THE intellectually curious perked up as the professor launched into his lecture. Today’s session focused on Shakespeare, with the professor spicing his thoughts with phrases from the Bard. Gesturing as he spoke, the little man paused to lower his voice while reciting dramatic lines. Histrionics transported his students to far away Verona, Rome, or London. Tomorrow, the professor might discuss mathematics, just as astronomy absorbed him yesterday. His students marveled at their don’s seemingly endless reservoir of knowledge.

But squalor surrounding professor and students belied the collegiate deportment. The professor’s lectern consisted of an ash heap. For instructional aids, he used brown paper as a blackboard and burnt coal for chalk. Barefoot, dressed in tattered shirt and pants, the professor sartorially disguised his academic status and rank of colonel. Union officers, not adolescents, comprised his students, for the vortex of the Civil War had swept the academician from tree-shaded campus to Confederate prison. Colonel John Fraser, master of the classics, had landed in a prisoner of war camp after a tortuous journey from old world to new, from pedagogy to soldiery, from classroom to battlefield.1

John Fraser was an academic who began and ended his collegiate career in Western Pennsylvania. Almost nothing has been written about this Scot who commanded Union troops during the Civil War and also served as president of two major land-grant universities. Fraser’s bold ways, which served him so well before the war, seemed inappropriate for the situations in which he found himself after the war.

John Fraser’s peripatetic life as immigrant, scholar, warrior, and university president mirrored America’s mid-century social and political convulsions. Joining the tide of European immigrants inundating the antebellum nation, Fraser packed a dazzling knowledge of the western intellectual tradition along with his baggage. As a molder of youth, Fraser’s approach to cultivating virtue through discipline and piety exemplified the best of America’s old-time colleges. When war shattered his adopted land, Fraser displayed a full measure of devotion by leading troops at Gettysburg, the Wilderness, and Spottsylvania, and languishing for months as a prisoner of war.

Ironically, the victory he struggled to achieve ushered in a new America that turned his familiar educational milieu of God and Greeks upside down. A man of intellect and ethics devoid of political sensibility, Fraser proved temperamentally incapable of executive duties required of the postwar nation’s “new education.”

Although the post-war educational achievements of military leaders such as Robert E. Lee, Stephen D. Lee, Francis A. Walker, and Joshua Chamberlin have been documented, the failure of other, if less luminary, commanders at peacetime roles in college administration have gone largely unnoticed. A tendency to read history backwards often attributed such post-war success to skills honed by wartime leadership experience. But Fraser’s unsuccessful presidencies of two institutions later to number among America’s major research universities — Pennsylvania State University and the University of Kansas — suggest Fraser’s post-war career accentuated personal characteristics that functioned in the army and old-time college but impaired his later ambitions.

While confined as a prisoner of war, Colonel Fraser probably reminisced about his boyhood along the Scot-
tish coast. Here, Macbeth, Thane of Cromarty, once strode the heather across the cliffs overlooking Cromarty Firth. Below, the town where Fraser was born in 1827 boasted the capacity to host anything afloat. Between tolerably fertile soil and maritime activities, the folk of Cromarty eked out a richer livelihood than the upland crofters who struggled with barren soil. But Cromarty, battling the sea alone, ringed by water and anchored by mountains, bred just as vigorous a Scot. Something in that awe-inspiring landscape yielded the individualist, the lone wolf; the wanderer as empty as a bagpipe wail on the dusky moors.2

For centuries, Cromarty’s fishermen had put for herring waters until the schools disappeared years before Fraser’s birth. Along with the town’s chief commodity, dozens of coopers, sailors, and fish curers vanished from Cromarty’s thatched-roof streets. But Fraser’s father, a ship Chandler, plied his trade in the growing ship-building business.5 Always resourceful with the sea, Cromartians turned a hand to cod fishing, manufacturing sailcloth, and trading. Surrounding the seaport town, castles and other relics bespeaking of exhausted civilizations dotted the landscape. Their legacy of specters, fairies, and Gothic terrors still shok Cromarty. Altogether, the town’s fascination and timeless regularity endowed life with a particular warmth. Up from the pier, tucked among Cromarty’s crooked streets, stood two kirk — one for Scots patois speakers, the other for the Gaelic.4 With a typical parental urge to improve the station of their progeny, the Frasers coaxed their precocious son to enter the ministry.5

Scotland’s stern Presbyterian faith gripped the souls and thoughts of its people. In no other country had the Reformation so triumphed without contest, replacing Popery, ironically, with a faith akin to the unearthly rites of Scotland’s ancient paganism. Perhaps the Frasers sought to appease divine wrath by positioning one of their own in an influential spot. The embers of fire and brimstone still glowed from an evangelical fire that swept the Highlands two decades before Fraser’s birth. Fervor from this evangelism brought the day of reckoning closer to folk who quaked over uncertainties beyond the grave.6 But in their burning attempt to know God, the Scots developed a curiosity about themselves and the world around them. Ages of theological debate honed a knack for unravelling the knottiness of things intellectual. Flourishing individualism went hand in hand with cultivating reason and acquiring knowledge. In the century before Fraser’s birth, the Scots could indulge in self-congratulation for producing the creative minds of David Hume, Adam Smith, Robert Burns, and Sir Walter Scott.7

Though young John Fraser balked at the grimness of lifelong asceticism in a vicarage, his folks agreed to the youth’s insistence on a teaching career. Sometime before mid-century, wee hauchle Fraser, who when fully grown rose to only five-foot-six, left the Fraser hearth in Cromarty for the University of Edinburgh. Preeminent in most fields, Scottish universities had influenced the land’s intellectual flowering. Few students graduated, instead attending a range of courses to quicken the curiosity in their blood. Unlike higher education in the United States, which retained a Puritan penchant for classicism, the progressive Scots encouraged practical application of discovery.8

What John Fraser discovered at Edinburgh was that he didn’t care for Scotland’s seat of learning. He tarried only briefly in the rarified halls of Edinburgh, beginning a lifetime of itinerancy. Fraser then enrolled at the University of Aberdeen, where he applied his intellect with remarkable success. Beyond an energetic approach to academic work and an ambition to succeed, Fraser demonstrated a genuine love of scholarship. He pushed the limits of his kinship’s curiosity while tempering it with reverence for the Almighty. Fraser’s intellectual tastes spanned the spectrum of human knowledge. Thucydides and Lucretius, Napier and Newton, Descartes and Hume touched and stirred Fraser’s soul. At the conclusion of his final year, the university fathers awarded Fraser the Huttonian prize, presented only once every 10 years, for his wizardry in mathematics.9

Following the trail of emigrating countrymen, Fraser set sail for the New World. As the vessel sighted and bobbed, Fraser welcomed the dull hours as an opportunity to peruse his Huttonian award — a collection of gilt-edged, leather-bound Greek and Latin classics. Whether arranged before his departure or by accident, when the ship anchored in Bermuda, Fraser landed a teaching job at the Hamilton Institute, courtesy of Her Majesty’s colonial beneficence.10 In time, a bad supply of water on the island affected Fraser’s health. Searching for a more salubrious environment, he secured a head-
master post at a private school in New York City.

Soon, however, Fraser's introduction to life in the United States soured. Personal and financial troubles plagued him. For one thing, as an alternative to Bermuda's bad water, Fraser had habituated himself to slaking his thirst with large quantities of Scotch ale. Eventually he kicked the habit on the advice of dismayed acquaintances who informed him that genteel Americans took exception to excessive tippling. Whether linked to alcohol or otherwise, Fraser then faced bankruptcy. In desperation he pawned his voluminous collection of books, including the treasured Huttonian classics.11

At this point of gloom, Fraser's fortunes turned. His storehouse of knowledge impressed one Joseph Paull of Connellsville, Pa., who in 1851 hired the Scot to serve as family tutor. Word spread in the neighborhood that the Paull children were receiving excellent instruction. Fraser's tutorship shortly grew to headship of a community enterprise known as Dunlap Creek Academy. But his reputation as a competent molder of youth, along with the influence of Reverend James Black, soon secured Fraser a post at a nearby college. Jefferson College in Canonsburg appointed Fraser professor of mathematics and astronomy four years after his arrival in Western Pennsylvania.12

The oldest institution of its type west of the Alleghenies, the college's humble origins in a log cabin masked its lofty mission of training Presbyterian clergy for the frontier. Although Jefferson had shaken off its missionary fervor by the time Fraser arrived, religious authority continued to drive the operation. Typical of other antebellum colleges, the institution's archaic curriculum attempted to transmit unquestioning belief in traditional authority through moral and intellectual discipline. Religion overarched a unified program of Greek and Roman writings, moral philosophy, metaphysics, mathematics, and logic that spared students from conflicting authority by teaching universal truths. Jefferson's accommodation to a society in flux consisted of infusing students with middle-class virtues such as enterprise, piety, and sobriety. The trustees' grand design to emulate Harvard and Yale achieved a national reputation for the college, which attracted to its socially elite student body a large proportion of Southerners. Among Jefferson's five dozen annual graduates the college counted scores of influential Americans, some of whom surfaced in John Fraser's life long after he left for bigger adventures.13

Fraser's comprehensive knowledge and Calvinist zeal corresponded to the paternalism Jefferson practiced in both pedagogy and development of future public leaders. Professors served as the cornerstone of a system designed to instill virtue through moral mentoring. Although the college president provided ultimate paternal authority, faculty members furnished students a continuous presence of kindly guidance and Christian example. They stood apart from the world, bonded with their charges in a state of prolonged adolescence.

Despite the position's deviation from society, Fraser flourished in the pietistic college's environment.14 In the spirit of his kinsmen who developed the era's dominant "Common Sense" philosophy, he had grounded his educational beliefs in Calvinism. Youth, Fraser felt, must know God to improve the conscience as a guide to moral conduct. But to lead the fulfilled, productive life that God intended, students needed not simply Christian doctrine but knowledge and imagination as well. Only by nurturing passion and reason, Fraser believed, could the human spirit soar.15

Fraser applied this conviction in his role as don in Jefferson's educational process. His zeal and enthusiasm for teaching galvanized students jaded by too many moribund lectures. Although Fraser's old world manners struck Jefferson's students as a bit odd at first, they soon viewed the diminutive Scot as a refreshing alternative to woolly-headed pedants who failed in the classroom.16 "He loved the work of the teacher," recalled one of his students. "Differential and integral calculus and mechanics... are not of a character to afford much pleasure to the average student; yet Professor Fraser's perfect mastery of them, and his manner of instruction and elucidation, clothed them with an interest to the dullest of his pupils."17 Those who lacked ability to keep pace were tutored by Fraser after class.18 "I have little confidence in the phrase 'talent for mathematics,'" Fraser once remarked. "Many a poor boy, failing to understand the problem before him, is called a dunce, when too often the name by right would belong to the teacher."19

In spite of his small stature, Fraser's piercing eyes, rich voice, long hair and beard evoked a commanding presence mesmerizing to adolescent minds.20 Under-sized the Scotman might have been, but the head set atop the diminutive body suggested, remarked one
student, “that after an average head had been made there had been set upon it in addition a crown representing all the nobler parts of the brain.”

In the days before academic specialization, Fraser represented the Renaissance man of broad intellectual mastery. He displayed not only command of mathematics, but also history, law, natural sciences, philosophy, and literature. Fraser pried students with these subjects along with writers such as Mill, Schiller, Goethe, the Brontes, Coleridge, Dickens, Thackeray, Ruskin, and Spencer. For many Jefferson students, the end of a class day meant accompanying Professor Fraser to his room in the “Fort Job” boarding house. Here, to the boys’ amazement, he captivated them with subjects they normally considered deadly. One student termed it “a wonderful treat” when the professor launched into his discussion “with the eloquence of a great soul awake and on fire.” Fraser acted out of a conviction that education must burst through institutional confines and relate to real-life experience. “Oh, to give the young the eye that sees!” he emphasized. Irrespective of his own scholarly turn of mind, Fraser admitted the inherent lifelessness of knowledge. Without integrating God, self, and the environment, knowledge could hardly be meaningful, and consequently useful, to prospective Christian gentlemen.

The absence of Jefferson College’s usual contingent of Southern students in 1861 reflected the national schism seething to a boiling point. During initial months of the fighting, the federal war effort increasingly siphoned off Jefferson’s students. Fraser resisted an initial impulse to enlist, preferring instead to bide his time and wait for the commission he felt he deserved. “I have concluded to stay at home for the present,” Fraser wrote late in 1861, “and do my best to aid...in taking care of the children whom our warriors have left behind.”

The opportunity presented itself during summer 1862, when the conflict’s obduracy prompted the Lincoln administration to call for 300,000 more volunteers. “Young gentlemen, the country needs strong and brave defenders,” Fraser told a class in August, “and since I am sound in wind and limb, I see no good reason why I should not enroll myself with them.” Fraser then announced his intention to recruit a company of volunteers. Two weeks later, the Washington (Pa.) Reporter noted that “Captain John Fraser” had successfully recruited an entire company in less than a week.

The feat indicated Fraser’s popularity in the community and among a student body that had dwindled to a few hundred. “This is unprecedented in the recruiting line,” boasted the Reporter, “especially if we take into consideration that this is the third company recruited from Canonsburg and the country around....” When the group formed company G of the 140th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, one of over 20 three-year enlistment regiments summoned by Governor Andrew Curtin, Fraser received appointment as lieutenant-colonel. But the influence of Jefferson College remained. Once assembled at Camp Curtin in Harrisburg, Fraser’s first maneuver marched a band of former students, scrubbed and attired in dress blues, to Presbyterian Sunday services conducted by a former college associate.

Days later, while boarding a train bound for the front, Fraser might have been surprised to meet one of his former students, James A. Beaver, ’56. Beaver had surpassed his former mentor in rank as colonel of the 148th Pennsylvania. Both regiments had been attached to the Second Corps of the Army of the Potomac. On the way to earning its reputation as the army’s shock troops, the Second Corps transported the Pennsylvanians to the eternal fire and back. The 140th’s initial assignments forced the regiment to battle not Rebels, but more insidious enemies such as homesickness, malaria, typhoid, and frostbite. Otherwise the western Pennsylvanians were exempted from a combat role. Sent to guard the Northern Central railroad during Lee’s invasion of Maryland in the fall of 1862, the 140th then slunk into the monotony of winter camp at Falmouth. The severe winter prompted one veteran to recall that the boys “had experiences of discomfort and suffering which were scarcely equalled by Washington’s command at Valley Forge.”

But like their tenacious counterparts from 1778, the regiment, along with the rest of the army, emerged from the winter in fighting trim. When the army’s spring offensive culminated in the Union debacle at Chancellorsville, the 140th joined in the war’s blood-letting for the first time. As the Union lines caved in on the second day of the battle, the 140th supported a battery lacing hot iron into rushing hordes of Confederates, then wheeled its smoking guns off the field to prevent their capture.

The summer of 1863 saw Lee make his second incursion onto northern soil. When the month-long maneuvers by both armies climaxed at Gettysburg, the 140th found itself perched in reserve on the Union left on the battle’s second day. Hastily advancing to the right of the third brigade, they paused to load at the edge of a maelstrom known ever after as “the Wheat field.” Suddenly the 140th was hit by convulsive rifle fire from a line of screaming Rebels. Scores of soldiers dropped in the blast, including the regiment’s brigade commander. When the regimental commander also fell on their charge across the wheat field, leadership of the brigade fell to John Fraser.
Not knowing this, Fraser, with his lines crumpling, twice sent for orders. When no replies came he decided to hold his ground and, as he put it, "keep the enemy at bay as long as possible" for the safety of those in advance. \(^{35}\) Waiting until the last possible moment, Fraser ordered a retreat. Losses for the 140th were frightful — out of 490 who had crossed the wheat field on July 2, 241 failed to cross it on the return. \(^{36}\) As a tribute to Fraser's leadership of a brigade in extremis, divisional commander John Caldwell termed Fraser's behavior "worthy of all praise." \(^{37}\) Although his authority as brigade commander ended with the retreat, Fraser received a commission as colonel of the 140th later that month. \(^{38}\)

For the next 10 months, the 140th experienced only limited action until Grant's offensive in May 1864. In the impenetrable tangle and gloom of the Wilderness in Virginia, the 140th shared in the May and June see-saw fighting on the Federal left. At one point in the fighting, Fraser noticed a mass of Confederates in the underbrush just a few paces in front of the regiment, and he ordered a successful charge.

Six days later they faced more sanguinary action at Spottsylvania. \(^{39}\) Preparing his troops to spearhead the famed Second Corps assault against the "Bloody Angle," Colonel Fraser walked down the ranks with words of encouragement. \(^{40}\) In the vanguard of the juggernaut 40 ranks deep, Fraser went down with a wound as his troops stormed the Rebel salient and planted the regiment's colors on the works. \(^{41}\) The wound put Fraser out of action for a month.

Fraser returned on June 11, in the midst of Grant's attempt to beat Lee to the punch in seizing Petersburg. \(^{42}\) After a few days of temporary assignment, he was ordered back to his old division's Fourth Brigade. \(^{43}\) The next day, as Fraser advanced his new command from earthworks thrown up near the Weldon Railroad, Rebels suddenly appeared at his left flank and rear. Commanding as coolly as he had at the wheat field, Fraser ordered the brigade to ease its way back to the earthworks, but the Rebels came in swarms this time and captured Fraser along with many other Federals. \(^{44}\)

Fraser's new career as prisoner of war began in Libby Prison, but the Rebels shortly moved him to Macon, Ga. Old memories were probably stirred when he discovered several of his former Jefferson students sharing Confederate hospitality with him. \(^{45}\) Sometime in September, Confederate authorities moved Fraser again, this time to Charleston, S.C. Survivors remembered how the ex-professor amused himself by calculating the distance of batteries based on the flight time of their shells. Here he also used his remarkable memory to entertain comrades with Shakespearean plays and lectures on science, philosophy, and literature. \(^{46}\)

In early October, Fraser's captors marched him to a barren field near Columbia, S.C. The prisoners nicknamed the desolate spot "Camp Sorghum" in honor of the camp's chief repent. In November 1864, while Brig. Gen. Nelson Miles tried to arrange for the colonel's exchange, Fraser drafted a letter to Lt. Gen. William Hardee complaining of the prison's conditions. \(^{47}\) Writing on behalf of all of Camp Sorghum's 1,400 prisoners, Fraser complained mostly about rations and lack of shelter. He composed four drafts of the letter, each more diplomatic than the preceding one, informing Hardee "that we have not exaggerated anything or set down aught with malice." \(^{48}\) Fraser presumably thought Hardee would be shocked to learn that prisoners use pine boughs for shelter, and received only a handful of "unbolted" cornmeal with molasses for daily rations. No evidence exists that Hardee ever received the letter. Soon after Fraser wrote it, prison authorities responded to Maj. Gen. William T. Sherman's relentless thrust into the Carolinas by moving Camp Sorghum's inmates northward. Fraser and his colleagues were released in North Carolina late in February 1865. \(^{49}\) He returned to command his brigade following Lee's surrender, and shortly afterward was mustered out of service. \(^{50}\) Two years later, the War Department issued a general order breveting Fraser to brigadier general for "gallant service." \(^{51}\) When he returned to Canonsburg as a war hero with remnants of his command, the college held a reception in his honor. Why Fraser did not remain at Jefferson College following his triumphant return to campus is unclear. The 1865 merger between Jefferson and neighboring Washington College might have been a factor. Perhaps old peripatetic instincts were aroused, or new psychological problems induced by three years of combat and prison trauma surfaced. Or perhaps Fraser simply based his decision on a more lucrative offer than Jefferson College could afford.

In September 1865, the fledgling Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, later to become Pennsylvania State University, invited Fraser to join its faculty as lecturer on military tactics and professor of mathematics and astronomy. In establishing course work in military science, trustees of the college were attempting to comply with terms of the 1862 Morrill Land-Grant Act. Doing so might have given them an edge in the Pennsylvania legislature, where other colleges in the state vied for the act's benefits. \(^{52}\) Probably Fraser's acquaintance with former student and comrade-in-arms James A. Beaver rather than his reputation as a warrior attracted the trustees' attention. Before the war, Beaver had joined
the law practice of influential college trustee H. N. McAllister, a Jefferson College alumnus himself. Beaver also had married McAllister’s daughter.53

The financially strapped Agricultural College that greeted Fraser scarcely lived up to the dreams accompanying its establishment a decade before. A revolutionary venture in vocationalism at the higher education level, the institution incurred the wrath of the state’s traditional colleges. Even friends of the college argued over whether it should train farmers or offer farmers a classical curriculum in the Jefferson College genre. It had tried to do a little of both, which some found infuriating and others laughable. The state’s farm community asked why its sons should learn farm chores more profitably learned at home, or be seduced away from farming by fancy subjects.

The 1862 Morrill Land-Grant Act’s potential as a source of funding momentarily stimulated the college’s prospects. It offered land to each state for the endowment of colleges offering military tactics, agriculture, and the mechanical arts. But the act’s progressive spirit lacked focus. It also ambiguously mentioned “classical studies” and “liberal education.”54 Although the Pennsylvania legislature had granted the act’s benefits to the Agricultural College in 1863, an insidious amendment stating “until otherwise ordered by the state of Pennsylvania” sent representatives from colleges all over the state scurrying to Harrisburg.55

Debate over disposition of the benefits continued for years. Former Agricultural College president Evan Pugh spent weeks in the legislature lobbying for the Morrill Act’s funding. As proof of the Agricultural College’s worthiness, he had drafted a prophetic “Plan for the Organization of Colleges for Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts.” In the plan, Pugh, a chemist holding a Ph.D. awarded in Germany, asserted that agricultural and mechanical colleges must serve as social agents by advancing the frontiers of knowledge. That meant scientific research, and Pugh outlined the faculty and material needed for this innovation in public education.56 The college only required money to carry out the plan. But Pugh, weakened by over-work and laid low by typhoid, died in 1864. By the time Fraser arrived, the Agricultural College sorely missed Pugh’s leadership. In desperation the trustees doubled tuition from $100 to $200 and mortgaged the college for $80,000 to retire its debts.57 Faced with dwindling enrollments, a moribund curriculum, increasing enmity, lack of legislative support, and big financial woes, the college’s future appeared doubtful.

Although he had only taught at the Agricultural College a few months, Fraser diagnosed the college’s malaise and suggested a remedy early in 1866. To Fraser, the college’s problem centered on its product. By establishing a unique but needed niche in the educational marketplace, the college could attract students while simultaneously impressing legislators and the public. In particular, by instituting a program in mechanical arts, the college could conform to Morrill Act provisions. The legislature had long used the college’s lack of mechanical arts education as ammunition against it during debate over Morrill Act benefits.58

Fraser began by campaigning among the half-dozen other faculty members against President William H. Allen’s administration. Together, they drafted a resolution stating the need to change the current administration’s educational policy, which had “failed, and, in the judgement of the faculty cannot but fail to satisfy their expectations as the friends of enlightened practical education.”59 Fraser thrust the document before the trustees on May 7, 1866. In turn, the trustees asked the faculty for suggested “changes and improvements in the literary and scientific departments of the college...”60 What Fraser and his colleagues produced represented a drastic departure from the college’s educational policy. President Allen, having lost control of his office to the upstart, resigned. Not surprisingly, the trustees indicated that Fraser must show everyone how to implement the scheme he had set in motion. They appointed him president September 5.61

Fraser’s plan, in fact, reflected little original thinking on his part. It contained many elements of his predeces-
sor’s “plan,” which had lain dormant since Pugh’s death. Both called for additional degree programs to meet the needs of a rapidly industrializing nation, 23 faculty, teaching assistants, pursuit of scientific research, and abolition of the student labor rule. In attempting to succeed with the plan, Fraser displayed a flair for marketing.

Although the college hardly possessed resources to implement it, Fraser put up a good front. He stumped about the state. He lowered tuition. He issued a circular announcing the college’s new program. Designed to appeal to legislators and the public, the circular stated that the Agricultural College now completely conformed to Morrill Act provisions. However, most of its details were imaginary. The pamphlet puffed up the little college considerably, boasting of nonexistent degree programs in engineering, mining, and metallurgy accompanied by a list of nonexistent faculty. It proclaimed abolition of the student labor rule in favor of military training. As additional promotion, alumni were welcomed back anytime to review courses free of charge. Most innovatively, the circular announced initiation of “practicums” designed to introduce students to “original observation and research.” At least Fraser’s reforming spirit struck the faculty favorably: “President Fraser,” a colleague wrote, “has been at the head of affairs only a few months, but we hope he is the man for the place, and if the trustees are not clod hoppers...we have reason to anticipate the establishment here of an excellent institution.”

The plan, however, failed to produce the immediate results necessary. By mid-July 1868, a friend of the Agricultural College mourned the loss of Evan Pugh, adding, “I am now satisfied that the selection of Mr. Fraser as president was a most unfortunate one for the college on account of his administration abilities.” Enrollment plummeted from 114 in 1865 to 30 only two years later. Although the legislature finally yielded to the Agricultural College in the land-grant funding struggle, it did so with the expensive stipulation that the college purchase and maintain three experimental farms. Between the farms and interest on the $80,000 mortgage, the college’s financial outlook appeared bleak.

Frustrated, Fraser asked to be relieved of the college’s financial and maintenance responsibilities early in 1868. This may have irritated a few trustees, who were then forced to spend an additional $1,000 annually on a financial officer. Six weeks later Fraser resigned, citing “irreconcilable differences” with the board of trustees. At their next meeting, trustees handed Fraser a severance check for $598.58 while voting to discontinue his reorganization plan. The following academic year the college reverted to the same curriculum it had offered when Fraser arrived.

Fraser’s plan required more time to yield results than the trustees’ patience could bear. Although Fraser intended to move the college closer to the spirit of the Morrill Act, the plan simply had been too grandiose for the Agricultural College’s pitiful budget. It portended a future of land-grant education 20 years away. No one at that time, in Pennsylvania or elsewhere, knew much about public industrial colleges or how they were supposed to work. They represented a progressive but untried concept in education. No model existed to emulate. Probably with complete sincerity Fraser, the idealist, seized the plans of Pugh, the visionary. No one questioned the possibility of implementing Pugh’s grand scheme. After all, Pugh’s legacy included an outstanding reputation in agricultural education. It was Fraser’s lot to prove the plans were inappropriate for the situation.

Fraser, though, had been protecting his flanks all along. He had already accepted the chancellorship and presidency of another public institution, the University of Kansas. Fraser retreated from the Pennsylvania imbroglio to the struggling Kansas institution possessing an overblown title.

The “University” of Kansas existed in name only, belying the reality of a solitary little building set atop windswept Mount Oread in Lawrence. The school counted 140 students, but 136 of these were enrolled in the preparatory department. Although Kansas had directed its land-grant benefits toward another institution, the university depended on capricious state legislators to survive. The layout could hardly have been better than the Agricultural College for Fraser, but he probably felt fortunate to depart from Pennsylvania with his dignity. Fraser also must have taken personal satisfaction from besting for the job a more prominent ex-general, Oliver Otis Howard. Once again, Fraser’s connection with Jefferson College had paid off: he owed the Kansas appointment in part to two Jefferson alumni living in Lawrence.

Fraser plunged into his new responsibilities as he had at the Agricultural College. He immediately decided
the college needed a new building, but legislators were in no mood to comply with his latest dream. He then secured a special bond issue from the people of Lawrence to fund the structure, his greatest achievement as president. Under Fraser, the faculty grew from four to nine, and in 1870 Fraser implemented the program in engineering that had caused him grief in Pennsylvania. At the age of 45 he married a recent graduate with whom he had been in love since her freshman year. President Grant visited the campus in 1873, the same year Fraser presided over the school’s first commencement. While Fraser delivered an address at the ceremony, pranksters lowered a human skeleton onto the stage labeled “Prex.” When young Mrs. Fraser, whispering, asked her husband what “Prex” meant, he replied “the faculty.”

Fraser’s halcyon days at Kansas ended as troubles mounted in the early 1870s. Some of the problems he encountered at the college in Pennsylvania surfaced again in Lawrence. The legislature grew increasingly ungenerous in the wake of the 1873 recession and a plague of grasshoppers that descended on Kansas. Then an adversarial relationship developed between Fraser and the faculty, who claimed he managed the school like a drill camp. Although Fraser demonstrated competence at managing a large-scale organization during the war, he lacked political skills necessary for success as a university president.

A temperamental individual, Fraser’s moods on any day swung from irascibility to congeniality. “He possessed executive ability in no mean degree,” remembered a faculty member, “but he lacked the power of controlling men and harmonizing discordant elements.” Reminiscent of Fraser’s promotional tactics in Pennsylvania, a faculty member accused him of inflating the number of students listed in the college catalog merely for publicity. Ironically, the strategy Fraser used against President Allen in Pennsylvania was turned on him by the Kansas faculty. They presented a petition to the board of regents outlining their complaints about Fraser’s authoritarianism. Apparently unable or unwilling to out-maneuver the faculty, Fraser resigned in April 1874.

Fraser poorly exemplified the utility of classical education that he himself advocated. Despite his vast knowledge of human behavior stored as metaphors and similes from literature and history, he could not transfer these tropes to practical social interaction. His administrations did not miscarry because the old soldier failed to grasp the importance of practical higher education. Fraser’s defeats radiated from a basic incapacity to communicate in situations requiring tact, deference, and accommodation. While his style succeeded in the perfunctory, authoritarian spheres of the military and old-time college, Fraser found his imperiousness and erudition of little use in public administration.

The circumstances at both foundering institutions would have tried the most adept leadership, but Fraser’s surliensness and stubbornness to compromise engendered subversive enmity that ensured the collapse of his initiatives. Even though he displayed sensitivity to institutional environments by adjusting to legislative and public constituencies in Pennsylvania and Kansas, Fraser’s inability to orchestrate and inspire human resources available to him blurred the institutional vision he tried to establish.

Most damaging, Fraser’s saturnine temperament and lack of political savvy were exposed by a new educational environment galvanized by the Union victory he had struggled to achieve. When Emerson, shortly after the war, detected “a cleavage...in the hitherto firm granite of the past,” he could have been focusing his remark on higher education. Together, science and technology opened what gradually grew to a great gulf separating “new education” from the paternalistic, sectarian college of Fraser’s pre-war career. The transforming milieu introduced not simply new subjects, but new learning methods emphasizing inquiry and observable proof over dogma and blind acceptance. Science, reflecting the American affinity for materialism, slowly toppled God from the curricular apex. Learning of an empirical nature suited to a technological age left little room for the scholar possessing multiple interests and regard for the unity of knowledge. Unity deferred to diversity, specialists replaced tutors, and paternalism gave way to competitiveness until the antebellum college seemed but an archaic relic. That education was no longer a matter of instilling “young gentlemen” with virtue, or pursuing truth in a religious framework, must have perplexed Fraser’s world view.

Beyond adjustment problems to an alien educational paradigm, Fraser confronted demands for a corresponding new type of higher education leadership. Typical of other post-war public higher education institutions, the colleges Fraser steered faced under-funding, uncertain missions, over-burdened faculties, and isolation that challenged administrative capacity. “It was not then a day for erudition,” an observer wrote, “but a time for clear faith, homely, and direct relations with the people, wisdom in giving advice.” For a scholar accustomed to exerting unquestioned authority, the circumstances were most unpromising.

Fraser’s successes in life, developing adolescents and leading them in battle, had reinforced his authoritarian
manner. Had he served instead as president of an old-time college, some of which resisted pressure to change years after the war, Fraser also may have counseled college leadership among his successes. As the ultimate paternal authority on campus, the old-time college president commanded a socially removed hierarchy submissive to unconditional direction. The position demanded ramrod supervision, firm guidance, and personal convictions about piety and moral teaching. But the new education’s response to social needs required executives skilled in human relations both within and beyond college walls. The inchoate foundering of early public colleges burdened the president with harmonizing faculty of increasingly divergent interests. More important, the new education discarded religiously inspired academics in leadership posts for men of worldly affairs possessing business acumen and negotiation skills. Those whose temperament suited the old-time college tradition of standing apart from the world could not succeed. The political struggles for turf from within this environment and the fight for legislative support from without confounded an aging Calvinist soldier accustomed to the paternalism and insularity of an earlier day.84

After he resigned the university’s presidency, Fraser moved to Topeka. Nominated as superintendent of public instruction at the 1874 Republican state convention, Fraser reportedly performed admirably in the post. Once again, however, Fraser’s adroit political gestures proved his undoing, and he lost the job after two years.85 A Kansas editorial eulogized him as a “devoted friend” of education, but added that “he was, however, no politician; his purity of motive, his straightforwardness and outspoken frankness ill fitted him to enter the arena of political strife.”86

Weary of Kansas and politics, Fraser late in 1877 joined the faculty of the small Western University of Pennsylvania (later renamed the University of Pittsburgh) as an instructor in political economy and history. In the institution’s 1878 catalog Fraser’s name is listed at the bottom of 17 faculty members. His effort to find peace in the trade he once loved ended after he lost a bout with smallpox on June 5. Even death failed to end Fraser’s troubles or his wandering. An entry in the faculty minutes of Western University five days after his death referred to rumors circulating that “in some way injustice was done” to the old general “by the Faculty, or some members of the Faculty…”87

Thus adjustment problems plagued Fraser to the end, and his final attempt to recreate happier days in the classroom probably proved unsatisfying after 15 years of executive level positions. Befitting a life of moving from school to school, battlefield to battlefield, and prison to prison, Fraser’s widow disinterred his body from Allegheny Cemetery in Pittsburgh and moved it to a family plot in Oshkosh, Wisconsin.88

---
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