viewed as important goals. To achieve these goals many coaches recruited professional players and expanded time devoted to training. Thus, professionalism was another element that had crept into intercollegiate athletics.

President Eliot had become dissatisfied with the trend of intercollegiate athletics, and Cotton acknowledged Eliot's disfavor:

The time came when the President viewed with no slight concern the abnormal development of athletics. It was not the number of the athletic organizations nor the amount of money expended that disturbed him. He was interested in physical exercise for young men. No one connected with the University followed with more eagerness the various contests as long as they were kept within bounds. But when he saw oarsmen collapsing in the boat at the conclusion of intercollegiate races, runners falling prostrate at the finish line, and football players sustaining injuries they would carry through life in his opinion a reform was required.

The advantages of athletics that Eliot had echoed were overshadowed, as far as he was concerned, by the disadvantages of them. Eliot outlined the following disadvantages of athletics:

38Cotton, op. cit., p. 206.
The disadvantages of athletic sports in colleges are much more difficult to describe; because they are in the main the results of wanton exaggeration, and are not necessarily inherent in the sports themselves. When thus exaggerated, they interfere with, instead of clarifying and maintaining mental activity; they convert the student into a powerful animal, and dull for the time his intellectual parts; they present the colleges to the public, educated and uneducated, as places of mere physical sport, and not of intellectual training; they make familiar to the student a coarse publicity which destroys his rightful privacy while in training for intellectual service, and subjects him to insolent and vulgar comments in his personal qualities; they induce in masses of spectators at interesting games an hysterical excitement which too many Americans enjoy.\textsuperscript{39}

As early as 1874 Eliot warned against the trend of intercollegiate athletics, and in his annual report he stated:

While the Corporation have given the best possible evidence of their desire to foster these manly sports, they have felt compelled to discourage by every means in their power the association of students with the class of persons who make their living practicing or exhibiting these games; to dissuade students from making athletic sports the main business, instead of one of the incidental pleasures, of their college lives; and to prohibit altogether the taking of money for admission to witness the sports upon the College playgrounds.\textsuperscript{40}

Beginning in the 1870's, Eliot increasingly found himself devoting space in his annual reports to the abuses


\textsuperscript{40}President Eliot's Annual Report, 1873-74, p. 23.
seeping into college athletics, and in 1882, a section devoted to athletics became officially part of the president's annual report.  

There were several aspects of intercollegiate athletics that President Eliot criticized. As intercollegiate athletics was gaining national popularity, a greater emphasis was being placed on success. Alumni, students, and in some cases college presidents demanded winning teams. To produce successful teams athletic coaches were compelled to demand more time and training from athletes. Eliot criticized the excessive amount of time and training devoted to athletics, and this criticism appeared in his annual report:

In the highly competitive sports which give rise to exciting intercollegiate contests, namely, boat-racing, baseball, and football, there have been developed in recent years some evils of a serious nature. In the first place, the intercollegiate contests have made competition so keen that the time devoted to these sports by the principal crews and teams is excessive. No sport which requires of the players more than two hours a day during termtime is fit for college use.

With the excessive amount of time devoted to training, Eliot became concerned with the influence it had on the intellectual


42Earnest, op. cit., p. 224, stated that several college presidents used athletics as advertising to attract support from wealthy alumni and the public.

development of the participants: "In baseball and football the amount of time devoted daily to these games by the principal players is altogether too great, and in football the training is so fatiguing that the good players have little vitality left for intellectual labor during the season." Eliot was also concerned with the physical stress of overtraining, and he commented:

The baseball team of last spring was distinctly overworked; and half the crew gave out in the four-mile race. In all probability the nervous strain resulting from prolonged training, many exciting contests, and an anxious sense of responsibility, has not been sufficiently considered.

During the collegiate year athletic teams had to journey outside of Cambridge to compete. Eliot was opposed to such travel during the academic semester, because this meant that many times students had to miss classes. This was another aspect of intercollegiate athletics that Eliot criticized:

The breaking up of College work for the individual student by frequent absences to play games at a distance from Cambridge is an evil which ought to be checked. It is a greater evil than formerly, now that intercollegiate games take place all the year round, that is, in winter as well as in spring.

and autumn.  

Essentially, one area concerning athletics that Eliot opposed was the amount of time it was taking from academics. Eliot feared that physical interests were overwhelming the main purpose of education, mental development. He expressed this concern in the following manner:

It is high time that the whole profession of teaching in school, college, and university united to protest against the present exaggeration of athletic sports during the whole period of education, and especially to bring competitive sports within reasonable limits, and establish the supremacy of intellectual and moral interests over physical interests in all institutions of education.

As more and more spectators attended intercollegiate games the more commercialized they became. No longer was a football contest seen by a mere hundred or so fans dispersed around the sidelines; the intercollegiate football game became an event which was played in a packed stadium seating thousands of spectators. The mass hysteria which accompanied athletics, the cheer leaders, pep rallies, train loads of returning alumni, and victory parades, were considered repulsive by Eliot. The idea of having spectators crowd into a stadium to watch an intercollegiate contest did not

---


go well with Eliot, for he was of the opinion that "A
game that needs to be watched is not fit for genuine
sportsmen." Eliot believed that large crowds produce an
adverse effect on the players, and he contended that
screaming fans put pressure on players and many times
players would continue playing even though they were injured.  

Many profit making enterprises such as hotels, trans­
portation companies, athletic outfitters, and, one of
particular concern to Eliot, gambling, were attracted to
intercollegiate athletics. Eliot opposed the profiteering
of athletics:

The betting evil is greatly increased
by the practice of exhibiting the game in
public halls in many American cities far
remote from the scene of action. The
popular excitement over football games is
spread and maintained for commercial pur­
poses by newspapers, transportation companies,
and hotels, which reap a considerable profit
from these assemblages, since the public
is prepared to spend large sums of money
order to witness these exciting contests.  

Eliot contended that gambling spoils sport:

The passion for gambling affects the
markets not only for stocks and bonds, but
for the great staples of commerce and the
necessaries of life. All the competitive
sports are damaged by it; and in the forms
of betting and of playing games for money

48 Ibid.
Graduates' Magazine, VII (March 1899), 386-87.
50 Eliot, "The Situation in Athletics," Harvard
Graduates' Magazine, XVII (June 1909), 645.
According to Eliot, the procedure of collecting money to witness a collegiate game was not in good moral standing and inappropriate for institutions such as Harvard and Yale, and he elaborated:

The public interest in baseball and football has made it easy to collect large sums of gate-money, both on college grounds and on public grounds convenient to New York and other cities. The money thus easily got is often wastefully and ineffectively spent. There is something exquisitely inappropriate in the extravagant expenditure in athletic sports at such institutions as Harvard and Yale—insti-
tutions which have been painfully built up by the self-denial, frugality, and public spirit of generations that certainly did not lack physical and moral courage, endurance, and toughness, yet always put the things of sense. At these universities there must be constant economy and inadequacy in expenditure for intellectual and spiritual objects; how repulsive then must be foolish and pernicious expenditures on sports.52

Harvard teams received subsidies for travel from transportation companies and hotel owners, and Eliot declared that this practice contributed to the future perpetuation of commercialization of college athletics. Dr. Sargent quoted President Eliot and recommended that university presidents consider Eliot's request to abolish commercial interests from athletics, and Sargent wrote:

51Eliot, More Money for the Public Schools, p. 29.

...it can be safely predicted that they will all come eventually to the ground occupied by President Eliot, of Harvard, who said, in a recent report, that "college clubs and crews should be forbidden to employ trainers, to play or row with professionals, or to compete with professionals, or to compete with clubs or crews who adopt either of these practices; that they should be forbidden to give exhibitions in large cities for the purpose of money making; and to receive subsidies from railroads and hotels in furtherance of this object."^33

Since competitive athletics catered to elite athletes, Eliot believed it was an impediment to the development of universal participation in sports and games, and to this concern Eliot remarked:

The strong tendency of the highly competitive violent games is to reduce the proportion of boys and young men who play them, and to impede the universal development of wholesome sports accessible to all.54

As an alternative Eliot called for "domestic competition"—that is, contests within the university itself—in order to increase the number of students participating in each given sport. Eliot declared that two intercollegiate matches in any one sport is sufficient to maintain interest, and that the playing of games by teams organized within the university should be greatly extended and encouraged.55

---

^33 Sargent, "Evils of the Professional Tendencies of Modern Athletics," Journal of Social Science, XX (June 1885), 90.


Eliot favored mass participation rather than preparing a small group of elite athletes. Concerning this Eliot wrote:

In all the sports it is very desirable to develop some agreeable, local competition, so that a large number of crews and teams may always be in practice. Thus, two or three more clubs for rowing, like the Weld Club with its 413 members are needed, in order to put a large number of crews on the river and develop a wholesome and interesting competition at home.

Another alternative that Eliot suggested was the physical education courses offered by Dr. Sargent, and to this alternative he stated:

Meanwhile it is to be observed that there is much wholesome physical exercise taken, and much genuine athletic sport enjoyed in the University, in ways wholly independent of these exaggerated inter-collegiate games. The variety of the exercises and sports is always increasing. For two years past the class exercises on the floor of the Gymnasium have been very useful.

The editor of a New England newspaper praised President Eliot's efforts in promoting sports for all:

He is not a bookworm or a weakling physically. Probably nobody has a saner appreciation of the meaning of education—the drawing out and development of the faculties of the body as well as of the mind. He appreciates highly the value of athletic exercise and has consistently urged their extension within the university. He would like to see every student entering

the gymnasium and taking part in field sports.

Eliot was concerned with the influence intercollegiate athletics had on secondary school programs of athletics. He feared that the overemphasis of athletics in American colleges was filtering down to secondary schools. His concern for this was expressed in the following:

The American secondary schools have distinctly lost ground within the last twenty years, because the afternoons are so generally devoted throughout the year to competitive games of ball, and the boys' daily conversation runs on the games, instead of on their reading, their walks, or the sights and sounds of real life in city and country.

In a manner that typified Eliot, he illustrated the vulgar condition of American athletics by comparing it with a European counterpart. He admired the manner in which the British carried out their athletics, because their practice of athletics was devoid of the vulgarities found in American athletics, and according to Eliot:

The English schools and universities have never been affected with these vulgar evils in connection with their athletic games; and their wholesome habit of universal out-of-door exercise is maintained quietly and firmly without any such adventitious excitements.

In a letter to the editor of the Nashua Telegraph, Eliot

---

58 Nashua Telegraph, April 17, 1908, newspaper clipping found in the Eliot Papers, Box 202, Harvard University Archives.


mentioned that Harvard needed a rational view toward sports, similar to the English view of athletics:

What we want at Cambridge is more diffused athletics, and less of the concentrated variety. Fortunately, the students themselves are at last beginning to realize that it is possible to have so many intercollegiate contests as to diminish the interest which they excite. Your desire to reduce training and advertising is perfectly sound. We Americans are coming very slowly to the rational English view of steady, vigorous exercise all the year round, with nothing of the prize fighter's diet, brief exaltation, of endurance and subsequent re-action.

Development of the Harvard Athletic Committee

On May 29, 1882, alarmed by the number of undesirable elements in athletics, the faculty at Harvard appointed a committee to consider the influence of athletic sports on academic work. After their examination, they recommended that a standing committee on the regulation of athletic sports be appointed. It was suggested that the committee include three faculty members, including the director of the gymnasium, and submit a report to the faculty every year.  

61 Letter from President Eliot to Eliot Lord, editor of the Nashua Telegraph, July 3, 1908, Eliot Papers, Box 202, Harvard University Archives.

This committee of three constituted the first committee on the regulation of college sports at Harvard. In 1882 the committee established the following regulations for the conduct of Harvard athletics:

(1) No college club or athletic association should play or compete against professionals. (2) No person should assume the functions of trainer or instructor in athletics upon the grounds or within the buildings of the college without authority in writing from the committee. (3) That no student should enter as a competitor in any athletic sport or join as an active member any college athletic club including baseball, football, cricket, lacrosse, and rowing associations without a previous permission to do so. (4) That all games outside of Cambridge should be played on Saturday, unless permission to play upon other days was first obtained from the committee.

A fifth regulation was added in 1883 which stated that no person should be a member of a crew unless he knew how to swim.

The purpose of the committee was to eliminate professionalism from Harvard athletics, decrease the amount of games played outside of Cambridge, and to insure that athletes are in proper physical condition to enter athletic

---

63 From 1882-1884 its members included Charles Eliot Norton from fine arts (Chairman), John W. White from classics, and Dudley A. Sargent; from 1884-1885 the committee included John W. White (Chairman), William E. Byerly from mathematics, and Dudley A. Sargent.

64 This regulation implied that no student was allowed to participate without a medical examination conducted by the director of the gymnasium.

activities.

In 1885, after three years of operation, the committee proposed to the faculty that the committee should be expanded to consist of the following five members: the director of the gymnasium, a physician resident in Boston or Cambridge, a recent graduate of Harvard interested in athletic sports, and two undergraduates. The faculty agreed to the new committee formation which introduced representatives from the student body and alumni. However, to maintain faculty control the powers of this new committee were restricted. All of its members were appointed by President Eliot, and the committee was required to consult the faculty on all questions involving general principles before communicating its decisions to students.

The members of the athletic committee intended to eliminate evil features and check vicious tendencies in athletics. They were interested in fostering the best aspects of sports, and they were not disturbed to see athletics grow and flourish. The work of the athletic committee was not an impediment to the growth of athletics, and within the first six years of the committee's existence, there was an increase in athletic activity. In 1881, there was a total of about 54 students participating in athletic contests, and by 1888, there was a total of 417. The growth of athletics during this period was brought to the attention of the Board of Overseers by an alarmed sector of the faculty who had discovered that, on the average, more than one intercollegiate
contest had taken place each week of the college year in 1887. Following this uneasiness among certain faculty members, the Board of Overseers in the spring of 1888 appointed a committee to investigate the alleged abuses of athletics. This committee investigated the facts, and four of its five members recommended the adoption of the following vote:

That the Faculty be requested to prohibit any undergraduate from taking part in any athletic contest with the students of any other College or with any organization not belonging to the University during the College year.

The adoption of this recommendation would eliminate intercollegiate athletics at Harvard during the college year, and in order to carry out athletics the students would have to turn to Eliot's recommendation of "domestic competition."

The majority of the committee also recommended the following:

That the existing Committee on Athletics should be increased from five to seven members by adding thereto one member of the Faculty and one undergraduate, and that this Committee should be given the entire supervision and control of all athletic exercises within the precincts of the University, subject to the authority of the Faculty.

A minority report was also submitted to the Board of Overseers, and it recommended the following:
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(1) That the formal intercollegiate contests be limited to Yale, and that University teams be alone permitted to take part in them.
(2) That these contests take place only at New Haven, Cambridge, or such other New England city or town as the Athletic Committee may from time to time designate.

After discussion, on May 2, 1888, the overseers adopted the following propositions:

Whereas in the opinion of this Board an undue prominence is now given to Athletic Contests in the College, and excesses and abuses attending the same and mainly incidental to intercollegiate contests should be checked and guarded against for the future, Therefore,
Voted, That in the opinion of this Board intercollegiate contests should take place only in Cambridge, New Haven, or such other New England city or town as the Committee on Athletics may from time to time designate, that University teams alone should be permitted to take part in intercollegiate contests, and that students should be prohibited from taking part in contests with organizations not belonging to the University, except on Saturdays and holidays.

On May 9, 1888, the following votes were adopted by the overseers:

Voted, That in the opinion of this Board it is expedient that the existing Committee on Athletics should be increased by adding thereto two members of the Faculty and one undergraduate,—the undergraduate members of the Committee to be appointed by the undergraduates in such manner as the Faculty may determine; and
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that the Committee should have entire supervision and control of all athletic exercises within and without the precincts of the University, subject to the authority of the Faculty.

Voted, That in the opinion of this Board additional space should be provided as soon as practicable for use as a college play-ground.

These votes were sent to the Corporation, and on May 14, 1888, the Corporation voted:

Voted, To transmit to the College Faculty a copy of the communication received from the Overseers in relation to athletics, and to request them to examine the whole subject and make a report thereon to this Board. 71

The faculty appointed a committee of three to investigate the votes of the overseers. The faculty passed the following votes in regard to the Committee on Athletics:

Voted, (1) That the Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports shall hereafter be constituted as follows: of three graduates of the College; of three members of the College Faculty,—these six members to be appointed by the Corporation; and of three undergraduates, who shall be chosen during the first week of the College year by the majority votes of the following students,—the presidents of the Senior, Junior, and Sophomore classes and a representative from each of the following athletic organizations,—the Boat Club, the Cricket Club, and the Athletic, Baseball, Football, Lacrosse, and Tennis Associations, who shall be called together for the purpose of making this choice, by the President of the University.

(2) That this committee shall have full power over all matters relating to athletics and athletic contests, subject to all general
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regulations as the College Faculty may from time to time adopt.

(3) That this committee shall hold office for one year, beginning at the opening of the academic year. 72

The Corporation and Board of Overseers adopted the rules accepted by the faculty. Thus, in 1888, the Harvard Athletic Committee shaped up to include three members of the faculty, three members of the alumni, and three undergraduates. The 3-3-3 plan for athletic committees became widely used in other colleges.

In 1889, under the direction of the athletic committee, the following regulation was made:

None but bona fide members of the University taking a full years work, and none but amateurs by the accepted definition were allowed to represent the University in any public contest. 73

The nine member athletic committee was responsible for the conduct of athletics at Harvard. This included management, budgeting, care of all athletic teams and grounds, as


73 Ibid., 1889-90, p. 16. The following rule was used to determine an amateur: No one shall be allowed to participate in any athletic contest, either individually or as a member of any team, who either before or since entering the University shall have engaged for money in any athletic competition, whether for a stake, or a money prize, or a share of the entrance fees or admission money, or who shall have taught or engaged in any athletic exercise or sport as a means of livelihood; or who shall at any time have received for taking part in any athletic sport or contest any pecuniary gain or emolument whatever, direct or indirect, with the single exception that he may have received from the College organization or from any permanent amateur association of which he was at the time a member the amount by which the expenses necessarily incurred by him in representing his organization in athletic contests exceeded his ordinary expenses.
well as enforcing rules and regulations. President Eliot stated the purpose of the Athletic Committee: "From the beginning it has been the object of the Faculty and of the Athletic Committee, not to cripple or abolish the competitive sports, but to have them conducted with moderation and honesty, and in a generous temper." Eliot recommended for other colleges and universities to consider an athletic committee, and he stated:

In the judgement of all the authorities of Harvard University,—Corporation, Overseers, and Faculties—they require at all American universities and colleges steady and watchful control, such as the Harvard Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports has exercised since 1882.

In 1893, the athletic committee decided to alleviate some of its burden by placing the management of all athletic teams under one head, calling the new organization by the same name as the organization for track athletics—the Harvard Athletic Association—and appointed a manager. The newly appointed manager was to have full charge of the funds and management of all teams, all care and improvement of the athletic fields, and prepare arrangements for handling crowds at all spectator games. He was only responsible to the athletic committee.
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In 1895 the following rules of eligibility were adopted by the athletic committee:

Rule 1. No one shall be allowed to represent Harvard University in any public contests, either individually or as a member of any team, unless he can satisfy the Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports that he is, and intends to be throughout the College year, a bona-fide member of the University, taking a full years work.

Rule 2. No student on probation can take part in any public athletic contest.

Rule 3. No one who is not a regular student in the College or Scientific School, and no regular student in either of these departments who has ever played in any intercollegiate team of any college, shall play upon a Harvard team until he has resided one academic year at the University and passed the annual examinations upon a full years work.

Rule 4. No student shall be allowed to represent Harvard University in any public contest, either individually or as a member of a team, who, either before or since entering the University, shall have engaged for money in any athletic competition, whether for a stake, or a money prize, or a share of the entrance fee or admission money; or who should have taught or engaged in any athletic exercise or sport as a means of livelihood.

Rule 5. No student, whether he has represented one or more colleges shall take part in intercollegiate contests for more than four years; and this period shall begin with the year in which as a player upon a university team he first represented any college.

The rules established by the athletic committee are very similar to the rules governing intercollegiate athletics today.

President Eliot observed that the rules adopted by the athletic committee since its inauguration have had several different objects in view:

(1) To secure the physical safety of the players so far as possible;
(2) To keep the players up to a minimum, at least, of college work;
(3) To reduce the number of contests, and to prevent contests in Cambridge from interfering with the work of the College;
(4) To preserve the College character of the contests themselves and of the training therefore;
(5) To exclude all players who are not genuine students and amateurs.\textsuperscript{78}

On several occasions the athletic committee was requested to take action on the issue of abolishing intercollegiate football at Harvard. The most severe action taken by the committee was a recommendation to the faculty that resulted in banning Harvard's football team from participating in the 1885 intercollegiate football season.

At the conclusion of the 1883 football season, the members of the committee felt that the conduct of intercollegiate football was too brutal and demoralizing. Thus, the committee informed the captain of the football team that several games of the 1884 season will be observed to determine the practicality of intercollegiate football at Harvard. Committee members observed four games during the 1884 season, and their conclusions were submitted in a report to the...
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They were not in favor of intercollegiate football:

In every one of these games there was brutal fighting with the fists, where the men had to be separated by other players, or by the judges and the referee, or by the bystanders and the police....

Unfair play, often premeditated and sometimes concerted, was a prominent feature in all of the games, and, although not always successful, was rarely punished. Intentional off-side play and unlawful interference with opponents who were not running with the ball were the rule rather than the exception. The game is demoralizing to the spectators mainly through its brutality; unfair play they usually fail to recognize.

The committee concluded their report with the following recommendation to the faculty:

We therefore recommend that all games of football be prohibited to students of the college, except those played by our own men on our own grounds, and that there shall be allowed only in case it shall prove possible to eliminate all objectionable features from the game. We believe that football, played in the proper spirit, under proper conditions, may be made one of the most valuable of college sports, and we should deprecate its permanent loss.

The faculty approved the committee's recommendation, and
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intercollegiate football at Harvard was prohibited in 1885. The ban lasted for one season, and on January 5, 1886, the faculty adopted the following vote to withdraw the prohibition on intercollegiate football:

Whereas the Committee on Athletics has advised the Faculty that the game of football has been much improved during the past season:

Voted, on recommendation of the Committee, that the Faculty's prohibition of intercollegiate games of football, adopted January 6, 1885, be now withdrawn.

The question surrounding the abolishment of intercollegiate football re-emerged several times at Harvard. On February 19, 1895, the faculty voted to adopt the following resolution: "That the Faculty desire the Committee on Athletic Sports to put a stop to all intercollegiate football contests." The matter was taken up by the athletic committee, and shortly afterwards they reported adversely to the resolution of the faculty. After receiving this resolution from the athletic committee the faculty voted 41 to 25 on the following:

The Faculty having received and considered a communication from the Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports, dated February 25, 1895, remain of the opinion that no student under their charge should be permitted to take


part in intercollegiate football contests.\textsuperscript{84} This wish of the faculty was not regarded by the athletic committee, which took the ground that it was not subject to the authority of the faculty.

On February 3, 1903, the faculty again sent a resolution, which was passed by a faculty vote of 32 to 7, to the athletic committee calling for the abolishment of intercollegiate football. The athletic committee replied that "the present situation in the intercollegiate athletics does not appear to render advisable the discontinuance of intercollegiate football at Harvard."\textsuperscript{85}

In 1906, a much more severe attack was launched against intercollegiate football. This time the faculty was joined by the Board of Overseers in voting for the prohibition of football. In 1905, the Board of Overseers had dispatched their own committee to investigate the abuses of intercollegiate football, and in January, 1906, the overseers received a report that disfavored the game of football. The Board of Overseers, on January 10, therefore voted to prohibit intercollegiate football at Harvard.\textsuperscript{86} The following proposal was sent to the athletic committee:

\begin{quote}
The Committee on Athletic Sports be requested to report to this Board what
\end{quote}
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changes they propose in the game of football, and until said report has been acted upon and approved by the Governing Boards to permit no further games of intercollegiate football.

The faculty, on February 6, voted 31 to 3 in favor of prohibiting intercollegiate football at Harvard.88

President Eliot had all along expressed his disfavor with the game of football in his annual reports, and he supported the move for abolishing football at Harvard.89

Thus, the Board of Overseers, the faculty, and the president united in demanding that the game of football be stopped. This body of adverse opinion, however, did not impress the athletic committee, because two months later the committee on athletics passed the following vote:

The Harvard Athletic Committee, by virtue of the authority delegated to it by the Corporation and the Board of Overseers, hereby votes to sanction the game of football at Harvard as an intercollegiate sport for the season of 1906.90

The athletic committee felt that the evils of football had been checked with the passing of certain eligibility rules.

On May 9, the report of the committee on athletics was presented to the Board of Overseers. The report recommended
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the following vote be adopted by the Board of Overseers:

That the Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports be authorized to permit, during the season of 1906, but not later than December 1, 1906, games of intercollegiate football, under the new rules, upon such terms and conditions as said Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports shall consider advisable in order to test the propriety of continuing intercollegiate football, and that a copy of this vote be sent to the President and Fellows.  

Two days prior, on May 7, the Corporation voted to adopt the resolution presented by the athletic committee by a vote of 15 to 9. President Eliot was one of the nine members of the Corporation to vote against the resolution. The overseers agreed to accept the committee's proposal, and thus, the athletic committee was able to overturn the united demand of the faculty and Board of Overseers to abolish intercollegiate football.

The athletic committee had demonstrated that it had autonomy in making decisions concerning the affairs of athletics at Harvard. The control of athletics which was originally under the authority of the faculty had waned. The original intention of the athletic committee was to be under faculty control, and the first committee consisted of three faculty members. In 1885, the committee expanded to
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include undergraduate and alumni representation, but all the policies of the committee had to be approved by the faculty. In 1888, the athletic committee shaped up to include nine members—three faculty members, three members of the alumni, and three undergraduates, and it was voted that this committee shall have full power over all athletic contests but subject to all general regulations as the college faculty may from time to time adopt. However, the faculty had lost its power to control athletics, and it never regained its control over the conduct of athletics at Harvard.

Intercollegiate Football as a National Issue

Beginning in the 1890’s, the question concerning the value of intercollegiate athletics emerged as a national issue. Many educators criticized athletics for its distraction to students and distortion of academic ideals, and the sport that received the most controversy was football. As well as educators and college administrators, opinions concerning the value of intercollegiate football were expressed by athletic coaches and trainers, students, alumni, public figures, and editors of national journals. Some believed that the game was a vicious display of brutality, while others saw it as a vigorous sport fostering discipline and courage. The issue concerning either the reformation or abolition of football at institutions of education was
discussed at college board meetings, state and national education meetings, and eventually at the White House. The public was informed of the pros and cons of intercollegiate football in numerous articles which appeared in newspapers and national journals.

One of the most outspoken critics of football was President Eliot. Since Eliot held a prominent position as a leader of American education, his criticisms on the value of football became nationally known. Excerpts from his annual reports dealing with athletics were reported in the New York Times as well as national journals, and many educators confided with Eliot on the football issue.

Eliot objected to the extreme publicity football received, the large proportion of injuries among the players, the absorption of the undergraduate mind in the subject for two months, and the disproportionate exaltation of the football hero in the college world. However, he considered these to be the lesser evils. His major criticism of football was its moral quality, and Eliot outlined the poor moral standards of football:

> The game is played under established and recognized rules; but the uniform enforcement of these rules is impossible, and violations of the rules are in many respects highly profitable toward victory. Thus coaching from the side-lines, offside play, holding, and disabling opponents by kneeling and kicking, and by heavy blows on the head and particularly about eyes,
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nose, and jaw, are unquestionably profitable toward victory; and no means have been found of preventing these violations of rules by both coaches and players.

Eliot declared that, "Football is a fight; and that its strategy and ethics are those of war. One may therefore resort in football to every ruse, strategem, and deceit which would be justifiable in actual fighting." The intent of maiming an opposing player in football was described by Eliot in the following manner:

The weaker man is the legitimate prey of the stronger. One should always try to discover the weakest man in the opponent's line, as, for example, the man most recently injured, and attack him again and again. If a man, by repeated blows about the head and particularly on the jaw, has been visibly dazed, he is the man to attack at the next onset. If in the last encounter a player has been obviously laimed in leg or arm or shoulder, the brunt of an early attack should fall on him. As a corollary to this principle, it is justifiable for a player, who is in good order, to pretend that he is seriously hurt, in order that he may draw the opponent's attack to the wrong place.

To summarize, Eliot considered the following as grave evils of football: (1) the immoderate desire to win intercollegiate games; (2) the frequent collisions in masses which make foul play invisible; (3) the profit from violations of rules; (4) the misleading assimilation of the game to war
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as regards its strategy and its ethics.\textsuperscript{97}

An historian of American higher education analyzed the influence that the evils of intercollegiate athletics had on university life:

The most tragic result of overemphasis and commercialization in athletics was that colleges lost their moral leadership. Students and the public, seeing the chicanery and hypocrisy involved, became cynical about the honesty of college officials who winked at or connived at professionalism, fake eligibility rules, and unsportsmanlike play. Certain members of every faculty and administration became notorious for their willingness to relax academic standards for athletes...The athletic field became the most powerful forum on the campus, and the doctrine preached there was "win at any price."\textsuperscript{98}

He also observed that football's greatest achievement, during Eliot's era, was its contribution to social democracy in the colleges. According to his analysis, football broke the pattern of snobbishness based on race, religion, and wealth, and he wrote:

Students and alumni alike recruited team candidates from all ranks and races. In 1893 the captain of the Harvard team was William H. Lewis, a Negro. American Indians from Carlisle played against the most aristocratic teams in the East. The sons of Polish immigrants shared locker rooms and training tables with Princeton Anglo-Saxons. The many jokes about the unpronounceable names of football players are only testimony to the prevalence of
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second-generation Americans on college teams. And because of the prestige of football heroes, such men tended to become big men in college.

Morison also contended that the growth of athletics tended to foster social democracy, by bringing together men of the widest social origins. In a similar vein, Rudolph attributed the growth of social democracy among students to intercollegiate football. Thus, the issue concerning the value of football was debated by those who felt that the game was not rational for academic life, and those who believed that the game was valuable in fostering social democracy.

Educators and college administrators voiced their opinions on the value of intercollegiate football, and not all were in agreement with Eliot's criticisms. In 1902, President Charles Thwing of Western Reserve College published a survey where he reported that college presidents generally responded favorably toward football, and he concluded:

I have lately conferred with many college officers, both presidents and deans, representing colleges from Maine to California, and from Texas to Michigan, regarding the game. ... in the judgement of most, tho not all, college presidents, the good of the game of football exceeds the
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evil of the game.\textsuperscript{102}

William J. White, a University of Pennsylvania faculty member, criticized Eliot's position on the football issue. In White's estimation the sport developed courage, skill, and character, and that the desire to win, publicity, enormous crowds, and large gate receipts were not evils. He contended that football profits support numerous activities for the total student population, and he felt that intercollegiate football contributed to student unity and a sense of belonging, which he considered as an important aspect in developing social behavior.\textsuperscript{103}

The president of Brown University, the Rev. William H.P. Faunce, stated that football had done more than any other one thing to build social life in colleges. To the social benefits accrued from football Faunce responded:

> It is not a question of physical benefit or damage. It is a much larger, broader question—it is a question of social, or of moral benefit. The real benefit is not in the bodily joy, or the exercise, but in the giving expression to the larger life of the institution. As much as I deplore the injuries that result from football, I say that they are of little account compared with the enormous
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social benefits it has brought about.  

The social aspect was also voiced by President Northrop of the University of Minnesota:

> The effect[of football] on the intellectual tone and scholarship of the whole college is, as far as I can see, not perceptible in any way, except that a genuine college spirit is cultivated itself, which binds students to their Alma Mater, and is valuable both to the student and the college.  

President Adams of Wisconsin viewed the value of football as an outlet for excessive physical energy, and he declared that the improved order in colleges was in part due to football.

Concerning the overemphasis of athletics as a detriment to mental development, President Merrill of Colgate stated the following:

> I cannot see football is detrimental to the intellectual tone and scholarship of the whole college. Probably it is distinctively helpful. The athletic spirit is quickened in the whole body of students, and undoubtedly the general attention to healthful exercise and even to the severe work in track athletics, baseball and basketball is beneficial
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Eliot's fear of athletics overtaking intellectual pursuits was responded to by President Prather of the University of Texas, "Everything considered, athletics is not with us a dangerous rival of intellectual interest and activity."  

President Jesse of the University of Missouri was not in agreement with Eliot's condemnation of football for its moral quality. President Jesse felt that football allowed for the development of moral behavior, and he stated:

> The training for athletic contests is begetting now among our students more manliness, more cleanliness, fairness, temperance and many other qualities that lie on the border lines between muscles and morals.

California's President Wheeler extolled football for its training in leadership, and he noted:

> If not overdone, it tends to make him (the student) manly, direct, co-operative, and selfcontrolled. The bearing of old football players, I think I have noted, is marked by quietude of manner and repression of bluster. If I wanted a man to manage a school, or conduct a department of a business enterprise, I should count football experience as a decided recommendation.

Woodrow Wilson of Princeton, who, in the late 1880's, coached football at Wesleyan College in Connecticut, and
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as an undergraduate student was the secretary of a student board directing football at Princeton, stressed the moral qualities of football. Professor Burt Wilder of Cornell attacked Wilson's views, and he commented, "If football developed 'moral qualities,' why were referees necessary?"  

Indeed, there were many prominent individuals in education who felt that intercollegiate football was of value to college life, and even the idea of bodily injury did not seem to bother some administrators. The president of Notre Dame, Father John Cavanaugh, commented: "I would rather see our youth playing football with the danger of a broken collarbone occasionally than to see them dedicated to croquet."  

Eliot, however, was not an isolated critic of football. In 1888, President Barnard of Columbia questioned the value of football on the ground that only a few students benefited from the physical exercise and the others were distracted from their studies. Godkin, the editor of Nation and a persistent critic of football, claimed that football produced more spectators than participants, and he believed that the over exaggeration of football had not contributed to providing wholesome opportunities for students to engage in
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physical exercise. These critics believed that the benefits of sport are achieved through participation and not spectating, and this was in agreement with Eliot's belief.

Eliot's major criticism of football was its poor moral standards. President Butler of Columbia agreed with Eliot, and he denounced football for its lack of developing moral qualities:

The moral qualities which it was supposed to foster were not strongly in evidence. The most important football games had become in fact purely professional contests, for professionalism is not so much a thing of money as it is a thing of spirit and point of view. At times, when students should themselves be taking physical exercise for their own good they stood grouped by hundreds, watching a contest between trained representatives of their own institution and another.

In the early 1900's the public became more aware of the brutality of intercollegiate football, as newspapers and journals began to report annual casualty and injury rates attributed to the game. During the 1905 season, the New York Times reported that eighteen players had died on account of football, and 159 were injured. In the following year there were eleven deaths and 104 injuries.
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article entitled "Gridiron Casualties" reported the following:

With the returns for the Thanksgiving Day games yet to come in, a summary of the football casualties for the season of 1908 has been compiled by a Chicago statistician. He finds that thirteen deaths were directly due to the game, and that 129 participants were seriously injured. The list of injured, it is explained, does not include the hundreds of players who were hurt, but not so seriously disabled as to necessitate more than trifling surgical attendance.  

In an editorial the Outlook launched its criticism of football:

Something is the matter with a game... which takes the time and attention, not only of the players, but also of the undergraduates as a body, until for weeks they talk and think nothing but football; which requires the constant attendance of skilled surgeons, who conduct on the field what one of the most eminent has called 'a hospital clinic.'...Why are men coached to slug?  

Concerning the conduct of football the New York Times wrote:

...that mayhem and homicide should become its familiar accompaniments will not be permitted. That point is not yet reached, but it cannot be denied that the rapid development of modern methods of play tend in that direction.  

It appeared that the early 1900's, with the publication of casualty reports, would generate national opposition to
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intercollegiate football. Eliot, however, did not think so. In a letter, he mentioned that even deaths and injuries seemed to lack an effect in moving people to oppose football, and he wrote:

I am sorry to say that the number of deaths and injuries incurred in playing football does not seem to be an effective argument against the game among either men or women. Indeed, the liability of the players to injury really increases the excitement of the spectators, and seems to add to their pleasure. To be sure, the spectators generally believe that the players as a rule recover from the injuries they receive on the field, which is by no means the fact.  

As the casualties accumulated, the members of the Inter-collegiate Football Rules Committee were reluctant to take action in reforming the game. Therefore, Endicott Peabody, headmaster of Groton Preparatory School, requested President Theodore Roosevelt to call together the football coaches of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton to consider reforming the rules of football. President Roosevelt accepted the challenge and invited coaches and several faculty members from Harvard, Yale, and Princeton to attend a meeting at the White House.
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On October 9, 1905, representatives to the White House conference assembled for an informal luncheon with the President and the Secretary of State Elihu Root. The conference was represented by the following: Yale, Walter Camp and John E. Owsley; Harvard, William T. Reid and Edward H. Nichols; Princeton, Arthur T. Hildebrand and John B. Fine. The New York Times reported that "President Roosevelt to-day took up another question of vital interest to the American people. He started a campaign to reform football." At this meeting, the President asked the conferees to develop rules modifications that would eliminate the brutal elements of the game.

President Eliot was very sceptical of the conference. He charged that President Roosevelt's White House conference to reform football has brought together coaches who are responsible for the evils in the game. The Washington Post quoted Eliot as saying the following to President Roosevelt's reform efforts:

The President, with characteristic vigor, has tackled a hard job. It is hard to bring about a reform through the very men who have long known about the existing evils and have been largely responsible for their continuance. His one chance is to convince them that the evils have become intolerable.


It was Roosevelt's intention to reform football, and the idea of abolishing the game was completely out of the question. As early as 1893 Roosevelt made comments concerning football reform, and he wrote:

What I have to say with reference to all sports refers especially to football. The brutality must be done away with and the danger minimized....The rules for football ought probably to be altered so as to do away with the present system of interference, while the umpires must be made to prevent slugging or any kind of foul play by the severest penalties.¹²⁵

Roosevelt was not very pleased with Eliot's comments concerning football, and he wrote Eliot a letter indicating his desire for reform and that Eliot should consider reform instead of making statements on how football is not fit for college life. By calling for reform Eliot could be more effective in influencing the conduct of football, and to this Roosevelt wrote:

I further think that one reason why they [evils of football] are not remedied is that so many of our people whose voices would be potent in reforming the game, try to abolish it instead.¹²⁶

At a second White House meeting, the President invited Dr. J. William White, professor of surgery at the University of Pennsylvania, to discuss the ways in which brutality in


football could be alleviated.127

The rules suggested by President Roosevelt to reform football were: (1) a definition of professionalism; (2) a rule stating that all members of a college athletic team must be genuine students of the college which they represent, and to be satisfactory in their studies; (3) a rule to prevent the procurement of good players from other colleges by social or money inducements.128 Roosevelt's suggestions, however, were concerned with eligibility rather than eliminating brutality.

In the midst of Roosevelt's reform efforts, a new storm of anti-football feelings emerged when the newspapers reported the death of Union College's Harold P. Moore in a football game contested on November 25, 1905. The Nation called for an immediate abolishment of the game.129 Chancellor Henry B. MacCracken of New York University urged for the abolition of football if immediate reforms were not taken. He set forth three reasons why the sport as presently conducted should not be tolerated longer. He said the game was homicidal, exalted bulk and brawn over brains, and emphasized money-making unduly.130 He invited Eliot to assume the
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leadership and call a conference to deal with the football issue. Eliot's reply to MacCracken's request was quoted in the *New York Times*:

> I do not think it expedient to call a meeting of college presidents about football. They certainly cannot reform football, and I doubt if by themselves they can abolish it. For example, I cannot on my sole authority put an end to football at Harvard.  

Chancellor MacCracken was greatly disappointed by Eliot's reply. On the subject he stated:

> I am disappointed that President Eliot did not see fit to respond to my request. While President Eliot is not Chairman of the Harvard Board of Overseers, I do not doubt that he has sufficient influence to inspire such action. As far as I am myself concerned, I cannot take any action in this matter, for I have only my individual vote in the meetings of the Faculty Committee on Athletics. That vote is for the abolition of football in New York University.  

Nevertheless, MacCracken went ahead with his plans, and on December 8, 1905, with thirteen institutions represented, MacCracken's conference convened in New York. The intent of the group was to generate a movement to reform football. On December 28th, a second session was held which attracted sixty-two colleges from all sections of the United States. They formed the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of America, and Captain Palmer E. Pierce of the


United States Military Academy was elected president of the new organization.\textsuperscript{133} In 1910 the title was changed to the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

MacCracken's conference established a New Rules Committee of seven and instructed them to meet with the Old Rules Committee to seek an amalgamation of the two committees.\textsuperscript{134} Since its origin in 1876, the Old Rules Committee controlled the regulation of college sports. It was represented by Eastern colleges, and it had been inactive in establishing reform measures for college football. It was Roosevelt's intention to have these two committees meet so that a national code of rules and regulations would be established. Roosevelt was successful in convincing William T. Reid, Harvard's football coach, to dissent from the Old Rules Committee and join the committee representing the Intercollegiate Athletic Association. On January 12, 1906, the two rules committees held independent sessions at the Hotel Netherland in New York City. Reid dissented from the Old Rules Committee and joined the new organization, and an exchange of notes brought the two groups into agreement for a joint session.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{133}New York Times, December 29, 1905, 7.


The amalgamation of the two committees set into operation the establishment of new rules and regulations for the reformation of college football. New rules were established to decrease the brutality of the game. The game was to include one more official, making a total of four, and playing time was reduced to sixty minutes; hurdling and mass play formations were outlawed. The forward pass was made legal, but with one great drawback: if incomplete, the team attempting to pass was penalized fifteen yards on the first and second down, and on the third down they lost possession.

The 1906 intercollegiate football season witnessed a changed game. Harper's Weekly expressed that the revised rules appeared to have had success in opening up the game. Even Eliot had an optimistic comment concerning the new rules:

The game of football was somewhat improved by the new rules extorted last year from its creators and managers by the pressure of public opinion. Under the new rules the game is livelier and therefore more interesting to watch. It gives appropriate opportunities to several kinds of natural athletes, and it affords fewer opportunities for foul play and brutality, whether deliberate and planned or sudden and accidental, than the game under the former rules afforded.

Eliot, however, found the new rules only partially effective, and he stated:

137New York Times, March 7, 1907, 10.
The injuries inflicted on the Harvard players were of the same character as were suffered under the former rules, but they were much fewer in number. The spirit of the game, however, remains essentially the same. It is properly described by the adjective "fierce"—a term which is commonly applied to the game by its advocates. It therefore remains an undesirable game for gentlemen to play or for multitudes of spectators to watch.

President Roosevelt's influence in reforming intercollegiate football was significant. He expressed his desire for reforming the rules of football by calling together members of the Old Rules Committee to the White House. President Roosevelt was also successful in exerting his influence on bringing about an amalgamation of the Old Rules Committee and the New Rules Committee of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of America, later known as the National Collegiate Athletic Association. His significance in establishing reform was expressed by Lewis:

President Roosevelt's role in the 1905 football controversy, probably the single most important event in the history of intercollegiate sport, was a significant but not a crucial one. His action did determine the direction of football, but he did not save the game, because its existence was never threatened; nor did he bring about reform in either rules or conduct by issuing an ultimatum,..., he used his position in government and his personal power of persuasion to force the Rules Committee to recognize the national organization. The development enhanced the position of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States. Thus, President Theodore Roosevelt should properly be viewed as one of the founding

138 Ibid.
fathers of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

President Roosevelt was a firm believer in athletics. Speaking to Harvard students in 1907 Roosevelt stated the importance of participating in sport:

It is of far more importance that a man shall play something himself, even if he plays it badly, than that he shall go with hundreds of companions to see someone else play well....Athletics are good, especially in their rougher forms, because they tend to develop courage. They are good also because they encourage a true democratic spirit; for in the athletic field the man must be judged not with reference to outside and accidental attributes, but to that combination of bodily vigor and moral quality which go to make up prowess.

The idea of a sport being rough or injurious did not bother Roosevelt. Concerning this view Roosevelt wrote:

I believe heartily in sport. I believe in out-of-door games, and I do not mind in the least that they are rough games, or that those who take part in them are occasionally injured. I have no sympathy whatever with the overwrought sentimentality which would keep a young man in cotton wool, and I have a hearty contempt for him if he counts a broken arm or collar bone as of serious consequence, when balanced against the chance of showing that he possesses physical address, and courage.


Roosevelt believed that athletics have their place, and should not be indulged in as the sole purpose of life. In a letter to his son, who was a member of the Harvard football team, Roosevelt wrote:

I am delighted to have you play football. I believe in rough, manly sports. But I do not believe in them if they degenerate into the sole end of any one's existence. I don't want you to sacrifice standing well in your studies to any over-athleticism; and I need not tell you that character counts for a great deal more than either intellect or body in winning success in life. Athletic proficiency is a mighty good servant, and like so many other good servants, a mighty bad master.  

Roosevelt criticized those who made comments concerning the abolishment of football. He called Godkin's views on football irrational and branded the editor a "trouble maker." He charged Godkin with ignorance and a lack of manly qualities. When the question of abolishing football was debated at his alma mater, Harvard, Roosevelt rallied to defend the game. Speaking to Harvard students he stated:

It is to my mind simple nonsense, a mere confession of weakness, to desire to abolish a game because tendencies show themselves, or practices grow up, which prove that the game ought to be reformed.

142 Letter from President Roosevelt to Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., October 4, 1903, Theodore Roosevelt Cyclopedi, p. 32.
144 Speech delivered at the Harvard Union, February 23, 1907, Theodore Roosevelt Cyclopedi, p. 182.
Roosevelt felt that Eliot's opposition to the game was foolish, and to this Roosevelt wrote: "I think Harvard will be doing the baby act if she takes any such foolish course as President Eliot advises." 145

In June, 1908, an incident occurred which caused the greatest difference of opinion between President Roosevelt and President Eliot. Several days before the Harvard-Yale rowing contest, two members of the Harvard crew, Sidney Fish and Charles Morgan, Jr., were suspended from competition. Fish and Morgan, who were about to leave for Connecticut, to compete against Yale, were detected in the act of removing a restricted book from the library. They removed the text for the purpose of preparing for a final examination. Since this text was not permitted to be taken from the library, they had violated the rules, which resulted in their suspension from competition. The victory over Yale was in jeopardy, and an extraordinary excitement took hold of alumni and students. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., sent a telegram to his father asking him to interfere, as a concerned alumnus, in the suspension of the oarsmen. Hearing of this news, President Roosevelt and Assistant Secretary of State Robert Bacon, both loyal Harvard men, dispatched a telegram to Eliot expressing their astonishment at the

severity of the punishment and requesting him to modify his position and permit the men to row. The request was sent in the following telegram:

Is it not possible and would it not be more fitting and just to substitute another punishment for Fish and Morgan if as is stated, they merely took away a book which they were permitted to use in the library? It seems to us, that it is unfair and unnecessary to make others suffer for an offense of this kind for which some other punishment might surely be found.146

Eliot refused to change his decision, and he responded to Roosevelt's request:

Each man did a dishonorable thing... The least possible punishment was putting them on probation, but that drops them from the crews. A keen and sure sense of honor being the finest result of college life, I think the College and graduates should condemn effectively dishonorable conduct. The College should also teach that one must never do scurvy things in the supposed interest or for the pleasure of others.147

Eliot contended,

...that the withdrawing of Fish and Morgan from the crew is not regarded as a disciplinary measure. It is simply in strict accord with the agreement with Yale, under which no man supposed to be under discipline from Harvard College can compete in any athletic contest with Yale.148

146 Ibid., VI, p. 1117; also printed in "Oarsmen Suspended," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XVII (September 1908), 127.
147 Ibid., p. 1118.
Eliot took the position that he was following the established rules and regulations governing intercollegiate rowing between Harvard and Yale.

Following this incident, Roosevelt, in his correspondence to Eliot, expressed his feelings on the manner in which Eliot handled the situation:

My concern was somewhat for the crew, because, like most sane and healthy Harvard graduates, I am always anxious to see the eleven or the nine, or the crew, or the track team, win....Yesterday at lunch there were present certain Harvard graduates and undergraduates, and three or four editors of leading periodicals, and I was interested to find that they all of them attributed the action of the faculty, attributed your action, simply to your hostility to athletics; that is, they all accepted as a matter of course the view that no such disproportionate punishment would have been inflicted, excepting for the fact that this gave an opportunity for the Harvard College authorities to strike a blow at Harvard athletics.

Since they had lost power in controlling athletics at Harvard, Roosevelt charged that the faculty and President Eliot used the incident to demonstrate their authority on athletic affairs.

President Eliot had gained a reputation as an opponent of intercollegiate athletics. His criticisms of intercollegiate football were published in newspapers and national journals. He contended that the game contained many qualities

149 Letter from President Roosevelt to President Eliot, July 10, 1908, The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt, VI, p. 1120.
that were morally and physically injurious, and he seriously doubted if reforms could change the nature of the game. In 1905, when the public cried out against the brutality of football, President Roosevelt initiated a reform movement. By 1906 the game was changed, and it appeared that reform could indeed modify the nature of football, thus dispelling Eliot's contention; but, in 1909, the year Eliot retired, the Nation reported a total of thirty players killed and 216 injured. Mass play had reappeared, and the forward pass was ignored as too difficult or too risky.

Events in 1909 indicated that the brutality of football had not been extinguished. On October 30th, during a contest between Harvard and Army, Cadet Eugene A. Byrne suffered a fatal injury; two days later Cadet Byrne died, and West Point cancelled the remainder of its football games. Two weeks prior to this event, an Annapolis player, Midshipman Earl Wilson, suffered severe injuries to his neck and spine which resulted in paralysis. On November 15th, University of Virginia's Archie Christian, Jr., died of fatal injuries suffered during a match against Georgetown; both universities cancelled football for the


151"Cadet Byrne Dead; No Army-Navy Game," New York Times, November 1, 1909, 1.
rest of the year. In light of these events, perhaps Eliot's minority evaluation of the nature of football at that time was accurate.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: ELIOT AS CRITIC

Charles W. Eliot became the twenty-second president of Harvard University on May 19, 1869. He held this position for forty years, and following his retirement in 1909, he continued to be active for seventeen years as president emeritus. During this period, Eliot loomed large in American education.

By the turn of the century, Eliot had established himself as one of the most influential reformers of American education. He was an outspoken critic of American education, and his criticisms resulted in reforms that influenced all levels of education. To support his critical evaluation of education, Eliot relied on his comparative analysis of European education and his educational philosophy.

Prior to his nomination as president of Harvard, Eliot had travelled to Europe, and for three years he studied the weaknesses and strengths of European systems of education. His studies revealed that education in European nations served to contribute to the nation's social, political, and
economic well being, and Eliot concluded that the quality of a nation's educational system depends on this relationship. Convinced that education should relate to societal needs, Eliot criticized that American education was backward and not contributing to the rapid advance of American society. He attacked American higher learning for its feeble condition in professional training, graduate studies, and scientific research; and, at Harvard, Eliot's immediate reforms were directed at improving these areas. The reforms established at Harvard served as a model for the transformation of American higher learning.

Eliot did not limit his reform efforts solely to higher learning, for he realized that in order to raise the standards of colleges and universities, the quality of education in the preparatory schools must likewise be reformed. He also contended that adequate programs in technical and vocational training needed to be provided for those students not aspiring to go on to college. His affiliation with the National Education Association, and his position as chairman of the Committee of Ten, enabled Eliot to exert his influence on reforming lower levels of American education.


2James, op. cit., I, p. 138.

3Veysey, op. cit., p. 81.
The second criterion which Eliot relied on to support his criticisms of education was his educational philosophy. The writings of Emerson and Spencer inspired many of Eliot's reforms. Influenced by Emerson's thoughts on self-reliance, Eliot believed that the student should have the freedom to choose his own studies, and that a student is much more likely to succeed in a subject which interests him strongly than in a subject which does not. This inspired Eliot to advocate student freedom in choosing courses of their interest; this was the principle of the elective system. The elective principle was one of Eliot's outstanding reforms which influenced higher education throughout the United States. Inspired by Emerson's belief that education should be as broad as man, Eliot moved to liberalize the traditional course of study from its narrow curriculum consisting of Greek, Latin, and mathematics. To provide students the opportunity to discover their interests, Eliot proposed to broaden the educational curriculum.

Eliot's views on education were also influenced by Herbert Spencer. Eliot admired Spencer's concern for sense training, which contended that an individual does not solely learn from books but by doing and using his senses. This inspired Eliot to recommend courses which develop the senses such as laboratory work, manual arts, and physical education.

As well as serving for the betterment of society, Eliot viewed education as one of the most effective means of improving the quality of living. He considered a strong and
healthy body as the indispensable foundation for an effective and happy life, and this was one reason for Eliot's support of physical education in American schools. As America was transforming from a society of agricultural pursuits to an industrial nation, the need for physical exertion became less essential. To make up for the benefits of physical exercise lost in this transformation, Eliot urged schools to require programs of physical education. He emphasized the teaching of skills in lifetime sports such as rowing, tennis, sailing, or any sport that could be carried out individually.

Eliot's concept of lifetime sports was not only for the benefit of the individual but for society as well. Eliot contended that a nation of physically active citizens would result in a more efficient society. Men working in industry and the military would be more productive in their work, if they were in good physical condition.

Although Eliot stressed individual sports, he did consider the utilization of team sports in schools. Since American society depends on collective activity, Eliot called for schools to incorporate group activities where students learn to work in a cooperative manner. Eliot considered

activities such as team sports, orchestras, theatrical plays, and marching bands as an effective means in cultivating cooperative behavior.\(^6\)

Eliot contended that the pursuit of rugged individualism in American society, where members of society are able to follow their own destinies, was no longer applicable. The transformation of American society to one of industrialization and urban living resulted in the dependence of others, and the change from individualism to collectivism had taken place. Due to the change in American society, Eliot called for reforms in education to prepare citizens for a new society. His reforms advocated a plan of education that would prepare an individual to lead an effective and satisfying life, by pursuing his own interests, but at the same time contributing to the betterment of society. Essentially, Eliot advocated a collective society that does not suppress individualism, and the curriculum of American education was to provide the student with individual interests and prepare him for collective living. Thus, Eliot's support of physical education in American schools was consistent with his educational views of preparing an individual to live in a collective society, and physical education was to serve the following purposes: (1) contribute to an individual's life of satisfaction; (2) through team sports provide the individual with cooperative learning; (3) physical development for

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 8.
productive efficiency and military preparedness.

As reforms followed, Eliot was effective with his criticisms on education. His comments concerning the feeble state of American education were based on sound philosophical principles and comparative analyses of education and its relationship to society.

Eliot was well known as a critic of intercollegiate football. However, Eliot did not limit his criticisms solely to football, for he contended that the evils found in football were exhibited in other sports as well. The recklessness and brutality demonstrated in football was linked by Eliot to the games of basketball and hockey, and he considered them unfit as rational college sports. The New York Times quoted Eliot's disapproval of hockey and basketball:

To discontinue hockey and basketball at Harvard would do no harm. Basketball is very objectionable. It is too rough, and there are too many chances for cheating. The rules have been stretched so that they spoil the game. It would be a good thing, especially, to have basketball discontinued.


"Eliot Against Basketball," New York Times, November 28, 1906, 1. The early game of basketball was a rough sport. Players did very little dribbling, and there was a good deal of wrestling for the ball. Many courts were no larger than a volleyball court, and in some cases completely enclosed by a wire screen so that the ball was always in play. Elbows and fists were used freely, and mouthpieces and nose guards were standard equipment for players. It was not until 1911 that a rule calling for two free throws be given for a foul in the act of shooting.
Team sports were not favored by Eliot, because they lacked the development of skills that could be used throughout one's life. Rowing, once his own specialty, was the only popular intercollegiate sport in which he showed an interest. In a speech delivered to Harvard rowers, he extolled the qualities of rowing:

I want to express my entire sympathy with the doctrine which has been preached here several times to-night, that in rowing and rowing hard you get great fun. That is just what I got in the year 1858. But I will point out another thing in regard to that fun—it lasts, it lasts all one's life. I can still row and it still gives me great pleasure to row...that is more than you can say of any other sport which is used in college. This is a sport, the fun of which lasts until you are over 70....it is a sport which is absolutely clean and honorable.

This was also mentioned in one of his correspondences:

"Football is, to my thinking, the least profitable of college games, because it cannot be played except in youth; whereas rowing, tennis, and many forms of track athletics can be enjoyed until a man is well advanced in years."\(^9\)

To curb the evils of intercollegiate athletics, Eliot proposed the following recommendations:

The following changes would certainly diminish the existing evils: (1) There should be no Freshman intercollegiate matches or races; (2) no games, intercollegiate or other, should be played on any but

\(^9\) Eliot, "In Praise of Rowing," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XV (March 1907), 531.

\(^{10}\) Letter from President Eliot to Mr. H.G. Myers, March 7 1907, Eliot Papers, Box 110, Harvard University Archives.
college fields, belonging to one of the competitors, in college towns; (3) no professional student should take part in any intercollegiate contests; (4) no student should be a member of a University team or crew in more than one sport within the same year; (5) no football should be played until the rules are so amended as to diminish the number and the violence of the collisions between the players, and to provide for the enforcement of the rules; (6) intercollegiate contests in any one sport should not take place oftener than every other year. Finally, if trial shall prove the insufficiency of all these limitations, intercollegiate contests ought to be abolished altogether.

This exhaustive list of proposals illustrated Eliot's decision to deemphasize intercollegiate athletics. In fact, Eliot demonstrated that intercollegiate athletics contain too many evils, and the only solution in doing away with them was abandonment. Students, alumni, and others who followed intercollegiate athletics criticized President Eliot for being too adamant on athletics. James commented on Eliot's proposals:

"Needless to say the undergraduates felt that he did not understand their sports, and they did not agree that in the main he was an intelligent critic. In his relations with them and with many of the alumni the consequent disaccord over athletics assumed a greater importance than it rightly deserved. It more or less caused them to overlook other achievements which should have made Eliot popular, and it served to perpetuate the impression that he was a stiff and unsympathetic schoolmaster sort of person while everything else was tending to"

obliterate the notion. If he had been able to approach the regulation of athletics with a little more art and a little better intuition of undergraduate motivation he would perhaps have made more rapid headway in reforming intercollegiate competition."

On several occasions Eliot demonstrated his imperfect knowledge of competitive sports. On one occasion, he thought a college pitcher was being deceptive on the diamond when he feinted to throw a ball in one direction and then threw it in another, and he concluded that this type of behavior fostered elements of dishonesty, or what he termed as "professional tricks." When commenting on football, Eliot maintained that the manly way to play football was to attack the strongest part of the opponent's line. During a football game against Yale, the Harvard crowd had joined together to sound off the following cheer, "three cheers for Harvard and down with Yale." According to Eliot this was a display of poor manners, and he remarked, "Of course it's right to be enthusiastic for your own side; but why sing a song that's rude to our guests? Why wouldn't it be better to sing 'three cheers for Harvard and one for Yale'?" His critical evaluation of football was based on what he heard and read about the game, and he only witnessed one football

12 James, op. cit., II, p. 70.


14 Quoted in James, loc. cit.
His credentials as a critic of athletics rested solely on his opinions and his participation in rowing, and he made no attempt to understand athletics from the student's point of view.

In evaluating intercollegiate athletics, Eliot's concern was with the influence athletics had on academic life. Eliot believed that the purpose of higher education was for character development and moral cultivation. To be acceptable in an academic environment, Eliot declared that athletics must be promoted either as wholesome pleasures which do not interfere with work, or as means of maintaining healthy and vigorous bodies in serviceable condition for the intellectual and moral life. Eliot contended that with athletics considered as an end in themselves, pursued either for pecuniary profit or for popular applause, a college has nothing to do. Eliot claimed that the conduct of intercollegiate athletics was not in line with the purpose of higher education. Eliot believed that the evils present in intercollegiate athletics, namely, the extreme publicity intercollegiate athletics received, the disproportionate exaltation of the athletic hero in the college world, the overemphasis on winning, as well as commercialism and professionalism, contributed to poor moral development. Therefore, Eliot concluded that the conduct of intercollegiate athletics was not appropriate for an academic environment.

Briggs, loc.cit.
Twenty years after Eliot's retirement as Harvard's president, the Carnegie Foundation published a study of American college athletics. The Carnegie study elaborated on several aspects of intercollegiate athletics that were considered as inappropriate for college life, and many of the evils revealed by the study were similar to Eliot's criticisms. The report concluded that, if properly conducted, athletics have the potential to inculcate certain desirable traits such as courage, perseverance, and initiative. However, the report stated that intercollegiate athletics as presently conducted failed to produce such desirable traits. Because of the deceit and chicanery with which sports are so often surrounded, the Carnegie report found that moral cultivation was not evident in the conduct of athletics in American colleges and universities. Although Eliot's knowledge of athletics was imperfect, his criticisms concerning the poor educational value of intercollegiate athletics was supported by the findings of the Carnegie study of collegiate athletics.

As a critic of intercollegiate athletics, Eliot received a great deal of attention. His statements concerning athletics were reported in journals and newspapers, and he received several letters asking him for his views on the


17 Ibid., pp. 298-301.
the relationship of athletics and education. The Alumni Association of the University of Wisconsin consulted Eliot for his opinion on the relations of intercollegiate athletics to college life and character. The superintendent of the public school system of Lansing, Michigan, was concerned with the effect of athletics on education, and he sought out Eliot's advice:

In making some investigations along educational lines, I find it necessary to know as definitely as possible the effect of athletics in high schools and colleges. I know of no better way to ascertain this than to get the concensus of opinion from our leading educators,--those who are so close to the work that they can give judgements from actual observations.

A member of the Milwaukee School Board requested Eliot's advice on the following: "I would consider it a great favor if you would give me your opinion upon the merits or demerits of foot-ball as a college and high school sport."

On the national level, Eliot received several requests to assume the leadership in bringing about reforms in intercollegiate athletics. Because of his position of

18Letter from Howard Leslie Smith of the Alumni Association of the University of Wisconsin to President Eliot, February 1, 1899, Eliot Papers, Box 110, Harvard University Archives.

19Letter from Jason E. Hammond, superintendent of public education in Lansing, Michigan, to President Eliot, March 6, 1900, Eliot Papers, Box 110, Harvard University Archives.

20Letter from the Milwaukee School Board to President Eliot, December 13, 1902, Eliot Papers, Box 110, Harvard University Archives.
influence, the Nation suggested President Eliot as the most suitable leader in reforming athletics in schools and colleges. In 1905, as mentioned previously, Chancellor MacCracken of New York University invited President Eliot to lead college administrators in a movement to reform intercollegiate football. Eliot, however, declined to assume such a position, because he was convinced that intercollegiate athletics had burgeoned to levels beyond his influence.

Charles W. Eliot, who had transformed Harvard College into a leading American university, influenced American education with the elective principle, and advocated academic freedom, was certainly one of the most influential leaders in the history of American education. However, he has unable to use his influence to abolish intercollegiate football. When he presented his criticisms of American education, Eliot represented only a minority view. Since his criticisms were based on sound conclusions which clearly demonstrated the flaws of American education, reforms were inevitable. In his critical evaluation of intercollegiate athletics, Eliot again assumed a minority view, but this time he failed to overcome the majority. Even at Harvard, where Eliot was successful at getting things done as he saw fit, he was unable to eliminate football.

21 Nation, LXXVI (January 29, 1903), 83.
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APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS DISCUSSED AT THE COMMITTEE OF TEN CONFERENCES

1. In the school course of study extending approximately from the age of six years to eighteen years—a course including the periods of both elementary and secondary instruction—at what age should the study which is the subject of the Conference be first introduced?

2. After it is introduced, how many hours a week for how many years should be devoted to it?

3. How many hours a week for how many years should be devoted to it during the last four years of the complete course; that is, during the ordinary high school period?

4. What topics, or parts, of the subject may reasonably be covered during the whole course?

5. What topics, or parts, of the subject may best be reserved for the last four years?

6. In what form and to what extent should the subject enter into college requirements for admission? Such questions as the sufficiency of translation at sight as a test of knowledge of a language, or the superiority of a laboratory examination in a scientific subject to a written examination on a text-book, are intended to be suggested under this head by the phrase "in what form."

7. Should the subject be treated differently for pupils who are going to college, for those who are going to a scientific school, and for those who, presumably, are going to neither?

8. At what stage should this differentiation begin, if any be recommended?

9. Can any description be given of the best method of teaching this subject throughout the school course?

10. Can any description be given of the best mode of testing attainments in this subject at college admission examinations?
11. For those cases in which colleges and universities permit a division of the admission examination into a preliminary and a final examination, separated by at least a year, can the best limit between the preliminary and final examinations be approximately defined?
APPENDIX C

HARVARD UNIVERSITY CATALOG DESCRIPTION

OF PHYSICAL TRAINING FOR 1889-1890*

UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

FOR

EXERCISE, PHYSICAL TRAINING, AND ATHLETIC SPORTS

THE HEMENWAY GYMNASIUM.

DEDUCLEY ALLEN SARGENT, A.M., M.D., Director.
JAMES GRAY LATHROP, Assistant.
LEWIS HURLBUT BETTS, Recorder.

The gymnasium, named in honor of AUGUSTUS HEMENWAY of Boston, who gave it to the University, is a handsome and spacious structure built and equipped with the utmost thoroughness. It is furnished with the best patterns of ordinary gymnastic apparatus, and with many new appliances designed to develop the different parts of the body, and so constructed that they can be adjusted to the strength of the strong or to the wants of the weak.

The gymnasium is open to all students of the University except on Saturdays, when it is closed at 6 o'clock. The attendance is voluntary, and the system adopted is one designed to meet the special wants of each individual. Realizing the great diversity in age, size, and strength, as well as in health, of the students who attend the University, the Director makes no attempt to group them into classes which pursue the same course of exercises.

Upon entering the University, each student is entitled to an examination by the Director, in which his physical proportions are measured, his strength noted, his heart and lungs examined, and information is solicited concerning his general health and inherited tendencies. From the data thus procured, a special order of appropriate exercises is made out for each student, with specifications of the movements and apparatus which he may best use. After working on this prescription for three or six months, the student is entitled to another examination by which the results of his work are evaluated and the Director can formulate a fresh prescription for his individual case.

A course of informal lectures is given by the Director, in which the theories and principles of physical training are practically illustrated.

*Harvard University Catalog, 1889-90, pp. 349-52.
COMMITTEE ON THE REGULATION OF ATHLETIC SPORTS.

COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS.

John Williams White, Ph.D., Professor of Greek.
William E. Byerly, Ph.D., Professor of Mathematics.
Albert Bushnell Hart, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History.

GRADUATE MEMBERS.

Henry P. Walcott, M.D.
William Hooper, A.B.
George B. Morison, A.B.

UNDERGRADUATE MEMBERS.

Benjamin T. Tilton, Class of 1890.
Stephen V. R. Crosby, Class of 1891.
Neal Rantoul, Class of 1892.

OFFICERS.

John Williams White, Chairman.
Albert Bushnell Hart, Secretary.
William Hooper, Graduate Treasurer.

The President and Fellows established the Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports by the following vote, passed October 15, 1888, to which the Overseers consented October 17, 1888: —

"Vote, That the following be adopted as one of the standing rules and orders of the President and Fellows and the Board of Overseers: —

"A Committee for the Regulation of Athletic Sports shall hereafter be annually appointed and chosen as follows: three members of the College Faculty, and five graduates of the College — that six to be appointed by the Corporation with the consent of the Overseers; and also three undergraduates to be chosen during the first week of the College year by the majority vote of the following students: the Presidents of the Senior Junior and Sophomore classes, and a representative from each of the following athletic organizations: the Boat Club, the Cricket Club, and the Athletic, Baseball, Football, Lacrosse, and Tennis Associations; who shall be called together for the purpose of making this choice by the President of the University."
PHYSICAL TRAINING.

"This Committee shall have entire supervision and control of all athletic exercises within and without the precincts of the University, subject to the authority of the Faculty of the College, as defined by the Statutes."

Under the authority thus conferred the Committee exercises a general supervision over the grounds and buildings devoted by the University to athletic sports and exercise; over the times and places of athletic contests; and over the physical condition of those engaged in them. The regulations framed by the Committee forbid the employment of unauthorized persons as trainers, and require intercollegiate and other contests to be held at such times and places as will cause least interference with study. No person is permitted to take part in athletic contests without a physical examination by the Director of the Gymnasium, and his permission so to do. No person who is not a student of some department of the University in full and regular standing is allowed to take part in any athletic contest or exhibition. The Committee chooses its own officers, and appoints a Graduate Treasurer, who exercises supervision over the accounts of all athletic organizations using University grounds or buildings. The Committee makes a report annually to the President of the University.

ATHLETIC BUILDINGS.

Besides the Gymnasium, three other buildings are held, either by the University or by trustees, for the exclusive use of students of the University. By the gift of Henry R. A. Carey, Esq., a substantial brick building has been erected on Holmes field for the use of members of the principal teams, and of other students. It has a floor area of 7844 square feet.

The University Boat House, situated on Charles River, about half a mile from the College, is used principally by regular crews. It has a floor space of 6893 square feet.

The recent gift of George W. Weld, Esq., places at the disposition of the students a second boat house, intended chiefly for students not rowing on regular crews. It is situated about one third of a mile from the College, and has a floor space of 1400 square feet, sufficient for the use of 300 students.

PLAY-GROUNDS.

For outdoor exercise, the University and the students have provided three grounds. Jarvis Field, adjacent to the Gymnasium and Carey Building, is about 430 feet by 600 feet, and has an unencumbered area of about five acres. The students have provided permanent seats for 3500 persons, and have laid down around the field a quarter mile running track.

Jarvis Field, a few hundred feet from Holmes Field, is 380 feet by 670 feet, or about five acres in area, and has permanent seats for 2315 persons.

Norton Field, of seven acres, is held on lease by trustees for the benefit of students of the University. The rent is paid by the students.

By the gift of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and some of his friends, the University owns a tract of about seventy acres of salt marsh land, situated across the Charles River, about half-a-mile from the College. It is hoped that this tract may eventually be prepared for play-grounds.
APPENDIX D

STUDENT ROSTER OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY SUMMER SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL TRAINING*

COURSE IN PHYSICAL TRAINING.

A practical course in Physical Training, designed especially for teachers, was given at the Henegway Gymnasium in the summer of 1887, beginning July 6 and lasting five weeks.

The aim of the course is to qualify men and women as instructors in the Harvard system of physical examination and training. The present need is for intelligent organizers and teachers rather than for skilful performers — for those who can arouse enthusiasm for health and bodily development rather than for gymnastic feats.

The course consists of lectures by Dr. Sargent, examinations and exercises condensed from the winter course, and a new system of exercises adapted to the needs of school children.

Certificates are given indication of the time spent at the school, the work done, and the nature of the service that each teacher is capable of rendering.

A preliminary course of reading is prescribed for those who have entered their names for the course.

Students.

Alden, Charles Everett, A.M. (Brandeis Coll., Instructor in Physical Training, Colby University.

Bell, James Franklin, Lieut. U.S.A. (U.S. Military Academy), Professor of Military Science and Tactics, Southern Illinois Normal University.

Bell, Mr. still, railroad

Birckhead, Mrs. May Taylor, A.M. (Univ. Coll.), M.D. (Women's Med. Coll. of N.Y.), Instructor, School of Physical Culture.

Bond, Sara Adams, Teacher, Emerson School.

Boyle, Helen, Teacher of Gymnastics, Brearley School.

Bunting, Anna Julia, Director of Gymnastics, Rockford Seminary.


Waterville, Me.

Carbondale, Ill.

New York, N.Y.

East Boston.

New York, N.Y.

Rockford, Ill.

New Britain, Conn.

SUMMER COURSES. — PHYSICAL TRAINING.

Cartwright, Emma Lucretia, Teacher, Conn. Normal School,

Clark, Frederic, Teacher of Pianoforte,

Crenshaw, John Bascom, A.M. (Randolph-Macon Coll.), Professor of Physical Culture, Randolph-Macon College.

Dodge, Fred Herbert, A.B. (Yale Univ.),

Dudley, Albertus True, A.B., Director of Gymnasmum, Phillips Exeter Academy,

Durgin, Ella Gertrude, Teacher of Elocution.

Eddy, Ruth Elizabeth,

Finlay, William, Private Gymnasion,

Foster, Alice Bertha, Director of Gymnasion,

Women’s Educational and Industrial Union,

Fuller, Harriet Wheeler, Teacher of Gymnastics, Howard Collegiate Institute, W. Bridgewater,

Gilley, Frank Millo, A.B., Teacher of Science, Chelsea High School,

Hall, Alice Tripp, A.B. (Wellesley Coll.), M.D. (Woman’s Med. Coll. of Penn.), Physician,

Hanna, Delphine, Director, Ladies’ Gymnasium, Oberlin College.

Hern, George Andrew, M.D., (State of Mich.); Director of Gymnasium, Medical and Surgical Sanitarium,

Hart, Helen Gertrude, Teacher of Elocution, Woodstock College, McMaster University,

Henry, Fannie A., Assistant, Sanitary Gymnasium Cambridge,

Houghton, Boice Marie, Teacher of Dramatic Action and Gymnastics, New Eng. Conserv. of Music,


Ingraham, Lulu Vaughn, M.D. (Woman’s Med. Coll. of Penn.), Physician,

Johnson, Helen M., Teacher, Public School,

Knights, Delia, Iowa State Normal School,

Ladd, Carolyn C., Director of Gymnasium, Bryn Mawr College,

Lang, Thomas, A.B.,

Lindhart, Christopher F., M.D. (Western Reserve Med. Coll.), Teacher in Physical Culture, Newark Academy,

New Britain, Conn.

Cambridge.

Ashland, Va.

Somerville.

Exeter, N. H.

Dover, N. H.

Cincinnati, Ohio.


Buffalo, N. Y.

Cambridge.

Chelsea.

Amherst.

Oberlin, Ohio.

Battle Creek, Mich.

Woodstock, Ont.

Boston.

Boston.

Denver, Col.

Boston.

Malden.

Cedar Falls, Iowa.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Malden.

Newark, N. J.
SUMMER COURSES.—PHYSICAL TRAINING.


McDaniel, William Roberts, A.M. (Western Md. Coll.), Professor of Mathematics, Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.


Murphy, Mary J., Instructor in Physical Training, Swarthmore College, Bridgton, Me.


O'Connor, Annie Theresa, Assistant, Sanatory Gymnasia, Cambridge.

Oxford, Orriette Hutchins, Memorial College, Malden.

Putnam, Helen C., A.M. (Vassar Coll.), Teacher of Gymnastics, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

Richardson, Mrs. Annie Gove, East Boston.

Rose, Laura Lincoln, Professor of Elocution, Mt. Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, and Lake Erie Seminary, Patiersonville, O., Newton, Pa.


Seymour, Isabelle, Teacher in Physical Training, Ogontz School for Young Ladies, Ogontz, Pa.

Spencer, Martha Fiscella, Teacher of Elocution and Literature, Kansas State Normal School, Emporia, Kan.


Thurston, Ada, A.M. (Vassar Coll.), Teacher of Gymnastics, Parker Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Truitt, Annie Eliza, Teacher, Grammar School, Brownsville, Me.


Washington, Booker Tolifero, Principal, Tuskegee Normal School, Tuskegee, Ala.

Weeks, Laura Field, Teacher of Gymnastics, Friends' School, Providence R. I.

Whittier, Frank Nathaniel, A.B. (Bowdoin Coll.), Director of Gymnastics, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

Williams, Janet Norton, Training Teacher, Kansas State Normal School, Emporia, Kan.

A similar course will be given at the Hemenway Gymnasium in the summer of 1888, beginning Thursday, July 5, and ending Wednesday, August 8. Fee for the course, $50.00, payable in advance to Allen Danforth, Boston.

For further particulars address D. A. Sargent, M.D., Director, Hemenway Gymnasium, Cambridge, Mass.
APPENDIX E

ANNUAL REGISTRATION AT THE HARVARD
SUMMER SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL TRAINING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1887</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1889</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1893</th>
<th>1894</th>
<th>1895</th>
<th>1896</th>
<th>1897</th>
<th>1898</th>
<th>1899</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX F

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS WHO HAD ATTENDED

THE HARVARD SUMMER SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL TRAINING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Islands</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Rico</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX G

ARTICLES AND RULES GOVERNING THE COLLEGE UNION*

The following articles were drafted on May 26, 1858:

I. That a regatta be instituted between the colleges of the United States, and that the time and place of the next regatta be determined at each regatta.

II. That the race for the year 1858 take place at Springfield on Friday the 23rd of July at half past four o'clock.

III. That two courses—one a straight course and the other a turn and repeat—be measured, either to be rowed according to the state of the river and the weather.

IV. That the race be between boats manned by under-graduates, including the graduating class.

V. That a set of colors be procured, to be presented to the winning boat, and the expense be borne by the boats entering the regatta.

The following rules were drafted:

1. The course shall be three statute miles.

2. The position shall be decided by lot.

3. An allowance shall be made of twelve seconds per oar in favor of smaller boats.

4. Any boat crossing another's bow, so as to compel her course, shall be disqualified to win a prize.

5. A boat may carry a coxswain or not, as it sees fit.

6. Each college shall appoint an umpire, and the umpires shall choose a referee.

7. Each college may enter as many boats as it pleases.

APPENDIX H

RESULTS OF HARVARD-YALE-OXFORD-CAMBRIDGE QUADRANGULAR MEETS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1899</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1911</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX I

THE FOOTBALL CONCESSIONARY RULES ESTABLISHED

BY HARVARD AND YALE IN OCTOBER 1875 *

The following rules were established to govern the first Harvard-Yale football contest:

I. The grounds shall not be more than 400 feet nor less than 300 feet long, and one half the length in width.

II. The goal posts shall be 20 feet apart.

III. The number for match games shall not exceed 15 nor be less than 11.

IV. Time of game shall be left to the discretion of the captains, but shall in no case exceed two hours, and that side shall be declared victor which, at the end of the allotted time, shall have secured the majority of goals. To secure a goal the ball must pass between the goal-posts and over a cross line 10 feet high.

V. After a goal has been won sides shall be changed and the losing side shall kick off. In the event of no goal being won at the lapse of half an hour, ends shall be changed.

VI. The ball may be caught on the bounce or fly, and carried; the player, so carrying the ball, may be tackled or shouldered, but not hacked, throttled, or pummelled. No player may be held unless he be in actual possession of the ball. No batting with the hands is allowed.

VII. When the ball passes out of bounds the player first touching it shall advance to the point when the ball went out and throw it in at right angles to the line.

VIII. Every player is on-side, but is put off-side if he enters a scrimmage, upon his opponents' side, or, being in scrimmage, gets in front of the ball, when the ball has been kicked, touched, or is being run with by any of his own side behind him (that is, between himself and his goal line). Every player
when off-side is out of the game, and shall not touch the ball in any case whatever, or in any way obstruct or interrupt any player until he is on-side.

IX. A player being off-side is put on-side when the ball has been kicked by, or has touched the dress or person of any one of the opposite side, or when one of his own side has run in front of him either with the ball or having kicked it when behind him.

X. In kick off, the winners of the toss shall have the choice of side or kick off. The ball must be fairly kicked, not babied, from a point (to be decided by the captain).

XI. Until the ball is kicked off no player shall be in advance of a line parallel to the line of his goal and distant from it (to be decided by the captains).

XII. The two judges and a referee shall be determined upon by the two captains of the contesting sides.

XIII. In match games a No. 6 ball shall be used, furnished by the challenging side and becoming the property of the victor.

XIV. The ball cannot be taken from off the ground except for a kick, and it must be kicked from the point where it was taken from the ground.

XV. No hacking, throttling, tripping up, or striking shall be allowed under any circumstances. No one shall be allowed to wear projecting nail, metal plates or gutta-percha on any part of his shoes.

XVI. In case of a foul the referee shall throw the ball perpendicularly into the air to a height of at least 12 feet from the place where the foul occurred, and the ball shall not be in play until the ball has touched the ground. On continued transgression of these rules by any player, the side to which he belongs shall lose him.

*Information taken from "Foot-Ball Rules Established," Harvard Crimson, October 29, 1875, 34-35.
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"Why a Student Should Choose Harvard," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XXIII (September 1914), 49-55.


2. Concerning Eliot:


"Dr. Eliot's Essays," Outlook, LVIII (February 5, 1898), 384-85.

Dunbar, Charles F. "President Eliot's Administration," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, II (June 1894), 449-76.


Few, William P. "President Eliot and the South," South Atlantic Quarterly, VIII (April 1909), 184-91. Discusses Eliot's impression of the South, and his views on topics such as segregation, integration, and racial relations.


Hadley, Arthur T. "President Eliot," Harvard Monthly, XLVII (December 1908), 88-89. President Hadley of Yale praises Eliot as the most influential figure in American higher learning between 1870 and 1880.


"President Eliot," Nation, LVIII (June 14, 1894), 442-43. The article praises Eliot's achievements in liberalizing Harvard.

"President Eliot and Herbert Spencer," Harvard Teachers' Record, IV (1934), 33-36. The similarity between Eliot's belief in laboratory courses and Spencer's sense training is explained.

"President Eliot and Professor Hanus," Harvard Teachers' Record, IV (February 1934), 4.

"President Eliot on Educational Reform," Outlook, LX (October 29, 1898), 535-36.


"President Eliot's Jubilee, 70th Birthday," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XXI (June 1904), 592-96. Includes several congratulatory letters to Eliot on his 70th birthday. Among them are letters from President Arthur T. Hadley of Yale and Princeton's President Woodrow Wilson.

Richardson, William A. "How President Eliot was Elected," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, VII (June 1899), 535-47.


Thurber, Samuel. "Opening Remarks by the President," The Academy, VII (May 1892), 190-91. The president of the Massachusetts Classical and High School Teacher's Association praises Eliot's efforts in reforming all levels of American education.


3. Concerning Athletics and Physical Education:

Adams, Charles K. "Moral Aspect of College Life," Forum, VIII (February 1890), 665-75. Adams, who became president of the University of Wisconsin, states that athletics provide an outlet for excessive physical energy, and improved order in colleges is in part due to athletics.


Bennett, Bruce L. "Contributions of Dr. Sargent to Physical Education," Research Quarterly, XIX (March 1948), 77-91.

Bingham, William J. "Athletics in School and College," School and Society, XX (October 11, 1924), 454-60. Bingham was a member of the Harvard Athletic Committee, and he contended that athletics foster character development. He believed the evils of intercollegiate athletics were due to poorly trained coaches and not due to the nature of athletics.


Briggs, L.B.R. "Intercollegiate Athletics and the War," Atlantic Monthly, CXXII (September 1918), 304-09. Dean Briggs of Harvard states that intercollegiate athletics provide proper training in collective behavior, but disapproves of commercialism and win at all cost elements in present athletics.


Dexter, Edwin G. "Accidents from College Football," Educational Review, XXV (April 1903), 415-20. A University of Illinois professor published a thorough survey of football. After tabulating returns from some sixty colleges, Dexter concluded that one college man in ten played football, and larger schools had twice as many men actively participating in the game. One player in thirty-five lost class time because of injuries, but the number of men permanently disabled or killed seemed negligible. Dexter states that the press accounts of college injuries were "grossly exaggerated."

Dwight, Benjamin W. "Intercollegiate College Regattas, Hurdle-Races, and Prize Contests," New Engander, XXXV (April 1876), 251-79. Presents several aspects of intercollegiate athletics to prove their harmful effects.

"Football Reform," Outlook, LXXXI (November 18, 1905), 648-50. Criticizes football for its brutality, and calls the gridiron a "hospital clinic."


Faunce, William H.P. "Character in Athletics," National Education Association Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, XLIIL (1904), 558-64. President of Brown University discusses the evils of college sports, and proposes to resolve them. He is not in favor of abolishing athletics, because they are too valuable for moral development.

_____. "The Value of College Athletics," Outlook, LXXXII (January 27, 1906), 151-52. President Faunce of Brown University contends that "the old drinking and carousing... the smashing of windowpanes and destruction of property of previous generations" no longer existed on college campuses, and he credits the rise of athletics for this.

Fitz, George W. "American Society for Research in Physical Education," American Physical Education Review, IX (March 1904), 60-62. Fitz discusses the founding of this research organization.

_____. "Conditions and Needs of Physical Education," American Physical Education Review, IV (December 1899),
337-39. Fitz calls for a re-examination of the foundations of the theory and practice of physical education.

Fitz, William T. "Editorial Note and Comment," American Physical Education Review, XI (March 1906), 35-36. Fitz states that he has become dissatisfied with the efforts of the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education.

"The Football Deaths," Nation, LXXXIX (November 4, 1909), 424-25. In the fall of 1909 a total of thirty players were killed and 216 injured. The article declares, "Football is not merely a sport, now; it is a contrivance for injuring and maiming."


"Football in Disfavor," Outlook, LXXXII (January 27, 1906), 151. Speaking to Brown alumni, Charles Evans Hughes attacks the commercial spirit of football.

"Football in its Proper Light," Nation, LXXX (February 9, 1905), 108-109. Article reports that football has gotten so out of hand that even Eliot with all of his prestige would be unable to accomplish anything in reforming the game.

"Football Prohibited at West Point and Annapolis," Nation, LVIII (March 15, 1894), 187.

"Football Reform by Abolition," Nation, LXXXI (November 30, 1905), 437-38. This editorial criticizes intercollegiate football for its brutality, professionalism, and immoral conduct.

Foster, William T. "An Indictment of Intercollegiate Athletics," Atlantic Monthly, CXVI (November 1915), 577-88. President Foster of Reed College suggests intramurals in place of intercollegiate athletics.

Godkin, Edward L. "Athletic Craze," Nation, LVII (December 7, 1893), 422-23. The editor of this journal criticizes the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.

Godkin, Edward L. "Athletics and Health," Nation, LIX (December 20, 1894), 457-58. Godkin claims that athletics have produced more spectators than participants, and he feels the over exaggeration of athletics has not contributed to providing wholesome opportunities for students to engage in physical exercise.
Godkin attacks football for its training of foul play, and he is not optimistic that the game will improve.

Green, George W. "Athletics in Colleges," New Englander, XXXV (July 1876), 548-60. Green believes that athletics can be very beneficial to a student's body and intellect, but he criticizes the overemphasis of newspaper glorification.


Hollis, Ira N. "Intercollegiate Athletics," Atlantic Monthly, XC (October 1902), 534-44. Presents the undesirable aspects of intercollegiate athletics, especially the intense desire to win.


Lowell, A. Lawrence, "Football and Intercollegiate Distrust," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XV (September 1906), 9-12. Eliot's successor believes that the qualities in football are practical in preparing youth for society.

Meylan, George L. "Athletics," American Physical Education Review, X (June 1905), 157-63. A Columbia University physical educator presents several advantages and disadvantages of athletics.

Moore, John H. "Football's Ugly Decades, 1893-1913," Smithsonian Journal of History, II (Fall 1967), 49-68. Presents the various opinions that emerged during football's brutal decades, and Eliot's views are included.

Nation, LXXVI (January 29, 1903), 83. Because of his position of influence, the Nation suggests President Eliot as the most suitable leader to bring about reform in football in American schools and colleges.

Needham, Henry B. "The College Athlete," McClures' Magazine, XXV (June, July 1905), 115-28; 260-73. This two part article exposes professionalism in collegiate sport.

Richards, Eugene L. "The Football Situation," Popular Science Monthly, XLV (October 1894), 721-33. The author, a mathematics professor at Yale, supports football as a sport creating school unity, and he feels that the game is not brutal.


Royce, Josiah. "Football and Ideals," Harvard Illustrated Magazine, X (November 1908), 40-47. Harvard's Professor Royce examines the ideals of football. He contends that football develops immoral behavior, but to the true lover of football it develops ideal morals, namely loyalty.


__________. "Evils of the Professional Tendencies of Modern Athletics," Journal of Social Science, XX (June 1885), 87-90.

__________. "History of the Administration of Intercollegiate Athletics in the United States," American Physical Education Review, XV (April 1910), 252-61. The formation of athletic committees is reviewed, beginning with the Harvard Athletic Committee in 1882 to the formation of a national association in 1905.


__________. "A Physical Instructor's Suggestions for Improvement," Review of Reviews, XXXIII (January 1906), 74-75. Sargent offers his views on reforming athletics.


__________. "The Physiques of Scholars, Athletes, and the Average Student," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XVI (June 1908), 607-17. Sargent compares the biological differences between three classes of men found in a college environment.

Shaler, Nathaniel S. "The Athletic Problem in Education," Atlantic Monthly, LXIII (January 1889), 79-88. Professor Shaler of Harvard favors athletics as being beneficial to higher learning, but he deplores the over-emphasis on winning.

Stewart, C.A. "Athletics and the College," Atlantic Monthly, CXIII (February 1914), 153-60. The author compares the unethical practices of intercollegiate athletics with those of big business.

Professor Taussig views sport as a social activity, but he feels that it should not be regarded as part of education. He deplores the extravagence of sport and criticizes society for allowing it to be so extraordinary.

Thwing, Charles F. "Football: Is the Game Worth Saving?" Independent, LIV (May 15, 1902), 1167-1174. President Thwing of Western Reserve College supports football despite of the numerous evils. He reports a survey where college presidents generally responded favorably toward football.


Whitney, Caspar W. "Is Football Worthwhile?" Collier's, XLV (December 18, 1909), 13, 24-25. Presents the views of various college presidents during a crucial period in the development of football.


Young, C.A. "College Athletic Sports," Forum, II (October 1886), 142-52. Young compares the pros and cons of intercollegiate athletics, and he concludes that the advantages of athletics outweigh the disadvantages.

4. Concerning Athletics and Physical Education at Harvard:


"The Battle of the Delta," Harvard Register, I (1827), 251. Reviews an early inter-class contest that was called "football."


"The Foot-Ball Situation," editorial, Harvard Monthly, XIX (February 1895), 212-16. Expresses the journal's support of reforming football and not abolishing it.


Mathews, Joseph J. "First Harvard-Oxford Boat Race," New England Quarterly, XXXIII (March 1960), 74-82. This was the first international collegiate athletic contest and was participated before an estimated crowd of one million spectators. Explores the heavy news coverage given to the event.


(May 1913), 478-83. Provides a history concerning Harvard's international athletic contests.

"Oarsmen Suspended," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XVII (September 1908), 126-29. Includes the correspondence between Roosevelt and Eliot during the suspension of two Harvard oarsmen.

"The Overseers Permit Football," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XV (June 1906), 694-95.

"President Eliot's Annual Report--Athletics," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, II (March 1894), 376-83; III (March 1895), 368-70; IV (March 1896), 425-27; V (March 1897), 363; VI (March 1898), 358-60; VII (March 1899), 383-87; VIII (March 1900), 456-57; IX (March 1901), 452-53; X (March 1902), 484; XI (March 1903), 412-13; XII (March 1904), 424-25. These are excerpts from President Eliot's annual report which deal with athletics.


________. "A Department of Physical Education," Harvard Illustrated Magazine, XIV (May 1913), 457-61.


Storey, Moorfield. "Report on Regulation of Athletic Sports," Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XV (June 1907), 642-68. Includes a history of the actions taken by Harvard's athletic committee since it was created in 1882.


Whiton, James M. "The First Harvard-Yale Regatta (1852)," Outlook, LXVIII (June 1901), 286-89.

5. Concerning Education:


for standard curricula in American secondary schools.


Robinson, Oscar D. "The Work of the Committee of Ten," School Review, II (June 1894), 366-72. One of the members of the Committee of Ten concludes that Eliot's contribution to the committee's work was above all other members.


C. Newspapers.

1. Editorials by Charles W. Eliot:


2. Concerning Athletics:

"Abolition of Football or Immediate Reforms," New York Times, November 28, 1905, 11. Chancellor MacCracken of New York University advocates the abolition of football. He presents three reasons why the sport as at present conducted should no longer be tolerated. He said it was homicidal, exalted bulk and brawn over brains, and encouraged money-making unduly.

"Cadet Byrne Dead; No Army-Navy Game," New York Times, November 1, 1909, 1. On October 30, 1909, during the Harvard-Army football match, cadet Eugene A. Byrne suffered an injury. He remained unconscious and the doctors worked on revitalizing him. Unfortunately, the doctors were not successful, and he died on the morning of November 1. Two weeks prior to this event, an Annapolis player, Earl Wilson, suffered severe injuries to his neck and spine. Football came under heavy attack and West Point cancelled the remainder of its football games.


"Eleven Killed at Football," New York Times, November 26, 1906, 1. Eleven players were reported killed and 104 injured in the United States during the 1906 football season. These figures are compared with the casualties of 1905, when 18 players were killed and 159 severely injured.


"Eliot Arraigns All Athletics," New York Times, March 7, 1907, 10. Eliot calls for "domestic athletics," that is, contests within the university itself, and that inter-collegiate athletics should be limited to two games a year.


"Eliot Rebukes Roosevelt," New York Times, June 23, 1908, 1. Confrontation between President Roosevelt and President Eliot concerning the suspension of two Harvard oarsmen is reported in this article.

"Favor Revision of Rules," New York Times, November 27, 1905, 5. Presidents of universities expressed the feeling that if a revision of existing football rules does not result in reforming the game then it should be abolished.


"Football is Prohibited by Harvard Overseers," New York Times, January 16, 1906, 8. At a board meeting on January 10, the overseers agreed to ban intercollegiate football at Harvard. The board acted on the report of its Committee on Physical Training, Athletic Sports, and Sanitary Conditions. The report claimed that football is too brutal to be allowed.

"Football No Value in Life Training," New York Times, April 17, 1908, 4. Eliot suggests only two intercollegiate games in any one sport be played during a season.


New York Herald, November 24, 1889, 16. A reporter for this newspaper provides a vivid account of the brutality and acts of violence in the Yale-Harvard game. One Harvard player, he wrote, deliberately kicked a Yale man in the face. The reporter concludes, "It is astonishing that Harvard employs him."

New York Times, November 10, 1897, 6. This editorial presents the views of the Times concerning the nature of football, and finds it to be too brutal and homicidal.
New York Times, November 21, 1905, 1. President Roosevelt invites Dr. J. William White of the University of Pennsylvania to discuss the alleviation of football injuries.


New York Times, November 29, 1905, 1. Reports President Eliot’s reply to Chancellor MacCracken’s request that he lead the reform for football rules.


New York Times, December 29, 1905, 7. Captain Palmer E. Pierce of the United States Military Academy was elected president of the I.A.A.A.

New York Times, January 20, 1906, 8. President Faunce of Brown University said that football has done more than any other one thing to put college life in America on its present high plane.


"President Eliot Not There," New York Times, November 26, 1905, 5. On November 25, 1905, Harvard and Yale played a football match before a crowd of 43,000. The game was to test new rules established between Harvard and Yale. Eliot refused to be among the crowd to watch a gladitorial event.


"President Eliot Won't Act," New York Times, November 27, 1905, 12. President Eliot turns down Chancellor MacCracken’s request to act as chairman of a committee consisting of university presidents to act against football.

"Roosevelt's Big Job: Hard to Reform Football, President Eliot Says," Washington Post, October 11, 1905, 9. Eliot was quoted as saying that President Roosevelt's White House Conference to reform football has brought together football coaches who are responsible for the existing evils in the game.

"Roosevelt Campaign for Football Reform," New York Times, October 10, 1905, 1. President Roosevelt initiates a reform movement to eliminate the brutality of the game of football.


"Yale Downs Harvard by Only Six Points," New York Times, November 26, 1905, 5. Mentions the spectacle that attracted 43,000 spectators. The crowd was the largest ever to have seen a football match at the time.

3. Concerning Eliot:


4. Harvard Newspapers:

"Do We Spend Too Much Time in Athletics," Harvard Advocate, December 17, 1880, 77. Disproves the claim that athletics consume too much time at Harvard.


"Inauguration of President Eliot," Advocate, October 29, 1869, 49-54.

Minot, R.S. "Football Forty Years Ago," Advocate, May 26, 1876, 92.


Sibley, J.R. "Football and Enrollment," Advocate, February 16, 1912, 147. Sibley compared enrollments for Harvard and Yale and found that enrollments tended to decline following a loss in football. He concludes that the relation of football success to enrollment increases and declines with failure in football.


"The Week—Physical Education," Advocate, April 26, 1898, 17. The Harvard newspaper feels that physical education should not be made compulsory or allowed college credit. The argument given is that physical education is a valuable course but it does not have the requirements of being an art or science.

"The Week—President Eliot," Advocate, January 19, 1883, 97. Reports that Eliot's annual reports will start to include a section on athletics, because of its growing influence.

II. Unpublished Sources.

A. Sources located at the Harvard University Library system.

1. The Eliot Papers:

The Eliot Papers are found in Pusey Library which houses the Harvard University Archives. The Eliot Papers include letters, unpublished articles, addresses, pictures, and many other miscellaneous items concerning Charles W. Eliot. The Eliot Papers are contained in boxes numbered 66-140 and 200-365. The following material was most useful:

a. Addresses delivered by Eliot:

Address delivered at the dinner of the New England Society in New York City, October 25, 1905, Box 103. Eliot discusses the ideal of the modern scholar who possesses a sound mind in a sound body.

Address delivered at the inauguration of John H. Finley as President of the University of the State of New York and State Commissioner of Education, January 2, 1914, Box 103. Eliot mentions his approval of the Dalcroze method of physical education.

b. Letters:

Letter from President Eliot to Dr. Dudley A. Sargent, September 4, 1879, Box 260. Eliot outlines the conditions for the position of director of the Hemenway Gymnasium.

Letter from President Eliot to Mr. H.G. Myers, March 7, 1907, Box 110. Eliot expresses the lifetime values of rowing, tennis, and track athletics.

Letter from President Eliot to Dr. Sargent, July 6, 1907, Box 206. Eliot inquires into Sargent's private school, and whether his private interests are taking away his duties at Harvard.

Letter from President Eliot to Eliot Lord, editor of the Nashua Telegraph, July 3, 1908, Box 202. Eliot states his admiration for the British view of athletics.

Letter to President Eliot from Dr. Sargent, August 29, 1893, Box 260. Dr. Sargent notified Eliot the reasons for the decline in enrollment in the summer course of physical training for 1893.

Letter to President Eliot from Dr. Sargent, September 18, 1896, Box 260. Includes attendance and budget figures
of the Harvard Summer School of Physical Training for the past three years.

Letter to President Eliot from Howard Leslie Smith of the Alumni Association of the University of Wisconsin, February 1, 1899, Box 110. Requesting Eliot's opinion of the relationship between athletics and education.

Letter to President Eliot from Dr. Sargent, August 17, 1899, Box 245. Dr. Sargent informs Eliot of the high standards set for the summer course in physical training.

Letter to President Eliot from Jason E. Hammond, superintendent of public education, Lansing, Michigan, March 6, 1900, Box 110. Requesting Eliot's advice on the effect of athletics on education.

Letter to President Eliot from the Milwaukee School Board, December 13, 1902, Box 110. Requesting Eliot's advice on the merits and demerits of football as a college and high school sport.

Letter to President Eliot from Dr. Sargent, July 28, 1907, Box 206. Sargent replies to Eliot's inquiry into his private school.

Letter from William Blaikie to Allen Danforth, bursar of Harvard, June 17, 1879, Box 260. Blaikie recommends Dr. Dudley A. Sargent for the position of assistant professor of physical training and director of the Hemenway Gymnasium.

Letter from Jerome D. Greene, Eliot's secretary, to Dr. Sargent, October 27, 1902, Box 106. Notifies Dr. Sargent that President Eliot has approved extra funding for the expansion of the summer course in physical training.

Letter from Dr. Sargent to Jerome D. Greene, April 26, 1906, Box 260. Sargent informs President Eliot of his feelings on compulsory physical education for all freshmen and sophomores.

c. Harvard records, reports, and catalogs:

Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer of Harvard College, 1869-1909. President Eliot's annual reports include his comments on athletics and physical education, and in 1882, Eliot initiated a section that would provide an annual report on athletics.

Annual Report of the Board of Overseers, 1869. The report, for 1869 included findings that were similar to Eliot's
suggestions as printed in his two part article en-
titled "The New Education." This coincidence may
have aided in Eliot's nomination to Harvard's
presidency.

Harvard Catalog, 1888-1890, pp. 349-52. Reviews the pro-
gram of physical education at Harvard.

"Summer Courses--Physical Training," Harvard University
Catalog, 1887-1888, pp. 321-24. Includes the names
of the students who attended the first summer
offering in physical training.

B. Sources located at the Library of Congress.

1. The Theodore Roosevelt Collection:

The following letters were sent to coaches and faculty
members of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, to discuss
reforming football: Letters from President Theodore
Roosevelt to Walter Camp, Arthur T. Hildebrand, John
B. Fine, Edward H. Nichols, and William T. Reid,
Jr., October 2, 1905, Vol. 151, Letterbook No. 29.

Letter from President Theodore Roosevelt to President
Roosevelt urges Eliot to consider reform rather than
to abolish football.

Letter to President Theodore Roosevelt from Endicott
Peabody, September 21, 1905, Vol. 97, Letters Received.
A request for President Roosevelt to take action on
reforming football.

C. Dissertations and Theses.

Bennett, Bruce L. "The Life of Dudley Allen Sargent, M.D.,
and His Contributions to Physical Education." (Ph.D.
dissertation, University of Michigan, 1947).

Fesler, Wesley E. "A Brief History of Physical Education
at Harvard College." (M.A. Thesis, The Ohio State
University, 1939).

Lewis, Guy M. "The American Intercollegiate Football Spectacle,
1869-1917." (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland,
1964).

Wagoner, Jennings L. "From In Loco Parentis Toward
Lernfreiheit: An Examination of the Attitudes of Four
Early University Presidents Regarding Student Freedom
and Character Development." (Ph.D. dissertation, The
Ohio State University, 1968).