Rising expectations of donors and institutional size complicated colleges' governance. As their missions shifted away from protecting a distinct version of Protestantism and toward regional, and even national, competition for prestige among affluent Protestants, the relationships of governing boards, presidents, and faculty changed. The result was conflict. By World War I, as these colleges adapted to their modified missions, all four became more bureaucratized with roles more clearly differentiated and face-to-face community no longer a feasible ideal.

The declining role of denominations and clergy in college governance was the most visible change, though its effect on the behavior of governing boards defies expectations. Franklin and Marshall, the most determinedly denominational college, had the least intrusive trustees after 1890. Whereas the board of trustees ran many daily operations in the 1860s and 1870s, it was relatively unobtrusive after John Stahr became president in 1889. Thereafter the board usually met only during commencement week. Its Committee on Instruction was authorized to visit classrooms and oversee academic affairs, but in practice it made only cursory annual visits. The committee's reports invariably praised the faculty's work and seconded their request for additional equipment and instructors. There is little evidence of conflict between the faculty and the board of trustees; only one faculty request was rejected in this period.1

1. They rejected a faculty recommendation favoring coeducation. Franklin and Marshall College, Board of Trustees, Minutes (Franklin and Marshall Archives), 1890–1922.
After 1890, the trustees influenced Franklin and Marshall primarily through the power of the purse. The denomination’s financial limitations and the board’s refusal to permit presidents to court alumni in effect vetoed curricular innovation. The trustees, for instance, approved faculty proposals to bolster science offerings and to create a bachelor of science degree. But lack of funding stunted the science program for decades, leaving Franklin and Marshall as one of the last colleges in Pennsylvania to institute a B.S. degree.\(^2\) The fact that Franklin and Marshall had the fewest students and most limited curriculum of the four colleges on the eve of World War I was due, not to denominational hostility, but to the financial limitations of the relationship with the German Reformed church and dependence on the Lancaster area.

At Bucknell, trustees allowed more autonomy after the 1882 coup. Most of the trustees William Bucknell appointed lived hours away, mainly in Philadelphia, making meetings infrequent and campus oversight difficult. Although many were clergy, any inclination toward pastoral oversight was discouraged by distance. When wealthy businessmen joined the board in the 1890s and 1900s, the pattern of noninterventionist trustees was already established. The decline of clergy from 48 percent to 25 percent of the trustees in the 1890s improved fund-raising without changing the board’s campus role. By 1890 responsibility for most affairs had already passed to the president.

The most intrusive oversight was on the campus without clergy. Only Swarthmore’s governing board intervened in campus life persistently after 1890. Its determination to maintain guarded education was facilitated by the fact that many managers lived only a short railroad ride from campus. Their intrusion into campus affairs during the 1890s resulted in regular clashes with the president and the faculty. When President Magill retired in 1889, he was replaced by a noted Herbartian psychologist, Charles De Garmo. The managers were originally attracted by his reputation in teacher training and hoped he would revive the normal department. However, De Garmo wanted to move education courses—and Swarthmore—into the collegiate mainstream. While De Garmo and the faculty sought to raise Swarthmore’s standing in the academic world, the managers contin-

ued to emphasize guarded education within Hicksite traditions. They pressed him to enforce strict social regulations, increase Bible instruction, and maintain a high proportion of Quaker students and faculty. The managers were so sensitive to deviations from Quaker traditions that they called a special meeting before accepting a donation of two pianos. The conflict intensified in 1897 when the board rejected faculty proposals to permit students to attend off-campus church services and to create honor scholarships. De Garmo’s annual report expressed regret over the failure of Swarthmore to meet competition from other schools, and he resigned a few months later to accept a chair at Cornell University.³

The managers chose a more compatible successor, William Birdsall, the principal of a Friends secondary school and an ardently traditional Quaker. Birdsall launched an extensive recruiting drive with special emphasis on convincing midwestern Friends to send their children to Swarthmore rather than to state universities. Despite Birdsall’s vigorous recruiting and his popularity among older Friends, he could not attract enough younger ones. Enrollment declined, and the percentage of male students dropped to 40 percent of the class of 1902. For students, faculty, and some alumni, the increasing disparity between Swarthmore and prestigious colleges became painfully obvious. Birdsall resigned in 1902 and returned to secondary education.⁴

Joseph Swain’s arrival marked the end of the attempt by the managers to mold the school to traditional Quaker ideals. He accepted the presidency on the condition that the board would raise more money and fewer objections. The board’s executive committee continued to meet monthly, and a visiting committee inspected the campus weekly. But the managers delegated much more power to the
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president and the faculty. The managers' powerful instruction committee followed suit. In the 1890s it had even reviewed requests for minor pieces of equipment and actively participated in faculty appointments. A decade later, the committee no longer considered minor administrative details, and it shared the major decisions with President Swain. By 1915 the committee rubber-stamped the president's appointments and exercised discretion only in matters with major financial ramifications.\(^5\)

The other serious case of trustee intervention occurred, surprisingly, on the most university-oriented campus. At the very time Princeton was becoming a research university, disputes brought it national attention and trustee intrusion. The first incident resulted from dissatisfaction with the leadership of McCosh's successor, the Rev. Francis Patton, a conservative theologian who had been the prosecutor in the famous Briggs heresy trial. Although Patton did not impose his orthodox religiosity on the campus, his lackadaisical administration delayed movement toward university status, so valued by some powerful faculty and alumni. The drift particularly frustrated younger faculty who had trained in graduate schools and expected Princeton to embrace university values. By 1900 some of them created, over Patton's objections, a committee to reform the curriculum. By blocking its proposals, Patton forced a showdown. Dissident faculty joined with some former classmates of the McCosh era, by then rich and influential trustees, to force Patton out of office. He accepted a generous "golden parachute" in June 1902, and the trustees immediately elected one of the conspirators, Professor Woodrow Wilson, as his successor.\(^6\)

After four years of spectacular success, Wilson became embroiled in two disputes that nudged him out of Princeton and into politics. The quadrangle system proposal (see Chapter 6) and a dispute over
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locating the graduate school both created alliances between factions in the faculty and on the board. Wilson consulted only three faculty members before submitting his quadrangle plan to the trustees in June 1907. After a summer of alumni attacks, Wilson finally sought faculty support and won a preliminary vote, 80–32. The minority included older alumni faculty who opposed Wilson’s desire to replace the eating clubs with residential colleges. Unfortunately for Wilson, these alumni faculty, although less prestigious in the academic world than the younger nonalumni faculty, had close ties with some of the trustees. His plan was rejected.7

Eventually a similar split occurred in the battle over planning the proposed graduate college. Professor Andrew West gained exceptional power under Patton and, after administering a spectacular sesquicentennial celebration in 1896, was named dean of the graduate college. The trustees gave him almost complete autonomy over the incipient program and, to keep him from accepting an offer from MIT, promised generous financial support. West loyally supported Wilson’s expensive undergraduate curricular reforms, assuming that the next priority was his graduate school. When Wilson turned instead to the quadrangle plan, West felt betrayed and began to use his considerable influence with the trustees against Wilson. Grover Cleveland, chairman of the trustee’s Committee on the Graduate School and West’s intimate friend, was particularly influential in the dean’s behalf.8

Two bequests that offered to finance conflicting versions of the graduate college set off the second stage of the battle. Wilson envisioned graduate students living in the center of the campus and adding sophistication to undergraduate life. West, enamored with the ambiance of Oxford and Cambridge, wanted a self-contained graduate college with sumptuous social amenities. Both wanted to


thrust the collegiate tradition upward into graduate education, but their differences set off a celebrated conflict.  

Again Wilson sought faculty support when he began to lose ground with the trustees. A number of faculty, especially three senior professors recently recruited from rival universities, disliked West’s emphasis upon amenities. In 1908 they helped Wilson force West to accept oversight by a faculty committee. After Cleveland’s death the trustees’ Committee on the Graduate School also rallied to Wilson’s cause, but the whole board sided with West by a 14–9 vote in 1909. Wilson threatened to resign, splitting the trustees and delaying final action. He then toured alumni clubs and found that, although the New York and Philadelphia alumni opposed him, he had support elsewhere. With Wilson on the verge of at least partial victory, a third bequest left several million dollars to fulfill West’s plan. A few months later Wilson resigned to run for the New Jersey governorship, leaving behind a bitterly divided college.  

His campus battles gave him a handy if exaggerated political image as an opponent of privilege.

Princeton’s trustees overruled a majority of the faculty in both instances. Fund-raising efforts and the controversies brought alumni and trustees intrusively into university affairs. For fifteen tense months after Wilson’s resignation in 1910, a trustee served as acting president. During the interregnum the faculty argued with the trustees over chapel attendance and fellowships. The faculty finally requested that the board appoint representatives to meet with a faculty committee to promote “mutual understanding upon policies combining administrative and educational features.” After considerable agonizing, the trustees elected (on a 17–9 vote) John Hibben, a former Wilson intimate who had sided with West. Hibben’s election caused two of Wilson’s allies to resign from the board and withdraw their financial support. Several faculty members also left and others con-
sidered doing so, fearing that Hibben's election meant continued domination by the trustees and by faculty who supported West and were unsympathetic to true university values.12

Their fears proved to be unfounded. Hibben conciliated the warring factions, and most Wilson supporters remained at Princeton. West's critics gained places on the faculty and trustee committees overseeing the graduate college. Hibben voluntarily surrendered the president's prerogative over faculty appointments and increased the power of faculty committees.13

The decade of trustee activism at Princeton did not create a tradition of intervention. Faculty stars, now valued for their national reputations, lost the battles but won the war. By 1917 the board rubber-stamped most faculty decisions on academic and social affairs. By bringing peace to the campus President Hibben encouraged the trustees to limit their role to major financial and policy matters.14

On all four campuses, pastoral oversight by the governing boards was replaced by financial control by 1917. The proportion of clergy on the boards declined—but at these four colleges there was surprisingly little correlation between clerical trustees and board intervention.15 The two denominational colleges with heavily clerical boards had the least intrusion, while the one without clergy and the one moving toward university status experienced considerable trustee intervention. Clerical and nonclerical trustees both pulled back from intrusive campus oversight in the 1880s and 1890s. Thus, the rising proportion of businessmen and nonclerical professionals did not create the sharp break from pastoral habits. Generational change was much more significant. Younger trustees, regardless of profession, did not expect the colleges to protect a distinctive life-style, were more comfortable with the new student culture, and granted more autonomy to the president and faculty. Presumably, they were also
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more used to bureaucratic administration with clearly separated functions. On the other hand, rapid growth and the concomitant fund-raising created conflicts that extended the power of wealthy lay trustees (especially if they were alumni) into campus life. The lesson for presidents and faculty was that autonomy and financial support were enhanced by avoiding controversy.

Presidents controlled their campuses if they kept their institutions within the bounds of propriety. Increasingly they were promoters, campaigning for new buildings and programs and inspiring donors to match their rivals. Even Franklin and Marshall’s quiescent President Stahr continually pressed the trustees for new facilities and appointments.16 Presidents Harris, Swain, and Wilson tried to shape governing boards that would support growth and their policies. At Bucknell, Franklin and Marshall, and Princeton, the president was an ex officio member of most trustee committees before 1900. At Swarthmore the board of managers initiated policy until Joseph Swain’s arrival in 1902. Although not formally appointed to trustee committees until 1910, Swain immediately took the initiative and made managers spend their time reacting to his recommendations. Strong presidents like Swain, Harris, Wilson, and Apple cultivated an image of efficiency that fit business expectations.

The policies of the new entrepreneurial presidents suited the desire of many faculty members for institutional growth, but presidents came to share less and less else with faculty. The role of the president evolved from head of the faculty to chief administrator of the institution. The presidents’ withdrawal from teaching most concretely demonstrated the estrangement. Swarthmore’s President Swain was the first to abandon teaching. His two immediate predecessors taught several courses, though neither carried the heavy load that President Magill bore in the 1870s and 1880s. Similarly, Francis Patton and Woodrow Wilson taught one or two courses at Princeton each semester, a significant reduction from James McCosh’s backbreaking load. Wilson participated actively in departmental meetings and activities. President Hibben initially taught an ethics course but eventually dropped that last remnant of McCosh’s keystone senior course. At Franklin and Marshall, Henry Apple stopped teaching in 1914,

16. See Franklin and Marshall, Trustees, June 1894.
but a colleague's death forced him back into the classroom the next year. The tradition of a heavy presidential teaching load lasted longest at Bucknell, where John Harris taught all philosophy courses and averaged ten to fifteen hours a week in the classroom. His ethics lectures gave Harris weekly contact with every senior. Through these courses and a Sunday morning Bible class, Harris maintained an old tradition long after it was discarded at the other campuses. When Harris retired in 1919, it passed from the Bucknell scene too.

Institutional growth and trustee and faculty withdrawal from former duties made the executive function more onerous. After 1900, presidents repeatedly requested administrative assistance. The Princeton trustees refused to give President Patton a secretary, so he wrote all of his own letters. Woodrow Wilson had to be satisfied with undergraduate assistants until he suffered a partial physical collapse in 1906 and the trustees finally approved a full-time secretary. By 1916 Princeton employed sixteen full-time administrators. In 1900 Swarthmore hired a combination registrar and presidential secretary who also corrected sophomore essays and ran the Friends Historical Library. President Swain personally administered all scholarships, admissions, and purchases during his first four years in office. In 1906 he convinced the managers to raise the administrative budget, and he created several full-time administrative positions over the next decade. Swain’s correspondence reveals a major shift; his attention was increasingly taken up by architects, planners, and investors, and his relation to campus affairs was mediated through student and faculty committees. In 1902 President Stahr secured a part-time registrar to relieve Franklin and Marshall faculty from maintaining
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student records. The next year, Stahr’s request for a full-time assistant was granted only after an investigation by a trustee committee. But President Apple’s requests for additional personnel and a centralized accounting system in the 1910s were readily approved.21

These requests were more than responses to growth. Franklin and Marshall and Swarthmore in the 1910s were the size of Princeton in the 1870s. The new administrative positions reflected changing approaches to organization. They also resulted from trustee determination that student life continue to be regulated after faculty backed away from that duty. The result, as Laurence Veysey has argued, was an extensive bureaucracy unknown in European universities.22

The model of the entrepreneurial administrator-president spread rapidly, even to small colleges. While Patton seemed to confirm the notion that dynamic presidents had to be laymen, the careers of the Revs. John Harris, John Hibben, and Henry Apple demonstrate that clerical presidents could also be aggressive institution builders. Harris was a particularly fascinating combination of old and new conceptions of the presidency. His heavy teaching load and deep involvement in Baptist affairs continued traditional presidential functions. But his penchant for growth at any cost based on vocationally oriented curricula and vigorous public relations resembled the approach of Veblen’s “captains of erudition.” His administrative style was also transitional. Harris modeled himself upon older presidents who discharged a variety of functions single-handedly, yet even he eventually built a small bureaucracy.23

Harris ruled the faculty autocratically for thirty years, from 1889 to 1919. Under earlier presidents the faculty met weekly to record grades, deal with disciplinary cases, and discuss general matters. Harris only called the faculty together five or six times a year, bragging that such “meetings were strictly for business, whereby much time

was saved and harmony promoted."24 "Harmony" meant eliminating opportunities for faculty dissent. Decisions pertaining to individual faculty members were conveyed from Harris through department chairmen he appointed. Harris regulated faculty activity closely, even ordering a biologist to remove questions on reproduction from his exams. Another time he directed professors Lindemann and Davis to exchange sporty caps for respectable derbys. One professor recollected that "if one adjective were chosen to describe the Harris regime at Bucknell, it most probably would be _austere._"25

Harris made himself the only line of communication between the faculty and the trustees. He served on the board of trustees for several years before his election as president and, in 1894, was appointed an ex officio member of all trustee committees. The faculty did not send a single remonstrance to the board during Harris's thirty years in office. The remarkable display of apparent harmony demonstrated Harris's determination to delegate as little authority to faculty committees as possible. Dissatisfaction brewed beneath the surface; when Harris retired, the trustees immediately approved a reorganization establishing eight faculty standing committees and authorizing monthly faculty meetings.26

By 1917 similar administrative structures and presidential roles were developing at all four campuses. Princeton's size required greater complexity, but bureaucratization also proceeded on the three smaller campuses. The presidents built power bases and clearly differentiated themselves from the faculty. The managing boards increasingly restricted themselves to major policy decisions, especially financial ones. Routine matters that trustees and faculty dealt with in the 1870s and 1880s were delegated to the presidents, who, assisted by growing
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administrative staffs, increasingly controlled institutional policy after 1890.  

Increasing presidential power was a mixed blessing for faculty. The creation of an administrative staff released them from onerous chores. Faculty and presidents shared a commitment to institutional growth and actively sought support for it. But the growing professional self-consciousness of academics often clashed with presidential prerogatives.

In the 1870s and 1880s governing boards played active roles in faculty appointments at these four colleges. After 1890 they increasingly ceded the prerogative to presidents and even the faculty. At Bucknell, the trustees delegated the power to President Harris and their Committee on Instruction and Discipline; in practice the committee’s role was minor. Harris apparently made appointments with little faculty consultation. The board of trustees at Franklin and Marshall delegated the responsibility to a standing committee, but its role is unclear. The board of managers, acting through the instruction committee, controlled appointments at Swarthmore until Swain became president in 1902. His recommendations were routinely approved by the committee. President Patton, apparently from disdain for administrative drudgery, delegated the decisions to Princeton’s department chairmen. For instance, Professor Woodrow Wilson selected his only colleague in the new department of jurisprudence and political economy. As president, Wilson occasionally preempted the departments, but under his successor the faculty gained nearly complete control.
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Not surprisingly, the criteria for faculty appointments increasingly stressed training in graduate schools rather than theological seminaries. But, at least for the 1870s and 1880s, the significance of this transition has been exaggerated. Until the late 1800s theological seminaries offered the most advanced scholarship in the areas that became the humanities and social sciences. Until the disciplines matured and the graduate schools grew, hiring seminary graduates was appropriate and unavoidable. It was not until the 1890s that the universities began to offer an adequate alternative professional model and supply of Ph.D.'s. Between 1870 and 1890 the number of American faculty tripled from about five thousand to over fifteen thousand. Only one doctorate was awarded in the United States in 1870, and 1888 was the first year in which the number passed one hundred.32

After 1890, graduate schools rapidly surpassed the theological seminaries in the subject areas relevant to undergraduate education, and theological training became much less common for faculty. Even Harris and Patton, the most traditionally pious of the presidents, hired few faculty from seminaries. Franklin and Marshall moved away from clerical faculty more slowly. In 1909 nine of its fourteen faculty members were ordained ministers, and virtually all had studied in the Reformed theological seminary adjacent to the college in Lancaster. This high percentage resulted from the long tenures of several professors and the small science program; few faculty hired after 1910 had degrees in divinity.33 The ministerial tradition remained stronger in the trustees' choice of presidents. Woodrow Wilson, the son of a Presbyterian minister, was the only one of the six presidents who served at Franklin and Marshall, Princeton, and Bucknell between 1890 and 1917 who had no theological training. (Since the Society of Friends did not have a ministry, Swarthmore's presidents were laymen.)

Instead of hiring theological seminary graduates, the colleges found another way to recruit faculty with denominational and institutional loyalty: they appointed nonclerical alumni. The alumni connection


was nearly synonymous with religious affiliation to the sponsoring denomination. In addition, an alumnus had spent four years under the "proper" influences and could be expected to observe the basic Protestant amenities. President Harris was the most addicted to homegrown products: over 80 percent of his appointments were alumni. He maintained that "the best men for us [were] our own men," whereas outsiders took "years before they became an integral part of the life of the Institution."

Harris selected promising undergraduates as potential faculty and encouraged them to attend graduate school. When he had the funds to begin a civil engineering program, he sent a promising student, Charles Lindemann, to Harvard and upon Lindemann's return entrusted him with establishing the program. Several years later Walter Rhodes went to the University of Michigan for graduate study in electrical engineering with a similar promise, and in 1907 he returned to open the department. Harris assisted some students by convincing trustees to donate fellowships to support graduate work. Others were less fortunate; in 1915 he informed a young alumnus in the biology department that budgetary problems made this a good time to begin graduate study. The instructor borrowed money and enrolled at Columbia. The extreme inbreeding delayed Bucknell's accreditation by the American Association of Colleges until 1927 and by the American Association of University Women until 1931.

Franklin and Marshall College was less insistent on employing its own graduates, but most of its faculty had studied at the Reformed theological seminary in Lancaster. Although dependence upon the seminary continued into the twentieth century in the humanities, most science and social science professors appointed after 1890 arrived with some professional training or took leaves for additional university study.

With neither clergy nor many alumni to call upon, Swarthmore recruited university-trained scientists from its inception. Faculty in
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other subjects were hired from Friends secondary schools through the 1890s, although there was a growing emphasis on advanced degrees and alumni status. President Swain also went further afield and recruited some respected scholars such as John Miller, an astronomer from Indiana University.37

At Princeton, President Patton followed McCosh’s example of recruiting young alumni who had spent several years in graduate school. But Woodrow Wilson and his dean, Henry Fine, wanted to compete academically with universities and gave no preference to alumni. During Wilson’s eight-year presidency, the percentage of alumni in the total faculty dropped from 68 percent to 41 percent; the proportion in the junior faculty plummeted from 78 percent to 29 percent. There were only twelve alumni in the first group of forty-nine young preceptors, thirty-seven of whom had Ph.D.’s. Wilson also hired Princeton’s first Catholic and Jewish faculty. Concern with university status resulted in recruiting two Cambridge University mathematicians and in luring professors away from Missouri, Chicago, Pennsylvania, and Yale. But even for Wilson, concern with character was not totally excluded in favor of scholarly standards; he wanted scholars who were “clubbable” gentlemen.38

As doctorates became valuable commodities for institutional reputations, colleges began awarding honorary degrees to their own faculty. All four colleges used this device to bolster their faculties’ credentials. Although this had gone on before, it was especially widespread between 1890 and 1910 at these colleges and nationwide. By World War I the requirements for awarding honorary degrees were more standardized, and incestuous honorary degrees fell into disrepute as faculties began to fill with earned doctorates.39

College teaching became a more distinct vocation at all four campuses after 1890. In the 1870s and 1880s the existence of preparatory and normal programs blurred the distinction between secondary and higher education and the identity of college faculty; the threat dis-

37. Swarthmore, Register; Phoenix 6 (May 1886): 15; Friends Intelligencer 43 (16 May 1885), 50 (7 October 1893), 57 (31 March and 23 June 1900); selected correspondence, 1898–1902, Birdsall Presidential Papers.
appeared in the following decades. Princeton eliminated its short-lived preparatory school in the early 1880s. Swarthmore dropped its normal program in the 1880s and its preparatory classes in the early 1890s. Bucknell and Franklin and Marshall retained their secondary schools, but college faculty were rarely asked to teach in them after 1890.

Growing use of administrative staff and faculty committees eliminated duties that had once consumed faculty time. In the 1870s and 1880s the faculties, meeting as a whole, passed judgment upon changes in courses, disciplinary cases, admissions policies, and other details of campus life. Beginning in the 1890s, such responsibilities were delegated to ad hoc or standing faculty committees or to newly established registrars and deans. Faculty regulation of student behavior shifted from disciplining individuals to regulating organizations. After 1890 the number of discipline cases brought to the faculty dropped markedly. But the obsession of students with extracurricular life, especially athletics, became a thorn in the side of all faculties. They set up rules requiring good academic standing of participants, limiting the number of athletic contests and road trips, approving organizational constitutions, and overseeing the finances of the frequently insolvent student groups. Faculties tentatively began to share some responsibility for regulation with students through honor systems, joint committees, and student governments.

The academic structure also became more compartmentalized. Departments had existed in name for decades, but most had only one or two members and few functions before 1900. Institutional growth and disciplinary specialization made departments functional at Princeton during Wilson’s presidency. Departments started playing a role at Bucknell and Swarthmore by 1910. Smaller Franklin
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and Marshall did not divide academic duties along departmental lines until the 1920s. These colleges experienced a limited form of the internal differentiation that characterized the emerging universities.

While faculty duties and departmental structure became well established in this period, academic freedom and tenure were barely extant in these institutions. Despite a lack of de jure protections, faculty enjoyed surprising de facto security. Woodrow Wilson's voluminous papers give a comprehensive picture unavailable for other presidencies. They disclose that, under special powers granted to him by the trustees to reorganize the faculty, he dismissed a French professor for lackadaisical teaching. The resulting outcry forced Wilson to grant him an extra year. Thereafter Wilson was loath to use that power and, except for one forced retirement, removed no other professors. Both terminations resulted from inadequate teaching rather than issues of academic freedom. If other presidents removed faculty, the limited records hide the action. The long careers suggest that arbitrary termination was rare. Princeton was the first to offer formal security by creating a tenure system in 1915.

Only one clear violation of academic freedom surfaces in the records of the four colleges. German-born Franklin and Marshall professor Richard Schiedt publicly supported his homeland in World War I from the outbreak of hostilities. After American intervention the board of trustees declared that it "neither could nor would tolerate divided allegiance in the teaching force of the College" and appointed a committee to deal with the errant professor. Schiedt resigned shortly thereafter, in spite of one trustee's vigorous objections. This action, brought on by the passions of war and the vulnerability of an institution with a German heritage, stands out as an
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exception. Although records do not show how many nonconformists were not hired or were stifled after being hired, overt violations of academic freedom were uncommon. The creation of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915 provided procedural recourse for some; faculty from Swarthmore and Princeton joined immediately, and a Bucknell professor joined in 1920.47

The creation of vested pensions provided more tangible security for faculty. The absence of dependable retirement benefits no doubt caused great anxiety to any faculty member who was not independently wealthy. Trustees sometimes awarded limited ad hoc pensions. At the turn of the century they became more common, though small. President Magill and Professor Beardsley, each of whom served Swarthmore for over thirty years, received $500 annually. Freeman Loomis, a professor at Bucknell for thirty-five years, received $600 and a room in his first year of retirement; the sum was reduced to $400 the second year and to $200 the third.48
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48. Swarthmore, Executive Committee, 13 April 1906; Bucknell, Trustees, 20 June 1899, 19 June 1900, 18 June 1901.
Establishment of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1906 radically improved the situation. The foundation offered faculty pensions to all nonsectarian institutions. Princeton qualified immediately. Swarthmore, after failing to establish its own pensions, dropped the formal requirement that managers be Quakers in order to qualify. Bucknell did not apply to the foundation, opting for an ultimately unsuccessful scheme to establish pensions among Baptist colleges. Franklin and Marshall's board rejected President Apple's plan to reduce the number of trustees elected by the Reformed synods in order to qualify. But when ex-President Stahr retired from the faculty in 1915, he received a twelve-hundred-dollar pension—higher than any previously awarded. All four colleges either joined the pension fund or were forced to consider alternatives.49

The Carnegie pension, tenure systems, and the AAUP increased formal faculty security. Departmental structures and the elimination of nonteaching duties protected faculty from unprofessional pressures. Clearly the professionalized faculty who were starting to dominate by 1917 had gained considerably more autonomy than their predecessors. The results of professionalization for salary, standard of living, and social status, however, were less positive.

Professionalization brought higher pay and greater privileges for well-known faculty, as colleges came to value their academic reputations. This increased bargaining power was demonstrated most dramatically at Swarthmore. The board of managers cut faculty salaries by 10 percent for several years around the time of the depression of 1893. But a decade later they capitulated to the demands of Professor John Lowes, who threatened to accept an offer from Indiana University unless the managers pledged one thousand dollars annually for the English section of the library and gave him an assistant.50 Astronomer John Miller conditioned his acceptance of a Swarthmore


50. Swarthmore, Committee on Instruction, 9 March 1896, 14 April 1896, 18 September 1906. Lowes accepted an offer from Harvard several years later. See Friends Intelligencer 60 (20 June 1903): 393 for an expression of the need to pay more to meet competition from universities.
appointment upon the purchase of a 24-inch telescope. Having ar­
ranged this, President Swain conveyed the good news and added, “But remember this is a Friends' College and thee should give up thy smoking. Please wire thy acceptance.” When Miller balked at giving up the noxious weed, Swain backed down.51

In 1892 the University of Illinois offered Woodrow Wilson its pres­
idency at $6,000, twice his Princeton salary. President Patton resisted making a counteroffer to avoid “invidious distinctions” among the faculty. He finally raised Wilson’s salary to $3,500 and gave him an assistant. Five years later, to counter an offer to head the University of Virginia for $4,000 and a house, several trustees created a secret annual $2,500 subsidy. A decade later such enticements were com-

51. "Quaker Astronomer: John A. Miller," clipping from The Sky (March 1941), Faculty Papers (Friends Historical Library).
mon: a trustee openly built a rent-free house that lured an eminent University of Pennsylvania biologist to Princeton rather than Yale. In 1914 a noted botanist successfully demanded “facilities for carrying forward my chosen lines of investigation, and freedom to control the number and character of students accepted to work in my classes.” Bucknell and Franklin and Marshall continued to rely heavily upon their own graduates and were less involved in bidding for faculty.

Star professors clearly benefited from the new academic marketplace. Those lacking a national reputation or working in institutions not seeking one fared less well. Salaries remained fairly static. At Bucknell and at Franklin and Marshall, professional salaries rose slightly but remained in the $1,500 range. Swarthmore paid its established professors about $2,000 in the 1890s and 1900s; their pay rose to about $3,000 after 1910. Wilson’s $3,500 made him the highest paid Princeton faculty member in the early 1890s. A quarter-century later, that would still have been higher than the salaries of all but a few full professors recruited from other universities at about $4,000.

The academic star system meant that salary disparities among faculty grew considerably. In 1890 the highest paid professors typically received about 25 percent more than the lowest paid, and there were relatively few faculty in the lower ranks. Except for the stars, that relative equality among senior faculty continued. But the number of junior faculty grew rapidly at Swarthmore and Princeton. In 1915 Swarthmore had fourteen professors, each making about $3,000; eight assistant professors in the $1,500–2,000 range; and fourteen instructors receiving $800 to $1,200. Princeton hired large numbers in the lower two ranks at similar salaries. Wilson hired his preceptors at salaries ranging from $1,400 to $2,000 in 1905. When Princeton created a tenure system for assistant professors in 1915, they received a salary of $2,000. Princeton also hired a number of “assistants,” presumably graduate students, at $425.

The differential between presidential and faculty salaries also grew. Before 1890, presidents made only marginally more than professors.

52. Link, Papers of Wilson, 7:609–35, 10:481–531; Bragdon, 227; Myers, 57–58; Mulder, 135–56.
Franklin and Marshall’s John Nevin made $1,500 in the 1860s, while his colleagues received $1,200. James McCosh made $4,000 when Princeton professors were paid $3,400. But his successor was making $8,000, twice the salary of any professor except Wilson, when he left office in 1902. John Harris and Joseph Swain also made about twice the salary of their faculty colleagues. Only President Apple of Franklin and Marshall remained in the same salary range as his faculty.54

Faculty were relatively well paid in comparison with the average American. In 1890 the mean income of American clerical workers was $848, and for industrial workers it was $486. The highest salary at these four colleges in the 1890s was Woodrow Wilson’s $3,500. Typical salaries for professors ranged from $1,400 to $2,000. Presidential salaries were equal to Wilson’s professorial pay. By 1910 the national average for clerical workers was up to $1,156; for industrial workers, $630. The highest paid professors were receiving $4,000, with most between $1,500 and $2,200. When the rank of assistant professor emerged, the pay was typically about $1,500. Thus, the average faculty member remained well ahead of clerical workers and far ahead of industrial workers, but the differential was declining.55

How can these figures be reconciled with frequent complaints about impoverished faculty? The exaggerated laments served the purposes of university reformers seeking financial support for the new academic order. But there was some basis for the deeply felt sense of deprivation. Faculty salaries were in relative decline. Salaries in many other occupations rose sharply between 1890 and World War I, a rise matched in academia only by stars. This was part of a long-term relative decline; Colin Burke estimates that faculty made 7.5 times as much as the average unskilled laborer in 1850, a ratio that declined to 5.2 in 1890, 3.3 in 1920, and about 2 in recent decades.56 In

54. Salaries derived from trustees minutes and scattered institutional histories.
addition, faculty families usually conformed to the middle-class ideal of a single breadwinner; multiple-earner working-class families could, in favorable conditions, approach the income of professional families. Young faculty in the new junior positions could find themselves temporarily behind working-class families when few faculty would have doubted their right to incomes several times greater than those of the working class.

Worse for the faculty psyche, the average American was not their frame of reference. Many of their neighbors were doctors, lawyers, and businessmen, whose incomes were rising rapidly. The trustees and many students came from upper-class families that were making the greatest gains in a booming economy. Even the highly paid Princeton faculty suffered by comparison in a community that attracted a growing number of plutocrats after Grover Cleveland retired to it from the White House in 1897. Faculty compared themselves with other professionals and corporate executives—in other words, with their neighbors and students' parents—and most were not keeping up. Like many professionals in the Progressive Era, professors felt squeezed from above and below by the working class and the wealthy.

The two institutions that openly bid in the new academic marketplace paid higher salaries. But correlation is not causation. While the two colleges most committed to the academic revolution, Princeton and Swarthmore, paid higher wages, that differential largely preceded the reforms. In the late 1860s an educationally traditional Princeton paid about twice the salaries offered to faculty in Lewisburg or Lancaster. Once Swarthmore decided to be solely a college in about 1890, it began to pay about one and one-half times that of the two other Pennsylvania colleges, while Princeton continued at about twice their salaries. When Princeton and Swarthmore both plunged into academic reform at the turn of the century, the differentials remained. The main difference was that a few academic stars negotiated higher salaries, but large numbers of young faculty were slotted into new junior categories—thus keeping the average differential about the same. Rather than the academic revolution lifting salaries, the causation may be reversed; already affluent colleges were the ones that could take part.

57. Frank Stricker reached similar conclusions about the disparity between faculty laments and their relative comfort. Stricker, 251–56; Mulder, 188.
Although professionalization did not bring high salaries for most faculty, many apparently lived well. Unfortunately, it is difficult to measure their economic status. Many faculty probably brought family money with them and lived beyond their salary. Because the census dropped direct measures of wealth after 1870, faculty wealth in later decades is a matter of conjecture. The most useful indicator that can be teased from the census is the number of servants living with the family, which was recorded in all five extant censuses from 1860 through 1910. Over the whole period, faculty were twice as likely to have servants (58 percent) as their neighbors (29 percent), and over six times as likely as the community (9 percent). Faculty were three times more likely than their neighbors to employ more than one servant, and thirteen times more likely than the community (Table 8).

If the figures are broken down by period, there is evidence that the relative standing of faculty members declined after 1890. From 1860 to 1880, 77 percent of faculty homes included servants; this declined to 46 percent for 1900 and 1910. The proportion of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Servants</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Neighbors</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 315</td>
<td>N = 517</td>
<td>N = 927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


58. For the methodology used to analyze the 1860, 1870, and 1880 census data in Tables 8 and 9, see Chapter 3, notes 3–7. The latter censuses used were 1900 (reels 982, 1406, 1423–25, and 1488) and 1910 (reels 896–97, 1338–40, 1352–55, and 1423). I located about two-thirds of the faculty in 1900 and 1910. “Neighbors” are the five households listed above and below the faculty member; “community” is the college’s political unit. In 1900 and 1910, that was Lancaster City, Princeton Township and Borough, Lewisburg Borough, and Swarthmore Borough. In selecting “neighbors” and “community,” I used sampling ratios that would yield about fifty cases for each category at each college.

Home ownership was not a meaningful category because some of the most affluent faculty rented, perhaps from the college. I counted “domestics,” “companions,” “nurses,” and “housekeepers” as “servants,” which biased the data against my conclusion.
neighbors with servants remained between one-quarter and one-third. In the community the percentage dropped from 11 percent to 7 percent.\(^{59}\) If servants continued to be an accurate indicator of wealth after 1870, faculty continued to be affluent in the following decades, but their relative advantage declined—slightly in comparison with the general community, sharply in comparison to their neighbors. Fewer twentieth-century faculty enjoyed the luxury of servants, though they were still dramatically more likely to have servants than the average American.

Comparing the professions of faculty neighbors to those of the community provides another indicator of status (Table 9). Throughout the period, faculty neighborhoods were about three times more likely to contain professionals or proprietors of large enterprises (23.5 percent) than the community in general (8.8 percent). Fewer of their neighbors were manual workers and small businessmen (47.7 percent) than was typical in the general population (65.9 percent). The elusive category "none" (in which I included the retired) probably masks a greater disparity between faculty neighbors and the general community. It seems that many reporting "none" who lived near faculty were independently wealthy, a condition sometimes indicated by phrases like "living on own income." "None" in other parts of town was often linked with indicators of poverty.

Thus, most faculty in these colleges lived in affluent neighborhoods among doctors, lawyers, ministers, and businessmen, and many were able to hire servants. Their income, wealth, and household structure clearly distinguished them from most of the community. However, after 1890 the differential, as measured by salaries and servants, was decreasing, suggesting that although faculty continued to live in elite neighborhoods, their position within those neighborhoods declined.

Thus, professionalization was not synonymous with prestige and wealth; rather, it signified change in reference groups and adjust-

\(^{59}\) In the 1900 and 1910 censuses street addresses were recorded, enabling me to choose those living within five houses on the same street. This makes the 1900 and 1910 neighbor cohort a better sample but skews comparisons with the data from the 1860, 1870, and 1880 censuses, biasing the data in favor of my thesis. For that reason I have not compared the figures in tabular form. The resulting data indicated that the percentage of neighbors with servants declined minutely from 28.6 percent to 28.0 percent. If I had continued the sampling method as used for 1860–1880, the resulting data would probably show that the proportion of neighboring households containing servants declined modestly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Proprietor</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business/Craftsmen</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi- and Skilled Manual</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Manual</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 571  N = 927  N = 262  N = 470  N = 309  N = 457

ment to a nationalizing society. With the academic revolution, faculty, like other professionalizing groups, moved along the spectrum from "localism" toward "cosmopolitanism." Their predecessors had participated in a local and regional intellectual life that was largely composed of nonacademics. A professionalized academic culture became a viable alternative in this century as a truly national society and economy emerged. University-trained faculty were part of a national and even international academic life but were probably more isolated intellectually from nonacademic professionals.

The advantages of academic professionalization have often been exaggerated by denigrating the intellectual role of religion in nineteenth-century colleges. As seen above, however, theology provided an umbrella for concerns later labeled the humanities and social sciences. Denominational organizations and publications provided sources of social and intellectual community that were not carried on by younger professors. Franklin and Marshall faculty members published prolifically on various subjects in the Reformed Church Review. Richard Schiedt, for instance, regularly published articles on science and politics. Faculty often served on the editorial board. But by 1915 only the older faculty participated. The Presbyterian (and Reformed) Review and the Princeton College Bulletin provided similar outlets for Princeton's professors. After Wilson became president, faculty published almost solely in the new disciplinary journals. The Northumberland Baptist Association remained a focal point for some senior members of Bucknell's faculty. Some Swarthmore faculty played important roles in liberalizing Quakerism and healing the Orthodox-Hicksite split through summer schools, articles in the Friends Intelligencer, and activism within the Meeting. They were leaders in the creation of the American Friends Service Committee in 1917, and two Swarthmore history professors, William Hull and Jesse Holmes, were part of the five-man delegation to the All Friends Conference held in London in 1920.


declined at all four campuses among faculty hired after 1900, but the transition was slow.

Some bridged the old and new academic cultures. Henry Van Dyke of Princeton was a professor of English, an alumnus, and a Presbyterian minister who did graduate work at Princeton Theological Seminary and in Germany. His appointment symbolized the change from McCosh’s evangelical Presbyterianism to the more genteel style of Patton and Wilson. Van Dyke wrote *The Story of the Other Wise Man*, a saccharine Christmas story still in print. A champion of liberal theology, he chaired the committee that modernized the Presbyterian *Book of Common Worship* in 1903. At the same time, he was a leading defender of literary idealism in professional circles. Swarthmore’s John Lowes traveled farther toward the new scholarship. He began his career as professor of ethics and Christian evidences at Hanover College in Indiana. He had English added to his title and eventually left for doctoral studies at Harvard, where he fell under the spell of philologically based criticism. Swain then hired Lowes as one of Swarthmore’s new academic breed. Lowes later returned to Harvard and was elected president of the Modern Language Association. Careers like these show that the old and new academic models are not dichotomous. There were many transitional figures.

By World War I all four campuses were bureaucratizing, progressively differentiating functions among presidents, faculties, and governing boards. Trustees, clerical and lay alike, increasingly left administration to the presidents and concerned themselves with policy and finances. Faculties reduced the time spent on duties other than teaching and research; they traded their former roles for autonomy. Presidents slowly acquired staffs to take over those duties and separated their lives and their salaries from those of faculty members. Energetic presidents consolidated considerable power and established themselves as the channel of communication among faculty, trustees, and other constituents.


The period between 1890 and 1917 has often been depicted as a golden age for faculty, the time when they escaped the limits of denominational colleges for the dynamism of universities. But the faculty experience at these four colleges defies such clear-cut dichotomization. It is even problematic that the academic revolution produced monetary and status gains for faculty. At these four colleges in the late nineteenth century they were part of a local elite and leaders of genteel culture. Faculty status and wealth apparently did not increase after the turn of the century, even at the two institutions participating in the academic marketplace. Instead, these case studies support Colin Burke's conclusion that there was an inverse relation between relative economic standing and professionalization. As university-trained faculty formed a new academic profession and culture, they freed themselves from some social and intellectual limitations and established their place in the emerging national culture. Between 1890 and 1915 professorial life became a more specialized and professional calling, in which faculty achieved greater control over their work at the cost of greater isolation from the local society. They lost some of the benefits of a less exclusive academia, as did society. Histories of academic professionalization have described the ultimate result well, but have often oversimplified the process.

64. Burke, 232–33.