CHAPTER FOURTEEN

POST-WAR ADJUSTMENTS

Facing the "New World"

* * *

BACK TO PEACE

The resourcefulness and adaptability of the college organization and program were demonstrated not only by the effectiveness with which personnel and equipment were mobilized for war service, but also in the facility and celerity with which return was made to normal status. This was effected in the midst of disorganization, confusion, and inadequacy of resources. Elaborately organized classes on technical and war issues were abandoned or completely altered in aim and emphasis. The S. A. T. C. demobilization had been followed by the departure of about 700 students with consequent disruption of the scheduled classes for the rest of the year. But this reaction was only temporary. The post-war years marked an unprecedented zeal for higher education, especially in engineering, industrial science, and home economics. Only agriculture showed a relative decline. Veterans were eager for the special training which the federal vocational board provided for them, and these students added an appreciable proportion of the increased attendance until their needs were met.

In face of mounting enrollment and extended program the building shortage was acute. Laboratories, classrooms, offices, and residence halls were badly overcrowded. Land and farm

buildings were urgently needed for experimental work. During the next five years the essential needs were met by the completion of the hospital, and the erection of the armory, the library, the physics, and the home economics buildings, and the purchase and equipment of the animal husbandry and veterinary investigation farms.

PERSONNEL CHANGES

Deaths, resignations, and administrative reorganization occasioned an unprecedented number of major appointments in the post-war years. The deaths of Deans Stanton and Mac-Kay and vice-Dean Beach in successive years, 1920-22, removed key leaders from the institutional staff. Lieutenant Colonel Marston retired from military service to resume his deanship, Dean Bever was transferred to Industrial Science, and Dean Buchanan became the first head of the Graduate College. Anna E. Richardson was brought from the federal board of vocational education as the new dean of Home Economics. Professor Maria M. Roberts became dean of the Junior College. In 1922 the office of dean of men was created. John E. Foster of the state department of education was selected for this responsible position and soon afterward was also made dean of the summer quarter. Charles Harvey Brown was secured as college librarian and Dr. James F. Edwards as head of the college health service. In the reorganization of the business and recording functions, Herman Knapp was made business manager and treasurer and James R. Sage, registrar.

This period of readjustment also marked the selection of an unusual number of heads of leading departments: In agriculture: Henry H. Kildee, animal husbandry; Ernest W. Lindstrom, genetics; Bethel S. Pickett, horticulture; and William H. Lancelot, vocational education; in engineering: Almon H. Fuller, civil; Orland H. Sweeney, chemical; and J.

Brownlee Davidson, who returned to agricultural engineering after four years at the University of California; and in science: Edwin R. Smith, mathematics; Carl J. Drake (following a four-year term by E. D. Ball, '95), zoology and state entomologist; John E. Evans, psychology; and Tolbert MacRae, music. The war and reconstruction brought a correspondingly large number of changes in the general staff.

Although, characteristically, popular interest in military organization waned rapidly with peace times, the War Department and the college administration sensed the lesson of the past struggle and present uncertainties. There was no intermission between the temporary organizations of the war and the permanent instructional organization. In January, 1919, an R. O. T. C. unit was created under the command of Lieutenant Colonel John K. Boles. The early response, particularly for the advanced courses, was discouraging. No ex-service men entered the training. The following year the work was headed by Colonel Pearl M. Shaffer, the real organizer of the new course. Colonel Shaffer was a native of Iowa, a graduate of the State Teachers College, and had seen service in the Philippines, on the Mexican Border, and in the World War. He had taken advanced training at the Army Service School at Fort Leavenworth and had served four years as professor of military science at the Kansas State College. His first task was to build up the instructional staff. He secured a staff of six commissioned officers, and the assistance of twenty-four non-commissioned officers, specialists, and privates. General Lincoln was continued to his death in 1922 to deliver special lectures and used his influence in every way to support the training.

The legislature gave liberal support. An armory was built in 1921, partially destroyed by fire in December, 1922, and rebuilt the next year. The College shared to some degree in the reaction against military training which took place in

American colleges in the late twenties and early thirties. The agitation was more from outside organizations than from sentiment within. Petitions were circulated among students and townspeople and preferential votes taken. Bills were introduced in the legislature providing for putting the training on a voluntary basis, and a group of anti-military organizations secured a hearing before the State Board of Education in 1930, but no action was taken. At Iowa State the sentiment never reached large proportions. The high caliber of the officers detailed, the strong support of the work by the administration, as well as a full opportunity for discussion, and a rational provision for the relatively few "C.O.s" largely accounted for this lack of the extreme demonstrations that were made in some colleges. Here as elsewhere the new European crisis eventuating in World War II brought a marked cessation of agitation.

A WORLD WAR MEMORIAL

At Iowa State, as in other large colleges, there was a general feeling that the place of the College in the war should be commemorated by some outstanding memorial. Student, faculty, and alumni sentiment was canvassed and proved to be overwhelmingly in favor of a college union building. The peculiar function of such a building seemed most in harmony with the spirit of the sacrifice that it represented. The votes for a purely decorative memorial like a tower, monument, arch, or specialized building, such as a museum, were very few. The project was launched in a giant mass meeting in the spring of 1920 which inaugurated a preliminary campus canvass. In the succeeding months the campaign was vigorously pressed among alumni throughout the country. President Pearson was supported by the president of the Alumni Association. Morris J. Riggs, '83, who in 1922 secured a leave of absence from his business for two months to present the cause. The

enterprise was so large, involving plans for an outlay of nearly two million dollars, that, in a period of business deflation, it was prolonged, but progress was steadily made.

SEMI-CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

The institutional enthusiasm called forth by the achievement in the war, as well as the growing maturity of the College and the passing of a convenient land-mark—the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of instruction—suggested a general observance. The celebration was so elaborate that though planned for October, 1919, it could not be held until the commencement in June, 1920.

The organization of faculty, alumni, students, and townspeople was most inclusive. In addition to the programs of general and special addresses, several other projects were planned. A history of the College was to be started and a brief summary prepared. In July, 1919, the alumni association had asked that Dean Stanton prepare such a history, and a committee of which he was chairman began the collection of materials early in 1920. The Dean's illness in March, which necessitated his going to the hospital, interrupted his work, and the committee decided to issue a brief pamphlet as an historical souvenir-a general introduction and brief accounts of the developments of the divisions and services. This effort marked the beginning of the assembling of a college history collection. In 1922 Professor Pammel was made chairman of the committee and with inadequate facilities assembled available pamphlet and manuscript material and held a large number of interviews with alumni, former faculty members, and early settlers. The preservation of such unofficial records as exist is due largely to his tireless efforts. Another committee, headed by the reference librarian, was concerned with the compilation of a college war record and the collection of an exhibit of war souvenirs.

The celebration was held on the two days between the 320

baccalaureate and commencement—the speaker at the former was President Ernest D. Burton of the University of Chicago and at the latter, President Marion L. Burton of the University of Minnesota. The general founders' day program was devoted to addresses on various relations of the land-grant colleges—those with the Department of Agriculture by Secretary Wilson, with the state by Senator Clem S. Kimball, '89, and with the public by Dean Eugene Davenport, of the University of Illinois. There were also greetings from the University by President Jessup, from the private colleges of the state; by President Holmes of Drake, as well as from representatives of the Federation of Women's Clubs, the Farm Bureau, the Manufacturers' Association, and the State Bureau of Labor. The afternoon was given over to athletic events, a military drill, and an elaborate historical pageant depicting the founding and functioning of the College. The second day was devoted to divisional symposia in which distinguished alumni and other leaders in the various fields represented participated. Unfortunately the addresses and discussions were not published.

CAMPUS MEMORIALS

This historical consciousness, called forth in large part by the College's heroic participations in the war, was further shown in the marking of campus sites of especial historical interest and the establishment of memorials to the early leaders. The dedication of groups of trees was especially appropriate as a constant reminder of the sacrifices and achievements of the founding fathers. But among the campus memorials, natural and designed, the Stanton carillon—the "bells of Iowa State"—must always have a unique appeal. Dean Stanton's will had provided that his residuary estate should be devoted to a permanent memorial, and his heirs decided that an addition to the memorial of 1899 would be the most appropriate daily reminder of one of the College's

truest and most devoted sons. The addition of twenty-six bells changed the original chimes of ten to a carillon of / thirty-six. The memorial was dedicated on October 6, 1929,/ with a concert by Anton Brees, the noted Belgian carillonneur.

THE POST-WAR STUDENT

The post-war student was all too little concerned with the past—indifferent to its struggles and contemptuous of its triumphs. With certain ex-soldiers there was an over-critical attitude—invariably, the less their direct participation, the more was their complaint and discontent. With all there was a reaction from the strain and stress of war exertion and control. The jazz age, with flapper and sheik flouting conventions and affecting ultra-sophistication, made its impress on the land-grant as on other colleges.

INTEREST IN CURRENT ISSUES

But along with this seeming frivolity was an increased interest in public affairs—especially in international relations. The combination of absentee voting and woman suffrage gave increased reality to elections. Leslie M. Shaw's address in May of 1924 on "Constitutional Government vs. Democracy" had been received respectfully if not wholly appreciatively. Phil LaFollette's attempt to make an impromptu stump speech on the campus that fall aroused much more interest. On October 31, the Cardinal Guild sponsored an all-college mass meeting in the gymnasium at which professional spell-binders of the three leading parties presented their causes. Straw votes were taken with a zeal if not a technique that anticipated the Public Opinion Institutes.

International relations, the League of Nations and the World Court, post-war tariffs and reparations were the most popular subjects of group and lecture discussion. The Bok peace plan was debated on successive days before capacity audiences by the veteran editor Harvey Ingham for the af-

firmative and Walter Clyde Jones, '91, a prominent Chicago attorney, for the negative. Speakers like Irving Fisher and Raymond Fosdick were heard gladly, and the realism of H. H. Powers commanded interest. The Oxford international debates began in 1924 and served to revive interest in this main intellectual contest.

THE INTERNATIONAL HOUSE

The presence of a representative group of foreign students gave greater reality to world issues. Their interchanges of opinion in the Cosmopolitan Club provided a forum for the discussion of questions of current interest—national and international. "The Gables," the former residence of President Welch and of Professor Stalker, willed to the College by the latter's sister, Mrs. Sallie Stalker Smith, '73, in 1927, became the International House, the residence of foreign students. This group exerted an influence that was a constant corrective to narrow, provincial view.

STUDENT RELIGIOUS CENTERS

Even more direct humanitarian appeal was made by the church foundations, whose establishment in these years was in part a recognition of special sectarian obligation for its constituency in state colleges and in part an evidence of the war zeal for institutional drives and establishments. Six denominations established centers about the campus, four with their own churches and two with student houses in connection with downtown churches. The other city churches developed special student organizations; they all had clubs or fraternities with extended programs of religious and social activity. The combined effort was expressed in an "all-out-to-church" Sunday, religious emphasis week, and Sunday campus chapel. This last was the sole survivor of that traditional institution; daily chapel went out with the war. Sunday chapel continued, conducted by prominent clergymen of different de-

nominations, until the retirement of Dr. Cessna from the chaplaincy in 1929. His personal influence, exerted for a full generation up to his death in the fall of 1932, quite transcended organizations and special creeds. His appeals to the student body and the faculties were messages that carried respect and influence for right living, and his persisting optimism was a challenge to a cynical and despondent society. His philosophy was epitomized in his oft-repeated assurance, "I wouldn't miss for anything being alive in these days."

ATHLETIC EMBROILMENT

Whatever the extent of student sophistication and seriousness, the regard for the big activity remained normal. Athletics in the post-war years had a continuing interest, intensified by temporary interruption during the war. During the S. A. T. C. regime, along with the flu visitation, regular team training and intercollegiate schedules had been suspended. In other ways Cyclone fortunes had not been good for some time, and in 1919 open dissension developed. Clyde Williams resigned as director in March to enter business after a service of thirteen years. In later days his contribution to I. S. C. athletics was commemorated in the renaming of State Field "Clyde Williams Field." Mayser, the popular choice, was selected as his successor. Football fortunes, however, did not improve, and after the second coach, appointed upon Mayser's recommendation, threatened to resign, the council requested the director's own resignation in May, 1923. Mayser's devoted followers among students and townspeople rallied vigorously to his support. After an unruly campus demonstration, incited in large part by contumacious speeches of prominent local alumni, Pearson agreed to a hearing before representative students. The members of the athletic council, who had striven tirelessly but unavailingly to secure a harmonious adjustment within the department, presented charges of inefficient leadership and demoralizing dissension. In defense

the director alleged unfair treatment and unethical methods of espionage. In the end Mayser resigned, and the council, after prolonged faculty discussion and consultation with alumni representatives, was reorganized to provide, in accord with the conference practice, for definite faculty control: there were to be six representatives from the faculty, three from the alumni, and two from the student body. The episode brought most unfavorable publicity, created disturbing unrest among the students, and increased the opposition to the administration of certain local interests who were disgruntled by the long-standing controversy over the location of the city to college road.

THE COLLEGE AND THE AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM

Certainly the College needed all possible unity within and good will without in confronting the problems of reconstruction. The agricultural depression from the fall of 1920 raised problems that defied immediate and definite solution and thus brought impossible demands upon the College. Iowa as the leading agricultural state was the center of proposals for farm relief. Without becoming committed to visionary or intransigent plans, Iowa State through its alumni and staff had an increasingly important place in agricultural leadership. Large numbers of graduates continued to fill important positions in the federal service. Pearson made one of the main addresses at President Harding's agricultural conference in 1921. Professor W. H. Stevenson was a delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome in 1921-22 and 1924. In this hectic decade the College provided leadership for the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and for the Department of Agriculture. Pearson was chairman of the executive committee of the Association from 1919 to 1935 and president in 1924. Dean Marston served as president in 1929, the same year that he headed the American Society of Civil Engineers. Marston also served as chairman of the engineering experiment station

section, and Curtiss headed the agricultural. Both Pearson and Curtiss had been prominently mentioned for the secretaryship of agriculture during the campaign of 1920, and Curtiss received active support for the appointment following the death of Henry C. Wallace in 1924. Wallace's appointment to the Harding cabinet had brought this prominent alumnus and former staff member to the direction of agricultural policies at this most critical juncture. His scientific attitude was shown in his selection of trained experts and in his efforts to coordinate the work of the department with the agricultural colleges. It was evident that the College's main contribution to the agricultural recovery would not be in advocacy of any particular panacea but in carrying on systematic research projects, both intensive and extensive, extending to lines hitherto neglected. The title of Pearson's address at the national conference expressed the need and aim, "A National Policy for Agricultural Research."

Without waiting for such a rounded-out national policy, the research agencies of the College were dealing with varied phases of the agricultural problem, especially as it affected Iowa. Corn breeding that was to revolutionize production was undertaken. Soil-building programs were developed. Orchards were extended. Meat and dairy breeds were improved. Plant and animal pests were combated. The dairy and poultry industries were put on commercialized bases. Chemical engineering gave utilization to agricultural waste products. In 1929 Wällace's Farmer listed the "ten greatest discoveries in agriculture in the past twenty years," and a perusal of bulletins and reports would have revealed that the organized and individual research efforts at the Iowa State College had made major contributions to all of them.

INCREASING EMPHASIS UPON THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Characteristic of the interest and emphasis of the unsettled twenties was the attention given to the social sciences. The

demand was hastened by the post-war problems of consumption, distribution, population concentration, and world interrelationships. Agricultural journals and organizations were clamoring to have something effective done and done immediately about tenancy, agricultural credit, marketing, and taxation. Systematized courses and research data and conclusions, it was felt, should point the way so clearly that even the politicians could not mistake it. Social welfare agencies were calling upon the sociologists for surveys of rural populations and their living standards with "interpretation" of the findings. From many and diverse quarters—mild reformers and aggressive pressure groups—there was an insistent if generally vague demand for the teaching of "citizenship."

From the first, largely through the breadth of view and interest of Dr. Welch, for a technical institution the College had given unusual attention to courses in this field. But in accord with prevailing emphasis there had been little specialization and no effective applications. "There is no line of agriculture, science, or learning," President Beardshear asserted in his report for 1900-01, "in which a youngster can get along reasonably well without a living and working acquaintance with history." This subject was joined to literature until 1900; for the next quarter of a century it was administered with psychology. Dean Stanton had conducted the courses in economics unassisted until 1902, when Benjamin H. Hibbard, '98, was added as an instructor; and in 1906, when his former student became a full professor, the Dean relinquished with confidence this one of his numerous responsibilities that in the past he had been loath, upon administrative hint, to yield to other minds. In 1912 Hibbard accepted a call to Wisconsin, and John E. Brindley, who had come to the department in 1907, succeeded as head.

As early as 1894 the editor of the *Student*, quite in the modern spirit, had urged that a chair of citizenship be established to acquaint the students with the great issues of the day and to

enable them to apply and relate their knowledge to the duties of life. From 1904 to his death in 1909 ex-Superintendent Barrett, with an extended experience in actual government, gave courses in "civics," including national, local, and comparative government, with considerable attention, according to course description, to functional aspects. From 1910–14 American government was taught with economics, under the department title "economics and political science" to 1913, when the name became "applied economics and social science." In 1914 the government courses were given by the history-psychology department. Psychology, beginning with Welch and continuing to the later period with his student of the first class, Cessna, had always been given prominent place among the general subjects.

The first systematic effort to apply the social sciences to actual social problems was in Dr. Brindley's researches in taxation. As a recognized authority in the principles and practical operations of public finance and as a leader in state and national taxation organizations, he was able to render effective service as expert consultant to legislative committees and state administrators. His contribution to the notable report on taxation reorganization of the joint legislative committee of the Thirty-ninth General Assembly, in January, 1923, was especially influential for future policies.

As early as 1908 Professor Hibbard offered a course in agricultural economics, and this continued to be offered in the department of economic science in the science division down to 1918. Meanwhile in 1913 Professor G. H. Von Tungeln was secured to develop courses in rural sociology in the same department and Professor B. H. Munger for work in farm management in the division of Agriculture. The Agricultural Experiment Station added sections in both of these lines. Still another sub-department and section were added in 1918 when Dr. Edwin G. Nourse was brought to the College to develop advanced courses and direct research in agricultural eco-

nomics. Finally, in 1921 the three lines of applied economics farm management, agricultural economics, and rural sociology—were united in one section of the station and in one department, both headed by Nourse and further integrated by being a part of the department of "economic science, applied economics and social science" under the general headship of Dr. Brindley. The agricultural economics department was jointly administered by the two divisions. In 1923 Nourse was called to the Brookings Institution, and Clarence L. Holmes succeeded as section director and head of the divisional department. Upon the creation of the bureau of agricultural economics in the Department of Agriculture in 1922. Henry C. Taylor, '96, who had been serving successively under Secretary Wallace as chief of the office of farm management and of the bureau of markets, was transferred to the headship of the new bureau. Taylor had been encouraged by President Beardshear to do advanced work in the unexplored subject of agricultural economics at the University of Wisconsin and in Europe. Taylor and Hibbard were regarded as the pioneer authorities in this general field.

Other lines of economic interest were recognized at the College in the development of industrial or engineering economics in the engineering division and of consumption economics in home economics. Both were connected with the general department and jointly administered with industrial science. The research work both in agriculture and in home economics was stimulated by the Purnell Act of 1925.

History and government continued to be administered with psychology until 1929, when they were included in the economic science department, and industrial history was made a major line of work in Industrial Science. In response to a demand for more direct attention to citizenship training, the first professor of government was appointed the same year. In 1930 history and government became a separate department. Professor Louis B. Schmidt, who had been in charge of

the history-government courses since 1922 and who became the head of the new department, had been a pioneer in the development of undergraduate courses and the organization of research in industrial and agricultural history.

The department of psychology as reorganized under Dr. John E. Evans in 1922 provided two main lines of applied work—educational in connection with the teacher-training program in agriculture, home economics, and industrial arts; and industrial and social psychology, including such applications as the psychology of business and the psychology of safety. As a general service agency of the institution, the department administered the testing program and served as consultant for the health service.

INCREASING FRICTION OVER ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTION

With expanding program and changing emphasis, the modern issue of status and functions appeared. The President's ambitions for the standards and standing of the College, suggested in his communications to the Board before his election, had grown with the increased demands, widened opportunity, and intensified competition of the post-war era. He gave ready support to the demand of alumni and students that the divisions be renamed "colleges" and that the institution as a whole be officially rechristened a "university." Such change of nomenclature, he believed, would be but a recognition of the facts of institutional organizations, program, and standards. To keep the more restricted designations, he was convinced, was an injustice to the institution in popular if not professional rating and consequently a handicap to its graduates. In keeping, too, with the true functions of such an institution, as determined by federal and state law and the practice of other representative land-grant institutions, the offerings should be enriched by a larger number and a wider

range of liberal subjects. Hitherto, he pointed out in his final report, the College had "consistently remained in its proper field of work and . . . made less rather than more enlargements and developments than are needed or would be justified."

The true merits of this pertinent issue were confused and complicated by personalities. The enmity between the presidents of the state's institutions of higher education made harmonious adjustments and cooperative intercourse impossible, and Pearson's differences with the Board over curricula, building, campus expansion, and financial control had about reached the breaking point.

The Board, whatever their mistakes and lack of vision, had hard realities to face in the transition and deflation years. In the midst of an agrarian distress in which the "primary" postwar depression was to run into the prolonged "secondary" industrial depression with no effective pickup between, essential demands upon the legislature were greatly increased: a building deficit must be made up, costly equipment secured, and certain new lines of work for which there was an irresistible demand or to which the College in its federal relations was definitely obligated developed and maintained. Rigorous legislative struggles, with a rivalry of alumni groups which brought deadlocks and threatened all adequate appropriations, had to be faced each biennium. The Board of necessity rather than by choice sought economy measures and devices.

Since the consolidation of major lines of work was now definitely out of the question, the main retrenchment proposal for the State College was the abolition of degree courses in forestry and technical journalism. Either by remarkable prescience or a lucky hunch, the President was firmly convinced that these particular fields had great future promise and in defiance of the wishes of the Board sought to build them up. There was the usual professional, local, and alumni pressure

against any proposed dismemberment. Again, to seek justification, the Board turned to the experts.

CAPEN-ZOOK REPORT

With the vain hope of discovering that substantial savings could be made through the curtailment of duplicating or unnecessary courses or activities, the legislature was induced to authorize another survey, a decade after the much discussed one of the Bureau of Education. The investigation of 1925 was made by the chairman of the previous one, Dr. S. P. Capen, who had become president of the University of Buffalo, and President G. F. Zook, of the University of Akron. The findings of the two reports were as contrasting as the conditions which they reflected. The eminent educators—oblivious of their conventional function of pointing out what was seriously amiss and of warning against dangerous tendencies—characterized the existing institutions in superlative terms. Through "the sympathetic and constructive service rendered by the State Board of Education" more progress had been made than in any other state in which the land-grant college and the university were operated separately. "The institutions at Ames and Iowa City are certainly not now surpassed and probably not equalled in size or in quality by the corresponding institutions of any other state that has divided its university enterprise." The growth in enrollment had greatly exceeded the generous prediction of the previous decade.

On the full parity of the State College the committee made most emphatic and unequivocal pronouncement: "Certainly if ever there was a distinction between the State University and the State College in standards, equipment, teaching, and investigating personnel and advanced character of the work done, there is now no longer such a distinction nor has there been any for some time. The Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts is a technological university. By every test of educational quality that the committee knows,

it is comparable to the State University and to other universities elsewhere. The State of Iowa operates its university from two centers. Whatever the two institutions may be called, neither one is entitled to priority of recognition by virtue either of its history or of its name. If a contrary opinion still prevails in any quarter the committee would like to aid in dispelling it."

The committee was reassuring on the matter of duplication. The situation had improved greatly in that respect and there were no serious cases of it. It was the committee's opinion that in general, in this state and elsewhere, the wastes of duplication had been greatly exaggerated. The only recommendation on this score for the State College was the discontinuance of a degree course in forestry.

As in the earlier report, the main warning and exhortation concerned inter-institutional relations. The morale had improved greatly, but this might be destroyed by uncertainty as to future policies and by an "atmosphere of unrest and controversy." The investigators therefore regarded "renewed and active efforts to promote cooperation among the institutions . . . of the highest importance. . . . It is important that the State Board of Education should banish misunderstandings among the institutions and should secure the support of the State for an enlightened policy looking to their future development."

PEARSON'S RESIGNATION

The report thus upheld Pearson's main contentions as to the status and scope of the College. His views seemed further vindicated a few months later when, upon the advice of the Governor, the recommendations regarding forestry and technical journalism were "rescinded." But while endorsing the President's program, the commission had emphasized the necessity of harmony within the state system for its realization. With the existing leadership in the institutions and on

the Board such harmony seemed impossible. Pearson recognized the impasse and offered his resignation. This action was undoubtedly influenced by lack of fuller harmony and understanding within the College. Pearson's methods had brought increasing dissatisfaction and unrest among some members of the staff, and an influential element of the students had been alienated by the misunderstandings over the athletic situation and the seeming curtailment of effective student participation.

The resignation was made in January, 1926, to take effect at the end of the college year, with a request for a leave of absence for the summer to travel in Europe. There was a rumor, shortly to be confirmed, that Dr. Pearson had been offered the presidency of the University of Maryland. The Board asked a reconsideration, granted the leave of absence, and voted a substantial increase in salary. Whether or not the negotiations were entered upon with the best good will and good faith, they failed. The resignation was accepted with resolutions of appreciation, and Herman Knapp was appointed acting president. Following his return from Europe Pearson left the scene of his long and achieving presidency for his new labors.

PEARSON PRESENTS HIS CASE

That he left the College with deep regret his final report to the Board bore witness. This report, which he distributed among those interested in the College and its program, was at the same time a record, an apologia, an argument, and an appeal. It epitomized his achievements and the controversies that had terminated them. He summarized appreciatively the high achievements of the College in the main technical fields and urged again the familiar arguments for adding to the offerings in the humanities, providing further training for citizenship, and giving more adequate designations to the institution and its parts. A system of long-time campus planning that would avoid crowding and congestion was recom-

mended, and contrary to Board action, he advised the purchase of additional land for the men's dormitories. Generous praise was given to the staff and a strong plea made for an increased salary scale, a pension system, and sabbatical leaves as essential to the highest efficiency. The loyalty and generosity of the alumni were recognized. Tribute was paid to the devotion and sacrifice of the Board.

The one note of direct complaint amounting to bitterness was reserved for the position and practices of the finance committee. Here was "an intermediary committee . . . composed of persons who admittedly know less about educational administration than the college executive, and yet have an authority exceeding his. . . . If any member of this gobetween committee has policies of his own that he wants to make effective, it is possible for him to accomplish much by indirect methods. When he controls finances he has great power over all activities. He is likely to become the real president of the institution while the nominal president does the best he can within the limitations that he knows to exist." While expressing the kindliest feelings for the members of "your employed finance committee" he felt strongly that "the system was fundamentally wrong and . . . destructive in practice." Power without responsibility was never wise or safe, and any device that provided for it could not endure. He added sarcastically that if the committee were to continue to exercise their existing power and influence, he suggested that it would be best to give all responsibility to them and abolish the Board. But he felt that the trouble could be best corrected by the Board itself.

From their side the Board no doubt found it difficult to view the retiring executive, or either of his fellow executives, in the role of a "nominal president." Their records, verified by their personal experiences, made abundantly evident that he had sought tirelessly from first to last to be every inch a president. The Board had had occasion to feel, too, that apart

from the matters with which their influential committee was concerned the President had not always acted in accord with their policies and declared desires. While, as the 1915 survey had emphasized, there were grave difficulties involved in the financial administration, the differences of issues here presented extended to questions of fundamental policies and jurisdiction quite beyond these concerns. And back of the policies which might have been reconciled were always the clashing personalities—a government of laws and regulations, but one directed and administered by men.

Dr. Pearson departed with deep disappointment at thwarted purpose and unattained objectives, but under his leadership the College had experienced an unprecedented growth—enrollment more than doubled, land area increased a half, a score of major buildings added, administrative organization completed, and matured programs of instruction and research inaugurated that had brought national and international recognition and standing. His administration, in fact, had marked the modernizing of the College.