President Carter’s attacks upon the legal and medical “establishments” have revived public debate about the impact of professions upon American society. It is surely appropriate, and even urgent, that we re-examine the way that the structures and assumptions embodied in professional organizations channel important aspects of national life. The origins and evolution of professionalization have received considerable attention from historians. Recently Burton Bledstein has broadened the discussion with his thesis that a “culture of professionalism” provides the best conceptual framework for understanding the middle class of urbanizing and industrializing America. Although, as Thomas Haskell suggests, Bledstein overstates the case, his work promises to provoke new and broadly ranging discussion of professionalization and its relationship to higher education.¹

The organization of the traditional professions as well as some newer ones proceeded with dramatic speed between the Civil War and World War I. National organizations were founded or revived, training was extended, licensing standardized, and group consciousness raised. Law, medicine, and engineering were particularly prominent in establishing the pattern. Its adoption signalled the ascendency of a faction in each field that found the new structures and practices to be an effective way of gaining control of the profession. The battle over “scientific” medicine is the best-known of the internal disputes that occurred within each area.² The academic world shared this tradition.

Modern academicians have not neglected the origins of their own professional heritage. The dramatic dichotomy between the lives of antebellum college professors and those employed in the universities of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is described in the standard histories of American higher education.\(^3\) The typical pre-war pedagogue was a minister in the denomination sponsoring the institution who taught a wide-ranging and back-breaking course load and was expected to oversee closely the students' moral and social life. The professional experience and intellectual life had strong local denominational connections. Although there were variations from this model and several institutions such as the University of Michigan and Harvard sporadically and temporarily fostered more professional career patterns,\(^4\) the essential stereotype remains useful.

The new breed inhabiting early twentieth century universities provides a clear contrast. Most had received advanced training in a specialized field at an American or European graduate school. Their daily duties centered on teaching and research within a discipline. They maintained national and international disciplinary contacts that would have been quite alien to earlier generations. A new model had developed that was based upon specialized training, group consciousness, formal organization within disciplines, early career commitment, and a reward system emphasizing published scholarship.

Although this contrast gives vivid testimony to the emergence of a potent new professional model, it only informs us about our most visible predecessors. The meaning of professionalization for less renowned individuals and institutions remains relatively unclear. Robert McCaughey's examination of Harvard from 1819 to 1892 has helped to fill one part of the void by studying an entire faculty.\(^5\) But the fixation with the dramatic "emergence of the university" has left us relatively ignorant of professionalization at the vast
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5. McCaughey, "Transformation."
majority of institutions that did not embrace university structure or values.\textsuperscript{6}

This article is designed to respond to that need through a multiple case study of the recruitment criteria, professional duties, and institutional role of faculty at four colleges between 1870 and 1915.\textsuperscript{7} The time-frame was chosen as one that covers that period of growth and innovation often labelled "the age of the university". The use of a multiple case study permits more extensive examination of institutional individuality than is possible in a broad survey, but provides greater diversity, and thus a stronger base for generalizations, than is possible in using a single case. This approach also compensates for the fact that college archives are usually significantly less complete than those of universities. An historian researching colleges is unlikely to encounter the rich sources on faculty that McCaughey enjoyed at Harvard.\textsuperscript{8}

Institutions from one region were chosen that represented the dominant collegiate form of 1870, that is, private, Protestant, white, and predominantly male. Four colleges fulfilling that criteria were selected from eastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey on the basis of adequate archives and a diversity of denominational sponsors. In 1870, Bucknell University, Franklin and Marshall College, the College of New Jersey (popularly known as Princeton College), and Swarthmore College generally fit the standard image of the "old-time" college.\textsuperscript{9} They were small undergraduate institutions that exercised close moral, social, and religious supervision over their students. The curricula of three were dominated by prescribed courses in philosophy, mathematics, and the classics. The exception, Swarthmore, embraced the elective system and emphasized science in accordance with Quaker predilections. The four provide a sampling of an important segment of collegiate institutions in 1870.

\textsuperscript{6} The overemphasis upon universities is well explicated in James Axtell, "The Death of the Liberal Arts College," \textit{History of Education Quarterly} 11 (Winter 1971): 339-345.

\textsuperscript{7} The only published multiple case study of colleges in this period is George Peterson, \textit{The New England College in the Age of the University} (Amherst, 1964). His treatment of faculty concentrated upon their intellectual development. Most case studies of individual colleges fail to address the question of professionalization directly. An important exception is John Barnard, \textit{From Evangelicalism to Progressivism at Oberlin College, 1866-1917} (Columbus, Ohio, 1969), especially pp. 35-42, 79-82, 111-112.

\textsuperscript{8} McCaughey, "Transformation," p. 244.
In the 1870s and 1880s these colleges slowly came to value specialized training for their faculty to the extent that it could be easily reconciled with other loyalties and traditional job demands. The recruitment criteria reflect this cautious shift. Previously most of the faculty, as well as the presidents, were ministers whose scholarly attainments rarely reached outside of theology. The tutors who assisted in the elementary classes were usually young ministerial candidates working their way through theological seminary or waiting for a “call” to a pulpit or professorial chair. But the proliferation of knowledge and the work in German and early American universities presented new forms of competence and training.

Franklin and Marshall’s choice of a new mathematics professor in 1880 typifies the resulting compromise between the older religious aims and specialization. The Trustees’ Committee on Instruction listed five acceptable candidates and then nominated Jefferson Kershner. Although he was not a minister, Kershner had several other qualifications: he was German Reformed, he had pursued graduate work at Yale, and he was the only alumnus of Franklin and Marshall among the candidates. His alumnus status was especially stressed in the committee report and after discussion the Board appointed Kershner to the faculty.9 One of the trustees, writing in the leading Reformed journal, acknowledged that faculty members must increasingly be specialists, yet he maintained that even in a world of specialists the colleges should seek out clergymen first and if none were available with a special fitness for teaching then “let other men of sound Christian faith . . . be employed.”10

---


Bucknell followed a similar set of priorities, seeking Baptist clergy wherever possible.  

Rev. James McCosh, who assumed the presidency of Princeton in 1868, sought to broaden somewhat the criteria for judging job applicants. Under his predecessor the faculty had been dominated by Presbyterian clergy, and scholarship took a back seat to piety. But McCosh recommended to the Board of Trustees that they should take at times an instructor belonging to another evangelical denomination, provided he is very eminent in his department. This will not impair but rather strengthen our Presbyterianism. Of the 30 officers of the College, 28 are at the present time Presbyterians, and a good number, perhaps too many, are Presbyterian ministers.

The trustees responded with a prescription that fell short of even this moderate suggestion. In addition to stating a preference for alumni and for an emphasis upon teaching ability, the trustees responded that, as far as possible candidates should be “members of the Presbyterian Church, or of those denominations closely allied to it, the Reformed Dutch and the Congregational.”

Although McCosh wished to lower denominational barriers and hire fewer ministers he was determined to maintain an ardently religious faculty. In a letter of inquiry to a college president about a candidate for a faculty position, McCosh, subverting the trustees’ position, said that

we do not expect any religious pledge. We do not require candidates to belong to any particular denomination. But as we are professedly a religious College we should like our instructors to be people showing respect to religion and attending on its public ordinances. Can you say anything on this point? Did Professor Kerr wait on your religious services—Episcopal I believe[?]"  

A similar concern pervaded his correspondence with William B. Scott, a recent graduate, whom McCosh had persuaded to under-

---

12. See for example, Bucknell University, Board of Trustees, Minutes, 22 June 1880, Bucknell University Archives.
13. College of New Jersey, Board of Trustees, Minutes, 26 June 1876, Princeton University Archives.
14. Ibid., 8 February 1877.
15. James McCosh to President Caffree, 1875, McCosh Papers, Princeton University Manuscript Collection.
take studies in Europe. The president followed Scott's graduate work at Heidelberg and, on the verge of offering him a faculty position, broached the sensitive subject.

You are aware that the Trustees and all your friends here are resolute in keeping the College a religious one. You have passed through various scenes since you left us... If a man has the root in him he will only be strengthened in the faith by such an experience. It will be profitable to me to find how you have stood all this.16

In his last report to the Board of Trustees McCosh accurately described his recruiting policy as having been to look for the best man available and then inquire about his probable influence on the College's religious life.17

But since the best men were not usually available to Princeton, McCosh looked for talented undergraduates and encouraged them to pursue graduate work usually in Europe. If their work was successful and their faith was unshaken a position at Princeton beckoned. In addition to Scott, McCosh recruited a number of other young faculty in this manner. To build his faculty quickly, McCosh had recruited heavily from the staffs of other colleges in his first years. But in an age demanding more specialization, scholars who were also alumni provided a prime source of men able to combine older demands with the newer ones. McCosh increasingly employed this tactic. In the last ten years of his tenure fifteen of the twenty-three professors hired were alumni, mainly from classes which had graduated under the aging president.18

Although McCosh respected scholarly research, teaching ability weighed heavily in his evaluation of candidates. In a letter to President Daniel Gilman of Johns Hopkins, McCosh reported that although he was convinced of a certain candidate's scholarly ability he was "anxious to know" whether he was "also a lively teacher."19 McCosh showed similar concern about Scott's teaching ability. After affirming Scott's religious and scholarly progress,

17. College of New Jersey. Trustees. 9 February 1888.
he filled his letters with advice on teaching for the young graduate student.  

At Swarthmore the managers (i.e., trustees) constantly pressed for the addition of Friends to the Staff. Due to the Quaker antipathy to higher education and to the lack of a professional clergy, there were a number of outsiders and no ministers on the Swarthmore faculty. Despite the lack of clergy the managers shared the views of their counterparts in the other colleges that faculty should be drawn from the college's sponsoring denomination in order to provide the students with the guidance necessary for what Quakers called "guarded education". President Edward Magill had to defend his staff publicly in the *Friends Intelligencer* by pointing out that twelve of the twenty-one faculty were Friends and that four others had Quaker lineage. Furthermore he maintained that "in the appointments of professors and instructors at Swarthmore, other things being equal, a member of our Religious Society is always preferred."  

At another time he defensively reminded one of the most influential trustees that the number of Friends on the staff had risen in the thirteen years of operation. Magill questioned prospective faculty members on their religious affiliation. Although his exact use of the information is not clear, he seems to have been primarily concerned that their beliefs would not prevent them from taking in the campus meetings, rather than that they should show a positive adherence to Quaker faith.  

Magill also questioned applicants on their ability to maintain discipline. His concern with this quality overshadowed any interest in scholarly attainment shown in his correspondence. Although Magill was more committed than the Board of Managers to raising the academic standards, his recruiting procedure indicates the limits of his own acceptance of university priorities. 

The emphasis upon religious and institutional affiliations, rather than upon external standards of scholarship, reflected the expectation that faculty members would be subservient to the local and denominational authorities. The faculty was excluded from most

20. McCosh to Scott, 15 March and 14 May 1880, McCosh Papers.  
23. Letters to Magill from Thomas Stein, 3 April 1883, Edward White, 4 April 1885, H. I. Riley, 5 April 1885, Magill Papers.  
major policy decisions, including even the selection of their own colleagues. In the absence of professional standards and with the concern for moral oversight and teaching, the boards of trustees were confident that they were capable of selecting the best policies and personnel. Presidents like Magill and McCosh actually shaped many of the decisions, but the faculties shared neither formal nor informal power. An extreme case of trustee omniscience occurred early in 1883 when John Bach McMaster, a young instructor in the School of Science at Princeton, published the very successful *A History of the People of the United States*. The faculty suggestion that a chair in American history be established for him was serenely brushed away by the trustees with the sentiment that McMaster should stick to engineering. Within months he received several offers and later became one of the country's leading historians while holding a chair at the University of Pennsylvania.  

The absence of the faculties of the four colleges from the process of selecting their colleagues was only one of several indications of their subservient role. The trustees and president felt free to make extreme demands on professors' time. A death in the faculty, new courses, or financial retrenchment meant increased teaching loads. When President McCosh called on the Princeton trustees to reduce the size of freshmen classes by creating extra sections, they responded by simply adding an hour to each tutor's daily work load. Although in this case some extra pay resulted they wanted it clearly understood "that, in giving this authority, the Trustees do not by such act admit that the Trustees are not entitled to all of the time of each tutor." More commonly no bonus accompanied increased work loads. The faculty had to wait for relief until the Board chose to augment the staff.

In addition to the heavy teaching load the faculty had arduous non-academic tasks, acting *in loco parentis* could be hard work. Professor Ferris Price found himself overseeing six days a week at Swarthmore, as well as proctoring study halls, and taking attendance at Bible classes and Sunday Meetings. Other professors doubled

27. The minutes of the governing boards of all four colleges in the 1870s and 1880s give a similar picture of poor working conditions, job insecurity, and petty non-academic tasks.
as librarians, museum curators, and registrars. The president and trustees expected the faculty to pay as much attention to their non-academic tasks as to the academic. President McCosh sternly held the faculty to their duty of attending chapel.  

At Bucknell one of the main reasons for the dismissal of Professor Charles James was the charge that he refused to spend his evenings studying in the college building and keeping order. Professor Maria Sanford's employment at Swarthmore ended because she failed to inform the manager's Committee on Instruction when she left campus for a speaking engagement.

In spite of the stringent demands on their time, faculty received barely adequate salaries and little job security. At times of financial distress faculty salaries presented a ready target for retrenchment. The payroll was sometimes in arrears, an affliction especially prevalent at Franklin and Marshall. One year the Swarthmore salaries were subject to a sliding scale of reductions based on the College's enrollment. More serious was the lack of a tenure system, which made it possible for a professor with years of service to be dropped at the trustees' or president's sudden whim. When a professor died in office, trustees apparently had clear consciences if his survivors received the remainder of the year's pay. A few venerable professors were lucky enough that when they reached an age at which teaching became physically impossible, the trustees arranged a pension. When William Nevin, the brother of a former president of Franklin and Marshall, could no longer carry a full teaching load, he was placed on a pension and continued to teach a few classes. By setting the pension at $800 annually and hiring a young replacement at $700, the pension involved no additional outlay beyond Nevin's normal $1500 salary. Nothing beyond such ad hoc arrangements existed. In the 1880s, there were a few improvements in working conditions. Most notably Boards became more willing to grant leaves of absence for further study in Europe or in the growing American graduate schools. More money was also appropriated for scientific research and field trips.

29. See, for instance, his reports to the Board of Trustees on 22 December 1875, and 9 February 1888. For the private reaction of one young professor see, Scott, "Some Memoirs."

30. Bucknell University, Board of Trustees, Minutes, Bucknell University Archives, June and July 1877.

31. Edward Magill, Sixty-Five Years in the Life of a Teacher (Boston, 1907), p. 177. Maria Sanford went on to an eminent career at the University of Minnesota.

32. Franklin and Marshall, Trustees, 15 June 1886.
At a time when national academic organizations and journals were becoming a central part of university life, most faculty at these four colleges continued to operate within a relatively localistic environment. Before 1890 the faculty at each of the four colleges met almost weekly to deal with discipline, scheduling, marking, and student activities. When professors frequently spent an entire career in one institution, the college community could be the primary professional reference group. The absence of departmental barriers and the presence of common religious commitments provided the possibility of a close sense of community. The denominational journals, in which professors could publish articles on a wide variety of subjects besides theology, offered formal opportunities for intellectual cross-fertilization. The self-sacrificing loyalty of so many professors to their institutions suggests that the moral sense of duty involved in running the college community and of preserving moral and intellectual order must have partially compensated for the colleges’ authorities. The localism of their personal and professional lives made escape unlikely, but provided possibilities for a type of community that would be less common in the new academic world.

After 1890 the new professional academic model became more visible with the creation of Chicago, Stanford, and Clark, and the development of strong graduate programs at other institutions. Disciplinary specialization and its concomitants of departmentalization, career mobility, scholarly research, and hiring on the basis of reputation within a discipline posed a compelling alternative to traditional patterns. Faculty life at all four colleges moved towards this new model, but the different priorities and beliefs of each institution produced varying blends of old and new.

The proportion of ministers on the staffs declined rapidly after 1890. As graduate work became a necessary qualification for an appointment or advancement, three years of additional seminary work became a great burden even for those inclined to theological study. At Princeton six of McCosh’s thirty-four appointments had been clergymen as opposed to only one of the first sixteen choices made by Francis L. Patton, who succeeded him in 1888. Of the twenty-six appointments made at Bucknell during John N. Harris’
presidency (1889-1919) only one went to a Baptist pastor. Franklin and Marshall moved away from ministerial faculty more slowly. In 1909 nine of the fourteen professors were ministers and virtually all had studied in the Reformed Church's Theological Seminary adjacent to the college in Lancaster. This high percentage resulted partly from the long tenures of several of the college's professors and few of the staff hired after 1910 had degrees in divinity. The ministerial tradition remained stronger in the trustees' choices of presidents. Woodrow Wilson was the only layman among the six presidents who served at Franklin and Marshall, Princeton, and Bucknell from 1890 to 1915. Since the Society of Friends did not have a formal ministry, the issue did not arise at Swarthmore.

Hiring alumni became the crucial mechanism for ensuring denominational and institutional loyalty when the selection of ministers was no longer appropriate. The alumni connection was nearly synonymous with religious affiliation to the sponsoring denomination. An alumnus had spent four years under the "proper" influences and could be expected at the least, to observe the basic Protestant amenities. President Harris was the most insistent upon procuring home-grown products, hiring over eighty percent alumni. He maintained that "the best men for us [are] our own men" whereas outsiders took "years before they became an integral part of the life of the Institution."

Harris specialized in spotting potential faculty members in the student body and either convinced them to go to graduate school immediately or hired them as instructors for the academy, sending them off for advanced study at a later date. Harris also initiated new programs in this manner. When he foresaw that funds would be available to begin a program in civil engineering he sent a promising student, Charles Lindemann, to Harvard for training and upon his return entrusted him with establishing that program at Bucknell. Several years later Walter K. Rhodes went to the University of Michigan for graduate study in electrical engineering with a similar promise and in 1907 he returned to open that department. Harris also assisted the aspiring students by convincing a trustee to donate a fellowship to support their graduate work at the University

35. Princeton, General Catalogue, pp. 18-21; Bucknell University, Catalogue, (Lewisburg), 1889/90 to 1919/20; John H. Harris, Thirty Years as President of Bucknell University (Washington, 1926). pp. 49-51 Franklin and Marshall College, Catalogue (Lancaster), 1909/10; Student Weekly, 1 (16 September 1915): 15.
36. Harris, Thirty Years as President of Bucknell, (p. 103, see also pp. 49-51); Bucknell University Bulletin, "Announcement 1908," 7th Series, No. 4.
of Chicago, which had Baptist connections. At other times the
president achieved his goal more ruthlessly. In 1915 a young
alumnus teaching in the Biology Department was called into Harris' 
office and informed that since the university faced financial trouble
and retrenchment was necessary, the time had arrived for him to
take a leave for doctoral study. Although the instructor was still
in debt from his undergraduate years in Lewisburg, his only option
was to borrow more money and enroll at Columbia.7 Harris con-
tinued this approach until his retirement in 1919, leaving Bucknell
with a very inbred faculty.8

Franklin and Marshall College was less insistent upon employing
their own graduates but compensated by appointing a number of
professors who had studied at the Reformed Theological Seminary
in Lancaster. Work at the seminary continued to be sufficient
training to teach their humanities courses at least until 1910. Those
hired to teach science or social science were expected to have aug-
mented their theological training with some university work.9

Swarthmore had had to rely upon non-alumni in the 1870s and
1880s since the college did not graduate its first class until the early
1870s, but started adding alumni in the 1890s. Swarthmore had a
tradition of hiring science professors with substantial advanced
training, and, in the 1890s, secured several Ph.D.'s from Johns Hop-
kins. But in other subjects teachers from Friends secondary schools,
preferably alumni with some advanced training, were often re-
cruited. With the 1902 appointment of Joseph Swain, former
president of the University of Indiana, to head the college, Swarth-
more began to emphasize professional scholarly standards. The
new president searched for candidates who were recognized in ex-
ternal academic circles as well as being acceptable in a Quaker
environment.10

37. Edwin Theis, Centennial History of Bucknell University (Williamsport, Pa., 1946),
pp. 227-230; Harris, Thirty Years, pp. 43-51; Bucknell University Alumni Cata-
logue (Lewisburg, Pa., 1921); John W. Rice, “Reminiscences,” John H. Harris
Presidential Papers, Bucknell University Archives.
38. Oliphant, pp. 257-258.
39. H. M. J. Klein, History of Franklin and Marshall College (Lancaster, Pa., 1952),
pp. 120-206; Franklin and Marshall, Trustees, 1887-1915.
40. Swarthmore College, The Register of Swarthmore College 1862–1914 (Swarthmore,
Pa., 1914); Phoenix, 6 (May 1886): 15; Friends Intelligencer, (16 May 1885): 50 (7 October
1893); 57 (31 March and 23 June 1900); selected correspondence, 1889-1902. Babbidge,
210-216.
At Princeton President Patton followed McCosh's example of recruiting bright young alumni who had spent several years in graduate school. But Woodrow Wilson and his dean, Henry B. Fine, wanted to compete academically with universities and did not give particular attention to alumni. During Wilson's eight years in office the percentage of the total faculty with Princeton degrees dropped from sixty-eight to forty-one percent and the proportion in the junior faculty plummeted from seventy-eight to twenty-nine percent. The new concern with university standards was reflected in recruiting two Cambridge mathematicians and in luring professors away from the universities of Missouri, Chicago, and Pennsylvania, and Yale University. Despite this emphasis, non-academic standards continued to be an important consideration, especially in hiring younger men. But expertise was not the sole criteria. While selecting the "perceptors" for his new undergraduate curriculum, Wilson stressed the importance of character.

They are to be selected primarily upon their stand as gentlemen, men who are companionable, clubable, whose personal qualities of association give them influence over the minds of younger men. If their character as gentlemen and as scholars conflict, the former will give them the place.

The Dean of the Graduate School, Andrew West, still hoped to recruit Princeton alumni. As Patricia Albjerg Graham suggests, in the ambiguous university model Princeton adopted, the concept of gentlemanliness provided a way station between piety and expertise.

The increasing prestige of the universities convinced colleges that their faculties should at least appear to have advanced training. At times the colleges resorted to a simple device. All four awarded honorary degrees to their own professors to cover weak spots. Although this was a time-honored procedure, it was employed to an unprecedented extent between 1890 and 1910. After the latter date

42. *Daily Princeton*, 17 April 1905, quoted in Bragdon, *Woodrow Wilson*, p. 305. Lawrence Veysey has noted that concern with "character" was even present in the most research-oriented universities. See Veysey, *Emergence of the University*, pp. 418-433.
restrictions on the awarding of such degrees became more widely accepted and the practice was curtailed.  

The prerogative of selecting faculty increasingly moved from the trustees to the president. At Bucknell the trustees appear to have delegated the power to Harris who apparently did not confer with the faculty. The Board of Trustees at Franklin and Marshall formally delegated the responsibility to a standing committee but in reality the president’s role apparently grew. The Board of Managers, acting through its Instruction Committee, continued to dominate appointment practices at Swarthmore until Joseph Swain became president in 1902. Committee approval of his recommendations quickly became a formality. President Patton, more from distaste for administration than from conviction, allowed department chairmen at Princeton to make most decisions on new staff. For instance, Professor Woodrow Wilson selected the assistant professor who was to be his only colleague in the new Department of Jurisprudence and Political Economy. As president, Wilson occasionally preempted the departments. His successor gave the faculty greater discretion in hiring, hoping to heal the wounds of the institutional battles in Wilson’s last years.

As the professors’ qualifications became more specialized and as academic reputations came to be more valued by the colleges, their ability to bargain with their employers rose markedly. At Swarthmore in the 1890s the Board of Managers reduced faculty salaries by ten percent during the panic of 1893 and three years later still refused to restore the cuts. This action was in the well-established

44. See the alumni registers for lists of honorary degrees. There is a good description of the practice at Bucknell in Oliphant, *The Rise of Bucknell*, pp. 228-229. For a description of this phenomenon at the national level see, Rudolph, *The American College and University*, pp. 396-397.

45. Bucknell, Trustees, 1889-1917; Bucknell University, Faculty Minutes, Bucknell University Archives, 1889-1917.

46. Franklin and Marshall, Trustees, 1890-1917.

47. Swarthmore College, Instruction Committee, Friends Historical Library, 1890-1916. See especially a letter from President Birdsall to Abby W. Miller read into the minutes of 1 March 1900. Isabelle Bronk to William W. Birdsall, 20 March, 29 March, and 4 April 1901. Birdsall Papers.

48. Woodrow Wilson to Winthrop M. Daniels, 16 May and 30 May 1892 in Arthur Link (ed.), *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* (Princeton, 1969), The Trustees Minutes of 1890 to 1902 confirm that this was a typical procedure.


50. Swarthmore, Instruction Committee, 9 March and 14 April 1896.
tradition of balancing the budget at the faculty's expense and expecting them to accept financial adversity as part of their duty. But when colleges became more conscious of professional reputations as valuable commodities in institutional competition, this situation changed. At Swarthmore ten years after the managers refused to restore salary cuts, they capitulated to the demands of Professor John L. Lowes who threatened to accept an offer from the University of Indiana unless the managers pledged $1,000 annually for the English section of the library and provide an assistant to lighten his workload. Another scholar conditioned his acceptance of Swain's offer of an appointment upon having a twenty-four-inch telescope for his work. Swain having arranged this wrote the good news and added, "but remember this is a Friends' College and thee should give up thy smoking. Please wire thy acceptance." When the prospect balked at this Swain backed down.

As Princeton moved toward university status the bargaining power of the prestigious faculty increased rapidly. In the early 1890s President Patton refused to raise Woodrow Wilson's salary in spite of the offer of a university presidency that would have doubled the young professor's income on the grounds of not wanting to make "individious distinctions" within the faculty. Five years later the offer of the presidency of the University of Virginia forced several trustees to contribute privately $2,500 a year to retain Wilson's services. The stakes rose rapidly. A decade later a trustee built a rent-free house to persuade a well-known University of Pennsylvania biologist to come to Princeton rather than Yale. In 1914 a noted botanist successfully demanded "facilities to carry 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, which perceived their missions in more localistic terms, continued to rely heavily upon their own graduates and were less involved in this type of open market bidding.

51. Ibid., 18 September 1906. Lowes, who gained a moderate literary reputation, went on to Harvard a few years later.
52. "Quaker Astronomer: John A. Miller," clipping from The Sky (March, 1941), Faculty Papers, Friends Historical Library.
Compensation for professional work had never been high and this was accentuated by the lack of security. Academic freedom and tenure were virtually unknown concepts at these institutions. Even with the relative strength of the faculty at Princeton, Wilson was able to remove several full professors who were not meeting his expectations, under authority the trustees granted him to "re-organize" the faculty. At Bucknell, President Harris forced a biologist to remove questions on reproduction from examinations and required two other professors to trade their sporty visored caps for derbys. There was only one definite case of a faculty member being fired for political reasons, but the lack of open conflict was not due to presidential or trustee support for the concept. One reason was the emphasis in hiring upon "character", a euphemism for the candidate's conformity to the institution's practices and beliefs. Also the newness of the concept in America and the lack of formal protection made expression of unpopular opinions particularly dangerous outside universities. The creation of the American Association of University Professors in 1915 provided recourse for some. Members of Swarthmore's and Princeton's faculties joined immediately and a member of the Bucknell faculty followed suit in 1920.

The absence of retirement benefits continued to be a source of insecurity. The trustees awarded pensions only on a parsimonious ad hoc basis. President Magill and Professor Beardsley, each of whom served Swarthmore for over thirty years, received only $500 annually. Freeman Loomis, a professor at Bucknell for thirty-five years, received $600 and a room his first year of retirement. The sum was reduced to $400 the second year and to $200 the third. Creation of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1906 had a distinct impact. The Foundation established

57. The removal of Professor Richard Scheidt, of Franklin and Marshall College was the only violation of academic freedom for political dissent I found. Scheidt, a German immigrant publicly supported that nation's position in World War I. The College historian whitewashes the affair, but the Trustee minutes reveal that Scheidt was fired for dissent. Richard Scheidt, "Germany and the Formative Forces of the War," Reformed Church Review, 19 (1915): 19-48; Klein, Franklin and Marshall, p. 178; Franklin and Marshall, Trustees, Minutes, 23 November 1917.
59. Swarthmore College, Executive Committee, Friends Historical Library, 13 April 1906; Bucknell, Trustees, 20 June 1899, 19 June 1900, 18 June 1901.
pensions for faculty of all non-sectarian institutions. Princeton qualified immediately. Swarthmore, after trying to establish their own program, appealed to the foundation for membership in spite of their denominational affiliation. When the foundation rejected this plea the managers decided to drop the formal requirement that members of their governing board be Friends in order to qualify. Bucknell considered a denominational pension plan, and considered and rejected applying to the foundation. President Apple’s attempt to reduce the proportion of Franklin and Marshall’s board elected by the Reformed synods was blocked by the trustees but it may be significant that ex-President Stahr received a $1,200 pension in 1915. All four colleges either joined the pension fund or felt compelled to consider alternatives.

The colleges and their faculties experienced in mild form the differentiation of function that characterized the universities. Faculty members were gradually relieved of the burden of overseeing students’ non-academic life. In the 1870s and 1880s the faculties, acting as a whole, passed judgment upon individual course changes, disciplinary cases, admissions policies, and other details of campus life. After 1890 these responsibilities were increasingly delegated to ad hoc or standing faculty committees or to the new offices of dean or registrar. As the presidents became more clearly administrators and developed administrative staffs, faculty gained autonomy from the duty of regulating student life on a day to day basis. Faculty regulation of student behavior shifted from the discipline of individuals to the general regulation of extracurricular


62. For the inner-workings of such committees see Woodrow Wilson’s notes taken as Secretary of the Committee on Discipline and as a member of other committees in, Link (ed.), *Papers of Wilson,* Vols. 7-12. Catalogues list faculty committees shortly after 1900 for Franklin and Marshall, Princeton, and Swarthmore. But none are listed for Bucknell until 1919, reflecting the extreme autocracy of President Harris.

63. The reduction and eventual elimination of presidential teaching indicated the increasing differentiation of function. Swarthmore’s President Swain decided not to teach when he assumed office in 1902. The presidents stopped teaching at Franklin and Marshall in 1914, Princeton in 1916, and Bucknell in 1919.
The growth of administrative apparatus and faculty autonomy from the burden of acting in loco parentis proceeded more rapidly at Princeton and at Swarthmore than at Franklin and Marshall and Bucknell.

The academic life of faculty members also tended to become more compartmentalized. Departments had existed in name for decades but they usually consisted of one or two professors and had little function. But increasing institutional size and disciplinary specialization led to real departmentalization at Princeton by 1903. A departmental structure also started to take firm shape at Bucknell and Swarthmore by 1907. Franklin and Marshall's faculty, however, did not effectively departmentalize until after 1915. The denominational organizations and publications that had provided sources of social and intellectual community were not carried on by younger professors. Franklin and Marshall faculty members continued to publish prolifically on various subjects in the *Reformed Church Review*, but by 1915 only the older ones participated. The *Presbyterian (and Reformed) Review* and the *Princeton College Bulletin* provided similar outlets for Princeton's older professors into the early 1900s. The Northumberland Baptist Association and the Swarthmore Monthly Meeting were focal points for the attention of the senior members of Bucknell's and Swarthmore's faculties. Younger faculty, especially at Swarthmore and Princeton, tended to relate more to national academic organizations and less to local and denominational groups.

In conclusion, between 1870 and 1915 academic life at these four institutions became more "professional" in the sense that the concept was taking form in the leading universities. During the first two decades the evolution was slow, the principal change being a growing insistence that job candidates have some specialized graduate training, especially those applying in science and mathematics.

64. See for instance, Princeton University, Faculty, Minutes, Princeton University Archives, Faculty, 18 November 1892, 25 October and 1 November 1893, 17 April 1905; Swarthmore College, Faculty, Minutes 16 February 1903; Bucknell, Faculty, 21 January 1902, 9 May 1903, 15 June 1903, 18 June 1910, 26 May 1917; Franklin and Marshall College, Faculty, Minutes, 19 September 1906.


After 1890, prolonged training, reduction of non-academic duties, teaching and research within an area of specialization, and formal organization into disciplinary departments appeared in varying degrees at the four colleges. The clerical professor was becoming an endangered species. Better pensions and recognition of academic freedom appeared toward the end of the period.

The variation in the extent of professionalization at the four colleges is best explained by the reconciliation each institution made between the cosmopolitan aspects of academic professionalism and the more localistic dimensions of the colleges' missions. The trustees and presidents sought to shape their faculties to fulfill their perception of academic competence as well as particular institutional and denominational roles. In the 1890s the tension was still easily reconciled. The institution, denomination, and community continued to provide the principal reference groups for most faculty. However, after the turn of the century, recruitment at Princeton and Swarthmore was heavily based upon success by national academic standards. Bucknell and Franklin and Marshall continued to emphasize the denominational and local relationships. By the end of this period senior faculty at the latter two colleges continued to define themselves primarily in localistic terms, while junior faculty appear to have been caught between that world and a more cosmopolitan one.

Despite these differences, there are striking similarities in the methods college authorities used to control the effect of professionalization. The use of alumni, the retraining of existing faculty, the awarding of honorary degrees, and the judgement of "character" were effective mechanisms for regulating the type of person entering the institution on a professional basis. Guarantees of gentlemanliness, if not of conventional piety, continued to be important considerations for employment. The faculty gained considerable "professional space," but this freedom reflected autonomy rather than institutional control.

69. Veysey, Emergence of the University, pp. 332-337, suggests there was a similar tendency of faculty to gain autonomy, rather than power, at universities.
taking its clearest form in the universities clearly exerted a profound influence upon faculty life in the colleges. But the impact was carefully managed to fit the self-concept and clientele of each institution, as perceived by the presidents and trustees. The form of professionalism that stressed autonomy bypassed direct conflicts over institutional control, but left college authorities with the mechanisms to eliminate professional academics who did not fit their perceptions. Piety was being replaced by expertise, but new tests of “character” were still available to limit the range of behaviour and opinion that professionalization might introduce into the colleges.

TOO MUCH OF A GOOD THING . . .

There is much talk about compulsory education, progress, woman’s rights, &c. Wonder where we are running? Suppose we stop and look. Are we producing better children, better men and better women? If not, something must be radically wrong. . . . the final result of success must be reckoned in character. Is there one person in twenty capable of receiving a thorough education either compulsory or voluntary? We are making it too easy for our children; they must have the softest places, everything furnished down to a walnut with the “goodies” picked out. . . . Poor things! they must be “edicated,” and they get it, and are sent into society to inflict upon it that most unendurable swell and petty pomposity, resulting from an over-dose of modern education. Was there not a healthier state of affairs years ago, when but three months of common school were taught, and many went only each alternate winter, after chopping half a cord of wood each morning or something equivalent, when we were taught to spell “abracadabra” both backwards and forwards? Twenty-eight years is the average of human life. The aim of the times seems to be to waste at least that much in schools and make the old fellows’ [sic] raise the “taters” and corn. Is there not an opening here for the “crusaders” — a sad need of prayers and spiritual “himes?”

Genius of Liberty (Uniontown, Pa.), 9 April 1874.

Contributed by Schuyler C. Marshall, California State College
A HOAX

A curious cheat has been practiced upon a number of unsuspecting Germans in this county and probably upon many in other places.

In June last, letters in the German language, post-marked at Lebanon, Pa. and signed T. [illeg.] Reichert, were received by several Germans here. Each of these letters stated, that Mr. Charles Petersen, of Philadelphia, had put into the hands of the writer, a packet of letters, brought by the ship Alexander from Amsterdam, and that among them was one for the person he then addressed; that the cost upon it was one dollar, and that it should be immediately forwarded, upon the transmission to him [at] Lebanon, of a par note to that amount. In case the money was not forwarded he would leave the letter with a person in Philadelphia, until the return of the Alexander from Europe. To give the letter an official appearance, there was printed in one corner of it a seal, containing the words: “CORRESPONDENCE SEAL OF AMERICA” and underneath it written, “163, f o.B. [illeg.] Orie—W. Weber.” The money, in many or all instances, was sent to him; but the promised letters not being received here, the postmaster [at] Lebanon was written to, who says in answer, that the fellow who wrote the letters and took [out] the answers, is a stranger who has not since been heard of, and that the whole affair is no doubt “a Dutch Yankee trick.” The postmaster says the fellow’s correspondents in and near Pittsburgh, were very numerous. Can no plan be adopted to discover this “flying Dutchman” and his Amsterdam letters?

Greensburg Gazette, 9 November 1821.

Contributed by Robert M. Blackson, The Pennsylvania State University, Altoona Campus