A British invasion, a recent merger, a takeover, and stockholders quarreling with management: these late twentieth-century news items could also describe the four colleges in the twenty-five years after Appomattox. The denominational and local groups that controlled the colleges in 1865 could not provide sufficient revenue to satisfy the colleges' postbellum ambitions. The rapid industrialization of the mid-nineteenth century created new potential donors. Most shared the colleges' traditional denominational and ethnic affiliations, but some were young urbanites for whom the affiliation had a different meaning. In the next quarter-century, each college was shaken by conflict between the denominationalism and localism that shaped the antebellum institutions and new versions of those traditions.

These side currents of industrialization and urbanization affected each college differently. Each was at the intersection of a unique convergence of forces. It is therefore necessary to examine the particular dynamics within each college community separately in this chapter before examining common patterns in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Of the four institutions, the College of New Jersey was in the best position to tap the new sources of wealth. In the 1850s and 1860s, Princeton College had lost its intellectual edge and national clientele, but it retained some prestige in the Middle Atlantic states, especially among Scottish and Scottish-Irish Presbyterians. Princeton needed to capitalize on their loyalty if it was to regain its former eminence and keep pace with colonial rivals like Harvard and Yale.

The selection of a new president in 1868 to replace the aged John Maclean exposed the denominational forces contesting the college's
future. The college had to choose between continuing as the bastion of Old School “high church” Presbyterianism or adopting a Presbyterianism more compatible with mainstream evangelical Protestantism. The strongest support for continuity came from local ministers, especially several who taught at Princeton Theological Seminary while sitting on the college’s board of trustees. The Presbyterian church exercised no official control, but Presbyterians dominated college governance. Until 1901 one-half of the trustees had to be clergymen; no denominational affiliation was specified, but the self-perpetuating board normally appointed Presbyterians. The leading Old School Presbyterian theologian, the Rev. Charles Hodge, presided over the trustees. The board’s first choice for president was a leading opponent of the new biblical criticism on the theological seminary faculty. One alumnus expressed the progressives’ dismay that the trustees had “cut a plug out of the prow to stop a leak in the stern of the old ship.”

When the candidate declined, the board made a more daring choice. Princeton’s enrollments and reputation had been sinking for two decades, and while the dominant faction of the trustees wanted loyalty to Old School Presbyterianism, they also sought educational respectability. Lacking another candidate with all of the desired qualifications, the board went outside American Old School Presbyterianism. Echoing John Witherspoon’s appointment a century earlier, they turned to the home of Presbyterianism, Scotland, to recruit someone who had been outside the Old School/New School schism and who would bestow the aura of European academic respectability on Princeton.

The Rev. James McCosh, a Scot teaching at the Scotch-Irish Queens University in Belfast, was well known to American Presbyterians. His philosophical and religious writings were more popular in the United States than in Great Britain, where Scottish philosophy was out of fashion. Assisted by his American publisher, Robert Carter, a New York–based Scottish immigrant, McCosh toured American colleges in 1866. Fortuitously, both the New and Old School Presbyterians were meeting simultaneously in St. Louis, seeking to end their schism.

2. F.B.H. to Kittie, 10 April 1868, McCosh Papers (Princeton University Manuscript Collection).
Both sides accorded McCosh a place of honor. McCosh briefly visited Princeton on his trip east. He returned to Belfast after attacking Mill, Comte, Spencer, and the pantheists before an appreciative audience of New York Presbyterians.

Two years later he was offered Princeton's presidency. The *New York Observer*, the leading Presbyterian newspaper, had reported McCosh's trip very approvingly. Its editor, Irenaeus Prime, was a Princeton trustee who may have nominated McCosh. His involvement in the evangelical alliance must have worried the Old School faithful like Hodge. But the chance to recruit an internationally known Presbyterian educator on the centennial of John Witherspoon's migration to Princeton apparently overcame the trustee's misgivings about McCosh's evangelicalism.³

Although historians have usually labeled McCosh an educational conservative, he dramatically reformed Princeton. At the inaugural, Charles Hodge's welcoming address pointedly warned against major departures. McCosh reassuringly couched his proposals in language reminiscent of the Yale Report of 1828, but they were a departure for Princeton. He believed religion and science were easily reconciled and was even willing to expose students to agnostic scientists. Modern languages and literature would receive more attention. Scholarship should be promoted, albeit with more attention to teaching and spiritual oversight than occurred in the German universities.⁴

McCosh quickly implemented many of his designs. In twenty years McCosh renovated the curriculum and faculty, transformed the campus, and increased the student body from 264 to 604. By the time of his departure in 1888, Princeton had a considerably strengthened faculty and a rising reputation within and beyond academia.

How did McCosh achieve these reforms in the face of opposition from influential members of the board of trustees? Some credit surely goes to the president's remarkable energy, despite beginning his twenty-year term at the age of fifty-seven. He astutely played the trustees and faculty against each other. In addition, McCosh's timing was


good; the recent healing of the Presbyterian church schism made his brand of evangelicalism more acceptable. But personal energy, educational reforms, and denominational peace alone cannot explain this remarkable growth. 

The educational reputation of Princeton may have sunk in the two decades before McCosh’s appointment, but it could still draw upon a valuable social reputation. Princeton had been reduced to a regional institution by the 1860s, but since its region included New York and Philadelphia, parochialism did not mean pauperism. McCosh, an experienced fund-raiser for the Scottish Free church, quickly exploited the opportunity. In his first fifteen months, donations of over $150,000 endowed two professorships, financed a gymnasium and a classroom building, and increased the endowment. 

In twenty years McCosh raised almost $3 million. Some funds came from alumni, but most came from businessmen with an ethnoreligious affinity for the college. McCosh was particularly well suited to exploit Princeton’s historic connections with Presbyterianism and Scottishness. The largest contributor was John C. Green, a Presbyterian who built a fortune on the China trade. Green was not college-educated but was devoted to Presbyterian causes. The new gymnasium was donated by Robert Bonner, a Scotch-Irish immigrant who became the publisher of the New York Ledger and president of the Scotch-Irish Society of New York City. Robert Stuart, a first-generation Scottish-American sugar magnate from New York, contributed $100,000. John A. Stewart, an associate of John Jacob Astor and Peter Cooper, was also drawn to Princeton by its Scottish Presbyterianism. So too were many smaller donors and many of the contacts McCosh made in the Midwest. Princeton received particularly strong support from the Scotch-Irish Pittsburgh elite, including the steel duo of Jones and Laughlin. McCosh had a genius for promoting Princeton in a way that provided a sense of community and respectability to a group not yet fully accepted or at home in America.

Official denominational contributions were minimal. The only of-


ficial support was the New Brunswick Presbytery's annual donation of several prizes and scholarships for six to eight Princeton undergraduates who planned to enter the ministry. Except for an 1887 admonition urging "the Churches of Princeton and the Faculty of the College to use their influence in closing the saloons in the place," the presbytery's reports on college activities were perfunctory and approving. McCosh reduced Princeton Theological Seminary's influence on the college.\(^7\) The financial payoff of Princeton's denominational connection came from individual rather than official sources.

McCosh also promoted a sense of community among alumni. He encouraged the development of local alumni clubs, traveling often to speak at their meetings. He also championed alumni representation on the board of trustees. The trustees rejected this innovation, crimping McCosh's solicitation of funds. Although gifts prompted by ethnoreligious loyalty funded most of McCosh's projects, he perceived the value of the new relationship. It could, however, be a two-edged sword. Many younger alumni embraced the new collegiate life-style, centered on athletics and fraternities, that McCosh found repugnant. His abolition of fraternities in the early 1870s pitted him against many younger New York alumni, some of whom were related to benefactors and trustees. The college's rising reputation also attracted wealthy Episcopalians, whose conspicuous consumption offended the president. By successfully tapping funds to build an attractive campus, McCosh unintentionally promoted a life-style he detested.\(^8\)

McCosh's influence declined in the late 1870s. The board's opposition to alumni representation as well as McCosh's discomfort with the new student life-style alienated some affluent alumni. Traditional Presbyterian trustees who disapproved of McCosh's liberal Presbyterianism and educational innovations regained the initiative and blocked McCosh's desire to start a graduate school. When McCosh retired in 1888, they rejected his choice of a successor, a young genteel scholar with liberal Presbyterian leanings, and replaced him with an ardent conservative.\(^9\)

7. Presbytery of New Brunswick, Minutes, 1876–1902 (Presbyterian Historical Society). Passage quoted is from 4 October 1887.


McCosh has often been cited as the archdefender of the old-time denominational college. The rhetoric of his late-career battles with Harvard's President Eliot has obscured his innovations. His broadly evangelical Victorian piety placed him in the Protestant mainstream. When McCosh left, the trustees tried to reestablish Princeton's close ties to the traditionalist minority in Presbyterianism. To be sure, Princeton would not long retain McCosh's evangelical Protestantism, but neither would it reclaim the traditional piety of Old School Presbyterianism nor sustain its Scotch-Irish identity. McCosh's success in attracting the scions of the new industrial wealth would draw Prince-
ton toward an affluent gentlemanliness that shunned evangelicalism, piety, and ethnicity.

In Lancaster, Pennsylvania, another Calvinist college stayed even closer to its traditional base. The aftermath of the Civil War, which had come within a few miles of Lancaster, brought Franklin and Marshall College under the formal control of the German Reformed church. When the class of 1866 numbered only six and finances were desperate, the trustees acted. They removed the president as well as James Buchanan, the president of the board of trustees, and coaxed noted theologian John W. Nevin out of retirement to be president. The trustees legally bound the college to the German Reformed church with a new charter granting the synod the right to name all trustees in exchange for its promise to raise $100,000 and move the theological seminary from Mercersburg to join the college in Lancaster.¹⁰

Lancaster was the economic hub of south-central Pennsylvania. The market town for agriculturally rich Lancaster County, the city also had an industrial base, especially in pig iron and cotton textiles. Between 1850 and 1880, the number of people employed in manufacturing plants in Lancaster grew from 1,688 to 4,252, and the capital invested in manufacturing grew from $895,285 to $3,795,740. Despite the city's growth, its economy was increasingly controlled by Philadelphians. By 1890 the boom was over, and textiles, iron, and cigar-making were declining. Other industries replaced them, but Lancaster was clearly a secondary city.¹¹

In 1890 Lancaster remained a heavily Germanic city. The Lutheran, German Catholic, and Reformed churches accounted for a majority of Lancaster's church membership. Anglo denominations (Methodist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Irish Catholic) accounted for about one-third.¹² Thus Franklin and Marshall's overlapping German, Reformed, high church, and Calvinist traditions potentially ap-

---

pealed to much of Lancaster's population. But German Reformed leaders were ambivalent about appeals outside the denomination.

Unfortunately for Franklin and Marshall, the denomination was also unwilling to give the college a monopoly in Reformed education. It was the most prestigious Reformed institution, but not the only one. The lingering traditionalist/evangelical battles engendered by the Mercersburg Theology further undercut any hopes of monopoly. By the time peace between the factions was finally made at the General Synod of 1873, there were already several rival colleges competing for the limited denominational funds.13

The Pennsylvania congregations of the Reformed church were the logical source of funds for a formally denominational college. The synod approved a plan to solicit at least one dollar from every adult member of the Reformed church in Pennsylvania. Although the synod directed the pastors to implement the Dollar Plan, it slipped quietly into oblivion. The college's hired agent, a retired Reformed minister, obtained thirty-five thousand dollars to endow a professorship of history from an elderly eccentric who had once been impressed by one of the agent's sermons. But among the congregations, the agent encountered rival claims from other Reformed institutions and dissatisfaction with Franklin and Marshall Academy.14 The college had created a secondary program immediately after the 1853 merger, but it was run poorly for several decades.15 Since an academy was more attractive to most farmers than a college, its weakness limited the appeal of Franklin and Marshall as well as depriving the college of a dependable source of Reformed students.

In 1872 the church reiterated its determination to control the college. A synod committee complained to the board of trustees about a plan that granted scholarships to any Lancaster County school district whose inhabitants contributed one thousand dollars because the scholarship plan increased the belief "among a large part of our

people that the College was no longer an Institution of the Church, but belonged to the world, and their particular interest for it, in distinction to the many other institutions would be lost.” Although local residents responded favorably to the plan, the trustees withdrew it in the face of synodical criticism. A further comment by the synod’s committee illuminated another dimension of the college’s financial problem. It suggested that the trustees lower the goal of a $500,000 fund-raising campaign because “our people are mostly engaged in agriculture and not in commercial pursuits.”

The theological seminary, raising money to build its own campus, was a formidable rival for congregational contributions. In addition, several other Reformed church institutions had sprouted in Pennsylvania: Ursinus College, Palatinate College, Clarion Collegiate Institute, and Mercersburg College. The principal of Franklin and Marshall Academy attacked the splintering effect of these rivalries in the Mercersburg Review and recommended channeling all Reformed church energy into creating denominational feeders for Franklin and Marshall College. But the editors disagreed, telling Franklin and Marshall to accept its denominational rivals.

The alumni association dated from the Marshall College days, but its loyalty was not matched by financial ability; it was dominated by professors at the college and ministers until the late 1880s. Its campaign to establish an alumni professorship of English literature and belles lettres dragged on for decades.

As the only officially denominational college in this study, Franklin and Marshall demonstrates the advantages and disadvantages of that status. The college retained a definite mission and the loyalty of a faction in the denomination. But the financial rewards were limited. The denomination encouraged congregational giving, but it had few funds of its own. Congregations had many demands on their beneficence, and higher education was a low priority to most members of this heavily rural denomination. The limited funds committed to collegiate work were scattered among several institutions. The principal denominational contributions came from a few individuals.

17. Ibid., 416–47; Klein, 102.
Lancaster offered alternative sources, but German and Anglo non-Reformed citizens were not regularly solicited. As German ethnicity weakened, it became an identity that Franklin and Marshall's authorities only promoted when it coincided with denominationalism. They had sufficient denominational and local support to maintain a modest college but not to provide the expensive new facilities demanded by the growth of science and more gentlemanly student lifestyles.

While Lancaster could support a modest college, Lewisburg could not. Philadelphians finally engineered a dramatic takeover. But when the Civil War ended, there were few indications of the tumultuous events to come. The reverse of Franklin and Marshall, the University of Lewisburg entered the postwar years in good health and with weakened denominational ties.

A backhanded contribution removed a burden from the institution. Since 1855 the university had operated a theological seminary. When John P. Crozer died in 1866, his estate offered to finance relocating the seminary in Chester. The university agreed and relinquished control of the renamed Crozer Theological Seminary to the Philadelphia Baptist Association. Although Crozer's attempt to move the whole university ten years earlier had precipitated dissension, this offer did not. The seminary was an albatross that employed two Lewisburg professors and tied up forty thousand dollars of endowment but produced no revenue, since ministerial candidates paid no tuition. The seminary's removal effectively increased the endowment while reducing expenses. Although the removal reduced the University of Lewisburg's claims on the largesse of Pennsylvania and New Jersey Baptists, it initially strengthened the university, now left with its collegiate department, academy, and female institute.

At the same time the Baptists of Lewisburg had grown to sufficient numbers and wealth to erect an impressive stone Gothic church to replace the modest structure in which the first university classes had been held. The sight of President Justin Loomis personally shingling the 175-foot steeple seemed to symbolize the strength of the university and its ties to the local community. So too did the occupation of the pastorate by the Rev. Robert Lowry, a nationally known Baptist hymn writer and a professor of literature at the university.

The apparent stability proved illusory. Ironically, construction of
the church was one reason, leaving the local Baptists twenty thousand dollars in debt. The panic of 1873, floods, and fires undercut the town's and the university's finances. Even the Chicago fire was felt in Lewisburg because the university had invested some of its endowment in Chicago real estate destroyed by Mrs. O'Leary's cow.

Loomis's attempt to duplicate his successful fund drive of 1864-65 in the early 1870s failed. While local funds were dissipating, President Loomis and the board of trustees angered alternative sources in Philadelphia. Loomis and some local trustees banned fraternities and curbed athletics in the early 1870s, despite protests from the Philadelphia Alumni Club. Several fraternities operated secretly with alumni support, until Loomis ended Sigma Chi's sub-rosa existence and expelled a member of the class of 1875 shortly before his graduation. In response the alumni demanded the unprecedented priv-

Fig. 6. President Loomis (seated, right), Professor James (standing behind him), and the rest of the University of Lewisburg faculty, 1874.
lege of nominating every third trustee. The board promised to select more alumni but kept selection in its own hands.\textsuperscript{20}

Loomis aggravated the situation by attacking Charles James, a popular professor of classical languages at the university since 1851. At Loomis's insistence the board of trustees fired James by a 9–3 vote on questionable charges. The decision aroused bitter opposition, especially among some of James's former students. When the trustees met in June 1878, they were greeted with demands for Loomis's removal from the Philadelphia Alumni Club and the board of curators, the weaker half of Bucknell's two-headed governance structure. They requested reconsideration of the cases of Professor James and the expelled student. Loomis resigned, but the trustees loyally urged him to remain another year, against the wishes of the curators and the alumni.\textsuperscript{21}

The demise of President Loomis was symptomatic of a deeper crisis. The continual strife within the college alienated the alumni, many of whom were the very Baptist clergy the college relied on for students and funds. In the late 1870s enrollment dropped sharply, with disastrous financial results. There were only forty-four college students left when Loomis resigned in 1878, and the class of 1879 numbered only seven. Enrollments in the academy and the female institute also dropped dramatically, reducing total enrollment to 135, only half the normal number.

The younger alumni and the trustees pinned their competing hopes on the new president. After a prominent Philadelphia Baptist minister declined the job, the trustees turned to a young faculty member, David Jayne Hill. Only twenty-eight years old, he had published highly successful books on rhetoric and American literature. As the son of a Baptist minister and part of the University of Lewisburg "family," he was acceptable to the trustees. He went through a perfunctory ordination as a minister to satisfy the trustees, but he shared the


\textsuperscript{21} University of Lewisburg, Trustees, 29 June 1875 and 24–25 June 1878. The trustees claimed they received the requests too late, but the minutes show that the curator and alumni notes were tabled until Loomis could be asked to remain for another year.
curators' views. He reinstated fraternities, added electives to the curriculum, and consulted with alumni and students. Enrollments immediately increased.

Hill's administration also faced financial problems. In the first year of his presidency he used over 10 percent of the endowment to finance his reforms. He sought a rich savior and virtually put the institution's name up for sale. He targeted William Bucknell, who had tried to move the institution to Philadelphia twenty-five years earlier, as the most likely candidate. Bucknell was a rags-to-riches real estate and utilities magnate who had given over half a million dollars to Baptist causes but was disenchanted with the University of Lewisburg. Hill eventually got a sympathetic hearing; Bucknell renewed his offer of fifty thousand dollars to move the university to Philadelphia. Eventually Hill convinced Bucknell to offer the sum without removal if the university raised a matching amount and transferred governance to a single body whose membership would be chosen by Bucknell. The financially desperate board of trustees capitulated. The matching fifty thousand dollars was raised, and on 7 March 1882 William Bucknell's handpicked board of trustees took office. With Bucknell calling the tune and the Crozer family as the leading contributor of the matching funds, the battle of the 1850s had come full circle.22

At the 7 March meeting the trustees obediently resigned. The new charter eliminated the board of curators and vested sole authority in the board of trustees, four-fifths of whom were to be Baptists. Bucknell retained eight of the old trustees and replaced twelve incumbents. William Bucknell, not surprisingly, was elected chairman of the board, and the Rev. Judson Rowland, the leader of the old board of curators, was named treasurer. Baptist pastors played prominent parts on both sides of the struggle, and the same number were on the old and new boards. Some non-Baptists were on the old board of curators as well as the newly constituted board of trustees. The change was geographic and generational; the new trustees were younger, and most were Philadelphians. This was not a revolt against

the "denominational college"; it was a modernization and urbanization of it.\textsuperscript{23}

The old board of trustees had been dominated by Baptists from the Lewisburg area, many of whom had been governing the university since the 1850s. The economic reverses of the early 1870s that temporarily reduced local sources of funding had precipitated the crisis, but Lewisburg soon started to grow again. In the 1880s the Reading Railroad extended its line to Lewisburg and built an impressive station. New mills and furniture factories were established. Lewisburg could support a few stately churches and some elegant Victorian homes, but it could only have sustained a college by extraordinary sacrifices. Lewisburg’s temporary reverses had only hurried the inevitable.\textsuperscript{24} Even a prosperous Lewisburg was not in the same league as Philadelphia. Keeping control in Lewisburg would have meant forgoing the expensive new facilities parents and students were beginning to expect—or even bankruptcy. A united and heroic effort by local wealth might have prevented the urban takeover, but the internal dissension and competing claims on local Baptist largesse made that unlikely.

William Bucknell contributed handsomely, personally donating a chapel, a chemistry building, and an observatory for the college as well as underwriting improvements in the academy and the female institute. In addition, sports-crazed alumni donated a gymnasium. The campus was modernized by 1890. The ailing endowment, which almost dropped below $100,000 in 1881, was over $350,000 in 1890, primarily due to William Bucknell. The University of Lewisburg was renamed Bucknell University in 1886, accurately reflecting the donor’s importance. President Hill had astutely cultivated this philanthropy. Bucknell expressed his personal esteem for Hill in an invitation for Christmas dinner, when “we will talk about University [and] all my relatives will be glad to meet the Great President of LU [University of Lewisburg] and their Father’s prince.”\textsuperscript{25}

Hill avoided alienating Bucknell through radical departures or expensive expansion. Although retaining “university” in the new name,
Hill created a modernized multipurpose institution with a modest collegiate section and no graduate students. He rebuilt enrollments to Civil War levels, but eschewed expansion. When he left there were 71 college students in a total institution of 286. He relied on Bucknell's generosity rather than growth to finance projects. Hill's addition of electives to the curriculum and acceptance of fraternities and intercollegiate athletics met students' expectations for collegiate life in the 1880s. Yet he retained a relatively traditional curriculum and grading system, strict social rules, required chapel, and the annual day of prayer for colleges.26

Although he made no attempt to turn Bucknell into a true university, he personally thirsted for the intellectual life and social freedom of a university. He was corresponding with Daniel Gilman about studying psychology under G. Stanley Hall at Johns Hopkins University when the Baptist-sponsored University of Rochester offered him its presidency. William Bucknell and the board begged Hill to decline and countered with the offer of a new house, a raise, and a year of study leave with pay. However, Gilman and others easily persuaded Hill to take the new position.27 He left behind a modest, prosperous college that was part of a multipurpose “university” controlled and supported by Philadelphia Baptists in a small central Pennsylvania town.

As at Bucknell, control of Swarthmore shifted toward wealthy urbanites, especially Philadelphians. The Baltimore Quakers who initiated the idea of founding the college envisioned a rural institution financed by a large number of stockholders with equal votes. They soon lost on both issues to wealthier Philadelphia and New York Quakers. A campus site was purchased within ten miles of Philadelphia in 1865, and after bitter debate the stockholder system was revised to favor wealthier contributors.

The Baltimoreans demonstrated their dissatisfaction through reduced contributions. Of the $93,000 pledged at the time of incorporation, Philadelphians promised $55,000 and New Yorkers $32,000, while the Baltimore Meeting subscribed only $6,000. Their share

27. David Jayne Hill to Daniel C. Gilman, 26 March, 20 June, and 10 July 1888, Gilman Collection (Johns Hopkins University Manuscript Collection); Gilman to Hill, 20 June 1888, Hill Papers; David Jayne Hill, As It Seemed to Me (ca. 1930, University of Rochester Library Special Collections, typescript), 474–76; Parkman, 32–35.
later declined even further, shrinking to only $250 of the $30,000 collected in 1867. When Benjamin Hallowell, one of the founders, resigned from the board in 1868, his seat, previously reserved for a Baltimorean, was given to a New Yorker. Before the college had even opened its doors, control had moved to the north.  

The geographic shift reflected growing dependence upon wealthy contributors. By 1866 there were sufficient funds to begin constructing the main building. But contributions lagged, and in spring 1869 the enterprise was still in doubt. Then Samuel Willetts, a New Yorker and chairman of the board of managers, pledged one-half of the necessary fifty thousand dollars if that amount was matched by Philadelphians. They did so, and on 21 October 1869 classes began with 173 students in the preparatory department and 26 qualified to begin at the collegiate level. 

The managers of Swarthmore insisted that classes not begin until dormitory rooms were ready for all students—an indication of their cultural defensiveness. Although of English ancestry, nineteenth-century members of the Religious Society of Friends resembled an embattled ethnic minority. Following the doctrine of simplicity, Quakers continued their distinctive “plain speech.” Many also adhered to “plain dress”; some Quaker men still wore brimmed hats and gray coats without lapels. The faithful avoided holiday celebrations and distrusted music, art, and modern literature. Remaining culturally distinctive was especially demanding for a group that, unlike the Mennonites, did not retreat to rural isolation. The main hope for passing the life-style and values to their children lay in providing a “guarded education.”

Swarthmore College was founded when Quaker education, particularly for Hicksites, was in decline. Hicksites were united in their determination to stem the drain on Hicksite membership, but they

28. Swarthmore College, Board of Managers, Minutes (Friends Historical Library), 1 December 1863, 2 December 1867, and 1 December 1868; Homer D. Babbidge, “Swarthmore College in the Nineteenth Century: A Quaker Experience in Education (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1953), 54–68.
29. Swarthmore, Managers, 4 December 1865–5 August 1869; Friends Intelligencer 26 (13 March, 17 April, and 26 June 1869); Babbidge, 226.
disagreed on the nature of “guarded education.” Liberals such as Lucretia Mott and John Hicks demanded only commitment to Quaker beliefs, whereas traditionalists demanded zealous protection of their life-style and customs. Swarthmore’s first president, Edward Parrish, was in the liberal camp and felt that if students were given considerable autonomy they would be guided by their intuitive sense of right and wrong. Traditionalists, however, gained control of the board of managers and forced Parrish to resign. His successor, Edward Magill, had taught at Boston Latin School and was more willing to impose the discipline and traditional Quaker values demanded by the board. The managers’ reports to the stockholders stressed their assiduous efforts to keep campus life consistent with the Hicksite ideals on dress, plain speech, entertainment, and religious services. One manager even sought to ban Orthodox Quaker writings from the campus. Another provided funds for an on-campus meeting-house, which liberals had previously blocked. The traditionalists dominated until the late 1880s. However, Hicksites did not argue over one subject that was deeply divisive elsewhere—coeducation of the sexes—reflecting the Hicksite belief in the intellectual equality of the sexes.31

Control of the board of managers by the traditionalists exacerbated a deeper problem. Swarthmore could not attract enough Friends to get more than a small coterie of college-level students and, even by filling the “college” with preparatory students, could not get more than about half the desired number of Friends children. Although the traditionalist managers resisted admitting outsiders, Swarthmore’s financial structure necessitated it. Stockholders had agreed to invest the initial sum for constructing the college; it was supposed to run at cost thereafter. Gifts from managers or other wealthy Hicksites financed some capital expenditures, but all current expenses were to come from tuition, making it suicidal to reject applicants from other denominations.

With only half the college’s students being Friends, the managers

constantly felt that guarded education was threatened. In response they increased the worship requirements, applied them to all students, and rejected a student request to bring ministers of other faiths onto the campus. In 1880 they instructed Magill to reject all further non-Quaker applications, but it was a pipe dream. Their subsequent $100 reduction of the college's $350 fee for Friends was insufficient to entice many more of the faithful.\footnote{Swarthmore, Stockholders, 1880, p. 58.}

The failure to attract more Hicksite students stemmed from the social composition and educational attitudes of the denomination. In the schism Hicksites had done considerably better than the Orthodox in the countryside; a large proportion of their members were farmers, few of whose children desired higher education. For secondary education, a majority of Hicksites entrusted their offspring to the public schools rather than face the daunting costs of preparatory classes at

\footnote{\textit{The Edward Magill Papers} (Friends Historical Library), box 1, contain a letter from the managers directing Magill to decline applications from non-Friends. Babbidge, 109–18.}
Swarthmore. A guarded education was particularly expensive since everyone (except a few day students) had to live at the college.\textsuperscript{33}

Even among Hicksites able to pay for a Swarthmore education, few were particularly interested in collegiate work. Although the faculty and presidents Parrish and Magill wanted to emphasize the collegiate program, a majority of the managers shared the rank-and-file priority on preparatory and teacher training programs. Most students entered those programs with no intention of continuing on to the college. Of those students who did begin the collegiate program in the 1870s and early 1880s, only about one-third graduated. President Parrish perceived this danger from the start and warned that only unceasing vigilance would keep the institution aimed at a collegiate ideal. Magill urged the managers to raise the minimum age for admission and eliminate the preparatory classes; instead the managers added a younger class in 1877.\textsuperscript{34}

The desire to provide teachers for Friends schools led to the opening of a normal department in 1878. The program included special courses and practice teaching for four-year college students as well as a shorter certificate program. The preparatory department served as a model school. In 1884 the managers increased the program’s size by encouraging students to abandon the baccalaureate program in favor of one or two years of normal courses. This directly threatened the collegiate work, especially since normal program students paid a considerably reduced fee that drained funds from the college. In addition, preparatory students, who had always exceeded the collegians, outnumbered them by nearly three to one by 1883-84. Magill corresponded with numerous other college presidents, including David Jayne Hill at Bucknell, and received an almost unanimous response: a normal department did not belong in a collegiate institution. In a report to the managers the faculty asserted that the best training for future teachers was instruction by proficient professors in a regular college curriculum supplemented by lectures on pedagogy. The faculty also recommended dropping all preparatory classes.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33} Parrish, 36-43; Benjamin, 33-34, 221-22.


\textsuperscript{35} The faculty report and Magill’s correspondence with other college presidents are in box 8 of the Magill Papers. Swarthmore College, \textit{Annual Catalogue}, 1884/85 and 1885/86. Hill’s letter to Magill was dated 7 April 1885.
The faculty recommendations were eventually accepted after a change in the board's composition. Clement Biddle and M. Fisher Longstreth led the fight to save the preparatory classes and support the normal school. But when Eli Lamb, headmaster of a Friends school in Baltimore, succeeded Biddle as chairman of the managers' Committee on Instruction in 1884, the tide turned. Lamb shared the faculty's belief in collegiate standards and disliked the normal program, preferring a replica of G. Stanley Hall's pedagogical lectures that Lamb had attended at Johns Hopkins University. Lamb kept Magill informed of the board's feelings, and they plotted to elect like-minded managers. They met stiff opposition, and at the height of the battle over the normal department, Lamb warned Magill that they "must step very cautiously or there will be trouble. CMB [Clement M. Biddle] must have a hearing." Magill and Lamb prevailed; the normal program was abolished, and the preparatory classes were phased out. Lamb represented a new generation of Hicksites who were challenging the control of the traditionalists.

It was a dangerous victory for Magill and the faculty. Phasing out the preparatory and normal programs eliminated more students than could be attracted by collegiate studies. Although the number of collegians increased from 83 to 123, total enrollment declined from 304 to 240 between 1883–84 and 1886–87 as younger students were eliminated. Since the managers remained wedded to the principle that tuition should meet current expenses, the college's revenue declined. It took many years to replace all of the preparatory students. When the preparatory program was phased out completely in 1894, the college enrolled a near-record 187 students; but even that was smaller than the total enrollment had been in 1869.

Eliminating the subcollegiate programs reduced Swarthmore's potential Quaker clientele. The president and faculty had won over enough managers to the idea of emulating more prestigious colleges that were eliminating noncollegiate programs. But the stockholder system and the refusal to solicit non-Quaker donors added to the sacrifice. Some wealthy, urban managers apparently shared the col-

36. Eli Lamb to Magill, 9 April 1885, Magill Papers.
37. There are several valuable letters between Lamb and Magill in box 8 of the Magill Papers (Friends Historical Library). Magill, 195–201; Swarthmore College, Annual Catalogue, 1880/81–1889/90; Swarthmore College, Committee on Instruction, Minutes, 15 June 1885.
38. Swarthmore, Managers, 20 June 1887; Babbidge, 226, 230.
Table 1. Undergraduate and Total Enrollments, 1869–1890

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Princeton</th>
<th>F&amp;M</th>
<th>Bucknell</th>
<th>Swarthmore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869–70</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(155)</td>
<td>(215)</td>
<td>(199)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879–80</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(473)</td>
<td>(156)</td>
<td>(171)</td>
<td>(290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889–90</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(771)</td>
<td>(273)</td>
<td>(285)</td>
<td>(273)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Numbers without parentheses indicate the number of regularly enrolled undergraduates. The numbers in parentheses indicate the total institutional enrollment.

SOURCE: The figures were compiled from catalogs and college histories. The methods of counting differ slightly depending on which branches of the institution were included and how part-time students were counted.

Collegiate vision. They backed a more casual student life as well as the abolition of the preparatory and normal programs. They also offered the additional financing that the college badly needed to compete with similar institutions. A campaign to create Swarthmore's first endowed professorship dragged on for years until three urban managers offered to endow matching chairs. In 1887 Swarthmore suddenly had four endowed chairs.

These decisions had deeper ramifications for the Hicksite community. The editors of the Friends Intelligencer supported collegiate standards and more relaxed rules for students at Swarthmore. But for many Hicksites the doctrines of plainness and simplicity defined their distinctiveness. Adopting the mainstream model of collegiate life endangered denominational identity, especially for rural Hicksites. Philip Benjamin found that 13.5 percent of the influential Philadelphia Race Street Monthly Meeting had some college education. This showed considerable interest in higher education among urban Hicksites; but the base was small, and over half the college graduates had attended non-Quaker institutions. Whether to compromise with "the world" posed a ideological and practical dilemma for Swarthmore.

Collegiate enrollments at these four institutions were small by modern standards. The colleges, however, were part of larger multifunctional institutions (see Table 1). Only the College of New Jersey ever stood

39. Friends Intelligencer, for instance 18 December 1875 and 26 September 1885. In the 1880s it began a regular column on Swarthmore. Benjamin, 217–22.
alone in this period, and even it ran a preparatory school for six years and admitted students to subfreshman classes. The other three colleges included educational ventures running the gamut from elementary school to theological seminary.

A surprising number of colleges survived; but why were they not supported more fully in this period? Their failure to undertake major curricular innovation has been offered as an explanation. But this does not seem to have been the case. Swarthmore, which had the most innovative curriculum, attracted relatively few applicants and was pressed by supporters to shift resources to noncollegiate programs. The experiences of these colleges suggest that there was broader public interest in denominationally sponsored secondary and normal schools than in higher education. These colleges could not have prospered merely through curricular reform; three of the four only survived as part of multifunctional ventures. The ideal of a freestanding college existed in the minds of faculty, but it was unrealistic for most institutions. These case studies offer no evidence that curricular reforms would have unleashed an untapped demand for higher education.

The denominational connections, official and unofficial, provided little systematic financial assistance. The denominations were insufficiently hierarchical to command large sums of money, and few congregations were willing to make deep sacrifices for colleges, which had to compete with academies, theological seminaries, and foreign and home missionary societies for denominational solicitations. The small share of denominational funds given to colleges was increasingly targeted to future ministers.

The financial significance of denominationalism was its ability to generate individual benevolence. Denominational colleges were essentially voluntary associations that depended upon the generosity of those who felt loyalty to them. Most contributions between 1865 and 1890 came from a few individuals whose sense of connection with the college came from ethnoreligious affiliation. Even for Franklin and Marshall, with a legal denominational connection, denominationalism was a surrogate for a complicated nexus of influences controlling and financing the institution. Denominationally inspired funds, combined with those stimulated by local boosterism, were sufficient to maintain a modest college comfortably. Franklin and Marshall demonstrates the limitations of formal denominational control,
and the University of Lewisburg demonstrates the limitations of small-town support. But when the local community was replaced by two metropolises, as for Princeton, significant sums of money could be raised.

Access to urban industrial wealth best explains the differences in institutional facilities and size. Princeton's 1869 endowment ($522,000) was larger than that reached by any of the other three colleges until the 1890s.40 By 1890 its endowment was $1,524,000 when endowments at each of the other colleges were under $300,000. Princeton was a denominational college with a traditional curriculum, but it was able to use its ethnoreligious connections to draw upon the wealth of two metropolises. The other three colleges lacked the same access to wealth. Franklin and Marshall College and Bucknell University served social groups that were less urban and less wealthy, while Swarthmore owed its existence to a group that had severe reservations about higher education. Even at Princeton the existing sources were insufficient to finance all of the academic, social, and athletic facilities that had become fashionable by 1890. Meeting both these demands and the colleges' ambitions required new approaches. Another identity, alumni status, started to be cultivated by 1890, especially at Princeton.

The courting of alumni revealed deeper generational tensions within Protestant society. For college authorities in the 1870s and 1880s, denominationalism encompassed ethnicity at Franklin and Marshall and at Princeton, and a distinct life-style at Swarthmore. In addition, most donors and faculty expected the four colleges to promote the sober ascetic piety of Victorian Protestantism. But the students showed increasing discomfort with these values and later, as alumni, promoted a less denominationally centered and more indulgent genteel Protestantism. In each college generational tensions grew between older ethnoreligious and life-style traditions and the vanguard of muscular Christianity. The former were stronger in rural areas and small towns, while the latter was gaining favor among the urban industrial elites. By 1890 financial growth depended upon a college's ability to tap the wealth of the latter. The more colleges wanted to

build laboratories, dormitories, and gymnasiums, the more they needed to satisfy the desire of the new upper and upper-middle classes for institutions that could provide them with a sense of community without the restrictions of Victorian piety and denominationalism. Truly distinctive colleges risked marginality after 1890.