

# UC Santa Cruz

## UC Santa Cruz Electronic Theses and Dissertations

### Title

The Failure of Reform: A History of Higher Education in the United States

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/60b247zs>

### Author

Paschal, Mark Randall

### Publication Date

2016

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SANTA CRUZ

THE FAILURE OF REFORM: A HISTORY OF HIGHER  
EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

HISTORY OF CONSCIOUSNESS

by

**Mark Randall Paschal**

September 2016

The Dissertation of Mark R. Paschal

Is approved:

---

Professor Barbara Epstein, Chair

---

Professor Christopher Connery

---

Professor Deborah Gould

---

Tyrus Miller  
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies



## TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Introduction	1
Section I: From Colonists to National Experiments	20
Chapter 1: The Colonial College from Zenith to Nadir	29
Chapter 2: Fits and Starts	75
Section II: Becoming Broad	160
Chapter 3: Antagonisms	161
Chapter 4: Science and the Professions	207
Section III: Consolidating the System	237
Chapter 5: From Consolidation to War	242
Endnotes	313
Bibliography	361

## ABSTRACT

The Failure of Reform: A History of Higher Education in the United States

Mark Randall Paschal

The history of higher education is often described and understood to be one of evolution. The story generally goes that the long history of higher education persists along a more or less unbroken line of progress and development, finally culminating in the forms we have today. However, this understanding eliminates or softens the struggles and conflicts that gave rise to the various institutional forms that higher education takes on in a given period and elides the economic, social, and political issues that gave rise to particular forms of education. I tell a different story based on a survey of primary and secondary texts regarding the history of higher education in the United States. I specifically focus on the development and founding of Research Universities as an institution to conserve and protect the emerging professional class in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. My research shows that reform of existing institutions is generally futile without the prior founding of new institutions that force the existing ones to reform. All institutional forms are the products of class conflict as modes of production undergo transformation - so long as the existing forms generally meet social expectations, there is no need to for substantive reform. When these social expectations are not met, however, new forms must be sought. These social expectations are contested within and beyond existing institutions by students, faculty, staff, administration, and community voices. This combustible mix has created the

institutions we have today and will create new ones in the future.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my amazing wife Cate Randall Paschal first and foremost. Without your support, patience, love, and wisdom I probably would not have written this and without your questions it would have most likely been inscrutable! I will take this printed opportunity to say that I love you and am excited that you love me! Nat! I am so excited to watch you grow up - I am already so proud of you and can't wait to see you become your own person. I would also like to thank Barbara Epstein - your incisive editing and constant support were invaluable. Deborah Gould and Christopher Connery - I could not have asked for better readers than you. Thank you! Thanks to Anne Spalliero for your administrative help, your encouragement, and your ability to get stuff done. I would like to thank Gopal Balakrishnan for drilling in the relationship between writing and events taking place in the streets. I would like to thank the History of Consciousness program at UC Santa Cruz for the opportunity study and write; my fellow students for sharpening my intellect and fostering my curiosity; and faculty at every level for encouraging me and demanding more from me. My parents, George and Carol, deserve a huge amount of thanks for putting up with me when I was young and especially putting up with me now that I am older - I love you and am exceedingly lucky to be your offspring. I am who I am in large part because of you. I would very much like to thank Viewpoint Magazine, and Asad Haider and Salar Mohandesi, for giving me the opportunity to develop ideas and themes and also edit some work. The U.R.G.E. Collective was extremely valuable to

me as I workshopped ideas and tried to convey the significance of my work to others also critically studying the university. There are too many more people who deserve thanks, but I need to say thank you to all the students, staff, faculty, and community members who organize, struggle, shut down campuses, occupy buildings, march, petition, and demand a different and better education than what currently exists. That is how change has happened historically and it will be how it happens in the future. This dissertation would not exist without you and I hope that it helps inform current and future struggles. In love and in struggle!



## **Introduction**<sup>1</sup>

By the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it has become something of a truism that college is absolutely necessary for financial independence and success. Gerber, the baby food company, has resources for new parents to start college funds and financial planning companies can be seen all over television touting their ability to help families plan for their child's college fund. Education, especially higher education, has become a panacea for all that ails the US economy and is often presented as a principal means to foster broader civic engagement. At the same time, the cost of higher education has exploded. As college has become a socially necessary experience, its cost has risen so as to put most who enter its hallowed halls into debt. This, in turn, has sparked various forms of protest on and off campus. Students at various campuses have occupied buildings, closed their campuses, erected tent universities, marched, and held rallies. This work arises from my own position within the protest movement at the University of California, Santa Cruz. In organizing, I talked with hundreds of students and faculty members, many of whom thought that there was simply nothing that could be done to change how the institution operated and what its priorities were. I was told that we didn't know how universities operated and made decisions. And I was told that I should be focusing on my studies so I could make money in a real job! It became quite obvious, therefore, that these questions should form the basis of my dissertation research.

What was immediately obvious, upon venturing into the history of higher education, was the utter strangeness of college even a century and a half removed

from my own time. While Harvard traces its history back to the Puritans, a Puritan would be hard pressed to find any similarities between then and now. A professor of English in 1805 would find the methods, means, and objects of the modern professor to be strange and unfamiliar. The 13 year-old son of a wealthy sea captain, attending William and Mary in 1785, would have expected to go for a year and the main product of that time would be discipline, provided by faculty and the president, rather than knowledge. In 1859, it would have been illegal for anyone to even educate a young black woman in Virginia. A further chord of dissonance can be heard when we consider that many felt colleges to be useless throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Experiments in education flourished: from mechanics institutes to schools for the deaf and blind, from women's colleges to agricultural work stations, few thought that education as it was constituted was a particularly useful idea.

As I studied further, it became more and more apparent that the state and status of higher education are tied to class relations. The Revolutionary War, the arrival of industrial capitalism (and the immigrant population it needed) in North America, the attempt by slave states to expand their territory, and numerous other economic and social effects tore apart the class structure of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries and, with it, the higher education system that had served it. The 19<sup>th</sup> century, read one way, was a century in which a new class structure, with its attendant class-based institutions, was coming into focus. That means, then, that a history of higher education in the United States is, at the same time, the history of class formation in the United States. To properly tell this story requires attention to details that don't immediately seem to

concern the university. It also means looking at aspects of higher education that, initially, seem like tangents. These will, over the course of the work, become integral to the story of the formation of higher education. Higher education, I argue, therefore begins with the social and economic life of a community or social movement and, therefore, that is where the dissertation starts.

With the total transformation of the US economy at the latter end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, capital accumulation and labor agglomeration had reached unprecedented volumes. Throughout that century, reformers, entrepreneurs and institutions sought ways to preserve the old, adapt to the new, or use the new conditions to advance their own interests. For some, this task required forming new towns, new commercial enterprises or new institutions; for others, it meant spirited defense of the old ways and institutions; for others, it meant reformation of that which existed so as to maintain existing social relations in the flux of change. This flux was a direct result of the opening of much of the North American continent to market relations. This, in turn, saw the recruitment and immigration of millions of laborers as well as the legal emancipation of former slaves to the labor markets. Such seismic transformations forced the birth or re-shaping of institutions such that they could become capable of either controlling the conditions under which that labor was deployed or the conditions under which that capital was accumulated and circulated. By the close of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the state, the corporation, the labor union, the prison and the research university had all emerged as leading institutions through which capitalists,

the working class and professionals contended. In what follows, I am concerned principally with the university, though it is important to keep in mind the ebbs and flows of the other three organizing institutions (prisons, corporations, and unions). The history of higher education, I argue, shares with each of the others the central goal of organizing the labor of the working and professional classes that were called into being by industrial capitalism.

It is my argument that the particular form that the research university in the United States assumed is derived from the class expectations and ambitions of the professional, middle class movement of the mid- to late-19<sup>th</sup> century. It, therefore, is the institutional form that this middle-class developed to establish its particular modes of thought and worker self-control. I contend that the roots of the struggle emerge in the first decades following the Revolutionary War as the traditional professional careers - lawyer, doctor, and clergy - were forced to transform following the institution of a Republican form of democracy. Many of the new professionals who emerged from the colonial, state, and religious colleges found a mismatch between the social and economic mores of the post-revolutionary country and the education they had received in their colleges. Over the next seven decades, they and their progeny sought to implement scientific progress, housed in the rational halls of the research university, as their instrument to class power. By organizing its deployment in universities, they, rather than capitalists, could shepherd society along towards a more equitable distribution of the social wealth, thereby defusing the diffuse tensions that they believed threatened the nation. Overhauling the university, though, meant wresting its

control from the religious denominations and wealthy who dominated higher education and, in the process, developing an institution run by faculty for faculty in which they could expand the breadth of professionalism; this would ensure society was administered by rationalism and merit rather than superstition, brute power, or mere popular opinion. Political and economic corruption and mob rule were to be feared as the principal obstacles to a rational society and could be combated most effectively, they seem to have believed, through the rule of scientific rationalism in every aspect of social, political, and economic life. Once an occupation was brought into the university, research demanded that a theory of the practice of an occupation, rather than its historical practice, should determine the shape and direction of technological progress. Once the model was established in the agricultural schools, more and more occupations saw the university as the means to raise their social standing along with the possibility of determine amongst their practitioners how their work was to be organized. It would become the dream of many working class parents for their child to go to university to enter into the professional middle-class.

The creation of the North American research university (both public and private) was possible only within a capitalist world: the knowledge and labor that world made possible organized and influenced were a direct result of the forces unleashed by industrial capitalism in the US in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. This is not to say that industrial capitalists configured the university or created it. Far from it, in fact. The institution owes far more to the self-organization of college students seeking employment, esteem and a healthy paycheck than it does from capitalist recognition of need. Upon taking

jobs as faculty, they found themselves unable to reform the existing colleges. They therefore set about, over the 19<sup>th</sup> century, to create an institution by which they would control the conditions under which they sold their labor. Because they did not own the means of production, but had prospects beyond the sale of their physical ability to labor, they sought an institution in which to organize their intellectual labor. A similar process happens with the large industrial unions that surface towards the close of the century. However, the institution of the professionals, the research university, has proven far more resilient and potent than did the institution of the working class, the union. This is because of its orientation to industrial capitalism as well as to the other emerging professions - the university was able to unite the ambitious middle class without jeopardizing the circulation of capital in a way that unions found difficult.

*Industrial Capitalism and the Foundation of New Forms*

From the 1820s to the 1870s, the US entered into a prolonged period of experimentation and polemics regarding education. The older models of student discipline, university governance and pietistic fervor were tottering in the post-revolutionary world. Further, the German state's experiment with state funded research institutions and the material benefits that accrued to Prussian industrialists and military presented a powerful challenge to *laissez-faire* education as practiced by the US and England. As the manufacturing and landlord class—the bourgeois owners of property—began to assert their hegemony, existing institutions implemented small reforms to appease students while not offending their older constituencies. As the 19<sup>th</sup>

century wore on, several new institutions were founded in the mid-Atlantic and Midwest: many explicitly rejected the older Northeastern establishment (re: merchant capitalism) in favor of a new clientele - the industrial capitalist and the workers to be employed in related fields.

The influential educator George Ticknor, for example, declared to Thomas Jefferson that, “I am persuaded that the further progress of learning among us depends on the entire change of the system against which it is directed.”<sup>2</sup> It was to the budding capitalists – educational reformers constantly refer to them as “mechanics,” “agriculturalists,” and “commercial interests” - that education would have to appeal for support and clientele.

Following the global recession of 1837, people had less money, needed family labor, and were not particularly interested in a classical education. This only increased the fervor to found institutions because their founders promised the ability to increase the efficiency of all manner of labor through scientific investigation: by the Civil War, there were more than 250 colleges and universities in the US. In 1850, the state of Ohio, with three million people, had more than thirty institutions. England, meanwhile, with a population over 23 million, had four institutions for higher education. Canada, which required government charters to found a school, saw some expansion, but nowhere near the US.

As an institution, after all, the the classical college served three main functions: first, to discipline the children of the wealthy (even as late as the 1850s around 15 percent of the college students were under 17 years of age).<sup>3</sup> Second, they sought to

train a cohort of properly trained men to administer public service posts (political and religious). Third, it was meant to pass on the knowledge deemed necessary for what social leaders deemed a “civilized” society. Its certification was not necessary to enter any job markets, its professors did not engage in research except as a hobby, and its classroom time consisted principally of recitations of readings assigned. For most in the US, it was not an especially useful institution, though its leaders thought it necessary for social survival. The colonial college was a legacy of aristocratic forms adapted to the needs of merchant capitalism.

Throughout the US Midwest and South, especially, attacks on the old schools mounted. In 1858, the superintendent of California schools, for example, decried that the graduates of the old colleges were more or less useless individuals.<sup>4</sup> It should be stressed that this was not simply a call by administrators for new forms: some segment of students in Canada and the US had, since at least 1815, been traveling to Germany to receive what they considered an appropriate education (and then coming back to agitate for better education here) while others, stuck in the US due to lack of finances or desire, rioted, demonstrated, and formed secret clubs that demonstrated a demand for new educational imperatives. Higher education in this new era was propelled into being by students, administrators and civic leaders.

According to the historian Laurence Veysey, by the 1870s the model of education wherein the few learn to govern through an appropriate education had been surpassed by, on the one hand, utilitarian education (where knowledge focused on technique and efficiency in a given field) and, on the other, disinterested research (where research was



meant to expand the breadth of what was known in order to both increase general knowledge as well as to ascertain the rational laws governing life). Truth was no longer to be passed down, but achieved by expert consensus by amassing research; knowledge with applications, developed in the lab, would guide scientific endeavor. The Humanities, an effort to renew aristocratic education within the bounds set by research and utility, developed in the 1880s as a link to pre-capitalist universities.

For the adherent of utilitarian education, investigation should lead to knowledge that is useful. Stanford President David Starr Jordan claimed in the 1890s that university education was moving “toward reality and practicality.”<sup>5</sup> A professor at NYU in 1890 declared that, “The college has ceased to be a cloister and has become a workshop.”<sup>6</sup> Proponents were interested in alleviating the miseries of industrial capitalism while maximizing its productive forces. Not yet ready to compete with apprenticeship in training waged workers, their early strength was in the Social Sciences. Utilitarian investigation in the university was to have three ends: 1) each graduate would feel themselves obliged to civic virtue, 2) the university would train national, state and municipal leaders in correct governing principles rather than of graft and corruption, and 3) rational methods of analysis would replace the limited and too interested prejudices of local leaders.

Those practicing disinterested research, on the other hand, sought non-utilitarian learning and investigation - the expansion of knowledge as a good in its own. This is the home of basic science: the discovery of natural laws and their properties through investigation. In 1894, “a disinterested observer” summed up the difference between

utilitarian and research driven visions of the university: “On the one hand, there is a demand that the work of our colleges should become higher and more theoretical and scholarly, and, on the other hand, the utilitarian opinion and ideal of the function of a college is that the work should be more progressive and practical. One class emphasizes the importance of... making ardent, methodical, and independent search after truth, irrespective of its application; the other believes that practice should go along with theory, and that the college should introduce the student into the practical methods of actual life.”<sup>7</sup> The Graduate Program was ideal for both models; their preferred methods of training were the recently developed laboratory and seminar.

Worried that the civilizing nature of Western Culture would be lost in this new university more consumed with pecuniary and banal interests, a minority of professors, typically in philosophy and the literary arts, set about reviving the aristocratic mission of the Arts in the Humanities.<sup>8</sup> Paul Shorey, University of Chicago Classics scholar, proclaimed: “There is one great society alone on earth, the noble living and the noble dead. That society is and always will be an aristocracy.”<sup>9</sup> Never claiming more than a minority, these professors and their advocates sought to give character to the emerging mass society. It would take the student rebellions of the 1960s to break apart this conservative outpost; following, this cultural mission would be contested by conservatives, the New Left and post-modernists with no clear victor.

By 1920 (when enrollment numbers for the 18-24 age group begin to approach 5%) the basic structure of US higher education, and the model that would provide the template for other countries—especially post-war Canada—had settled: an

administrative apparatus devoted to building the institution through prestige, public relations and management/procurement of resources. A faculty more or less loosely aligned to one or a mix of the three educational ideals. And a student body increasingly attracted to the university by a job market that not only rewarded those who supplied their own social and professional skills, but had, with the arrival of unemployment in the 1880s, begun to punish those without marketable skills. Students, as has typically been the case, helped to ensure that the new institutions, knowledge and methods they propagate survived while punishing, through matriculation and campus organizing, those unable to deliver the education necessary for industrial and urban life. In the US, the large public and private universities of today were essentially all in existence by World War I and represented the ideal to which education aimed. Elite (and mediocre!) colleges, specializing in a liberal arts undergraduate represented another branch of higher education. Normal Schools, long the realm of teacher's education, were to become state colleges—poor mirrors of the elite liberal college.

Mass representative democracy and industrial capitalism require, however, not just education for the so-called best and brightest, but also for the broad middle composed of the working and agrarian classes. Even by the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, capitalist enterprise was in need of managers and engineers, government was in need of disinterested bureaucrats, and, as important, the sons and daughters that did not need to labor in the factory or field desired occupation in business or a professional field. The community or junior college emerged as this instrument. According to the National

Center for Education Statistics, there were 248 Junior Colleges in the US by 1927 educating more than 45,000 students, a 10-fold increase in just 8 years.<sup>10</sup> Junior Colleges are important because they contextualize access. President Lowell of Harvard found something wonderful in these schools: among the “merits of these new institutions will be [the] keeping out of college, rather than leading into it, [of] young people who have no taste for higher education.”<sup>11</sup> In other words, Junior Colleges functioned as a mechanism for giving the veneer of democratic openness while simultaneously offering access to limited vocational skills and the narrow chance to renew the ranks of the elite by proving oneself among the brightest. In this way, a system of mass education had, between the World Wars, been established and sanctioned by most layers of society, one that tied national well-being to economic growth through industrial expansion.

In tracing out the story of higher education in the United States, I intend to show the structural and conjunctural changes in the social, political and economic life of the people of the United States such that the university could be born. Against these changes, it will become apparent that the Colonial College had become an artifact, though one that refused to simply wither away. I will show that structural limits within the old Colonial College made it an imperfect match for the new era and that there were many different ideas of what higher education, freed from its Colonial fetters, could become. In the second half, I intend to show how the research university took hold and grew, the structural and conjunctural conditions under which that happened,

and the class-based movement that built and fortified the whole decentralized system of higher education that came to dominate by the dawn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This is not a simple story of good people resisting and bad people forcing. Life is far more complicated than that; instead, it is the story of people striving to do what they think is best and, working under conditions not of their making, creating dynamic institutions that, nonetheless, fall victim to (or are step in step with) the social conditions of capitalist accumulation.

By the end, I hope to trouble notions that the university exists for the public good or that higher education is the answer to economic, social, and moral ills. I aim to show that higher education is the product of class-based social movements and, as such, have structural limitations that cannot simply be reformed, but that require rethinking the institution itself. The present shape of higher education has been developed by class struggle, though this fact has largely been written out of the popular imagination regarding universities and colleges. Understanding the class history of the university as an institution can help sharpen analysis regarding the practices of higher education institutions not just in the past, but also today; such an understanding can also act as the grounds for further analysis regarding the massive changes that have convulsed higher education since the 1960s. While that investigation is beyond the scope of the current work, it very much informs the research and writing that went into what follows.

Telling this story has required making choices about the organization of the work.

While what follows is essentially a chronological telling of the story, the story itself follows three main arcs: what is happening at a social and economic level; what is happening within the reform movement of the university; and what is happening at the level of student life. I believe the university that developed owes its form to the interaction of these three arcs. Shifting economic and concomitant social change are the background against which faculty, reformers, and students acted. At the same time the activity of faculty, reformers, and students affected how economic and social imperatives were felt in their communities and, at the same time, directly affected what it meant to attend university and what would be the experience and expectations of the institution. Especially at the beginning, it may not be immediately clear to the reader why students figure so prominently in the telling of the story. However, I hope that by the end I will have made a clear case that the university reform movement is unthinkable without considering the self-organized activity of students. By the end of the work, I aim to show that where the Colonial College was home to several autonomous zones of activity, the research university had managed to absorb this autonomous activity into itself. Why and how that was the case is most fully articulated in the Student Life sections, which is why they are among the most important, even if they do not immediately appear so at first.

### **Prelude: In Kingdoms Far, Far Away**

Though the scope of present work is constrained to US history, it can be useful to provide a rapid recounting of the larger history of what has become the complex of

higher education. As the Roman Empire splintered, its ability to oversee education was severely curtailed. In the East, centuries of war chased Hellenic education into the Islamic empire, while in the West rural monasteries were left to oversee the perpetuation of this learning.<sup>12</sup> The Latin Church used rural monastery schools to train leaders and legal minds in knowledge of two “books” that shed light on human possibility: the Bible and Nature. Through the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and dialectic) the Bible could be studied, while the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music) opened an understanding of Nature. These schools became adept at canon law, a useful subject given the juridical confusion engendered by Roman collapse. With the rise of trading cities in the 9th century, urban cathedral schools emerged to displace the monastery schools. Writing in *The University, an Illustrated History*, Mariano Peset notes that these cities were “settlements of merchants who won privileges and freedoms from monarchs and feudal lords for their dealings and travels, and were entitled to elect their city authorities.”<sup>13</sup> The cathedral schools came to specialize in recent works devoted to canon and Roman civil law as merchants, popes and princes sought to define their legal - both civil and religious - relationships.

The development of the first universities out of these cathedral schools in the 12th century was closely connected to the rise of scholasticism and systematic theology and grew in conjunction with civil authorities’ attempts to carve out spaces of autonomy from the church. It arose as an attempt to use and codify the contradictory rulings of various popes, assemblies, church councils and other interests regarding faith and civic conduct on the European continent. Through the arts, scholars and their various

backers hoped to determine the relationships between earthly rulers of all sorts: churches, kingdoms and city leaders. Because of the knowledge that universities held—and their ability to train highly skilled legal and theological minds—cities craved their presence, though student strife made for a sometimes ambivalent reality. (For instance, Christopher Lucas writes that King Henry III tried to lure the Parisian university to England during the brutal repression of the Parisian student strike of 1229.) University charters, further, guaranteed a high degree of autonomy from Church and civil leaders, making it a space nominally beyond the control of the authorities—it became a zone where controversial ideas could be debated and discussed. Universities also ended the monopoly that the Church had maintained on the development and codification of knowledge.

During the Italian Renaissance and Northern Reformation, young scholars fled the existing universities as they saw little hope for reform of methods and governance in institutions built to maintain the present. Forming academies devoted to the knowledge flooding in from Arabic scholars, these Humanists aligned themselves with princes and noblemen seeking to displace the power of the Pope and Holy Roman Emperor. Where scholasticism had developed to give order to a mess of laws, decrees and texts, the Humanist saw poor translations, outdated formal requirements and, most damning, a stubborn allegiance to a passing mode of life. Martin Luther, teaching at an academy in Wittenberg, initially urged the destruction of the universities, but soon saw the usefulness of founding new institutions; his academy became the first of the new Protest Universities in Northern Europe. By reorganizing knowledge, sources



used, and methods of understanding, Renaissance and Reformation thinkers saw that they could found new institutions to supplant the old order. Following the Counter-Reformation, which also formed new universities to deal specifically with the threat, existing universities could not avoid choosing a side to support. In this, students were usually decisive as their riots and attendance patterns went a long way in determining support and patronage for these institutions. The University of Bologna, long the standard for legal studies, slid into mediocrity attempting to remain neutral; the University of Paris, conversely, sided with Counter-Reformation and thrived in the new era.

Aware of the potential importance of these institutions in training minds to adjudicate disputes and guide leaders, settlers in the British colony of North America founded Harvard in 1636 - with Cambridge as their model. In a short amount of time, its graduates and supporters believed it had lived up to their hopes: in the 1670s, a commencement speaker claimed that without Harvard, “the ruling class would have been subjected to mechanics, cobblers, and tailors, the gentry would have been overwhelmed by lewd fellows of the baser sort, the sewage of Rome, the dregs of society which judgeth much from emotion, little from truth... Nor would we have rights, honors or magisterial ordinance worthy of preservation, but plebiscites, appeals to base passions, and revolutionary rumblings.”<sup>14</sup> By the US Revolutionary War, nine colleges had been formed to create a religious leadership and governing class; Princeton, founded in 1746, was a crucial development whose students and faculty, often of humble means, were on the front lines of agitating for Republican education.

That Princeton was a product of Scottish life bears on its mission: William Hamilton notes that within the Scottish Enlightenment, “their outlook on higher education had always been democratic, the aristocratic tradition did not predominate as in England.”<sup>15</sup> Higher education coupled with emergent democratic forms became a mechanism for combating the aristocracy and its importation in the colonies had profound effects on the development of Republicanism and the American Revolution.

The above sketch provides, in macro form, the general shape of the story I aim to tell regarding the history of higher education since the Revolutionary period of US history. First, it is crucial to recognize that higher education does not simply exist as a sacred trust standing outside of time and place. Its existence and particularities depend very much on the social, economic and political structures of its time. Further, their conditions for existence very much rely on social conflict. As the splintered ruling factions of Western Europe sought to assert their various claims, scholars from the schools were a key means towards this end; as the bourgeois aimed to assert their own rights and privileges against these older factions, they too saw the advantage afforded to those who could organize knowledge for their particular purposes. For a class to contend at a societal level for dominance, they gradually came to understand, it was not enough to reject the existing means for producing legal and civic right, but they had to themselves develop a means to produce alternative legal frameworks (one could, here, think of the famous rights of man which, for the bourgeois in America and France provided a rationale for revolution that rights of citizens could not). What the

history of the US, especially in the 19<sup>th</sup> century makes clear, though, is that there is no straight line to the development of these types of institutions. Theory and desire may provide clues as to what type of knowledge and form an educational institution might take, but it is only in the actual practice of those institutions that their ability to thrive, much less survive, can be determined. Further, in these times of transition, especially when the contending sides are not entirely clear and society itself is in flux, the impetus to found new institutions may be clear, but the models themselves are still evolving as various stakeholders - especially those with the money to support education - find their own interests at odds with reformers seeking other ends from the university.

## **Section I: From Colonists to National Experiments**

Coming out of the Revolutionary War, the leading edge of economic and cultural production was dominated by merchant capitalists in the North and slave-owning Plantation masters in the South. By the close of the Civil War, industrial capitalists had come to dominate the political economy of the US. The intervening years were a time of prodigious change as new modes of labor and new forms of capital, along with their concomitant new forms of political being, challenged the old order and each other. Antagonisms produced institutions by which various social groups attempted to organize the emerging industrial society. This society, requiring tremendous aggregations of people and capital, can be characterized by a burgeoning national economy, an expanding education system and the advent of political concerns that necessitated a new type of governmental actor - the bureaucracy. By the close of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a family of institutions specific to the economic, cultural, political and legal conditions of industrial capitalism would arise to shepherd US society through the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. These were the university, the prison, state bureaucracy, the labor union and the corporation. Their birth and prosperity were the result of a number of contingent decisions and unintended consequences arising from an industrial mode of production.

No institution arrives fully formed without antecedent forms, of course. To understand how and why something new appears in history, a general knowledge of macro events is necessary to give a framework within which that thing's history can be told. From there, the stresses and fissures within the antecedent forms can be examined

in order to produce a coherent story about the failure of a particular institution to meet the needs created by larger macro changes in society. This, in turn, gives an understanding of why particular actors thought a given course was necessary or wise and why and how they were opposed. From these oppositions, finally, a picture of the new institution can emerge. Towards that end, I will sketch with broad strokes the social and economic transformations of the post-colonial era before more concretely entering into the daily life of those who attended and taught at the colonial colleges. From this, I hope to illustrate the estrangement of higher education at the time from the society that was growing up around it as well as from the students who sought to make use of the institution in some way nonetheless. It was these students who found their colleges wanting, after all, that produced a transformed system of higher education in the United States.

In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, a capitalist class composed of merchants and land speculators had begun to assert its political ambitions on colonial society such that by mid-century or so many farms were moving beyond subsistence farming to the production of commodities for a commercial market. Through accumulation of property, leaders emerged whose interests were identified with their region's interest and, therefore, whose interests were equated with the public's interest. The historian James Lemon writes that this accumulation of wealth was principally achieved through the accumulation of land, but that urban merchants were keenly aware of the possibilities for import/export profit that coincided with the rise of a landed class.<sup>16</sup> By the

mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, Lemon argues, somewhere around 15-20% of Northeastern farmers had begun producing commodities not out of necessity, but out of a desire to reap profits and, ultimately, to accumulate more land. This forced recalcitrant farmers to follow in their footsteps, though they were disadvantaged by their late starting position. There was room to resist this move, however, and agricultural outposts withheld from commodity markets up into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This type of resistance rarely turns back time and cannot found an alternative society for long; the conditions for a society founded on the intertwined principles of private property and wealth accumulation were already set and would soon become an economic imperative to be met by all.

It could be immediately pointed out that the Puritans had, from the very beginning, brought with them the seeds of this dissolution: individualism regarding salvation and relationship with God. Though that may be the case, at least two considerations have to be accounted for. First, for the Puritan, the relationship with God takes precedence and is the bedrock from which all other relationships are formed. Crucially, God is the bond between each other member - community relationships are not possible without God - and community is therefore of paramount importance: the community is the manifestation of God living with humans. This is evident from the Mayflower Compact, through sermons, and in the communities that Puritans established. Secondly, and just as important, to establish a settler society requires a level of social cohesion by which to overcome external and internal threats: from drought and native peoples to disease and natural human failings. As Jurgen Herbst claims, "For settlers in the English-speaking colonies of North America the

circumstances of migration and settlement largely determined the arrangements they made for schooling. In Massachusetts, for example, anxiety for collective survival in a precarious physical, as well as social, environment had prompted the provincial government six years after its landfall to authorize the funding of Harvard College to assure an advanced Latin education for their future secular and religious leaders.”<sup>17</sup> Over the next decades, the General Court established several new means to provide education throughout the colony because they saw it as a condition of community survival. Both Puritan ideology and the harsh realities of colonial life heightened the importance of community relationships.

These conditions had far reaching effects throughout the institutions that provided the ideological and communitarian foundation for the colonial society.<sup>18</sup> These structures, buffered by religious and ethical commitments, were unable to withstand the new commercial imperatives brought about by commodity production. The Great Awakening, a byproduct of the Scottish Enlightenment, was a mass revival founded on the ideals of individual relationships with God and society against the communitarian structures that had characterized the earlier Colonial period. Princeton, founded on the ideas of Scottish bourgeois immigrants to New Jersey, provided the institutional home for this movement, though it quickly spread to the other Colonial colleges. Religious leaders who continued to espouse this increasingly anachronistic communitarian thought were beginning to be abandoned. From cultural leaders like Benjamin Franklin and new religious leaders emerging from the colonial colleges the poor, those who had to work for others as servants and tenant farmers, were targeted

by the new legal and juridical norms governing labor and an ideological assault by this emerging society that they themselves were to blame for their allotment in life: their inability to accumulate wealth manifested a moral failing. Collective attempts, such as those by weavers in New Jersey,<sup>19</sup> to resist bourgeois legislation to enshrine these relations in law were met not with solidarity, but castigation and the imperative for individuals to work harder. Finally, these conditions were solidified by the imposition of taxes, first by the Royal Government and later that of the US, that enforced the production of goods and commodities onto all those who owned land. It was exceedingly difficult to avoid incorporation into capitalist social relations.

By the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, aspirations for colonial life were nothing more than nostalgic illusions - capitalist social relations had been firmly entrenched. The question now was what a wholly capitalist society would look like in the US. Several factors would play a role in determining this shape. Railroad titans and large scale public works programs displayed the ability of this new society to coalesce huge sums of capital, rewriting established patterns of transportation, politics, and industrial production and organization. Massive increases in population, from twelve and a half million in 1830 to twenty three million in 1850, with a huge influx of immigrant workers (the number of people immigrating between 1840-1850 nearly tripled that of those immigrating in 1830-40). Due to the paucity of skilled labor in the US, a worker could make substantially more in the US than in many areas of Europe. Coinciding with the rise in the number of workers, and the liberation of slaves in South, was the development of the prison as a constitutive feature of labor discipline - both as a



source of cheap labor (contractors could get labor for at least half price) and the forced indoctrination of capitalist work habits in inmates. Following from both the new corporate forms of industrial and finance capital as well as the tremendous increase in the labor pool, was the arrival of a new professional class of worker and, with them, the university as its central means of organization and community building. Initially descended largely from the Northeastern merchant families and Southern plantation owners, the first *professional academics*, their professionalism being a principal condition for the arrival of the university, found opportunity in the unstable class structure to self-organize and create a new type of institution through which to amplify the value of their labor as well as their own ability to control how they labored.

The development of new institutions was happening concurrently with the erosion of the older communal institutions of local church, family, and locally oriented markets and the forms of education they relied on and fostered. The values that had sustained these were being made anachronistic by the increasing dominance of private property and the accumulation of wealth. Capitalism disrupts and causes new formations not simply because of greed, but because people need to supply themselves and those close to them with the means of reproducing their lives, which increasingly meant access to money and debt. By the close of the Civil War, industrial capitalism would relegate the older modes of production to secondary positions; into this vacuum the old models could not follow unchanged - new institutions would have to be developed capable of providing continuity and communities of solidarity.

The forms of organization that correspond to these social groups had, by the close

of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, all more or less arrived on the scene. The corporation as the institution of the industrial capitalists; the trade union of the working class (the prison its malevolent opposite); and the university of the professional class. Increasingly, the farmer and small manufacturer, lacking an institutional form of strength (more on the peculiarities of the relationship between farmers and colleges in the section on the land-grant universities) were sidelined, though not quieted, in a world now dominated by the three interest groups and their institutions. Industrial capitalists, whether the railroad titans or the newly minted national bankers, and their corporations were firmly established as a legal possibility by the closed of the 1860s. The industrial working class, sparked by the refusal of men in Martinsburg, West Virginia, initiated the United State's first mass strike in 1877 and the formation of the Workingmen's Party. Worker's Power and unions soon followed. As for the university, state funding of the professional middle class had become a fact with the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862. The interaction of these three class centered institutions created a public sphere whose foundation was centralized control of economic and governmental functions and whose internal consistency and logic was provided by professional and academic associations. Already by the first years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the American Federation of Labor (AFL) was working with capitalists and academics - in the National Civic Foundation (NCF) - for a country in which all shared, in different measure of course, in the bounty of industrial capitalism. Beyond that, they propagated an economic alternative to *laissez-faire* capitalism in which the working class could share in the expansive wealth of an industrializing nation while the

professionals came to manage the corporations and profits of the industrial capitalists.

The crucial role of academics in elaborating and propagating this vision and their role in training the labor, administrators and intellects for this new era provide the cornerstone for astounding growth of, and power of, universities and colleges at the turn of the century. However, it was their ability to self-organize in the university that allowed them to position themselves for capitalist patronage. This self-organization was important for two reasons: the first, that it led to reform attempts within existing colleges, leads to the second - the realization that a limits within the existing forms of higher education could only be surpassed by creating new institutions un beholden to past stake holders. Internal agitation and external creation were the means by which the modern university was created. In creating the research university, they created an institution through which to consolidate their professional status while also creating clients in both the middle class (for students), state, and corporation. They further provided the concepts and categories through which the emergent middle class began to understand the industrialized world and its problems. The unprecedented accumulation of capital and wealth in the hands of a handful tycoons was also the condition upon which university faculty were to establish chairs, open new departments, establish themselves as useful, expand their physical plant, and consolidate the form of the Research University as the premier educational and training institution in the US.

Section I is focused on the creation of this university. It seeks to answer questions

about why a new form was necessary, why then, why there, and why them? It starts with the discontent surrounding the traditional colleges in the first chapter to the persistent attempts to found a new institution worthy of the industrializing forces found in the manufacturing cities. (I should say, by way of terminological clarification, that both "university" and "college" were used in the self-description of these institutions, but what becomes known as the American style research-university does not arise until the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century.) From there, I chart the antagonisms from which the university finally emerged to conclude with the formation and consolidation of the universities and the professional associations. I focus on the vision of those seeking to bring forth a new form because almost all of them came up through the ranks of a lackluster educational system unable to quench and stimulate their curiosity and from that, and their various positions in society, saw the inadequacy of the educational institutions of their time. Because they were students, because they were educators, because many of them became educational tycoons of a new sort, and because their visions laid the groundwork for nearly universal higher education, it bears examination why their particular forms won out and what failed and why. The professional model was very much an idea created through higher education and these men. I will also pay as much attention as possible to the agitation of students - their riots, their secret societies and their forms of sociality - in forming the new university as well as to the organizing of the professional faculty as a means of ousting the clergy and amateurs educators. It was student life and professional organizing, after all, that provide the clearest demand for new forms of educational life.

## **Chapter 1: The Colonial College from Zenith to Nadir**

The early history of the Colleges in the Colonies and Republic are, more often than not, the story of poverty, riots, and student self-organization. It is crucial to understand this because institutional poverty, student strife and strength, and student self-organization had to be overcome for a new form of higher education to flourish. For this reason a history of the research university in the United States has to start with the struggles of the existing colonial colleges. To map their failures and successes in order to see how and why they were inadequate to the era of advanced capitalist society.

Before mapping failures, however, a brief discussion of why colonial colleges existed is in order. Phyllis Vine's work gives us some indications. Parents who sent their children to college (students were often as young as 12 years old) seemed invested in the story of moral decline (often as a function of overly indulgent mothers) and their own inability to effectively raise their children. They believed they required the tools that the college possessed (such as Greek, Latin, mathematics and Moral History). These parents believed their children would be leaders of society and they desired for them to have the best opportunity to do so - given elite thought of the time, the college seemed the most likely place for their children as here they would encounter good male role models whose knowledge and wisdom would set them on a path towards righteousness. "Parents," Vine writes, "appear to have sensed their growing inability to manage adolescent sons through the traditional, weakened, dependency based on the distribution of land."<sup>20</sup> Many well-off fathers in pre-Revolutionary days, further,

believed that a new era was dawning and that, perhaps, they could not impart to their sons the skills that would be necessary in the future world. As important as these new skills were the development of social connections that college could afford. Benjamin Franklin saw the Academy of Philadelphia as an ideal meeting place for the best of society to unite their families. Franklin was not alone in this belief. Vine writes that, "Preliminary findings based on an investigation of a sample of 368 students from Princeton, Philadelphia, and King's indicate that about one-quarter of the students married sisters of classmates or daughters of trustees or presidents."<sup>21</sup> For students who did not marry the daughter of a classmate, apprenticeships were often cultivated by attendance at a college. The colonial college, on the whole, offered a version of discipline, social connection, consolidation of social power within the upper class, and, as a happy cap, an education.

In the beginning, churches were largely responsible for funding higher education in the colonies. Founded on the Christian zeal for missionary work and moral communities, financial support from the Christian community, as the education historian Howard Miller writes, "was deemed a responsibility of more than casual significance."<sup>22</sup> Without overgeneralizing, the formation of the pre-revolutionary colleges were largely aimed at correcting the moral lassitude of families in a changing world. The historian Phyllis Vine writes that, educators - and the denominations that gave them power - "laid the blame to improper training within the family. They pinned their hopes for social stability on a pacific, orderly generation of youth."<sup>23</sup> This

did not, however, mean that the Colleges were flush with funds. With small class sizes and marginal economic and social importance, the denominations gave only what would suffice to keep the doors open. Absent abundant wealth, the colleges relied on students to provide financial support. Student fees, until the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, were the main means by which colleges and universities balanced their finances. In turn, this reliance on student money effectively limited the disciplinary action available to the Colleges because the ultimate punishment, expulsion, was nearly unthinkable. Colleges were then left with few options on the numerous occasions that a major riot or mischief - such as the assault of a faculty member - occurred.

Students, meanwhile, dealt with the tedious studies (recitations and compulsory chapel were the principal means to outfit the mind) in other ways than just mischief and riot. Organizing the social life of the college took precedence as a means to stave off boredom and engage in serious academic work. Organizing as a class (this fundamental unit of student identification remained well into the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and its shape remains in the use of Freshman, Sophomore, etc.) and later as debating societies and fraternities, students created a rich social world beyond the purview of those left to shepherd them into adulthood. Through these student-originated and self-run organizations, they cultivated student solidarity, achieved internal discipline and coherence, and attempted to create the conditions for a stimulating education.

Meanwhile, faculty often found themselves as spy, disciplinarian, teacher, and conduit of denominational wisdom. Many faculty, understandably, found this an oppressive situation. While there is evidence that faculty at Harvard had begun, by the

late 18<sup>th</sup> century to see themselves as primarily educators, on the whole the conditions of collegiate life and educational expectations would ensure they were unable to organize until the teacher/student, administration/faculty, and college/society relationships had been reconfigured. These three phenomena, then, set the stage upon which ambitious men who had emerged from the Colleges would create a new form of education that would, within a century, become a premiere institution of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

#### *A. Republican Education*

What it means to provide higher education changes in the political and economic times in which the institution finds itself. In addition to the problems of poverty and riots, schools also had to contend with changing political and social circumstances as well as the question of who education is meant to serve. What is notable about the post-Revolutionary attempts to reform higher education was not their attempts to develop forms capable of solving the problems of the colleges (these all failed), but rather its attempts to create an education commensurate to the needs of the new Republic. Further, as the historian Jurgen Herbst drives home, it was largely the work of philosophers, statesmen, authors and politicians, rather than “teachers, parents, or local taxpayers,” that drove educational reforms and experiments.<sup>24</sup> It was these men and women, ambitious and looking to the future of US national interests, that drove the thirst for and development of education at all levels. These wealthy and influential men and women, then, were the spring from which education bubbled and their



interests are found everywhere one looks.

Republicanism, after all, is an attempt to attenuate the potential dangers of radical democracy. Since the representative of the people, rather than the people themselves, make decisions, it stands to reason that the government must make sure that those capable of becoming representatives of the people take on the qualities necessary for leadership: high moral character, cosmopolitanism, and rational discipline. David Robson has written that, “These were the characteristics inculcated through a liberal education in the arts and sciences, and they could be acquired by men of proper temperament, no matter what their birth.”<sup>25</sup> For these wealthy and enlightened men, a truly Republican education should be open to all, should encourage and reward the best, and should teach a rational and disinterested form of governance.

Chief among the attempts to re-create higher education in the post-revolutionary world were the debates concerning the founding of a national university. For George Washington, a national university was necessary because sectarian education would never be able to provide the resources for a flourishing university system.<sup>26</sup> He believed that a certain homogeneity among citizens was necessary and this could not be accomplished through the several diverse efforts of the sects. Princeton Trustee Robert Finley (whose own university was non-sectarian) advocated for such a unity through the centralized production of Primary and College textbooks, through which a common educational basis could be crafted. Benjamin Rush (Founding Father and founder of Dickinson College) thought that the existing colleges were too narrow in

scope - as evidenced by their exclusion of women. For him, because women “often regulated” the opinions of men, they should also be educated - not just in “the usual branches of female education,” but also in the principles of liberty, freedom, government and patriotism. Together, these critiques grew out of a conviction that *to formalize the break with monarchical and priestly power, a new type of education, different than that offered by the Colonial colleges, was required.* The *ancien regime* had survived by ensuring the ignorance of the people; a ready antidote lay in a national education system. James Madison, in his proposal for the university, wrote that, “it is universally admitted that a well instructed people alone can be permanently a free people people.”<sup>27</sup> A Congressional Committee that endorsed Madison’s own educational proposal concluded that, “The world is still a willing captive to the spells of ancient genius; and the rivalry of modern empires will be perpetuated by their arts and their learning, the preservers of that fame which arms alone may indeed win, but can never keep.”<sup>28</sup> To be sure, plenty of clergy supported this mission: they, too, saw their sermons and lives as weapons to finalize the break with religious and secular leaders that purported to speak as God. The capture and institutionalization of revolutionary enthusiasm as antagonism to the *ancien regime* was to be effected primarily through education and enlightened forms of government by replacing priest and caste with a secular religion formed in universities.

In order that the state resist those older forms of authority, whose familiarity lends them an easy legitimacy, the new state must involve itself in the cause of education. Rush, in his pleas for a national university, declared that the only way for the people of

the States to form under this new form of government was, “by an education adapted to the new and peculiar situation of our country.”<sup>29</sup> This could most easily come through a new federal university, founded by an act of Congress, “into which the youth of the United States shall be received after they have finished their studies, and taken their degrees in the colleges of their respective states.”<sup>30</sup> This federal university would not entirely supplant the state and local colleges, whose mission would still be to the state and local arena, but would recruit the best students into the capital so as to have a government composed of its best citizens from all over the nation. The coursework and form of learning should teach the necessities of “civil and public life” in the new world created by the Revolution. There were, he wrote, “a new class of duties to every American” and these can only be filled through new forms of education.<sup>31</sup> If the United States was to perpetuate its independence and compete with Europe, the citizenry would need to know history, the best agricultural methods, principles of commerce, emerging manufacturing processes, philology (through which the people might perfect the English language and so emancipate themselves from England<sup>32</sup>), French and German (the languages of commerce, culture, and banking), “Those parts of mathematics which are necessary to the division of property, to finance, and to the principles and practice of war,” and, of course, “athletic and manly exercises.”<sup>33</sup> Additionally, as the Revolutionary War General, and Southerner, Francis Marion argued, it was only through education that a citizenry could understand and tame its own government.<sup>34</sup> The Revolution could only be a break if it was able, in the form of new institutions, to consolidate a new social ethic with an economic system

based on free markets.

US capitalism was almost entirely based, at this time, on agriculture and developing its capacity was of principal importance to those hoping to secure the new State. As Robert Finley argued as late as 1815, “The American people have also manifested a strong predilection for manufacturing pursuits of various kinds. These objects respectively are highly deserving of national patronage. But, from the extent of our territory, the excellence of our climate, the fertility of our soil, the ideas, habits and necessities of the people, *agriculture* appears likely to be the general and predominant occupation of the American States.”<sup>35</sup> From a governance standpoint, many of the early national leaders felt that higher education, by which a leadership strata could be ensured, was necessary for those who would lead the electorate. However, unless the country could establish itself as an economic unity and compete with Europe, there was little hope that the tenuous union could survive. A reconstituted and reconceptualized education was to be a weapon in the hands of the now regnant American bourgeoisie against the forms of economic and cultural domination of Europe.

Capitalist education would take more than simply theory, though. While the capitalist strata believed that higher education was a crucial weapon against Europe and against democratic missteps, it had to develop the concrete forms that would empower the bourgeois. This became the project of several private capitalists and institutions over the course of the next century. However, the process had firmly begun

in the post-revolutionary world. As Jurgen Herbst writes, “now legislatures in the new states began to incorporate colleges which they neither had funded nor acknowledged as provincial or state institutions. These colleges owed their creation to the initiatives of private individuals or groups and came to exist side by side with the older public institutions.”<sup>36</sup> Churches, of course, were a large contributor to this expansion; their influence would remain sharp up and through the 20<sup>th</sup> century, though they could not escape the dictates of capitalist higher education. The major new form, though, was the invention of what Daniel Boorstin calls the Booster College.<sup>37</sup> These, Herbst elaborates, were founded by town promoters, real estate speculators and developers. They were intended, as Boorstin tells it, to convey permanence, to assure the stability and sustainability of a new township, knit a community together in an institution, and finally, bring in some state funding.

Herbst writes that the old collegiate form, dating to 16<sup>th</sup> century, saw the state, the church and the university as a united front of public institutions founded on the principle that “the confession of the sovereign determines the confession of his subjects.”<sup>38</sup> In the colonies and then states, the Great Awakening and the Revolutionary War destroyed this formulation: there could no more be a centralized monopoly on higher education. In the absence of a sovereign through which to unify a people, instruction could be undertaken by a myriad of different actors. In the immediate aftermath of the Revolution many states attempted to create new colleges, but they found it more cost effective and less time consuming to have a wealthy person or group found and run a college. Further, the men attempting to found a National

University, as well as many of those who supported the old colleges, reeked of aristocratic privilege. In the new world opened by the revolution, a more populist character for education was sought. Away from the established capitals, colleges could provide both intellectual protection from the government while conferring legitimacy and stability to burgeoning areas. Herbst also points out that these new colleges did not have to be ecumenical in the same way that state funded universities did, so those they attracted could bring a whole community with them when they attended.

By the start of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, two separate issues had essentially killed the idea of a National University. First was the rise of industrial capitalism, whose base came from a different social strata than the refined lawyer-statesman, whose base was in mercantile capitalist endeavors, who had ushered in the Revolution. The second was changes taken by the existing colleges themselves. David Robson writes that democracy, rather than Republicanism, gripped the states at the turn of the century and that this new class of small manufactures rejected the ideals of republicanism as something that did not benefit them very much. Robson examines the mismatch between Charles Nisbet (a Scotsman lured to the US by Rush and his supporters in an attempt to recalibrate education in the country) and his role as president of Dickinson College - a role that Benjamin Rush stumped for and which the Republican leadership hoped would be enough to attenuate the democratic impulses of people looking to move beyond the Revolution.

Second, Revolutionary enthusiasm and the calls for a national university, which

would have severely undercut the autonomy of the colleges, forced the existing schools to adapt. At Yale, for instance, Connecticut state officials were brought into the Board and given the same rights as the original members. While disturbing for Yale, it was the only way the school could stave off the national usurpation. Ezra Stiles, president of Yale during this time, wrote in his journals of the dangers brought about by the new era: “A Rejection would be converted into Obloquy against the College & increase the Offence & Disgust of the Civilians; & an Adoption will not only wrest the College out of the hands of Ecclesiastics, but bring the deistical & mixt Characters hereafter ascending into the Council to such a Controll & Influence in this Institution as to neutralize & gradually to annihilate the Religion of the College, & so to lower down & mutilate the Course of Education, & model it to the Tast of the Age, as that in a few years we shall make no better Scholars than the other Colleges, or the Univ. Of Oxford & Cambridge.”<sup>39</sup> The scarcity of resources was a concern, of course, for Yale, as it feared losing students to a federal university. Worse, though, a National University would have made Yale ancillary to the new institution. In the end, state involvement was the price to pay for autonomy. President Stiles commented that this move would undoubtedly foist upon him professors he disliked and who would foment against him, but that in the end, state assistance would be a good thing for Yale.

On the whole, the existing colleges attempted to make a national university redundant. They, therefore, attempted to join together the education desired by national leaders with their own ideas about what education should look like. Roger Geiger, an education historian, comments that presidents and faculty tried to weld

together Republican ideas - “instilling selflessness, patriotism, and virtue in the citizens and leaders of the new republic” - with Enlightenment learning - “these years mark the zenith of Enlightenment influence in American colleges, a time in which theology sought to accommodate the truths of science and reason.”<sup>40</sup> However, as they set about imbuing their charges with the new spirit of the age, a conservative reaction against the unruliness of Republican era students, coinciding with a series of religious revivals which were partly a populist response to federal attempts to consolidate power, undermined whatever popular legitimacy these schools had garnered in the post-revolutionary moment.<sup>41</sup> (To cite a handful of such attempts at federal consolidation, both Shay’s Rebellion - and the inability of the federal government to raise an army to defeat it - and the Whiskey Rebellion - sparked by the first federal tax on a domestic product - were armed responses to federal consolidation of power. The Federalist party, which was steering the direction of the national constitution, found its support in the large shipping and commercial interests, which many who made up the populist movement were suspicious of. Further, the federal government, with the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, took upon itself the power to create new states, against the wishes of existing states to expand. The attempted formation of the National University was a further provocation that was more easily defeated). While not solving any of the problems of the College, and, indeed, exacerbating many of the existing one, the post-revolutionary period is notable for bringing to the fore the importance of higher education to the development of a national bourgeois as a means by which to legitimate and consolidate executive and legislative decisions. The promise of this



future would not arrive until a century later, but already this impetus was alive and well at the birth of the nation. The specter of a National University, too, shows the power of new institutions to cause older ones to reform themselves lest they suffer consequences.

### *B. Poverty*

Since the founding of Harvard in 1636, colleges and universities have been desperate for funding from any source they might receive it. In every case, they offered an education amenable to those who would pay for it. In the early days, this clientele was made up of Christian churches and families who were attempting, in the words of John Winthrop, to establish "a due form of government both civil and ecclesiastical."<sup>42</sup> The college was seen as necessary because a number of men - indentured servants, disobedient children, and any number of other "unworthy persons" - had made their way to the colony and were perverting this ecclesiastical and civil government. Initially, these churches and families demanded the type of education associated with Cambridge and Oxford. That is, a curriculum steeped in Greek and Latin, the wellsprings of Western civilization and the languages of proper culture, and privileged a gentlemanly approach to culture and employment. Overwhelmingly, in the first generation or two of each new college, the majority of students entered the ranks of the clergy, whose influence was crucial to setting up the ideological expectations of the settlements that organized Colonial and Republican life.

The colonies created a whole new funding problem to be solved by the colleges. In

England, private philanthropy had long set up, according to the historian Daniel Wren, beneficent relationships with grammar schools and polytechnics. Philanthropists avoided giving to Oxford and Cambridge, however, because these two institutions were already large land owning operations and were not in need of their help. In the colonies, church groups were the main thrust of financial and student support - and they were not flush with funds. "It has been estimated," Wren writes, "that the total productive funds of all institutions of higher education in existence in 1800 amounted to less than \$500,000."<sup>43</sup> Little support from federal or state governments existed. Endowments, even at the oldest schools, were very small: it would take Harvard until the 1830s to break \$600,000. Princeton, having gone bankrupt in 1829, was able to amass an endowment of \$476,000 by 1868. However, "Harvard, the best endowed, reported \$90,608.75 income in 1840, with 43.3 percent of that amount coming from its endowment."<sup>44</sup> While there was some enthusiasm for the idea of college, there was not a tremendous enthusiasm to pay for the actual colleges.

In many ways, the experience of Harvard set the model for the spread of higher education. Founded by graduates of Cambridge, it was entrusted by the general court of Massachusetts to refine and culture the men who would go on to lead the new society. Working and expanding homesteads, however, tended to take precedence over maintaining gentlemanly standards in the wilderness. Though most families could not afford to lose the labor of a son to college, those sons who managed to complete some education found pulpits ready to be filled. Within a generation or two, settler

communities could support merchants and land speculators, traders, and pastors. When the sons of these merchants, traders and pastors went to college, they almost always chose law or medicine as their profession. They also engaged in far more riotous behavior while at school than did their fathers and others seeking enter the ministry. Desperate for the tuition students brought, Harvard found it difficult to rein in the bawdy behavior of these less pious students. Opprobrium greeted these student outbursts, but, on the whole, those who marked the failure of Harvard for this behavior found it more attractive to found a new college than fight the rot.

This did not wipe out Harvard's (or, later, Yale's or Princeton's) ability to attract students. It meant that the new schools would essentially follow the model set down by Harvard and that the existing schools would have to draw closer to families with wealth. John Leverett, a prominent politician and lawyer, ruled as president of Harvard from 1708 until he died sixteen years later. During his time, responding to the threat posed by the founding of Yale, he made it his mission to further the “intercommunity of the learned” - the unification of Harvard faculty and Boston elite, with Harvard itself serving as the most potent symbol of this union. By seeking to make his students integral to the merchant and professional activity of Boston, he also sought to make the city's vitality instrumental in attracting students - which, to his chagrin, met with only moderate success. This new relationship did, however, bring Harvard a level of stability that it had previously lacked.

Within a few generations, Harvard grads, fearing their alma mater had slipped in the Christianizing part of its mission, founded Yale. Concern over the apostasy of

Harvard and Yale would lead later denominational leaders to found colleges in Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and New York. The splintering of colleges had the unfortunate effect of seeping financial support from the first institutions while increasing competition for students and resources within all of the early colleges.<sup>45</sup> This competition, though arising out of doctrinal commitments, forced the colleges to eschew, wherever possible, hard doctrinal stands. “Forever desperate for patrons and tuition-paying students,” writes the historian Christopher Lucas, “colleges found it expedient even in matters of basic governance to provide for minority sectarian representation on their respective boards of trustees or overseers.”<sup>46</sup> Colleges desperate for students and funds found they were caught between serving their denomination and any family willing to send its child to school. To make matters worse, the colleges depended for their survival on a close-knit community; following Lemon and Charles Post, it becomes clear that the communities, at least in the Northeast, were beginning to stratify on class lines according to the ownership of land and the ability to produce commodities for the markets. Commodity production, fairly well-established by the 1750s, produced striations in the community that worked to ensure less, not more, support for the colleges as fewer families could afford, nor felt it was worth their while to support, the colleges that were becoming beyond their means to make use of. Because of the cost, college tended to benefit those families that were better at commodity production than it did those who farmed for subsistence.

Each successive college sought ways to expand and preserve its clientele. The College of New Jersey (Princeton) pioneered two important innovations: first, it

formed a system of academies by which to provide the necessary education to get into the colleges (knowledge of Greek and Latin, essentially) and ensure a stream of students.<sup>47</sup> Second, blessed by location in New Jersey, which lacked an official denomination, they had no denominational requirement to navigate (though a confession of faith remained necessary). King's College (later renamed Columbia), the College of Rhode Island (later renamed Brown), the State University of New Jersey (later renamed Rutgers) and Dartmouth all followed this model, likely because they were also the product of religious conflict and could not afford to alienate any potential students. While Yale's board resisted this ecumenical trend, Harvard, William & Mary and the University of Pennsylvania had capitulated early. By the Revolutionary War, these nine schools counted around 750 students, though three-quarters of them attended Harvard, Yale, William & Mary and Princeton. By the Revolution, a significant minority of these students were being trained as ministers - though that was typically the career of choice for the poorer students who managed admission.

In the aftermath of the Revolution, the future of higher education was an open question. Some, as described above, advocated for a centralized education system through which a national university would set the agenda for the other colleges. Others, decrying this federal overreach, wanted existing schools and the states to determine their own educational output. The newly independent states rejected a national university and almost immediately sought to expand and reorganize their

educational institutions. Legislatures chartered universities in Maryland, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Vermont; William & Mary reorganized their faculty; Pennsylvania created a public school (later joined to the College of Philadelphia as the University of Pennsylvania); and New York set up the University of the State of New York to balance the traditionalism of Columbia. Unfortunately for these aspiring centers of learning, there was so little interest in their offerings that they had to compromise and cut corners, short-circuiting their attempts to foster a Republican wellspring. Though the population bloomed (from just over two million in 1770 to over five million in 1800), college enrollments were decreasing at the close of the century.<sup>48</sup>

Following Independence, settlers started pushing west - a practice previously forbidden by British law.<sup>49</sup> Congregations and college graduates followed, attempting to create in the wilderness beacons of light on the model of the existing colleges. Town leaders were often enthusiastic, for a college (though it could just as easily been a prison or asylum) meant higher land prices, which they owned, and prestige for the settlement. The zeal to found new colleges, though, was often ill conceived: Julian Sturtevant, later the president of Illinois College, reflected in 1837 that land speculators had tended to benefit the most. He claimed that, "These arrangements were entered into righteously, inconsiderately and ignorantly. The righteousness was largely on the side of the land speculator, the religious men engaged in the enterprise having little conception of the resources necessary to found a college worthy of the name, or of the broad co-operation indispensable to its success. They had neglected to

count the cost."<sup>50</sup> The further spread of colleges had the effect of increasing competition for resources and students at a time where there simply weren't many of either. Though they increased the value of land for property owners and speculators and brought a measure of pride to townsfolk; the colleges themselves rarely amounted to much and taxed the inadequate supply of professors in the country. Instruction was lacking, standards were non-existent, and the degree itself meant very little. Many of the colleges formed in the post-Revolutionary and expansionary time amounted to little and faded away in debt after a few unsuccessful years. The most lasting impact of the wide spread of education at this time was in student self-organization.

Adding to these woes, the ideologies of laissez-faire economics and democracy<sup>51</sup> required entrepreneurship: politicians were more often interested, at least until the financial crisis of the late 1830s, in funding public works projects and funneling federal and state largesse to their supporters and patrons. When they did spend on education, they rarely spent at a level adequate to the ambitions of the college founders. Philip Lindsley, President of the University of Nashville, speaking in 1837, noted that if the Legislature of Tennessee was not going to provide an adequate education for the people, it was up to the people themselves to make it so, though it would be preferable if the government would provide for the education of its citizens. By 1835, Francis Wayland, president of Brown, could comment that the government had, in a charitable reading, done nothing while the religions, left to their own devices, had at most a mixed record. The relationship to the state was extremely vexed. This is not to imply that the Colleges did not seek legislative help, only that they despaired of getting

much.

The poverty of the colleges and universities could not be addressed in this period and, indeed, it is not entirely apparent what the colleges would have spent the funds on. Plant expansion (the plant refers to the college grounds and buildings), the purchase or rent of land, and the hiring of more faculty were possibilities, but the curriculum, demand, and faculty structure never really demanded large coffers. Until the purpose and organization of higher education was better defined, there was little point, from the perspective of those giving money, to give more.

#### *Organizational Structure*

Because the college did not do very much, in the early days it could do without large funds. These early colleges had small libraries, no laboratories, small physical plants, and faculty who were in no position to demand high wages. For those who engaged in the day-to-day education of youth, their reward was largely in influencing the next generation and shoring up familial social worth. Colleges up through much of the 19<sup>th</sup> century had two types of teachers: tutors, who had usually just graduated and considered this time to be a temporary reprieve before entering a profession, and regular professors. Professors usually had no teaching specialty or specialized training, and were deemed worthy of the title by having achieved a BA earlier in life and proving themselves useful in a profession; it was largely the province of older and self-sufficient men. On the whole, Carl Becker writes, they were men capable of educating only through recitation - by making sure that students could quote passages and read



the ancient languages - rather than lecture and theoretical explanation.<sup>52</sup> This is not meant to besmirch these men, however, because society in this time saw them as adequate to the task of education: ensuring the young mind was furnished the mind with proper knowledge and the mental discipline to use this knowledge.<sup>53</sup> In fact, this is essentially what the founders and trustees of colleges wanted. Charles Nisbet, president of Dickinson College, denigrated his trustees, claiming that as far as they were concerned, the college could be an elementary school - that “teachers be mere day-laborers for seven hours a day, summer and winter, and allow only two months a year for vacation.”<sup>54</sup> What prestige was to be found in the calling was imported by the luminary, with the urge to reinvest in his alma mater tending to bolster community affection for the successful man.

Final authority in the early American colleges lay with the English governors, denominational boards and later the state legislatures. These bodies had more pressing matters to attend to than overseeing middling educational institutions and came to rely on presidents - teachers invested with internal authority - to oversee the functioning of the colleges. While having to report to an outside body, the president largely had free rein to do as he pleased in the school. By simply being in position to be president, he was granted the authority and legitimacy to effect his will.

The educational mission of the colleges owed much to Protestant and revivalist tendencies. Protestants believed that God had endowed everyone with the ability to discern truth for themselves, but that truth could only emerge in conjunction with hard work and proper discipline. Throughout this period, writes Geiger, sought to “provide

students with a liberal education, which meant facility with classical languages, grounding in the three basic philosophies of Aristotle - ethics, metaphysics, and natural philosophy or science - and a smattering of general worldly knowledge.”<sup>55</sup> To describe it this way, though, gives it too much coherence and consistency: in reality, presidents experimented with classes by which to attract students - in this, they almost always failed. “By no educational criteria,” the historian James McLachlan derisively notes, “derived from any time, place, or philosophy, can the early 19<sup>th</sup> century American college curriculum as actually taught be made to look attractive. It consisted almost solely of a drill in Latin, Greek, and mathematics, with a cursory view of science and some moral philosophy and belles lettres as the capstone.”<sup>56</sup> As colleges faced more competition, they did what they could to include some new sciences (such as geology, chemistry and engineering courses), though they lacked the faculty and resources by which to make this knowledge useful or important - these courses were typically the result of professorial fancy rather than institutional investment. Partly this was due to the poor state of preparatory education - without a coherent secondary education, there could be no coherent higher education - and partly to the stubborn insistence on the vocation of teaching - to properly fit a young mind to society as it existed in increasingly bygone days.

We could say, then, that the schools used their resources to the best of their abilities, but the demand for higher education was generally lacking and a clear idea, and ability to follow through on it, were absent. The demand for funding led schools to small experiments in courses taught, but not in the governance, teaching, ideology, or

purpose of higher education. Nothing in first 175 years of North American higher education would have led anyone to imagine that a whole new regime of higher education would surpass and supplant the old forms by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>57</sup>

### *C. Student Self-Organization*

Before continuing, I would like to remind the reader that, though it appears this section bears little weight to the argument, the trajectories and trends outlined here will become significant to those seeking to create a new type of higher education system. I give this section on student life so much weight for two primary reasons: first, to mark the distance between the experience of collegiate life today with that of students in previous eras and, second, to show the necessity of subsuming student life to the grand project of the research university. Student independence and self-organization were a significant block to administrative plans and would continue to be so until they were brought under the auspices of the research university.

The early colonists attempted to create a social life for their colleges by emulating the collegial residential structure of Cambridge. Here, students and faculty lived in close proximity to each other at all times. The necessary funds and architecture to establish identical buildings were missing in the colonies, yet they nonetheless set out to copy shared living as a way to instill in students a common life and, through diligent policing, moral character. In England, the edifice of the college had emerged, Victor Morgan shows, during the Reformation when Cromwell's purges severed the connection between the monasteries and the colleges. Over time, the residential

colleges themselves began to accrue endowments and land ownership - and thus political power - to offset the loss of Catholic backing. Land ownership in England gave them the political power. In the colonies, where land was not such a rare commodity, this was less of an issue than the power of these residential halls to focus the authoritarian control of the colleges and to heighten the idea of a community committed to the pursuit of the truth that would allow society to thrive. However, students developed, over time, a complex social structure through which to resist this control, to organize entertainment, and to socialize (with) one another.

The young men who attended colleges in the first two hundred or so years were typically aged between 14 and 22, and came from a fairly diverse class background. That they catered to all social classes did not, however, mean that all the social classes attended in equal numbers. "For the most part," writes Miller, "the colonial colleges trained those sons of the rich who desired a higher education, but they also became increasingly accessible to the sons of the middle and lower classes, or at least to the more extraordinary of those sons."<sup>58</sup> Older students tended to be poorer and were often working their way towards entering the ministry: it was, to be sure, a path to social mobility as it gave them access to prominent positions in their communities. These sons were, Carl Kaestle states, usually the first in their family to go to college and they often made the choice at their mother's encouragement. Poor fathers seemed to have preferred that their sons continue to provide the surety of present labor rather than the possibility of future godly service or prestige.<sup>59</sup> Lacking wealth, familial prestige, even with a son in the professional ranks, is hard to come by. The younger

students, more typically from elite families, planned to enter law or medicine. Their families saw in education a means to extend influence, mainly through careers in law (where lawyer statesman was the highest ideal), but also the church, medicine and public office: through family wealth and influential community positions, they formed and coalesced an elite pattern of authority. In general, however, few saw a real need to attend college at all. Because professionals were not strong enough to enforce their monopoly on esoteric knowledge until the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, licenses or other markings of merit were unnecessary to enter the legal, doctoral, or ministerial professions.

College had two purposes: one was to confirm or confer status, while the second was, as Oscar and Mary Handlin argue, typically a means for families to discipline their children as they navigated the transition to adulthood. It may be the case that the diversity of ages gave some presidents pause - McLachlan writes that they queried whether their charges were “citizens, or children”?<sup>60</sup> The consensus until the late 19<sup>th</sup> century was that the university was to act as the *paterfamilias*:<sup>61</sup> as the institutional embodiment of patriarchal authority, regardless of the student's age. What this power was supposed to teach is inextricably twined with Puritan beliefs about sin and human nature. Nathaniel Eaton, serving as Harvard's head master in 1638, was convicted of “gross misdeeds” due to the beatings he administered to students and stewards, though it wasn't the beatings that drew condemnation, but rather the brutality and the irrationality with which he deployed these beatings. Cambridge's social leaders had expected that, “Eaton, as master of the college, should have absolute power over his students including the power to discipline them in the manner and to the degree he

saw fit.”<sup>62</sup> Puritan thought on punishment, Kathryn McDaniel Moore writes, was growing to rely on the power of rational persuasion, rather than punishment, to bring the sinner closer to God. Eaton, in relying on irrational brutality, contravened the intention and practice of power. Eaton’s own punishment was a reflection of what the Puritans looked for in punishment: he was let go from his position though was not placed in prison and was set free on his own recognizance (he soon fled to England and ended up dying in debtor’s prison, so...). Eaton’s trial, Moore writes, “set a precedent concerning Harvard discipline; namely, that the guiding purpose was to bring the student to reason - to reform him, rather than simply to repress or punish his behavior.”<sup>63</sup> They were responsible for outfitting these minds and making sure their youthful vigor did not retard this process. (It would take until 1734, but whipping was finally abolished as a legal punishment at Harvard). Because corporal punishment was more likely to have the opposite effect of that which was intended, it was necessary to develop other means.

The student organized social system worked both for and against this goal: by allowing students to enforce their own codes of discipline that, in many ways, mirrored the social expectations of the colleges, the president found a body to help maintain control. On the other hand, a good deal of mischief and carousing was the result of this organization, and organization, in these cases, only served to make more severe the trouble.

According to Henry Davidson Sheldon, whose 1901 book on student life stands as an influential attempt to understand the shifts and changes in university life by paying

attention to student behavior, students at Harvard, William & Mary, Yale and Princeton really developed the concept of student life. Those colleges that followed in their wake followed their traditions, which, in turn, were following in the traditions of Oxford and Cambridge, though in conditions far removed from those universities.

### *Student Life*

The first form of student life to be organized was the "class," organized as Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors.<sup>64</sup> The association of students with others in their year of matriculation came to be the primary means of student association before it was ever recognized by officials. While there had existed a scholastic distinction for the purposes of teaching and requirements, students gave these bureaucratic distinctions a social dimension. The social dimension of class probably emerged around the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and spread almost immediately. It was not ceremonially recognized by the colleges until at least 1776, when student speakers, elected by their class, first came to speak at Commencement.

The class originated, according to Sheldon, due to recitation as instruction, the freshman laws, the system of common life, and the distance between professor and student. Where in England, institutional wealth allowed scholarships and stipends and individual tutors to combine with university lectures, the colonial schools were too impoverished to embody these traditions. Instead, they had a uniform course of study that relied on recitation as the main form of scholarship. Recitations were a group activity composed of those students who entered in the same year, that remained

together every year they attended. The freshman laws dictated that incoming students had to serve upperclassmen (or sometimes the president or a faculty member) while sophomores accustomed them to the school life. "The Freshman Laws," writes Sheldon, "contained in germ all the abuse to which first-year men have since been subjected."<sup>65</sup> Ironically, when these "laws" were eliminated in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, students turned to initiation rites<sup>66</sup> and, often more cruel because they were unstructured, hazing<sup>67</sup> to welcome freshmen to campus. Because these were not, and could not be, official, faculty could not control the practice; no students would snitch for fear of running afoul of secret student courts that could ruin a student's collegiate career. In conjunction with these first two, the common life of all students - eating together, going to class together, carousing together - led to the fusion of identity by year.

Finally, the strict discipline of the college engendered solidarity between students. Prayer occurred twice a day, often beginning while it was still dark; students were made to summarize earlier sermons; clergy, who originally made up the professoriate, punished any sign of blasphemy or lack of religion as forcefully as they thought they could. The colleges attempted to regulate every aspect of student life through a proliferation of rules. "The Harvard laws," writes Sheldon, "enumerated eighty-three separate offences. Most amusements were forbidden. The students could not hunt or go sailing without permission, at New Haven. Theatrical performances, billiards, cards, and dice were on the black list. A student might not lie down on his own bed in daytime nor spend his own money without first securing the consent of the authorities.



He was strictly prohibited from leaving his own room except at certain specified hours, and was never permitted to attend elections or mingle with citizens.”<sup>68</sup> It was up to the professors to ferret out and punish these infractions. It would take several decades before the colleges would bring them under control by formalizing and co-opting them. Until the arrival of the professional university, these conditions and student autonomy would persist.

Among its many functions, the class organized violence. In the “rush”, students were provided the opportunity to beat each other in a more or less orderly manner. It draws its origins from the common dining hall: all the classes would eat together and then leave with their class. As they exited, higher classes, at the rear, would jostle and harass the younger classes until a melee broke out. Over time, these tussles took on a life of their own: there are stories of students ripping up steps to use as cudgels in one melee and organized street fighting (that townspeople watched with merriment) in others. Hazing, rushes, and other harassment were a means by which a common class identity was forged and provided an inestimable (for students) avenue for excitement, danger and solidarity in otherwise dreary conditions. Outside the school, however, these practices were seen as destructive and license to behavior that would not be tolerated anywhere else. They did not reflect well on the school and inhibited their ability to raise money.

Through the class, students who made overtures to faculty - whether by visiting a faculty member, arriving to class early, or asking questions after class - were shunned. “Any student who showed lively interest in his studies, or was unusually courteous to

his instructors, or who refused to join in some general disorder, was open to suspicion. To furnish the faculty with information concerning any prank or violation of the statutes was the most heinous crime a collegian could commit, and the bare suspicion of it subjected a man to social ostracism.”<sup>69</sup> Under these conditions, there could be no accord between faculty and student: a kindly faculty member who tried to take an interest in student could only be seen as a spy and a student interested in these advances was most likely selling out his class. Collegiate life, with this form of student life, was inimical to professional instruction.

As the colleges grew older and grew in size, friends within a class also began to form secret clubs and societies, though nearly all of these early groups would evaporate when the students graduated: some examples are clubs that formed to swear off shaving for a year, to mock secret societies, to eat fine food, or to submitting each other to intense member criticism. Other clubs arose that attempted to organize mischief such as stealing hens or turkeys to eat, joyride their neighbor’s horses, or sing lewd songs to faculty members. Class members kept their solidarity after graduation through reunions. At Commencement, which was treated as a holiday by the town and drew important people from across the region, the lower classes organized to mock and satirize the proceedings and the senior class gave out awards to their members.

Some of the clubs, though, took on a life of their own. At Harvard's Porcellian Club, founded in 1791, a number of close friends were in the habit of meeting every other Friday to socialize and eat. In time, their aspirations for social position caused

them to label their meetings a Gentlemen's Club and, following a successful pig roast, they named themselves the Porcellian Club. The sixteen members were united "on some of the strongest principles of our nature; upon sociability, brotherly affection, and generosity; and upon those qualities of liberality and courtesy and that spirit of a true gentleman which are best expressed in the Greek motto of the society."<sup>70</sup> They had three trustees, former graduates, who held the club's property as a trust. A short list of their members is pretty impressive (no word whether a longer list would also be impressive): at least eleven of them, including Wendell Phillips, Edward Everett, John Adams, Charles Sumner, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and James Russell Lowell would lead the charge to recreate higher education in the US.

Yale had a much more elaborate system of secret societies that never overlapped class. Instead, each class would enter a new society as it advanced another year. By the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, these societies were both quite advanced and cutthroat in competition with each other. "Many men are pledged long before they reach New Haven, and a keen struggle ensues for the possession of the men from a distance. The trains are infested with representatives of the various societies, who jump upon the platform of the moving cars, fight the brakemen, incommode the travellers, and defy the police, in the desire to offer the advantage of the best freshman society to the incoming student."<sup>71</sup> Freshman societies sorted all the students, though they did not ensure assignment in a Sophomore society, which did not ensure assignment in a Junior society, which certainly didn't ensure election to either the Skull and Bones (which "gather[ed] in the real ability") or Scroll and Key ("the men of brilliant social

qualities”). This sorting mechanism, which endlessly funnels upward and is then able to introduce secret society members to past generations, has been difficult to install anywhere else due to the rigid class nature of Yale. Harvard, the only school that could have gone this route, instead founded its clubs on “congeniality,” according to Sheldon.

By spending all their time together, working through the curriculum, carousing and engaging in all manner of boredom and excitement, the class was the paramount means by which a class outlook was developed and defended. Yale’s President Porter wrote that, “I indeed do not see how an American college without fixed classes could have an efficient common life. In the American college the class is the charmed circle, within which the individual contracts most of his friendships and finds his fondest and most cherished association. The sentiment of his class is that which influences him most efficiently, and is to him often the only atmosphere of his social life.”<sup>72</sup>

### *Debating Societies*

In the debating societies, students developed for themselves an education adequate to their time. Influenced by the German enlightenment’s commitment to reason and discussion as a means to truth and knowledge, they became the colleges’ most dynamic setting for scholarship. To this Germanic quest for truth, they mixed an Anglo-Saxon idea of politics that was less concerned with war and more focused on the relations between individual and society.<sup>73</sup> As matriculants got older through the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, they found the intellectual embrace of the college cold and cast about for

vehicles through which to discuss and understand the events around them. In fact, it appears that Harvard's attempt to prepare its students for public life by improving their oratory skills led students, dissatisfied with the hoary nature of their studies to form the first society in the 1750s, though their heyday came in the years immediately following the Revolutionary War. Conflict with Royal Governors, the imposition of taxes, the move to a merchant capitalist economy, and the local character of colonial politics led to an active political engagement throughout the colonies, but especially in the colleges where many students had designs on careers in law and politics.<sup>74</sup> The churches, centers of political thought in those days, played an important partisan role in all these conflicts, so the two major cultural forms - religion and politics - were fused and commanded engagement.<sup>75</sup>

Everywhere that Societies appeared, naturally, faculty sought to suppress them, fearing the consequences sure to be unleashed by undisciplined thought furnishing its own mind. Faculty attacked them on grounds that they fragmented the thought of students. Too immature to understand the conditions of debate, faculty argued, student's arguments could only be half formed, at best. The wide variety of debating subjects, too, snuffed out the focus facilitated by the official curriculum and, therefore, the mental discipline it was meant to foster. Instead, the loudest and crassest received the highest applause. James McLachlan writes of these societies that they were, "in effect, colleges within colleges. They enrolled most of the students, constructed - and taught - their own curricula, granted their own diplomas, selected and bought their own books, operated their own libraries, developed and enforced elaborate codes of

conduct among their members, and set the personal goals and ideological tone for a majority of the student body.”<sup>76</sup> According to Sheldon, the debate societies did not produce many brilliant statesmen, but it produced a tremendous number of excellent men (that the era of the lawyer-statesman, epitomized by the Founding Fathers, was ending at this time certainly didn't help the failure to produce luminaries). By juxtaposing various opinions, experiences and tastes, the societies had fostered insights into the common life of what would become the professional class. Further, they provided alternative ideas about curriculum and educational practice to those young men who would go on to attempt a reform of higher education. It was, then, here that the first moves towards understanding the professions, including faculty *qua* faculty, as existing for themselves began.

From the Revolution through the 1830s, the class and debating societies dominated the student social scene. This is, again, partly because politics was a primary cultural concern as the country was establishing itself. Every existing college sprouted debating societies with the close of the war. These clubs all had written constitutions and most were quite similar, though they did not feel themselves bound by the constitutions. “The regular programme consisted of prepared orations, debates, declamations, and critical papers treating of literature and science. Extemporaneous speaking was the most common, but the literary dissertations or essays received most attention, and were often spoken of as being of unusual merit.”<sup>77</sup> Student committees judged their peers, rewarding and rejecting as necessary. Humor, literature, and light hearted

writing and orations were a common staple, though by no means the entirety of their activities.

In time, nearly all the schools had two clubs, which then divided campus loyalties, but also gave coherence and vitality to the group identity. Competition between them extended to the selection of members, the size and quality of their libraries and the accumulation of college honors.<sup>78</sup> The libraries were a tremendous addition to students' lives as the college's library was usually small and consisted of older Latin and theological texts; the debating societies offered shelves full of modern political texts. It was a point of pride for societies to have a better library than their rival, so it is not surprising that they worked so hard to build up their libraries.<sup>79</sup> McLachlan writes that at Princeton, students checked out from their own society's library, "an intensely cosmopolitan and sophisticated list... the Whigs extended the formal curriculum by reading Ovid, Tacitus, Terence, Virgil, Herodotus, Homer, Josephus, Juvenal, Pindar, Quintilian, Livy, and others on their own, most often in translation."<sup>80</sup> Some of the texts were read for their particular interest, no doubt, but McLachlan writes that most were read as part of the extra-institutional curriculum that the students themselves developed in their societies. If a student were able, with others in his group, to fulfill the required work, he would get a diploma from the society. Where the diploma ensured ability with texts, engaging in debate showed that the student had facility with the thought behind the text. Topics for debate included public affairs, philosophy, religion, and social issues and questions. So, the debate club provided a well-rounded curriculum, developed by students in collaboration with former members, that

remained beyond the capture of the institution.

While these societies were initially secret, this was not an essential ingredient. Nor were initiation rites, which were largely pro forma. As a society's class graduated, they contributed to the hall and it did not take long before the facilities in the hall had far surpassed those of the classroom. Socially, it was better for a student to perform well in the societies than in the classroom and society honors were weighted higher, among students, than college honors. Prestigious alumni, too, advocated for the societies they had grown from. The societies thrived in a time when academic achievement was beyond the ambition of the colleges. If the college was to provide the discipline that would guide all future knowledge acquisition, it was not intended to give students knowledge of the world. Students, as much as possible, abandoned their traditional studies - recitations and oral exams - in favor of theoretical and practical knowledge that offered insights into how the world operated.

It is not for nothing that most of the men who created the new and experimental universities had passed through these clubs while in school and attempted to bring a little of the taste for new ideas and subjects to the schools they sought to form. Crucially, societies also helped to bond past and present members together, as at Commencement alumni returned and offered exhortations to their societies and feasted together. McLachlan concludes from his study that these young men understood that it was their mission to renew the world. "Equipped with a profound faith in the power of oratory, of the pen, and of the printed word, the neohumanistic man of letters of 19<sup>th</sup> century America saw himself as a culture-shaping hero, bent on



the reformation of society according to the ideals transmitted in the student societies and colleges. Some would try to reshape existing institutions according to these ideals, or to embody them in new institutions. Others were among the leaders in the scores of reform movements that characterized the United States of the 1810s, 1820s, and 1830s.”<sup>81</sup> So, past members continued to influence the curriculum and shape of education that the students were developing. It is my argument that reformers, almost all of whom had come through these societies, sought to create a new educational system built upon these experiences, as well as their experiences in Europe. The new educational system, if they were to have their way, would in fact capture student developed curriculum and activities, institutionalizing them, but also bringing them under the purview of the professional academic rather than the student.

#### *D. Riots*

Students often had cause to confront the college *en masse* and demand better treatment (often in the form of better food). Many of these rebellions, according to Sheldon, were quite well organized and only rarely turned violent. Students voted, as a class, whether to strike or boycott to effect their ends (classes were also involved when situations did turn violent, but more on that in the next sub-section). Other than food, students worried about the arbitrary judgment of faculty by which Commencement honors, which helped recommend or place students in professions, were awarded. At the same time, when colleges changed their curriculum or scholarly practices without proper warning, students turned to rebellion. Any change that promised more work

was vociferously rejected. In 1790, for example, Harvard attempted to enforce public examinations, the students rebelled, turning finally to violence to prevent this change which was forced on them after they had already been enrolled.

Over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, students began to get a bit older and the rote memorization, early chapels, capricious punishment and terrible food (A.M. Bevis' work *Diets and Riots* is a particularly entertaining account of the myriad food riots at Harvard) were less likely to impress the student. Discipline, the hallmark of the colleges, faced a serious threat: Sheldon writes that, "Profane cursing and swearing, the frequenting of taverns and alehouses, the custom of keeping wine, beer, and distilled liquors in college rooms, all increased, to the sorrow of the governing authorities."<sup>82</sup> More worrisome, however, was the new direction of student activity: organizing and inciting riots. Regardless of the college rules passed or punishments meted, students did not give up these new habits. That there were few enduring means to punish students - expulsion was both theologically and financially difficult - did not help the faculties cause. Furthering the trouble, fractious faculty and student relations made negotiating or tempering student expectations nearly impossible. Low level antagonism, such as drawing out faculty and tutors to attend to mischief at night was a favorite past time of students, though the enmity could quickly escalate. It bears comment that early college architecture was not built for surveillance and, instead, offered a ripe setting for ribaldry and clandestine activity. Put together, student life in the colleges was, from the mid-century on, characterized by student/faculty antagonism and riot.

Through the 17<sup>th</sup> century, most cases of student misconduct were solitary incidents and were dealt with through shaming of the student. Corporal punishment or expulsion was occasionally resorted to in cases of “fornication, theft, or assault.” This began to change as Harvard's enrollments began to rise in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. S.E. Morrison writes that, “The increase came largely from the seaports which reaped the first harvests from land speculation and West Indian commerce, and the rum business... The new crop of young men came to be made gentlemen, not to study.”<sup>83</sup> The highest number of enrolled students in the 17<sup>th</sup> century was twenty-two in 1695; by 1718, there were a hundred and twenty-four students. This change in the composition of the student body, brought about through Leverett's work with the Boston elite, and the expectations of these students affected misconduct. Moore cites four particular changes: a large increase in the number of misdemeanors, parties and pranks, debauchery and petty theft - “the kinds of crimes that increasing affluence encouraged” - and, most disconcerting, group misconduct announced itself. In 1728, twenty-two students were, “Variously punished for ‘nocturnal expeditions’ and ‘entertainments’ beginning with stealing and roasting geese and ending with drunken riots.”<sup>84</sup> Gambling was popular throughout the 1730s; a large number of students were punished for violating chapel rules; many students in 1766 and 1767 were punished for contacting venereal diseases.

Riots typically exploded around Commencement ceremonies, Guy Fawkes Day, or were a response to bad food. The Bad Butter Rebellion of 1766 is one of the most

famous. In it, a complaint about rancid butter, “escalated to a highly charged debate between the students, headed by the governor’s son, and the board of overseers, headed by the governor, over the obligation to obey an unjust sovereign.”<sup>85</sup> The rebels negotiated a truce wherein they signed a confession, but faced no consequences.

In any given year, it was likely that mischief or trouble originated with a core of agitators. Moore writes that, “Such repetitions and linkages indicated that from time to time cliques of students existed from whom much of the misconduct emanated. The members of these cliques often included the sons of the great families of Boston such as the Winthrops, Brattles, and Saltonstalls, as well as the sons of the newly rich merchants and traders.”<sup>86</sup> These students were often the ringleaders in riots and also engaged in more licentious behavior (such as a 1735 “great debauch” in a student’s room). Charles Nisbet, the Scottish president of Dickinson College, declaimed these students at the close of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. He found no authority on which to punish them because their parents would not stand for any serious rebuke. Students absented themselves whenever they desired and received no punishment; they were “generally very averse to Reading or thinking, & expect to learn every thing in a short Time without Application, & there are Quacks in sundry Parts of the Country, who flatter Expectations of this Nature, & undertake to teach young Men every thing that can be taught, by Way of Amusement, & in a short time.”<sup>87</sup>

Banding together, some of the poorer (and typically older) students would occasionally form societies to protect themselves and the school. Harvard's Association for the Suppression of Vice,<sup>88</sup> formed in the aftermath of the Bad Butter Rebellion,

offered a means by which to inform on those who stepped too far while also ensuring a modicum of protection to those who ratted on their mates. These student were not opposed to frivolity, “cider parties” and gambling were common occurrences in their ranks, but on the whole appeared to want different things from College than their younger peers. The Colleges did what they could to exacerbate the antagonism between these positions so as to gain allies among students: the poor students, who throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> century accounted for between  $\frac{1}{4}$  or  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the student population at Harvard, were often paid by the Colleges to inform on their peers. The ranks of the tutors were often filled with these students who, lacking family connections to place them, needed more time to find and prove themselves in their chosen profession.

On the whole, argues Moore, these earlier students were rowdy, not revolutionary. They did not dispute that the college officers had the right to make laws and did not find the enforcement of broken laws onerous. As long as the punishment fit the crime, they also did not protest. The law was what it was; they may have wanted to explore as much freedom as permissible under those laws, but they did not expect the overturning of those laws. Mockery, formality and ceremony seem to have been the reception of the law and its consequences. The numerous food riots, too, were not a call to revolution, but to edible food.

### *The Dawn of a New Age*

Gripped in the thrall of the Revolutionary War, however, students mixed the rhetoric of revolution with their basic demands for better food. Where the

revolutionaries had, as Becker notes, found in the Rights of Man what they could not find in their rights as citizens (the justification for revolt), the students, too, took to demanding better treatment not as students, but by their claim to be men. Uprisings became a common experience throughout the colonial and Republican eras. Harvard was closed for a month in 1766 and, two years later, several students were expelled for their role in another rebellion; in 1807, all school operations ceased and several students were expelled and/or beaten.<sup>89</sup> 1819 saw freshmen and sophomores rebel at the quality of the Commons and in 1828 the famous Bread and Butter Rebellion shut down the campus. In 1834, another long rebellion resulted in the destruction of property. In 1830, Yale experienced a massive uprising known as the Conic Section's Rebellion whose root lay in a change in the method of teaching math (they were being told demonstrate proofs on the blackboard rather than their books). Most of the class refused to recite and others signed a petition. The faculty acted quickly and expelled forty-one students. No other school would accept them and they were forced to negotiate with the administration. This was the last of the great rebellions at Yale during the mid-century.

Princeton's Great Rebellion of 1807 illustrates both the damage done to the colleges and the types of student who was at the forefront of the action. In that April, a great number of students rioted, shuttering Princeton's doors for a decade. One of the ringleaders, Abel P. Upshur, would go on to become the Secretary of State for the US. Upshur, like many of the rioters, was a Virginian from a wealthy plantation family. He was brought before the Board as one of those who led students to, "resist the

authority of the College, and he persisted in adhering to the principles of the combination.”<sup>90</sup> All the students were expelled, though most transferred to William & Mary or Yale. At William & Mary, one of the Princeton rioters, Andrew Hunter Holmes, helped incite another riot and was again expelled. (Holmes’ brothers all achieved a level of fame: his oldest brother was a member of the House of Representatives and later governor of Mississippi and would subsequently become the senator of Mississippi; Hugh Holmes was a judge in the general court of Virginia. When Andrew died in battle, he was a major in the army and the Virginia Legislature awarded his relatives a gold sword in his memory. Holmes’ sisters married prominent men and their sons populated legislatures, judges benches, and the upper ranks of the military.) The disciplinary action of the colleges seems to have largely been a mirage, as there was effectively no curb on those students who brought in tuition. There are a few reasons expulsion was more bark than bite: first, they could easily transfer to another school; second, the schools own theological positions stated that God could transform the student if the student would only submit to His authority; and third, the tuition they brought in was enough to offset the punishment.

Several of the state schools found it difficult to appropriate money from their legislatures because of the rebellions brewing on their campuses. Remembering that college attendance was at a low ebb, institutionally if not in total numbers, the ferocity of the students is a little more understandable. While others their age were out making their fortunes in the new country and its frontier, those in college were confronted by a disciplinary regime and a curriculum known more for rigidity than freedom of

thought in the purpose of furthering their parent's ambitions. Those students who did matriculate sought to lay claim to the rights and dignity they were afforded by the Constitution and, when rebuffed by college presidents - who saw the college as the *paterfamilias*, the institutional embodiment of patriarchal authority - they revolted, using what Rodney Messenger terms, "student's propensity to form horizontal bonds of sympathy and loyalty" to defy the college.<sup>91</sup> In fact, Geiger writes that, "In the first three decades of the [19<sup>th</sup>] century, colleges experience the worst student violence of their histories... these years were distinguished by episodes of collective resistance to college authority."<sup>92</sup> However, unlike the German student revolts at the time,<sup>93</sup> these students had been unable to organize themselves across campuses and saw few tangible results as a result.

The administrative and public call for a return to order was swift and stern. At Yale and Princeton, presidents Dwight and Green saw their mission as "inducing religious revivals among [their] students."<sup>94</sup> This resolve to rededicate the Colleges to properly fitting minds saw the eradication of the Enlightenment experimentation that characterized the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and the ushering in of a new period of piety spurred by the Second Great Awakening. Yale's Timothy Dwight enforced a new disciplinary regime to sever the connection between politics and students experience of college. Presidents turned their attention to fomenting revival rather than Republican idealism. Many believe that the conservative turn towards more traditional education - away from Republicanism, that is - was a consequence of these unruly



students and the dangerous ideas they'd been taught. For instance, the books and ideas of Thomas Paine, honored for his role in the Revolution, were forbidden on campuses due to his endorsement of the 'infidel philosophy' of the French Revolution. Falling enrollments and student violence dampened what enthusiasm had remained for these colleges and state support quickly dried up.

Geiger records that in the first twenty years of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, more seminaries<sup>95</sup> were opened than colleges.<sup>96</sup> Student unrest was not eliminated, but these moves did temper the political dimension to this unrest. The widespread movement to found seminaries and divest from the colleges because the dangerous germ of revolution in riot had the main effect of weakening the position of those existing colleges and creating a movement for reform by looking to the past. The seminaries were established to reform the old order, but those founded to discipline the old colleges were too small and poorly funded to seriously challenge for long and many were incorporated back into the colleges they'd sought to displace. The increasingly evident mismatch between the social expectation of education and its result called for entirely new approaches to education, not simply the invocation of past forms. The existing colleges seemed to exist only to discipline students, but even in this limited capacity they failed. If higher education was to survive the coming industrialization of the country (and there is no particular reason that it should), it would have to revolutionize itself.

In general, we can say that all of the institutions for governance and knowledge

production were in crisis brought about by transformations in the social, political and economic character of the nation. Internationally, similar forces were transforming the relationships between nations and the competition for markets - for banking and manufacturing concerns - were heating up as Germany became the rival of Britain. For those paying attention to these shifts - ambitious bourgeois networks, older patrician elites, and the nascent working class - it was clear that changes were necessary. What these changes would look like, who would impose and direct them, and how society would be organized in their aftermath were the questions this period left open.

## **Chapter 2: Fits and Starts**

In the first chapter, I tried to show that colleges are always reforming and adjusting based on the interests of faculty, presidents, students, and supporters. Reform, however, was typically a slow process in which the power dynamics between actors remained minimally changed. By the second decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, several new colleges had been created, some of which hoped to radically transform higher education itself, rather than merely reforming it. Other new colleges, born in radically different contexts from those in which the colonial colleges had arisen, had no other choice but to offer a different form than that of their progenitors. Further, a nascent professionalizing movement was beginning to cohere, allowing for faculty to imagine new types of institutions in which they, rather than the president or outside interests, controlled the conditions under which they taught. The development of what became the experiments in higher education throughout the early part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were by no means an even temporal or spatial process. The process doesn't even produce what would be the first proper research universities until the latter half of the century. However, several important developments occur that bear examination.

In this chapter, I'll look at the sheer number of new colleges that were created in this period with an eye towards understanding what whetted the appetites of their founders. Some were attempts to recreate Yale in the Midwest, others were technical schools, and still others focused on populations which had, until then, had little access to higher education. These schools faced particular problems and offered unique solutions - some of which were later widely adopted. At the same time, attempts to

reform or recreate what higher education was within the older colleges were ongoing. The colleges that came in for critique were older and well positioned to defend their place and did so with gusto; further, their students tended to start new colleges out West, so many of the newer colleges remained allied to the older ways. Even still, the different conditions in the West forced experimentation onto all the new schools. For those dedicated reformers, however, it became clear that attempts at reform within the existing and established schools was an arduous, perhaps impossible, process. What they did following is foundational to understanding how higher education became qualitatively different in the 19<sup>th</sup> century than it had been previously. They determined that, in order to get the higher education they desired, they had to found new, sometimes experimental, institutions. They learned from each other and made alliances - with legislatures, with industrial capitalists, with labor organizations - wherever possible in order to advance their goals. These alliances become the bedrock on which higher education grew for the next 120 years; so, I argue, understanding them is crucial to understanding the past and present of higher education.

Graduates of the older colleges, at least those who wanted to remain in higher education, had a couple of options: found new colleges, attempt to create space for themselves and new ideas in the established schools, or organize to bring about a new type of professoriate - one that radically altered the way education in the US was conceived and practiced. I'll look at the schools in the Midwest that, though created by students steeped in the old way of educating, and bound to it, still managed to develop some new forms simply out of necessity. Many other graduates began, in the 1810s, to

travel to Europe to pursue training in the profession of teaching (that is, where the professors themselves were able to control, to at least some extent, the conditions under which they taught and researched) - something as yet unavailable in the US. These students often found their way to the older colleges once back in the US and many then attempted to transform the structure of higher education. They had poor results, on the whole, and set about finding ways to create new institutions based on a different model than that of the older Colonial Colleges. This would become a major story in this period - the self-organization of this disparate crew of graduates as a body capable of founding a new type of institution.

While new colleges were being founded all the time, intentional first steps towards a new type of institution were made at Thomas Jefferson's University of Virginia, rebuffed by the counter moves of the Yale Report, and invigorated by the proposals to found a great university in New York. In the South, conflict spurred by the imperative for the spatial expansion of slavery seemed to provide the necessary impetus to create Southern institutions, while in the North, the advance of industrial capitalism and the growth of New York seemed to provide the conditions under which a new type of education, as yet undefined, but whose methods and subjects were in alignment with the coming age of industrial capitalism, could flourish. While attempts fell short of their target, they showed that new ideas could take shape in institutions built to embody those ideas, where they'd be unthinkable in the old, and that a cadre of men and women were forming who could begin to build new types of institutions. Students, too, had much to react to: westward expansion, European investment in US

manufacturing and commerce, and new careers were obviously new stimuli, but so too were rising enrollments, new academic expectations, and university scrutiny of student organizing. As usual, student life developed within and alongside these social and economic transformations, becoming more complex and adding new forms of sociality: secret Greek letter societies and sporting events, for instance, trace their birth to this era.

This ferment within higher education, sparked of course by the student riots, dire financial straits of most colleges, and the limited educational ambition described in the last chapter, was seen as an urgent cause by educational reformers. That so many colleges were being formed, and that they needed to compete for students, also created an opening through which new professors could experiment from the beginning. It was at the old colleges, those accounting for the most students at a campus level, and those that had been around the longest, that found it the most difficult to adapt. After all, why should they? Every improvement they made cost money. Michael B. Katz, in his review of literature on 19<sup>th</sup> century colleges, writes that, “The average direct cost of college tuition, fees, room and board rose from 1/3 of a skilled manual laborers’ salary to 60% between 1800 and 1860. In the East, by 1860 the cost of attending one of the more well known schools represented close to all of workers’ annual income.”<sup>97</sup> Because they were not yet compelled to change, they could afford to make small tweaks to their structure without radically altering the form. This would be untenable by the close of the century, however.

For reformers, based largely in the older schools and related by blood to many of

the oldest families in the US, the crisis in higher education seems to have embraced six themes. First, student violence and disruption had gotten way out of hand. Second, the subjects and method of teaching seemed, increasingly, out of date - rather than fitting students for the world, they seemed to ensure that they would be left out of the new world. Third, admissions standards - still reliant on knowledge of Greek and Latin - were such that the colleges were shutting themselves off from the very students - those not born of the patrician New England families, but whose fathers were prosperous sea captains or town founders - who could most profit from an education and who could, in turn, most profit the colleges. Fourth, falling enrollments and the rapid diffusion of colleges throughout the country meant there was very little money to go around and even fewer qualified students. Fifth, and perhaps most damning, the colleges seemed to offer nothing for the young men - and, sometimes, women - who wanted to make a name for themselves in the dawning industrial age. Sixth, reformers capitalized on the fierce populism of the post-Republican period - a populism that would usher Andrew Jackson to the US presidency in 1829 - to demand democratic reforms in the colleges. Becker writes that, "As early as 1830 the workers of Philadelphia declared 'that there can be no freedom without a wide diffusion of intelligence; that the members of a Republic should all be instructed alike in the nature of their rights and duties as human beings, and as citizens;... that until means of equal instruction shall be equally secured to all, liberty is an unmeaning word, and equality an empty shadow.'"<sup>98</sup>

A general crisis of the professions, too, was cause for consternation. While lawyers and doctors dominate the imagination when one thinks of professionals, throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century they experienced a series of difficulties and setbacks that severely curtailed their power to influence society. As Gerard Gawalt has shown, there were very serious reasons for a reaction against lawyers as early as the 1820s. He writes, “Careful study of the development of the Massachusetts legal profession during the century, 1740-1840, indicates that a lawyer class based on education, marriage alliances, economic prosperity, and paternal occupations certainly did exist and did dominate the most prestigious and lucrative political and judicial positions after the Revolutionary War.”<sup>99</sup> (It should be noted, of course, that not all lawyers attained such an elevated status. As Philip Gaines shows in his study of the legal profession, for most of the early 18<sup>th</sup> century and much of the middle 19<sup>th</sup> century, most lawyers were simply not held in high regard. Those that did not come from influential and wealthy families did not, as often, find the legal profession a means towards prosperity).<sup>100</sup> Jacksonian democracy, in fact, can, in part, be seen as an assault on the lawyer-statesman<sup>101</sup> (often with a degree from Harvard or Yale) that dominated post-revolutionary politics - Gaines writes that lawyers often talked about their moral duty as a defense against the trope of rascalion lawyer, even back in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Following these setbacks, lawyers had a much more circumscribed role. From the 1820s onward, the legal profession and legal education began to establish law schools and publish about their own profession as they were forced to re-evaluate and reconstitute what it meant to be a lawyer. According to William Johnson, in his study



of doctors and lawyers in late 19<sup>th</sup> century Wisconsin, law schools as they existed previously were a means towards legal knowledge and not a means towards certification of general knowledge. It would take until the 1880s and 90s, following the adoption of the bar and legal schools, before they would again have independent power. In large part, the legal profession was to become an advocate for the client based not on right or wrong, but on the law as it currently existed.<sup>102</sup> No longer to make the law, but to parse the law as it exists. Where the bulk of the 19<sup>th</sup> century saw lawyers trying to project an image of themselves as upright, moral and honorable, by the close of the century - with advent of a new type of professionalism (that born of scholarly aptitude and merit) - lawyers had, according to Gaines, become focused on the practice of law and the “practical matters of skill, expertise, effectiveness - an emphasis in keeping with a new conception of the lawyer as technician and of legal education as the training of experts.”<sup>103</sup>

Meanwhile, as Johnson notes, the proliferation of quacks, irregular doctors and homeopaths, was undermining the authority of trained doctors, while the isolation of the profession gave them little social contact with their peers. It is true that doctors had helped create medical schools throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, though these largely amounted to attempts to codify schools of thought regarding medicine, not provide a general praxis of medicine. As such, they could not be the cohesive element necessary for a national consensus - they certified, if anything, an ideological position. Johnson writes that, “With notions of professional competence in doubt, doctors... responded by heightened attention to the task of defining and enforcing competing conceptions

of orthodoxy,” largely through, “the formation of medical societies, the passage of legislation, and the establishment of medical schools.”<sup>104</sup> However, the power of the professionals would not wax until the arrival of the research university.

Preachers, too, were beginning to re-estimate what it meant to professionalize. Following the Great Awakening and increased immigration to the United States, the denominations were determining that it was necessary to train more preachers and to do it better than they had in the past. How to go about that was the question. The development of seminaries was deemed the ideal means. Natalie A. Naylor writes that, “Education for the ministry became formally organized, systematized, and extended in the specialized theological seminaries which substantially improved professional preparation.”<sup>105</sup> Because the denominations had to license preachers, and their old line leaders were beginning to die, it was in the interests of the denominations to develop a form of education that could get them the number of pastors they needed in as quick a time as possible, all while giving the best ministerial education possible. However, it was also the perceived failure of existing education that spurred the development of the seminary. Because Unitarians had taken over at Harvard, Congregationalists founded Andover in 1807 as a bastion of their creed. In fact, the first head of Andover was a former president of Harvard, Eliphalet Pearson, who had resigned due to the number of “liberals,” according to Naylor, who had taken up teaching positions at Harvard.<sup>106</sup> Seeing the success of Andover, however, other denominations took up this specialized form of education. Unitarians at Harvard, for example, created a divinity school in 1811. They were joined by other seminaries

throughout the land. By 1840, Naylor writes, there were more than fifty such schools in operation.

For students, becoming a pastor was a great way of following God's plan for their lives or, from another angle, gain leadership and influence within a community. Naylor writes that, "Seminary-educated ministers constituted a growing elite in the profession. The theological seminaries were both a product of professionalization of the ministry and a means of contributing to professional self-consciousness among the clergy."<sup>107</sup> The seminary, as home of the post-undergraduate education, offered a better path towards employment and prestige than did any other educational endeavor throughout much of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They had better libraries, greater access to scholarly publications (including those of Germany), and funding (including funding for students) than did any other form of higher education. Naylor even asserts that many of those men who would one day become professors had their first post-graduate education in a seminary. Because professors were not yet professionals, and clergy filled the ranks of the professors, those men who had gone through seminary were the bulk of the professoriate for much of the antebellum years.<sup>108</sup> Further, because seminaries required an undergrad education, they began the movement of professionals to place collegiate experience as a central pillar of professional development.

Though not yet a profession, the training proffered by professors was also under attack. Many believed it to simply be better to explore, apprentice, or forge a new company (perhaps making bootstraps?) to supply the nation's need for commodities

and the blooming industrial markets with machines. In this view, professors simply couldn't educate for the times. From another angle came an attack on professors, though this was from their former students. As consolidation in the ownership of land in the established states forced people into cities or out to the West and farmers to develop their crops as commodities, Germany offered a model whereby knowledge itself could become an input for industrial production. Through combinations of skill and investigation, professionals trained in the German university augured the rise of a new class of workers that could found its consciousness on owning, or at least managing, the means of the production of that knowledge necessary for industrial innovation. The professor, here, was integral to the functioning of capitalist society, though in a different guise than that offered by the old colleges. The gentlemanly life to be attained through proper comportment, in these conditions, seemed an absurd anachronism to many. It is these concerns that animated the private and public discussions of reformers and dreamers.

The slow transformation in the training of ministers was an important step in the realization of new types of education, but there was another emerging profession that also offered reformers encouragement: engineering. From the vantage point of capitalist accumulation, the development of engineers in the second decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was of tremendous importance: both to the nation and the process of making natural resources into the raw materials for capital's use. Up until the War of 1812, Terry Reynolds contends, the education of engineers could remain in apprenticeships

because these were the best, as yet, known means of producing quality engineers. However, national demand for engineers following that war meant that engineers could not, through apprenticeship alone, reproduce themselves at a high enough number.<sup>109</sup> It was not just the government that required more engineers; the spread westward, by boosters and their followers, required new roads, canals, and trains, and these required engineers.

Following the French, military schools (such as West Point, founded in 1802) were created, while, following the British efforts to get useful knowledge into the hands of those who would use it, polytechnic schools (such as Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, founded in 1824) were created. These schools were implicit critiques of colleges specializing in general education: they did not require an undergraduate degree to enter and they foreswore much of the general knowledge that the mainstream colleges so prized. They aimed to train engineers. These schools, further, were cheaper to operate in their narrow purview. At some of the traditionally minded colleges, engineering was added to the curriculum or made a specialty. According to Reynolds, there were four of these schools before 1840 (the University of Vermont, Columbia, Princeton and New York University (NYU)). Before the Civil War, they were joined by four more northern schools. In the West, especially Ohio, engineering courses began to proliferate at several colleges. The University of Virginia, too, tried out this method for half a decade. By the 1850s, however, this method fell out of favor. It simply could not provide the training necessary to fully educate an adequate engineer.

Throughout the South, colleges began to demand that engineering simply become

part of the general education. Many schools in the North followed Columbia, which, in 1830, created a new bachelor's degree, focusing on scientific education. Some other schools created special engineering schools as adjuncts to their main college. Before the Civil War, these schools only existed in the North, but they rapidly spread West and South. Yale (its scientific school was created in 1846 and offered engineering in 1852) and Harvard (The Lawrence Scientific School in 1847) were the first to create adjunct colleges to focus on the sciences, but other schools followed suit. It is also true that the economic depression of 1837, caused by massive engineering projects and the speculation upon which they required, dulled the need for engineers for some of the mid-century. For most of these attempts, only one faculty member was required in order to start something, and when they left, the program disintegrated.<sup>110</sup> It was not necessarily institutional will, but professorial curiosity, that sparked a move towards scientific work. The public was not yet demanding that engineers be produced to a sufficient level that would allow the proliferation of programs at what would be expected following the Civil War.

Reform and experimentation, especially away from New England, were not engaged in as the attempts of young professionals to empower themselves. Oftentimes they were undertaken because a school had no other choice. Educational scholars such as David Potts point out, accurately, that the colleges that came to exist in the antebellum age often had a lot of community support and made themselves important in the day to day life of their region. In order to pay back this community support,

schools had to offer courses that the community wanted and the colleges had to be administered in such a way that the community felt it belonged to them. Boosters were instrumental in this process. Boosters were typically men who owned a lot of property in a given geographic area and then did whatever they could to increase those property values. That meant starting colleges, banks, infrastructure, and bringing transportation (such as trains). Potts cites Timothy Boutelle, who helped create Colby College and Waterville, the town Colby resides in, was emblematic of the booster. He, and his kind, did all this because, “the private and public interests of a man like Timothy Boutelle were tightly interwoven. By bringing a college, a bridge, and a railroad to Waterville, Boutelle improved not only his own cultural and economic status, but also that of the town and region to which he had committed his talents and energies.”<sup>111</sup> While Colby was a Baptist institution, the whole town and region were invested in its thriving. In fact, towns often pledged several thousands of dollars to the founding and propagation of the college. Colleges were seen as good by town fathers because students and teachers would come from outside of town and invest money in the town, and colleges helped increase property values. In the end, colleges and universities become major economic drivers for the areas in which they reside because businesses form around them as a tertiary sector, students, faculty and support staff (when they come into being) put their money into rents and commodities produced in the area. By the 1880s, state wide centralization of the various religious sects meant that local support and direction became subordinated to the state centralization of funding and direction.

With the spread of higher educational institutions, more students could gain access to some type of higher education. These schools, helping to anchor new towns and cities throughout the expanding nation, also helped urbanize many youth as they attended college and took jobs in the towns that needed their intellectual labor, according to Colin Burke. Potts continues, “The curricula of these institutions, it can be argued persuasively, was intellectually vital and responsive within the cultural context of this period.”<sup>112</sup> In order to attract students, these colleges had to open their curricula to become attractive to potential students. The development of science, especially, was of interest to students. Not science as an abstract good, but science that could help develop regional business. That these schools were folded into the cultural and economic mission of their regions is crucial - they were a response in two particular ways: 1) of a capitalist system that needed methods by which to amplify the output of labor and 2) of the need for adequate educators in the increasingly far flung higher education system. Colleges were integral to the growth of the regions they were located in and, therefore, were often a source of pride and the generation of wealth.

There are beginning to be, then, the development of several forms of higher education, none of which were formalized or sorted in a hierarchy. The process of rationalizing and formalizing the relationships between these schools, and developing the leading edge of capitalist education, was to be the project of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

### *Self-organization of Graduates*

Beyond the self-organization of students while in college, dissatisfied graduates,



too, began the work of organizing a new educational model. They began overseas, where the reorganization of German higher education offered a new model as well as in Scotland, where the Scottish Enlightenment, bourgeois capitalism and university thought offered a model akin to the state sponsored education of Germany. Between these two emerging models of capitalist education, students from the US began to draw inspiration as to how a new model could work in the US. The experience was illuminating both for the men who travelled abroad and for those who corresponded with them. The first two students to travel to Germany (for the University of Göttingen), George Ticknor and Edward Everett, began a long line of US students who spent time abroad in German and Scottish universities. Students used their attendance as a force in advocating for forms of education consonant with developments in the political economy of the post-revolutionary era. In these two countries, the differences between the former colonies and these industrial powers were put into stark relief.

Libraries, writes Ticknor in a letter to the Boston merchant Stephen Higginson, were among the chief amenities necessary for a real university that the US lacked. “I cannot better explain to you the difference between our University in Cambridge [Harvard] and the one here than by telling you that here I hardly say too much when I say that it *consists* in the Library, and that at Cambridge the Library is one of the last things thought and talked about.”<sup>113</sup> That the debating societies housed greater, and more accessible, libraries than the colleges pointed to the institutional inattention to the direction the leading edge of academic work was moving in.<sup>114</sup> Even though

Princeton (though we could substitute any of the other colleges at the time) had accumulated more than 7,000 books by 1816, it was open for 3 hours per week and there were strict rules on what could be checked out. Meanwhile, American Whig Society members made 6,481 withdrawals from their own library between 1813 and 1817. Further, this did not improve with time: James McLachlan writes, “the Victorian period, when books were plentiful and cheap and faculties larger, saw only steady decline at Princeton, from five one-hour openings a week in 1831 to a single one-hour opening in a week in the early 1860s.”<sup>115</sup> For a new breed of students for whom Germany beckoned, typically attending the older schools on the East Coast rather than the new colleges established in the West, the Library was the site of investigation, of the advancement of knowledge, while in the US it was quite common for a student to ignore books and the college's library throughout the entirety of his studies. McLachlan writes that the literary societies were where students poured concentrated their academic pursuits. Ticknor concludes by arguing that, “I am persuaded that the further progress of learning among us depends on the entire change of the system against which it is directed.”<sup>116</sup> Institutions, he believed, rather than students, should be determining the character of academic interest.

The advantage of Europe went beyond just its libraries, however. From Germany, Ticknor wrote to Thomas Jefferson (who was seeking to create a new university in Virginia) that professors have the freedom to teach whatever they might desire without fear of public, state or religious censure. The same occurred in France and, he claimed, this had direct relation to their Revolution; if such an education were opened

in England, there would be another revolution there. In Germany, however, “it passes as a matter of course and produces no effect but that of stimulating the talents of their thinking men.”<sup>117</sup> In this way, the modern university is understood as a central institution of bourgeois democracy. Here, the ideological foundations for bourgeois government, as well as the scientific foundation for industry, were promulgated to great effect. German, and to a lesser degree French, education matched the bourgeois time, and therefore bolstered their system of governance and culture. In fact, advances in German universities led Ticknor to confide to Jefferson that Germany was at least twenty years advanced in scholarship than England was and that, therefore, the US should be looking to Germany in order to develop new state and educational forms.

That German faculty were organized differently, and had different loyalties, than US professors had a lot to do with this advanced scholarship. Steven Turner, writing about the reforms in Germany, notes that professors in the 19<sup>th</sup> century German university were loyal to the institution, but also to the specialized field he worked in. Loyalty to the institution meant striving to be a quality teacher, being ecumenical with other faculty, and working for the good of the particular university. Loyalty to the academic field takes its importance in standards concerning “research, publication, and professional interaction. The discipline as a whole and the specialist community in particular define these professorial values, for they govern the struggle for reputation and recognition within the discipline community.”<sup>118</sup> While both loyalties might be felt, the latter takes precedence as it affects salary, prestige, and promotion opportunities. In fact, the German university system appears, according to Turner, first in Germany in

the early 19<sup>th</sup> century and would certainly have been noted by US visitors. That said, professors in Germany, throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, came from both the academic and non-academic world. In the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, however, Göttingen University had more than two-thirds of its professoriate who saw themselves as full-time academics who wanted to work within a specialized field. The other one-third were still active practitioners in the fields in which they taught. Before the professoriate could be wholly organized as a profession for itself, however, it would need disciplinary communities to develop enough to be able to determine who could speak in their name. “The rise of such disciplinary communities,” Turner writes, “in the later 18<sup>th</sup> century can be traced in the emergence of self-conscious schools, the propagation of specific research techniques, and the proliferation of specialized journals.”<sup>119</sup> These had yet to be developed in the United States, but were a necessary condition for the academic ambitions of those men who travelled to Europe<sup>120</sup> to continue their education.

Joseph Green Cogswell, who travelled to Göttingen following Ticknor and Everett, reported to Stephen Higginson (his benefactor) that those two had made an impact in Europe and were making the US proud. He then writes, “I am not in the least Germanized and yet it appeals to me when I think of the difference between an education here and in America; the great evil with us, is in our primary schools, the best years for learning are trifled and whiled away.”<sup>121</sup> He notes that the point of society in the US was to bring about practical men, but that this could much better be done by preparing students in youth. As it was, these years were invariably wasted and

meant that the higher education could never approach that of Germany as students could not be trusted with commensurate courses. The interest of US students in higher education was not the problem, but the lack of infrastructure, culminating in something like a German research university, was.

Cogswell also notes a change in attitude of the learned men in Germany and in the US. He writes that in the cultured circles of the Northeast, social life anticipates the return of Everett - as a man of general letters; however, the new model of the professor in Germany eschews the socialite life for that of the investigative scholar. For his part, when Cogswell returned from Germany, he became the head librarian at Harvard before helping to found, in 1854, the New York Public Library system which, upon its creation, was meant only as a research library. In between, he partnered with George Bancroft, with whom he had been a student in Germany, to form the Round Hill School, an experimental school. Bancroft, while reflecting on his experience while in Germany, enthused that the sciences were, “carried on here as a trade, though an elevating and important one... It is admirable to see with what calmness and patience every author is read, every manuscript collected, every work perused, which can be useful, be it dull or interesting, the work of genius or stupidity... It is refreshing to see what men can do, though labouring under the most unfavourable circumstances; and to think, how nobly all good literature would thrive, if we could transplant it to America... if learning would only go to school to religion.”<sup>122</sup> The professional nature of the professoriate in Germany was a stimulating example for those who saw amateurism and unproductive practices dominating the US educational scene and

who were, through shared travels and correspondence, attempting to bring forth something similar in the US.

It was not just the men and women who travelled to Europe that created change, however. Westward expansion and a looming conflict between slave owning states and their northern neighbors created an imperative for schools to churn out young graduates versed in the ideology of their regions cause - and thus for the formation of colleges in the south of equal stature to those in the north. Expansion, obviously, leads to the creation of jobs for faculty members - faculty members who tended to be younger and who tended to have ambitions within the academy rather than outside of it.

At its root the necessity of new institutions was a result of the objective reality of a changing economy and the subjective pushes and pulls exerted on individuals and groups as they attempted to navigate a world increasingly hostile to the institutions meant to shepherd a society built on merchant capitalism and slavery. “The eclipse of established colonial hierarchies after 1828,” write Jencks and Riesman, “created a vacuum which almost everyone was eager to fill, but nobody succeeded. The rest of the nineteenth century therefore saw a continuous struggle for power and legitimacy between the many subcultures that flourished in the rapidly growing nation.<sup>123</sup>” Because change was rooted in objective conditions, there were regional differences in the various attempts to create an adequate higher education. In this chapter, we’ll discuss these regional differences broadly as the South, the Northeast, and the Midwest. Because student life has always been dynamic and, as the previous chapter

argued, a spur towards the emergence of new forms, the chapter will conclude by looking at how they adapted to the new realities of collegiate life.

#### *A. University of Virginia and the South*

The social (chivalry) and economic (slavery) conditions of the South had, at some point, to call for particularly Southern institutions. There are a number of reasons for this. First, elite Northern attitudes toward the South have always been steeped in condescension: Ralph Waldo Emerson, a Harvard graduate, wrote that Southerners were good for nothing, spoiled and useless - “The proper way of treating them is not deference, but to say... ‘Fiddle faddle,’ in answer to each solemn remark about ‘The South<sup>124</sup>.’” Further, the Missouri Compromise of 1819, wherein the western expansion of slavery was curbed, though at the expense of Missouri and the Arkansas territory, was seen as an attack on Southern sovereignty and regional autonomy - and its basic ability to reproduce its economic system. In editorials and writings throughout the South, the theme of Southern Nationalism was connected to an education system designed for the particularities of Northern/Southern competition. As quoted by Bruce Eelman, Peter Wallace, the editor of the Spartanburg *Carolina Spartan*, declares, “an educated and intelligent people, cannot be enslaved.”<sup>125</sup> While offering a common justification for the slavery of African people, Wallace made sure that his readers understood that it was incumbent upon the South to educate its own people so as to avoid financial and cultural servitude to the North. Southern culture, relying on the enforced slavery of hundreds of thousands of humans to tend to its agricultural

product, meant that schools and education, too, would look different.

Second, the South lacked the urban growth of the North because commodity production took place on massive plantations rather than in cities. Public schooling, John Hardin Best points out, was created for an industrializing people and, therefore, concerned itself with industrial matters.<sup>126</sup> In the South, that element was lacking. For a Southern gentleman, the historian Jennings Wagoner comments, education was crucial, but only insofar as it helped him and his offspring demonstrate honor. Wagoner writes that classical literature was essential, though the simple pursuit of knowledge was frivolous: a Southern family sought a “a veneer of learning,” not its abundance.<sup>127</sup> Further, the Southern elite, who could provide for the the education of their own children, preferred, according to Eelman, to spend their tax money on property protection (land and slaves) rather than education. Seeking to transform this worry, some legislators, such as Joseph Wofford Tucker of Spartanburg, argued that education would firmly entrench the idea that “every white man shall *feel* he is free and every negro *know* that he is a slave.”<sup>128</sup> A strong education system would entrench elite attitudes throughout the South and allow for a more spirited defense against Northern intellectual attacks. For highly educated men like Thomas Jefferson, anti-education views were short sighted and could only lead the South to ruin (for Jefferson, another particular worry was that government would escape from the common people because they would have no framework for understanding its machinations without education).

Education in the South, education historian John Best writes, did two necessary things at once: provide democratic citizenship for the educated and auxiliary (or worse)



status for the uneducated. Across the board, for those educated and uneducated alike, the dominant forms of teaching were non-formal: they were the family, the church, and the plantation. Common Schools in the South were given a spur by the same religious reform movements that affected schooling in the North, but the university situation had to rely on different stimuli. Even still, absent quality higher education, there was little reason the plantation could not provide the bulk of educational experience for slave and free alike. Because, of course, the term “uneducated,” is not entirely the correct word: the plantation provide the bulk of education in that it taught slave and master alike. The slave, as a natural beast, deserved to be dominated and controlled by the master. In order for Common Schools and universities to flourish, the plantation had to cease structuring all life in the South. Another, as yet absent, force (industrial capitalism) had to prevail.

For many other Southern men, most ably articulated by Thomas Jefferson, Harvard and Princeton were part of a Northern ideological front aimed to steal and indoctrinate Virginian (and Southern) students in Northern lifestyles.<sup>129</sup> To counter this, a form of higher education was required that united religion and statecraft in the colleges themselves. This was not, in and of itself, all that was required, however. To attract students, a new school couldn't merely advertise that it was opposed to northern hegemony. It must, at the same time, offer the student education and training in fields of study adequate to the time and taught by faculty who were experts at the body of knowledge and who, at the same time, could communicate that knowledge to

the student. In this way, the leading lights of society were invited to take an interest in the creation and development of the crown jewel of Southern education: the University of Virginia.

Crucially, however, the advance of educational techniques was not just a Southern concern. While cloaked in some rhetoric of Southern pride, the University of Virginia was seen as an important step by reformers in both the North and the South. George Ticknor, who had gone to Europe after college and who was one of the brightest students of the post-Revolutionary era, wrote in a letter to Thomas Jefferson that, “I think a general & well-grounded discontent is beginning to prevail in relation to the system pursued at all our colleges in New England, which, being substantially the same, that existed here [England] a century and a half ago, can hardly be suited to our present circumstances and wants.”<sup>130</sup> With the proliferation of new colleges over the length and breadth of the US and its territories, schools found that, in order to lure students to their campus, they had to adapt to local conditions and prejudices. However, to pioneer a proper mode of education appropriate to the form of government and economy in the US was, believed Ticknor, “very difficult within the limits of the ancient system, & none has yet dared to pass these limits.”<sup>131</sup> He believed that Jefferson’s innovations had the potential to surpass this “ancient system” by moving beyond the principles set by colleges developed to serve a monarchy. Those interested in new forms were anxious for the University of Virginia (UVA) to work so that it might be the new example that others could innovate from.

Jefferson began planning for UVA following an abortive effort to reform his alma mater, William & Mary. It would take a half a century before he was able to get UVA up and going, however. From the first, he desired his university to receive government funding so as to remain above the squabbles of sectarianism and to ensure a level of support that would aid in the administration of the effort. This, though, required that the university was “worth patronizing with the public support.”<sup>132</sup> For Jefferson, a close connection existed between educating everyone in the state in Republican modes of enlightenment thought and democracy and in the production of a class dedicated to democratic governance. It *also* entailed full time faculty who had been trained for the position.

After leaving government in 1809, Jefferson sought to establish such a college in Virginia. He joined with group of men interested in creating an academy and together they formed Central College in 1816 - a stopgap move for them. The Virginia legislature, in 1818, approved \$15,000 for a state funded university and named Jefferson head of the commission to found the university. The Rockfish Gap Commission was to determine the site, validity and breadth of Jefferson’s plan. They first had to work out what higher education was to do: they determined that primary education should give everyone the ability to transact their own business; allow for him to calculate, express his ideas, and maintain his contracts & accounts in writing; improve his morals by reading; understand patriotism and neighborliness; “and, in general, to observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social relations under which he shall be placed.”<sup>133</sup> Higher education, however, required something more

and was, in turn, required by the state. It was for those who would be statesmen, legislators, judges, and those “on whom public prosperity, & individual happiness are so much to depend.”<sup>134</sup> Rather than the production of lawyers, doctor, and clergy, it was to produce men to oversee the smooth functioning of state and civil society. University education must, therefore, concern itself with the nature and forms of government and law; agriculture, manufacturing; and commerce; teaching; math and the physical sciences; “and generally to form them to habits of reflection, and correct action, rendering them examples of virtue to others and of happiness within themselves.”<sup>135</sup> Education was to be expanded far beyond its former disciplinary (in both senses of the word) functions.

The Commission explicitly argued against letting education remain a “private & individual” - one left to the plantation, it seems - affair. The aims and means were too large and imposing to be left to individual whims and would not be able to advance to a sufficient degree without legislative help; essentially, the plantations could no longer control educational content in the coming world. “Education...” the Commission gathered, “engrafts a new man on the native stock, & improves what in his nature was vicious & perverse, into qualities of virtue & social worth; and it cannot be but that each generation succeeding to the knowledge acquired by all those who preceded it, adding to it their own acquisitions & discoveries, and handing the mass down for successive & constant accumulation, must advance the knowledge & well-being of mankind.”<sup>136</sup> Without the advance of education, citizens would remain too locally oriented and lack a relationship to the society that should give them strength. The

orientation of those in a democracy should be towards society, and thus society is responsible for educating them. The idea of accumulating knowledge - through compilation and experience more so than scientific investigation - by which to guide the moral and civic virtue of “the people” was not new, but the means to achieve it were changing.<sup>137</sup> For its secular founders, the university would replace the church in alliance with the state, leading to an enlightened public led by rationality rather than faith.

Towards this end, there was to be no professor of Divinity - the professor of Ethics was to cover what is worth knowing in that area. This did not, Jefferson was at pains to point out, mean that UVA was against all religion; it was against allegiance to any one particular religion in a state institution as this was a step towards intellectual enslavement. Instead, each sect should endow their own professor and was to have space at the University, have access to its grounds and libraries, but not the official endorsement of the University. Rhetorically, the Commission looked to displace religion from its central role in education - see, for instance, how the sects had divested from the older colleges in order to found seminaries! - because catering to the sects was an enervating experience for the colleges.<sup>138</sup> At the same time, clerical opposition to the formation of the university was both a thorn in the side of the founders while, concurrently, proving their point about the dangers of sectarianism.

Thomas Cooper’s career provides a brief illustration. A friend of Jefferson and opponent of clericalism, he was urged by Jefferson to take a position as professor of chemistry at UVA. Stiff opposition from church leaders dissuaded him, but he was

soon offered a position as president of South Carolina College. Here, however, Presbyterian attacks led to efforts to remove him on charges he was offending parents of students and the larger community; that he'd inveighed against religion in his lectures; and tried to ground his students in knowledge that was contrary to what they had been taught by their community. Cooper began his defense by stating that when John Locke wrote the Constitution of the the colony of South-Carolina, he explicitly made a point to bar religious discrimination. His principle argument was one crafted to resonate with Southerners fearful of Northern hegemony:

"The liberties of the American people depend on the principles that will govern the present case. If the Trustees may construe the Constitution, so as to serve a present convenience - they may substitute their own discretionary construction, and indirectly contravene the plain meaning of the constitutional expressions - if they are at liberty to supply, at their own will and pleasure, any supposed *caus ommissus*, among the constitutional provisions - if they are at liberty to mould the national compact into any form that may suit the present notions of the present Board - and make the constitutional rights of the citizen to bow down before the decisions of a temporary tribunal - if *they* may do all this on the present occasion, why is *Congress* to be prohibited from doing the same?"<sup>139</sup>

He continued, arguing that everywhere Revolution sprouted, it had been caused by the people rising up against tyranny, the figurehead had been removed, but not the power. Instead, tyranny had been maintained in a different guise. In the US, Federalists and "consolidationists"<sup>140</sup> (enemies in the North) were the continuation of this power against the people and, by analogy, the sects were placing themselves in the same position. The Revolution meant nothing if the people were still under the dominion of the sects! He concluded, according to the Columbia, South Carolina *Times and Gazette*, with this barb: "Sir... This is not a day when the human intellect may be required to bow down before the presumptuous ignorance of civil authority, as the sufficient Judge

of all possible controversies. No sire: the *tribunal of the public*, is the only Court of Appeals in the last resort; and fact and argument, with full freedom of discussion to all the parties before that court, are the means by which Truth seeks to obtain its decision in her favor.”<sup>141</sup> The charges against him were dropped, but what I find so significant is that appeal is given to the public, which the university wanted to educate, rather than the institutions (such as the churches and their colleges) authorized to proclaim justice. If the latter were to trespass against the Constitution, against the people, the institution becomes invalidated; that people, in turn, would owe their cultural and social make-up to the university, which had the backing and support of the people, and not that of the church would be a significant break. With the creation of the UVA, the authority of the church was to be usurped by that of the university.

In addition to barring the centrality of religion, the Commission set about to enshrine in law those bodies of knowledge useful for Southern society,<sup>142</sup> how many professors were to teach, and how much they were to be paid; it, however, left later additions to the university to future governing boards. Because the state had a direct interest in quality of citizen and politician being produced, it was up to the state to ensure they were properly educated. This is tremendously important because, in the absence of a monarch to guarantee contracts and public morality, these would have to be decided among the people (though, more accurately, we should say their representatives) themselves.

The University of Virginia was chartered in 1819 and opened in 1825. Before

opening, there were a number of tasks to complete. In order to acquire the books and professors necessary to establish a quality school, UVA sent Francis Gilmer to Great Britain to recruit.<sup>143</sup> He found it nearly impossible to find any professors - at Oxford and Cambridge, still the only universities in England at the time, all the students desired to be lawyers, politicians or clergy. Even the poor students found traveling to an unknown school in a new country beneath them. Further, the young graduates found the teaching load in the US onerous and the knowledge required to broad for them. The paltry vacations Jefferson had proposed, also, were inadequate.<sup>144</sup> To this Jefferson replied that the objection could not be got around because no one in the States would tolerate more time off: “we see no reason why the laborer in the field of Education should require such respites more than those in Law or Medicine; and especially when we require of the first of these only 2 hours every other day.”<sup>145</sup> Gilmer then set off for Germany and the University of Göttingen, “where the late political persecutions of men of letters, will naturally incline them to us, and where classical literature at least, is highly cultivated.”<sup>146</sup> Jefferson, however, denied him that course due to the language barrier, so he set off to Scotland. In the end, UVA opened with five European faculty members – four from England and Scotland and one from Germany – to augment three American faculty.

While its opening was a joyous event, even those who approved of UVA did not have to look hard to find fault. Edward Everett, a young professor at Harvard and friend of Jefferson, lauded the great advances proposed in the document, but still found a glaring lack in the plan: there was no “destination” for the graduate of the



college. The ranks of the professionals were filled not with men who had emerged from college with a general *and* specific knowledge about their profession and its relation to the larger world. If there is no useful connection between a college education and the profession a student will enter upon completion, there is little point in the broad and undifferentiated education they were to receive in college. Medicine, for instance, as taught at UVA would be too general for the student looking to become a doctor and too specialized by those who are not - they are likely to forget everything they learned within a short period. Professional schools could not be the answer, however, as they lacked the requisite resources to provide the common baseline of knowledge that is shared by all the professions - or that should be shared by all the professions. "Learning," Everett wrote, "is not such a wretched mechanical thing, that you can cut it in pieces and carry the parts hundreds of miles from each other, and they will still retain all their properties."<sup>147</sup> Even the progressive plan for UVA, then, fails because it is unable to think about education beyond the limitations of the older Discipline and Piety model. (Jefferson, for his part, was pleased with the criticism, believing that it was much in line with his own desires - and considering the two men were friends, it should not be too surprising.)<sup>148</sup> The connection between knowledge production, education and post-graduate life still had a ways to go, though UVA was a strong opening salvo.

In conceptualizing the relation of the university to the student, Jefferson sought to place the student in a relationship of freedom, through which the student could

encounter true thought. One of the principal differences at UVA, Jefferson informed George Ticknor in an 1823 letter, would be overcoming the unfortunate habit, formed at Harvard, of making all students subscribe to one course of learning. It would be up to the students which lectures they attended, “of letting every one come and listen to whatever he thinks may improve the condition of his mind.”<sup>149</sup> Not only would this overcome the narrowness of the classical curriculum, but it might achieve a new relation between student and faculty. Student discipline, a notoriously thorny issue, and its corollary, student insubordination, were, Jefferson believed, the biggest block to education. He hoped that democratic principles would subvert insubordination and ease the chore of discipline: “We may lessen the difficulty perhaps by avoiding too much government, by requiring no useless observances, none which shall merely multiply occasions for dissatisfaction, disobedience and revolt, by referring to the more discreet of themselves the minor discipline, the graver to the civil magistrates, as in Edinburgh.”<sup>150</sup> By trusting the student - a condition made possible by recruiting older students - and providing a stimulating curriculum, the twin hopes of fostering a knowledgeable citizenry and overcoming the disciplinary problems of the colleges might be accomplished. Trust between faculty and student would allow the entire school to operate; the former chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at UVA, Jennings Wagoner, described the ideal as an “academical village,” where everyone would bring out the best in each other.<sup>151</sup>

UVA’s students, on the whole, came from wealthier families than their Northern counterparts. Most of them came from the South, and most of their families owned

slaves. Some older students, who were interested in serious study, used UVA as a graduate school. Most students, though, showed little inclination to study as there was little social advantage to doing so. Wagoner writes that only 55% of students, between 1825-1870, stayed for longer than one session, and only 11% were there for longer than three years. For those interested in study, the university was superb; for everyone else, lax discipline, foreign faculty members, and a cult of honor frustrated the advent of a new age.

Within just a few months of opening, these students had made a mockery of self-discipline and self-government while running roughshod over the faculty – who lacked the means and authority to rein them in. The faculty were in no position to take authority: other than the German professor, the faculty were all under thirty. Wagoner writes that,

“the youthfulness of some of the professors and their apparent lack of solicitude for the personal bearing and society of the students rather quickly provoked friction... Equally significant, the professors’ position of authority, their more serious and scholarly orientation, and the ethical code they embraced generated numerous “clashes of honor” between faculty and students.”

Without a history of professional respect, Southern student culture, steeped in gentlemanly honor, was simply too much for the faculty as constituted. Beyond the heavy drinking and partying, what was really troublesome was the frequent use of guns on the grounds and violence directed at faculty. Though against the rules, many students had brought their pistols, muskets, and rifles with them, and enjoyed firing them at night. They claimed that a firearm was necessary in case someone affronted

their honor. Honor, on one occasion, was the reason given by a group of students for beating and horsewhipping the chairman of the faculty, while close to a hundred students watched.

While Jefferson died (1826) before things got too bad, he did witness his nephew smash whatever illusions he'd had about Republican forms and student discipline. In the very first semester, students set about showing their displeasure for the European faculty. On one occasion, students threw a bottle of human excrement through a professor's window while he was entertaining guests. The next night, Wagoner writes, a group of students dressed as "Indians," began shouting, "Damn the European professors." Rather than let the disturbance lie, two faculty tried to intervene. One student was seized, though not before he called for help. Students flew out of their rooms and chased the professors off with sticks and stones – *and* words. The next day, sixty-five students presented a resolution stating that the faculty were at fault. Two of the European faculty immediately quit while the others threatened to do so. The others demanded order be imposed by the Board. Jefferson, Madison, and James Monroe (all on the Board) and other distinguished board members gathered all those associated with the school. They implored the guilty students to confess so as not to make the innocent students sully their honor in defending them. At this point, Jefferson's nephew stepped forward in guilt. The leaders were expelled; student self-government, within the first semester, had been shown to be wholly unworkable as the institutional relationships of the time were constructed. Rodney Hessinger relates that Jefferson, forced to create a new disciplinary mold, told the students that, "coercion

must be resorted to where confidence has been disappointed.”<sup>152</sup> This disturbance, though, was not even the most severe: in 1836 and again in 1845 the state militia were required to restore order, and in 1840 a professor died of a gunshot wound. New regulations (which were later relaxed) and a faculty composed of largely US born professors – combined with larger systemic changes in student life and the social conditions of Southern life – helped bring a measure of peace to the campus before the Civil War. However, the experiment was understood by most to have failed: the students simply refused, Rodney Hessinger writes, to govern themselves.

Significantly, UVA was an elite project meant to develop a ruling class for its time, rather than a development by those who would work as faculty or attend as students. The institution was the product of the Enlightenment, the Revolutionary War, and Virginia’s fear of Northern aggression. While it had scattered support throughout the country, it was not the product of academic workers to develop new forms by which to concretize their own ambitions. It was an attempt by elites to recast their own vision of society in a shifting time. There were neither the faculty to organize the institution nor the society to require it. The composition of the faculty – international and with little connection to the area, students or culture – could not implement or sustain the desired reforms, and there was no social authority to impose order. It was the instantiation of an idea that lacked a base that could bring it into existence.

### **Elsewhere in the South**

In general, many of the concerns that animated Southern discussions about higher

education mirrored those swirling throughout the country. In large part, the similar concerns arose because many of the men who taught in the South had been educated in the North, and thus were seeking to organize their labor in line with their colleagues elsewhere. Because of their higher level of education, Jane Weyant points out, these attempts at reform in the South took place in the context of state universities.<sup>153</sup> Elites, however, were looking to delink the relationships between North and South - an endeavor that required formulating an education to rival the great schools in the North while elaborating a particularly Southern ideology. With the University of Virginia as their starting point, both faculty and elites set about reformulating the foundation upon which education rested in order to bring about a system of education organically related to the institution of slavery.

For those following in the wake of the University of Virginia, a model now existed by which to agitate for re-formation. While the experiment in Virginia had not lived up to its own standards, it was still by far the best education available in the South and offered space to play off of. For those in the South seeking to carve out a space for higher education, an angle they continually played was the role it could play as an advocate for Southern rights and autonomy against Northern power. Simply arguing for a Southern base, however, wasn't going to bring in support as a matter of course. That support had to be built through much work. It also required maintaining position against the schools that emulated what already existed. For instance, in 1824, Cumberland College (soon the University of Nashville) was "revived and reorganized," rapidly building its reputation as the "Athens of the South." It inspired

several new universities that soon took its students and competed for its faculty. The University of Nashville, alas, had no sect or political party to feed it. Carving out space from the ideological control of party and sect, while a necessary condition for the advent of the university, was at the time akin to signing one's own death warrant. Without these traditional, and so far only, reliable and available forms of funding, budgets could not be completed, plans for operation were left in the air, and uncertainty ruled. Because there was not yet a social base upon which the university could plant itself, its advocates had to figure out how to create this base.

At his inaugural address as president of the University of Nashville (1825), Philip Lindsley tried to confront head on impending poverty by sparking in his audience a connection between education and freedom from the North.

"A free government, like ours, cannot be maintained except by an enlightened and virtuous people... To the people our rulers are immediately responsible for the faithful discharge of their official duties. But if the people be incapable of judging correctly of their conduct and measures; what security can they have for their liberties a single hour? Knowledge is power, by whomsoever possessed. If the people would retain in their own hands that power which the Constitution gives them, they must acquire that knowledge which is essential to its safe keeping and rightful exercise."<sup>154</sup>

The ownership of knowledge by the people is, he argued, the only sure way to remain free. For educators, seeking to gain funding and students, the Northern schools and the plantation had to be superseded as the preeminent site of the production and dissemination of knowledge. In these arguments, therefore, liberty was explicitly tied to the development of Southern universities that would, while keeping students in the South, also displace the plantation as the primary site of ideological knowledge production. Knowledge holds power as a weapon in conflict, not in an abstract

mystical sense, but against Northern ambitions towards the Southern economic system. What was needed was a means and method to reproduce this form of power and disseminate it as widely and deeply as possible.

Lindsley was a product of Princeton and had been offered its presidency - along with several others - but turned them all down until a school in the South came calling. He saw there an environment amenable to the reformation of education not possible in the established centers of the North. Rather than the stale reproduction of the old models, the material conditions of the South demanded a new mode of education. The proliferation of universities here would, Lindsley hoped, make it such that, "hundreds and thousands can immediately avail themselves of their aid."<sup>155</sup> By removing education from the hands of the wealthy and placing it in the hands of the people, through the integration of state and university, a democratic urge would develop the people in opposition to centralized government. "The farmer, the mechanic, the manufacturer, the merchant, the sailor, the soldier, if they would be distinguished in their respective callings must be educated. Should it be objected, that well-educated youth will not *labour* for their support; that, if they become farmers or manufacturers, they will, at most, merely superintend and direct the labours of others, I answer - 1<sup>st</sup>. That we, at this moment, need thousands of such men."<sup>156</sup> For those worried about the ability of education to upset society, he argued that it would not end class, but would rather make those at the top earn their place in competition with men from every class. As befits a democracy, everyone (well, all those legally recognized as persons) would find their appropriate place in society through their own skill and work



rather than having the arbitrary accident of birth (except for skin color) determine the course of their life.

Philip Lindsley's 1837 commencement address at the University of Nashville is illustrative of attempts to cajole funds from the public coffers. He laid out some typical objections to higher education, offered a defense, and pled for money so that Nashville, too, might have such an institution. Only through public financing of higher education would the university be able to expand beyond the cloister of the wealthy. The reason, he said, that the college had been able to sustain itself was due to the cultural function it played, especially its ability to cohere an elite culture. This could be seen, clearly, in the administrative apparatus of the college. To be a trustee or board member in the Northeastern colleges, he noted, was a great honor conferred primarily to the wealthy and eminent - those who have demonstrated themselves most suitable to their time. (That elite families groomed one of their sons to take such a position testified to the importance of the college.)<sup>157</sup> The faculty, prominent individuals, were not central, but rather, "at most... an accident, a circumstance - while the University lives forever."<sup>158</sup> The college and the state, both essential institutions for public life, survive not due to individual genius, but rather its aggregate function. The preservation of the institution was valued far more highly than the subjective feelings of faculty, students, or trustees. "Thus the people," Lindsley confides, "are taught to respect and reverence the literary character, and the literary institution, and the literary professor, and the whole teaching *corps* of the Commonwealth."<sup>159</sup> Respect for civilization spreads from the colleges, even though they do not, as yet, educate that many. However, those that do

attend are united to their school and aim to make its survival a matter of fact. The university in the Northeast, then, was a means of perpetuating certain social and economic relationships. If the South and West were to establish themselves against the control of the Northeast, they would have to develop institutions for these functions.

Where the colleges had so far failed, and manifestly so, was in their partisan nature - both political and religious. The University of Nashville, he slyly applauded his audience, had members of both parties, and no denominational domination, on its board. Public opinion, expressed through the accretion of political and religious viewpoints, cancels out bias. That the university was an umbrella for every religious affiliation and political persuasion (figured by Lindsley as "abolitionism, and radicalism, and agrarianism, and ultraism, and amalgamationism, and Loco-Focoism, and Lynchism, and Fanny-Wrightism")<sup>160</sup> was the only means by which it might legitimately serve its function. For the university, Party politics was a double edged sword. On one side, the founding of universities and colleges (along with prisons and the building of bridges) were an excellent way for the Party to cycle federal wealth back to the regions in the form of spoils. On the other, however, accusations of party control of education could be debilitating and were a sure way to ensure funding ceased in the event the Party lost its electoral majority. The only way to find a middle ground was by depoliticizing politics through equal representation.

On the whole, according to the Weyant, the South required an education less reliant on commercial aptitude and more towards the production of educated gentlemen. In this, they found inspiration in Henry Tappan of the University of

Michigan. He believed, she writes, that “The solution was not to fit the colleges to the ‘temper of the multitude, [but to] educate men as men [so that] the charm, and power, and dignity of learning would become apparent to all.”<sup>161</sup> Finding a reformist model based not on industrial capitalism but gentlemanly erudition would no doubt have appealed to many in the South. It could be seen as an updating of the plantation by more formal methods.

Given that the most valuable education took place on the plantation, educators and reformers at other schools in the South had some latitude in which to experiment. Before taking the presidency of Harvard, F.A.P. Barnard was a professor at the University of Alabama. There, in 1854, he led the faculty attack on electives, declaring that a school could be seen to be successful not in admitting more students, but maintaining high standards. He believed, at the time, that student selection of courses should, Weyant writes, be limited to their ability to complete the course, not gain a practical utility. He thought if schools wanted to provide practical education, they needed to make the student stay at school longer so as to get the classical learning in first. Once he became the President of Ole Miss, however, he seems to have changed his thinking and sought instead to equalize the relationship between classical and practical education. He attempted to do this by creating two levels: a required curriculum steeped in the classics and a post-graduate program in science, mathematics, politics, agriculture and history. The Board at Ole Miss ran with his suggestions, enlarging the library and creating an observatory. The Civil War, however,

cut down the opportunity for Mississippi to take the lead in education in the South. Prior to Barnard's administration, George Frederick Holmes had been able to convince the Board to rely on an Honor Code for student behavior, negating the need for faculty to police students. He, unlike Barnard, saw chaos erupt in the school.

At the University of Georgia, in the late 1850s, a number of faculty rebelled against the regnant educational theory of the school, demanding practical classes, the end to professorial spying on students, and the ability to treat their charges as young men. The older faculty were able to rebuff their charge, but the Board of Trustees took up their cause. They brought a case to the state legislature to modernize the school, but the Senate rejected the plan. It was attempted again, and passed, in 1859. It was accepted and funded, to a small degree, based on the number of Southern students attending Northern institutions. Again, however, the Civil War intervened before real progress could begin.

Each school in the south had a different character, of course, and the ambitions and vision of reformers was often unmatched by their colleagues. On the whole, Weyant concludes, southern educators tended to suspect mass education, choosing instead to restrict it to the classical formations. Improving standards and shoring up the classical system were seen as better than opening the doors to all of society. She writes that, "they resisted the anti-intellectual tendencies of Jacksonian democracy and refused to sacrifice academic excellence to the demands of the majority for popular mass education."<sup>162</sup> Given the anti-democratic nature of the Southern elite, this should not be too surprising.

*B. Patrician and Professional*

In the North, reformers, such as George Ticknor and Edward Everett, were attempting to drag the old institutions into the new future, with UVA and Germany as their guiding light. Inspired by the professionalism of the German system and the implications that model would have for their own careers, the civic life of the country and the boon for the economic prospects of the nation, they sought to use the examples of existing alternatives against the limited purview of the institutions that employed them. As men who intended to be professional men of science rather than professionals in the older fields, their attempted reorientation had some moderate successes, yet also produced, in the Yale Report, a striking and powerfully influential document meant to moderate enthusiasm for new forms. On the whole, their attempted reforms were humored but ignored at the institutional level: Amherst is illustrative in this context. Here, the faculty prepared a Report in 1827 recommending parallel courses for professional and non-professional student, among other reforms. As was the case everywhere, however, the Board did not adopt their plan and reforms languished until sufficient pressure from outside eventually forced them to make changes several years later. However, their report laid the groundwork for men in New York to attempt a next step. In convening the Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen, a call was put forth with the explicit intention of founding a university equal to the greatness of New York City, the burgeoning capital of both industrial and merchant capitalism in the US. The initial failure of the resulting effort, which would

eventually become New York University (NYU), to live up to the high-minded spirit of its founding moment illustrates the arduous task of instantiating an institution by which to shepherd and guide transitions from one mode of production to another.

For Ticknor, the importance of the University of Virginia to reform efforts was inestimable: without it, he thought it would be impossible to unseat the old system that had found its seat in Harvard. UVA, he hoped, would "serve as a model to lead all other institutions in the country, just as our imperfect establishment at Cambridge has led all others into an unfortunate imitation of its clumsy system for the last half century."<sup>163</sup> In his second year teaching at Harvard (1820), Ticknor gathered the president and some interested faculty and presented a plan for reform at Harvard. "*A change must take place.* The discipline of college must be made more exact, and the instruction more thorough... We must therefore change, or public confidence, which is already hesitating, will entirely desert us."<sup>164</sup> He charged that the method of teaching at Harvard produced vastly inferior intellectuals than did that of Germany, largely because what was expected of a graduate in Germany bore little resemblance to what was expected of a graduate in the US. If the university was to have any say over the "intellectual character" of the country, it must take up the call to reformation presented by Virginia. The "Great Rebellion" of 1823 (discussed in Chapter 1) helped further his cause for a thorough rethinking of the conditions and means for educating. These reforms included changing university laws, dividing Harvard into divisions based on related studies, better examinations, more studies, a German style lecture system to replace rote learning, among others. Ticknor noted that while Harvard was

stocking its faculty with more able professors than retired professionals (lawyers, doctors and clergy), he castigated them for expansion without a change in methods or courses. Recitations, the common mode of instruction, were worthless he claimed, and give slight to important subjects. A total move away from recitations would be impossible without the advent of a true library. This hurt Ticknor's classes as the paucity of Harvard's library meant he could not teach a course on French, and had to postpone a course on Spanish because there were not suitable materials for study. He eventually taught his Spanish course, though only because he himself had amassed one of the world's great private libraries. In his own courses, on Spanish and French literature, he gave lectures on literary history to accompany readings. Reflecting his belief in the ability of freedom to allow students to best direct themselves (perhaps a legacy of his time in the debating clubs in his own education), he made attendance in his classes voluntary and encouraged the elective system pioneered by UVA. A new code of statutes was passed at Harvard in 1825, but most reforms of substance, from the viewpoint of the reformers, were ignored. Electives and the division of classes were made available, but only to more advanced students and even then the changes were optional and therefore not taken up by other professors. Ticknor's own field, Modern Languages, was granted a department and electives were made the norm, though these reforms were limited to those areas he had direct control of. Ticknor resigned in 1835, frustrated by his inability to reform the institution.

Where Harvard had already attained a certain level of prestige that retarded its ability to transform easily, not all of the older colleges were in the same predicament.

At the University of Pennsylvania (Penn), low attendance and flagging fund raising produced an environment where the trustees found the school close to collapse. So, in 1813 they brought on Frederic Beasley to be Provost. While he and most of the faculty were fired in 1828, he was able to pioneer a new mode of faculty/student relationship. Beasley had two main projects in his time at Penn: to get more authority over students and use meritocracy as a tool of governance. Beasley believed that his students would compete amongst each other and strive for excellence if it were implemented: Hessinger writes that he was fired before he could see this vision through, but that his successor only took the job if these became the norm. In Beaseley's estimation, this reform could only be implemented if his students were older and better prepared than current students were. Given Penn's need for students, however, it was going to be difficult to attain this goal. That new schools were continually created, further, didn't help Penn's position. As a staunch Lockean, Beasley believed that coercion was a terrible means to knowledge: instead, he argued for the creation of "forms and formalities" whose spectacle would "awe" students in to respect.<sup>165</sup> A corollary to this was that hierarchies had to be created within the student body. As has been discussed in the student sections above and below, students typically felt a greater bond of loyalty to each other than they did to those tasked with administering discipline. It would be necessary to break this solidarity and meritocratic means, following John Locke's writings, were precisely the way to do it. Hessinger cites the historians Joseph Kett and Steven Novak, writing that they "have been quite right to argue that students' propensity to express horizontal rather than vertical allegiances was a defining feature



of student disorder in this period. Students did not seem to engage any political issues from outside society, but there was a political cast to their riots and disorders.”<sup>166</sup> “By seeking,” Hessinger continues, “to use students’ ‘sense of shame’ or more positively, ‘their principles of emulation and honor,’ to their advantage, professors might goad students into both good scholarship and good behavior.”<sup>167</sup> Where Jefferson sought the elimination of the *in loco parentis*, Beasley sought to make it fit a modern world. Meritocracy fit much better the world of capitalism than did the older models: merit was a weapon in the hands of the authorities to break student solidarity. Merit became, with Beasley’s successor, the structuring philosophy of higher education and spread far and wide. This progression of merit would work both linearly (as students progressed in years, they would gain more privileges) and vertically (student competition within class would accrue privileges to the better performing students). Crucially, the professor/student relationship would be fixed as that of superior/inferior.

Penn was not the only school to experiment with technologies of merit. Yale had used numbers and letters to rank students and their performance dating to 1783, finally developing a four point scale in 1813. Elsewhere around the country school administrators were attempting to rank students as a means of discipline. However, Beasley appears to have been the first to lay out a theory of merit that would help update and transform *in loco parentis* to a world now structured by capitalist concerns. Beasley had always been an outsider and the local elites who ran the college, Hessinger contends, rebuffed the native North Carolinian’s attempts at reform. Beasley sought to

remove from their hands the power of control over students (some of whom were their own children) and they refused. That he was caught between a Board leery of giving up control and students who, if they desired, could demand days off and use their leverage to gain them, essentially made his reforms impossible. Beasley's replacement, William Delancey, came from the Board and was the son of a prominent New York family. He had the social rank to contend with both the Board and with students. Recognizing the soundness of Beasley's tools, he sought to empower the faculty against the students and use meritocracy as primary means to student discipline. Faculty were given the power to suspend and dismiss students. He believed that, "The principles on which we settle the question of comparative merit are, their scholarship, their punctual attention to their duties in the class-rooms, and their general deportment as students."<sup>168</sup> Not just their intellectual ability, but their general fitness as students was considered.

It would take parents several years to accustom themselves to this new regime, the public longer, and students the longest. Students at Harvard, for instance, were able to defeat Ticknor's attempts at instituting merit. There, they destroyed property and rioted. Professors reported that rather than feel superior to those lower than themselves, students took pity on them and engaged in trouble on their behalf. Even when parents believed in the regime, they would question it as it related to their child, demanding professors alter son's grade. It would take, Hessinger argues, the full professionalization of the professoriate before the public, parents, Board members, and students could place their trust in a system that relied on professorial judgment to rank

and place youth.

*Defense: The Yale Report*

Yale could be justified in claiming to lead the counter attack. After all, by the 1820s, more college presidents had been trained at Yale than anywhere else and, along with Princeton, more faculty than anywhere else - partly as a result of its students fanning out to create mini-Yale's throughout the country. It had weathered the storm of student unrest (though it was by no means immune) and emerged as the leading institution of higher education. As such, it was a principle target of those seeking a reconstituted system of education. Julian M. Sturtevant, in assessing the role played by Yale in the 1820s, notes that it was inadequate in nearly ever regard, though it did "exert a great and salutary influence over the student."<sup>169</sup> Because its purpose and means were meant to mirror the fixed and unchanging truths of God and civilization - because it was focused on drilling correct knowledge into its students - it could still exert a moral influence on a young man without instructing him in anything that would aid his professional ambitions. It was still the case that tutors, who were yet to go on to professional careers, did most of the drilling, while a professor read to the class. According to its critics, however, Yale could claim superiority only because there were so few to challenge it. "In mental, moral and social science," Sturtevant lamented, "our instruction was far from satisfactory... No justice has yet been done to the intuitional nature of the rational soul. In a word, in spite of drawbacks, I am forced to say that from 1822 to 1826 Yale was probably doing better work than any

other college in our country."<sup>170</sup>

The defense of higher education was also a defense of the graduates of Yale who, through their professional work in churches and law offices, gave ideological and material content to the doctrines of a society whose organization benefitted the merchant class. For those industrialists, farmers and commercial interests intent on breaking the power of the professional gentry (figured by the lawyer statesman, on the model of the founding fathers), subverting this power and its methods of instruction and self-perpetuation could only happen through the formation of new institutions that could devalue and disempower the older. The Yale Report was therefore a counter-attack that aimed to highlight the malleability of the current system while inviting those whose fortunes were being made in industrial manufacturing to enhance their status through attendance.

The Yale Report was, in practice, a response by the faculty to critics of the university. President Jeremiah Day and professor James Kingsley, two of the more influential men in education circles, essentially soothed those listening to malcontents for twenty years and forestalled reform at Yale till the end of the century. They began, first, with an admission that their system was imperfect, but that there was room for remedy within the existing model. There might, they acknowledged, be some merit in looking to Europe because changes in, "population, refinement, and opulence" in the US make its society more similar to that overseas.<sup>171</sup> They took pains to point out that since the beginning of the school small changes have been admitted as part of the normal process of growth. Small reforms were both necessary and useful - but they

should be kept small and within the broader field of institutional authority as it existed. There was, after all, now instruction in chemistry, mineralogy, geology, and political economy, after all (though these were introduced as interests of faculty, not as important elements of education). The core of the school had, however, remained, and this was what was now under attack. In new times, they conceded, sometimes older formations have to pass away and, "perhaps the time has come, when we ought to pause, and inquire, whether it will be sufficient to make *gradual* changes, as heretofore; and whether the whole system is not rather to be broken up, and a better one substituted in its stead."<sup>172</sup>

As far as the faculty were concerned, the primary object of College is to "*lay the foundation of a superior education*: and this is to be done, at a period of life when a substitute must be provided for *parental superintendence*."<sup>173</sup> College is to provide the "*discipline* and the *furniture* of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge."<sup>174</sup> To set about this course, they believed, required a careful and deep foundation in Greek and Latin: knowledge that itself formed good character. Electives, while nice, were transitory and therefore incapable of instilling the timeless values of Western civilization; they were too haphazard and arbitrary. "The mines of science," the Report declared, "must be penetrated far below the surface, before they will disclose their treasures."<sup>175</sup> Understanding education as investigation into phenomena, while lacking students of good character and intellectual backbone, would be worse than useless. Because the College was to form character, science and literature must be attended only in proper proportion. Students, who had been entrusted to the College

by their parents, must learn to discipline and order their own minds because without a proper training in this, they would be left to their own fleeting desires - to value their own interests above that of the society they lived in. This, the Report argued, was doubly dangerous in an environment where the young could strike riches in so many new ways. Because the education of youth in communities and families was suspect without the institutional framework provided by formal education, they believed, it fell to the college to guard society by producing students who would become social leaders, thereby reproducing what was noble and salutary in the leadership. Where the family failed, the college and the leaders it trained would intervene. And, to be sure, family was no longer, they believed, able to serve as a bulwark against the demands of the arriving industrial age.

A spirited defense of the dead languages required this view of society. Those that wished to appeal to the masses through practical schoolwork, the Report claimed, misunderstand the point of education: it was not to prepare a student to make a living, but to provide the foundation on which all future professional education and concomitant social action were to be built on. In order to properly enter the public sphere, to prove oneself worthy of being heard, one must possess that foundation. The Report claimed that, "he who is not only eminent in professional life, but has also a mind richly stored with general knowledge, has an elevation and dignity of character, which gives him a commanding influence in society, and a widely extended sphere of usefulness."<sup>176</sup> Even as elites in the US sought to retain this figure, American graduate students continued to seek out an education in the industrial capitalist countries of

Europe where this older model had been superseded.

The Report, further, rejected institutional training of workers - "minute details of *mercantile, mechanical, or agricultural* concerns," as well as law and medicine - believing that apprenticeship and practice were the appropriate space for such training. A proper education would of course benefit all who laid claim to it, but it was a fallacy to believe that education should be made to suit the student, rather than the student being made to fit society. If the reformers were to have their way, the Report insinuated, Reason would be lost: people would perhaps perform tasks adequately as they had learned, but would lack an understanding of life beyond those tasks. And besides, in the impoverished conditions the colleges found themselves, they would be unable to even teach a practical skill to the level an apprentice would find working a practice. Prescribed courses were therefore necessary because those were the courses, deemed by the most educated and wisest, to ground all of life in this society! "They are not the peculiarities of any profession or art," but rather the foundation of labor in a civilized life.<sup>177</sup> Only that which was common could be the foundation of society and, given that the so-called Dead Languages and their knowledge were common to the greatest civilizations, they must be required. That they formed the basis of education, rather than subsist as mere adornment, was of upmost importance for the future prospects of the country. As Potts writes, "The link between mental discipline and secular success, a pervasive theme in the Report, is particularly important in assessing this document's impact. Throughout the antebellum years college promoters stressed this success theme. With 'intellectual facilitates properly strengthened,' they argued, a

graduate would find that traditional college studies 'do pay professional men... a large dividend, and that immediately.'"178

Reform, the Report cautioned, that did not lose sight of this must happen slowly over time, conserving the best and resisting the fleeting whims of taste. They write, "We believe that our colleges may derive important improvements from the universities and schools in Europe; not by blindly adopting all their measures without discrimination; but by cautiously introducing, with proper modifications, such parts of their plans as are suited to our peculiar situation and character."<sup>179</sup> What should be focused on at this juncture, they believed, was raising the standards of admission. From there other prospects might be opened. Different types and levels must have their own object; the object of the College, training for professional life, must not be diluted by admitting everyone for every study. "When the college has lost its hold on the public confidence, by depressing its standard of merit, by substituting a partial, for a thorough education, we may expect that it will be deserted by that class of persons who have hitherto been drawn here by high expectations and purposes."<sup>180</sup> More students might enter the schools, but they would be of lower quality and therefore not the students that would provide society with the necessary rudiments to prosper.

It was doubly important in a democracy, where narrow and parochial interest have a way of crowding out national interest, to teach the people *what* their interests were and *how* to express them.

"Our republican form of government renders it highly important that great numbers should enjoy the advantage of a thorough education On the Eastern continent, the *few* who are destined to particular departments in political life, may be educated for the purpose; while the mass of the people are left in comparative



ignorance. But in this county, where offices are accessible to all who are qualified for them, superior intellectual attainments ought not to be confined to any description of persons... A thorough education ought therefore to be extended to all these classes. *It is not sufficient that they be men of sound judgment, who can decide correctly, and give a silent vote, on great national questions. Their influence upon the minds of others is needed; an influence to be produced by extent of knowledge, and the force of eloquence.*"<sup>181</sup>

It was clear, the Report stated, that "merchants, manufacturers, and agriculturists" were the future and that most of the wealth accruing in the country was falling to their hands; it stood to reason, therefore, that they be educated in the old ways so as not to destroy society with pecuniary interest and base morals. Colleges were not stationary institutions; how they changed, therefore, was the question. Do they become better institutions or do they let the modern age overrun it?

*C. Midwest - laying the foundation for mass collegiate education.*

In the West, town founders and promoters clamored for higher education as a means to civilize their space and raise property values (they also clamored for prisons and asylums, which had the added benefit of federal and state funding): the appeals to state legislatures to create "the Athens of America" or "... the West" or "... the South" reveal themselves in the plethora of college towns named for the legendary cities of Western civilization. Northeastern graduates, and the social networks they inhabited, saw in these invitations to found schools an opportunity to create equivalences between the West and the older cities of the east. At the same time, many others in the East thought expansion would weaken the position of the old colleges by watering down the meaning of a degree (there were over five hundred colleges chartered between the Revolutionary War and the Civil War, though many never opened and many others

floundered or collapsed). Because Yale had a missionary zeal for sending its students out to found colleges, many of the colleges in this period took their shape from Yale, though the experience of education in radically different contexts did produce some new phenomena.<sup>182</sup> Oberlin, for instance, was founded by Yale graduates and opened to women and black students. The ferment brought about through the establishment of old forms in new milieus revealed to those anxious for a new foundation the poverty of continuing with radical change: throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, enrollments remained low, colleges cash strapped, and their influence small. However, those schools that were experimenting were seeing a modicum of success.

Of course, new institutions in the West and South had to respond to the conditions vastly different than those that encountered higher education in the Northeast. Julian Sturtevant, a Yale grad who would eventually rise to the presidency of Illinois College, notes in his memoirs that the early days of Illinois College were, “crude times, and the introduction of New England ideas of education and theology in a community largely southern in its opinions and prejudices, and accustomed to an uneducated ministry, could not have been accomplished without some pretty sharp conflicts.”<sup>183</sup> The attempt to create outposts of New England ideas and culture in communities alien to those conditions met with some resistance because it was not an education deemed useful for the youth of the area.

Illinois is an interesting place given that many of its early settlers were poor. Missouri allowed slaves while its neighbor Illinois did not; wealthy Southerners therefore travelled to Missouri to establish themselves while poor immigrants from the

Northeast and Europe settled Illinois where, as Sturtevant notes, they would not be competing with slave labor for employment. Further, a Presbyterian split, figured as New Englanders versus those influenced by the Scots and who had their strength outside the Northeast, saw in the New England colleges a missionary zeal that was a vague cover for the advance of New England political power. Sturtevant claims that, "It was perceived that the newly awakened zeal of the East for home evangelization was rapidly swelling the numbers and increasing the influence of the New England party."<sup>184</sup> Through religion and education, the Northeast was thought to be extending its reach to the frontiers. The close proximity to the Missouri territory obviously colors the reception of the colleges here, but opposition to Northeastern influence is a defining feature of the history of the struggle to form universities.

These colleges relied on recruiters to scour their region to drum up both financial support and students. As James Findlay writes, recent scholarship tends to "emphasize the functional roles other colleges played in a society dominated by local, decentralized institutions, suggest non elitist characteristics among the students attending these schools, reveal expanding, not contracting, enrollments which tend to reinforce the apparent functionalism of these schools and point out curriculum innovations occurring behind a facade of conservatism."<sup>185</sup> Even these new interpretations, however, ignore the role of religion - a strange misplacement given that religion was the cornerstone upon which they were built. Because, as Findlay points out, the context in which these colleges exist is that of a Protestant society. One of the key

insights in this reappraisal is the role of “*intra*-denominational conflicts - especially among Baptists and among Presbyterians - played in shaping the early history of the schools founded by these groups in Illinois and Indiana.”<sup>186</sup> Part of formulating these revisions has been the important move away from the Northeast, to examine the role of the West in shaping educational institutions, purposes and expectations.

Collegiate agents were crucial in formulating and fostering the demand and growth in higher education in the West where there were not yet networks that depended on collegiate education. “Throughout the ante-bellum era,” Findlay writes, “college agents served as the principle fund raisers for their respective schools. They also became important people in interpreting the colleges’ broad purposes to the larger community. Because they were nearly always ministers (faculty of the colleges or local clergy on leave from a regular parish) or lay persons widely recognized as associated with a sponsoring denomination, agents also reflected the characteristics of the religious groups which were the chief support of the colleges. The agents, then, served in a unique mediating role between the colleges and the churches.”<sup>187</sup>

The churches often made the success of these new colleges a profound interest. In 1841, a convention of Methodist leaders in Indiana organized a general collection among its members “for the aid of our University”<sup>188</sup> - Indiana Asbury University. Preachers inserted pleas and commands on the topic of University giving into sermons and Elders were tasked with ensuring parishioners complied. The conference argued for this so that, “the entire strength of the Church may be concentrated upon the great object we desire to accomplish, viz.: the religious and intellectual improvement of the

whole community.”<sup>189</sup> Findlay comments that every Methodist pastor in Indiana had become an agent for the university. “Through preaching and even more significantly through the pastoral visits of local preachers with individual church members, the message of the value of education as a key method of achieving ‘the religious and intellectual improvement of the whole community; was to be pressed home.”<sup>190</sup> As there was no state run system, the denominations had the responsibility, and more importantly, the opportunity, to develop their own. “Religious leaders eagerly embraced this opportunity, especially in the Midwest, since control of the educational system from the primary level through college would enable evangelical Protestants to influence deeply the entire cultural and social system then developing in the region.”<sup>191</sup> Thus, the infrastructure of Midwestern leadership was birthed in the church colleges. Because each state was set up as a different conference, agents crossing state lines were nearly unheard of. The state leaders could in this way retain some semblance of control over the educational output. (This control of educational output was one reason that professor's wanted an institution that they controlled rather than the denominations; as far as capital was concerned, religious education is fine enough from a social standpoint, but was too myopic in scope to control education wholesale).

Similar efforts occurred in Illinois, but because the Illinois Conference of Methodists had members in both Indiana and Missouri, there was no central leadership to ensure funding and students. Further, Illinois' Methodists established new schools as they migrated, rather than concentrating their resource in one state school. The schools' agents, too, had fewer restraints on them because of the more fractured

nature of the Convention - they traveled to Southern states, the East Coast and also Great Britain for funds. The Illinois' Convention, Findlay relates, also relied on exhortations to raise money, rather than an organizational plan. This meant that McKendree University had much more severe financial problems than did Asbury. The system developed between Asbury and Indiana Methodists, then, helps explain its structural soundness - its ability to withstand dips in funding while also ensuring a steady stream of students.

Presbyterians, Findlay's research shows, also developed schools in the 1820s and 30s in Illinois and Indiana. Once a school was founded, agents were immediately recruited to help them succeed. Presbyterians and Congregationalists from the East had, in 1801, initiated a collaboration such that each would help the other in their missionary work in the west. The schools they founded were non-sectarian, though leaned decidedly Presbyterian. However, due to the dual nature of these schools, agents were not as beholden to the Presbyterian leadership as were their Methodist analogs. They were able to utilize both local fundraising while maintaining close ties to their parent organizations back east. They raised local funding while remaining in constant contact with the center back in the East. Agents were sent to the East Coast for financial support. In 1843, sensing that things had to change, Congregationalists and Presbyterians organized the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West (SPCTEW), "designed to systematize the fund raising in the East in support of the Plan of Union colleges in the Mississippi Valley. Through this national benevolent society denominational leaders were able to plan

more carefully with the colleges how and when money was to be raised, to control the agents' visits to the East and to end potentially destructive competition or proliferation of agencies that eventually would exhaust eastern donor's interest and ability to give."<sup>192</sup> The manufacturing cities of the East, then, were the building block upon which the schools grew. It is important to note that the SPCTEW was one of only several Missionary Societies that organized funding and speaking tours in order to proselytize in the West through the universities and churches. For Presbyterians, their entire existence in the West was predicated on a relationship with the East.

Agents had a special interest in drumming up as much support as they could, since they drew their pay from a portion of the funds they raised. Findlay writes that an annual budget for one of the colleges prior to the Civil War was about \$10,000 or less (in 1853, Knox College in Illinois' annual expenses were \$4,340). On such a scale, agents could ensure the existence of a school. More importantly, though, the constant circulation of agents in and among the regions, towns and districts created and enhanced the bonds between the areas and the college. "Hundreds of people in local churches," Findlay writes, "heard the messages about higher education and then gave money and moral support over the years to specific colleges that signified concrete and impressive commitments to formal education."<sup>193</sup> Overwhelmingly, agents collected small donations, though there were some large gifts mixed in. For these colleges, scientific progress, farming techniques and innovation were unimportant - the colleges existed to "provide teachers, ministers, lawyers - many of the leaders of the new

society of the western states; to schools that would offer new avenues of mobility to poor young men into a rapidly expanding middle class; to institutions that would serve as important centers of cultural and moral guidance for communities left uneasy and uncertain because of extreme social fluidity and flux.”<sup>194</sup> This is not to say that scientific progress and innovation were totally absent: “The educational aims and purposes of the colleges had to be explained and made meaningful to the farmers, small shopkeepers and tradesmen of the Midwest. Both agents of the colleges and denominational connections were crucial in facilitating the never ending quest for support in local communities.”<sup>195</sup> These colleges were, then, both conservative and liberatory at the same time. The colleges had a shared vision of training pastors, teachers and lawyers - to civilize and Christianize - while also providing a financial boon to the entire community.

#### *D. Capital's Capital*<sup>196</sup>

As the nexus of trade between Europe, much of North America, and the Caribbean, New York was becoming the pre-eminent city in the United States. It was, increasingly, home to the leading merchant and industrial capitalists and its real estate was undergoing a boom. For many of its wealthiest inhabitants, however, New York lacked a particular institution which they believed necessary to cement the city's place in not just the US, but in the world - a university. Sure, Columbia College existed, yet its methods and content were stuck in a century US capitalism was fast escaping. A



handful of New York's prominent men (politicians, merchants and bankers), therefore, got together and invited all of the college presidents in the country, plus the country's most outstanding intellectuals - in addition to several men from Europe and South America - to attend a meeting to lay the foundation for what would become New York University.

Called just two years after the Yale Report was published, the New York men sought to lay the groundwork for a peculiarly American institution that would, they hoped, rival, and in time surpass, the great educational institutions of the world. As they surveyed the collegiate landscape, seeing more colleges in the US than there were in Europe, they noted the vast disparity in quality that separated even Harvard and Yale, much less the small and far flung denominational colleges, from the elite institutions that formed the backbone of European intellectual and bureaucratic elite. From the beginning, it was their purpose to bring the colleges and men they produced into more frequent contact with each other and their ideas as a means to consolidate and expand their wealth and social status using Literature, the Arts, and Sciences as the linchpin.

As the opening statements of the Convention, handily compiled in the *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, make evident, such an institution was viewed as a necessity by the city's wealthiest capitalists. The committee to invite and organize the new university included such luminaries as the Rev. James M. Mathews,<sup>197</sup> the Rev. Jonathan M. Wainwright,<sup>198</sup> the Hon. Albert Gallatin,<sup>199</sup> and John Delafield.<sup>200</sup> "In contemplating the various plans," said Delafield, "by which the

University, as well as other seminaries of learning in our country, might best promote their common cause, it has been thought, that a meeting of literary and scientific gentlemen, to confer on the general interests of letters and liberal education, would be attended with happy results.”<sup>201</sup> Part of the appeal, they wrote, was to break the isolation of America’s intellectuals and to build an infrastructure of science and culture. New York City (NYC) donated use of a common council chamber for the event. All told, around one hundred men showed up.

Some attendees, having traveled abroad and received advanced education and degrees in Europe’s best universities, were interested in what a great university could do for scholarship and, thus, for their own teaching positions; others were influenced by the German universities' contribution to commerce; and others sought to open space for the flourishing of a new culture consonant with America’s capitalist ambition. It was not the formation of a church or the state, but rather capitalist wealth infused with reformist faculty members beginning the process of professionalizing in concert with city and regional politicians. While most of the men in attendance had graduated, or at least attended for a time, a college, they left the arguments about the future direction of the university to the academics and professors (not necessarily the same thing at the time) - many of whom were attached by family to the wealth of New England and New York. These men laid out extensive criticisms of existing education - for men and women, children and the deaf - as a means to elaborate the problems facing the decentralized US education system. From there, the intellectuals, many of whom were professors who had themselves attempted some sort of reform within their

own institutions, argued amongst themselves about all aspects of university life, governance, pay, coursework, and methodology.

The central question that occupied the first section of the meeting was brought forth in a letter by George Bancroft.<sup>202</sup> He asked the gathered men two questions: whether the nation required a new university and whether New York had the responsibility of providing it.

"With respect to the wants of the country, the answer must be found in the *numbers of our people*, already surpassing that of any protestant kingdom or state in the world, excepting England; in the *character of our government*, which can never interfere with free inquiry and the pursuit of truth; in the *relative age of our population*, which, in its rapid increase furnishes a larger proportion of persons to be educated than is found in older countries; in the *basis of our social system*, which regards intelligence as a conservative not less than as a productive principle in the body politic; in the *forming character of all our institutions*, which are as yet hardly fixed, but remains yet to receive the impress which they are to bear forever; in the *period of our history*, when the old states are in truth rapidly becoming the mothers of new ones; in the *condition of our strength*, since the weakness of to-day becomes to-morrow, the confidence and admiration of the world; and lastly in the *character of our population*, proverbially ambitious, and inquisitive, where elementary education is already universally diffused, and where under the auspices of our political equality, the public walks of honor and emulation, are crowded with throngs from every class of society."<sup>203</sup>

Given New York's place as a global city, the passing away of old systems for new ones, and because New York had become the hub that connected not just Europe to the US, but all sites in the US to each other,<sup>204</sup> it would be immensely profitable for the city to gain for itself an institution of higher learning capable of accumulating and augmenting the useful knowledge of the world. Bancroft had in mind an institution on par with those of Europe, but one that would remain American in nature.

The sentiment that the nation had the resources to compete on equal footing with Europe, that New York should lead, and that there were not yet adequate institutions

to consolidate this pervaded the proceedings and gave them purpose. Henry E. Dwight<sup>205</sup> spoke for many when he said, “As our population becomes more dense, there must be a greater division of mental as well as of physical labor, and to meet the wants of the country, our literary institutions must be remodeled, or new ones must be established.”<sup>206</sup> For all concerned, an essential ingredient, the connection between business and university, could not adequately take root until this happened.

In introducing the event, the Rev Dr. James Mathews, claimed that,

“the sentiment seems to be general, that the time has arrived when [the country] calls for something more; when she requires Institutions which shall give increased maturity to her Literature and also an enlarged diffusion to the blessings of Education, and which she may present to the world as maintaining an honorable competition with the Universities of Europe. By general consent, too, it has been considered that it is both the duty and the privilege of New York, to be, at least, one of the places which should lead the way in this noble work; and for reasons that are equally obvious and cogent.”<sup>207</sup>

This institution must be "created" in order to “sustain” a nexus between science, knowledge and wealth. “Commerce,” Mathews continued, “should ever be considered as inseparably allied to science and the arts, and when they have been divorced from each other, the consequence has always been disastrous to both; -commerce, and the wealth that follows it, rendering a community selfish and contracted, while science languishes for the want of that support and countenance which liberal wealth alone can bestow.”<sup>208</sup> The key to the financial and cultural dominance of Munich, Berlin, London and Paris, he pontificated, was the character of their literary and scientific institutes. New York, absent this, would be unable to rally a class of men to serve as the foundation for the accumulation of wealth and culture so necessary to compete with Europe. The task of the convention, then, was to determine what the new wants and

needs of the country were, which types of knowledge would be important in the future for commercial activity to flourish, and what type of instruction would best facilitate this. As they wrote in their closing statement, they were developing the theory of a new type of institution and to return to their current lives invigorated by the new possibility opened by their convention.<sup>209</sup>

While all the problems they addressed were interesting, space allows for a more truncated treatment here. Among their priorities, though, they debated what type of knowledge should be necessary to enter the college, who should be responsible for determining whether a student had it, and what the then current preoccupation with Greek and Latin meant for young men and women who could not enter the colleges because they lacked this knowledge - or the interest in attaining it. The more forward thinking among them argued against the use, or at least the privileging, of the old languages, feeling that it preselected young people who, already attached to wealth, would not necessarily work very hard. They also believed that by increasing the variety of knowledge necessary to enter the university, more and better students would attend, thus growing the need for more faculty, the prestige of the university, and bringing the new class of capitalist merchants into the cultural field of those who were already established. The old line thinkers remained firm that Greek and Latin were the necessary starting point of all knowledge and that they, in fact, provided the basis upon which future knowledge and skill acquisition should be built.

Next, they set out to discuss collegiate life. As currently constituted, it was rife with conflict between president, tutors, faculty, and students. For the faculty, some argued,

professionalizing was the answer. By professionalizing, they meant using research to develop and apply theory in order to advance knowledge. On these principles, only their peers would be able to judge the value and efficacy of their work, and therefore they would be insulated from the administration through their own networks. Where in the US the professor largely collected and disseminated knowledge, European professors - professional professors - used research and the application of theory to advance knowledge. Following this model would drastically change the prestige, power, and practice of the faculty. With this role, too, the conflict, stemming from the faculty's role as campus disciplinarian, between students and faculty - which in the US led to countless riots, building occupations and, on a few occasions, school shuttering - could be alleviated. At heart, the problem was what the college existed for? The college, most agreed, was to fit young men to "the common vocations of life;" the university, absent as yet in the US, existed for science and the advance of culture - which went hand in hand, they all agreed, with the advance of commerce. For this reason, the focus of the Yale Report on the dilution of quality brought about by the spread and development of new institutions was a straw man. First, the university cannot represent the dilution of learning, but was rather the condition of its elevation by altering its scope and delivery through the creation of a new academic profession: the professional professor. It was obvious that a true education provides the tools for the further acquisition of knowledge; it does not follow, however, that the course structure must be that defended by Yale. Second, and more pertinent to the discussion, specialization was not the ruin of the intellect. Specialization would allow those with more limited educational

aspirations to more fully immerse themselves in their desired subjects, rather than undercutting the task of character formation. As currently constituted, unthinking authority, rather than love of learning, was the student's motivation. Voluntary association, rather than sorting out students according to a logic that privileges the older era, would allow students themselves to decide what the course of their studies would encompass.

A number of social benefits, Professor Henry Vethake believed, would also follow the university: first, only a university built on specialization and diversification could break the "*esprit du corps*" that allowed the class, the traditional affiliation of students based on their year of matriculation, to both dominate and disrupt educational efforts. Because the class was the chief means used by students to organize their own entertainment and resistance to the colleges, and because it turned the smallest slight into a riot, it was incumbent on the university to destroy class power.<sup>210</sup> Second, it would also bring in a number of youth from more moderate incomes - "our farmers and mechanics" - whose hard work and lack of money would inspire other students to work harder and leave aside the frivolities that money can provide. Third, by eliminating honors and class distinctions, the university could bring students and faculty together, rather than repelling each other. Breaking the power of the class would come, the progressive faction of the convention believed, with a new regimen devoted to merit, not by perpetuating the increasingly anachronistic social organization.

They then moved on to how it was that students, once admitted, should be

educated. Convention consensus moved towards eliminating the preference for recitations and installing instead a mixed course of lectures and recitations. As Professor Perdicari put it, a focus on “the *eye* and the *ear*,” possible by prodigious use of the blackboard (introduced to the US at West Point, also a project of Thomas Jefferson), were necessary. In Dr. Lieber's opinion, “establishing a new University, which aims at teaching the higher branches, and therefore generally would not have very young persons among its students, a system somewhat similar to that of the German universities ought to be followed; I mean, the student ought to be left more at liberty, and time ought not be wasted in *recitations*.”<sup>211</sup> To allow students to question their professors on difficult or obtuse matters, to introduce objections to texts, and generally work through problems in collaboration with faculty would constitute an education. Self-respect and a respect for order would necessarily follow; the faculty would be admired! Entrenched interests - students, faculty, administration, and denominations - at the existing colleges, however, made their reform an impossibility. These interests, after all, had organized the system and were comfortable in it. "The fact is," Vethake claimed, "that the existing state of things, which I am anxious to see altered, is the necessary result of the arrangement of the students into regularly organized bodies, and of the distribution among them of the usual distinctions and honors."<sup>212</sup> Because students had self-organized student life and were able, through the threat of class solidarity, to block faculty reforms, figuring a way to control student life and therefore break student self organization was a fundamental step in creating a professionalized university. Breaking that organization, something difficult to imagine



as an act of reform, was to be the task of this new university.

With such a different foundation, student discipline would have to undergo a similar transformation. Public humiliation and *in loco parentis* - police methods - encouraged enmity, not scholarship. Ferdinand Hasler<sup>213</sup> thought no university should punish its students. Mr Woodbridge echoed these sentiments, saying that every civilized country had done away with punishment (through the development of universities and prisons) as vindictive action: reformation had become the goal. To suppress crime, Mr Woodbridge claimed, two means existed: "*force*<sup>214</sup> and *influence*." Given the hoped for maturity of the older students, influence should be the primary factor; in a Republic, it was unconscionable that the colleges continued to place men under the constraints of an arbitrary set of laws.

Properly speaking, a university should concern itself only with discipline in the lecture room; in all other areas of life, the student must be guided by freedom. "The necessity," claimed Gallatin, "of assimilating the system of education to the present state of society, is felt every where; and the governments of Europe, where the necessity is far less urgent, are daily adopting measures to that effect. But that which with them is only an anticipation is already with us an imperious necessity."<sup>215</sup> In the US, the people were sovereign, yet they had not much knowledge to go with their Republican born intellect.

While not all assembled agreed on the foregoing, they were all agreed that a better system of primary and secondary education was necessary so as to equip students with an intellectual apparatus before they arrived on the university campus. Without this,

US higher education would continue to concern itself with the task of educating at a secondary level and the faculty, overburdened by this work, would be unable to engage in the rigorous research. Following, the university should itself be the training ground for teachers. In making teaching a profession, the prestige and pay for teachers, and thus the desirability of the job, would increase. Unless it was understood that school teachers possessed a theory of their profession and the esoteric knowledge that accompanies it, the public would not properly value their labor. In this way, pedagogy itself becomes a science worthy of the name.

Related to the need for a broader and better system of primary and secondary education, which itself entailed the professionalization of teaching, was the need to professionalize as professors. To the question of why such an institution was even necessary in an era of free-market entrepreneurialism, many of the young German educated professors offered that a university made possible a co-mixture of commerce and culture necessary to build a great civilization. For this to truly happen, Bancroft argued, the position of faculty would have to change. Starting with their salary. In order to attract the most number of people to this job, higher public esteem and honor, of which paychecks are a part, were in order. Dr. Lieber supported this claim: German faculty, he informed the gathered, were not so successful because they were poorly paid (which in the US had been said made them work harder). He pointed out that the new schools that were built by the state paid well and attracted remarkable and brilliant faculty. On the other hand, it was not love of money that impelled the faculty to excel, either.<sup>216</sup> That the professors were organized as a profession, and

received pay commensurate with that, was the secret of their success. "Teaching in German universities, of which there are so many, forms a real profession, as that of the healing art, or that of theology; the emulation therefore is much greater, than in countries where the Professors of universities form but a small body, not numerous enough for emulation."<sup>217</sup> If the faculty hoped to be paid well qua faculty, they needed to organize themselves on professional lines.

Pay alone could not be determinative of value, however. As important was governance. At every existing college, faculty themselves had no legal right to determine who their colleagues would be, had little to no impact on standards of teaching, on evaluation of students, or what reforms would look like. Instead, these were determined by the church body, the president, the state legislature, and the board as applicable. While it was rare that the faculty were not consulted, this was the extent of their voice and it was easy for their concerns to be ignored.

Ideally, the faculty themselves would have control over who was nominated and elected to the position though, because faculty were already nominally involved, this motion was controversial. "Such a body," claimed Mr. Sparks, "would be as capable as any other, to say the least, of judging in regard to the requisite qualifications of a candidate, and much more capable of deciding whether his personal qualities, traits of character, and habits of thinking, would make him acceptable in their community. It seems evident, therefore, that something is lost, and nothing gained by referring this nomination to another body of men, who have no interests in common with the party chiefly concerned."<sup>218</sup> The faculty constructed their field and, therefore, the faculty

should be solely determinative. The professional interests of faculty, on the one hand, and clergy and politicians, on the other, would necessarily diverge as the faculty achieved consciousness of themselves as a group for itself.

Following the four day convention, its account was published and received significant national and international press. The wholesale reform of education was high on the list of the ascendant capitalist class, along with the professionals who were attaching themselves to it..

The resulting institution, which would eventually become NYU, was plagued by controversy and in desperate need of support, but the principles it laid down were taken up by others in the aftermath. The Convention itself was too broad and contentious to lay out any firm plan, so the moorings of the school continually floated for the next couple of decades. We have here, then, a gathering of professors, prominent men, and other interested parties attempting to found a school based on the professional preferences of academics - professors were putting an institution in place through which their profession could take form - in cahoots with the leading capitalist interests. Finding clients for their services would prove to be the make or break issue for them: would there be material means to support them? Professionals, after all, do not create the material means for their own reproduction, but depend for their survival on a group of clients interested in their labor. Where the midwestern schools used denominational boosters to rouse financial support and students, and the old colleges relied on decades and centuries of networks, NYU lacked both. Those capitalists who

saw in the institution promise did not care to invest their own capital on such a project: it was too easy at the time for men with large sums of capital to make more through investment in trade, infrastructure, and real estate. Wealth did not yet need complicated tools to extract more wealth or to manage employees - these would, however, become necessary in time. The Convention's ideas would have to wait another half a century, for the advent of large scale federal government funding and tycoon capitalist funding (when the corporation was beginning to take the lead away from the tycoon capitalist), to take hold. The NYU attempts, despite the political representation at the body, to procure state funding were not nearly as successful as they hoped. Partly this was due to the large scale enthusiasm for public works funding (the readily available government capital was more attractive to these New York capitalists than investing in education), which then helped lead to the financial crash of 1837. Part of it, on the other hand, was the reluctance of the legislature to hand over continual funding without the ability to tinker with the product. Tuitions and increased enrollment were the principle means by which they sought to fund their new venture - finding parents and students interested in their vision, absent a network of boosters, was to prove difficult, however, and they had to adapt to slow enrollments from the beginning.

As important as the suggestions for improvement in this to be constructed university are, I argue, the diagnoses and discussion of the problems facing higher education are the truly important and lasting contributions of the convention. And, as the several articles that followed from the publication of its minutes shows, the dialog

continued far beyond the initial date or even the founding of the university. NYU struggled and meandered for a long time, yet many of the theories on higher education extrapolated at the Convention proved fruitful.

Towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, professionals would finally find in state legislatures and industrial capitalists the means to prosper. That support, though, would have to wait until the rise of the corporation - the social form capital takes to organize large scale projects. Even then, it would take years of effort to prove to capitalists and the state that this form of labor and property had both a use and exchange value. The tycoon capitalists who first organized monopolies laid the groundwork for the use of this profession, but the corporation would take it to new heights. Thus, it was the self-organization of these men - and the need for support to continue this organization - that made possible the advent of the university.

#### *E. Students*

All in all, in both the 1820s and 1830s college enrollment jumped by more than 80% - seeming to back up the claims of the establishment that a revolution was not necessary in the administration and purpose of the colleges. Moderate reform enticed some students, while the newly wealthy saw in the colleges a means to augment capital with cultural capital. Ronald Story further shows that the older families saw, at least in a Harvard education, a means to consolidate family and network ties.<sup>219</sup> That new colleges were being established throughout the expanding West also helped explain the

jump in numbers. The economic collapse of 1837 proved a damper on educational ambitions, however, and the 1840s saw stagnant growth rates. Perhaps, reformers began to argue, the old arguments could be revisited? Francis Wayland, president of Brown during this decade, argued that economic depression revealed the uselessness of the old college and that, therefore, this realization was what led to the stagnation. According to Geiger, Wayland “accurately diagnosed the weakness of the eastern colleges: they catered solely to the professional class and furnished students with only a preprofessional education - precisely the narrow focus advocated in the Yale Report. Entirely neglected were practitioners of industry and commerce, who were responsible for the transformation taking place in the American economy.”<sup>220</sup> Those students who did attend college, however, kept finding ways to make the time relevant and entertaining. Student life came in for a dramatic shift from its earlier days, inventing new forms of self-education and competition. The social background of the students who began attending college in the 1820s was, therefore, different from their predecessors and these students could not help but transform the social life of students. While the class remained largely unaffected, the debating society was de-centered by the rise of fraternities, a new enthusiasm for athletics and other opportunities created by wealth and evolving student interests.

As colleges accepted more students in the 1820s, the debating societies did as well. Factional splits within the club and internecine conflict were an immediate result. Internal conflict led to new cliques - fraternities, secret societies, and other social organizations - that struggled for control within the societies. These antagonisms were

more fierce on the East Coast than in the West or the South. In the West, a leisure class largely uninterested in politics, though highly attuned to the vagaries of social refinement, was filling the societies; because society was not as settled as it was in the Northeast, the social ramifications for membership were not felt to be as intense.

The vigorous populism characteristic of Jacksonian democracy, too, worked a change in where students chose to matriculate: before long, the college hero became the exemplary athlete while the effete/pasty author/philosopher, in popular verbiage at least, hid in the library. Centered in the northeast, the athletic development of the college student took many by surprise. Emerging around the time of the theoretical foundations of the professor's university, the full arrival of the diversified student life that would dominate the 20<sup>th</sup> century would have to wait for the triumph of the university over the college. Until then, a lively student life continued to develop with the break up of the hegemony of the old colleges.

### *Fraternities*

The first fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa, traces itself back to December, 1776 at William & Mary. "The aim of the organization," writes the historian Henry Sheldon, "was social with some incidental literary training; non-collegians were occasionally admitted to membership."<sup>221</sup> Students at Yale followed, in 1780, and were joined by Harvard two years later. The Yale chapter attempted to maintain a literary relationship with Harvard, but the effort foundered and the societies took the character of locally oriented entities. Sheldon writes that it was predominantly an elite debating



society that also engaged in fairly rigorous revelry.

In 1821, the first competitor for the Kappas arrived at Yale with the Chi Delta Thetas. Sheldon writes that, "If we can judge from the branch at Amherst, it was a select literary society. The exercises consisted of translations in prose and verse from the classical authors, dissertations on literary subjects, and criticisms of ancient and modern books of note. At the conclusion of the programme the college Professor of Literature criticized the proceedings."<sup>222</sup> The modern fraternity movement, though, really dates to 1825 and the legalization of the Kappa Alpha Society at Union College. Over the next twenty years, fraternities sprouted throughout the country. A web of national fraternities was augmented by a number of local organizations that also sprang up in the same twenty year period. "The struggle," recounts Sheldon, "between the secret and anti-secret societies for the possession of promising men waxed fierce during the forties and fifties."<sup>223</sup> The competition between students within a class for prominence within a society began to disrupt some of the class solidarity that had characterized earlier eras of student life. It also led to formations that looked beyond the ambit of the individual college. In 1847, an open society at Williams joined with like organizations at Union, Amherst and Hamilton to create the Anti-Secret Confederation. Within a decade, however, they were to artfully illustrate the futility of resistance: they became the Delta Upsilon and took on many of the features of the secret fraternities - the only real difference was that their constitution was open to the public.

Fraternities have been divisive from the first. As fierce as the rivalries were, the

condemnation and approbation of fraternities was nearly as great. (Intriguingly, Sheldon notes that many of the faculty teaching in the colleges had come out of such clubs and there was a suspicion among many onlookers that they used condemnation of some to further the reputation and standing of their own clubs). According to Sheldon, “A feeling of partisanship almost as deep as this pervades the literature of the subject; most of the articles in books are either attacks or vindications, eulogies, or disparagements.”<sup>224</sup> Amherst President Edward Hitchcock, recognizing that if a society member was expelled from one college, he’d be welcomed into another that shared the club, circulated a letter among the Northern presidents about the possibility of crushing the fraternities. The overwhelming response was that fraternities were evil, but that crushing them would not work and would be counterproductive. Critics thought they helped to divide the student population through petty rivalry and envy and that they were also bad for religion.<sup>225</sup> Others mentioned the damaging effects they were having on the debating societies and, potentially, the class - which educational authorities were beginning to have influence on. Presidents, who were at least familiar with these two, feared that these voluntary associations would curb the ability of the class to modify and guide student behavior. President Robinson of Brown wrote that, “Fraternities and the management of class affairs lead to habits of intrigue and the practice of the low arts of the politician. Combinations and bargains are often made to secure the election or defeat of candidates for parts in exercises of class day at the end of the college course which are inconsistent with the disingenuousness of youth and scholars.”<sup>226</sup>

Princeton President McCosh wrote on their danger, claiming that, “They foster in youth when character is forming a habit of underhand action and underhand procedure which is apt to go through life. It should be one of our aims to rear open and manly character. There is always a tendency in these secret organizations to meddle with college management, to check certain plans of the college authorities, and influence elections to college honours. They often tempt young men to drink and dissipation. Nearly every professor acknowledges them to be an evil, but is afraid of them.”<sup>227</sup> The University of Michigan, in 1851, attempted to crush the fraternities and expel all their students. Freemasons and other local secret societies joined together and put an end to that administration. Princeton, it seems, was the only school to have gotten away with it.

The benefits of student social life in the societies, proponents of the new research university argued, far outweighed their demerits. Arguing, in the 1860s, that fraternities were beneficial, Cornell’s Andrew White believed that in a university absent the disciplinary controls of the college, these organizations would ensure social cohesion. First, these permanent clubs must maintain reputations and it was up to the individual character and actions of each student who wore the societies’ badge to not shame the society; students, then, would police themselves far better than administrators could. Faculty, too, could make use of the fraternity. When a student was failing, they could go to the fraternity (or sorority) and ask that they either remove or rehabilitate the student (the organization was dishonored by their failure, after all). Further, chapter houses were the responsibility of the students themselves and housed

the societies' possessions: they, therefore, were typically immune from the collegiate rioting that had damaged college owned residences under the collegiate regime. Lastly, attempts to suppress them only harmed the students and the college - it sent them underground where the national scope of the club made it harder to police. White wrote that, "if each fraternity is allowed to exist on its own merits, any one thought injurious by the college faculty can easily be driven out. It is one of the easiest things imaginable."<sup>228</sup> For the advocates of university reform, fraternities and sororities were easily a boon because they increased competition between students rather than encouraging solidarity against the professoriate. Competition could then be leveraged to make the student malleable in the professors' hands.

#### *Clubs for the Body and the Mind*

Until the 1820s, athletics were frowned upon by both colleges and students. For the schools born in colonial days, whose purpose was the production of gentlemen, athletics were unbecoming. The historian Francis Walker wrote that, "There was more than indifference, there was contempt for physical prowess. A man known to be especially gifted in this way was thereby disparaged in public estimation; if he was known to make much of it, he was more likely to be despised. It was taken for granted that he could not be good for much else. Brains and brawn were supposed to be developed in inverse ration; strength was closely akin to brutality."<sup>229</sup> However, as new students beginning to attend college reflected a shift in demographics, there was also a shift in what students themselves were looking for in college and athletics was

beginning to take an important place. Harvard was the first to devote time to the pursuit in the 1820s, so as to remove it from strictly student oversight, and Yale followed, though with tentative and insufficient steps. At Princeton, Amherst, Bowdoin and other schools, athletic competitions between classes were noted, though most students were not yet engaging in organized sport (preferring, perhaps, the riots and melees).

The first boating club traces to Yale in 1843. Inter-campus rivalries quickly ensued and intercollegiate competitions between Harvard and Yale became normal. Princeton and Amherst both had baseball teams by the late 1850s. Harvard and Yale were playing each other by 1868. These were student organized and driven endeavors, and their organization reveals this orientation: “the baseball players constituted themselves a society, with the regulation president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, and three directors.”<sup>230</sup> Classes at Yale were playing each other at football at least as early as the late 1850s. The student forms of organization, then, continued into athletics rather than being replaced by them. They were still almost entirely the domain of students - a way to organize violence and boredom - and were neither led nor organized by staff at the college.

Student publications, too, showed the definitive marks of student self-organization. They emerged either as the result of the secret activity of a few students or as an organ of a debating society. Originally a humorous and critical journalistic take on some collegiate affair, it would take several years before the form settled. In 1803,

students at Dartmouth published the *Literary Tablet* and, in 1806, students at Yale published the *Literary Cabinet*. These and other endeavors lasted a few runs before disappearing. Finally, in 1837, Yale students permanently founded the *Yale Literary Magazine*. Poetry, romance, humor and essay were typical of their editions. Students created both humorous and light publications as well as more serious minded journals.

In addition to collegiate life, students also took an interest in literary matters. The *Harvard Lyceum* appears to have been the first of these magazines. It existed to consider American literature examining and comparing modern works. According to a Yale grad of 1821, the Literary magazine “Must be strictly literary in character, ; propriety and taste forbid that it should intermingle with the facts and feelings of the world at large. Discarding politics, business, and polemics, it must be sustained as a thing of letters and taste.”<sup>231</sup> The students did not treat their subjects with scholarly or scientific interest, but rather as if they were statesmen or orators. To be an editor was among the higher honors a student could achieve. They initially failed not for lack of initiative, but rather due to the small size of schools and the financial burden of producing it. Many college presidents (such as Andrew White and D.C. Gilman) who led the charge to found and spread universities had been editors at one time.

As colleges grew in size and began to embrace new avenues of study, students transformed the way they related to each other and to the college. Finding more and more specialized avenues of interest led students, now part of larger class sizes at many of the older colleges, to find more pointed interests. They did not have to socialize with everyone in their class, but could focus on their friends in new extra-collegiate pursuits.

Student life was both a reaction to the changing collegiate landscape and a further enticement to develop a new form.

In general, the soil for a new educational system was being tilled and planted, yet the reformers were having a difficult time finding either a public or students in sufficient numbers to make their plans succeed. They needed to professionalize in order to gain power, but they could not get enough students to make professionalization a possibility. The plight of Francis Wayland at Brown can, in a way, epitomize the time period. Wayland was one of the most influential of the reformers and, with his position at Brown, was seen as a national leader in educational reform. The Board gave him near *carte blanche* to enact his reforms, yet he was fired after a decade long tenure (in 1855) because, as Jane Weyant writes, “it became apparent that the new system had failed to attract more students and had resulted in administrative and disciplinary chaos.”<sup>232</sup> Like many of the reformers of this era, he himself was unable to make his policies stick, yet his writings were critical for the next generation as they took up the mantle of educational transformation. These men were still waiting for a social movement to which they could hitch their ideas.

## ***Section II: Becoming Broad***

What made the higher education scene so dynamic in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (and up until the post-war period) was the tremendous churn provided by the establishment of industrial society. An emerging division of labor required new types of training and offered new means of investment for families where (relatively) cheap land was running out; for those looking to consolidate the practices of their labor in order to control that labor; and for those seeking to best position themselves in any manner they thought possible - this means the invention of new types of law, new types of management, new types of engineering, etc. It would also mean, by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, that new types of ideology would need to appear in order to justify the subjugation of the emerging working class and the supremacy of the emerging monopolies. This was to be produced, in part, by the universities. This is not to say that the tremendous number of other types of higher education were not also important - they were. That there were so many people trying so many different types of higher education in so many experimental ways shows an emerging society in need of new ideologies and new labor control practices.



### **Chapter 3: Antagonisms**

The mid-19<sup>th</sup> century was a time of tremendous ferment as industrial capitalism remade existing social relations. The previous chapters were concerned with the previously existing state of higher education within a society structured, largely, by a colonizing society and merchant capitalism. I showed that a growing group of reformers was recognizing that a new era was coming and, therefore, that higher education had to change to keep pace. Not just that, but that through the application of reason, a rationally constructed university could sit at the center of this new society. In order for this to happen, an entirely new form had to be created. Nothing ever emerges *ex nihilo*, of course, so I looked at those experiments that seemed to be the most influential in shaping what would, during the mid-century, become a new form of higher education. What follows in this chapter will more closely examine the conditions in which a re-formed higher education was to plant itself, try to understand the contexts which made possible new forms of governance, educational theory, and faculty, and therefore set the scene for the remaining two chapters.

By the Civil War, around two hundred and fifty colleges had been established. The bulk of these schools were not universities, but rather attempts to mime Yale (the bulk of the missionary workers establishing these schools came from Yale). For their founders and supporters, colleges and universities promised economic<sup>233</sup> growth (real estate prices tended to jump with a college nearby), regional pride, and a supposed civilizing influence on the area. Students, at times, responded well to this expansion, as enrollments saw a corresponding jump, climbing 80% between 1820 and 1837. With

the economic collapse of 1837 college enrollments stagnated. Following the 1850s, enrollments and new college construction again grew - primarily due to Christian sects founding colleges in the new settlements of the West. Additionally, state legislatures funded some new college construction as a way to dole out political favors, though educational institutions were not necessarily most highly prized. "In a few cases," claims Lucas, "legislatures awarded a college as a sort of consolation prize to a town that had lost out in the competition for a penal institution or insane asylum."<sup>234</sup> We should not undersell the appeal of colleges, however, as city leaders appealed to state legislatures for funds to create "the Athens of America" or "... the West" or "... South."<sup>235</sup>

The college meant far different things to different people. It was, of course, a public good because it trained ministers and legal minds while also increasing property values. It was also tremendously important because it had a positive affect on land values, and therefore helps explain why so many towns bid on, and some won, the construction and maintenance of a college. A successful bid would result in either denominational or government spending - and thus jobs - as well as an amount of prestige which would accrue to the town and its fathers. Local boosters were important for these new schools - believing that a college would enhance the standing of their town or territory, local elites spent their money to help attract and (with as little assistance as they could) sustain higher education because it would, amidst the general betterment of the town, help their own financial and cultural futures. Impoverished and small, many of these schools had only passing importance as the industrial

economy slowly churned up all social and legal relationships that had evolved in the burgeoning West.

At the same time, population growth in the US and the increasing demand for food and goods led large landholders and producers to do everything they could to amplify their productive capabilities. In Europe, universities had begun, through research and the application of techniques developed in labs, to help foster industrial innovation in farming and manufacturing. For wealthy Stateside farmers, such a relationship with a local university could prove extremely beneficial, but there were, as yet, no institutions capable of fulfilling this demand. This is why Illinois and Indiana, free states bordering slave states, took the lead in crafting a plan for federal help in developing higher educational facilities through which to foster the conditions for the university/capitalist co-operation. It was imperative for each of the colleges and regions to bolster their own college as much as possible so as to preserve property value and the ability to produce commodities in the most efficient and cost-effective way possible. This is not to say that there were not yet political and social difficulties, such as the low standards associated with schools throughout the South and the West and the opposition of small farmers to existing colleges in these regions, to overcome. Opposition stemmed largely from the fact that the benefits of legislative help were not equally distributed, but helped the larger farmers accumulate more resources; scientific advance for most small producers, after all, meant accruing debt in order to buy or rent machines which might help them hold on for a while longer.

By the 1850s, traction was being made by reformist attempts to remake higher

education and by industrialists seeking to create educational forms for the so-called industrial classes - the sons and daughters of the newly monied industrial capitalists, the immigrant laborers being recruited from Europe and the farmers being pushed off their land by debt and taxes (all are specifically mentioned by reformists as targets of the newly developing form of higher education). Men such as Henry Tappan, who would lead the University of Michigan to greatness, were working to build institutions to meet these needs: in 1851 he declared, “the commercial spirit of our country, and the many avenues of wealth which are opened before enterprise, create a distaste for study deeply inimical to education. The manufacturer, the merchant, and the gold-digger, will not pause in their career to gain intellectual accomplishments. While gaining knowledge, they are losing the opportunities to gain money.”<sup>236</sup> Higher education was figuring out how to offer these men and women reasons to attend. Precisely because these men were more than likely going to lead the new industrial economy, wealth and civic power would lay with them and, therefore, it was imperative that faculty align themselves with the this future.

At the same time, US colleges were continuing to produce a small number of graduates whose ambitions towards becoming faculty were increasingly set by professional academics in Europe. Either traveling to Germany or spurred by their colleagues overseas, they continued their attempts at professionalizing the teaching ranks. The creation of wealth by the expansion of industrial capitalism - the necessary spatial expansion of industrial capitalism and Southern slavery, already signaled by the

Missouri Compromise, would soon break into Civil War<sup>237</sup> - was itself the condition under which a whole range of professional activity,<sup>238</sup> and its concomitant - a middle class existing between capitalist and waged worker - could arise. Where once the statesman lawyer, the doctor and the minister had, along with merchant capitalists, constituted the upper class of society, the rush of capital towards industrial production was reorganizing society. The professional class, either the siblings and sons of merchant capitalists or ambitious youths who used the ministry as a means towards upward mobility, could not help but be reconfigured as well. Throughout the middle of the century, industrial growth and immigration produced a vast population of wage earners and, at the same time, an industrial capitalist elite. The wage earners owned nothing but their ability to labor and the industrial elite owned the machines and infrastructure upon which they labored (whether on farms which were increasingly using mechanical means of production or the increasingly prevalent factories). In the middle, between these two classes, a professional class - which neither worked for a wage nor owned the machinery of productive - sought to develop the means and institutions whereby it could exert control over the production of knowledge and, therefore, a degree of autonomy from capitalist exploitation. Universities where faculty controlled who taught, who graduated, and what knowledge was useful and important (and what counted as knowledge at all), along with the development of Societies in which to codify and develop knowledge, were the key component of the autonomy of the professional class. Together, then, these conditions were the foundation that called for the formation of new institutions through which a professional academic class

could establish itself against the sectarian and parochial control of trustees, legislatures and philanthropists.

Finally, it was becoming broadly apparent that the theory of The University laid down by the visionaries in New York in 1830 was a much better match for the economic and social conditions of industrial capitalism, providing, perhaps, a client base composed of industrial capitalists and workers by which to bring about the formation of the research university. The triumph of the research university, however, would require breaking the traditional administrative control structures, elevating the status of faculty by eliminating the dilettantes who populated the faculty, articulating a new juridical foundation for the colleges (largely based around who controlled what areas of the college - president, trustees/board, or faculty - as well as issues regarding public/private, and determining what student discipline would look like), and finding an adequate base of support. And enticing the industrial classes (both capitalist and worker) into the university. In the main, these moves occurred in the West, the South and the industrialized areas of the North, though reformers in the old guard made attempts to incorporate new reforms so as to widen the distance between themselves and their immediate rivals while not allowing the new schools to displace their supremacy. While this fight was taking place, students and faculty in some of the Western schools, beginning in the 1830s, were beginning to organize in order to break apart the prohibition on co-education with women and black students. While not producing many formal innovations, integration was a remarkable struggle by students that would, with the advent of the university, develop new forms of student social life.

From at least the 1820s onward, experiments in higher education (from workers schools, mechanics institutes, agricultural colleges, denominational colleges, or the research university), were interested in particular modes of labor - its enhancement, maximization, and control. In the midst of populist setbacks to lawyers and doctors, it was the professional faculty, emerging as a new entity, that organized for professional control of their work. This was obviously going on in the other professions, but the university becomes, in many ways, the condition of all professionalized success.

#### *A. New Conditions*

A central question percolating through the process of forming the University was who would support and nurture it. The men formulating the plans for higher education appeal, over and over, to the mechanics, the farmers, and the industrial classes as their audience. They sought, in their rhetoric, to found an institution through which to amplify the importance of these groups, to bring them into the literary and cultural environment of the ruling class. Many of these men, after all, were scions of the elite Northeastern families who, finding the old forms inhospitable to the new conditions of the industrializing and expanding country - and to their own ambitions - set about to effect a new social base for the organization of labor. The backdrop for this was Jacksonian democracy and anti-institutional fervor celebrating the potential of individuals.<sup>239</sup> Where the lawyer statesman associated with the old colleges and the debating club once ruled, the professional ambitions of this class had

been dealt a smashing blow by the 1830s, with the two-Party structure coming to thoroughly dominate by the 1840s. The imperative to invent new professional positions, and give them content in volatile times, was felt acutely by these sons of the older upper class.

In the wake of massive public spending campaigns by local legislatures in the 1820s, which caused a financial collapse, public support for public spending was difficult to drum up, however. The absence of support hit the recently founded colleges in the South and West hard and made the attempts to go beyond the college form exceedingly difficult. Thinking the relation of the emergent social system had been a primary focus of the New York convention, but even there they'd been unable to raise a base of support. As part of building their vision, university men took to public begging and cajoling in their quest for funding.

### *Southern Professionals*

As the system of education grew in size, the struggle between Southern educators, plantation families, and Northern educational systems intensified. The question revolved around what the proper object of the university was: to provide society with a set of educational and cultural ideals it already possessed, to spread enlightened thought, or for faculty to themselves determine the shape and scope of education? In 1856, Benjamin Hedrick, sparked a controversy by supporting a Republican for office. A North Carolinian who had been educated at Harvard, Hedrick had been hired by the University of North Carolina to teach chemistry; his advocacy of a Republican



who opposed slavery set off a firestorm of condemnation. John Engelhard (an alum and law student of UNC), spoke for many plantation families when he wrote, in 1856, "The importance of emancipating our young men from the baneful influences of the North - and no where is this influence more zealously exerted and powerfully felt than in Northern colleges and under black Republican teachers - has taken firm hold on our people."<sup>240</sup> He notes that Harvard and Yale, where Southern parents were proud to send their sons, were turning their students against their parents and the South.<sup>241</sup> To free the South from Northern interference in education, he claimed, required new schools with an orientation towards knowledge that provided Southern society something it was as yet missing. Existing education bore too indelibly the mark of Northeastern ideology - and therefore, in the confrontation of industrial capitalism and plantation slavery, the system of education would, as a whole, side with the North. That a Southern plantation owner should have to support a professor who taught against the institution of slavery ("Are these the doctrines he advocates to young men, two-thirds of whose property consists in slaves?")<sup>242</sup> was outrageous. Hedrick was let go, but he argued, in his defense, that student views are generally more or less defined by the time they arrived at College due to the education they receive in their homes. If this was the case, what was the object and purpose of higher education? It was purely the advancement of knowledge through the professional habits of a highly trained professoriate. Personal views were simply that and do not interfere with the discovering and exploiting the hidden laws governing nature. Higher education, therefore, exists not primarily to educate students, but lay hold of the productive capacities of nature -

which is done through training students, sure, but also through the development of theory and practice regarding mechanical production.

Capitalizing on this friction, Southern educators sought to drive a wedge between the older form of the colleges and their own vision of what a newly formed university could be. For Philip Lindsley, President of Nashville University, it was an opportunity to address religion's domination of education - a preposterous situation, as far as he was concerned. First, the proliferation of religious colleges kept all of the colleges weak by spreading out qualified faculty and students. Second, because they were local for many communities, there was not an necessity for students to go to the state sponsored school, effectively stealing the future of America's leaders. Sects, when establishing a college, acted like wolves in sheep's clothing, he claimed: whenever one got a charter for a school, it suddenly becomes a paragon of openness, proclaiming that all should attend without fear of conversion. Lindsley called this balderdash: "This is very modest and very specious, and very hollow, and very hypocritical. They hold out false colours to allure and to deceive the incautious. Their college *is* sectarian, and they know it. It is established by a party - governed by a party - taught by a party - and designed to promote the ends of party."<sup>243</sup> To pretend any different, to act as if the college was not a proselytizing tool, was a falsehood and made the prospect of creating truly rational and scientific institutions more difficult for lack of support and infrastructure. As science and philosophy abhor partisanship, he argued, universities seeking to educate should also avoid partisanship.<sup>244</sup> As faculty and reformers worked

to create their universities, they made use of this argument time and again: the reins of society should fall to non-partisans, specifically those trained at universities where science and rationality trumped faith and religion.

Again, however, competition from the denominational schools as well as the Northern institutions meant developing schools with a rational organization was difficult because they could not draw enough students or public support. It also provided an opportunity for reformers to draw out the differences between what they desired in a university and what currently existed in the colleges. Jasper Adams, President of Charleston College in South Carolina and founder of the American Institute of Instruction (devoted to educational reform) was one of many to take up this task. In many ways, his thought mirrors that of the reformers in the New York City convention. Like most, he believed that higher education was integrally twined with establishing and preserving morality, science, religion and culture. Given that Southern culture was antagonistic to the North, however, higher education in the South needed a new orientation.

In line with Lindsley, Adams argued that this meant trustees had to leave behind their denominational concerns in service to a new Southern standard. He found it useful that they be eminent men because their influence in society and government would bring both funds and a desire to preserve the form of society that granted them their position. Boards and trustees, overseeing the public institution over the course of its existence, are custodians of a public confidence and, as such, their interest must be

in preserving Southern culture rather than denominational creed. "This feature in their structure," he claimed, "to wit, the permanence and stability secured by a perpetual existence, is extremely valuable, and even essential, because large funds, extensive libraries, and a variety of philosophical and other apparatus, must, beyond what can ordinarily be collected in a single age, be indispensable to any considerable success and usefulness."<sup>245</sup> Boards should be understood as the legislative branch of the institution.

Because every institution is essentially a means towards an end - and in the case of a state school, that state's legislative body determines that end - the means must follow upon those ends. Boards are simply a means towards an end - an end they should be empowered to oversee, but not determine. For a state university, according to Adams, the chief end is to bring together, "a learned and effective faculty, qualified to impart such instruction in literature and the sciences as is called for by the wants of the community."<sup>246</sup> We can mark a transition here: for Adams and others like him, the old purpose of the College, to furnish the mind of young students with proper thinking in order to outfit him for the needs his community, was obsolete and the new end, organizing top notch faculty, was paramount - and required a new governing structure. Adams asserted that public opinion places with the faculty the responsibility for the conduct of the college. If that was true, then the faculty should be the ones to decide their associates and agents and the faculty alone should have the power to determine what they teach.

For their part, faculty were to be tasked with elaborating the vision laid out by the

Trustees in the name of the public. They should be the administrative apparatus, which would allow "them the stability and independence essential to the successful discharge of the duties of instruction and discipline, which ought always to be committed to them."<sup>247</sup> As there had been no reason to formalize the relationship between faculty and board in the College, it was necessary to do so with the new institution. As it stood, it fell to those men with visitorial power (essentially judicial or investigative power) to adjudicate disputes between the faculty and board. The ambiguity of the professor/trustee relationship, a relic from the old colleges, existed as a primary stumbling point for a proper education in that the faculty were not adept at teaching. Existing faculty almost uniformly lack, he writes,

The "qualifications which peculiarly fit them for the practical administration of those institutions. They are not often selected for their situation, by reason of any peculiar fitness. They consist without much discrimination of eminent lawyers, clergymen and physicians; successful agriculturists, manufacturers, merchants, and other substantial classes of the community. But assuredly, the qualifications which have given them eminence and success in the professions and branches of business, which it has been their choice to pursue, have imparted to them no peculiar fitness to gain the ascendancy over young men, and to inspire them with the love of virtue, and the enthusiasm of learning."<sup>248</sup>

Association with the school was necessary, but they were not themselves fit to be faculty.

Substituting a new type of faculty would then allow the faculty to take pre-eminence in the university itself. As things currently stood, however, "the faculty have been compelled to remain inactive, and let things take their course, or to resign their offices in discouragement and disgust."<sup>249</sup> In these conditions, there was no particular reason for students to obey or concern themselves with the faculty. Academic freedom

and self-determination for faculty were, therefore, the necessary conditions for the success of any institution of education that aimed to approximate the title of university, educate the masses, or be at all involved in the spiritual and intellectual life of the country. To enshrine the separation of spheres - or the autonomy of faculty against the Board - in the constitution of Universities must be the task of administrations intent on bringing light to the country.

In review, the responsibilities of the board and trustees should consist only in overseeing the charter; appointing the original faculty, assigning salaries, and adjudicating faculty disputes; ensuring the upkeep of the the institution; removing those faculty who were no longer fit to teach; setting the budget; and defending faculty to the public (they were, after all, to be considered as patrons).<sup>250</sup> In all this, though, they were to be governed by wisdom of the faculty.

Because the South needed to experiment with higher education, it was an attractive location for ambitious reformers to teach. There was not just a social base from which to experiment with education, but an imperative to do so. Boards and trustees rarely acquiesced to faculty demands, but the social space in which to advocate for these changes was opened. Lindsley and others turned down prestigious posts in the North because only outside of these centers could they gain the freedom and social support to formulate a new social base and economic function for the university. In the taut political climate of pre-war society, there was growing room to experiment.

*University of Michigan (The Catholepistemiad)*

One of the first universities to confront head on these concerns was the University of Michigan. Founded by Judge Augustus Woodward, a graduate of Columbia College, it bore the influence of Jefferson in its founding documents. Woodward, an amateur scientist, had been appointed as a judge in the territory of Michigan by Jefferson. During his tenure, he formulated his idea for a university, *A System of Universal Science*, that eventually laid the blueprint for what was, by 1850, the second largest state university (after UVA). He advocated thirteen professorships<sup>251</sup> that would be paid by the territory of Michigan; the professors were to, ‘have power to regulate all the concer[ns] of the institution, to enact laws for that pu[r]pose, to sue, to be sued, to acquire, to hol[d] and to aliene, property, real, mixed, and personal, to make, to sue and to alter, a seal, to establish colleges, academies, schools, libraries, musaeums, athenaeums, botanic gardens, laboratories, and other useful literary and scientific institutions, consonant to the laws of the United States of America and of Michigan, and to appoint officers, instructors and instructrixes, in, among, and throughout, the various counties, cities, towns, townships, and other geographical divisions, of Michigan.’<sup>252</sup> He augmented the thirteen with sub-instructors, also to be paid by Michigan. Taxes were levied to pay for instruction; lotteries were used to raise funds for land, buildings, books, libraries and all other necessary purposes. Trustees were to nominate acceptable instructors and professors; if a mistake had been made, a professor or instructor could be removed by the board. This was to be a state-wide system for education until adulthood. Primary School, classical academy and college were all established in this act and made dependent on the state. The requirement to

teach was proficiency in the field rather than success in a profession.

From the beginning, the dangers of sectarianism were paramount in the founders' minds. In the founding document of the University, they write that, "Experiments made in other States, by catering to the morbid prejudices of sectarians, have only embarrassed the institutions of the State, and matured the growth of numerous and rival colleges avowedly sectarian."<sup>253</sup> Even with the best intentions, no start is ever fresh, however, and it proved a delicate balance to undo the bounds that tied the school to religion. The material and social conditions that had for so long held sway, as UVA and the New York Convention illustrated, were difficult to disentangle. Through the end of the century, non-academic concerns were still able to preclude professional judgment of ability. For instance, in 1851, Professor Daniel Whedon was let go for opposing the growth of slavery. He had argued, in his defense, a position made possible by the legislation that founded the University. That legislation, he claimed, deemed that the purpose of the University was, "To provide the inhabitants of the State with the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of Literature, Science, and the Arts," not to be "used for the inculcation of political or religious dogmas."<sup>254</sup> In a telling move, disagreement and protest sparked by the arbitrary standards used to judge his merit as a faculty member were met by the Regents with a resolution to no longer hold open-door meetings so as not to reveal their deliberations. Michigan was, regardless, remarkably successful in their attempt to create a modern university. In fact, it could be argued that their university was the first truly modern such institution. They catered to the industrial classes, put organizational



power in the hands of their professionals, and did a pretty good job of avoiding factional strife.

### *Mass Capitalist Agriculture*

Amidst the ferment in higher educational governance, another key piece of the new university was being developed in Illinois by agricultural concerns. Around the early 1850s, an Illinois professor, Jonathan Turner, put to paper ideas widely in circulation throughout the Midwest and wrote would become the model for the Morrill Land Grant legislation. The outgrowth of a meeting by the United States Agricultural Society, this paper was an attempt by the Western states to develop an alternative professional education, this one reaching their core constituents: farmers and the immigrant working class. (The argument here is that it was at these Agricultural Conventions that the farmers and their politicians began to talk about the need for government sponsored science to help them maximize their yield. The Morrill Land Grant appears to have been written/inspired by midwestern agricultural concerns and then transformed by Morrill, a Vermont senator, when he was approached to sponsor it. A proper discussion of the Morrill Land Grant belongs in the next chapter, yet it is useful to note here the role that large-scale capitalist agricultural played in the creation of the new university).

### *B. Student Power*

Meanwhile, as Bledstein notes, students were continuing to change the culture of

education. By the late 1820s student life was beginning to take a new activist direction. At the time, it was thought that students simply reflected the political beliefs of their parents and communities and therefore little attention was paid them by politicians or parties. This did not stop students from organizing, however, though there were far fewer political clubs than other types of self-organization. "At Amherst," writes Sheldon, "we find records of a Colonization Society (1828), which aimed to support a colony of negroes in Liberia; an Antislavery Society, which existed for three years (1832-35), until it was suppressed by the faculty, and a Peace Society (1838), before which addresses were occasionally delivered."<sup>255</sup> Military and singing clubs came into existence in the 1780s. Science clubs in the 1820s. Amherst's Linnaean Society, in 1822, and Harvard's Natural History Society, 1837, allowed for the collection and display of specimens as well as the presentation of papers. At many schools, these were the only real place for scientific work and discovery; many of the clubs disbanded with the university's assimilation of science (due, in part, to those men who had been in these clubs becoming faculty themselves - Henry Ward Beecher, a famous phrenologist and abolitionist, is just one such example). Other students, to supplement their medical training, formed medical clubs to broaden their knowledge and assist in studies. Students also organized religious societies and clubs, due to the waning of sectarian feeling in the college hierarchy, students of particular denominations gathered to encourage each other, engage in benevolent activity, establish ties beyond the College, and provide for poor students. It is notable that the provision for poorer students was often a function of student organization.

Sometimes, however, student organization could have a dramatic impact on the social life of a region. This, in fact, is how schools in Ohio began to accept black students. The first African-American student, Alexander Twilight, to receive Bachelors Degrees did so in 1823, but this was by no means to become a regular occurrence. By the time of the Emancipation only twenty-seven Black students had graduated, and all of them were in the North. (It was illegal, after all, to educate African-Americans in the South until after the Civil War).<sup>256</sup> The first college for students of African descent, the Institute for Colored Youth, was started by Philadelphia Quakers in 1842. In the next few decades, two hundred colleges for African Americans were begun, though less than thirty remained by 1900. Following the Civil War, Southern attitudes towards education slowly changed or were redirected and education for Black youth was seen as a possibility - as long as it didn't upset racial hierarchies.

White reformers had been advocating for the extension of education to black folks for a while, though their concerns were generally paternalistic. Their main concern was to bring black students into the mainstream of American life and thereby to lift the race in general while disrupting the community based education that had been the concern of black communities.<sup>257</sup> Most schools for black students - created in the North and West, where it was not illegal, and before the Civil War - were initially begun with the intention of training black youth in the same skills and knowledge as white youth, though the differences in the material conditions through which black and white youth encountered education were quickly made manifest. The common

assumptions and education necessary for liberal education to acquire meaning and take hold were largely absent in the majority of black communities, however. Racism, both institutional and individual, made it such that even had the education necessary to engage in collegiate studies been present, very few of the rewards for completing that education would have been forthcoming. A much broader societal shift was necessary than to simply open white institutions to others. White students in Ohio were on the front lines of both of the movement to open higher education to black students, though they would learn that having progressive ideals meant little for their intended audience.

The student power movement that swept up Oberlin in the 1830s began at Western Reserve College in Hudson, Ohio. The matter of how to end slavery in the US was a hot issue, one that pitted faculty against the trustees. While the three members of Oberlin's faculty advocated immediate abolition, the trustees were in favor of the plan to ship freed slaves to Liberia. Lawrence Goodheart, an education historian, notes that the faculty, younger men who had come of age during the revivals of the 1820s, worked for abolition while the trustees, men of means within the community, desired "orderly social change even if it meant tolerating sin."<sup>258</sup> The College itself was the product of a number of families, who traced their families to Connecticut, that desired a nearby college wherein the critical shortage of ministers could be addressed. The town's people contributed money to fund the school and it was chartered in 1826.

In 1832, the three faculty members all became convinced by William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator* that abolition alone was the ethical stance to take on slavery. Not only were the resources to send all the former slaves to Liberia absent, but also the colonization of a new place by former slaves was a slow, impractical and cruel abdication of the responsibility to work against slavery, not ameliorate its effects. Elizur Wright, the youngest faculty member, wrote that, "The more I was troubled with [Garrison's] great fundamental principles - the more sick I was of that flexible, convenient expediency on which I say my own cause was based. In short, I burnt up my Colonizationism..."<sup>259</sup> While Wright had taught at Yale, one of his students, a white youth, had a dark complexion and was mercilessly hounded by Southern students who were convinced he was black. Other faculty had turned a blind eye, which outraged Wright. He was furious not only because of the treatment of a white student in such a manner, but what that treatment would have augured for "an acknowledged African."<sup>260</sup> Arguing that Yale should be focusing on bringing about right and proper attitudes in students rather than fostering the evil of their hatred, he left for Western Reserve - where similar attitudes prevailed.

However, these attitudes tended towards respectability rather than social change. While many of the Evangelicals in town and in the region believed slavery was wrong, they, for the most part, felt that an orderly transition would be far better than immediate liberation. They faced condemnation in town for their advocacy of abolition. One faculty member, Beriah Green, set up a debate on colonization and abolition in his rhetoric class. At the time, such debates were events for the entire

school. After parsing the issue, more and more students were attracted to the abolitionist cause. From the classroom and the pulpit, then, the faculty had launched an attack on colonization as a means to end slavery. Like many of the younger professional academics, they fell under the illusion that the presentation of proper arguments with impeccable logic would produce a change in the listener. This proved an unfortunate miscalculation.

“Practical men,” Goodheart writes, “the colonizationist trustees wished to keep evangelical enthusiasm within what they considered reasonable bounds and to avoid public controversy lest the existence of the college be jeopardized.”<sup>261</sup> Opposition was no longer simply centered in the faculty, but was proving a vital force in the students. The trustees formed a committee to figure out what to do. They refused calls to censure the faculty, but left the opportunity open for the future. Other trustees, disappointed with the result, formed a secret meeting to determine a course of action. The president, though not invited, showed up to defend the right of faculty (of which he was himself) to speak on whatever they felt they needed to speak. The controversy attracted attention in the East, which prompted a visit to Western Reserve by Garrison. In a speech at the school, Garrison proclaimed that the controversy revealed the close interests and relationships between slave owners and the colonization societies. *The Liberator* printed many essays from Wright, who used the enlarged platform to drum up support in the cities of the east. However, the Trustees were beginning to find that financial support, which they desperately needed, was drying up among their base because of the abolitionist proclivities of its faculty and students.

The institutional relationships they needed to survive meant a return to order, while advocating slow transformation and safer positions, were the only way they could maintain the institution while also mildly speaking against slavery.

Three faculty members decided, in 1833, that the conditions at Western Reserve were no longer conducive to education and decided to leave (one, professor Storrs, came down with tuberculosis, which he died from soon after the decision to leave). Wright quit academia to organize. Green resigned and took the presidency of Oneida Institute, a biracial school in New York. The trustees and their supporters trumpeted that the attempt to make Western Reserve College a “Seminary for educating Abolition Missionaries” had failed.”<sup>262</sup> Wright countered that attempts to censor discussion had already failed and that students would not submit to the quelling of their feelings. Without a dedicated leadership, however, the movement ceased to grow. At the same time, a similar controversy was stirring at Lane Seminary, in Cincinnati. One of the student leaders, Theodore Weld, had had his conversion to the abolitionist movement while visiting Western Reserve College in 1832. The evangelical rage at the sin of slavery fed all of these activists and set the stage for the Lane Seminary strike.

William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator* had begun publishing shots at the prominent Colonization Society<sup>263</sup> for advocating repatriation to Africa rather than abolition. This caused a stir in many of the schools planted by New England transplants. In 1834-35, Cincinnati's Lane Seminary, whose students were, according to Fairchild, "manual labor students,<sup>264</sup> energetic and self-relying," responded to Garrison's calls for

immediate emancipation, holding a meeting in the chapel to discuss the issue. Over the next eighteen days, students debated the issue until the abolitionist side emerged victorious - finally overcoming the opposition of even the students whose families held slaves. Students began to hold Sabbath-schools and day schools for black youth "and made use of all the means at hand to elevate and advance them."<sup>265</sup> This upset the trustees, who preferred a more settled environment. Once summer arrived, when all but one of the faculty and nearly all of the students were elsewhere, the trustees met and decreed that discussing slavery, in public or private, was to be prohibited. They also fired Professor Morgan, an outspoken opponent of slavery. The faculty returned, groused, and went about their business. The students, however, began a protest, culminating in four-fifths of them walking out. Arthur Tappan, a prominent commercial industrialist and anti-slavery crusader, offered the students \$5,000 and money to fund a professor in order to found a school devoted to the Abolitionist cause. Oberlin's founder, Rev. John Shipherd heard about this, and being sympathetic to the students (and ambitious for his own school), formulated a plan to incorporate Lane's students and Tappan's money. Creating a Theological Department, he invited the Lane students to become its first class. Shipherd, in coming into contact with these students, was excited and set about hiring Rev. Asa Mahan (a prominent opponent of slavery) as president and Professor Morgan as its first professor. The student rebels, accepting this offer, left Lane *en masse* and arrived at Oberlin in the Spring of 1835.

From its beginning in 1833, Oberlin had proven experimental. Men and women



were invited to attend; costs were kept as low as possible through a "Manual Labor System" by which students could work for their education; it was to be surrounded by a Christian voluntary community dedicated to supporting the mission. Most of these volunteers came from New England, New York and Ohio (a stronghold of New England thought). The school had a hundred students in their first year. It took as its basis, however, the curriculum of Yale and privileged the dead languages. Given these conditions, the early missionary zeal can be understood: it was, from the beginning, a place for those desiring to change to the world. J.F. Fairchild, one of the first students and later a president of Oberlin, wrote, "Those who wish the world to let them alone, must let the world alone. This Oberlin has not done, and never intended to do."<sup>266</sup> From the start, students were involved in the temperance movement, outreach to neighboring churches and Revival movements. In 1834-5, abolitionist fervor swept through the students. Percolating through the students to the faculty and Board would take time, however; many thought that there was a danger to "let[ing] the slaves loose among us."<sup>267</sup> Students were organizing, nonetheless, to prepare the school to enter the fray.

Shipherd, immediately before this, had made it known that the Trustees should resolve that students, "irrespective of color," should be admitted.<sup>268</sup> There were no precedents for such a move and it took a while for Oberlin students and trustees to acclimate themselves. Those in authority feared "mischiefs" would occur once black students began "swarming" the school and people in the area found the prospect of mixed education alarming. The resolution failed. Furious, Shipherd called for the

Board to meet again in six weeks - after abolitionist students had some time to advocate for the measure. This time it passed, by tie-breaking vote, but with a "timid" response. It was an "invitation and welcome," though many thought there would be "grave consequences."<sup>269</sup>

Surprising everyone, black students did not immediately swell the College to capacity and the arrival of black students had more symbolic than grave consequences. Charles Langston and James Bradley enrolled in 1835 and '36, and Sarah Watson Barnett became the first black woman to attend in 1842. The Lane students, on the other hand, caused the College to become a university as it now granted advanced degrees. Oberlin became known as a home for discontented and radical students. Anti-slavery took a firm and fierce hold and their students spent their vacations proselytizing and organizing against slavery. "The terrible mobs which sometimes occurred," recalled Fairchild, "were, perhaps, less annoying than the low and contemptible abuse, which was matter of almost daily experience."<sup>270</sup> Students, whose heroism had crippled one school and boosted another, bore the brunt of the pro-slavery condemnation, but if Fairchild is to be believed, it was a thrilling experience.

Similar abuse was hurled at all students, largely in their late teens and early twenties, and faculty for standing up for the Abolitionist cause. At Illinois College, a great mob was stirred by President Beecher's advocacy of free speech concerning abolition. Sturtevant and other faculty expected violence in standing up for Beecher. The issue caused many students to withdraw or abstain from class due to social and

parental pressure to repudiate this talk. Students, then, became a front line in the abolitionist battle and students were among those at the forefront of the struggle to integrate colleges and overcome slavery on moral and intellectual grounds.

### *Mischief*

Often times, however, students organized their power to fight with the towns that housed them. Though never reaching the levels of violence characteristic of European town/gown disputes (where massacres on both sides occurred from time to time), friction was not uncommon. US colleges were often in towns so small that the students couldn't help but dominate. In conflicts, again, the class organized the violence: at Bowdoin, lumberjacks and students would sometimes engage in fights and at Yale, sailors took to assaulting students, which brought about reprisal. These assaults created the "The Bully Club." Sheldon describes the phenomena as a sanctioned day of violence between sailors and students: "In the early fights with sailors a huge club was captured. Each year this club was bestowed on the strongest man in the senior class, who henceforth acted as class president, and led the students in conflicts with the town."<sup>271</sup> Throughout the run of the Bully Club, the students and sailors faced off at least once a year. In 1854, a town riot enveloped Yale and students had to fight their way out. One student, in his escape, stabbed a rioter; the townsmen reacted by bringing out a canon to destroy a Yale building. Police intervened and spiked the canon before it could be fired, however, and the crowd was eventually dispersed.

Midwestern and Southern students tended to engage in a higher volume of

violence. At South Carolina College, riots and boycotts were a common occurrence. "At one time," claims Sheldon, "all the students but twenty-eight were suspended for refusing to inform on one of their number. Again, sixty were suspended; while, at one session, seventy-seven refused to return because the petition on their favourite grievance, eating, had not been granted."<sup>272</sup> In 1837, every member of the senior class at the University of Alabama was expelled. Within a decade, every student was again expelled because none would swear on their innocence and so implicate a guilty party. Again, in 1847, all but three students were expelled. The class, as was customary, decided as a cohort whether to rebel and rarely did the entire school become enveloped, though multiple classes may at one time or another. Because the students were conscious of themselves as a class, writes Sheldon, they always struck together. "The faculty realized that the class organization furnished the support to outbreaks, and its attitude toward the class was bitterly hostile."<sup>273</sup> Schools attempted to legislate or prohibit class meetings, but were rarely successful.

### *C. The Old Guard*

It has been my argument that the formation of research universities was part of a larger inter-class and inter-regional class struggle whose background was the expansion of industrial capital to the west and south butting against the expansionary interest of Southern slave owners. Those institutions meant to conserve and propagate the culture of the old elites, as I've argued, did not simply give up and, for the most part, resisted into the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. While their students continued to develop a social life

similar to that of their fellows elsewhere, Yale, Princeton and Columbia maintained the collegiate model throughout this time period (while simultaneously adding courses, students and professional faculty - a factor in their eventual succumbing to the American University). Harvard, with Rutgers and Penn taking less prominent positions, attempted to attenuate the critique of the old colleges by folding the new into the old.

Harvard, especially, had had to find a new base of support following Yale's rise to dominance in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, and these reforms were ways to create a new client base while retaining its connection to Boston elite. Even so, the demands of faculty, who had been educating themselves to become professors - and therefore trained in particular fields of knowledge that they researched and then taught - rather than simply men of knowledge, forced the colleges to open their curriculum and structure. Finding the funds necessary for this gentle transformation and intra-board struggles were the defining feature of this period for the old colleges. For Harvard, this was increasingly difficult because their old base, the churches, had given up on them for the seminaries and Yale. Seeking new funding to offset this loss was the principle concern of President Josiah Quincy.<sup>274</sup> Appealing to Boston's elite and the Massachusetts legislature (which had ceased granting Harvard funds in 1823), he emphasized the role that the college, augmented by science, had in breaking the power of superstition over people's lives. "The duty of considering science and learning as an independent interest of the community, begins to be very generally felt and acknowledged."<sup>275</sup> Rather than contributing to the internecine skirmishes over

religion, the College was dedicated to advancing learning and science in the service of the community. Slavish loyalty to a particular creed, or party, lay in the past for Harvard - it was now a neutral site for the production of both moral citizens and useful knowledge. Towards these end, Quincy opened a law school to train the new breed of lawyers called for by the more limited scope of legal activity and also infused the library with a fresh directive to improve its offerings.

Edward Everett (1846-9) continued Quincy's reforms, opening the Lawrence Scientific School and making direct appeals to the legislature for state funding. While unsuccessful, Everett's two appeals for funds illustrate the direction that Harvard was moving: towards the University as public good. In an 1848 appeal, he claimed that with funding, Harvard would then offer Boston and the greater area scientific knowledge through which to advance industry; the next year, he claimed that university funding could help city and state leaders more effectively manage the population by offering social knowledge. "New truths and facts," he plead, "requiring new experimental illustrations, are constantly discovered in natural philosophy. Without taking into account deterioration by use, antiquated apparatus in the lecture-room is as useless as antiquated machinery in a manufacturing establishment. The advancement which has been made within thirty years in spinning and weaving, is not greater than that which has taken place in physical science."<sup>276</sup> As it stood, Harvard's labs were so inadequate, that it could not help but train ignorant scientists: given the paucity of resources, it could not possibly stay up to date on the new techniques and instruments through which science was advancing. Outrunning their meager resources,

Harvard, and thus Boston manufacturers, could not hope for men of science who could lead the state in the enterprises coming to dominate the economic landscape.

Everywhere Everett looked, however, funds were inadequate to ambitions. While new scientific knowledge was being produced throughout Europe and in the United States, Harvard's library was too ill-funded and antiquated to keep up. Further, Everett argued that since the library was, as established in its charter, a public utility open to anyone who wished to use it; as a public entity, the public should help pay for its upkeep and maintenance. Where once the library could contain those works which had stood the test of time, the times themselves demanded a new criterion. "Our library," he cajoled, "is amply supplied with many of the books belong to the first class [the great standard works which are never antiquated]... But it is surprising how small the number is of books which are of unchanging value, - I mean, sir, in reference to the wants of a library."<sup>277</sup> The scientific need to stay abreast of new developments meant that scientists must have a large and growing library: without state help, no scholar would be able to afford to privately keep such a collection - effectively barring all but the very wealthy from contributing to the welfare of the state. Wary of supporting the college, however, the legislature declined to free up the asked for funds.

In 1849, Everett changed his tack. The economic argument had not worked, but the flood of immigrants to the country, and the numbers of farmers being pushed off their land and into cities, opened a new avenue. He argued this time that public funding was essential to the public good under a regime of private property and democracy. Beginning by outlining the benefits that the college could have to the

merchant, industrial and seafaring classes, he argued that the legislature should contribute so as to make the cost of education low enough that any from these classes might attend. In 1849, it cost \$75 a year,<sup>278</sup> a cost somewhat higher than at other colleges - the cost to Harvard to provide this education, however, was at least twice that! Beyond this, he declared, the legislature had a duty to educate its people. "The duty of educating the people rests on great public grounds,-on moral and political foundations. It is deduced from the intimate connection which experience has shown to exist, between the public welfare and all the elements of national prosperity on the one hand, and the enlightenment of the population on the other."<sup>279</sup> For this reason, it should be in the interest of everyone in Massachusetts to fund higher education. Everett noted that these funds would not typically be going to the wealthy (who were sending their children to Yale in greater numbers than Harvard), but rather to those who were seeking to climb the social ladder - to contribute to the general welfare and, in the process, better themselves. The legislature could not be accused of distributing tax dollars to the wealthy, but instead for opening new avenues of social mobility. In this way, it would encourage the poorer classes to participate with and believe in the state. Crucially, he argued that the point of the university was not simply to educate the best, but rather to educate the vast middle (his own class background), the unspectacular, those by whose work the state and nation prosper. In sum, the new university was to target this strata, distinguishing it from the colonial college, which sought primarily the elite.



At midcentury, it was beginning to look as though the reform movement would sweep up even such outposts as Columbia. However, social conservatives had not yet given up their ghost, setting the stage for a regression. Oliver Wolcott Gibbs, a young chemist, was being pushed by the liberal wing of the Board to the chair of chemistry. Gibbs, having studied in Germany and France, was a strong proponent of the investigative method of professoring and teaching, while the (largely) Episcopalian conservative wing desired to maintain the orientation towards passing on known knowledge through the employ of learned, but not scholarly, men. The showdown, as Regent George Templeton Strong noted in his diaries, was over what role the physical sciences should play in a university education. The Episcopalian wing desired that Biblical Revelation guide the search for fundamental principles rather than investigation. If they were unable to prevail, Strong noted, "Columbia College is destined to be a sleepy, third-rate high school for one or two generations more..."<sup>280</sup> Given the Church's position of strength, Gibbs was blocked. The internal and external pressure necessary to force the Church's hand were lacking.

That New York was a sufficient base, and that Columbia was ignoring the demand for change, could be seen in the support given to the New York University, the Free Academy, the Cooper Institute and the Astor Library. Mr Ruggles, another Regent, wrote that, "We may console our pride, by claiming that our position has been one of dignified scholarship, too far above the age to be appreciated or encouraged,- but the answer will be, even if the extravagant assumptions were founded on fact, that we exist to educate the people, and should have lowered ourselves to a position a little less

exalted, that so we might raise them step by step."<sup>281</sup> For Ruggles and his allies, Columbia was in danger of becoming irrelevant - and was perhaps already there. "The great wave of commerce," he claimed, "has reached our landed estates, and we have but to coin them into revenue, far exceeding our utmost necessities. This flood of pecuniary prosperity, is, in no sense, due to us. It is the work of the busy community around us, and that community has now, more than ever, the right to ask us to come fully up to our duty. It has a right to ask, why the College, surrounded by more than fifty thousand youths, of age suitable for College studies, capable of education, and destined to suffer through life for want of it,-teaches but one hundred and forty?"<sup>282</sup> Ruggles argued that, by nature of its being, the university was a public institution and therefore belonged "to the world around us" rather than the religious sect that brought it into existence.<sup>283</sup> The public it had been brought into being to conserve - composed of merchant capitalists and the professions that catered to them - was gone; the College had now to decide whether it was going to adapt to the new public that was forming or whether it would pass away.

By rejecting Gibbs, and continuing to believe their mission was to a class that was every day dwindling, Columbia had become irrelevant to the great city, considered aristocratic rather than a friend of the manufacturing and commercial classes. Ruggles despaired, writing,

"The utter feebleness of the sons of the rich, and their total inability to combat the misdirected education, the crude theories, that make perilous the growing power of the needy classes, become more and more apparent, with each succeeding generation. If our seats of learning will awake to their responsibilities and their work, they may greatly mitigate, if they cannot entirely remove these evils. If they can do no more, they may at least transmute the holders of wealth, used only for

ostentation or self-indulgence, into liberal and intelligent leaders, in every good and generous effort for the common welfare."<sup>284</sup>

If they were to serve the wealthy only, at least they should serve the bourgeois rather than those with aristocratic pretensions. If they could not do that, Ruggles believed, revolution was on the horizon - one that Columbia could not survive. For Ruggles, this new class figure would require a thorough rewriting of the legal and juridical norms that governed the country. If Columbia was unprepared for this, and had not done anything to train those writing the new code, there was no reason to believe it would make itself necessary for the preservation of any future. Overcoming sectarian blindness was the first necessary step to free themselves to participation in world of the bourgeois.

What was needed at Columbia, then, was a bridge between the past and the future. Frederick Barnard proved to be perfect for this position. He'd graduated Yale the same year it had released its Report and, while a professor of chemistry at the University of Alabama and the University of Mississippi (where he also served as Chancellor), had argued both for the ideals of the Report while at the same time urging both administrations to let faculty themselves guide the classroom without interference. For the twenty-five years he was in office, beginning in 1864, he managed to increase the size of the faculty and departments while also instituting a limited elective plan, based in part on UVA's experiments in the early century. He did this, all the while, by maintaining strict student discipline and by retaining the classical curriculum as the core of the University.

Over two addresses to the Mississippi board, he outlined his thought on the matter:

education must be a combination of both traditional discipline and the right of faculty to teach without interference. In 1855, while a professor at the University of Mississippi (and just a year before becoming its chancellor), he had laid out what the ideal characteristics for a faculty position were. First he listed firmness because, "The hand must be at once strong and steady which holds the rein over the giddy impulses of heedless or undisciplined youth."<sup>285</sup> Unaccompanied by kindness, however, that hand would lack paternal authority. The professor must use "wise discretion," entailing he know his charges and, therefore, that the college remain small. Patience, a necessary attribute for those dealing with youth, would be essential for him to remain impartial in his judgments. He should also be above provocation. Most students, Barnard thought, were characterized by "thoughtless folly, or giddy recklessness," and therefore they need this paternal authority. If this were to be the case everywhere, the system of higher education would hardly have to be revamped; however, it should also be seen that these features of a college are necessary only for the particular style of education that resulted from the conditions under which the first colleges were birthed. That the administration of the Colleges required these relationships, but that education itself does not, means that it would be better for changes to occur. The chief change, he claimed, was to raise the age of admission, thus ensuring that the primary quality of the faculty was not discipline and governance, but rather scholarly aptitude. Through this change, faculty could be entrusted to teach, rather than discipline. They could, then, develop that skill in order to give impart knowledge to the students. As it stood, Board members oversaw faculty in the same way that faculty over their students -

making sure they did a job better suited to families.

### *Brown University*

The most sustained effort to reform an old college before the full-scale arrival of the university occurred at Brown university. Francis Wayland, a New Yorker who had graduated from Union College in 1813, took over the presidency of Brown in 1827, right as the Yale Report was released. Nonetheless, he struggled to expand science instruction, raise academic standards, and upgrade the textbooks used for higher education. During his time, too, he devoted much time to fighting for the professional ambitions of the emerging professional class. By 1850, he had set about to, as Hofstrader and Smith introduce him, "answer to the Yale Report."<sup>286</sup> At the time, his attempts centered on creating a curriculum useful for "merchants, farmers and manufacturers." It was his contributions to clarifying administrative and power structures in the university that concern us here, however. The crux of his thought was that the colleges were a mismatch with the society they were meant to serve and foster: for the new forms to emerge, a new type of public itself would have to arise by which the old forms might be relegated to the past.

Like many of the reformers of his time, he first sought to articulate what type of institution the university was and what it consisted of so as to carve out the roles and responsibilities of the various college actors. In his *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States*, published in 1842, he enters a prolonged discussion of what type of property the college consists of and, given that, how it should be run. Considering that

public property, as well as private given for public good, existed in a university, it was necessary for some entity to oversee it. Property, after all, must have overseers for the purposes of accountability - to ensure a proper return. The visitorial power (what we would now call supervisory power) exists for the "oversight of the property of the institution, the appointment and removal officers of instruction, the establishment of laws for the government of the society, and the general duty of ascertaining from time to time whether the ends desired by the founder or the State are accomplished."<sup>287</sup> In the US, this visitorial power was commonly located in a Board of Trustees. Legislative act grants a charter to a college - public property - which calls into being a group necessary to oversee this, as a condition of its being property. These Boards, composed of wealthy and upstanding community members, are typically responsible to no one.<sup>288</sup> At the time Wayland was writing, "board member" was a lifetime position and members replaced their own. There were some minor exceptions - by this time - where term limits had been imposed or the Board was staffed by members of the government, but these were rare exceptions. As late as the 1860s, President and Professor, barring some serious misbehavior, were lifetime positions (and Presidents still taught)<sup>289</sup> while the tutor had a position for a year, with the expectation that the work would last 2-3 years before he entered a professional field. Faculties remained responsible for student discipline, their pay, which was poor, was unaffected by their performance.<sup>290</sup>

Part of the problem was a flux in the purpose of the college and the university. If the power of the merchant class, as the dominant class in the Northeast and, by

extension, in the West, was being subsumed into the social relations of industrial capitalism (even if unevenly and asynchronously), training young men for its ranks could no longer be of primary importance. This constituted the confusion over what the purpose of higher education was. For a school created by private entities, writes Wayland, the one who creates it looks to the market to determine what is in demand.<sup>291</sup> A public college, however, is supported by the public and it has a right to visitorial powers - in the form of Trustees or Corporations.<sup>292</sup> Granting a publicly recognized degree or certificate requires there to be a way to judge its value; because a degree indicated a student was proficient in those literary and intellectual pursuits prized by a community, the community had to judge. It used to do this in the person of the President and Board. However, industrial society was transforming society and therefore new community standards were emerging. For Wayland, this meant a thoroughgoing reevaluation of the curriculum, faculty and governance - culminating, of course, in a new object and form for higher education. The emerging character of the Public was no longer that of mercantile capitalists, so a new education to meet the new character had to be developed.

It would be necessary, then, to attack the standards by which students were admitted and graduated. Crucially, an education based on the older admittance standards would, "unfit [students] for more active pursuits, and would not enable them to procure a sustenance by intellectual exertion. It would produce a large amount of very moderately educated talent, without giving any real impulse to the mental energy of the community."<sup>293</sup> The point was not to give everyone the same intellectual

apparatus, but to develop those that had special aptitude into "community treasures." While these "treasures" could be found amongst all the classes, the cost of finding and developing them was more easily handled by the rich - a significant problem going forward. Private enterprise could not be responsible for this task, because the demands of education (library, labs, philosophical materials, etc) were too much for the lower classes to pool together. "Hence arises the reason why a large portion of these means, all that which involves the outlay of considerable capital, should be the property of the public, and why it should be open to the use of all who might by the use of it be rendered in any way benefactors to the whole."<sup>294</sup> If public support were available, all of those who could benefit society, rather than those who happened to be rich, could find their way to the public sphere. With proper funding and proper oversight, the university would behave in such a socially responsible way.

Being a trustee was a huge social responsibility, then. They had to be familiar with the theory and practice of education, ideally. They should be wealthy (only the wealthy have the leisure time, funds to contribute, and, by nature of their wealth, would not be suspected of using their connections to increase their wealth - or so the prevailing thought of the time went) and virtuous enough that their motives would not be second guessed. That said, they should never be trusted: Wayland quotes, with approval, Jeremy Bentham on the dual nature of Board members to oppose and thief - "I do not like Boards, for... *Boards* are always *fences*."<sup>295</sup> The Board should not be too large, so as to avoid the tyranny of majorities and inertia of large bodies,<sup>296</sup> and term limits should be imposed to ensure active participation. Boards are, at best, a necessary evil



and their action must be constantly circumscribed and evaluated.

Because the relationship between public and trustees had only haphazardly come into being, it stood to reason that faculty relations, too, would be a hodgepodge. Wayland claimed that the colleges had gotten lucky in having a dedicated and loyal faculty, but that the whole system of teaching and discipline in the college was a historical artifact that reflected the lack of reason and planning that had gone into their creation.<sup>297</sup> The spread and diffusion of such institutions, however, and their growing enrollments and expanded public nature, indicated that these positions should no longer be governed by artifice and tradition, but must emerge as an efficient and regulated field. But here we run into the problem: charters, the contract that establishes the college and its various relationships, would have to be broken for this to come to pass. Figuring out how to buffer the personal interests of founders and powerful men from institutional interests was to be the fight of the mid-century. Complicating the issue was a lack, because they had not yet been trained in sufficient numbers, of men capable of manning these positions. Such an infrastructure as would allow such a vision to flourish was still largely absent.

In this breach Wayland saw two options. On the one hand, reformers could simply wait for communities to transform, which would make the colleges adapt. However, it was not at all clear that the industrial formations taking shape would see the virtue in retaining higher education in any of its forms. On the other stood the formidable task of changing the system so as to make it necessary to the future of the emergent society - which would necessitate a thorough reorganization of existing collegiate relations.

"The present system rests fundamentally on the power of visitation. The board, as I have said, is really in the place of the public. If it cannot be so constructed that it shall be able to discharge its functions, then let it be abolished, and let the rest of the system be so constructed that this deficiency may be supplied in some other manner."<sup>298</sup> *The task of reform, then, was to create a new administrative order to stand in for this new emerging public, a daunting demand that seemed unlikely within the existing colleges; even in the formation of new universities, however, distrust between the public, politicians, and influential men was so rampant that seeing these reforms to completion was a difficult task. What would have to emerge would be leaders representative of some sort of new public to emerge and establish new forms.*

For Wayland, there was not yet a clear picture of the composition of the new public, however there was a thought about how the universities and colleges could help shape and bring that public into being. The university, meant to serve the interests of the mechanical, agricultural, industrial *and* merchant/professional classes, must have the confidence of the people in whose name it grants its degrees. As it stood, socially eminent men, unversed in the theory and practice of instruction, could only serve to grant degrees recognized by the gentlemanly faction of society; there was no inducement to scholarship or critical thought. Where every other industrializing country had some mode of competition through which faculty were to cultivate higher standards of investigation and scholarship (and students followed their lead), this was wholly lacking in the US. Capitalist social relations had to conquer higher education: a system of "normal inducements" (competition, unemployment, pecuniary reward,

fame) must replace lifetime appointments.<sup>299</sup> This would, incidentally, make visitorial powers redundant by placing these powers in the social relations governing the university. In this way, a system would replace the random and haphazard assemblage of faculty, trustees, and presidents. By placing new appointments in the hand of faculty, who should rightfully recommend teachers to fill vacancies, rather than using now anachronistic personal testimonials that boards relied on, faculty themselves would sharpen each other and continue to demand the highest levels of scholarship. This would also open faculty searches beyond the small list of interested alumni, most of whom had not followed the latest theory and practice of instruction or academic development wrought by scientific study. Faculty aware of the latest discoveries in their field would then be empowered to reward or remove professors based on performance. Essentially, Wayland was arguing for the implementation of capitalist social relations into collegiate life by reform in line with the university movement. The public, after all, that Wayland thought the university belonged to was the public which was coming about by the reshaping of social relations and the society he wanted to better fortify was one determined by capitalist relations.

The last hurdle to overcome was the matter of cost. As things stood in the 1840s, because all colleges conferred the same degree, and cost was something that every college was worried about, each school listed the total price of every amenity, hoping to entice parents to send their child to the cheapest school, as a BA from most of the schools was understood to be roughly analogous. When students paid for college, they were paying to use the physical plant and to have access to professors; this, claimed

Wayland, cost "about seven thousand five hundred dollars. That is, for the use of its buildings and means of education, together with the labors of eight officers, it receives fifteen hundred dollars less than it could obtain from this property alone at the ordinary rate of interest."<sup>300</sup> Colleges with funds to spare used them to offset the cost of education or to make up for the financial lack of poorer students. In the end, the commodity "education" was far devalued below its exchange value. And this pertained even as faculty in the US were grossly underpaid (its corollary was that few promising young men entered the teaching position because they'd make more money elsewhere). There were two ways to solve this problem: either private philanthropy or public endowment. If the public was to pay the cost of education, the structure and purpose, as he maintained throughout his writings, had to change. Part and parcel with this was reining in the exorbitant costs of the physical plant - older students, consumed by their fields of study, were in a much better position to look after their physical and nutritional needs than the colleges. If education was to remain in the domain of the older professional classes, it does nothing for the poor and the argument against public spending is disingenuous.<sup>301</sup> Because, Wayland claimed, colleges are designed to create a particular type of society, and the future was clearly in industrial production, continuing to focus on the training of lawyers, doctors and theologians was myopic. Philip Lindsley, in 1832, had already declared that the "professional aristocracy" that lead the farmers and mechanics was unsustainable and that the colleges, to survive, must put themselves at the forefront of educating these men<sup>302</sup>. The professions as they had existed in Revolutionary times no longer determined the direction of society:

industrial capital did. "In a word," Wayland claimed, "let the College be the grand centre of intelligence to all classes and conditions of men, diffusing among all the light of every kind of knowledge, and approving itself to the best feelings of every class of the community."<sup>303</sup>

Summing up the condition of higher education in 1850, Wayland wrote that, "We have produced an article for which the demand is diminishing. We sell it at less than cost, and the deficiency is made up by charity. We give it away, and still the demand diminishes. Is it not time to inquire whether we cannot furnish an article for which the demand will be, at least, somewhat more remunerative?"<sup>304</sup> With the passage of the Morrill Act and the subsequent formation of Cornell University, however, things began to set up for the formation of a true university system that was to, within half a century, relegate the older college model to a subsidiary position.

All in all, the Old Colleges, throughout the mid-century, were forced - by the faculty who were demanding their due as professionals and students who demanded their due as citizens - to expand their course offerings, experiment with limited elective systems, ease up the restrictive disciplinary function of the college, and raise their estimation of science. This did not mean, however, that the boards and families supporting these schools simply gave in. They fought to maintain ecclesiastical control and the disciplinary function of the college. It was also true that Harvard and Yale had established scientific schools - it should be pointed out that the Smithsonian Institute and Rensselaer Institute, again, were new models that the older colleges based their

scientific schools on and that they only created these schools due to pressure from their own professionalizing faculty. Further, these scientific schools had little to do with the life of the college, being almost entirely absent from the consciousness of the students. Becker reports that in the 1850s, Andrew White, who would soon become one of the most famous college presidents, attended Yale without knowing that the Sheffield school existed. While arguing that the base of the college had changed, the old families still desired their children to attend school to perpetuate the cultural dominance of their class.

## ***Chapter 4: Science and the Professions***

By the 1860s, the sheer number of professionally oriented faculty, increased college attendance, and the beginning of financial support for universities (though less so for the colleges), began to swing support to the universities. Further, the collapse of the Whig Party in the 1840s, circulation of increasing amounts of capital due to the expansion of the railroads and War Bonds, and stepped up immigration to meet the labor demands of the industrializing urban centers wrought changes in the political, economic and social life throughout the various regions of the country, leading to the development of a strata of the labor force that could plan, manage, and maximize the productive capacity of the labor and capital. This strata would become the professional class - a class between labor and capitalist who would, through the collective control of the means to produce knowledge about their profession, be autonomous from both and thus able to mediate between capitalist and laborer while bringing wealth to the nation. The Civil War itself does not appear to have been a major event for the transformation of colleges, though secession by the South weakened Western opposition to Northeastern hegemony and the victory of the North (industrial capital) over the South (plantation slavery) and following occupation of the South by the Northern Army meant the imposition of capitalist social relations throughout the South and their extension throughout the West. This would be significant for obvious reasons.

Opposition to the spread of formal education and universities also took on the trappings of class conflict rather than intra-class conflict by the end of the 1870s as the

agricultural and industrial working class saw in universities a social form through which labor was to organize itself, though as an amelioration of class conflict, not its sharpening. The heyday of Worker's Schools would come in the second decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but by the 1840s it had been recognized that education would be a key means to adjust the working class to new rhythms of work and new conceptions of time. Richard Altenbaugh, in *Education for Struggle*, notes that Horace Mann, Massachusetts' first education secretary, published the "Report for 1841" in which he recommends education as a means to de-radicalize and adjust labor to new work regimes. Alexander Fichlander, director of the ILGWU Worker's University, echoed this sentiment in 1921, though for him it provided impetus for developing worker controlled education. Altenbaugh quotes Eugene Debs in 1896 to the similar effect: in its best forms, formal education (including and especially higher education) was "not equipped to solve labor problems," and was just as often "Arrogantly hostile to labor."<sup>305</sup> Most US cities had Mechanics Colleges by the 1840s, though they were typically apolitical and informal. By the 1870s, however, working people were turning towards more politically active educational organizing. The National Labor Union and the Knights of Labor advocated for workers to create their own libraries and reading rooms. Chicago in the 1870s, Altenbaugh informs, had a robust and militant system of "singing societies, theater groups, socialist and anarchist Sunday schools, dances, picnics, and parades and processions" as a means of countering formal education.<sup>306</sup> More formal radical educational colleges emerged in the US, emulating the British worker's education movement, in 1909, but there had long been distrust and hostility



to formal education as a tool by the capitalist class to defang radicals and make work more efficient.

Where the story of the Colonial Colleges was one of poverty, riots and student self-organization, the story of the Research University is the attempt to overcome all of these by extending the scope of professionalization: first to their own realm (the bulk of the current story) and then to those occupations opened by the triumph of industrial capital and US imperialism. My own thoughts on professionalism and professionalization follow closely those of Terrence Johnson. In *Professions and Power*, he writes that, "Professionalism, then, becomes redefined as a peculiar type of occupational control rather than an expression of the inherent nature of particular occupations. A profession is not, then, an occupation, but a means of controlling an occupation. Likewise, professionalization is a historically specific process which some occupations have undergone at a particular time, rather than a process which certain occupations may always be expected to undergo because of their 'essential' qualities."<sup>307</sup> The university, once established, was used by an emergent class, neither industrial laborers nor the owners of capital, to professionalize and, thereby, to control the conditions of work by a vastly expanded class of professionals (now no longer just lawyers, doctors and ministers, but also engineers, professors, accountants, and so on). Note that the university is the institution organized by professional academics whose chief purpose is the control and production of knowledge within the ambit of the profession: the education and instruction of undergraduates is a primary condition

upon which the university is allowed to exist, but it is not the primary concern of many faculty members themselves. Occupational control, through the university, elevates knowledge and technique to a form of commodity whose ownership and circulation reside primarily with those who have received the blessing of the faculty of the university. Here, a collective body of faculty, trained in the US and Europe, emerged to throw off the yoke of sectarian control in order to establish the conditions under which they sold their labor and, by extension, other occupations would also sell their labor - starting with the chemical, biological and social scientists. By the 1860s and 70s both the industrial union and the university had emerged as forms of social organization by which to compete with capitalists for both their share of the social wealth and the conditions under which their labor was bought and sold. It is not the case, then, that the university is the toy of capitalists, but rather an attempt to protect the new professional worker.

By the close of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, class conflict made it such that there was broad support from industrialists for this project, though that was not the case for much of the latter part of the century. Scorn and derision had been the industrial capitalists attitude toward the classical college and its attempt to fashion a social class fit for merchant capitalism. But they were ready by the late 1890s to begin supporting the universities. Andrew Carnegie, for instance, claimed in 1889 that, "While the college student has been learning a little about the barbarous and petty squabbles of a far-distant past, or trying to master languages which are dead, such knowledge as seems adapted for life upon another planet than this as far as business affairs are concerned,

the future captain of industry is hotly engaged in the school of experience, obtaining the very knowledge required for his future triumph." <sup>308</sup> Few of these men had gone through higher education, preferring instead to build empires in transportation, communication and mineral wealth. In the universities, however, they saw the potential for specialized knowledge concentrated on industrial questions to give them competitive advantages, for the training and development of men and women who could administer their enterprises (that such training would be paid for by society, rather than their corporations, didn't hurt), and as a means to burnish their images. It is absolutely true that they intervened in the professionalizing process (they had access to the capital that would make or break the universities, after all) and that their wealth built the physical edifice of the university. Where critics like Veblen and Upton Sinclair declaimed the influence of such men, the project of the university would have been impossible without them.

Numerical expansion was characteristic of the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. The US population ballooned from just over seventeen million in 1840 (around 600,000 of whom were immigrants) to over twenty-three million in 1850 (with immigrants counting over 1.7 million). Thereafter, rising immigration would characterize every decade and the population would double between 1850 and 1880. New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio - home of heavy machine manufacturing - were, outside of Virginia and its massive slave population, the only states containing more than a million people in 1850.

By the Civil War, there had been such a vast expansion of institutions attempting to spread higher education that, even though almost five hundred either never materialized or failed, there were still over two-hundred and fifty such schools. The fever to start new educational ventures continued to spread, such that by 1870 there were more than five hundred fifty colleges and universities and there would be over eight hundred by 1880. Enrollments, by 1869, had reached 62,839, but they sprouted to 115,850 just ten years later.<sup>309</sup> As a percentage of the population, the rise was not staggering, but by numbers alone this was a huge growth. Absolute enrollments increased everywhere, but especially so in the East. While Western schools averaged around 54 students per institution, their New England counterparts averaged 174. Over 60% of the colleges and universities were in the West and South, but they accounted for only 43% of the students.

An interesting side note regarding immigration concerns the failed German revolution of 1848. Following the revolution, in which German school teachers came in for heavy criticism and regulation by the victorious state, Herbst asserts that many emigrated to the US.<sup>310</sup> Once across the Atlantic, they discovered high ideals and poor conditions. That there were very poor teachers colleges, that pay and prestige were low, and that there were few resources for the vast and far flung education system were problems that they found most detrimental.

Many of the schools that opened in this period were established by sects (Catholic and Protestant missionary work followed wherever the frontier led), but there were also new attempts to found universities as well as failed attempts to effect a thoroughgoing

reformation of some existing colleges. The most interesting attempt in the latter category came from Francis Wayland at Brown, while the most important of the former was the founding of Cornell. Another form of college and university expansion was a large growth in technical and people's colleges whereby their founders (philanthropists or legislatures) hoped to influence both the moral character of the working and agrarian classes as well as increase their productivity. In these institutions, we already find a stage of struggle: on the one hand professionalizing academics attempting to further their interests and, on the other, attempts by wealthy agriculturalists, philanthropists, and industrialists to raise production levels to those consistent with European industry and agriculture. German capitalists, especially, had parlayed breakthroughs in university chemistry labs to agricultural dominance. Agricultural concerns in the US needed some similar connection.

Crucially, these new schools were not going to be supported by the churches, as the churches would not have control over them. At the same time, the funds from the government were not enough. Private philanthropy stepped in here to ensure their survival. Of the 205 donors who contributed more than \$50,000 during 1800-1899, 80% had made their money in a business ventures.<sup>311</sup> According to Wren, there were five main purposes for giving such large sums: to found or support technical schools, create or foster colleges in areas that the state and church had overlooked, to advance higher education for women, business professionalization, and the education of the freedmen. West Point, founded in 1802 by Jefferson, was the first polytechnic in the

country: it was a federal school. The second polytechnic, Rensselaer Institute, was created by Stephen Van Rensselaer, in 1824 at Troy, NY. Its purpose was to advance the application of science. By the 1850s, some business leaders, such as James Dwight Dana, feared the loss of students to Europe and endeavored to bring about educational options equal to those on the continent (a similar fear would lead Stanford to invest in electrical engineering a century later).

In 1847, Abbott Lawrence gave Harvard the funds for a science school at Harvard; Abiel Chandler provided Dartmouth the funds for the Chandler School of Science and the Arts; at Yale, Joseph Sheffield's beneficence brought about that college's scientific school; and in 1872, John Towne's philanthropy established the University of Pennsylvania's Towne Scientific School. Similarly, other colleges would receive gifts by which they could create science or engineering schools. "Peter Cooper's 'Union' led the way for privately funded polytechnic institutes in 1859. Boston Tech (which would become MIT) and Lehigh, created to be an engineering school, were both founded in 1860s by private philanthropy. This pattern continued throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>312</sup> Similarly contributed funds provided for museums, observatories, and other skill developing labs. "Latin and Greek were of little value to the fledgling accountant, sales person, factory superintendent, or middle manager. Business organizations required an advancing technology as well as the employees who understood and could apply it."<sup>313</sup>

Stanford, built by the railroad baron Leland Stanford and his wife, was told by Harvard's President Eliot that it would take around \$15 million to recreate Harvard's

buildings, labs and equipment; they were ecstatic because, as Jane Stanford exclaimed, “we can do it, Leland, we can do it!”<sup>314</sup> Eliphalet Nott’s gift of \$600,000 to Union College in 1854 exceeded the entirety of collegiate endowments in 1800.<sup>315</sup> By the mid-century, business tycoons needed a cost-effective way to train many future skilled employees. Rather than doing it in their corporations, it was better (as the tech companies would find in the 1960s) to have schools take that cost. As financial giving became *de rigueur* and the names of the benefactors were etched into the foundations of the universities, other wealthy people came to see the social esteem college and university giving granted. (Some wealthy philanthropists, such as Samuel Williston, refused to have their names cover the older names, but they were much fewer in number). There are also some hilarious instances where money was promised, names were changed (Queen’s College became Rutgers, for instance) and then the money was given elsewhere or revealed to have been nonexistent. Wooster College managed to extort tens of thousands of dollars from the robber baron Henry Clay Frick. Frick, during a meeting with College President Louis Holden, said he was uninterested in “Christian education.” Seizing on this, Holden said he’d tell the press this quote unless Frick paid for a library. Having just gone through the Homestead strike with negative press, Frick relented.

John D. Rockefeller revived the small Chicago Baptist College, such that it became the University of Chicago. William Bucknell was responsible for making sure that the University of Lewisburg did not vanish from the earth; Paul Tulane did the same for the University of Louisiana in New Orleans; Gardner Colby resurrected Waterville

College. There are many other such examples.

Matthew Vassar, who declared that, “woman, having received from her creator the same intellectual constitution as man, has the same right as man to intellectual culture and development,” gave the financial backing for Vassar College. Bryn Mawr and the Elmira Female College were also created by business philanthropists. Henry Sage endowed funds for Cornell’s College for Women. Johns Hopkins was opened to women when the heiress Mary Garrett promised \$300,000 with the condition that women would also be allowed admission. The Peabody Education Fund, created by the banker George Peabody, “became a model for the corporate foundation of the twentieth century.”<sup>316</sup> John F. Slater, whose uncle made his fortune in textiles, created a Fund to educate “freedmen.” And, of course, Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Julius Rosenwald and others also created foundations to ensure that the education offered to blacks in the north and south was consonant with the racial thought and economic conditions of the time.

While Joseph Wharton gave Penn money for a business school in 1881, it would be nearly two decades before another such school was opened. Wren speculates that it was because faculty were opposed to such endeavors. Nonetheless, by 1900, this type of giving catapulted its way into philanthropy. Until the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it was quite rare for a corporation to give philanthropically. The reason for this, Wren writes, was that “the corporate form of organizations was rare prior to 1800 and case law on proper corporate conduct was thin.”<sup>317</sup> In *Dartmouth College v Woodward* (1819), Chief Justice John Marshall ruled that a corporation was a contract and, therefore, could not be



interfered with by the state. Further cases, such as the *Charles River Bridge* (1837) case, elaborated on corporations, limiting them to the purpose of their charter. “The charter specified what the firm could do, that is, build and operate a bridge, but went no further than that. This strict constructionist position regarding charters meant that corporate acts were contractual, limited, and specific, and that any act beyond chartered powers was prohibited.”<sup>318</sup> Further, case law locked corporate managers into a “sacred trust” with stockholders, meaning they could only manage the company in such a way as to benefit these owners. Other cases provided that charity and business directors had no business together. Managers could spend their own money on charity, but corporations could not. According to the law, the corporation could only give away money if there was going to be a clear *and measurable* return.

Taxes, it should also be noted, would not have been affected by philanthropy. Federal income tax was nonexistent unless of times of war. A peacetime income tax was tried, in 1894, but repealed as unconstitutional in 1895. States could tax income, however. Inheritance taxes, too, were not very onerous. Those engaging in philanthropy, then, were not impelled by the tax advantages. “There would be no allowable corporate deductions for income tax purposes until 1935. Inheritance taxation during the nineteenth century penalized gifts to ‘strangers in blood’ such as ‘bodies politic and corporate.’”<sup>319</sup> These men, then, Wren concludes, were driven to give because they had a godly mission to be good stewards of their wealth. In fact, Andrew Carnegie helped establish “The Gospel of Wealth,” which elaborated that wealthy men had been given their wealth to steward it, which meant they had to give

some of it back and in better condition than when they accumulated it. This meant their wealth was to enrich the public. Museums, universities, and the like were therefore perfect venues for financial stewardship. Others did it to preserve their family name or stroke their ego. Others did so because they could further practical knowledge or extend knowledge to disadvantaged groups.

Against this backdrop, what it meant to be a professional was also changing. The occupation of lawyer will be illustrative. Stephen Skowronek, in *Building a New American State*, mentions that by the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, lawyers had developed two main career paths: either in building the Party machines or in crafting legal code. He writes that, "One held the reins of political power, whereas the other subtly molded the means of capital accumulation."<sup>320</sup> The anti-democratic and elitist attitudes and actions of the whole group, during the Colonial and post-Revolutionary era, had helped sweep in Andrew Jackson to the presidency and undid the social claims lawyers had long used to justify their position in society. In the post-Revolutionary world, lawyers had joined in small bar organizations and considered it a duty to serve society. As such, a mostly ideologically homogenous group took the lead in town, city and government service. By the 1820s, geographic expansion and populist attack had weakened their own ability to internally enforce discipline and mores within the profession. Skowronek writes that, "appropriate standards of conduct were becoming less obvious, controls less enforceable, and the informal and personalistic ties of the small group more difficult to maintain. On the other hand, the institutional insulation and status

pretensions of the early American lawyers came under bitter attack from a people organized for a more democratic politics.”<sup>321</sup> Everywhere, legislatures cut off the ability of bars to control their profession, opening up membership to nearly anyone. By the late 1850s, lawyers had been quilted into the fabric of industrial society and furthered their public interests through their client's cases. By the early 1870s, New York and Chicago had formed Bar Associations to again regulate entrance into their field. A national Bar Association, to fortify national standards, formed in 1878. One of the unintended consequences of this newly professionalized lawyer was that the expanding middle class had, for the first time, access to legal help as the practice became more banal.

*A. Land Grabs, Politics and a New Form*

The Morrill Land Grant of 1862 and Northern victory in the Civil War had important, though sometimes oblique, impacts on the future of higher education. The Morrill Act itself had little immediate influence on higher education, for reasons that will become evident later, though some states were well positioned to make use of its provisions. Northern occupation of the South was itself cause for the expansion of higher education in the South (not least from white philanthropists founding schools for former slaves), but also for spurring the federal government to more concern with the curriculum and facilities of the colleges and universities. The two events, taken together, help illuminate both the functioning of state power in this new period and

the increasingly widespread turn to professionals as a means to intervene in political and economic processes.

Generally, when debating the Morrill Land Grant of 1862, two positions emerge: it was a monumental achievement, important in theory if not in practice, or a land grab by Northeastern states. The Act, officially penned by Vermont Senator Justin Morrill, a “self-made man,” mandated 30,000 acres per Congressional delegate to the states, who were to sell them in order to fund universities organized to teach mechanical and agricultural methods and techniques. It was notable for providing guaranteed funding for a state sponsored university founded on science, agriculture, and and mechanical studies.<sup>322</sup> However, given the amount of land suddenly dumped on the market by the passage of the Act, the sale of land in a now saturated market led to fewer funds than founding a new institution would have required. The states could use the funds to found a new institution or to endow an existing school, as long as it was devoted to agricultural and mechanical studies. Of those states that chose to found, nearly all were terribly disappointed. New York, due to an infusion of outside funds from Ezra Cornell, was one of the few exceptions. As a rule, states that added the funds to existing colleges saw much better results. On the whole, the overall importance of the Grant to higher education institutions at the time appears to have been minimal.

Reformers had assumed that the working and agrarian classes would jump at the opportunity to convert their brute labor into advanced practices through the application of the latest farming methods and techniques that *Science* had brought

about. These new means of farming, though, would require that students, and therefore their families, leave behind the knowledge and tools that they and their communities were familiar with - and, as often as not, enter into debt to procure. In order to entice even the small number of students that did show up, college officials and reformers had to create awards and prizes to attract students. For those interested in higher education, the appeal lay in completely leaving their family's life behind - to join the swelling professional ranks - not in revolutionizing their agricultural practices. The early proponents of the Morrill Act claimed that its result was greater efficiency in agricultural production. However, Lucas writes that, "careful economic analysis suggests that the greatest increase in agricultural productivity per worker occurred well *before* land-grant colleges were firmly established; and, further, that federal and state land-use policies, natural conditions, market developments, canals and railroads, and a host of other factors were mainly responsible for whatever gains occurred."<sup>323</sup> On the whole, its contributions were ignored by capitalists and the working and agrarians classes they were meant to attract.

Land grants themselves were nothing new. The practice, by the US government, dates to the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 (which established that states could not expand, but that territories could themselves become states), which mandated selling land to speculators and individuals to provide operating funds for the federal government. Lucas writes that, following 1804, "every new state west of the Appalachians joining the union was granted two entire townships for a 'seminary of learning'"<sup>324</sup> Meant to assuage populist discontent in the Midwest, Lincoln also signed

the Homestead Act, meant to provide land to those who would work it rather than speculators, just a few months before he signed the Morrill Act.

As could be expected, Senator Justin Morrill, given his name graces the Act, gets much of the credit for the first educational land grant bill. However, it seems much more likely that an agricultural group centered in Illinois should get credit. A Northerner gets the credit, though, due to land speculation. Because land was significantly more expensive in the Northeast, the Midwestern industrial farmers who framed it hoped using a Northern Senator would sway the older states to support it. Morrill, having made some changes, first introduced the legislation with allotment based on the number of representatives a state had rather than simple flat value for each state, but staunch opposition from Southern and Western states sunk the first effort. As first submitted, New York and Massachusetts, which didn't have that much federally available land, would have been granted land in other states that they'd be able to sell to their own constituents. While the legislation passed, President Buchanan, needing to mollify supporters in the populist states, vetoed it. We should note also that opposition from the industrial sector appeared, warning that the country would be overwhelmed by "fancy farmers" and "fancy mechanics" who would think themselves superior to to these occupations.

Following secession, however, the Western and Southern alliance was broken and Lincoln had no trouble signing the Bill into law. In effect, it mitigated the populist effects of the Homestead Act by allowing Northern capital to buy up vast lands in the

Midwest for rock bottom prices. The amount of real estate dumped onto the market, all at once, destabilized land values and forced many others into debt - those who'd be stading on Homestead Act land or who'd purchased land from speculators and banks and who had used their land as collateral to purchase the equipment necessary to sell crops as commodities.<sup>325</sup> The biggest benefactor of the Act were Northern capitalists. As Nevins, writing in 1962, noted, the history of how much states charged for these lands is filled with "occasional elements of folly and rascality that make it embarrassing. A number of states let the land scrip slip through their fingers; fingers loosed by negligent officers, pried apart by speculators, or even greased by corruptionists."<sup>326</sup> Thorstein Veblen was neither the first nor the last in criticizing the Land Grant's for being founded and run by politicians looking to mollify voters rather than by academics or men of science (though how this differentiates from any other college or university in any other time was not addressed). All in all, it was a tremendous boon to Northern capital, sent thousands of farmers into debt - and foreclosure - and had a minor effect on the colleges.

Because so many of the new institutions that were created by the land grant act failed, it is worth investigating why. The decision to create new universities versus investing in existing institutions was typically the result of local power relations within legislatures, which often left the schools stranded when they were not the full focus. Where new schools were created, they were largely underfunded - the Morrill Grant did not supply yearly funding, but rather an infusion of cash that, due to the saturation of the real estate market, brought in less than was expected. These schools also quickly

became rivals with existing schools, competing as they were for student tuition dollars and congressional support, such that the market for higher education was swamped. Until the 1890 Morrill Act, when Morrill Act funding became paid on a yearly basis, poverty continued to haunt nearly all of the colleges and universities. Most state legislatures were happy to have these universities, but continued to seek alternative means by which to make them self-supporting. Work-study, sale of produce from university farms, tuition, wage freezes, cuts and terminations were common in this period. The smart schools, Geiger comments, used the initial Grant funds to focus on building their facilities and creating curriculums rather than attracting the fleeting fancy of students. “They were thus sustained long enough through their sickly infancy for social and economic conditions to catch up to the expectations that had prompted their premature founding. In 1890, after intensive lobbying by land-grant presidents, the Second Morrill Act gave them direct annual infusions of federal funds.”<sup>327</sup> Even with government support, private gift giving and philanthropy provided the bulk of college support.

It should not be a surprise that the plight of African-Americans was not particularly high on the political chart for any of the the Land Grant authors. The 1862 Morrill Act funds made no provision for race, so black people were pretty much completely left out. By the 1890s, though, the use of Morrill funds in the South had become so egregious that something simply had to be done. Frederick Humphries, an historian of the black land grant schools, writes that a combination of Northern



withdrawal from the South, Jim Crow laws, the blatant devaluation of black life, and renewed questioning of the value of education for black people, forced Congress to act again.<sup>328</sup> A revision of the 1862 Morrill Act, the 1890 Morrill Land Grant II, among its other concerns, specifically took up the education of black men and women. Due to their electoral power, the Northern states were able, through Congress, to mandate that black schools receive funds, though it enshrined separate but equal into law.

These schools were, for many years, plagued by political strife, racist violence, and, due to institutional threats to education for African-Americans at all educational levels, students with a lower level of training than students in white universities had received. Given the need for teachers throughout the black communities, the training of teachers was given paramount importance. Because white legislatures, philanthropists, and missionary societies led the push for this particular type of education, the education offered to black students hewed conservatively close to pre-research university concerns that had animated the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Institutional alternatives were difficult to come by, though, so there wasn't much forcing a new educational direction for these schools.

Faculty tended to be poorly paid and most of the resources the colleges had went to courses below the academic level of their white counterparts. This was, again, due in large part to severe institutional racism in the South, the North and every layer of government. Humphries writes that, "Unlike their white counterparts, 1890 [Morrill Land Grant II] institutions did not have the resources to train their students to be scientific farmers, research scientists, engineers and the like; nor were most able to

offer official ROTC training until after World War II.<sup>329</sup> The educators at these schools were typically graduates of colleges dedicated to black students (though not always - some schools in the North were, to a limited degree, matriculating and graduating black students) The education those African-American teachers were able to provide was, in almost every case, a heroic endeavor. Further, it was only after black students began applying to graduate programs at white institutions that funds were made available for graduate programs at the black schools. It was not altruism, but rather segregation that propelled the institutional education of blacks - institutional, that is, as opposed to the self-organized education based on the history and perceived needs of black people in the South. (Humphries points out that, as late as 1968, black land-grants received around \$70 million a year while their white counterpart schools in the same states received over \$650 million per year).

African-Americans were rarely able to set their own agendas in research because they had no access to the purse strings; Humphries writes that research priorities were arranged according to national, local and then state needs - and these could be addressed only after white universities had been given what they wanted. Research interests at the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's) tended to focus on Animal Science, Natural Resources, Human Nutrition, Plant Soil and, lastly, Rural Development. State funding, and therefore political processes, directly affected the ability of those schools created by the 1890 Act to offer a competitive education. That they were able to create quality educational opportunities and even compete with their white counterparts is a testament to the men and women who undertook the task. It

also raised the specter of abolishing these schools or incorporating them into other institutions as a means to quell the ability of African-Americans in the South to develop agendas of their own.

African Americans, then, had a quite limited horizon available when it came to educating themselves or developing the type of institutions that could compete within white culture, much less against it. For the historian Ronald Walters, the former was the only real option: “The acquisition of political rights was important to blacks not only as a badge of citizenship, but as a necessary tool in the competition to acquire the requisite social benefits political empowerment brings.”<sup>330</sup> Given the dangerous and precarious position of the former slaves, scratching and clawing for survival required taking those tools available to them and turning them as much as possible to their advantage. For an oppressed people, however, even this much can be a threat to the existing system. Walters adds that the emergence of black culture, the basis for an ideology as well as mobilization, was dangerous to white supremacy. Attempting to lay ahold of what was held as a right produced a politics of conflict. This is so because, writes Walters, from the very beginning of Western imperialism in the Atlantic the first political systems were intent on the domination and control of blacks. These systems dictated the terms on which defense or aggressive organizing could take place. By the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, blacks in the Northeast were forming organizations to protect themselves and educate themselves. In New York, a group formed the African Free School, for instance. In the wake of the Civil War, a new constitutional framework allowed for new political opportunities. However, political machinations in the name

of stitching together of a country took precedence over rights for black men and women. “This era,” according to Walters, “wrote a powerful paean to the fact that race could be a more dominant factor in America than the pursuit of the democracy that brought the divorce from Britain, or that American democracy could be deployed within the dominant group to the exclusion of all others.”<sup>331</sup>

### *Arrival*

Cornell was, in many ways the culmination and answer to the various trends that had been moving towards the establishment, rather than simply founding, of the American University. According to Becker, “Better than any other institution it may be said to have represented, in its organization and in its aims, all of the dominant trends of time. Located neither in the old East nor in the newer West, it was shaped by the interests and currents of opinion that prevailed in both regions.”<sup>332</sup> It was an amalgamation of the state universities, modeled on Michigan and UVA, and the privately endowed colleges, such as Harvard and Amherst. With the promise of federal land grant money, it was able to defer cashing in its grants until land values increased through the generous endowment of Ezra Cornell and other wealthy benefactors.

Because the New York grant was enormous - the proportional funding mechanism meant that it received one tenth of the total land grant - its allotment gave fair expectation that the funds, if wisely invested, could have an impact beyond that given to less populous states. Within a year of federal passage, New York had officially accepted the land and the provisions that came with it. Most, according to Becker,

initially supposed the sale would be immediate, netting around \$600,000, providing a stipend of around \$35,000 to \$40,000 a year for an already existing college - New York already had, after all, some 236 schools that would have done almost anything to qualify for the funds. Most of these hoped the legislature would divide the sum between all of those that qualified, but two colleges - the Agricultural College at Ovid and the People's College at Havana, both organized for agriculture and the mechanical arts - had the backing of wealthy senators and could place a claim for the full funds. Unfortunately, only their charters hinted at this, as neither yet had students. Ezra Cornell was the advocate for the school at Ovid, though by 1864, when it appeared it would not get all the funds, he tried to legislate a split between the Agricultural College and the Peoples College. For the salvation of the Agricultural College, the New York legislature would have to make extra appropriations, something they were not inclined to do, effectively killing its moribund future. In 1858 Senator Charles Cook, meanwhile, a wealthy capitalist in what is now Montour Falls, promised sufficient funds to a new college, the People's College, if it were to relocate to his town. Its founders agreed, though Cook was not as forthcoming as they'd been led to believe. With only a main building, but no facilities for instruction or students, the legislature gave all the Land Grant funds to the People's College. There were conditions,<sup>333</sup> however, that they were unable to meet, due to the sudden paralysis of Cook. At this time, Cornell and Andrew White met in the New York senate, forging a relationship that would consolidate much of the re-formation's hopes in one university: Cornell University.

Cornell, a farmer and inventor who'd seen his fortunes and rise and fall and rise again through his contribution to the spread of the telegraph,<sup>334</sup> had decided that he would invest the bulk of his capital in education rather than leave it to his family. His interest in education had led him, earlier, to establish the Cornell Library as a free public library to the people of Tompkins County; he was, as well, a principle force behind the founding of the Agricultural College at Ovid, hoping that the study of farming would help farmers maximize their production. While serving in the New York senate (where he chaired the Agriculture Committee), he met Andrew White (a young senator who chaired the Literature Committee - essentially the Education Committee). White, wealthy scion of a family that traced its roots to the *Mayflower*, had studied at Hobart College, Yale, Oxford, the Sorbonne, and the University of Berlin - and travelled to St. Petersburg and Italy - before teaching history at the University of Michigan. While at Yale, he complained bitterly that the whole system of education relied on the personality of professors to produce any enthusiasm in students. And even this was rare. Becker writes, quoting White, that, "Even the teaching of Silliman and Dana, masterly as he thought it, was 'listlessly heard and grievously neglected' by the students, because the system put a premium on the neglect of all 'studies that did not tell upon 'marks' and 'standing'".<sup>335</sup> While teaching at Michigan, White appears to have concluded that the best way to spread his talent and spend his fortune was to, "aid in founding and building a worthy American university," which was then, even at the University of Michigan, not yet present.<sup>336</sup> Part of his frustration with American colleges and universities was their poor planning and drab campuses - a far cry from

the magnificent and inspiring educational edifices of Europe. He pictured his ideal campus at Syracuse (again, the idea that New York was the greatest state and deserved, therefore, the greatest university was levied<sup>337</sup>) which led him back to his home state to run for office. He attempted to ply some wealthy New Yorkers to found a college where Syracuse University now stands, by pledging to use the bulk of his inheritance to construct a library or state of the art observatory, but was rebuffed. He then turned his attention to the State Senate, where he met Cornell.

Given the conditions of the Morrill Act, their committees were in contact and they struck up a friendship over their mutual interests in higher education and the need for more modern instruction appropriate for industrial society. Cornell invited White to a meeting of the Board of the Agricultural College, where he planned to pledge 300,000 acres of land in Ithaca and \$300,000 dollars, if the legislature would promise it half the Morrill funds. White protested, demanding that the Agricultural College demand the full scope of the allocation to build a comprehensive university. It took two years, but Cornell was finally convinced not to split the funds. Cornell's zeal for agricultural and mechanical science, combined with White's fervor for history, literature and architecture, and the years of theory built by those who had attempted to found and reform institutions, produced Cornell University.<sup>338</sup> Cornell agreed to give \$500,000 and White set about drafting a bill. Forging an alliance with the Board of the People's College, legislation was introduced to name Ithaca as the sole recipient of the Morrill funds.<sup>339</sup>

Cornell was, from the beginning, steadfastly opposed to sectarian interests and

committed to the project of co-education. Its governing board of trustees was made up of twenty-five people, seven of them ex-officio - Governor, Lieutenant Governor, legislators, President of the State Agricultural Society, the Cornell Library Librarian, and "the eldest male lineal descendant of Ezra Cornell."<sup>340</sup> The other eighteen were to be elected and at no time was a sect to have a majority. Sections 1 and 4 of the founding legislation laid out the purpose of the University. To teach and develop knowledge of the arts, sciences, and literature, as well as agricultural, mechanical and military instruction, tactics, and techniques. And, as Section 4 describes, "such other branches of science and knowledge may be embraced in the plan as the trustees may deem useful and proper."<sup>341</sup> Offices and appointments, according to its constitution, were open to "Persons of every or no religious denomination." It provided free education to at least one student from each assembly district in the state; these were to be chosen, "in consideration of their superior physical and mental ability," by use of examination, with special consideration to those whose fathers had died in military service.

White recalled that nearly every denominational college, plus the press, came out against the bill. The bill effectively killed the hopes for survival for many of the small schools, clearly circumscribed the horizon of others (Columbia was one of the few that did not oppose the Bill), and siphoned off potential students from the rest. Representatives with schools in their districts, even if they approved the plan, were unable to go along with the bill (such as Charles Folger)<sup>342</sup>. One school, Genesee College, was able to parlay its statewide Methodist support into a \$25,000 endowment



with which they hoped to attract Morrill funding, though no other school seems to have been able to display such support. Those papers that attacked did so for a number of reasons, some personal - the Rochester *Democrat*, apparently, was miffed at Cornell for something having to do with Western Union Telegraph Company - and others political - the 'moneyed aristocrats' at the New York Central Railroad, whose support Cornell and White needed to pass their bill (though the two voted against the railroads), traded support for their own bill to raise customer fees. Against populist charges that he was a wealthy aristocrat, Cornell believed that he, having himself risen from a humble farming background, was a better friend to farmers and mechanics than those who persecuted him, especially as many of them had inherited their wealth or relied on others to make their fortunes. After slowly working its way through back rooms and power struggles, Cornell University came into existence in 1865. With its charter, its board, 200,000 acres of land and an endowment of one million dollars, it lacked only students, faculty, buildings, library, laboratories, and equipment! The next three years were spent in procuring these.

Cornell authorized the University's Treasurer to buy the Comptroller's land (in Wisconsin pine forest), purchased 813,920 acres at thirty cents an acre, though since this was half the market price, Cornell was to occasionally pay thirty cents per acre to New York when land was sold. New York, then, received sixty cents per acre, which was to be placed in a College Land Scrip Fund, to be used, according to the Morrill Act, by Cornell. The profits of the sale were to be used for the Cornell Endowment Fund. The Morrill Grant Fund was \$594,000 and the Endowment was to be whatever

Cornell could procure on the open market. This sale eventually brought in nearly five million dollars.

From there, according to Becker, White put together the plan for the university, with three dominating ideals: that agriculture and mechanical arts were to be equal to all other studies; that liberal-arts should expand to incorporate history, political science, and modern literature; and that students should have a level of freedom in developing their own coursework and that freedom from collegiate discipline was to be desired in most matters. Divided into two Divisions, "Special Sciences and Arts" and "Science, Literature and the Arts," a true university at last had its form. The Special Sciences and Art division was akin to professional schools, incorporating, among others, agriculture, engineering, commerce and trade, medicine, law and education. The other section was intended to supplant the traditional college courses, with general, science and optional Forty-six professors were hired after the initial twenty-four proved too small. As the university could not afford to lure the best existing faculty in the world (they could not, after all, compete with the King of France for Professor Agassiz's service) as permanent faculty, they instead hired the most promising young men just out of college; they augmented these resident faculty with visiting scholars (such as Agassiz and James Lowell) that were to teach for a shorter period of time. The plan also called for, according to Becker,

"providing remunerative manual labor for students; fixed the student's fees at \$25 per year; opposed the dormitory system; suggested that if the citizens of Ithaca charged too much for board the university might build a dining hall and lease it to the students; emphasized the importance of obtaining, for the faculty, men of 'general culture' and good manners, although a few eccentrics might be tolerated on account of special distinction in scholarship; declared roundly that 'the

university will not tolerate feuds in the faculty'; made much of establishing close personal and social relations between members of the faculty and students; and made even more of the library as an indispensable part of any great university."<sup>343</sup>

There were not immediate facilities for women, but Cornell and White proceeded as if there would be. White, figuring a president was a necessary evil, asked the Board to appoint one, though they'd been planning on appointing him president anyway.<sup>344</sup> Becker relates that White was more of a "gentleman and a scholar" than a true scholar, that his interests lay in crusading rather than careful study, which ideally positioned him to pursue the founding of the university he had long dreamed of.

As they scrambled<sup>345</sup> to finish hiring professors (the last of the originally allocated twenty-six faculty members was hired mere days before opening), procure books and equipment from Europe, finish and furnish buildings, they were left wondering how many students would arrive. They'd sent out advertisements in hundreds of newspapers and informed countless influential people, but they did not count on the infamy Cornell had received in the years since its founding. It had become something of a cause in the country, as it offered to educate anyone, whether they had religion or not, in any subject they desired, by adequately trained professors. Its refutation of all academic norms, along with its high visibility and great wealth (and its promise to trade manual labor for half tuition), led to the largest incoming class of students in US history - 412 students.

The idea, the long work of scholars and academics to organize their labor in an institution devoted to their interests, was at last accomplished by the combined activity of state, wealthy capitalist, and cultural elite. It was, from the first, intended, and indeed understood, as an institution for the public good and the betterment of the

material and cultural conditions of the US. The conditions under which the foundation and consolidation of the university could finally arrive were not surprising: a trifecta analogous to it has, for centuries, sustained higher education and given it direction. That it was able to displace the older elite, to overcome the power of church and entrenched interests, through political power and alliance with railroads and other industrial endeavors, marks the university in its DNA. Overcoming the college, the institution so dear to the mercantile elite, was a project of professionalizing academics who needed, to instantiate their claims, the support of class interests beyond their own. Imputing to Cornell the most charitable readings does not preclude us from noting that he was, and understood himself to be, a capitalist, and that he imagined his school training armies of men who could play his role better than he himself. White, too, believed in the mission of capitalism and, in his writings, inveighed against Marx and other Socialist and anarchist thinkers. In this way, he was like most of the faculty and presidents who composed the university.

### ***Section III: Consolidating a system***

By the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, a crisis of legitimation in the US state was occurring - we know the reasons: industrial labor strife, new forms of capital accumulation, the occupation of the South, large increases in immigration, geographic expansion, and demographic growth. The old forms of democratic statecraft were unable to coerce the will of non-elites (some of whom organized into populist and socialist movements), the militias were unable to enforce the power of the state, and *laissez-faire* capitalism was unable to distribute wealth in such a way that a normalized operation of business and investment could take place. In fact, laissez-faire capitalism was allowing corporate capitalism to wreak havoc on what Silva and Slaughter call the “older, smaller, regional firms”<sup>346</sup> that had thrived under agricultural capitalism. These smaller capitalist constituencies still retained power at several local levels and they fought the encroaching power of corporate capitalism as well. The legitimacy of the state and the ability of capital to extract surplus value were in jeopardy and there was not, as yet, an available solution.

However, at the same time, a social movement of professionalization was taking place, with lawyers, journalists and academics at the fore. They crafted new bodies to develop specialized knowledge and organized in the now formed university to provide themselves as much influence and autonomy in the new and as yet undefined era as possible. The larger societal crisis made this possible: as the education historian Robert L Church writes (with specific interest in the social sciences, but his point can be taken more broadly), "particular attention [should be paid] to the academic social scientists'

continuing desire to make their knowledge influential in the real world."<sup>347</sup> The ability of the state to claim democratic legitimacy while at the same time ensuring control of capital remained in the hands of capitalist elites provided a perfect opening for knowledge producers to become influential. This was a national and international effort by the professional class to instantiate itself and was helmed by a leading cadre of academics, supported by a larger body of non-academic intellectuals, and made possible by the university which was becoming home to this knowledge. This knowledge, their argument went, could mediate the conflict between capitalists and the working class, lubricating the friction and allowing the smooth functioning of a rational capitalism in which everyone could win.<sup>348</sup> Broadly speaking, by placing training not just for professional jobs, but also administrative jobs (in both government and private enterprise) within the university's orbit, everyone in society theoretically had access to upward mobility while at the same time while removing blame for policy from individuals and placing it within a bureaucracy. This bureaucracy, rational and meritocratic, owing its existence to the professional middle-class, would administer in such a way as to avoid a society ending conflict of the classes. The crisis was, then, the opportunity for the professionalizing class to emerge as a middle, mediating class between capital and labor as well as intra-class conflict between large and small producers.

The dissolution, or at least recomposition, of the older agricultural way of life also had a key role to play in the rise of the university. While Charles Post and others have shown that American farmers were engaging in commodity production as early as the

1750s, by the 1850s it was nearly impossible to farm without being enmeshed in commodity markets. This had devastating effects, playing a key role in the long downturn signaled by the recession of 1873. Gavin Wright has shown, by examining land rental and land purchases that, “By 1890 the majority of American farm operators either rented their land or farmed on mortgaged land; by 1920 this was true for 65 percent.”<sup>349</sup> He writes that it is undeniable that many farmers had commercial interests from the time they began farming and that, as time went on, attitudes towards self-sufficiency were eroded as profit became more generally acceptable. However, he is quick to add that debt and financial coercion played as large a role as either of the other two. After all, if the farmer entered into debt to either purchase or rent land and the equipment to farm, if that farmer was unable to pay the loan, the creditor was entitled to abscond with the property as well as the labor power that went into building the farm up to that point.

Wright states that, “The community solidarity which generated these policies... was fundamentally a solidarity of *landowners*, which often had the effect of squeezing out those who were less fortunate.”<sup>350</sup> For most farmers, commodity production, since the 1850s, had elements of profit and avoiding interference by the landlord or creditor, but even more so commodity production was the result of fear of losing the ability to run a farm and, thus, being forced into waged labor. Foreclosure was the primary means by which this happened and was a powerful motivator to invest very long hours and risk familial poverty (investing in new machines and land) to ensure this didn’t happen. For those who were not close to redlining, however, university education was a

way of diversifying, of creating more opportunities to shore up their class position. Wright writes that those who sent their children to university were “small businessmen indeed, with substantial investment in land and equipment, established credit relationships, and an interest in passing their class status on to the next generation... American farm *owners* were a stable group, at least by the turn of the century.”<sup>351</sup> Those that voluntarily left the farm did not go into waged labor (proletarianization), but rather into college and toward professionalization. Most became neither capitalists nor working class, but rather professionals working for their practice.

As the old forms of work were becoming obsolete or degraded due to scientific and technological advances, professionalization beckoned as an alternative to continued farming or proletarianization. Jobs in accounting, banking, drafting, engineering, law, medicine, and academics, for instance, offered social status and the possibility of work independent of hourly waged labor. While it is obvious that not all of these professions are equal, they were typically higher status than waged labor. Students swelled the ranks of colleges and universities, creating more demand for more professors and giving professional academic associations power in which to grow their place and establish their necessity. However, this movement into the universities prompted several backlashes: a populist offensive against professionals; older elite invective against the transformation of the college; and student organizing against new forms of discipline and organization.

The crisis was not responsible for the creation of a new system of higher



education, but was rather the occasion by which a professionalizing class between labor and capitalist could justify itself to the state, capitalist, and labor. In his influential book, *Building a New American State*, Stephen Skowronek writes that, “short of revolutionary change, state building is most basically an exercise in reconstructing an already established organization of state power.”<sup>352</sup> Professionals did not set out to revolutionize their world, but sought to reconstruct it by ameliorating its difficulties. The new university system, as the training ground for professional development, was their base of power.

## **Chapter 5: From Consolidation to War**

The insidious things about capitalism is not that there exists a cabal at the top that makes people do things that they do not want to do. Capitalism is a social system, after all. Instead, the compulsion to sell one's labor makes it such that people themselves constantly figure out how best to position themselves on the market. It is for this reason, I believe, that the leading edge of industrial society in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century began to develop forms that would allow for their own interests to emerge as necessary skills, a move that required the creation of institutions to coalesce and form that skill. While academics began doing this in the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they were also joined by farmers, workers, lawyers and many others seeking the same types of goals: the ability to determine amongst their peers what the conditions of their labor looked like. On the whole, the institutions they developed were not antagonistic to capitalism and private property, but instead sought to use these to leverage their place in society. Academics, those interested in intellectual pursuits, saw in the university, whose primary example was Cornell and, increasingly, a reformed Harvard, a social form that could provide them a leg up in in a changing capitalist society.

Establishing a base of power, however, is not as simple as founding institutions for this purpose. Schools for African-Americans, women, and workers (those established by anti-capitalists, that is) all reveal that social conditions are a necessary condition for the success of such endeavors. From the founding of Cornell through the first World War, a tremendous number of new types of schools were attempted. Those men and women at the forefront of the movement for an expanded higher educational system

set about, during this period, to consolidate their base of support amongst a clientele willing to pay for their services while ensuring, as much as possible, that academics ran the institutions. However, by academics they typically meant those influential men who headed the universities and the disciplines, not the rank-and-file professors. The relationships forged in the founding decades saw the universities through until the second World War, when the US Federal government turned its beneficence to them.<sup>353</sup> Against the formation of very large universities which took up more and more of the academic worker and student marketplace, the existing and newly forming colleges had, by the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, to begin a process of specialization that led to a certain amount of formal distinctions in a now decentralized and dynamic higher education system.

#### *A. Professionalization*

Karl Marx, in a section in the *Economic Manuscripts* commented that Henri Storch had approximately one “ingenious observation,” namely that, “the material division of labour is the pre-condition for the division of intellectual labour.”<sup>354</sup> In the dissolution of the old mercantilist mode of capitalist production regnant in the Northeastern US following the Revolutionary War, those forms of professional labor, i.e. intellectual (legal, religious, and medical), also went through a dissolution process. The attacks on Colleges were but one part of this process. The appearance of the university, which could only arrive on the scene after the formation of an industrial mode of capitalist production, as a viable alternative to the College marked a renewed investment into

the material and intellectual division of labor. The formation of a much broader professional layer, necessary to facilitate massive capital and labor formations - and the new standards of living that would follow - cried out for institutions which could regulate how that labor was deployed, by whom, and under what terms. Such institutions would also delineate the scope of the individual professions and give these professions the means by which to develop the theory and practice of their labor. The self-organization of the professional class, emerging as an appendage of the industrial mode of capitalist production, was, from the beginning, dependent on industrial capitalism and was therefore tethered to it. In the formation and consolidation of the university, then, we see the formation of a material and intellectual division of labor endemic to a capitalist mode of production. Thus far, we've been concerned with the arrival and establishment of the university, but to better understand the cultural and economic conditions that called it forth, we will turn to the broader impetus towards professionalization at the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century. This will, ideally, more concretely situate the university within the professionalizing movement.

### *Professionals to the Rescue*

Societies of learned European philanthropists had been devoting themselves to ameliorating the conflicts produced by industrial society since the early 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>355</sup> In Germany, comments Max Weber, the state had already set about constructing an educational system to train experts whose bureaucratic administration could soften the brutal labor conditions brought about by capital intensive industrialization.<sup>356</sup> These

problems, however, had been absent in the US as most employment related conflicts could be contained within the home and workshop or, as Herbert Gutman points out,<sup>357</sup> through workers' absenteeism or job abandonment - the need for labor, after all, outstripped available bodies. As immigration increased and capital rushed to North America, however, the relations between capitalist and worker called for new types of industrial control.

Industrial control is a battle to determine where political power would be held and exercised. As the far flung towns and villages were knit into the social and political fabric of the nation by virtue of the railroad and telegraph, and as ward bosses came under fire for their domination (and corruption) of local voting, the movement of professionals sought to consolidate itself at the national level. Herbst comments that, "during the century's closing decades all across the country an alliance of businessmen, professionals, journalists, and other leading citizens - the movers and shakers of the progressive movement - spearheaded a campaign against inefficiency and corruption in city and public school administration."<sup>358</sup> For professionals, the more power was located in the bureaucracy of a beneficent state, which they controlled through the deployment of merit and/or educational certification, the more likely it was that professionals would fill administrative jobs, thus creating a bigger need for the education that was the condition of their assumption in the first place. The traditional way of thinking politics, then, as conservative versus liberal or leftist breaks down in the struggles to found an educational system. Conservative versus leftist obfuscates the struggle over the location of power - local and, at least to a

degree, accountable or at the level of state or federal, where power would then move in circles beyond the reach of most people. A technocratic state, where power was deployed through a bureaucracy trained in universities, could still be fought over on a left/right axis, yet it was, by this time, a battle taking place beyond the reach of most people. This was the genius of the professional movement - to limit access to power to those with merit based credentials based, more often than not, in university attendance.

Some of the first attempts at reform by professional organization were undertaken by a young generation of elites - educators, journalists, doctors, bankers and lawyers, in the main - from the Northeast. This group of reformers, who by nature of familial networks were typically self-reliant, prized rationalization and efficiency over patronage and thought that industrial industrialism required unnatural capital accumulation and inhumane working conditions, the latter of which were sure to cause a revolution. As most were the sons of old families, whose base was in mercantile capitalism, they inveighed against industrial capitalism and the ills it brought, not least because they believed industrial strife would destroy the country. The first intimations that these ideas were working their way to the US can be seen in the organization of the American Social Science Association (ASSA) in 1865.<sup>359</sup> Professionals of their time (i.e., not yet disciplined to an intellectual division of labor), they sought through independence from the Republican Party machine to influence social reform.<sup>360</sup> Their target was typically the rich, whom they hoped to educate beyond mere enlightened

self-interest; they preached a socially responsible capitalism as the means to ameliorate the harsh conditions of working class, the increasing debt of the agricultural class and the mollification of those professionals discontented enough that they might side with the increasingly strident working-class radicals and unions in calling for deep structural change.

Their educational efforts took place principally through journalism and secondarily through higher education reform. Journals and magazines, such as *The Nation*, *Harper's Weekly* and the *North American Review*, were created to stitch together a national intellectual community, though one firmly centered in the Northeast. Educational reform centered on bringing the elite into contact with, the education historian Robert Church writes, the “correct principles of political and social organization, the laws governing social and political relations which had to be obeyed if the society were to function properly.”<sup>361</sup> The relationship between journalism and education in this period can be illustrated by two Harvard hires around 1870. Hired as professors of political economy, Charles Franklin Dunbar and Goldwin Smith, each primarily known as journalists, attacked the emergent professional academics, whose interests in utilitarian and disinterested knowledge they found abhorrent as it abandoned the social and political consciousness they desired of their students. A singular idea, that if the elite were to maintain their dominance they must take up their social duty to society to lead through enlightened self-interest, ran throughout their work. Having been trained within the dictates of genteel society, the framework they assumed relied on individual compulsion for self-restriction for the continued

functioning of the free market, with legislation to curb only the most intransigent and public works to raise the social conditions of the working class.<sup>362</sup>

Charles Adams, capturing the opinion of many, wrote that the immigrant and urban industrial working classes were a “close combination of vice, ignorance and brute force, wholly inaccessible to reason or the dictates of public virtue.”<sup>363</sup> Most agreed that employers and clergy would have to lead this rabble. Through a limited version of the centralized government that coalesced during the Civil War, they tried to bind together a moderate interventionist state and a moderately circumscribed free market capitalism. Though legislation was unfortunate, they could see no other way to preserve the economic conditions without new political forms. In this way, reformers embarked on a course towards a rationalized and centralized government.<sup>364</sup> Following the Great Railroad Strike of 1877, when tremendous labor violence and an ineffective government response caused a panic in refined circles, many of its members began to look beyond even these mild calls for state regulation of working conditions. In turn, they began to call not just for enlightened self-interest, but also mechanisms to mediate the relations between capital and labor.

Most of ASSA's members had little to do with the research university as the organization identified with the country's oldest universities.<sup>365</sup> These men helped develop organizational forms that university-centered faculty professional organizations (like the Modern Languages Association (MLA) and American Historical Association (AHA)) would bring to maturity. They were forerunners of those faculty members who would fuse the investigative potential of the university and the



rational deployment of faculties as a means towards pursuing a course of action that would be the hallmark of professional activism. ASSA, as a self-contained social scientist organization, had rapidly developed departments that classified types of investigations by particular problems: departments for Education, Public Health, Economy, Trade and Finance, Jurisprudence and Social Economy. “Working together,” write Silva and Slaughter, “the several departments intended to discover the pertinent social science laws and transmute them into ameliorative legislation as the logical outcome of sustained scientific data and knowledge accumulation.”<sup>366</sup> They attempted, like the traditional colleges they were trained in, to discern the correct principles and right means of deploying them for the problems of their time. Through publications, like their own *Journal of Social Science*, and conferences they brought forth a body of knowledge they believed capable of intervening in social life.

This knowledge and its institutional organs, however, required a client, one that was currently served by the political Party system. However, this form of Party politics was having an increasingly difficult time legitimating itself. Attacking the Party state was their next logical step. Taking a cue from European professionals, they demanded merit-based appointments to political office (to break the power of patronage in appointments) and regulating agencies to determine the merit of those seeking entrance to the professions.<sup>367</sup> In such a development, they believed they could overcome what Max Weber would characterize as the charisma and partial knowledge of the Party, along with the corruption and back-room politics constitutive of such a system, with the rationality and discipline of the democratic bureaucracy.<sup>368</sup> In

breaking with party politics and demanding a merit based bureaucracy, these reformers discovered in nonpartisanship a political position outside the constraints of patronage from which they could attack all existing politics. Their scheme, according to Skowronek, was not to end the party system, but to make it subservient to a professional administrative apparatus. The Party would be reduced to setting out great plans and forming the issues that a nonpartisan administrative apparatus would then enact. It would no longer set and determine policy. This the reformers called 'legitimate party politics.'<sup>369</sup>

With the passage of the Pendleton Civil Service Act of 1883, which attempted to make certification a necessity for civil service position in the US,<sup>370</sup> reformers had a bulwark from which to separate politicians from the communities they were nominally beholden to.<sup>371</sup> Merit tests were thus instrumental in narrowing the political efficacy of the hungry working and agrarian classes while at the same time enshrining the interests of the professional class as that of society as a whole. However, there were substantial obstacles to full implementation of these tests. First, many Americans were simply not interested in a professional political class - better to have the system of ward bosses and party politics than people unfamiliar with their own particular customs and mores. Further, the party system itself was opposed to this certification: it would, after all, eliminate the privilege of patronage and, therefore, the whole base of their power.<sup>372</sup>

The tremendous growth of government in those years acted to both heighten party control and illuminate the need for reform. In the years between 1871 and 1901, the

number of federal civilian employees ballooned from 53,000 to over 256,000, many in the customs houses and post offices that facilitated business;<sup>373</sup> corresponding to this rise, the federal budget grew from less than \$300 million a year in 1871 to over a billion by just 1891.<sup>374</sup> With this vast growth, the means by which the government held itself together began to strain. Reform was both necessary and constrained by existing political arrangements. The challenge to Party politics changed the apparatus of government and that seed would have powerful transformative effects and serve as a useful founding moment for Progressive political movement. The Parties retained control of the government, yes, but the Parties were themselves being infiltrated by professionals who sought to transform them in the reform image. By 1900 nearly 100,000 federal employees had come under the requirements for merit-based employment. ASSA, note Silva and Slaughter, went a long way towards establishing the intellectual and social space within which the modern liberal state rose to prominence: the use of education as social indoctrination; the interventionist state as the means to assure societal equilibrium; the victory of a rhetoric of centralization, efficiency, scientific management and disinterested governance; and, following, that the disinterested and non-partisan expert was best suited to determine both need and the right course of action. The ASSA had the misfortune, however, of an analysis rooted in mercantile capitalism; a new generation, without the familial connections that would allow them to be self-reliant or unaffiliated, far more in tune with the intellectual division of labor in industrial society, created successor organizations within the orbit of the research university that would surpass the efforts of the ASSA.

These associations would be academic in nature, largely made up of professional academics, and oriented towards their discipline (History, Modern Languages, etc).

*Intellectual Division of Labor*

With the formation of a fully functioning university in Cornell, and the several others that formed in its wake (such as the Johns Hopkins, Stanford, and the University of Chicago, plus the reforms of Harvard), the stage was set for a redefinition of the intellectual division of labor both outside the university and within. Within the university, a new division of labor brought forth an academic hierarchy, an administrative bureaucracy, and clients from the private and public sector. These formalizing moves, begun at the research university, would ripple throughout higher and secondary education, creating the conditions from which higher education could assert its dominion over all forms of knowledge production and many of its dissemination. This structure remains with us, largely intact, to this day. While higher education has diversified and continued to expand, its institutional weight, size and inertia were created in this period.

With new universities popping up, and old colleges taking on that model to attract students and faculty, the increasing competitiveness of schools for still meager funds meant that standardization was imposed from the internal drive to acquire resources based on the ability of academics to produce results outside the ivory tower. The waning of denominational support and the quest for increasing funds to match the growth – in land, buildings and students – of research universities directly led to the

formalization of academic administration. To give presidents the tools and time to carry out their new tasks, an administrative bureaucracy had to arise to carry out the multiple functions that used to reside in the president's office (and student self-organization). Through specialization of tasks, the efficiency of the university would be increased while more adequately providing for the needs of the various constituents of higher education - something the overworked presidents could not accomplish on their own.<sup>375</sup> The acquisition of large amounts of capital necessary for the research university, and allocating that capital, required managers, not teachers who doubled as collegiate police. Benefactors desired to see their institutions rise in prestige, which increasingly meant judging institutions against each other, through the eyes of these benefactors. In order to attract those eyes, presidents became academic managers who formed associations and convened conventions, attempting through standardization to give measuring tools to those they sought resources from. The presidents and administrations that came into existence displayed a profound loyalty to the institution of higher education and identified their own success with that of the school they led.

According to Laurence Veysey, whose *The Emergence of the American University* is an exceptional account of the university, though not of the total state of higher education, at the turn of the century, there were two phases in the transformation of administration. (It should be remembered that these men had been dissatisfied students in the US and found their inspiration in the universities of Europe, especially Germany.) In the first phase, which took place as the curriculum's were in flux - the 1860s and 70s - marked the birth of visionary leaders whose work would structure

future developments. “Their aggressiveness, their concern for budgets and public relations, their interest, for example, in the statistics of their establishments, set what was then an entirely new standard.”<sup>376</sup> Many of these men were members of ASSA who, in seeking to expand the scope of higher education, sought relationships beyond the previously acceptable limits: principally with industrialists and bankers. The presidents of this first stage had not yet acquired large staffs and remained responsible for governance, oversight and fund raising. In the second stage, begun in the 1890s, the administrative apparatus exploded: deans, clerical pools, departments, and committees appeared to manage this great undertaking. Books on university management, such as Samuel Eliot’s *University Administration* appeared and associations of academic managers (such as the National Education Association) formed to standardize the position. Compromise among constituencies and institutional prestige became the manager’s main concern. Competition for students and funding meant that all decisions had to be made with an eye to how the market was going to react. Lacking any centralizing institutions to guide the development of higher education, it fell to perceptions of how students and legislatures would react to determine what was acceptable within the boundaries of higher education.

For young faculty, as has been discussed, teaching at the old colleges was an ambivalent experience. These faculty, increasingly lacking independent wealth, had to rely on just the wages they drew from teaching, which were typically poor. A paucity of jobs, lack of job security and the general lack of respect on the part of boards led

academics to begin forming their own associations in order to assert collective control over their work environment. The principle means by which they accomplished this were disciplinary associations, many of which grew out of the ASSA departments and displayed many of the same concerns, though articulated in new ways. By differentiating social science from socialism, radicalism, and philanthropy, ASSA had defined interventionist knowledge as, according to ASSA general secretary Henry Villard, ‘constructive’ of civil and political society: it was most assuredly not a ‘destructive’ force or one meant to ingratiate workers to their bosses.<sup>377</sup> It would, therefore, maintain social relations, but provide insight into how workers and bosses could collaborate rather than destroy each other. It was radical to the extent that it advocated a change in the relations between capitalist and laborer, but conservative in its fundamental belief in the legitimacy of a capitalist world. Where ASSA sought to perpetuate, according to Silva and Slaughter, the New England elite, the professional academics were organizing to establish the value of their specialized labor (in disciplines) in and for itself. These associations, through their journals and conferences,<sup>378</sup> were able to spread the cost of research and keeping up-to-date among their many members. In this way, disciplinary fields emerged as fields of investigation for specialized academics wherever a professor lived.

The first of these associations, The Modern Language Association (MLA) and American Historical Association (AHA), provided the models by which academics could move beyond the limitations of the ASSA. Philologists formed the MLA in 1883<sup>379</sup> and were followed the next year by AHA. AHA received a federal charter and

government funds in order to assist its program of manifest destiny (laying stronger claim to the Western United States as well as beyond into the Pacific Islands and Caribbean). The American Economic Association (AEA) followed the next year<sup>380</sup> and were joined immediately after by Political Scientists (APSA) and Sociologists (ASS). Unlike the ASSA, these associations were national in scope, attempting to coalesce a national understanding of the terms and concepts they employed while eschewing broader political questions within the language of their discipline. Through extensive specialized study, they hoped to elaborate and define the new rules that governed a society dominated by industrial formations and thereby open the eyes of capitalists and laborers to a world of mutual cooperation, ushering in an unprecedented age of prosperity. In short order, they began to produce a tremendous amount of research towards this end. They were still losing many of their brightest students, writes Veysey, to law and medicine and the bulk of what they produced - in 1906, “from one seventh to one tenth of the world’s scientific research” - was generally considered to be of second rate importance.<sup>381</sup> It was founding and consolidation, not the immediate quality, however, that determined the future; these, for the first time truly professional, academics had created an institution to direct and determine the intellectual division of labor. Now they just needed people (benefactors and students) to pay for their services!

Crucially, these associations also made an argument for the objective nature of the knowledge and scientific processes they were engaged in: individuals, even experts,



have blind spots and prejudices, after all. They argued that only through corporate bodies, where scientific knowledge and its processes subsumed individual (and therefore limited) experts, could make a case towards objectivity and therefore the discovery and promulgation of social truths. Disciplinary associations gave their members the ability to collectively shape the nature and purpose of their subjects, freeing them, to a degree, from the censorship of boards of trustees by standardizing the tenets of particular fields of knowledge. If this knowledge was indeed objective, academic investigation could make the case that their work would become essential to the functioning of industrial society. By intervening in disputes over the scientific rationalization of civil service, industry and the most important question of their time - the antagonistic relationship between labor and employers - academics could elevate their standing while contributing to the creation of a better world. Most importantly, for the young penny pinching academic, the professional associations allowed them to present a cohesive front through which to appeal for support and to advocate for more positions for their discipline within the burgeoning university system.

The university as home to the production and dissemination of knowledge, rather than simply its dissemination, had a profound effect on the societal definition of legitimate knowledge. The new model, with the backing of academic managers and association members, removed education from the realm of amateur individualism and made the production of, and access to, knowledge dependent upon the structure of the university. "At the heart of these educational managers' vision," write Silva and Slaughter, "was specialization. Systematically organized, specialized knowledge would

place university-based experts in a position of advantage in answering the full array of technical and social questions facing industrial America. Legitimate monopoly would follow successful solution of problems and the university - not regional culture, traditional religion, corrupt party politics or labor unions - would develop 'scientific' criteria for national decision making."<sup>382</sup>

Competition for students and prestige – both of which led to more donations - mandated that universities acquire land, new buildings, endowed chairs and money for an administrative apparatus to govern these increasingly sizable entities. Academic managers were able to use the flourishing disciplinary associations to attract wealthy benefactors for their institutions. These gifts, of course, had strings attached: university presidents found it expedient to encourage the new specialists to concentrate on the problems that industrialists and legislatures would be responsive to in order to prove their value. That the university was a result of capitalist social relations meant that its clients would be states and industrial capitalists, to a large degree; knowledge production, therefore, occurred inside a logic that demands a return on its investment. Their work was encouraged to find practical and technical solutions to labor organizing as well as the problems of production, transportation and distribution.

There were three principal places to turn for funds beyond those brought in by tuition dollars: industrial capitalists and prominent bankers, the state, and private citizens (who could both give on their own as alumni or philanthropists, or who could put pressure on their representatives). In conjunction with professional university

managers, disciplinary associations' leaders attempted to forge alliances with the (initially suspicious) industrial capitalists whose names now adorn the major buildings and academic foundations that support the US university system. (A number of prestigious universities founded in this era - Stanford University, Clark University, Johns Hopkins and Chicago University and the University of California - exist because of the money provided by men whose fortunes were tied to rise of industrial capitalism). In the social sciences, the AEA and and ASS established relationships with industrial and government leaders through foundations like the National Civic Foundation - a group of powerful industrialists, lawyers, bankers and labor leaders whose work would pave the legal and juridical path for corporate monopoly capitalism. Expertise and management were wed through the power of budgets and an educational infrastructure that carefully mediated between professor, student and civil society.

While leaders courted elites, many professional academics took to publishing in middlebrow newspapers, giving public lectures and submitting cartoons to publications in order to gain wider acceptance for both their thought and profession.<sup>383</sup> This corresponded to a vision of the profession as one where teaching was deemphasized while that of researcher, one who contributes to the societal growth of knowledge, was elevated: as experts whose knowledge could be aimed at social and industrial problems, they could intervene on the side of 'responsible public opinion ' and 'piecemeal reform.' This appeal produced some results in fundraising, but was far more effective in turning political support, and government funding, to higher education.

Most of these organizing social scientists were simply looking to make the world better within the terms society seemed to hold out for them. We see in the period between 1870 and 1920, comments Church, an increasing concern on the part of academic professionals to make their knowledge influential in the industrializing world. Absent a critical attitude towards the state and industry they were serving, however, thousands of young men began careers that would place them at the heart of a professionalizing national and imperial bureaucracy. Their individual partial “expert” knowledge would be brought to bear on the development of industrial production, in turn creating an ideology that would eclipse radical alternatives to Progressive democracy.<sup>384</sup> The development of expert thought, after all, relied on the ability of practitioners to administer the correct policies without recourse to their own interests and was therefore opposed to the organizational forms favored by socialists, anarchists, ward bosses, etc. Partisan policy makers, against such experts, would always be suspect. The working and agrarian classes, who relied on partisan parties to mediate the power of employers, as well as atavistic capitalists, unable to see beyond their own immediate interests, were the groups these professionals set out to woo and break.

#### *Professionalizing the Natural Sciences*

In the natural sciences, too, academics were professionalizing. However, given the cost of setting up labs, professors aiming to do investigative lab work were, from the beginning, more reliant on external benefactors to gain prestige than their

counterparts in the Social Sciences. So, while the state run higher education system in Germany was producing chemical breakthroughs that were allowing German manufacturing to excel, US industrialists and university men had a harder time coming to mutually beneficial terms with each other. How, in other words, would the natural sciences organize on professional lines if they were unable to control the shape and scope of their investigations? Would they be able to gain independence from the entities that gave them labs? On the whole, the answer was a resounding maybe! It is, in fact, in the natural sciences that the relationship between capitalist and university becomes most clear, though this relationship has always haunted the whole realm of the university: there is a necessary relationship, within the research university as it came to exist in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, between capitalist and knowledge production. It is this relationship that the professionals and their organizations sought to manipulate for their own ends. One of the first areas where industry and academics began to see a mutual relation develop, pharmaceutical development, emerged towards the close of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. First, however, the state of industry and academics would have to calibrate to each other.

Among the many reasons this took some time was a mutual distrust of each toward the other. Until the opening of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, neither side was engaged in activity that was relevant to the other. Here, the pharmaceutical industry will be instructive. “Reflecting the US Pharmaceutical industry’s roots in patent medicines and quackery,” write Furman and MacGarvie, “academic scientists were skeptical (if not openly scornful) of university ties with industry.”<sup>385</sup> Industry, too, was suspicious of academics,

preferring instead the practical knowledge that came from developing salable products directly. Legislative and medical transformations would make each side dependent on the other, however. In 1902 and 1906, respectively, Congress passed the Biologics Control Act and the Pure Food and Drug Act. These, comment Furman and MacGarvie, along with the 1906 Act mandating government approval of labeling, outlawed the production of quack cures. On industry's side, the formation of the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry (CPC) in 1905 – an outgrowth of the American Medical Association (AMA), itself founded in 1847 – provided a forum in which to bring together chemists and scientists who had been trained in graduate schools. One of their first projects was to make any advertisements for pharmaceutical products in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA) or other affiliated journals, subject to the approval of the CPC. Together, these developments encouraged more research-heavy modes of production. Pharmaceutical companies now had to demonstrate the efficacy of their wares, a process made much simpler through scientific research and publication through academic organs.

Universities, which had already been training chemists, now had increased motivation to turn out graduate students and others certified capable of doing this type of research. Pharmaceutical companies close to research universities began to build, with input from professional academics and labor from university graduates, research and development (R&D) labs. Those medicine makers in close proximity to universities, note Furman and MacGarvie, soon became industry leaders. By hiring graduates and offering supplemental employment to university faculty (happy to

augment their meager university salaries), they also raised the profile of that particular university, making the university happy. The firms further began to contribute funds and buildings in order to encourage academic investigation in areas closer to industrial needs - essentially streamlining a process already well under way and, in most cases, thoroughly amenable to all involved. Faculty and students responded well to this as their chances of financial recompense increased exponentially in relation to industrial developments.

A further impetus to large scale R&D labs was a change in patent law, in the mid-1890s, that increasingly gave patent rights to firms rather than inventors. Spurred by the automobile and electronics industry (with Thomas Edison's General Electric taking the lead), these changes had broad impact throughout all fields reliant on research and development. Because technology transfer from nearby universities to industry was relatively inexpensive, it quickly came to be the case that those firms close to universities saw rapid increases in the level of their efficiency and innovations. Their large R&D labs attracted more scientists and, consequently, brought more patents into the clutches of industry. "Furthermore," claim Furman and MacGarvie, "the trend towards specialization and professionalization in science increased the supply of qualified workers whose academic credentials reduced the uncertainty associated with hiring them, firms could establish labs to engage in long-term research projects."<sup>386</sup> Universities, it seems, could help socialize the task of specialized learning. The example of German dye manufacturers and US pharmaceutical engineering rapidly spread the notion that university trained and employed professionalized

natural scientists, working in tandem with industrial firms, would increase the prestige of their field, their university and themselves.

While not a surprise, it should be mentioned that nearly all of those who emerged from the universities with higher degrees (masters or Ph.D) were white men. That is not to say that women and African-Americans were incapable. Edward A. Bouchet was one of the first black men in the US to earn a Ph.D, in physics from Yale, when he did so in 1876. However, blacks were underrepresented in scientific communities, as the white dominated universities were notorious for rarely accepting or educating black students. When they did, men such as Charles Henry Turner, Elmer Imes, George Washington Carver, and Charles Drew could find employment only in black universities. Howard University proved to be one of the most important universities for African-Americans in science, as they developed a track record of hiring black Ph.D's who both taught and engaged in research.

In sum, the advance of industrial society produced, just past the mid-point of the century, the material conditions for the emergence of a wide-spread and newly specialized intellectual division of labor. Through the formation of the university, a research body founded on specialized investigation of every area of natural and human life, this professionalizing class finally had an institution through which to consolidate its status, formulate and calibrate its norms, and vet practitioners as well as future bodies of knowledge claiming professional status. In this way, professional



academics had created an institution, which emerged around the same time as the industrial union and the corporation, by which to organize and sell its labor.

As an institution, the university had two concerns that were often at odds: the desire of its clients to give them what they wanted and the desire of its professionals - the faculty - to determine their own work. Academic managers, former academics whose allegiance lay to particular institutions rather than to disciplines, straddled both concerns. They had to juggle the need to access funds and political favor with faculty seeking to explore subjects freely and without influence from without. Throughout its history, therefore, the American university has held within it a central conflict: how it would balance the needs of its clients (capitalists, governments, students, and parents) versus those of the professionals. It has required leaders within the disciplines to walk a tight line. The genius of the professional form of labor management, however, is that it is seemingly meritocratic. Those that rose to the top of the profession were those who made it by dint of their merit. They were empowered to speak in the name of academics because they had already demonstrated themselves to be exemplars of the profession. Or so the justifications went. Professions, of course, are not as neatly organized as this.

### *Developing the System*

One of the conditions necessary for the university to attract so many students was the formalization and spread of secondary education. For much of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, secondary schools - high schools - did not exist; instead, academies and college prep

courses were the means that students who anticipated going to college had attained the necessary qualifications. With a far-flung system of higher education, these means, and the vast divergence in standards between them - and the colleges and universities they fed - were inadequate to the demands of universities and their attempt to institute a more standardized set of knowledge by which incoming students should be admitted. It wasn't until the University of Michigan, in 1870, identified some secondary schools to be used as feeder schools that there came to be a system of establishing the basic knowledge college aspirants should attain. Following Michigan's successful experiment, these high schools spread throughout the Midwest over the course of the decade. By 1900, college preparatory classes were no longer ubiquitous as secondary education had reached at least a nascent stage of codification, with state universities themselves acting as their accrediting agency.

From the founding of Cornell, there would follow a thirty year educational conflict wherein the hierarchies between university and college, state and private, urban and rural, would form. In 1870, four year higher educational institutions had enrollments around 52,000 students. By 1900, there were 238,000 undergrads and 5,700 graduate students. To facilitate this growth, and as competition for better students grew both regionally and nationally, the better universities began national advertising campaigns. The research university, headed by Cornell, Johns Hopkins, UC Berkeley, Stanford, the University of Chicago and Harvard, would assert itself as the educational dominant. In time, as hierarchies within the field emerged, and federal, state and municipalities began to pour more money into the educational apparatus, more and

more colleges, if they'd been unable to cement their status as elite, attempted to join the ranks of the universities, where the meager tuition they could charge would be offset by government largesse. The principles of utilitarian and, coexisting peacefully alongside, the disinterested pursuit of knowledge, would dominate the ethos of the university. Displacing the older liberal studies, the Humanities, forged by conservatives at the Old Colleges as they transitioned to becoming universities, was to rise as the conservative heart of the university. In these years, an institutional form appropriate for the intellectual division of labor under industrial capitalism had come into being and has shepherded US science, industry and social relations since.

Given the tremendous growth of the entire educational system by the inter-war period, there emerged three broad forms, claims Roger Geiger, by which educational institutions could claim elite status. In the first, designated as the 'collegiate ideal,' residential students engaged in extracurricular activities and intended to attain professional jobs upon graduation (we could think here of Yale (at the time) or the University of Wisconsin). In the second, which focused on quality undergraduate education, smaller and often rural colleges (like Reed College or Oberlin) raised their standards and attempted to make a name for themselves in liberal education and student discipline. The third type focused on research - the advance of knowledge through faculty research (Harvard, the University of California, Berkeley, and Johns Hopkins). Private schools, also, went a long way towards distinguishing themselves from public schools during this period. More applications and fewer financial resources meant fewer admissions, which had the effect of making admission to these schools

more prestigious. “Columbia pioneered a form of selective admissions in which social criteria were used to limit the proportion of Jewish students, and the same discriminatory procedures were soon copied by Princeton, Yale, and Harvard.”<sup>387</sup> Their ambitions, too, became national in scope, leaving behind the parochial confines of regions in order to get the best students from all over the country. In this way, they helped facilitate the consolidation of certain locations as highly desirable and certain educations as of more worth than others. They turned to advertising and prestige systems to attract both students and faculty.

#### *Social Relations within the University*

Student activity continued to adapt to the changing educational forms, increased attendance and industrial mode of life.<sup>388</sup> As such, it was a spur to the transition that universities were taking in their educational standards and purposes. As students had taken responsibility to educate themselves according to the norms they imposed through their clubs, universities found it expedient to work with the clubs or to attempt to handle them so as to bring about the will of the faculty or president. With expanding class sizes and new types of students, universities set about establishing what sort of relationship would exist between faculty and student.

The more students matriculating, of course, meant that the policing of students had to evolve. Though the university was supposed to exist as a place where faculty and student met in conditions of mutual respect, the sheer number of young people on campus meant that rules and the ability to enforce them had to evolve, not wither.

Standardization, centralization, uniformity, surveillance and the veneer of accountability came to dominate. This became the job of an ever larger administrative apparatus.

The advent of the elective system, in the 1870s, was the young leaders' attempt to integrate vocational education and societal Truth. Finally able to pursue students who would figure into the future of industrial capitalism, schools like Cornell, Harvard and the University of California attempted to find ways to appeal to the sons and daughters of farmers, the better off working class, and professionals. Harvard President Charles Eliot promulgated an elective system whereby students could have a say in determining the shape and content of the education they received. In this move to an individual centered-education, the institution itself would not determine for students what would be important for their career, but would instead offer a number of courses that the student could develop a course from. Of course, the institution, as the instrument of academics, would predetermine which fields were interesting based on the faculty's own specialization. Students would be granted limited choice within a pre-arranged set of options, all of which aimed at integrating appropriate knowledge and occupational ambition, in addition to a standard curriculum reliant on the old teachings. It was a brilliant attempt by Eliot to bring the manufacturer and capitalist into the university in order to impart to them both knowledge that would help them in their career as well as the societal responsibility for shepherding the communities they were responsible for through this new era. David Starr Jordan, at the time president of

the University of Indiana but soon to take the same position at Stanford, spoke for the value of the elective system, claiming that, "It is not for the university to decide on the relative merits of knowledge... Each man makes his own market, controlled by his own standards. It is for the university to see [only] that all standards are honest, that all work is genuine."<sup>389</sup>

The development of electives, which were first experimented with at the founding of UVA, was hotly contested by both the left and the right, however. Within a few decades, Thorstein Veblen, a verbose critic of capitalism, wrote in *The Higher Learning in America* that, "In so advocating a wider range and freedom of choice, they have spoken for the new courses of instruction as being equally competent with the old in point of discipline and cultural value; and they have commonly not omitted to claim - somewhat in the way of an *obiter dictum*, perhaps - that these newer and more vital topics, whose claims they advocate, have also the peculiar merit of conducing in a special degree to good citizenship and the material welfare of the community."<sup>390</sup> For Veblen, electives placed all disciplinary subjects in the university on a level plane, conflating the ability to make money with being a good citizen. In elevating the practical benefits of utilitarian education, he and others claimed, universities catered to the needs of the employing classes by providing their workers with skill sets they could only previously acquire on the job, thus freeing up capital for other uses. In catering to corporate interests, universities equated the larger community with business and substituted venal gain for community relations. While there is certainly some truth to this, what these critics missed was that it was students who clamored for these

changes, not the capitalist class. It was students and their families, whose support higher educated needed most, who demanded vocational training rather than the narrow pietistic knowledge offered by the older models. Given an increasingly competitive market for labor, it should not be surprising that it was students, not capitalists, who drove the demand for vocational (both theoretical and practical) education. Capitalists moved to support universities only after they'd begun to demonstrate their usefulness in allowing them to accumulate and circulate capital. To justify the expenditure of both time and money, students expected to get a certain value back: this value came to take the shape of job market credibility.

That students would have a (limited) say in what they would learn struck traditionalists as heretical. Who, after all, were students, or even faculty, to determine what constituted acceptable knowledge or proper standards? Yale's Noah Porter, along with Princeton's Andre West, remained staunchly opposed to these reforms: regardless of what students desired, the express purpose of education must be the training and disciplining of the mind's mental and moral purposes. They, along with most other schools, did what they could to bring more and more types of knowledge into their institution, but they were staunchly in favor of the President and Board determining what access the student would have to that knowledge. Elaborating a refrain that still echoes today, Porter claimed that vocational education, increasingly popular among students, was out of place in the university: "The college course is preëminently designed to give power to acquire and to think, rather than to impart special knowledge."<sup>391</sup> The greatness of Western civilization, not the venality of modern

times, should be the determining factor in deciding what was taught. When their critics charged them with lack of relevancy, the traditionalists were wont to respond that this was exactly the case! Porter again proclaimed that, “the more urgent is this noisy tumult of life without and the stronger its pressure against the doors of the college, the greater need is there that certain studies which have little relation to life should be attended to.”<sup>392</sup> To be buffeted about by the winds of the present was to lose ones moorings and give way to any sense of society at all. In these colleges, and others without the prestige or funds to invest in graduate facilities or expansive courses, a liberal arts curriculum came to compete with the other two modes and offer itself as the conscience of higher education.

For the schools that assumed the mantle of research university, however, the liberal arts were no less a subject of inquiry than were the sciences, obviating whatever enmity Porter's critics claimed existed by shifting the argument. Harvard's Charles Eliot claimed that, “This university recognizes no real antagonism between literature and science, and consents to no such narrow alternative as mathematics or classics, science or metaphysics.”<sup>393</sup> The new university presidents and academic associations saw the university as the legitimate home for all knowledge, not just that which had previously been important. It was clear to these academics that no individual could retain all the knowledge required for the maintenance of industrial societies and that the university itself should become the repository for this knowledge.<sup>394</sup>

Summing up and elaborating a half-century of this style, Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago, delivered a series of lectures at Yale in the



1930s, collected in the appropriately titled *The Higher Learning in America*, that coalesced the many conservative arguments that produced liberal education. From the beginning he maintained that there should be some specificity to the university. Just because some types of education do not work for everyone does not mean that all education should be tailored for everyone. Training in the university, he argued, should make a student able to adapt to all fields, not narrow their horizons to particular skill sets. Rather than seeking to draw out what was common in human nature,<sup>395</sup> or finding that ‘the truth is everywhere the same’, modern education seeks to do it all better and finds it can only do it worse.<sup>396</sup> Because the actual practice of the disciplines changed so frequently, the university, Hutchins would claim, should teach the “general principles, the fundamental propositions, the theory of any discipline,” not their practice. Rather than merely studying the practice of the profession, education would be much better served by studying the history and traditions of the professions. This, he declaimed, was not the purpose of the liberal university. Insipid notions of progress had denigrated orthodoxy, meaning that students were now bereft of that knowledge necessary for original and incisive thinking.

There was, of course, another purpose for maintaining the literary arts: its civilizing impact. The Humanities, symbols of a renaissance of Greek culture, were the ideological hinge, asserts Gray Brechin, upon which manifest destiny and overseas imperialism were justified. President Wheeler of the University of California, in fact, “assured his audience, in 1899, that the university was to be no ivory tower for idlers but would serve as a beacon against barbarism, just as Athens had once stood against

Persia. A showdown between the races was approaching that would result in nothing less than a world war, and Cal was to play a major role in its winning: 'The University stands by the gates of that sea upon which the twentieth century is to see the supreme conflict between the two great world halves... It is set to be the intellectual representative of the front rank of occidentalism, the rank that will lead the charge or bear the shock.'<sup>397</sup> This civilizing mission could only arrive in tandem with the specialized investigations capable of revealing the scientific principles of all natural things. With this new knowledge, the US would stand at the pinnacle of the world, with the most efficient productive and administrative capacities of the major powers.

As far as the relationship between faculty and the administration (former faculty) were concerned, there was still much to work out. As the university was establishing itself, it also had to determine how the university would be governed. The hallmark of a professional is that they control, to a large degree, the conditions under which they work. However, in their need to attract federal, state, and philanthropist funding, academic administrations had to be able to assert some authority over academics. How this would look and play out has been a major concern for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, though its early patterns came to the fore around the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This was especially tricky because in academic thought, the totality of the field is supposed to determine truth. For outside influences to get in the way, to curtail the ability of academics to research and publish in order to add to the store of knowledge from which determinations might be made, was to make null the purpose of academia. To

truly be professionals, academics would require academic freedom. For Hutchins, “Academic freedom is simply a way of saying that we get the best results in education and research if we leave their management to people who know something about them.”<sup>398</sup> However, because a democracy is messy, academics found themselves having to create a defense for their right to speak as they believed their research led them. “The democratic view that the state,” Hutchins continued, “may determine the amount of money to be spent on education and may regulate education and educators by law has nothing to do with the wholly undemocratic notion that citizens may tell educators how to conduct education and still less with the fantastic position that they may tell them how to live, vote, think, and speak.”<sup>399</sup>

### *Reproducing Themselves*

The growth of very large universities meant that graduate students would take an ever increasing role in the instruction of undergraduates. Most faculty preferred graduate students as it was here that they were able to reproduce themselves and train their compatriots. Undergrads, however, often had very different career goals and tended to treat the university as a four year break before entering a real occupation. However, undergraduate tuition and alumni support became, in the absence of other funding alternatives, a major resource. Outwardly the universities had to compete to bring in the best students, though internally faculty were often more interested in training graduate students. While undergrads provided funding, research provided prestige and, increasingly funding from industry, think tanks and the government. They

both provide funding, but research provides greater amounts and also affords a level of prestige to universities that is not available to smaller liberal arts colleges. “What counts toward the advancement of learning and the scholarly character of the university is the graduate work,” inveighed Veblen, “but what gives statistically formidable results in the way of a numerous enrollment [sic], many degrees conferred, public exhibitions, courses of instruction - in short what rolls up a large showing turnover and output - is the perfunctory work of the undergraduate department, as well as the array of vocational schools latterly subjoined as auxiliaries to this end.”<sup>400</sup> The bureaucracy arises to deal more specifically with the undergraduate control, yet as both grow, the bureaucracy turns its eyes to more and more functions.

Figuring out a way for graduate students to pay their way through education also presents difficulties. It often falls on them to teach freshmen and sophomores: “placing them in the hands of graduate students, who are given teaching posts instead of fellowships.”<sup>401</sup>

### *Internal Operations*

For many of the younger faculty who were beginning to populate the ranks of the university, the German education system, which many of them had experienced either first hand (by crossing the Atlantic) or second hand (having been trained by faculty who'd travelled overseas) the German university, with its pursuit of disinterested knowledge, was their preferred model for the development of the university. Claiming that colleges and universities were not secular monasteries whose purpose was to

establish a culture, many younger academics instead argued that there was value in expanding the realm of what was known. Specialized education in narrow fields would allow for researchers to penetrate deeply into the mysteries of nature, society and humanity in order to broaden understanding of all aspects of life. “At Johns Hopkins in Baltimore,” claims Lucas, “the position was being developed that a university, as distinct from a college, was primarily a post-collegiate institution whose main purpose was the advancement of learning, to which the diffusion of knowledge through undergraduate instruction was strictly subsidiary.”<sup>402</sup> Rejecting the appeals of ASSA’s Educational Department to train undergraduates in discipline and piety, Tappan,<sup>403</sup> and Daniel Gilman,<sup>404</sup> at Johns Hopkins, offered a more compelling plan: narrow professional specialization through graduate work. Johns Hopkins, Stanford University, Clark University and Harvard Graduate School would become the exemplars of this mission.

To facilitate the specialized revolution in the research university, their presidents also sought full-time faculty to replace ‘practitioner-teachers’ and thereby give to professors the prestige of professionalism. Both faculty and students were encouraged to pursue specialized knowledge while remaining anchored to the timeless wisdom educational leaders imagined was responsible for the greatness of the West. Men such as Gilman at Johns Hopkins, write Silva and Slaughter, helped develop this thinking. The division of undergraduate general knowledge, where the Bachelor of Arts would establish that students had achieved proficiency in both new specialized knowledge as well as the timeless art of correct living, and specialized graduate level knowledge,

where the Ph.D signaled mastery of a specialized field of study, would lay down the blueprint for higher education throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

### *Educational Technologies*

A significant challenge in reforming education for these new purposes lay in overcoming the pedagogical form associated with traditional education: the recitation (memorization of a text that is then recited in class). When colleges sought to instill the timeless knowledge of the ages, recitation of the foundational tomes of the West could work. However, as faculty engaged in producing knowledge and utility required knowledge of mundane matters, pedagogical innovations drew upon the laboratory, the lecture, and the seminar to instill and inculcate knowledge. According to Veysey, these three modes came to rule every level of higher level. He writes that the lecture was home mainly to the social sciences and humanities and allowed those adept at entertaining to gain large followings while expounding their own ideas. Due to its passive nature, it attracted middling students and virtuoso professors. The lab taught the practice of discovery, the seminar - a favorite of US academics - gave students a useful bibliography of important texts surrounding an idea, allowed students to (sometimes) speak on equal terms with faculty, introduced students to each other's ideas, and, (sometimes) helped faculty out by getting students to do research for them. The group dynamic also helped sideline 'non-logical' thought. It was in this ferment that higher education's institutional structure and hierarchy of institutions would come to establish themselves.

### *Vocational Education*

In the end, most of the conservatives had little problem with the idea of vocational training, they simply wanted it separated and contained within vocational and municipal schools. In line with Veblen, they sought to turn back the tide on the monstrous growth of the modern liberal university. The education to train professionals and education for the pursuit of truth are two different concepts, they believed. In the modern university, they were wed, uneasily, and were in dire need of divorce. The search for employment had completely overrun the university, complained Hutchins. “The modern university is full of prelaw, prebusiness, pre dentistry, preengineering, and premedical students whose course of study is determined by their professional ambitions. In some institutions the professional schools themselves begin with the junior year.”<sup>405</sup> Industry’s reliance on the university for training was like an infectious disease that affects even faculty: “In the universities,” wrote Hutchins, “students study for the Ph.D. because it is almost impossible to secure a college or university post without it. Seventy-five percent of them have no interest in research.”<sup>406</sup> Casting back to a simpler time, before the German styled university had been grafted to the British residential college, conservatives mourned the denigration of thought through subservience to employment while refusing to note that this was the inevitable outcome of education in capitalist society. That all Americans without independent wealth would have to sell their labor creates the condition whereby higher education institutions are able to arrogate to themselves the role of job market gate keeper. To do this, however, requires expanding educational choices and skills to ever

more students. Like a dying sun, the university devours all knowledge and skill, giving itself a monopoly on the legitimate dissemination of these. Anyone can acquire knowledge and skill outside the university, but in this era the university, through of series of unintentional decisions, began to assert its right as the shepherd of legitimate knowledge.

### *Expanding the Student Base*

At the turn of the century, also, the university expanded its footprint by tentatively admitting the formerly excluded. While male students had revolted against women in the classroom in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, female students had been proven themselves capable of scholastic work. Opposition to co-education, centered on fears about their performance as well as the erosion of traditional values, existed into the 1920s, but by 1910 women made up close to 40% of the undergrad population and 47% by 1920. By the 1920s the tuition brought in by women attending college ensured their place in higher education: it would be too costly to ever deny them education. The results showed: Lucas relays that “by 1930, almost a third of all college presidents and professors were women.”<sup>407</sup> Women in the university were paid less than their male counterparts and received fewer promotions, but they were now an active part of the university life. Until, that is, the 1930s, when fewer positions were made open to women as a reactionary movement against women’s equality set in across the country. Because of this growth in women's education, in the 1920s women entered the professional work force in unprecedented numbers. In the mid-twenties, women



constituted almost 45 percent of the professional work force, a share that began to decline in 1930 and reached its lowest point in 1960, after which it began climbing again.”<sup>408</sup>

Co-education, though, was the end result of many years organizing. Throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century a number of women’s academies had been established to educate women to the changing needs of households. They did not stress academic standards and had little financial support. Oberlin was the first school to offer co-education and also the first to grant the BA to women. Of the four women who enrolled in 1837, three earned a BA in 1841. The spread of state colleges and universities in the West saw the concomitant spread of co-education: Iowa in 1855 and Wisconsin in 1863 began offering co-education and Indiana, Missouri, Michigan and California followed throughout the 1860s. By 1875, almost all of the universities in the West had begun accepting women for the BA degree. Co-education, however, did not mean equal education. Because higher education was in transformation, and curriculums were beginning to undergo some significant changes, access to education was different than access to the professional jobs that were still only really open to white men, and so the education proffered to women was different.

The question of what a college degree was useful for, then, arises again in this context. In the first waves of co-education, however, it was important to establish that a woman was capable of collegiate education and life. Purposes for education and degrees would have to follow this. Sadly, many of the first waves of women ended up simply returning to their homes and chafed at being unable to use the knowledge to

better society. That was, in fact, the first impediment to be overcome in increase the scope of women's education. According to Helen Ekin Starrett, whose 1896 book on this subject was an attempt to give women the resources to go to college, one of the main reasons families declined to send women to college was that it made the graduated woman's life difficult. One father told Starrett that, "'I'm not so certain about this 'higher education' for girls and women... for the reason that I don't see what they are going to do with it, especially if they stay at home. I am not certain that it isn't a mistake, and that it doesn't unfit them for the place in life that they were designed to fill... Of course their mother and I wanted to do the very best we could for our daughters, seeing that we had no son; and we concluded one of the best things was to give them all the education they would take."<sup>409</sup> This particular family was pretty well off, so all of their daughters went to school. They enjoyed the experience quite a bit. When their eldest, Sarah, returned home, though, her father thought she should learn how to do housework and other things that a woman was expected to know. She was unsatisfied with this course of action, however. According to her father, she said, "But, father, I must do something; I shall shrivel up and dry away without something to occupy my time. Oh, dear! I wish I had my college-days to live over again."<sup>410</sup> Her father claimed to understand how she would be bored after that, being stuck in their house in their small town. Further, Sarah had been educated out of a good marriage in that area, as she was too independent for most men. "The girls don't take any pleasure in their company, and the boys are afraid of them."<sup>411</sup> The main thing, he claimed, was that his daughter was unhappy. If that were not the case, he

confided, everything would have been fine. He was happy that she'd been able to go college - a college girl is, "busy; she is regular and systematic in the employment of her time; she is experiencing day by day the delight of agreeable mental activity, the joy of acquiring knowledge, the conscious expansion of her intellectual powers, the widening of her horizon of life, and all this in the cheerful and stimulating companionship of her classmates."<sup>412</sup> Upon graduation there had to be something to occupy her.

Starrett tells several tales of similar nature, told either by parents or by students themselves. The common element was the vibrant experience of college, which made the expected return to domesticity discouraging. Starrett recounts that it was much worse in the 1880s than it was in the 1890s, but the problem persisted - there was not yet room in the larger economy for women. "I have said," Starrett writes, "that at the close of her college career the average college girl, daughter of well-to-do parents, usually finds herself face to face with blank nothingness in so far as worthy occupation of her time is concerned. Her brother, who may have graduated at Yale or Harvard at the same time, is perhaps decreed an additional year or two of foreign travel before settling down to the real purpose of his life; but his education and his travel are both accomplished with an important and definite object in view; viz., the fitting him to take a strong, firm hold on the life-work which unquestionably lies before him, even though what that life-work is to be may not be clearly defined."<sup>413</sup> So, the principal difficulty of the female graduate was the closed nature of economic activity.

Second, however, was that the "mental and physical habits" that she accustomed herself to in college vanished as soon as the degree was earned. To suddenly have

“nothing” to do was extremely hard on the graduate. However, simply doing something (such as housework) missed the point: “it must be occupation that amounts to something - accomplishes some worthy result. The round of social duties will not do this: the greater or smaller share she may take in the duties of the household will not do it; for as the good old man’s daughter of whom I have spoken, argued, she will be apt to feel that it is not very good economy to use a three-thousand-dollar education doing three-dollar-a-week work.”<sup>414</sup> The point of life for many graduates was to do something worthy of one’s talents - education’s first duty, then, was to prepare students to do something (not necessarily a particular thing, but anything so long as it requires action). To make use of the talents imparted at college to give back to society.

For this reason, many women found work as teachers in the fast growing lower school movement. Starret offered, encouragingly, there there was bound to be a strong market for college-educated female teachers simply because there were so many new schools and men no longer found those jobs attractive. Potential occupations also existed in “art, music, literature, the learned professions” and, the most important of all, teaching kindergarten.<sup>415</sup> While professional jobs for white men were a common avenue for a post-collegiate career, it was still not the case the degree opened up new worlds for women. Until this changed, in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, education for women was still necessary for a university's bottom line, but still largely an afterthought.

Nonetheless, women continued to matriculate. For those who attended a co-educational institution, introduction to student life was a complicated endeavor. There

was little evidence, most university leaders believed, that could show the beneficial nature of such an experiment. Many, in fact, thought that mixing the sexes in the university was a recipe for disaster. As usual, the concern was usually couched in language about how education would have a physiological effect on the students - both women and men. The Reverend John Todd, writing at the beginning of the 1870s, asked: "Must we crowd education on our daughters, and for the sake of having them 'intellectual,' make them puny, nervous, and their whole earthly existence a struggle between life and death?"<sup>416</sup> Some men also believed that the stress of academic work would ruin a woman's reproductive system. Fears of education's debilitating effects were also met by concern over its masculinizing influence: Lucas writes that many believed, "Too much learning would render her unfit for her preordained destiny as wife and mother. Coeducation meant a violation of the natural division of complementary spheres of competence and influence between the sexes: it could serve only to 'coarsen' or 'masculinize' young women, even as it made men more effeminate and less aggressive."<sup>417</sup> Others, Lucas shows, believed that the more men and women were exposed to each other in college, they would become less attracted to each other. Still others believed that if women were to go to school that the traditional family structure would be upset: a student at Vanderbilt complained that, "No man wants to come home at night and find his wife testing some new process for manufacturing oleomargarine, or in the observatory sweeping the heavens for a comet."<sup>418</sup> At heart for many was what equal education would do to the family: if women were to be given access to the means of knowledge production, or at least first hand access to its

dissemination, why would they continue to marry? (It is true that many of the pioneering women who attained degrees and academic careers did not marry.)

Even still, the Western states, in their desperate need for students, were finding it more difficult to deny women admission to university. The governing board at the University of Wisconsin declared, in 1872, that, “It is too late, amid the noontime splendors of the nineteenth century, to ignore the claims of women to higher education... Whatever shall make her wiser and better, that she may learn; whatever knowledge she may be able to use, either in adding to her own happiness, or in promoting the happiness of others - that knowledge she may rightfully acquire.”<sup>419</sup> Even schools in the South and Mid-Atlantic were offering women co-education. Only the old colleges in the Northeast were able to resist this pressure, which explains the rise of parallel institutions and women’s only education there. The new Northeastern universities, such as Cornell, offered co-educational courses, but that was more a function of its radicalism than of Northeastern tolerance. Harvard accepted that women could sit for exams and earn credit in the 1870s and began, through an annex that would become known as Radcliffe College, to develop courses for women by 1879. This model spread to other elite schools like Columbia and Tufts. By 1880, one-third of the higher educational institutions had at least some co-education and by 1900 three-quarters of them would.

Truth be told, the collegiate experience was not particularly amenable to women. Black women, especially, found it difficult to seek higher education. That women were barred from living on campus in most cases (race and sex mixing was simply too much

for most administrators to comprehend) did not help matters. In classes at the University of Wisconsin, women had to stand until all the men had been seated; everywhere men and women were kept segregated as much as possible and in most schools women were barred from participating in extracurricular activities. At the Normal School (Teacher's College) associated with the University of Missouri, women couldn't go to chapel; men were unable to take classes that women were required to take; and women could only use the library in hours that men were not allowed to be there. And at Harvard, women were only able to use the main library, Widener Library, if they stood; they were totally excluded from other, smaller libraries until the 1960s.

Change did come slowly, however. Missouri's president, by the 1870s, was finally convinced that the world would not end if men and women participated in some activities together: he wrote that, "Finding, however, that the young women... did no matter of harm, we very cautiously admitted them to some of the recitations and lectures in the University building itself... providing always, they were to be marched in good order, with at least two teachers, one in the front and the other in the rear of the column as guards."<sup>420</sup> Women were slowly allowed to attend chapel and, after their presence had been noted, they were able to also pray and sing in chapel. Like slowly going into water to acclimate yourself to the temperature change, women were slowly allowed to co-mingle with men in chapel, classrooms and some extracurricular activities. The president of Ohio State University could even admit, by 1897, that perhaps there was something salutary in co-education: it helped to give women some

backbone and made men less rambunctious!

Even though many university administrations were becoming more friendly to co-education, it was by no means universalized. Lucas writes of a University of California student year book, in 1892, that carried an ode to 'Tender Delores': it warned against spending time with women who were interested in their studies (though, to be fair, no one was supposed to be that interested in their studies at the time) - studying was found to make "her pretty little nose very red," and her "rosy cheeks would become jaundiced, and her hair thinned." She would be unfit for any occupation - including wife - except for schoolmarm. UC Berkeley President Benjamin Wheeler, in 1904, gave a speech that must have been comforting to women: "You are not like men and you must recognize the fact... You may have the same studies as the men, but you must put them to different use... You are... here for the preparation of marriage and motherhood."<sup>421</sup> The education women received should be put to making their houses run smoothly and in keeping their men happy with them and their job as wife and mother.

Marion Talbot, dean of women at the University of Chicago, claimed something different, however. She wrote, in 1910, that women have, "proved their ability to enter every realm of knowledge. They must have the right to do it. No province of the mind should be peculiarly man's. Unhampered by traditions of sex, women will naturally and without comment seek the intellectual goal which they think good and fit. The logical outcome of the present status of women's education will be intellectual freedom on an individual basis."<sup>422</sup> It would be several decades before this proven



ability would be proven enough to provoke general social consent.

Other groups, too, had difficult times accessing higher education, though not necessarily for a lack of options post-graduation. In the 1920s, Jewish students, were allowed to attend universities in large numbers. This did not mean they were universally welcome, however: said Harvard president Abbott Lawrence Lowell, “Where Jews become numerous they drive off other people and then leave themselves.”<sup>423</sup> Jobs existed, yet social prejudice went a long way towards barring equality within the hallowed halls of academia.

While women and Jewish students were becoming a fixture on campuses, most schools were not yet comfortable with accepting black students. There were a few reasons for this: first, and most obviously, racism. That a black student would be able to perform as well as a white student in the classroom was, for many, an absurdity. Second, the state of African-American primary and secondary education as such that very few black students could be said to have qualified for admittance to a university. Third, the creation of alternative school systems - primarily the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, but also urban and vocational schools - were meant to provide an alternative. By 1900, there were only eighty-eight black students who had received degrees from white colleges (and it should be noted that many of these were from Oberlin) and only 475 from black colleges.<sup>424</sup> Even where they were able to matriculate, however, the instruction bore little resemblance to that received by white

students. “As the twentieth century opened,” recounts Lucas, “there were approximately 3,900 blacks enrolled in nearly a hundred different black schools and colleges, perhaps less than two-thirds of which offered real collegiate-level courses of instruction.”<sup>425</sup> In 1917, only 1 of the 16 black land-grant colleges in the South was doing college-level education. Even through the 1930s courses that would only count as preparation for college in white institutions of higher education accounted for 40% of the curriculum in black institutions of higher education.

Though the South comes in for popular condemnation, the place of former slaves and their children was tenuous throughout the country. Though the legal edifice of slavery had been dismantled, the entire social and cultural system remained largely untouched. Lee Bernstein, who has written about the relationship between slavery and the Southern penal system, writes that though emancipation had removed the legal validity of slavery, the government was unable and unwilling to roll back the criminal-justice system that kept blacks tied to oppression. This justice system followed Blacks as they migrated North in the early 1900s. In this climate, it is remarkable that African-Americans were able to carve out any institutional space for education at all. Many whites, especially those able to wield public opinion, argued that blacks were not fit for freedom/democracy, arguing that, in the absence of benevolent slavery, in which the white master was actually helping the uncivilized barbarian become human, legal domination by their betters was still necessary. Challenged and dismantled during Reconstruction, a legal system of discrimination was built and ratified at every legal level throughout the South, including the US Supreme Court. Bernstein continues

that, “The definitions of crime, decisions to prosecute, and forms of punishment were all informed by and helped define the everyday lives of slaves and slave owners.”<sup>426</sup> The shift, after emancipation, was that the private whim of the immediately visible master was given over to the strict enforcement of the state. In those places where blacks began to enter the political system and enforce the law for whites as well as blacks, vigilantism reared its head.

Given these barriers to life, black students and teachers made a heroic attempt to educate with the resources available to them. Black schools tended to be poor and remedial. White schools, though, had so many racist barriers to the education of black students that it seemed not worth it to those who had been accepted. Oftentimes it took action from the courts to integrate schools: this was how black students gained admission to the University of Maryland (1936, when Donald Gaines Murray was admitted after a court battle) and University of Missouri (1938, after Lloyd L. Gaines attempted to gain admission to the U of M's Law school; the Supreme Court ruled that Separate but Equal required either admission or the creation of an equally equipped law school for black students. The Missouri legislature chose the latter: it was not until 1951 that the first African-American student was admitted to the U of M's Law School).

Strange as it would have seemed to anyone in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, many universities were becoming almost overcrowded by the 1920s. Echoing many conservative commentators, the President of the University of North Carolina felt that

a precipitous decline in academic standards had been the direct result of too many students crowding into its halls. As the early 20<sup>th</sup> century progressed, two schools of thought opposed each other: on the one hand were those who argued that education should be made available to everyone regardless of what that meant for academic intelligibility; on the other hand stood those who saw in education an elite function best served only for those who sought to achieve excellence in their studies. As a way to mediate these two, the junior college (JC) was established. By 1918, there were already 85 JC institutions that had over 4,500 students. Lucas writes that, “Of the 85, located in nineteen different states, well over half were concentrated in the five states of California, Missouri, Virginia, Texas, and Illinois.”<sup>427</sup> In the mid-1920s, there were 196 of these institutions serving nearly 45,000 students. 1938 saw a tripling of these numbers and made up 18% of college enrollment. These two-year schools initially saw themselves as funnels for students to universities and therefore used a curriculum very similar to the first two years of university education. In the 1930s, however, many JC schools began to see themselves as ‘terminal institutions’ where poor students could get the rudiments of professional skills and some liberal arts knowledge. President Lowell of Harvard found something wonderful in these schools: “One of the merits of these new institutions will be [the] keeping out of college, rather than leading into it, [of] young people who have no taste for higher education.”<sup>428</sup> JC’s, as understood by many of the leading lights of academia, operated as a mechanism for giving the appearance of democratic openness of education and further trained a limited work force in the skills necessary for an industrial work force.

### *Assessing Equivalency*

Accreditation was developed in the absence of a federal guarantee regarding the quality of higher education. Because education was absent in the US Constitution, and the separation of private from public was made explicit in the 1819 *Dartmouth College Case*, the development of education and its supporting institutions was left up to private enterprise. When the federal government began to involve itself in the funding and direction of higher education, it relied on accreditation groups that had arisen in the private sector and codified their importance by using their rankings.

With this large increase in the total number of students as well as in the total number of schools, the leading collegiate institutions worried that the value of the degree they granted could be easily confused or conflated with the degree of a diploma mill. This situation had to be addressed. In 1885, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges was founded by a group of secondary school leaders acting with college presidents (led by Harvard's Charles Eliot). Their first order of business was to actually establish what was to count as a college. As Barbara Brittingham<sup>429</sup> notes in her work on accreditation in the US, by the 1880s and 90s, there were around 900 educational institutions and more than one hundred fifty thousand students. Though that encompassed less than 2% of 18-24 year olds, it was becoming clear that the proportion of college age students was rising.

### *The Interwar Period*

The period between the wars is often characterized as the massification of higher education. With the form of the research university more or less settled; hierarchies established; and its purposes made clear, it was time to address critics who were still claiming it was geared towards elite attitudes and that it was unconcerned with the plight of the average person. While the poor and middling had always been admitted to US higher education, in the 1920s higher education opened its doors to the masses in greater numbers than ever. A US Department of Education report, "120 Years of American Higher Education: A Statistical Portrait," points out that, "Enrollment growth accelerated in the first 30 years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, driven by population growth and continuing rises in participation rates. Between 1899-1900 and 1909-10, enrollment rose by 50 percent. In the following decade, enrollment rose by 68 percent, and between 1919-20 and 1929-30, enrollment rose by 84 percent."<sup>430</sup> In order to do this, new means to educate more students had been required. "Elite patterns," writes Geiger, "are characterized by full-time, residential students, by cultural ideals of liberal learning and character formation, and by destinations in high-status professions. In contrast, mass forms of higher education cater to part-time or commuting students, convey applicable knowledge, and prepare students for employment in technical or semiprofessional positions."<sup>431</sup> The latter characteristics applied to junior colleges, teachers colleges and metropolitan colleges. Akron, in 1913, chartered a free municipal university that became a model for future endeavors. It taught courses in engineering, home economics, commerce and teaching. It aimed to train future employees of the

greater region. The College of the City of New York, similarly, undertook a similar call. By the end of the 1920s, it had 24,000 students. “In 1930... part-time and summer students exceeded full-time students at New York, Northwestern, Southern California, Boston and Western Reserve universities. By that date, the biggest American institutions were no longer research universities but municipal universities with large irregular enrollments.”<sup>432</sup>

Business, too, had come around to the idea that college could be useful. In fact, by the 1920s, it had become involved in advancing the cause of higher education. While formal education had played, at most, a minor part in lives of the tycoon capitalists of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was no longer infrequent for the managers and Vice-Presidents of the corporations that had arisen to dominate the field to laud it. While advocating for young people to attend college, though, they also made it known that certain types of education were to be desired. As WS Gifford, Vice-President of AT&T in 1928, wrote in a piece - “Does Business Want Scholars?” - for *Harper’s Magazine*, most businessmen did not see the professional training of college equalling that received by graduate students leaving the medical and law schools. He writes, “Consequently, a boy who stands high in the law school will possess knowledge more immediately useful than one who doesn’t, while no matter how high a boy stands in college he will not have much, if any, knowledge immediately useful in business.”<sup>433</sup> He lays out the argument that educators use to try to claim success in school equates to success in business: that students who make high marks in history are more likely to have success running a company. To assess this claim, AT&T, beginning in 1926, conducted a two

year study to determine the validity of the theory.

They looked into the records of 3806 college graduates who worked at Bell and who had not worked elsewhere (in order to make sure they had not been trained somewhere else first). Bell researchers asked the more than 100 colleges that they drew their employees from to help them determine where these students ranked in their class. They then correlated these to the median salary of those who graduated. “Of the 3806 men studied, 498 had graduated in the first tenth of their respective classes. By about the fifth year of their employment this group began to earn more than the other college men. They continued to increase their advantage little by little until they were twenty-five years out of college. Then they began to go ahead still more rapidly...”<sup>434</sup> The men who fell in the top third (including the top 10%) had a median higher wage than did those who did less well. Those in the middle third received a pay about  $\frac{2}{3}$  that of the top 10% and the students who’d graduated in the bottom third did the worst. Further, while the top 10% increased their earnings more rapidly the longer they stayed, the bottom third saw a marked decrease in the pace of promotions and raises. The numbers, then, conclude that the top 10% of grade earners had a 1 in 2 chance of earning more after five years than the average while the bottom third had only a 1 in 5 chance of earning more than the average. “Strikingly enough,” he writes, “almost exactly the same results as those just given were obtained separately for the engineering graduates and the graduates in arts and business who together make up the whole group studied.”<sup>435</sup> He noted that salary does not equate to success, but there is usually a correlation between the two. To conclude, he claimed that business did, in



fact, desire scholars and it didn't much mind what discipline they come from - that'd they had good marks was enough.

That business desired scholars was not met with universal delight. Thorstein Veblen, Upton Sinclair and a myriad of others inveighed against this. For Veblen, the academic world of the 1920s was already too close to the business world. The same trends that he saw as destructive of American society - that it was being organized along industrial lines - were redefining the colleges and universities. Somewhat myopically he declared that where the knowledge universities and colleges had once been responsible for had heroically served the needs of society, they were now serving market values. This was, to an extent, true, though the needs of society, earlier, had been intertwined with the needs of town fathers and land speculators, so there was not as much golden in the past as he attempted to claim. Even still, he saw the encroachment of useful and practical knowledge as a war on theoretical and abstract knowledge - though just the opposite could also be claimed. The common culture that he had known as it had once existed was being ripped asunder and he found a convenient scapegoat in practical knowledge, the capitalists who funded it, and the students who flocked to it.

Because this is such a common trope amongst academic critics today, it is worth some comment. For academics back then, as today, much of the exciting work of developing a field occurs in the theoretical and abstract. However, it is exceedingly rare for an institution to play in this field forever. There is a need for a society that

funds this abstract thought to receive some practical return (this will become a defining feature of Department of Defense spending on higher education in the 1970s, in fact). In the European Middle Ages, that return was in the form of lawyers and religious thinkers who could provide a framework for different types of rule. That not all academics did this, but instead continued to play in theoretical wonderlands, was perfectly ok. The system itself produced both theory and practical results. In a society governed by the dictates of industrial markets, the university and college have to return something to those markets. They must, at the same time, continue to churn out theory and abstract thought, providing the young with the ideas that allow new developments to spring forth. Veblen, and others like him, found themselves yearning for a university made possible by an industrializing society, but chafed at the clients they were forced to take on.

Because of this, though, some of his criticisms are quite sharp. When he claimed that the university system was an unthinking beast that grew because that is what industrial society demanded, he was not wrong. “Again it is a matter of institutional growth, of self-wrought changes in the scheme of use and wont; and here as in other cases of institutional growth and displacement, the changes have gone forward for the most part blindly, by impulse, without much foreknowledge of any ulterior consequences to which such a sequence of change might be said to tend.”<sup>436</sup> Further, he elucidated the emerging communal bonds within higher education. He claimed that faculty, in the new university, grew around a community of knowledge (say, for instance, History), not a community of scholars (say a small group of men and women

at one school who taught a myriad of subjects); this, he believed, severely limited the scope of higher education. The academic, in this situation, was beholden not to the social milieu which supported her institution (there was no need for her to know faculty in unrelated departments), but rather to a community of scholars, national and sometimes global in audience, who communicated through journals and conventions. While this might allow for the accumulation and dissemination of every more knowledge, students bore a new type of burden: it was no longer the faculties' responsibility to ensure the student learned.<sup>437</sup> The university and faculty members were absolved of their responsibility because their first duty was to the exploration and accumulation of knowledge; it was the student's responsibility to integrate these into her own life. Of course, even here the conventions of higher education had changed. Where only a century before those students would have attended college for a year before entering their father's business, say, in the 1920s it had become fashionable to attend college. The collegiate life, for those who could afford it, was filled with delight! At the same time, that these students attended university was the condition that the field of academics continued to expand, demanding more and more faculty.

Regardless of the criticism, total fall enrollment in 1939-40 was nearly 1.5 million students (893,250 men and 600,953 women).<sup>438</sup> However, the exclusiveness of elite institutions also accelerated in this period. Geiger alleges that, "The system was only weakly meritocratic and largely mirrored the social biases prevailing in the workplace."<sup>439</sup> As the job-market had expanded while codifying hierarchical relationships, the education-market had done the same.

The university system that had arrived at the end of the Depression was an amalgam of private interest and public welfare - i.e. corporate cooperation led by leading manufacturing, financial, professional and labor lights. The public good that universities came to serve was not simply the will of the capitalists or “the people,” but was rather centered in a corporate compromise between capitalists and labor where professionals managed that conflict.

### *C. Student Life as University Business*

With the arrival of the university, major changes were to take place in the organization of the student body, yet it remained the case that students were not yet forced to care about their studies. As Thelin points out, "in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, one of the most popular banners found in dormitory rooms nationwide proclaimed, 'Don't Let Your Studies Interfere With Your Education!'"<sup>440</sup> Most students did what was necessary to pass; despised professors who were strict with academic accountability; and disdained students who sought to attain more than a ‘gentleman’s C’. Pop quizzes were met with student revolt; when faculty assigned papers, students rapidly organized a black market for the procurement of these papers; students hired others to write papers or do assignments for them; and many students never even bought a book or checked one out from the library. The credential, which gained entrance to a professional world, turned out to be more popular than knowledge for its own sake. Given this, student life was becoming even more crucial to the life of the university.

Most important was that the formerly self-organized activity of students gradually became incorporated into the machinery of the university, with administrative positions (such as coach, dean of student life, etc) taking over. As more and more students matriculated, the power of the class as the central organizing structure of student life eroded. In its place, several organizations provided students with activities to meet others and create the collegiate experience. Competition between universities continued unabated, and the amenities a school could offer a student continued to loom large in attracting students who could pay. This meant that student activity itself should become an object of university advertisements and important as a means to gathering as much tuition dollars as possible.

This meant that student life would become fragmented. Around the same time, administrators began, en masse, to give up the bulk of their disciplinary functions, as student age rose to the high teens and twenties (students in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century were often as young as 13 years old); however, as a university bureaucracy came into being, positions arose to direct and orient students to an institution now far different from those even a quarter century before. Students who now had more potential friends to chose from and more specialized studies found the older university organization of the class a relic. They subdivided in numerous clubs and organizations as well as solitary pursuits. By the close of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, many of these clubs had become affiliated with the university and had come under some direction from a Dean of Student affairs or other such figure. The invention of numerous rites and rituals, meant to tie the student to the supposedly ancient lineage of the University, if not a particular alma

mater, arose to help structure both student and alumni relationships to the university.

With the rise of electives and larger student bodies, the shared interests of the students that made the class such a potent form of organizing were ended. Too many students had too many interests for there to exist anymore the cohesiveness required for class power. This was especially true in large universities and commuter universities in urban areas. The class, by the 1890s, had been reduced to a set of traditions and customs. "The class of to-day," wrote Sheldon in 1901, "is strongly institutionalized. It possesses a written constitution, stating its aims, defining its powers, and providing for a full corps of officers. These are the usual officers of all voluntary associations: the president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer, with the addition of athletic officers, the managers of the various teams, and a number of ornamental officials, such as historian, orator, poet, jester, whose duties are nominal."<sup>441</sup> The class, now student government, retained its titles, but largely ceased to have much meaning for the majority of the students. Classes still organized activities and many athletic teams retained a class base for a long time (these were fluid, as a sophomore on a football team, for instance, could, if really talented, play on a varsity team), but it no longer oriented the social life of a student.

By the 20<sup>th</sup> century, most faculty had given up their attempts to destroy the fraternities and instead turned to co-existence. They realized that academic managers could, as Andrew White had foreseen, be counted on to help enforce conservative social standards and discipline the most wayward of youth. The last offensives, in fact,

saw fraternities win with administrations and the courts against their enemies. At the University of California in 1879, frat members and a large band of students opposed to frats entered a spat. Some of the latter had attacked the fraternity in student papers, prompting some fraternity members to assault the students. The non-frat students then published a pamphlet detailing the history of cheating, wanton living, obscenity and a high proportion of expulsions compared to the larger student body. The faculty joined in the attack on fraternities, though the administration sided with the frats against the faculty. One of the last attempts to destroy fraternities occurred at Purdue University in 1881. Here, the administration, after having previously allowed frats, decided they were having an undue influence on the university. They forced all incoming freshmen to sign an anti-fraternity clause. One student, who refused and was in turn refused admission, took his case to the State Supreme Court, which ruled in his favor. Purdue's president resigned and was replaced by a man ardently in favor of fraternities.

General fraternities alone (as opposed to scholarly or honorary ones such as Phi Beta Kappa) counted over one hundred and sixty thousand members by 1900, with property totaling around five million dollars. That many of their members went on to fame certainly helped their cause. "Of their social pre-eminence," Sheldon notes, "there can be no question; in all the colleges from which we have received returns the fraternity members are the society leaders. From the list of alumni published, it would seem that a majority of the graduates of American colleges in the last forty years who have become famous were in their student days members of fraternities."<sup>442</sup>

The Debate clubs, which had once been the height of social life for elite students, had become an activity for those seeking to hone their specialized skills. As professionals continued their society wide attack on the power of political parties and corrupt politics, the debate clubs became an important training ground in the development of new forms of rhetoric through which to attack the enemies of meritocratic professionalism. The regimentation of organization, meticulous training, and clear statement of facts provide substance to public orations that political speeches at the time clearly lacked. In fact, one of the early complaints against them was that they were preprofessional and over-coached.<sup>443</sup> In their often dull, pedantic and overly serious style, they betrayed the tradition of revelry and satire that had formed the backbone of earlier Debate Society. In this era, debate replaced the unexpected and visceral with scientific endeavor - making public speaking one among many other specialties a student might pursue. No longer an end in itself, it served merely to achieve other purposes.

The condition necessary for team sports to begin dominating the social life of students was large universities. Without these, there could not have been the aggregate number of students to play and watch. Further, as these students graduated, they continued to identify with their schools through the public face of sports. Clubs had existed for sporting activities such as cycling, shooting, tennis, and golf since the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, though they did not come in for much attention from the university. "In nearly every case," writes Sheldon, "they are to be commended because they afford



healthful exercise without those adventitious rewards and excitements which unduly intensify the better recognized departments of sport."<sup>444</sup> They continued as the self-organized activity of students in clubs rather than the institutionalization of their interests as university activity.

From the mid-1870s on, however, organized athletics have dominated collegiate (and, crucially, alumni) life. Even in 1901, Sheldon asserts, three quarters of the news articles about a university concerned its athletic teams. "While within academic precincts athletics is only one of numerous interests, and many students have only the most superficial connection with the games, still, of all undergraduate concerns, intercollegiate contests play by far the largest part in the daily life and talk."<sup>445</sup> The first organized inter-collegiate events were in rowing, with the rivalry between Harvard and Yale taking the lead. The Rowing Association of American Colleges (largely the important New England colleges, plus a few in New Jersey and New York) held races. The craze lasted less than a decade, however, as the maintenance of boats and crews was too expensive given the collegiate infrastructure of the time; the withdrawal of Harvard and Yale from the alliance in 1876 effectively killed it.

Baseball, given the ready availability of land for fields and inexpensive nature of its equipment, was the most widely adopted athletic competition by the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. While not as interesting to watch as football, according to Sheldon (and many fans of football!), the ease of play facilitated its rapid growth. However, a professionalizing urban movement hurt its amateur appeal and college baseball never became a major spectator sport. Track and field had become more favored than baseball by the end of

the century. College administrators appreciated it because it drew a larger number of both students *and* spectators. That US track and field athletes were able to acquit themselves quite well internationally, which they did not do in boating, also helped the sport's popularity. Athletic prowess rapidly became very important to university managers, because of the publicity it brought their school. A top notch university had to invest in these contests or risk losing the advertising campaign to a competitor.

Then, as now, football dominated the college landscape. Though it had only been around since the 1880s, and only popular outside the Northeast after 1890, it exploded onto the college scene - as well as primary and secondary school. Already by the late 1890s the results of contests between large and important schools<sup>446</sup> were telegraphed and reported throughout the country. That it had not yet been professionalized, unlike baseball and cycling, kept the important action at the collegiate level. The role of football in cementing local relationships to colleges, I believe, was also instrumental in the spread and popularity of state universities in their critical period of growth in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Football, after all, took the combative spirit of riots (town/gown and class based) and made them into an entertaining competition that instilled a sense of pride in both college and town (that people could wager on the outcomes certainly didn't hurt). Football was the culmination of trends that had begun to appear in organized athletics as early as the 1860s. Sheldon lists the necessity to, "win at any cost, and in consequence unworthy stratagem and diplomacy were resorted to; overtraining was common, extravagance and the employment of professionals by no means uncommon."<sup>447</sup> This development was external to the university, though quickly

capitalized by it.

The press, desperate to sell papers in an era when only the De Youngs, Hearst and Pulitzer had generated profits, seized on football. The enthusiasm of the general public, which showed up by the thousands and paid a pretty penny for seats, illustrated the appeal of the sport. "The newspapers of the time exploited college athletics to a degree previously unheard of and out of all proportion to the importance of the sports in question. For weeks before every important game, the names and faces of all the players appear in every newspaper, with a detailed account of their skill, and 'after a period of training during which the boys are led to believe that their doings are of real importance to the civilized world, they come to the game far more overwrought mentally by the nervous strain than overworked physically'."<sup>448</sup> Publicity, given to stars, was maximized by college presidents seeking as much press as they could get, and led to the recruitment of players,<sup>449</sup> massive outlays of money, over-emphasis on training for teams, and intense rivalries (with a winner take all attitude in the press). Small colleges, finding their best players recruited to larger universities, had no choice (funding lay in the balance!) but to step up their efforts in these four areas. "The managers of the large teams could afford to be extravagant in their outlays for players as well as for the legitimate expenses, because the public interest in games made it easy to collect large sums of money, sometimes exceeding one hundred thousand dollars in a single season."<sup>450</sup> Those managers who did not do everything in their power to field a winning team were looked upon as "traitors" by undergrads. Sheldon notes that embezzlement was probably not endemic, though misuse of funds on wild exercise

equipment and regimes was the norm. Using these funds for the specialized purpose of athletic competition, rather than general student fitness and enjoyment, was a problem. Presidents of the universities attempted to circumscribe the training activity in order to mandate study, but the pressure of success was too great (and the normal college attitude towards study too lax) to make much of a difference. That players were wont to receive, in the words of President Eliot, "sprains, wrenches, congestions of the brain, breaking of bones, loss of teeth, and the enlargement and stiffening of the joints," did not help their cause, but did not hinder their enjoyment either.<sup>451</sup>

There were considerable attacks on football, though for the most part they had little effect. For students, the meager rewards for intellectual prowess were dwarfed by those for athletic competition. In Georgia, the state legislature passed a bill banning collegiate football, but the governor vetoed it. California also attempted such a bill, but it was never even brought to the governor. Religious and reformist (such as *The Nation*) papers were particularly fierce in attacking football,<sup>452</sup> but the dailies, which had made it a central feature, continued their support.

Curbing the great "excesses" of the sport became an administrative matter after 1890. Athletic associations, on the side of the students, were dominated by athletic teams and their captains, though they were nominally open to popular election. These provided monetary support to the teams, though in most other areas the teams were self-managed. Faculty themselves formed athletic committees to offer a check to excesses, though most of their members were unfamiliar with modern sports as they'd primarily graduated before the era had begun. Through the creation of a body

composed equally of faculty, alumni, and undergrads (typically managers or captains of the teams), a measure of supervision was finally introduced into athletic competition. It achieved financial control of university athletics, developed regulations for intercollegiate competition, and the means by which captains and managers were elected. This centralized body was the child of Harvard, which was therefore able to exert its influence throughout the country. The body had developed an eligibility code (ensuring that only students in good standing were eligible), rules for transferring students (so that they were not poached from smaller schools without some punishment), opposition to paid play (to ensure professionalism did not invade the college), and the institution of physical exams to ensure students are fit to play the violent sport. These rules had not yet been universalized, but they had taken hold at the large and important universities, which would ensure they were taken up by the smaller schools.

On the whole, the conflict over athletics helped popularize and publicize the availability of sporting goods and equipment available to students. Helping to stimulate the physical culture, and make it amenable to the manly ideology sweeping politics, helped to usher in the era of early 20<sup>th</sup> century masculinity and made the colleges a central site in the production of such masculinity. According to Sheldon, "The physical ideal which athletics exalt is calculated to counteract some of the most dangerous tendencies in modern life which tends to produce neurotic and luxury-loving individuals. The great co-operative games call not only for swiftness and strength, 'but make for courage, coolness, steadiness of nerve, quickness of

apprehension, resourcefulness, self-knowledge, and self-reliance, qualities useful in any profession!."453 Sheldon continues, claiming that industry and politics were both growing more mechanical, calling forth the need for a reminder of physical virtue. As far as the public was concerned, these contests provided some healthy outdoor amusement for people who were increasingly spending much time indoors. Organized athletics, too, were a large reason for strong alumni relations and passionate feelings toward the college, its colors, and songs.

### *Self-Government*

With increasing numbers of students and growing specialization of academics, not to mention new modes of student organizing, a new student relationship to college authority was necessary. President Warfield of Lafayette University summed up the attitude of presidents in this regard: "Give the seventy-five or more per cent of orderly students a voice in the determination of college conduct, teach them how to use that voice, encourage them to think that their reputation and the reputation of the college are at stake, and by an energetic public opinion they will more effectively suppress the disorderly element than any law that can be applied will ever do."454 At the University of Illinois, 1868 was an auspicious year for such an experiment. The president implored the students with talk of civic responsibility and the need for better faculty/student relationships than those that characterized the old colleges. It was proposed that the entire student body organize as a legislative body; the class president, vice-president, treasurer and a marshal composed the executive branch; and three judges

were appointed to try offenses. "Laws for preserving order, regulations against gambling and drinking intoxicants, against violations of sundry rights of students and trespassing on college property, were passed, and fines, ranging from a few cents to five dollars, were levied for violations of the code."<sup>455</sup> The great enthusiasm with which students took up the project slowly gave way, by nature of graduation and the influx of new students who had not participated in organizing the laws. The legislative body was reduced to twenty-one students. According to Sheldon, complicating the matter were administrators who changed policy, introducing a level of chaos to disciplinary proceedings, and the ego of students elected to the positions. Boredom and factions, however, also worked to against the attempt: given the marginal importance of their governance, students grew disillusioned and bored; at other times, factions arose to punish some students more fiercely than others. On the whole, however, it was at first considered a success because faculty were no longer required to be disciplinarian and could focus on their scholarship. Even this moderate success had a short life, however: abuse of authority and use of the body to settle scores resulted in a second body being created to balance the first. Further, the Illinois Attorney General challenged the legality of the enterprise, claiming that student government lacked the legal right to impose and collect fines. Faculty, then, had to be enlisted in their old form. Students voted to abolish the system after fourteen years.

Elsewhere, attempts at student government, often with more specific goals and circumscribed responsibilities, were enacted. The University of Maine, the University of South Carolina and Indiana University all tried plans for limited student self-

government. The experiments usually lasted a while before becoming unworkable or irrelevant. The increasing size of incoming classes, the increasing need of college administrators to understand and control more and more aspects of collegiate life, and student apathy toward the conventions of student self-governance helped to limit its appeal. Small colleges were better able to extend their experiments than the large universities, as the demands on students, faculty and administration were easier to handle. At universities, it was often easier to institute local (in dormitories, for instance) forms of self-government than it was to have campus wide-efforts. At Chicago, Penn, and Vanderbilt, for instance, students from each of the dorms elected a representative; these formed a board which, in conjunction with faculty, ruled on housing matters. On the whole, the experiments at making students responsible for student discipline were aimed not at empowering students as much as they were about instituting a new disciplinary regime of self-policing onto the students. The lack of sustained enthusiasm this engendered in students attests to the limited appeal this new form of self-organization had as compared to the older forms. As class sizes kept increasing and administrators had to sell the schools to parents and legislatures, all sides seem to have preferred a loose collection of rules with minimal oversight. With the arrival and consolidation of the university, its gradual incorporation into the fabric of industrial life, the collegiate life that had existed, from the beginning of higher education in North America, was absorbed into the machinery of the university. Student self-organization was made to perform all manner of services for the university - from advertisement to discipline - while it was becoming simultaneously made part of the



official activity of the university.

### *Conclusion*

I have endeavored to show that the system of higher education that came to dominate the 20<sup>th</sup> century was not simply the maturation of an existing collegiate system, but the development of an entirely new mode of education. As industrial capitalism transformed all social relations in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was an open question what education would become, who would direct it, and who would benefit most from it. The question was settled, to the extent that things can be settled, by professionals. By men and women who organized and built new institutions. They realized that reform within existing institutions was next to impossible and that they would have to create the institutions that they felt matched their desires. They could not have done this, however, without shoring up and strengthening industrial capitalism.

In the compact between capitalists and labor that came to characterize class relations for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, university trained professionals were the crucial. Their administration of corporations aided working class struggles for a larger share of capitalist profit. Their administration of American government (and empire) gave some measure of credence to claims of meritocratic rule. And professional jobs provided an avenue for upward mobility to the working class, helping to create and sustain a culture of aspiration. The term "middle-class" is a famously fuzzy regarding its content, but I have tried to argue that it was largely composed of the professional class. They, through much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, were able to control the conditions

under which they sold their intellectual labor. The university system was the cornerstone of their power.

It is this relationship between the university and professionals that came under attack from capitalist restructuring beginning in the 1970s and accelerating rapidly at the beginning of this century. It also came under attack from the New Left who sought to reform the university along less conservative. They discovered the difficulty that the first generation of University reformers found: it is extremely difficult to reform institutions. Programs such as Black Studies or Women's Studies might be introduced, but their independence and ideological direction are always fraught and their introduction does not transform the institution. Some students dropped out and started alternatives, but lacking the financial means of the capitalist class, their efforts could not provide a base for an alternative education that could force institutional reform at a large scale.

The creation of a new system of higher education in the 19th was the confluence the self-organization of professionals, class conflict, and student activity. Crucially, these happened within a larger world-wide reorganization in the mode of capitalist production from mercantile to industrial capitalism. This recomposition was the wedge that allowed the research university the purchase it needed to thrive. However, that mode of production itself has now been superseded, superseded by the technological products advanced within university labs. There is again a class recomposition taking place, one that is not yet finished yet which casts many of those affiliated with universities into the front lines of class conflict.

---

<sup>1</sup> A previous version of this Introduction appeared in FUSE Magazine, January 2013.

<sup>2</sup> George Ticknor, "On the Inadequacy of American Libraries, 1816," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 256.

<sup>3</sup> Cohen and Kisker, *The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergence and Growth of the Contemporary System*. 2nd ed., Jossey-Bass, 2010, 71.

<sup>4</sup> Christopher Lucas, *American Higher Education: A History*. St. Martin's Griffin, 1994, 135.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted from Laurence Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, The University of Chicago Press, 1965, 61.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from Lucas, 144.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted from Veysey, 122.

<sup>8</sup> I have written on the conservative nature of the Humanities in "Against the Humanities," *Viewpoint Magazine*, Issue 2, 13 Sept. 2012.

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in Veysey, 213. Harvard President Charles Eliot, among the most influential US educators of the past two centuries, claimed something similar: "But there is an aristocracy to which the sons of Harvard have belonged, and, let us hope, will ever aspire to belong - the aristocracy which excels in manly sports, carries off the honors and prizes of the learned professions, and bears within itself with distinction in all fields of intellectual labor and combat; the aristocracy which in peace stands firmest for the public honor and renown, and in war rides first into the murderous thickets" ("Inaugural Address as President of Harvard, 1869"). Henry van Dyke, professor of English Literature at the University of Paris and US ambassador to the Netherlands, gave a 1926 speech to the Phi Beta Kappa club at William & Mary titled, simply enough, "Democratic Aristocracy."

<sup>10</sup> United States, US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics. *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait*. Government Printing Office, 1993.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted from Anya Kamenetz, *DIY U: Edupunks, Edupreneurs and the Coming Transformation of Higher Education*, Chelsea Green Publishing, 2010, 16.

<sup>12</sup> Education historian Christopher Lucas writes that Emperor Justinian and his successors in the East were so beset by “imperial decline” that military matters consumed their resources. Meanwhile, in the West, the empire simply crumbled, such that, “By the eighth century, if not before, the Latin Church had come to exercise a monopoly on all learning, now conducted under the auspices of local churches and monasteries” (Lucas, 33).

<sup>13</sup> Mariano Peset, “Europe and the Universities,” *The University, an Illustrated History*, ed. Fernando Tejerina Turner Publishing, 2011, 41.

<sup>14</sup> Quoted in John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities*. Transaction Publishers, 1997, 10.

<sup>15</sup> William Hamilton, “The British Heritage,” in *Canadian Education, a History*. Edited by J. Donald Wilson, Prentice-Hall, 1970, 37.

<sup>16</sup> James Lemon. “Comment on James A Henretta’s ‘Families and Farms: *Mentalité* in Pre-Industrial America,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Volume. 37, Issue 4, 1980.

<sup>17</sup> Jurgen Herbst, “Nineteenth-Century Schools between Community and State: The Cases of Prussia and the United States.” *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 42, Issue 3, 2002, 319.

<sup>18</sup> Though often understood as an individualistic society, Puritans built their world on a conception of community and individual responsibility to that community. In the Mayflower Compact, among other texts, the individual’s relationship with God takes precedence, though it is immediately buffered by the relationship with those individuals who make up the community. Furthermore, for a settler society, there could not have been any other way to exist: external and internal threats (from drought and native peoples to disease and natural human failings) in a hostile land force communitarian structures to exist.

<sup>19</sup> Lemon, 692.

<sup>20</sup> Phyllis Vine. “The Social Function of Eighteenth-Century Higher Education.” *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 16, Issue 4, 1976, 413.

<sup>21</sup> Vine, 415.

<sup>22</sup> Howard Miller. “Evangelical Religion and Colonial Princeton,” *Schooling and Society: Studies in the History*

of *Education*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Johns Hopkins Press, 1976, 116.

<sup>23</sup> Vine, 409.

<sup>24</sup> Herbst, 321. Herbst details many 19th century attempts by people and communities to resist either centralized control of education (in New York, for instance) as well as resistance to state established elementary and high schools.

<sup>25</sup> David Robson. "Enlightening the Wilderness: Charles Nisbet's Failure at Higher Education in Post-Revolutionary Pennsylvania," *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 37, Issue 3, 1997, 272.

<sup>26</sup> This did not mean the elimination of religion - Rush wrote that even, "the opinions of Confucius or Mahomed inculcated upon our youth" would be better than no religion. (Benjamin Rush. "Thoughts Upon the Mode of Education Proper in a Republic," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited By Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 170).

<sup>27</sup> James Madison. "James Madison on a National University, 1810," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited By Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 176.

<sup>28</sup> "National University: In the House of Representatives," *Niles Weekly Register*. Edited by H. Niles, Franklin Press, 1817, 276.

<sup>29</sup> Benjamin Rush. "Benjamin Rush on a Federal University, 1788," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I* Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 153. Rush actually placed founding this university at a higher level than repaying debts, regulating the militias, and building the navy because, "We shall never restore public credit, regulate our militia, build a navy, or revive our commerce, until we remove the ignorance and prejudices, and change the habits of our citizens, and this can never be done 'till we inspire them with federal principles, which can only be effected by our young men meeting and spending two or three years together in a national University, and afterwards disseminating their knowledge and principles through every country township and village in the United states (Rush, 156).

<sup>30</sup> Rush, 153.

<sup>31</sup> Benjamin Rush. "On Republican Education, 1798," 170.

<sup>32</sup> Rush writes that, "The cultivation and perfection of our language becomes a matter of consequence

when viewed in another light. It will probably be spoken by more people in the course of two or three centuries, than ever spoke any one language at one time since the creation of the world” (“On a Federal University, 1788,” 54).

<sup>33</sup> Rush, 153.

<sup>34</sup> Bruce W. Eelman. ““An Educated and Intelligent People Cannot Be Enslaved”: The Struggle for Common Schools in Antebellum Spartanburg, South Carolina.” *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 44, Issue 2, 2004, 252.

<sup>35</sup> Robert Finley. “On National Uniformity in Textbooks, ca. 1815,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited By Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 223f.

<sup>36</sup> Jurgen Herbst. “The Institutional Diversification of Higher Education in the New Nation: 1780-1820.” *Review of Higher Education*. Volume 3, Issue 3, 1980, 15.

<sup>37</sup> Daniel J. Boorstin. *The Americans: The National Experience*, Vintage Books, 1965.

<sup>38</sup> Herbst, 16.

<sup>39</sup> Ezra Stiles. “Ezra Stiles on Changes in Yale Corporation, 1792,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited By Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 163f.

<sup>40</sup> Roger Geiger. “Ten Generations of Higher Education,” *American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges*. Edited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gunport, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999, 43.

<sup>41</sup> In the first twenty years of the 19th century, more seminaries were opened than colleges. “The institutions,” writes Geiger, “were in a sense alternatives to collegiate education and, as in the case of the Princeton Theological Seminary (1812), were votes of no confidence in the colleges. Seminaries became the locus for serious scholars of language and philology (and hence, German learning); and they attracted substantial gifts that might have gone to colleges” (Geiger, 47).

<sup>42</sup> Quoted in Carl Becker. *Cornell University: Founders and the Founding*. Cornell University Press, 1944, 5.

<sup>43</sup> Daniel A. Wren. “American Business Philanthropy and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century,” *Business History Review*. Volume 57, Issue 3, 1983, 321.

<sup>44</sup> Wren, 321.

<sup>45</sup> Lucas writes that, “It was widely acknowledge... that the creation of the Collegiate School at New Haven [Yale] had not helped Harvard’s cause, and the former in turn had been seriously weakened by the founding of a college in New Jersey. Nor was the latter institution in any condition to handle competition from Queen’s College at New Brunswick” (Lucas, 107).

<sup>46</sup> Lucas, 107.

<sup>47</sup> Miller writes that, “colonial Princeton flourished because it spawned an evangelical education empire that, in turn, sustained the college well into the nineteenth century. Scores of academies were established by Presbyterian ministers in the middle colonies and upper South in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and almost without exception, their founders were the sons of Princeton” (Miller, 125). These academies acted as feeders for Princeton, establishing a route from the periphery to Princeton. It also allowed many poor students not just a remedial education, but a route to higher education. The wealthier students rarely attended the Princeton academies as they had better preparatory opportunities available to them. On the whole, the wealthy were less inclined to the charismatic leaders of the Great Awakening, anyway, preferring instead the old order represented by Harvard and Yale.

<sup>48</sup> Geiger notes that in 1775 around 1 percent of eligible males entered college; that number had fallen to just .75 percent in 1800.

<sup>49</sup> See Robert Young (chapter 6 for the logic of this limitation imposed on settler communities by the British administration.

<sup>50</sup> Julian Sturtevant. “Sectarian Background of Illinois Colleges,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited By Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 241.

<sup>51</sup> Democracy should be understand here as a weapon of the bourgeois against the hereditary titles that had for so long ruled. Throughout Europe and the US, democracy was restricted to property owning individuals and was typically understood by them as a means to unseat the *ancien regime*. Democratic calculations change with the arrival of the masses in the late 19th century, but here is where an understanding of the role of compulsory education, and the expansion of higher education, goes a long way towards mitigating this arrival. This will be discussed in Chapter 5, though I will briefly say that it

was through the liberal arts and the Humanities that a national and liberal culture achieved hegemony in the US.

<sup>52</sup> Becker gives this description of faculty in that age: “Rarely troubled by doubt, and always disposed to rely on the recognized authorities, their chief distinction was to know and to enforce all of the right answers rather than to know or to ask any of the right questions” (Becker, 17).

<sup>53</sup> “It was,” notes Lucas, “a practice calculated to generate an adversarial relationship between faculty and students. Students who attempted to cultivate any sort of association with ‘the enemy,’ for example, were ostracized by their fellow classmates or were viewed with suspicion. Faculty, for their part, were inclined to resent being cast as disciplinarians and felt frustrated when their efforts to maintain order failed” (Lucas, 124).

<sup>54</sup> Robson, 278.

<sup>55</sup> Geiger, 40. However, already by the the beginning of the 18th century Harvard students would be uninterested in either classical studies or clerical education. Students tend to have far different ideas about what they want from education than do those who build and staff educational institutions.

<sup>56</sup> James McLachlan. “The *Choice of Hercules*: American Student Societies in the early 19th Century,” *The University in Society, Volume II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974, 466.

<sup>57</sup> I include Canada here, too, as its educational system, in nearly every respect, developed in opposition or collaboration with the United States, England and France. I have written (briefly) on this subject for *Fuse Magazine*, 36-1, Winter 2013.

<sup>58</sup> Miller, p. 117. Lucas, too, writes that Harvard drew its students from the sons of clergy, “merchants, shopkeepers, master mariners, magistrates, and attorneys, militia officers, and wealthy farmers. But included on the rosters also were the sons of artisans, ordinary seamen, servants and poor farmers” (Lucas, 108).

<sup>59</sup> For much of US history, the working and agrarian classes were more often opposed to universal education than elites were. This was largely because they viewed education as both impractical and confounding: it separated children from their families and communities. Further, most of the skills necessary for an agricultural economy - and even an early mechanized one - were learned by laboring alongside farmers or master craftsmen. As a whole, the working and agrarian classes believed they



already possessed what knowledge - other than instruction in English - they would need; secondary and higher education was essentially beyond the realm of necessary knowledge.

<sup>60</sup> McLachlan, p. 464.

<sup>61</sup> McLachlan quotes an early letter from Ashbel Grren, early 19th century president of Princeton: “Resolved, 1st... I am to endeavour to e a father to the instituiton. I am to endeavour to the utmost to promote all its interests as a father does, in what relates to his children and property. 2d. To pray for the instituiton as I do for my family,... 9th. To endeavour that my own family be exemplary in all things. 10th. To view every officer of the College as a younger brother, and every student as a child... 12th. To treat the students with tenderness and freedom, but yet as never to permit them to treat me with familiarity, or to lose their respect for me” (McLachlan, 465).

<sup>62</sup> Kathryn McDaniel Moore. “The Dilemma of Corporal Punishment at Harvard College,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 14, Issue 3, 1974, 336.

<sup>63</sup> Moore, 339.

<sup>64</sup> Sheldon writes that while the terms Freshman and Sophomore (sophister) originated at the English university, they had other social forms, such as numerous colleges and the tutorial system, that prevented the class from becoming the dominant social group (Henry Davidson Sheldon. *Student Life and Customs*. D. Appleton and Company, 1901).

<sup>65</sup> Sheldon, 87.

<sup>66</sup> As an example, Sheldon writes that, “A band of sophomores seizing a room, would close the windows, cover up the keyhole, and endeavour to sicken their victim by the density of the tobacco smoke. While waiting for the process to be effectual, the freshman would be compelled to scan Euclid or a Greek grammar, make speeches, sing songs, dance recite the alphabet backward, or perform any other nonsensical action that the ingenuity of his persecutors could suggest. If he proved obstinate or unwilling, the sophomores would throw a blanket over his head and blow tobacco smoke up under it until he was either stifled or sick. At the University of Vermont a pumpkin was taken, a portion of the top cut away, and the interior filled with fine-cut tobacco. It was then placed on the freshman’s table and fire blown into it. After the fire died away and the room was filled with smoke, the sophomores put the freshman to bed, with the pumpkin for a nightcap” (Sheldon, 99).

<sup>67</sup> Hazing was often directed at a student the sophomores didn't particularly care for. It would involve a kidnapping, the shaving of hair, writing on bodies in indelible ink or paint; at Harvard, students were placed in barrels that were then put in the Charles river; at other schools, he might be placed under a water pump for a long period of time; at times, Sheldon writes, the indignities were so offensive as to be unmentionable. "To the credit of American studenthood be it said that on an average not more than two or three such affairs occurred each year in a typical college, and in these cases the students who suffered brought the punishment on themselves in a majority of cases by some foolhardy boast or deed" (Sheldon, 101). While not all students participated in hazing, those who led the affairs were often elected to the highest offices a college student could be and the secret student courts that determined who was to receive the punishment could be quite powerful.

<sup>68</sup> Sheldon, 88. Unorganized student antagonism to this disciplinary regimen was directed at whatever symbolized the authority of the college. Yale students customarily broke building windows and took to locking professors in their rooms (faculty kept axes inside so as to break down the door when this happened). At other times, they played pranks, such as painting the president's house or putting cows on top of roofs. Southern students, at schools in the South or the North, appear to have possessed a particular genius and daring for mischief: assault of faculty members, flipping ovens, breaking windows, throwing stones at faculty houses and theft were among their specialties.

<sup>69</sup> Sheldon, 97.

<sup>70</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 171.

<sup>71</sup> Sheldon, 172.

<sup>72</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 124.

<sup>73</sup> Sheldon writes that nearly all the members of these societies were of Anglo-Saxon descent. "They are," he writes, "a testimonial to the strength of representative government and parliamentary discussion, and indicate the dominant interest in politics which has characterized the English race for the last three centuries. The debating society also indicates the nature of the Anglo-Saxon political interest, which has been concentrated less on international complications and military achievement and more on the adjustment of the relations between the individual and society" (Sheldon, 89).

<sup>74</sup> The clubs were not wholly dedicated to politics, it should be noted, though their political focus would

sharped as the 1760s and 70s produced more tension throughout the Colonies. Sheldon gives some examples of problems the societies took up in the pre-revolutionary days: “To extract the square root of 1/9-6/9. - Why is the weather coldest when the sun is nearest us? -Can finite Nature commit infinite sin? -Is God the author of sin? -Does the soul always think? -Was the flood universal? Ought the slave trade to be abolished? -Is tax on hogs politics?” (Sheldon, 94).

<sup>75</sup> The relationship between politics and the major cultural forms emerging from the college/university will be an important motif through this history. When the university begins its ascension, it does so by segmenting politics - through professionalism and merit - sheltering the political from the uneducated masses.

<sup>76</sup> McLachlan, 471.

<sup>77</sup> Sheldon, 129.

<sup>78</sup> The enmity between societies often ran deep and involved stiff competition for the most promising recruits. The societies took to sending their members to prep schools where students had committed to their school in order to sign up students who had yet to matriculate. At some schools, faculty tried to step in and assign students to societies, but this only exacerbated tensions between the clubs and between the faculty.

<sup>79</sup> McLachlan provides a list of books the American Whig society authorized purchase of on January 18, 1813: Beattie’s works, Burr’s trial, Malthus on population, Rosseau social contract, Doddridge’s rise & progress, Haller’s Letters, Volney’s Ruins, Humboldt’s New Spain, Paine’s Works, except the Age of Reason, Christian Panoply, Chase’s trial, Austin’s letters, Stuart’s Metaphysical Essays. 475f.

<sup>80</sup> McLachlan, 478. McLachlan lists an extensive library, and the frequency with which the tomes were used, on the following pages.

<sup>81</sup> McLachlan, 493.

<sup>82</sup> Sheldon, 82.

<sup>83</sup> Quoted in Kathryn McDaniel Moore. “Freedom and Constraint in 18th Century Harvard,” *The Journal of Higher Education*. Volume 47, Issue 6, 1976, 109.

<sup>84</sup> Moore, 110.

<sup>85</sup> Moore, 110.

<sup>86</sup> Moore, 110.

<sup>87</sup> Charles Nisbet. "Charles Nisbet Complains of Lazy Students and Educational Quacks, 1793," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I* Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 254.

<sup>88</sup> According to Moore, close to half of the students who joined this Association went on to become ministers.

<sup>89</sup> Some of the students, such as the great Unitarian leader Dr. Channing, achieved a bit of fame and epic poetry was written by students about the event. "The Rebellion Poem" and "Don Quixote at College, or the History of the Valiant Adventures lately achieved by the Students of Harvard University, Boston, 1807" are just two such examples.

<sup>90</sup> From the Minutes of the Board of Trustees. "'The Great Rebellion' at Princeton," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol 16, No 2 (Oct., 1907).

<sup>91</sup> Rodney Messenger. "'The Most Powerful Instrument of College Discipline': Student Disorder and the Growth of Meritocracy in the Colleges of the Early Republic." *History of Higher Education Quarterly*, Volume 39, Issue 3, 1999, 240.

<sup>92</sup> Geiger, 45.

<sup>93</sup> The first self-conscious student movements also arose in this era as the means by which educational reforms were to generalize themselves across civil society. While Humboldt was part of the move to effect the transformation of university structures, it fell to student movements to actually effect the change in university social life. Konrad H. Jarausch claims that students' lives were, as a whole, unaffected by Humboldt's reforms so, around 1815, they began to organize themselves. There were three stages of student organizing: in the first, the young student movement formed to reject the Restoration. The Napoleonic defeat and later military victory proved the truth of liberal modernism; students, who'd once been characterized by drunkenness and belligerence, gave themselves over to this new era by starting and joining clubs dedicated to liberal citizenry. This meant a preoccupation with "law, morality, fatherland and especially their state" (Konrad H. Jarausch. "The Sources of German Student Unrest 1815-1848," *The University in Society Volume II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974, 538). He writes that this also meant a rejection of drunkenness, belligerence and

whoring. The break initiated by these students was still weak, however: their horizon of professional possibility was circumscribed by limited career options. Bureaucratic careers and their own class standing presented a clear boundary beyond which this first stage could not yet move beyond.

In the second stage, students were radicalized by repression. Made outlaw, the student movement had to develop forms by which radicals might interact with a much wider student body whose political consciousness was less acute. Jarausch claims that repression against students and the fall of the Paris Restoration provided the opening whereby students could turn rhetoric into action. Radical students joined with adult activists and, in 1833, “attempted to seize the capital of the Deutsche Bund as a beachhead for a universal uprising” (Jarausch, 541). While this particular revolt failed, it was the first conscious armed threat demonstrating the unity of students and labor, thus providing an important precursor to the revolutions of 1848. Even so, it was an immediate setback and German civil society seemed to rule against the radicals.

In the third stage, student rhetoric moved away from unity to equality. They focused on their own institutional and civic concerns. “Influenced,” writes Jarausch, “by their reading and discussion of the Young Hegelians, the democratic poets and the French Utopian Socialists, radicals groped for new organizational models, characterized by ‘the greatest freedom and informality’” (Jarausch, 543). They opposed both the secrecy and radical hierarchy characteristic of the second stage. Between 1844-46, these radicals had composed around 50% of the university body. “Serving as agitational platform for the committed Left,” Jarausch continues, “representative student government nevertheless proved ephemeral because it rested on the only passing involvement of independent students, and attempts to institutionalize it in discussion subgroups only led to the resurgence of traditional associations” (Jarausch, 544). The radical students grasped the new era, yet were still bound by institutions whose formal transformations had so far only affected scholarship and production. Radicals, unable to coalesce a large radical movement, soon turned against the university itself. They condemned the new universities for their continued production of administrative functionaries rather than an egalitarian society. As long as the dominion of the aristocracy and bourgeois remained intact, they claimed, the horizon of opportunity for university graduates would be limited to the bureaucratic administration of society in its myriad functions.

In time, a hardening core of radicals became a true revolutionary force. Throughout the

1840s, a recession impoverished many students, graduates, artisans and peasants. Students came to see that their liberation was tied to the total transformation of society. When the revolution broke in 1848, radical students were at the forefront of mobilizing popular discontent. Soon, however, the elitism of many of these radicals began to alienate them from the larger movement. Unlike the poor students, who depended on scholarships and university paternalism to stay in school and avoid the terrible job market, the middle class students faced fewer repercussions for revolt and so were able to agitate for a better world. Poor students, largely, lacked the social space in which they could engage in revolutionary activity. They did very little actual fighting and attempted to arrogate leadership when it wasn't called for. Within the narrower realm of the university, however, they were able to loosen up the administrative strictures and gain a role in the election of admins and professors. Attempts to build radical people's universities or to create a radical student parliament fell apart, though, and their movement was reduced to university reform rather than the development of sustained revolutionary forms in education.

The weight of student activism had formed around pride in the Fatherland, republican liberalism and mostly cosmetic change. Student involvement in the liberal corporate university took the place of a radical transformation in the structures of the university. Jarausch writes that, "Indifference, fear of change, hope for bureaucratic advancement, and elitist arrogance combined to muffle the activists' clamor for the establishment of a Chair of Socialism in Breslau or the appointment of Feuerbach in Heidelberg" (Jarausch, 563). Further, the rise of administrative positions in industry and new scientific discoveries in the service of industrialism provided new jobs and positions beyond the saturated state bureaucracy.

<sup>94</sup> McLachlan, 469. Books, other than the Bible, were largely absent from the curriculum and college library circulation records show that students found intellectual stimulation outside the curriculum rather than in it - more on this in the next section.

<sup>95</sup> Around the turn of the century, Princeton Seminary, Andover in New England, the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Dutch Church at New Brunswick, and The Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church in New York were formed near to the old colleges to destabilize them. Catholics, Methodists, German Lutherans and Baptists all established denominational schools.

<sup>96</sup> Geiger writes, “These institutions were in a sense alternatives to collegiate education and, as in the case of the Princeton Theological Seminary (1812), were votes of no confidence in the colleges. Seminaries... attracted substantial gifts that might have gone to colleges” (Geiger, 47).

<sup>97</sup> Michael B Katz. “The Role of American Colleges in the Nineteenth Century,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 23, Issue 2, 1983, 216.

<sup>98</sup> Quoted in Becker, 20.

<sup>99</sup> Gerard Gawalt. “Sources of Anti-Lawyer Sentiment in Massachusetts, 1740-1840,” *The American Journal of Legal History*, Volume 14, Issue 4, 1970. 283.

<sup>100</sup> Philip Gaines. “The ‘True Lawyer’ in America: Discursive Construction of the Legal Profession in the Nineteenth Century,” *The American Journal of Legal History*, Vol. 45, No. 2, 2001.

<sup>101</sup> These men tended to have a fairly high estimation of themselves: Gaines writes that prominent attorneys in the early 19th century believed that, “The law was an exalted profession whose practitioners must be exemplars of the duty, character, values, and aptitudes commensurate with its noble status” (Gaines, 134).

<sup>102</sup> Gaines quotes Harvard professor Emory Washburn on the matter: “Such is the duty of the lawyer, who is not called upon to become the judge of his client’s case, but to see but that of his adversary is made out according to the law of the land” (cf Gaines, 139).

<sup>103</sup> Gaines, 153.

<sup>104</sup> Johnson, William. “Educational and Professional Lifestyles: Law and Medicine in the Nineteenth Century,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 14, Issue 2, 1974, 196.

<sup>105</sup> Natalie A Naylor. “The Theological Seminary in the Configuration of American Higher Education: The Ante-Bellum Years,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 17, Issue 1, 1977, 17.

<sup>106</sup> Not only did Harvard lose a president, but they also lost quite a bit of money: Samuel Abbot, Naylor writes, had willed \$100,000 to Harvard after his death, but changed it to Phillips Academy after a Unitarian was made professor of theology (Naylor, 19).

<sup>107</sup> Naylor, 21.

<sup>108</sup> Naylor notes that twenty-six Andover students in its first decade of existence became professors. “Fifteen percent of Princeton Seminary alumni of the first decade became professors. At Auburn, the

comparable figure was five percent in the first decade and seven percent in its first hundred years - 34 college presidents, 46 seminary professors, and 78 college professors.” Naylor, 25.

<sup>109</sup> Terry S. Reynolds. “The Education of Engineers in America before the Morrill Act of 1862,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 32, Issue 4, 1992, 460.

<sup>110</sup> Again, this is not to say that it was not significant. Reynolds has found, using Bailey Burritt’s work, that Columbia University had 28 engineering graduates, Wesleyan had nine, the University of Vermont had 12, Jefferson College 15 and Washington College 9 graduates. They also taught others who did not graduate with a degree (Reynolds, 480).

<sup>111</sup> David B. Potts. ““College Enthusiasm!” As Public Response, 1800-1860.” *Harvard Educational Review*, Volume 47, Issue 1, 1977, 32.

<sup>112</sup> Potts, 31.

<sup>113</sup> Ticknor, 256.

<sup>114</sup> McLachlan provides a list of books the American Whig society authorized purchase of on January 18, 1813: Beattie’s works, Burr’s trial, Malthus on population, Rosseau social contract, Doddridge’s rise & progress, Haller’s Letters, Volney’s Ruins, Humboldt’s New Spain, Paine’s Works, except the Age of Reason, Christian Panoply, Chase’s trial, Austin’s letters, Stuart’s Metaphysical Essays (McLachlan, 475f).

<sup>115</sup> McLachlan, 471.

<sup>116</sup> Ticknor, 257.

<sup>117</sup> George Ticknor. “Freedom and Scholarship in Germany,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 259.

<sup>118</sup> R. Steven Turner. “Reformers & Scholarship in Germany,” *The University in Society Volume II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974, 505.

<sup>119</sup> Turner, 510.

<sup>120</sup> Arthur Engel shows out how reformers and those professors seeking to be academic professionals sought to make change. It was a major tactic to point out how far Oxford had fallen in esteem world wide and to argue that the university invest in scholarship and professional academics. Everywhere the American academics would have gone, then, they would have been exposed to this thought (Arthur



Engel, *The University in Society Volume I*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974).

<sup>121</sup> Joseph Green Cogswell. "On Life and Learning at Göttingen, 1817," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 261.

<sup>122</sup> George Bancroft, "On the Academic Man in Germany, 1819," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 264f.

<sup>123</sup> Christopher Jencks and David Riesman. *The Academic Revolution*. Doubleday Anchor Books, 1969, 2.

<sup>124</sup> Ralph Waldo Emerson. "Opinion on Southern Students, 1837," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 435.

<sup>125</sup> Eelman, 250.

<sup>126</sup> John Hardin Best. "Education in the Forming of the American South," *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 36, Issue 1, 1996, 43.

<sup>127</sup> Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr. "Honor and Dishonor at Mr Jefferson's University: The Antebellum Years," *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 26, Issue 2, 1986, 161.

<sup>128</sup> Quoted in Eelman, 265.

<sup>129</sup> In a letter to Joseph Carrington Cabell in 1821, Jefferson wrote that, "How many of our youths she [Harvard] now has, learning the lessons of anti-Missourianism, I know not; but a gentleman lately from Princeton, told me he saw there the list of the students at that place, and that more than half were Virginians. These will return home, no doubt, deeply impressed with the sacred principles of our Holy Alliance of Restrictionists" (Thomas Jefferson. "Jefferson Plans the University of Virginia, 1800," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 224).

<sup>130</sup> Ticknor, "A General and Well-grounded Discontent," 268.

<sup>131</sup> Ticknor, "A General and Well-grounded Discontent," 268.

<sup>132</sup> Jefferson., 175.

<sup>133</sup> "Report of the Rockfish Gap Commission on the Proposed University of Virginia, 1818," *American*

*Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I.* Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 194.

<sup>134</sup> “Report of the Rockfish Gap Commission,” 194.

<sup>135</sup> “Report of the Rockfish Gap Commission,” 195.

<sup>136</sup> “Report of the Rockfish Gap Commission,” 196.

<sup>137</sup> It was, however, not in the thrall of ancient wisdom. The Commission announces that concrete life shows we must look forward rather than to the past. “What, but education, has advanced us beyond the condition of our indigenous neighbors? and what chains them to their present state of barbarism and wretchedness, but a bigotted veneration for the supposed superlative wisdom of their fathers and the preposterous idea that they are to look backward for better things and not forward, longing, as it should seem, to return to the days of eating acorns and roots rather than indulge in the degeneracies of civilization. And how much more encouraging to the achievements of science and improvement, is this, than the desponding view that the condition of man cannot be ameliorated, that what has been, must ever be, and that to secure ourselves where we are, we must tread with awful reverence in the footsteps of our fathers. This doctrine is the genuine fruit of the alliance between Church and State, the tenants of which, finding themselves but too well in their present condition, oppose all advances which might unmask their usurpations, and monopolies of honors, wealth and power, and fear every change, as endangering the comforts they now hold” (“Report of the Rockfish Gap Commission,” 196).

<sup>138</sup> Julian Sturtevant, another of the men attempting to create a new education, recalled attending a Methodist church while he was president of the University of Illinois. He recounts the endless vitriol spilled on Presbyterians and, further, the slander heaped on all those who attended college by the minister. That man, Mr. Cartwright, he noted wryly, was quite happy to take the title of Doctor Divinity a few decades later and then revel in having everyone address him as Dr. Cartwright. His conclusion, from his time in Illinois, was that, “The community was perpetually agitated by sectarian prejudices and rivalries” (Julian Sturtevant. “On the Anti-intellectualism of the Evangelicals in Illinois in the 1830s,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I.* Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 418).

<sup>139</sup> Thomas Cooper, “Thomas Cooper’s Defense of his Views,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary*

*History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 409.

<sup>140</sup> Cooper claimed that these were, “Men, with whom the government is everything, the people nothing” (Cooper, 410).

<sup>141</sup> Cooper, 416.

<sup>142</sup> Language was prominent in this scheme, with French, Spanish, Italian, German and Anglo-Saxon, and not Latin and Greek, were of principle importance.

<sup>143</sup> This was a controversial move on Jefferson’s part. John Adams, in 1825, respectfully castigated Jefferson for it: “The Europeans are all deeply tainted with prejudices, both ecclesiastical and temporal, which they can never get rid of. They are all infected with episcopal and presbyterian creeds, and confessions of faith” (John Adams. “Warns Jefferson against Importing European Professors, 1825,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 222.

<sup>144</sup> At Cambridge, one of the three vacations spanned July 1st through October 10th because, “it is indispensable, no one could study in such hot weather” and “It is necessary to refresh the constitution, oppressed by the continued application of many months” (F.W. Gilmer. “Mission for Jefferson, 1824,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 225.

<sup>145</sup> Thomas Jefferson. “Francis W. Gilmer’s Mission for Jefferson, 1824,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 229.

<sup>146</sup> Gilmer, 226.

<sup>147</sup> Edward Everett. “On the Proposed University of Virginia, 1820,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 201.

<sup>148</sup> Herbert Baxter Adams. *Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia*, US Government Printing Office, 1888, 134.

<sup>149</sup> Thomas Jefferson. “Jefferson on the Educational Regime at Virginia, 1823,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago

Press, 1961, 267.

<sup>150</sup> Jefferson, "On the Educational Regime at Virginia," 267.

<sup>151</sup> Wagoner, 164.

<sup>152</sup> Rodney Hessinger, "'The Most Powerful Instrument of College Discipline': Student Disorder and the Growth of Meritocracy in the Colleges of the Early Republic." *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 39, Issue 3, 1999, 242.

<sup>153</sup> Jane G. Weyant, "The Debate Over Higher Education in the South, 1850-1860," *Mississippi Quarterly*, Volume 29, Issue 4, 1976, 541.

<sup>154</sup> Philip Lindsley. "On the Inadequacy of Preparatory Schools, 1825," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 328f.

<sup>155</sup> Lindsley, "On the Inadequacy of Preparatory Schools," 329.

<sup>156</sup> Lindsley, 330. He noted, however, that "we find that the educated poor do in fact become, in the same proportion, more industrious, useful and happy" (331). A managerial cohort would not end labor, but rather make it more profitable for all!

<sup>157</sup> Lindsley remarks that, at the time, a professor of Greek at Yale, unable to find a position elsewhere, was now occupying a chair endowed by his Father because of the family prestige associated with the position.

<sup>158</sup> Phillip Lindsley. "On the Condition of the Colleges, 1837," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 244. A conceptual difficulty in sorting the emergence of the American University is the overlap in language regarding the institutions: Colleges, as I understand them, are the dominant pre-university educational form. They are most often a denominational institution devoted to the discipline of youth; the University, on the other hand, is a multi-disciplinary institution whose main focus is on the production of knowledge and the training of graduate students. In the US, support for this form could only come by continuing the disciplining of youth, thus a strange marriage between the old forms of College and the European University. The University Lindsley refers to here is really a College.

<sup>159</sup> Lindsley, "On the Conditions of the Colleges," 247. This desire to create a culture through education

has long been a dream of radicals who entered the university, often to find themselves struggling within the plurality of the university to create such an oppositional power. Lindsley writes that a desire to have the character of the ancient greats leads to entertainments and delights that might rival the excesses of Rome: “in a word, we imitate the *aristocratic* excesses of the great cities: while we overlook and disregard altogether what in them is most worthy of our emulation and fully within our reach... Their literary taste and superior intelligence and refinement, we might aspire to, and successfully aim at, and profitably cultivate” (249).

<sup>160</sup> Lindsley, “On the Conditions of the Colleges, 1837,” p. 246. He precedes these positions by arguing that the narrowness of the colleges has always led to disaster: “The university has been made the engine of error and tyranny and priest-craft and all manner of high-handed iniquity, in some age or country: so have the church and the civil government, divine revelation and human philosophy” (245).

<sup>161</sup> Weyant, 542.

<sup>162</sup> Weyant, 557.

<sup>163</sup> George Ticknor. “Ticknor Describes His Lectures at Harvard,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 266.

<sup>164</sup> George Ticknor. “Ticknor and the Harvard Reforms of the 1820s,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 271. Some of Ticknor’s associates gathered and published his reforms in a volume titled *Remarks*.

<sup>165</sup> Hessinger, 247.

<sup>166</sup> Hessinger, 249.

<sup>167</sup> Hessinger, 250.

<sup>168</sup> Quoted Hessinger, 260.

<sup>169</sup> Julian M. Sturtevant. “On the Quality of Teaching at Yale in the 1820s,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 274.

<sup>170</sup> Sturtevant, “On the Quality of Teaching at Yale,” 275.

<sup>171</sup> “The Yale Report,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard

Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 277.

<sup>172</sup> “The Yale Report,” 277.

<sup>173</sup> “The Yale Report,” 278.

<sup>174</sup> “The Yale Report,” 278.

<sup>175</sup> “The Yale Report,” 278.

<sup>176</sup> “The Yale Report,” 282.

<sup>177</sup> “The Yale Report,” 283.

<sup>178</sup> Potts, 40.

<sup>179</sup> “The Yale Report,” 285.

<sup>180</sup> “The Yale Report,” 286.

<sup>181</sup> “The Yale Report,” 287. Italics added.

<sup>182</sup> This is a major point of Jencks and Riesman’s *The Academic Revolution* - that the story of US higher education is towards the universal away from the narrow and parochial. They write that, “Indeed, colleges often seem to have been founded and maintained primarily as a reaction against the very fluidity of society and the rapid pace of change, as part of a vain struggle to maintain the old standards and the old ways” (Jencks and Riesman, 7). That many schools attempted to repeat old forms is not news - that many other colleges and universities did not, and so forced widespread transformation, is the real story of the 19th century.

<sup>183</sup> Sturtevant, “On the Sectarian Background of Illinois College, 1830,” 238.

<sup>184</sup> Sturtevant, “On the Sectarian Background of Illinois College,” 239.

<sup>185</sup> James Findlay. “Agency, Denominations and the Western Colleges, 1830-1860: Some Connections between Evangelicalism and American Higher Education,” *Church History*, Volume 50, 1981, 65.

<sup>186</sup> Findlay, 67.

<sup>187</sup> Findlay, 68.

<sup>188</sup> Quoted in Findlay, 69

<sup>189</sup> Quoted in Findlay, 69.

<sup>190</sup> Findlay, 69.

<sup>191</sup> Findlay, 70.

<sup>192</sup> Findlay, 73.

<sup>193</sup> Findlay, 77.

<sup>194</sup> Findlay, 78.

<sup>195</sup> Findlay, 79.

<sup>196</sup> A version of this section was given at the ACLA Convention at NYU in March of 2014.

<sup>197</sup> Reverend, Professor of Literature and Antiquities of the Sacred Scripture as well as first Chancellor of NYU; it was at his home that a small group of men came up with the idea to hold the convention.

<sup>198</sup> Wealthy and influential family; graduated Harvard College; tutor; priest in the Episcopal Church; DD from Union College and later from Harvard; DCL from Oxford; Secretary of the House of Bishops; Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary; extremely influential.

<sup>199</sup> Vice-President of the proceedings; diplomat to Russian and later France; Congressman, Senator, and Secretary of the Treasury; student at the academy of Geneva; faculty at Harvard; while living in Pennsylvania he helped secure peace during the Whiskey Rebellion by bringing the moderates to the side of the government; president of the National Bank; linguist, founded the American branch of ethnology, where he focused on Native American languages - in 1842 he helped found the American Ethnological Society.

<sup>200</sup> Columbia College graduate; merchant; bank president; Hudson River Railroad promoter; organizer of the Philharmonic Musical Society; first director of NYU; president of the NY State Agricultural Society where, in 1853, he convinced the NY State Legislature to charter the country's first agricultural college.

<sup>201</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, New York University, 1933, 6.

<sup>202</sup> Puritan family; married into the Dwight family; father a prominent minister and author; graduated Harvard; attended three German universities, getting his doctorate at Göttingen; knew nearly all of Europe's prominent intellectuals; tutor at Harvard, though he chafed at its backwardness; established the Round Hill School in Massachusetts as an experimental secondary education school; contributor to the *North American Review* and *American Quarterly*; unknown to him, he was elected to the Massachusetts

Legislature, but refused, and, three years later, refused a nomination for state senator; monumental historian, his *History of the United States* was the definitive text for years after his death; Secretary of the Navy; acting Secretary of War; established the US Naval Academy at Annapolis; ordered the occupation of California; first president of the American Geographical Society; Associate Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; selected by Congress to give the eulogy for Lincoln.

<sup>203</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 50.

<sup>204</sup> Bancroft wrote that, “Whether we give attention to it or nor, New York, the mistress of the sea, holding also in her hands the keys of the interior, is the very heart of the business community; and its pulsations are felt throughout the land” (*Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 51).

<sup>205</sup> The 8th son of Yale president Timothy Dwight; graduate of Yale; studied at Göttingen and University of Berlin; published a work on Northern Germany (its universities and student traditions, specifically); co-founded the New Haven High School; co-founded the Round Hill School.

<sup>206</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 140.

<sup>207</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 13.

<sup>208</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 14.

<sup>209</sup> “We are here to prepare,” the statement read, “for legislation, to compare views, to acquire knowledge from the experience of others, and thus carry to our respective spheres of active duty some portion of useful information” (*Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 222).

<sup>210</sup> In “Suggestions on the Proper Mode of Conducting an Education in Colleges and Universities,” it was argued that mischief and disorder were inherent in the very organization of the Class. “Classification is apt to produce favoritism; it is the peculiar constitution of the human mind to be pleased with the possession of power, and nothing so delights a little mind as the dispensation of rewards and punishments... it is destructive to good order, for the members of classes unite to oppose proper authority; and the feeling that through a classmate a class has been insulted, will produce obstinacy in the most honorable minds, the bloody laws of a Draco ought not to be necessary in a civilized community” (*Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 272f).



<sup>211</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 66.

<sup>212</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 38.

<sup>213</sup> A Swissman who'd emigrated in 1805; acting prof of mathematics at West Point from 1807-1810; Coast Survey for the federal government in 1811; first superintendent of the US Coast Survey in 1816; head of the Bureau of Weights and Measures in the Treasury Department (with the help of Albert Gallatin); and textbook writer.

<sup>214</sup> "By force," William Woodbridge argued, "I mean the whole apparatus of bolts, and fetters, and sentinels, and laws, enforced by the exertion of physical power, and administered by absolute authority, which distinguishes the military and naval systems of government" (*Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 149). He continued, saying that the use of disciplinary force ensures that faculty and students confront each other as enemies, with the faculty seeking to make their charges obey.

<sup>215</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 171.

<sup>216</sup> Lieber points out that Kant, Fichte and Schelling were not impelled by large salaries, but rather for love of their pursuit. He wrote that, "It seems to me, that were you even to give to a German a settled annuity, as those of the English fellows, he would nevertheless be found active and ambitious in the cause of science; because almost the only field of ambition of a German, I mean that ambition which looks beyond the life of the individual and seeks for another distinction than that of titles and wealth, is science" (*Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 66).

<sup>217</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 57

<sup>218</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, 83.

<sup>219</sup> Story writes that, "By the 1870s, Harvard graduates comprised two-fifths of the chief officers of the large New England textile firms and half the directors of the leading Boston banks and insurance companies. Prominence in law, medicine, politics, and scholarship was at least equally great." A large number of Boston's millionaires had Harvard degrees. (Ronald Story. "Harvard Students, the Boston Elite, and the New England Preparatory System, 1800-1876," *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 15, Issue 3, 1975, 293.).

<sup>220</sup> Geiger, p. 50f.

<sup>221</sup> Sheldon, 143.

<sup>222</sup> Sheldon, 144.

<sup>223</sup> Sheldon, 179.

<sup>224</sup> Sheldon, 178.

<sup>225</sup> Dr. Cosby, writing in 1868, railed against the fraternities because they severed the connection between parent and child - the fraternity substituted for the parent. "They are a pretence, and thus at war with true candour and manliness. However harmless in their active operations or undertakings, however well composed in membership, the habit of secrecy is insidiously weakening to the foundations of frank truthfulness in the youthful mind. Sham is not only a mean thing, but it blocks the way to truth. A lazy soul finds a quasi success in sham and gives up the pursuit of the true. A lad who receives honour among his comrades because he wears a mystic skull and bones upon his breast will proportionately lose so much of his zeal for scholarship or all else that constitutes true worth" (quoted in Sheldon, 183f.)

<sup>226</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 185f.

<sup>227</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 186f.

<sup>228</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 191.

<sup>229</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 147.

<sup>230</sup> Sheldon, 194.

<sup>231</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 154.

<sup>232</sup> Weyant, 541f.

<sup>233</sup> The state of Vermont was playing up the importance of education for state revenues as far back as 1819. Supporters for a University of Vermont made the case that a lack of a university had cost the state around \$14 million because students had gone to neighboring states. Other states soon picked up this argument as well.

<sup>234</sup> Lucas, 118.

<sup>235</sup> The *Overland Monthly* noted that, "California was 'a modern mate to ancient Greece,' but its university would impart a new humanity to the classical legacy. It would be like "the grand cathedrals of Europe... Its completion assured in the constancy of a people enamored of a sacred idea" (quoted in

Gray Brechin, *Imperial San Francisco*, University of California Press, 2006, 286). William Randolph Hearst's *Examiner* would repeatedly refer to Berkeley as the "Athens of the West," a sentiment shared, at least to a California audience, by Theodore Roosevelt.

<sup>236</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 136.

<sup>237</sup> See Charles Post's *The American Road to Capitalism*, Historical Materialism, 2012.

<sup>238</sup> New types of contracts required a new legal type, while accountants were increasingly necessary in large scale; with the spread of wealth, more money was available for health care; the vice and degradation that everywhere seemed to follow the working class, too, called for more preachers and men of social standing to effect a moral regeneration in urban spaces.

<sup>239</sup> See Stephen Skowronek's *Building a New American State*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.

<sup>240</sup> John Engelhard. "A Southerner Argues for a 'Southern' Education in the Hendrick Case, 1856," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 467.

<sup>241</sup> Northern attitudes toward the South had had, for a long time, a derogatory nature. Francis Hawks, an original trustee at the University of Mississippi, first president of the University of Louisiana, and rector of an Episcopalian Church in New York, claimed that Northerners, "looked upon us as *inferiors*, morally, physically, intellectually. They thought our children could not learn to read but for Yankee teachers... [At Yale] They coolly asked me how it was *possible* I could have acquired *there* [North Carolina], such an education as they knew me to possess?" (Francis Hawks. "A Southerner on Northern Attitudes of Educational Superiority in 1860," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 472.

<sup>242</sup> Englehard, 469.

<sup>243</sup> Philip Lindsley, "On the Problems of the College in a Sectarian Age, 1829," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 233.

<sup>244</sup> It is also preferable, Lindsley writes, to found colleges in large towns rather than small. "And wherever they have been established in small towns, the students are proverbially more riotous and ungovernable in their conduct, more boorish and savage in their manners, and more dissolute and

licentious in their habits” (“On the Problems of the College,” 235). Plus, there are far more resources in the large town than in the small, so they should cost less.

<sup>245</sup> Jasper Adams, “On the Relation between Trustees and Faculty, 1837,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 314f.

<sup>246</sup> Adams, 317.

<sup>247</sup> Adams, 316.

<sup>248</sup> Adams, 319.

<sup>249</sup> Adams, 322.

<sup>250</sup> Adams writes that, “such influence and patronage in favor of an institution, is like the descent of the dew of heaven, and of the refreshing rain, upon the dry and thirsty ground” (Adams, 326).

<sup>251</sup> One each in universal science, literature/language, mathematics, natural history, natural philosophy, astronomy, chemistry, medical sciences, economical sciences, ethics, military science, historical science and the intellectual sciences.

<sup>252</sup> A.B. Woodward et al, “The Catholepistemiad, 1817,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 190.

<sup>253</sup> George Duffield. “The Michigan Regents Warn against Sectarianism, 1841,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 438.

<sup>254</sup> Daniel Whedon, “Professor Whedon’s Dismissal for Advocating ‘The Higher Law,’ 1851,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 439.

<sup>255</sup> Sheldon, 162.

<sup>256</sup> Justifications for this ranged from altruism to fear. Some feared that it was cruel to the people themselves, as they were simply too inferior to understand knowledge; others saw education as dangerous to white supremacy; and others thought that the character of former slaves was such that education would simply not take.

<sup>257</sup> It should be noted that African-American education in the South, post-Civil War, was largely the

concern of the New England elite who were attempting to ‘convert and puritanize’ the freed slaves (James M. McPherson, “The New Puritanism: Values and Goals of Freedmen’s Education in America,” *The University in Society, Volume II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974, 615). These reformers attempted to train clergy first and educators second; they attempted to train a class of influential leaders who would become the standard bearers for a middle-class piety through which former slaves might be reconciled to a larger white culture. They fostered what they hoped would be a Christian environment, yet the system of rules, rewards and punishments led instead to paternalism and resentment. The outcome of white reform in these schools was often “spying by faculty and students, petty harassment, hypocrisy, student rebelliousness, and ingenious methods of evasion” (McPherson, 625). In general, this education was wholly unsuited to the needs of southern black men and women and more often than not alienated those who graduated from the communities they had come from.

<sup>258</sup> Lawrence B. Goodheart, “Abolitionists as Academics: The Controversy at Western Reserve College, 1832-1833,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 22, Issue 4, 1982, 421.

<sup>259</sup> Goodheart, 424.

<sup>260</sup> Goodheart, 424.

<sup>261</sup> Goodheart, 426.

<sup>262</sup> Goodheart, 429.

<sup>263</sup> The Colonization Society was the result of the efforts by Northern Quakers and Evangelicals, assisted by Southern slaveowners, to repatriate freed black men and women to Africa. They founded the colony of Liberia - which became a nation in 1847. It came under attack for many reasons - for not supporting the cause of abolition, for being an extension of US imperialism and for removing black people from the only home they’d ever known. In an 1831 letter to *The Liberator*, “a Colored Philadelphian” asked why, “some of our pretended white friends, and members of the American Colonization nSociety, why are they so interested in our behalf as to want us to go to Africa? They tell us that it is our home; that they desire to make a people of us, which we can never be here; that they want Africa civilized... Will some of these guardian angels of the people of color tell me how it is that we, who were born in the same city or state with themselves, can live any longer in Africa than they?... we consider the United States our home and not Africa as they wish to make us believe...” (“Letter to

the Editor,” *The Liberator Files*. 02/12/1831, [theliberatorfiles.com/colonization](http://theliberatorfiles.com/colonization). Accessed 12 August 2014).

<sup>264</sup> A “manual labor student” was a student who worked for the college in order to pay tuition or part of tuition.

<sup>265</sup> J.H. Fairchild. “On the Antislavery Commitment of Oberlin,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 428.

<sup>266</sup> Fairchild, 423.

<sup>267</sup> Fairchild, 427.

<sup>268</sup> Fairchild, 429.

<sup>269</sup> Fairchild writes that there was only one black person in the county, but many were expecting hordes to descend. When one black man entered the settlement, “The son of one of the Trustees, ran to the house, calling out, “They’re coming, father - they’re coming” (Fairchild, 431).

<sup>270</sup> Fairchild, 432.

<sup>271</sup> Sheldon, 113.

<sup>272</sup> Sheldon, 111.

<sup>273</sup> Sheldon, 111.

<sup>274</sup> Quincy, from a prominent family in Boston, also served on the state legislature and, as mayor of Boston, helped improve the living conditions of the city.

<sup>275</sup> Josiah Quincy. “Plea for Educational Freedom, 1840,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 436.

<sup>276</sup> Edward Everett. “Harvard’s Need for State Funds,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 380.

<sup>277</sup> Everett, 382.

<sup>278</sup> Close to \$2,000 dollars as of 2011.

<sup>279</sup> Everett, 386.

<sup>280</sup> George Templeton Strong. “The Gibbs Case, 1853-54,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 446.

<sup>281</sup> Samuel Ruggles. "The Case for the Appointment of Wolcott Gibbs, 1854," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 453.

<sup>282</sup> Ruggles, 454.

<sup>283</sup> Ruggles wrote that, "The College is, in no sense, an ecclesiastical body. It is purely a human, secular institution. Founded by a temporal sovereign, it is solely the creature of the State, and to the State alone, does it owe duty and obedience" (Ruggles, 454).

<sup>284</sup> Ruggles, 455.

<sup>285</sup> FAP Barnard. "The Ideal College Officer," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 388.

<sup>286</sup> Hofstrader and Smith, *American Higher Education*. 334.

<sup>287</sup> Francis Wayland. "Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System, 1842," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 335.

<sup>288</sup> Wayland writes that, "The corporators... are generally men of high professional standings, deeply immersed in business; and relying in the main, upon the superior practical knowledge of the senior officer of the college, in general, yield an assent to his suggestions, and assist him more by dividing with him the responsibility than in any other manner" (336).

<sup>289</sup> The demands on presidents was, however, beginning to split these responsibilities. Samuel Eliot, president of Harvard, argued in 1848 that, "Gentlemen almost exclusively engaged in the instruction and discipline of youth are not, usually, in the best condition to acquire that experience in affairs, and acquaintance with men, which, to say the least, they are extremely desirable in the management of the exterior concerns of a large literary institution" (Cited from Lucas, 125.) Arguing, with many other presidents whose professional activities was taking up more and more time, he argued for more business and practical minded men to man these positions than was currently the practice.

<sup>290</sup> Even this low pay, the colleges had to appeal to their communities for funding, as enrollments rarely paid for the meager cost of teaching. Wayland writes that, "This appeal is commonly made on the ground of the necessity of educating young men for the office of the Christian ministry; and it is

commonly successful,” (Wayland, 338).

<sup>291</sup> The concept of private college was developed in in the Dartmouth Case of 1819. Here, some measure of autonomy was granted to those institutions that sought to be private yet still gain access to public funds. Here, the legislature of New Hampshire attempted to change the charter against the wishes of its board. Daniel Webster famously argued this take over in the Supreme Court, claiming that abrogating the original charter would nullify all existing contracts before the Revolution. “Eleemosynary corporations are for the management of private property, according to the will of the donors. They are private corporations. A college is as such a private corporation as a hospital; especially a college founded as this was, by private bounty. A college is a charity” (Daniel Webster, “The Dartmouth College Case,” *The Great Speeches and Orations of Daniel Webster*. Beard Books, 2001, 6). Given that the university is thus a private entity, and is therefore the private property of a charitable group, “The right of visitation, then, accrues to them as a matter of property, by the gift, transfer, or appointment of the founder” (Webster, 7). It stands to reason, then, that no outside force could position itself as the owner unless otherwise invited. Even if the government grants funds to these institutions, it is not public money because that money has been given to the private entity and is therefore private money. “It may be public, that is general, in its uses and advantages; and the state may very laudably add contributions of its own to the funds; but it is still private in the tenure of the property, and in the right of administering the funds” (Webster, 10). The intrusion of the public into the character of the public disrupts all safeguards. Popular whim, not eternal values or community standards, will rule and there will be no chance of higher learning or teaching. “Party and faction will be cherished in the places consecrated to piety and learning” (Webster, 23). The question, as Webster lays it out, “is, in some sense, the case of every man among us who has property of which he may be stripped, for the question is simply this: Shall our State Legislatures be allowed to take *that* which is not their own, to turn it from its original use, and apply it to such ends or purposes as they, in their discretion, shall see fit” (Webster, 23). Chief Justice John Marshall ruled that the institution of private property mitigated against this takeover by the legislature. It is true that education is of concern to the state, and that it might itself found its own institutions, education as such is not automatically in the hands of the government. It is therefore beyond the right of the government to insinuate itself into the administration and governance of private bodies, though, as it is of national and state interest to have education as widespread as possible, the government can set up its



own schools.

<sup>292</sup> Wayland, 339.

<sup>293</sup> Wayland, 341. This will be a recurring theme among Conservatives and liberals in the early 20th century.

<sup>294</sup> Wayland, 341.

<sup>295</sup> Quoted in Wayland, 346.

<sup>296</sup> Where the general production of knowledge requires as large a pool as possible of researchers - to cancel out the various personal interests of researchers - the Board must be small so that responsibility can be evaluated. Wayland would later write that, "I do not say, that any honorable men would be guilty of so great a wrong, if they would pause to reflect upon the consequences of their action; but honorable men, when associated together, not unfrequently, by reason of thoughtlessness, are responsible for wrongs which individually they would be the last to justify" (Wayland, 352).

<sup>297</sup> Wayland claims that because faculty salary is so small and the position itself does not accord great honor, there is a lack of "all the usual stimulants to effort" and we can only conclude that "The motive arising from the knowledge that their labors are seen and appreciated by those in whom the community has reposed this high trust, must be in the highest degree salutary, if not absolutely indispensable.- There are no men in our country from whom important labor is expected whose position is so artificial and so at variance with the ordinary principles of human actions as the officers of American Colleges. Were they not honorable and virtuous men, they would not accomplish the tenth part of what they do" (Wayland, 347f.)

<sup>298</sup> Wayland, 349.

<sup>299</sup> Wayland believed that the "tendency" of the system "is to offer a bounty for indolence and incapacity, for it rewards them as well as industry and talent" (Wayland, 355).

<sup>300</sup> Wayland, 361.

<sup>301</sup> Wayland, in this critique, attacked the continuing connection between the three professions and higher education. "Now the class of society that is thus left unprovided for, constitutes the bone and sinew, the very choicest portion of this or of any community. They are the great agents of production, they are the safest depositories of political power. It is their will, that, in the end, sways the destinies of

the nation. It is of the very highest importance, on every account, that this portion of a people should possess every facility for the acquisition of knowledge and intellectual discipline. Nothing would tend so much to the progress of wealth among us as the diffusion throughout the whole people of a knowledge of the principles of science, and the application of science to the arts. And besides, a knowledge of moral and intellectual philosophy, of the fundamental principles of law, of our constitution, of history, of vegetable and animal physiology, and of many other sciences is just as necessary and just as appropriate to the merchant, the manufacturer, the mechanic, and the farmer, as to the lawyer, the clergyman, or the physician (Wayland, 372).

<sup>302</sup> Philip Lindsley. "1832 Baccalureate," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961, 376.

<sup>303</sup> Wayland, 373.

<sup>304</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 137.

<sup>305</sup> Quoted in Richard Altenbaugh. *Education for Struggle: The American Labor Colleges of the 1920s and 1930s.* Temple University Press, 1990, 22.

<sup>306</sup> Altenbaugh, 24.

<sup>307</sup> Terence J. Johnson. *Professions and Power*. The MacMillan Press LTD, 1972, 45.

<sup>308</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 145.

<sup>309</sup> *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait*, 1993.

<sup>310</sup> Herbst, 332.

<sup>311</sup> Wren, 324.

<sup>312</sup> Wren, 325.

<sup>313</sup> Wren, 335.

<sup>314</sup> Quoted in Wren, 335.

<sup>315</sup> Wren, 336.

<sup>316</sup> Wren, 340.

<sup>317</sup> Wren, 340.

<sup>318</sup> Wren, 341.

<sup>319</sup> Wren, 342.

<sup>320</sup> Skowronek, 33.

<sup>321</sup> Skowronek, 33.

<sup>322</sup> Several states had, even before the Civil War, chartered municipal colleges by which to provide an education to the so-called mechanical classes. Throughout the 1870s, a wave of city colleges arose as industrialization bloomed. Through night classes and city and state spending, they offered a variety of courses intended to help the working class gain new skills and an understanding of themselves within the existing division of labor.

<sup>323</sup> Lucas, 150.

<sup>324</sup> Lucas, 147.

<sup>325</sup> Illinois, illegally as there was available land in its own, located its claims in neighboring states and waited a decade before selling it in the hopes of gaining a viable sum.

<sup>326</sup> Quoted in Jeffrey L. Furman and Megan J. MacGarvie. "Academic Science and the Birth of Industrial Research Labs in the U.S. Pharmaceutical Industry," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. Volume 63, 2007, 772.

<sup>327</sup> Geiger, p. 52.

<sup>328</sup> Frederick S. Humphries. "1890 Land-Grant Institutions: Their Struggle for Survival and Equality," *Agricultural History*, Volume 65, Issue 2, 1991, 4.

<sup>329</sup> Humphries, 5.

<sup>330</sup> Ronald Walters. "American Political Systems and the Response of the Black Community," *The Black Condition: Schomburg Studies on the Black Experience*. Edited by Howard Dodson and Colin Palmer, Michigan State University Press, 2008, 2.

<sup>331</sup> Walters, 7.

<sup>332</sup> Becker, 21.

<sup>333</sup> They needed, according to Becker, to have, "within three years, at least ten competent professors, buildings adequate to house two hundred and fifty students, a farm of two hundred acres free of encumbrance, shops suitable for teaching the mechanic arts, a library, scientific apparatus, and 'cabinets

of natural history” (Becker, 64.)

<sup>334</sup> Cornell had originally been hired, based on a plow design he’d purchased the patent for, to dig rows for the laying of telegraph wire. When the wire insulation failed underground, it was his idea to put the lines above ground, using glass knobs on wooden poles to conduct information. In the explosion of interest, and the capital infusion that followed the creation of the sector, Cornell made a series of investments that were not to pay off until he retired from the industry. However, with the consolidation of the telegraph under Western Union, his investments suddenly made him extremely wealthy.

<sup>335</sup> Becker, 73.

<sup>336</sup> Quoted in Becker, 78.

<sup>337</sup> In 1858, White related his vision to George Curtis, which Curtis then shared at an address to the opening of Cornell. He remembered their conversation like this: “in the warmth and confidence of his friendship, unfolded to me his idea of the great work that should be done... Surely, he said, in the greatest state there should be the greatest of universities; in central New York there should arise a university, which, by the amplitude of its endowment and... by the character of its studies in the whole scope of its curriculum, should satisfy the wants of the hours” (quoted in Becker, 80).

<sup>338</sup> White’s vision of education, while radical for those in office, was pretty typical of a liberal democratic believer. He abhorred Marxism, preferring instead free-market economic thought. According to Becker, “He believed that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom, and that accordingly the essential condition for preserving the freedom of a republic was a sturdy and literate people, and leaders whose education enabled them to appropriate for themselves, and whose patriotism commanded them to place at the disposal of the community, the best that has been thought and said and done in the world. For a republic, therefore, the indispensable foundation was education - common schools for the people, colleges and universities for the leaders” (quoted in Becker, 78). History was the progressive story of God’s revelation in time and the essential battles had already been won. It was not a matter only of generalizing the victories of free speech, free economic activity, material prosperity, and the wide application of knowledge to the masses through education.

<sup>339</sup> There was, of course, the usual amount of backroom deals, political bribes, and charges of monopoly hurled against Cornell, but in the end they were able to politick their way forward. For a

detailed account, see Becker, *Cornell University*.

<sup>340</sup> Becker, 92.

<sup>341</sup> Quoted in Becker, 93.

<sup>342</sup> Folger's district contained two such colleges, and, though he'd helped Cornell and White draft the bill, he could not support it. However, White was able to provide to him legislation to create a humane insane asylum in his district to make up for the lack of a school. This did the trick.

<sup>343</sup> Becker, 119f.

<sup>344</sup> Becker writes that this made White a professor at Michigan, a State Senator, the president of a Syracuse bank, while also being a director in two others, director of a railroad, and executor of two large estates. He'd also been offered a position at Yale that he was considering.

<sup>345</sup> Upon opening, almost nothing was finished. There were not enough rooms for students or faculty, there were not enough classrooms to teach (one professor attempted to teach French, according to Becker, to two hundred students), and almost every building was unfinished. This caused White, apparently, bout of depression. Cornell, speaking to these troubles at the Commencement, said, "We did not expect to have a single thing finished... It is the commencement that we have now in hand" (quoted in Becker, 135).

<sup>346</sup> Edward T. Silva and Sheila A. Slaughter. *Serving Power: The Making of the Academic Social Science Expert*. Greenwood Press, 1984, 17.

<sup>347</sup> Robert L. Church. "Economists as Experts: The Rise of an Academic Profession in America 1870-1917," *The University in Society, Vol II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974, 571.

<sup>348</sup> There were, of course, socialists in the ranks of academics who, swayed by the texts of Marx and others, thought to wield research towards anti-capitalist ends. However, they were always a minority; they were useful in pushing the boundaries of acceptable professional practice (they rarely had more than a small percentage of support from fellow academics, even in times of trial), and gave legitimation to the process of knowledge production which had found a home in the universities.

<sup>349</sup> Gavin Wright. "American Agriculture and the Labor Market: What Happened to Proletarianization?," *Agricultural History*, Volume 62, Issue 3, 1988, 183.

<sup>350</sup>Wright, 188.

<sup>351</sup>Wright, 198.

<sup>352</sup>Skowronek, ix.

<sup>353</sup> However, as Upton Sinclair noted in *The Goose Step: A Study of American Higher Education*, the federal government was already, by the beginning of the 1920s, spending \$120 million dollars a year on higher education spending. During the Depression, the federal government spent more than \$93 million on student aid alone. These numbers would be dwarfed following WWII, however.

<sup>354</sup> Marx, Karl. "Theories of Productive and Unproductive Labor, Chapter Four," *Theories of Surplus Value: Marxists.org*. 1861-1863. [www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1863/theories-surplus-value/ch04.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1863/theories-surplus-value/ch04.htm). Accessed 13 September 2013.

<sup>355</sup> The History Group of the British Communist Party writes that the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Sciences and Commerce, one such group, advocated for the advance of industrial production in order to alleviate these conditions. They induced several new innovations in agricultural production to speed this: machines to aid deforestation, the introduction of new plants from colonies, advanced engineering for draughtsman, and a number of other tools essential for the industrial revolution (The History Group, "The Organization of Science: A Historical Outline of Science as a Social Activity," *Our History: Digital Archive*, History Group of the Communist Party, Volume 39, 1965. [banmarchive.org.uk/collections/shs/index\\_frameset1.htm](http://banmarchive.org.uk/collections/shs/index_frameset1.htm). Accessed 4 January, 2013).

Phillipson, too, notes the role that Scottish Enlightenment societies, such as the Select Society of Edinburgh, played in advancing the industrial revolution for the betterment of the peasant and working classes. The Select Society took to debating "problems of agricultural and economic improvement, legal and political reform, the treatment of servants, etc. And from the particular they moved to the practical. Within a year the society had become the patron of what was nothing short of a campaign for the general improvement of Scottish Society at large" (Nicholas Phillipson. "Culture and Society in the 18th Century Province: The Case of Edinburgh and the Scottish Enlightenment," *The University in Society, Vol II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974, 445). He comments that while the Society did not itself change Scottish life to much, they provided an identity for a splintered 'aristocratic society.'

<sup>356</sup> Weber writes that, “The French, English and American bureaucracies have for a long time foregone such examinations entirely or to a large extent, for training and service in party organizations have made up for them” (Max Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Translated and Edited by H.H. Garth and C. Wright Mills, Oxford University Press, 1946, 240).

<sup>357</sup> Herbert G. Gutman. “Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919,” *The American Historical Review*. Volume 78, Issue 3, 1973.

<sup>358</sup> Herbst, 336.

<sup>359</sup> Silva and Slaughter write that nearly three quarters of ASSA members were from New England, that most were from families whose roots went back to the 18th century and those with college degrees had obtained them from the pre-Revolutionary colleges. Most of their fathers were professionals (clergy, doctors, or lawyers) or mercantile leaders. They and their families controlled commerce, banking, education and cultural production in the region. A majority of the ASSA members were philanthropists and many were involved in elite social networks and had substantial financial holdings.

<sup>360</sup> In 1884, a large number of these independents decided they could not support James Blaine, the Republican presidential candidate, because he was seen to be too corrupt. They switched their allegiance to Grover Cleveland. Called ‘mugwumps,’ or king-makers, their support in New York was said to have won the election for Cleveland. many of these remained independents for the remainder of their lives. They abdicated the Republican party because, writes Church, “They felt their values increasingly menaced by Greenbackers and labor unions who threatened, the independents thought, to expropriate the property of the rich by what they viewed as the fanaticism or irrationality of Radical Republican reconstruction policy, and by the politicians. too incompetent in both a moral and technical sense to be called statesmen, who ruled the country” (Church, 575).

<sup>361</sup> Church, 577.

<sup>362</sup> Franklin Sanborn, an early general secretary for ASSA, wrote with delight of the new focus on public education, public health, industrial inspections and nascent attempts to regulate railroads and other public works. He advocated for the census and the opening of parks and cultural centers as a means towards greater social integration of all the classes.

<sup>363</sup> Quoted in Silva and Slaughter, p. 55.

<sup>364</sup> Massachusetts, home to many ASSAers, pioneered many of the forms that the liberal interventionist state would come to take as its own. Silva and Slaughter write, for instance, that ASSA members Samuel Howe and Franklin Sanborn helped create the Massachusetts Board of State Charities to help alleviate poverty. Soon, several other states had followed their lead. Of course, given that their sympathies lay with capitalism, they believed that the poor had received their just desserts, but that the good of society nonetheless depended on their being given a modicum of support. Massachusetts also was the first state to create a state labor bureau, which would come to serve as the model for a federal version.

<sup>365</sup> Two, according to Silva and Slaughter, were US commissioners of education while others were trustees at Harvard or Yale and others taught at Harvard, Yale, MIT, Cornell, Michigan, Iowa and Penn.

<sup>366</sup> Silva and Slaughter, 23.

<sup>367</sup> The reformers exempted themselves from the ‘humiliation’ of having to pass such tests. Their position in society had already, they explained, established their competence.

<sup>368</sup> Here again the distinction between types of rule and ethics is introduced by Weber. “In so far as discipline appeals to firm motives of an ‘ethical’ character, it presupposes a ‘sense of duty’ and ‘conscientiousness.’” (“Men of Conscience’ *versus* ‘Men of Honor,’ in Cromwell’s terms”) (Weber, 254).

<sup>369</sup> Skowronek, 54.

<sup>370</sup> Their model was a series of such acts first begun in Britain and soon followed in England.

<sup>371</sup> Between 1877-81, according to Skowronek, civil reform took on the characteristics of a real movement. Several reform organizations sprang up to agitate among local businessmen. The first, Skowronek continues, was in New York - unsurprising, given the highly lucrative New York Customhouse was there - and was soon followed by ‘affiliated societies’ in several major cities such as Boston, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburgh and San Francisco. A National Civil Service Reform League was initiated to coordinate these efforts. (It should be noted that the reformers, through their national associations, helped foster the idea of a national consciousness, even against their own wishes). Their major electoral weapon was a refusal to endorse any Party, choosing instead to endorse individual candidates if and when they proved themselves worthy of reform support. The cultural field was not yet ready for a full harvest, but their efforts proved formidable.



<sup>372</sup> Skowronek writes of the struggle of the Party bosses against this incursion by professionals. In their vision, officeholders would be given autonomy from the party bosses, which would imbue the office itself with respect and prestige. They sought to arrogate to the President power over regional matters, emancipating him from their control. Rutherford B. Hayes, soon after his election, declared that, “The end I have chiefly aimed at has been to break down Congressional patronage, especially Senatorial patronage... It seemed to me that as Executive I could advance the reform of the civil service in no way so effectively as by rescuing the power of appointing to office from Congressional leaders” (quoted in Skowronek, 56). By developing “national politics,” they attempted to create a setting for a centralized executive office un beholden to regional powers. Congress, understandably, was dead against these reforms and for the next half-century presidents found themselves having to use their power to appoint within the patronage systems while attempting to whittle away at it.

The next thirty years can be seen as an extensive fight over merit nominations for federal and state government positions. Presidents Garfield, Roosevelt and Cleveland all fought within the narrow realm of political leeway they had to install merit based qualifications, though they did so to differing political ends. Presidents had to be wary of their parties but they, as executives, also sought to bend their parties to their will. The presidential run of William Jennings Bryan was notable in that he alone ran on a platform opposed to the merit based, professionalizing impulse of the reformers. McKinley, after his election and to placate populists in revolt, declared merit qualifications had gone to far and rescinded some civil service classifications. These moves, however, were short lived, as this was an inexorable process.

<sup>373</sup> Skowronek notes that the Port of New York was responsible for more than 50% of federal revenues and also had more than a thousand federal employees. “More than any other single office, the New York Customhouse symbolized the fusion of party and state, and more than any other single office, it focused the interests of merchants and gentlemen reformers against spoils administration” (Skowronek, 61).

<sup>374</sup> Skowronek, 49.

<sup>375</sup> As far back as 1848, Samuel Eliot had argued that, “Gentlemen almost exclusively engaged in the instruction and discipline of youth are not, usually, in the best condition to acquire that experience in affairs, and acquaintance with men, which, to say the least, are extremely desirable in the management

of the exterior concerns of a large literary institution” (quoted from Lucas, 125).

<sup>376</sup> Veysey, 306.

<sup>377</sup> Silva and Slaughter, 46.

<sup>378</sup> Academic associations had been around in the US since at least the 1820s, though they were based on the amateur English models rather than the professional and specialized associations that grew from industrial universities.

<sup>379</sup> Silva and Slaughter note that Professor A. Marshall Elliott of Johns Hopkins, largely considered of middling intellect by his peers, was the spur for the organization and was rewarded by President Gilman for this move by a promotion to associate professor.

<sup>380</sup> Silva and Slaughter, 21. These economists illustrate the rule of corporate knowledge. While some might bear allegiance to Smith, Ricardo or Marx, they mediated their disagreements through Association mediums: conferences and journals. In this way, the community at large set the standards by which economic knowledge was to be judged.

<sup>381</sup> Cattell, quoted in Veysey, 179.

<sup>382</sup> Silva and Slaughter, 71.

<sup>383</sup> Church writes that “They understood that their support for labor and state regulation or control of monopolies would appeal to these classes more than to the elites whom Godkin and Adams sought to reach” (Church, 583).

<sup>384</sup> Sociology in Europe, Perry Anderson argues, was largely an attempt to displace the visceral appeal of Marxism. Anderson writes that, Sociology “notoriously emerged as a bourgeois counter-reaction to Marxism on the continent. All of Weber’s work on economy and society forms an immense, oblique contestation of the Marxism which had conquered the working-class movement in imperial Germany; his political hostility to that movement was undying. Pareto [Italy] sought to combat the primitive ‘mob-rule’ of socialism by writing a violent attack on Marx; Durkheim sought to domesticate it within the reformist perspectives of French positivism. A profound fear of the masses and premonition of social disintegration haunts the work of all three” (Perry Anderson. “Components of the National Culture,” *The New Left Review*, Issue 50, 1968, 8). England, however, lacked both the towering Marxist thinkers necessary to cohere a movement and, therefore, lacked the requisite foil necessary for the advent of

sociology. Anderson acknowledges the large communist movement of the 1930s but asserts that this was largely led by poets, engineers, and those in the natural sciences. It was unable to ground an imminent theory of class conflict and, therefore, remained largely a surface phenomenon. There were, to be sure, a number of 'individual exceptions,' but they were never able to reconfigure the relationships necessary to constitute a truly revolutionary culture. Marxist revolutionary theory, therefore, was denied a natural life in Britain by culture.

Anderson argues that the Industrial Revolution in England never provoked a proletarian revolution in England because because that was "checked by a prior capitalist class, the agrarian aristocracy which had matured in the eighteenth century, and controlled a State formed in its image. There was no insuperable contradiction between the modes of production of the two classes. The industrial bourgeoisie, traumatized by the French Revolution and fearful of the nascent working-class movement, never took the risk of a confrontation with the dominant aristocracy" (Anderson, 12).

This stands in stark contrast with the United States where the industrial bourgeoisie did, in fact, confront and eventually defeat the agrarian and commercial capitalist class that had been dominated by New England merchants and bankers. The project of the industrialists from New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and San Francisco was the necessary condition for loosing the energy of the working classes. In the same way that the steam engine magnified the power of locomotion, the industrial cities and corresponding debt ridden farms were the condition for a revolutionary working class movement throughout the early 20th century. The professionalizing of the academic classes, then, must be read against this backdrop.

<sup>385</sup> Furman and MacGarvie, 757.

<sup>386</sup> Furman and MacGarvie, 761.

<sup>387</sup> Geiger, 59.

<sup>388</sup> Similar changes in student social life have been documented in England around the same time. In the rapidly changing conditions of English society, students were taking it upon themselves to develop new forms of sociality which were soon institutionally incorporated into the universities - usually after an unsuccessful struggle to repress them - as a means to organize students. These changes, writes the English historian Sheldon Rothblatt, "were no simply a change in educational policy. They required

whole ranges of adjustment in values and behavior, the imposition of self-discipline, for example, in a society whose governing elites were accustomed to free time and free schedules” (Sheldon Rothblatt. “The Student Sub-Culture and the Examination System in Early 19th Century Oxbridge,” *The University in Society Volume I*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974, 302). They, along with the invention of “ancient traditions,” as Eric Hobsbawm recalls in his memoirs, “were supposed to inspire us, to assure of our superiority and to warn us against the temptations of ill-considered change” (Eric Hobsbawm, *Interesting Times: A Twentieth-Century Life*, Abacus, 2002, 103).

<sup>389</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 170.

<sup>390</sup> Thorstein, Veblen. *The Higher Learning in America*, Sagamore Press Inc, 1957, 143. It is worth noting that there were far more critics of higher education on the conservative side than on the left. For one thing, the progressive position, which garnered support from most liberals, was the position of reform. It attacked positions on the left and the right, but its main opposition came from the right. Most anti-capitalists had little use for universities in general. Those who did, such as Veblen, Upton Sinclair, and Scott Nearing, all leveled critiques at the university, though Veblen most clearly attacks on the system of electives, while the others target the role the capitalists play in the formation of higher education.

<sup>391</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 167.

<sup>392</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 168.

<sup>393</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 165.

<sup>394</sup> Their detractors, such as James McCosh of Princeton, dismissed these attempts, saying that “I cannot allow that it is an advance in scholarship. It is a bid for popularity” (quoted in Lucas, 166).

<sup>395</sup> Hutchins believed that this could best be done through training in the classics. “A classic,” after all, “is a book that is contemporary in every age” (Robert Maynard Hutchins. *The Higher Learning in America*. Yale University Press, 1936, 78). Only by understanding the universal could the particular, the thinking goes, stand out. He does not, in these lectures, lay out criteria whereby this is to be known: presumably, those tomes that had been instrumental in creating the intellectual infrastructure of the post-Revolutionary world. He obviously also believed in an insipid version of progress in which the Western world stood in for the universal, but this criticism is neither interesting nor new.

<sup>396</sup> Hutchins, 66.

<sup>397</sup> Wheeler, quoted in Brechin, 290. Wheeler shared both friendship and ideological connections with Theodore Roosevelt and William Randolph Hearst. They all proclaimed their disgust with effete academics and prized instead a macho self-sufficient and athletic man capable of intervening in the world around them. In their newspapers, universities and speeches, they attempted to exemplify this attitude.

<sup>398</sup> Hutchins, 21.

<sup>399</sup> Hutchins, 21.

<sup>400</sup> Veblen, 73.

<sup>401</sup> Hutchins, 8.

<sup>402</sup> Lucas, 144.

<sup>403</sup> Geiger writes that while Gilman and Johns Hopkins usually get the credit for being the first school to professionalize in this manner, Henry Tappan's reforms in the University of Michigan throughout the 1850s prefigured many of Gilman's reforms. It should not be that surprising, however, as they were all influenced by the German model of education and industrialization. Further, that Tappan's reforms are not more often cited in educational reform literature says as much about the hierarchical position of regions and cities as it does about the general transformation of education.

<sup>404</sup> Gilman had been a member of ASSA, but broke with them over the role of graduate education and specialization.

<sup>405</sup> Hutchins, 35.

<sup>406</sup> Hutchins, 36.

<sup>407</sup> Lucas, 206.

<sup>408</sup> Lucas, 206.

<sup>409</sup> Helen Ekin Starrett. *After College, What? For Girls*. Thomas Y. Crowell & Company, 1896, 6.

<sup>410</sup> Starrett, 7.

<sup>411</sup> Starrett, 8.

<sup>412</sup> Starrett, 8f.

<sup>413</sup> Starrett, 12.

<sup>414</sup> Starrett, 18f.

<sup>415</sup> Starrett, 18.

<sup>416</sup> Lucas, 155.

<sup>417</sup> Lucas, 155.

<sup>418</sup> Lucas, 155.

<sup>419</sup> Lucas, 156.

<sup>420</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 157.

<sup>421</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 158,

<sup>422</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 158.

<sup>423</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 205. Geiger also points out that Jewish faculty, if famous enough, could teach at Princeton, but Jewish students would have been unable to matriculate in this age.

<sup>424</sup> Lucas, 207.

<sup>425</sup> Lucas, 207.

<sup>426</sup> Lee Bernstein. "African Americans and the Criminal-Justice System," *The Black Condition: Schomburg Studies on the Black Experience*. Edited by Howard Dodson and Colin Palmer, Michigan State University Press, 2008, 7.

<sup>427</sup> Lucas, 221.

<sup>428</sup> Quoted in Lucas, 221.

<sup>429</sup> Barbara Brittingham. "Accreditation in the United States: How Did We Get to Where We Are." *New Directions for Higher Education*, Volume 145, 2009.

<sup>430</sup> "120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait," 73.

<sup>431</sup> Geiger, 57.

<sup>432</sup> Geiger, 56.

<sup>433</sup> W.S. Gifford. "Does Business Want Scholars," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Volume 14, Issue 7, 1928, 547f.

<sup>434</sup> Gifford, 549.

<sup>435</sup> Gifford, 550.

<sup>436</sup> Veblen, 10.

<sup>437</sup> It might be of interest to point out that around the turn of the century, colleges and universities began to experience much higher attrition rates than they had previously. The historian John Thelin writes that this is in part due to student culture of the early 20 century, wherein whole cohorts at universities would aim to do just enough to get by. The mantra at Harvard, in the 1920s, was, "Three C's, a D - and keep your name out of the newspaper. (John Thelin. "The Attrition Tradition: in American Higher Education: Connecting Past and Present," *Future of American Education Project: The American Enterprise Institute*. 4/20/2010, [www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/AttritionTraditionThelin.pdf](http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/AttritionTraditionThelin.pdf). Accessed 7 July 2013, 11). Students, I believe, reacted to this new world of academic responsibility by doing as little as they could. If you were to fail, you might as well fail collectively and enjoy the process!

<sup>438</sup> "120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait," 75. In 1899-1900, total enrollment was 237,592; in 1909-10, it was 355,430; in 1919-20, it was 597,880; in 1929-30, it was 1,100,737; in 1939-40, it was 1,494,203; in 1949-50, it was 2,444,900.

<sup>439</sup> Geiger, 60.

<sup>440</sup> Thelin, 10.

<sup>441</sup> Sheldon, 198.

<sup>442</sup> Sheldon, 227.

<sup>443</sup> Many students, writes Sheldon, still believed they'd enter into politics or public life, so public speaking and debate continued to have a heavy role in curriculums.

<sup>444</sup> Sheldon, 234.

<sup>445</sup> Sheldon, 230.

<sup>446</sup> In the East, these were Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Pennsylvania and Cornell; in the Midwest, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Northwestern and the University of Chicago were important, though they had nowhere near the cache as the Eastern schools. Virginia vs Vanderbilt, Missouri vs Kansas, and Cal vs. Stanford also had local, though rarely national, importance.

<sup>447</sup> Sheldon, 235.

<sup>448</sup> Sheldon, quoting Augustus Hemenway, p. 236. Sheldon describes a three page spread detailing one

game in the West. There are, “Twenty columns of printed matter and seven columns of illustrations, including cartoons and pictures of the captains and coaches of the two opposing teams. The article consists of two long accounts of the game - one popular for the general reader, the second technical for the football enthusiast. Besides these main features, there are biographies of all the players, the opinions of the captains, coaches, and the presidents of the two universities on the outcome of the struggle. In a personal note the emotions of the gray-haired father of one of the players are described in detail. Such a cheap notoriety tends to place the football player on a level with the prize-fighting and bicycle-riding profession” (Sheldon, 236).

<sup>449</sup> College recruitment has, since the invention of organized collegiate athletics, been a problem for observers. Sheldon writes that even in the late 1890s football captains were tasked with bringing in the best talent in the country, even if they were too poor or academically unqualified for traditional collegiate life. Success for the captain was determined by his ability to bring in a good recruiting class.”At times the captain visited the different preparatory schools, and by flattery and the promise of social favour secured some, while more substantial considerations were offered others” (Sheldon, 237). Rather than offering money straight up, players were proffered positions with high salaries and minimal responsibilities.

<sup>450</sup> Sheldon, 237.

<sup>451</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 240.

<sup>452</sup> Sheldon writes that, “Many of the points made by the Nation and the religious press were legitimate, but so strong was the animus of the writers, and so wholesale their denunciation, that they excited only the contempt and derision of the athletic faction” (Sheldon, 244).

<sup>453</sup> Sheldon, quoting a Francis Walker article in the *Harvard Graduate Magazine*, 251.

<sup>454</sup> Quoted in Sheldon, 256.

<sup>455</sup> Sheldon, 257.



## Bibliography

- Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen*, New York University, 1933.
- “National University: In the House of Representatives,” *Niles Weekly Register*. Edited by H. Niles, Franklin Press, 1817.
- “Report of the Rockfish Gap Commission on the Proposed University of Virginia, 1818,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- “The Yale Report,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- A Colored Philadelphian. "Letter to the Editor," *The Liberator Files: Boston Based Abolitionist Newspaper, Published by William Lloyd Garrison, 1831-1865*. 02/12/1831, [theliberatorfiles.com/colonization](http://theliberatorfiles.com/colonization). Accessed August 12, 2014.
- Adams, Herbert Baxter. *Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia*, US Government Printing Office, 1888.
- Adams, Jasper. “On the Relation between Trustees and Faculty, 1837,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Adams, John. “Warns Jefferson against Importing European Professors, 1825,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Altenbaugh, Richard. *Education for Struggle: The American Labor Colleges of the 1920s and 1930s*.” Temple University Press, 1990.
- Anderson, Perry. “Components of the National Culture,” *The New Left Review*, Issue 50, 1968.
- Bancroft, George. “On the Academic Man in Germany, 1819,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Barnard, F.A.P. “The Ideal College Officer,” *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Becker, Carl *Cornell University: Founders and the Founding*. Cornell University Press, 1944.

- Bernstein, Lee. "African Americans and the Criminal Justice System," *The Black Condition: Schomburg Studies on the Black Experience*. Edited by Howard Dodson and Colin Palmer, Michigan State University Press, 2008.
- Best, John Hardin "Education in the Forming of the American South," *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 36, Issue 1, 1996.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. *The Americans: The National Experience*. Vintage Books, 1965.
- Brechin, Gray. *Imperial San Francisco: Urban Power, Earthly Ruin*. University of California Press, 2006.
- Brittingham, Barbara. "Accreditation in the United States: How Did We Get to Where We Are." *New Directions for Higher Education*, Volume 145, 2009.
- Brubacher, John S. and Rudy, Willis. *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities*. Transaction Publishers, 1997.
- Church, Rober L. "Economists as Experts: The Rise of an Academic Profession in America 1870-1917," *The University in Society, Vol II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Cohen, Arthur, and Carrie B. Kisker. *The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergence and Growth of the Contemporary System*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Jossey-Bass, 2010.
- Cogswell, Joseph Green "On Life and Learning at Göttinggen, 1817," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Cooper, "Thomas Cooper's Defense of his Views," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Duffield, George. "The Michigan Regents Warn against Sectarianism, 1841," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Eelman, Bruce W., "An Educated and Intelligent People Cannot Be Enslaved": The Struggle for Common Schools in Antebellum Spartanburg, South Carolina." *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 44, Issue 2, 2004.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "Opinion on Southern Students, 1837," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

- Engel, Arthur. *The University in Society Volume I*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Engelhard, John. "A Southerner Argues for a 'Southern' Education in the Hendrick Case, 1856," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Everett, Edward. "Harvard's Need for State Funds," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- . "On the Proposed University of Virginia, 1820," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Findlay, James "Agency, Denominations and the Western Colleges, 1830-1860: Some Connections between Evangelicalism and American Higher Education," *Church History*, Volume 50, 1981.
- Fairchild, J.H. "On the Antislavery Commitment of Oberlin," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Finley, Robert. "On National Uniformity in Textbooks, ca. 1815," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Furman, Jeffrey L. and MacGarvie, Megan J. "Academic Science and the Birth of Industrial Research Labs in the U.S. Pharmaceutical Industry," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. Volume 63, 2007.
- Gaines, Philip. "The 'True Lawyer' in America: Discursive Construction of the Legal Profession in the Nineteenth Century," *The American Journal of Legal History*, Volume 45, Issue 2, 2001.
- Gawalt, Gerard, "Sources of Anti-Lawyer Sentiment in Massachusetts, 1740-1840," *The American Journal of Legal History*, Volume 14, Issue 4, 1970.
- Geiger, Roger. "Ten Generations of Higher Education," *American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges*. Edited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gunport, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Gilmer, F.W. "Mission for Jefferson, 1824," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of

- Chicago Press, 1961.
- Gifford, W.S. "Does Business Want Scholars," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Volume 14, Issue 7, 1928.
- Goodheart, Lawrence B. "Abolitionists as Academics: The Controversy at Western Reserve College, 1832-1833," *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 22, Issue 4, 1982.
- Gutman, Herbert G. "Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919," *The American Historical Review*. Volume 78, Issue 3, 1973.
- Hamilton, William. "The British Heritage," in *Canadian Education, a History*. Edited by J. Donald Wilson, Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Hawks, Francis. "A Southerner on Northern Attitudes of Educational Superiority in 1860," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Hessinger, Rodney. "'The Most Powerful Instrument of College Discipline': Student Disorder and the Growth of Meritocracy in the Colleges of the Early Republic." *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 39, Issue 3, 1999.
- Herbst, Jurgen. "Nineteenth-Century Schools between Community and State: The Cases of Prussia and the United States." *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 42, Issue 3, 2002.
- . "The Institutional Diversification of Higher Education in the New Nation: 1780-1820." *Review of Higher Education*. Volume 3, Issue 3, 1980.
- The History Group, "The Organization of Science: A Historical Outline of Science as a Social Activity," *Our History: Digital Archive*, History Group of the Communist Party, Volume 39, 1965. [banmarchive.org.uk/collections/shs/index\\_frameset1.htm](http://banmarchive.org.uk/collections/shs/index_frameset1.htm). Accessed 4 January, 2013.
- Hobsbawm, *Interesting Times: A Twentieth-Century Life*, Abacus, 2002.
- Humphries, Frederick. "1890 Land-Grant Institutions: Their Struggle for Survival and Equality," *Agricultural History*, Volume 65, Issue 2, 1991.
- Hutchins, Robert Maynard. *The Higher Learning in America*. Yale University Press, 1936.
- Jarausch, Konrad H. "The Sources of German Student Unrest 1815-1848," *The University in Society Volume II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974.

- Jefferson, Thomas. "Francis W. Gilmer's Mission for Jefferson, 1824," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- - - .. "Jefferson Plans the University of Virginia, 1800," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- - - . "Jefferson on the Educational Regime at Virginia, 1823," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution*. Doubleday Anchor Books, 1969.
- Johnson, Terence J. *Professions and Power*. The MacMillan Press LTD, 1972.
- Johnson, William, "Educational and Professional Lifestyles: Law and Medicine in the Nineteenth Century," *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 14, Issue 2, 1974.
- Katz, Michael B. "The Role of American Colleges in the Nineteenth Century," *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 23, Issue 2, 1983.
- Kemenetz, Anya. *DIY U: Edupunks, Edupreneurs and the Coming Transformation of Higher Education*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2010.
- Lemon, James, "Comment on James A Henretta's 'Families and Farms: *Mentalité* in Pre-Industrial America,'" *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Volume 37, Issue 4, 1980.
- Lindsley, Philip. "1832 Baccalureate," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- - - . "On the Condition of the Colleges, 1837," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- - - . "On the Inadequacy of Preparatory Schools, 1825," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- - - . "On the Problems of the College in a Sectarian Age, 1829," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

- Lucas, Christopher. *American Higher Education: A History*. St. Martin's Griffin, 1994.
- Madison, James "James Madison on a National University, 1810," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Marx, Karl. "Theories of Productive and Unproductive Labor, Chapter Four," *Theories of Surplus Value: Marxists.org*. 1861-1863. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1863/theories-surplus-value/ch04.htm>. Accessed 13 September 2013.
- McLachlan, James. "The *Choice of Hercules*: American Student Societies in the early 19<sup>th</sup> Century," *The University in Society: Europe, Scotland and the United States, Volume II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974.
- McPherson, James M. "The New Puritanism: Values and Goals of Freedmen's Education in America," *The University in Society, Volume II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Messenger, Rodney. "'The Most Powerful Instrument of College Discipline': Student Disorder and the Growth of Meritocracy in the Colleges of the Early Republic." *History of Higher Education Quarterly*, Volume 39, Issue 3, 1999.
- Miller, Howard. "Evangelical Religion and Colonial Princeton," *Schooling and Society: Studies in the History of Education*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Johns Hopkins Press, 1976.
- Minutes of the Board of Trustees. "'The Great Rebellion' at Princeton," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Volume 16, Issue 2, 1907.
- Moore, Kathryn McDaniel. "The Dilemma of Corporal Punishment at Harvard College," *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 14, Issue 3, 1974.
- - - . "Freedom and Constraint in 18th Century Harvard," *The Journal of Higher Education*. Volume 47, Issue 6, 1976.
- Naylor, Natalie A. "The Theological Seminary in the Configuration of American Higher Education: The Ante-Bellum Years," *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 17, Issue 1, 1977.
- Nearing, Scott. *American Education: Its Men, Ideas, and Institutions*. Arno Press & the New York Times, 1969.
- Nisbet, Charles. "Charles Nisbet Complains of Lazy Students and Educational Quacks, 1793," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

- Paschal, Mark. "Against the Humanities," *Viewpoint Magazine*, Issue 2, 13 Sept. 2012.
- Peset, Mariano. "Europe and the Universities," *The University, an Illustrated History*. Edited by Fernando Tejerina, Turner Publishing, 2011.
- Phillipson, Nicholas. "Culture and Society in the 18th Century Province: The Case of Edinburgh and the Scottish Enlightenment," *The University in Society, Vol II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Post, Charles. *The American Road to Capitalism: Studies in Class-Structure, Economic Development, and Political Conflict, 1620-1877*. Historical Materialism, 2012.
- Potts, David B. "College Enthusiasm!" As Public Response, 1800-1860." *Harvard Educational Review*, Volume 47, Issue 1, 1977.
- Rothblatt, Sheldon. "The Student Sub-Culture and the Examination System in Early 19th Century Oxbridge," *The University in Society Volume I*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Quincy, Josiah. "Plea for Educational Freedom, 1840," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Reynolds, Terry S. "The Education of Engineers in America before the Morrill Act of 1862," *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 32, Issue 4, 1992.
- Robson, David. "Enlightening the Wilderness: Charles Nisbet's Failure at Higher Education in Post-Revolutionary Pennsylvania," *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 37, Issue 3, 1997.
- Ruggles, Samuel. "The Case for the Appointment of Wolcott Gibbs, 1854," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Rush, Benjamin. "Benjamin Rush on a Federal University, 1788," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- . "On Republican Education, 1798," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- . "Thoughts Upon the Mode of Education Proper in a Republic," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Sheldon, Henry Davidson. *Student Life and Customs*. D. Appleton and Company, 1901.  
Sinclair, Upton. *The Goose-Step: A Study of American Education, Vol I*. Haldeman-Julius Publications, 1922.

Skowronek, Stephen. *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Silva, Edward T. and Sheila A. Slaughter. *Serving Power: The Making of the Academic Social Science Expert*. Greenwood Press, 1984.

Starrett, Helen Ekin. *After College, What? For Girls*. Thomas Y. Crowell & Company, 1896.

Stiles, Ezra. "On Changes in Yale Corporation, 1792," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Story, "Harvard Students, the Boston Elite, and the New England Preparatory System, 1800-1876," *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 15, Issue 3, 1975.

Strong, George Templeton. "The Gibbs Case, 1853-54," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Sturtevant, Julian. "On the Anti-intellectualism of the Evangelicals in Illinois in the 1830s," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

---. "On the Quality of Teaching at Yale in the 1820s," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

---. "Sectarian Background of Illinois Colleges," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Thelin, John. "The Attrition Tradition: in American Higher Education: Connecting Past and Present," *Future of American Education Project: The American Enterprise Institute*. 4/20/2010, [www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/AttritionTraditionThelin.pdf](http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/AttritionTraditionThelin.pdf). Accessed 7 July 2013.

Ticknor, George. "A General and Well-grounded Discontent," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

---. "Freedom and Scholarship in Germany," *American Higher Education: A*



- Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- . "On the Inadequacy of American Libraries, 1816," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- . "Ticknor and the Harvard Reforms of the 1820s," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- . "Ticknor Describes His Lectures at Harvard," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Turner, R. Steven. "Reformers & Scholarship in Germany," *The University in Society Volume II*. Edited by Lawrence Stone, Princeton University Press, 1974.
- United States, US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics. *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait*. Government Printing Office, 1993.
- Veblen, Thorstein. *The Higher Learning in America*, Sagamore Press Inc, 1957.
- Veysey, Laurence. *The Emergence of the American University*. The University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Vine, Phyllis, "The Social Function of Eighteenth-Century Higher Education." *History of Education Quarterly*, Volume 16, Issue 4, 1976.
- Wagoner, Jennings L. Jr. "Honor and Dishonor at Mr Jefferson's University: The Antebellum Years," *History of Education Quarterly*. Volume 26, Issue 2, 1986.
- Walters, Ronald. "American Political Systems and the Response of the Black Community," *The Black Condition: Schomburg Studies on the Black Experience*. Edited by Howard Dodson and Colin Palmer, Michigan State University Press, 2008.
- Wayland, Francis. "Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System, 1842," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Weber, Max. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Translated and Edited by H.H. Garth and C. Wright Mills, Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Webster, Daniel. "The Dartmouth College Case: Argument Before the Supreme Court of the United States, at Washington, on the 10<sup>th</sup> of March, 1818," *The*

*Great Speeches and Orations of Daniel Webster*. Beard Books, 2001.

Weyant, Jane G. "The Debate Over Higher Education in the South, 1850-1860," *Mississippi Quarterly*, Volume 29, Issue 4, 1976.

Whedon, Daniel. "Professor Whedon's Dismissal for Advocating 'The Higher Law,' 1851," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Woodward, A.B. "The Catholepistemiad, 1817," *American Higher Education: A Documentary History Vol I*. Edited by Richard Hofstrader and Wilson Smith, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Wren, Daniel A. "American Business Philanthropy and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century," *Business History Review*. Volume 57, Issue 3, 1983.

Wright, Gavin. "American Agriculture and the Labor Market: What Happened to Proletarianization?," *Agricultural History*, Volume 62, Issue 3, 1988.

Young, Robert. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Blackwell Publishing, 2001.