The Death of the Liberal Arts College

JAMES AXTELL

TO EVERY THING, said the Preacher, there is a season, a time to be born and a time to die. But sometimes the students of Life misread its signs and prematurely bury one whose time has yet to come. Historians no less than journalists sometimes write obituaries when they should be appraising the tenacity of age. Over the past twenty years historians of American higher education have fallen deeply into the trap of prematurity; the obituary they wrote reads something like this:

Washington, D.C., 2 July 1862. The American Liberal Arts College died today after a prolonged illness. It was 226 years old.

Born on the salty backwashes of the Charles River in Cambridge shortly after the Massachusetts Bay Colony was founded, the scion of Puritan Reform and Renaissance Civility grew to sturdy usefulness in the colonial years by overseeing America's leaders prior to their war for independence.

When the new nation emerged, however, demanding a larger, more expert citizenry, The College was unable to overcome its aristocratic origins and shortly contracted the disease that eventually led to its demise — arteriosclerosis. In the 1820s, when Jacksonian Democracy was urging needed reforms on American Institutions, The College's role in society contracted into a stance of pugnacious conservatism with the Yale Report of 1828. Even a number of its own reform-minded members could not edge it into the American Mainstream of Technological Growth and Democratic Expansion.

Today, after a recent cardiac arrest, its heart stopped on the floor of the House of Representatives, just as the roll call for Justin Morrill's Land-Grant Act had ended.

The vote was 90-25.

In short, the liberal arts college not only died a sudden death during

---

Mr. Axtell is Assistant Professor of History, Yale University.

or shortly after the Civil War, but no one should have mourned its passing, if indeed anyone did.

For those who still doubt that truth is stranger than fiction, a glance at the conventional wisdom of the nineteenth-century colleges will secure conversion. First, the antebellum colleges, which inhabit something called "The Age of the College," are variously described as "precarious, little, denomination-ridden, poverty-stricken," plagued by "dubious standards," offering little freedom or economic reward to their faculties. In a telling word, they were simply "unprogressive." Furthermore, they were vestigial structures on the American body social. "The old-time colleges were not organically knit into the fabric of economic life," says Professor Richard Hofstadter. "Although college training was an advantage, it was not necessary in the early 19th century to go to college to become a doctor, lawyer, or even a teacher, much less a successful politician or businessman. . . . Higher education was far more a luxury, much less a utility, than it is today." This explains the morbid "state of the curriculum" and the "backward condition of the art of teaching" in the old-time college that responded "so slowly to social change." As far as the colleges were concerned, antebellum America was a place of "Great Retrogression" and slow "Death." (1)

But *après* Eliot *le déluge!* Under the weight of the western land-grant universities (representing Utility), German scholarship and higher criticism (representing Research), and Darwinism (representing Science), "the old-time college crumbled." According to which history you read, the new universities either "absorbed," "replaced," "modified," "invaded," or "profoundly altered the content of" the colleges. By 1900 "the old independent college had yielded precedence to the university. Colleges continued to function" — a rare admission — "they even increased in number, but henceforth they carried on their activities as units of, or in competition with, the larger many-sided universities. . . . They had to adjust to a new frame of reference." Even the historian most faithful to the liberal arts colleges is led to write that "universities, indisputably, were the movement of the future" and that "it may be true that forces secreted within the American spirit were set loose by the Civil War, making inevitable the replacement of the old-time college." In the classic statement of this view, "the age of the college had passed, and the age of the university was

dawning." Clearly such history resembles nothing so much as, in George Peterson's apt phrase, "a morality play written in two acts." (2)

Unfortunately, clumsy moralism is not such history's only weakness. Fundamentally it is Whig history of the most blatant kind, written from the future where historical changes seem simply "inevitable" and the past teems with "revolutionary turning points," "watersheds," and "crises," all heralding the "dawning of new eras" and death's "transfiguration." It is short-cut history at its best, replete with winners, heroes, and historical firsts, and unencumbered with the complexities of change and continuity, flux and flow.

But it is not that this kind of history is simply outdated — despite its recent vogue in the hands of putatively "radical" historians — but that it is *bad* Whig history, as its tactics so clearly show. First, it reconstructs a model of the antebellum college largely from its critics' less-than-objective appraisals. Professor Hofstadter's chapter on "The Old-Time College" in his surprisingly influential *Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* is a perfect example of how *not* to write judicious history. Of the testimony used to characterize the antebellum colleges, one out of every four references contains the name of Francis Wayland, the reform-possessed president of Brown University who even his champions admit was either years ahead of his time or hopelessly unrealistic about the possibilities of American education. The other references draw on the works of Philip Lindsley, George Ticknor, F. A. P. Barnard, Thomas Jefferson, Henry Tappan, and a whole "Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen" called in part to "criticize the spirit of the Yale Report in 1828," all of whom, not surprisingly, dominate the section of Hofstadter's documentary history of *American Higher Education* called "The Quest for an Adequate Educational System." The only possible glimmer of recognition that the antebellum collegiate way might have had some saving graces comes from his inclusion of the Yale Report of 1828, admittedly "the most influential document in American higher education in the first half of the nineteenth century," though one cannot help feeling that its appearance was sponsored more by the needs of its enemies than by the praise of its friends. For the friends of the colleges are never subpoenaed to Hofstadter's kangaroo court; for all intents and purposes they did not exist. The hundreds of men and women who supported the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological

Education at the West, the myriad local benevolent societies for the financial aid of indigent college students, The American Home Missionary Society, the founding of over seven hundred community colleges, and the continuation of the established Yales and Princetons of the day are irrelevant at best and fantasies of romantic delusion at worst. As Professor Hofstadter assures us, "most of the *serious* literature of college reminiscence is a literature of complaint." With a judge like that, a trial is superfluous. (3)

Second, the Whig historiography invariably compares the colleges of one period with the universities of a later one. Thus we hear only of the "old-time college" (singular) with its "old-time college president" (fossilized) or of new universities (plural) with their empire-building presidents (dynamic) who fomented something called "the university revolution," but never of comparable institutions of the same era. By the same token it often slips from a consideration of the liberal education of one era to that of research, vocational, or graduate training of the next, instead of fairly assessing the changes, not necessarily for better or worse, in the liberal education of undergraduates over time. In its characteristic haste to abridge history, it conveniently blurs distinctions and rides rough-shod over differences, both of which are essential to the judicial process.

The reason for these imbalances is not hard to find. In his last reiteration of the Whig dogma, Professor Hofstadter effectively revealed the educational presuppositions with which he approached the history of higher education in "the old regime." "Sectarian competition, compounded by local competition, had prevented the educational energies of the country from being *concentrated* in a *limited* number of institutions of adequate size and adequate sustenance. Instead, the country was dotted with tiny colleges, weakly founded; only one out of five created before the Civil War survived — it is an incredible rate of failure. Those that did survive were frequently too *small* to be educationally effective; they lacked *complexity*; they lacked *variety*." It would not be unfair, I think, to suggest that Professor Hofstadter's model of an "educationally effective" collegiate institution, a model that he does not scruple to apply to the past as well as the present, resembles nothing so much as the large, sprawling centrifuge known as Columbia University. (4)

There is, of course, another interpretation of the widespread diffu-

sion of the educational energies of antebellum America that does not regard its subject with such transparent disdain. In his chapter on "Culture with Many Capitals: The Booster College," Daniel Boorstin argues that the booster spirit and the missionary spirit worked in harness to bring each western settlement "all the metropolitan hallmarks" — a newspaper, a hotel, and a college. This ideal of the complete community not only promoted "the diffuseness of American culture," but its vigorous boosterism secured the characteristically American marriage of the college and the community. "The distinctively American college," observes Professor Boorstin with obvious relish, "was neither public nor private, but a *community* institution." As President William Tyler of Amherst told the Society for the Promotion of Theological and Collegiate Education at the West in 1856, the genius of the American college with its local trustees was that "while the college redeems the community from the curse of ignorance, the community preserves the college from an undue tendency to monkish corruption and scholastic unprofitableness." (5)

The third weakness of the Whig dogma is that it assumes a crude and misleading functionalism — borrowed from modern sociologists — between a society's needs and the college's direct attempt to satisfy them through its curriculum. As Professor Hofstadter wrote, "the curriculum is a barometer by which we may measure the cultural pressures that operate upon the school." But as long ago as 1950 Richard Storr warned us that a common source of confusion in the writing of educational history was "the failure to separate the *need* for a specific kind of knowledge at some time and the actual *demand* for instruction in it. It is one thing to say that a society should have enlightenment in a special field; it is another thing to say that it includes young people who are prepared to pay for the opportunity of acquiring such knowledge." More recently Lawrence Stone has renewed the warning. "As every historian knows, all the institutions of society are partly functional and partly antiquated, vestigial, or even frankly 'dysfunctional.' This is because they all have a history and a life of their own, and their response to outside pressure is consequently imperfect, stumbling, tardy, and even reactive." (6)

Instead of the curriculum itself, Frederick Rudolph argues that the *extracurriculum* is "the most sensitive barometer of what is going on at a college" because "it is the instrument of change . . . the agency

that identifies [the students'] enthusiasms, their understanding of what a college should be, their preferences . . . [and] their attitude toward the course of study. . . . And because it is the particular province of lively, imaginative young men and women not immobilized by tradition, rank, authority, and custom, the extracurriculum is likely to respond more quickly than any other agency of the college to the fundamental, perhaps not yet even clearly expressed, movements in the world beyond the campus and to the developing expectations of society." (7)

Fourth, the Whig dogmatists almost always contrast a static, black-and-white snapshot of the antebellum college with a technicolor film of the new postwar universities. Even when they concede that the liberal arts college continued to exist after the Civil War, they deny them equal treatment. Understandably they would like to have the best of both worlds. On the one hand, they assume (incorrectly as we have shown) that the institutions of higher education in any society respond directly to pressing social needs and demands. On the other, they write as if the colleges did not respond to the same *general* configuration of social needs, inherited and imported traditions, and new ideas to which the new universities responded. At best the colleges are visible only as they capitulate to the inevitability of the "university ideal."

Fortunately this kind of myopia can be cured with the perspectives of several new (and older) studies of the liberal arts college in the so-called "age of the university," all of which clearly demonstrate that several colleges at least confronted the significant social and intellectual questions of postwar America as earnestly as any university, even though their various answers happened to differ from the universities' answers. (8) They also illustrate a simple fact about social and institutional change that Whig historians tend to forget in their rush to the narcotic generality, namely that "changes have come when particular men in a particular situation have been impressed by particular urgencies and when their thoughts or actions have been questioned by particular critics." Consequently, it is simply unreasonable to expect that hundreds of particular colleges in particular social settings would react to exactly the same configuration of social forces, much less that they would react in the same way. (9)

Finally, the Whig view assumes a one-way relationship between

contemporary social institutions — the university worked its magic on the college — but it never raises the possibility that something important flowed the other way. Common sense alone should call into question the reliability of any account in which a new specialized institution does not derive at least some form and substance from the sole antecedent institution of the same specialty. From most Whig histories one gets the distinct impression that modern Harvard, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins sprang full grown from the heads of Eliot, White, and Gilman, without so much as a backward glance at the collegiate institutions in which they were all educated.

Without doubt there were conscious and definite differences between the new universities and their collegiate predecessors, but their zealous promotion by the Whig historians has obscured significant continuities from one to the other. The most apparent continuity was the often frail but persistent belief that a *college* of arts and sciences should form the heart of a true university, even the most diffuse. Another was the residential nature of "the collegiate way of living." After an initial flirtation with the uncongenial German ideal of official unconcern for the student outside the classroom, the new universities returned to the distinctly American concern for the whole collegiate experience of their students. By World War I nearly every state and private university had begun to build dormitories or college systems after the Oxbridge model in an effort to recapture the union of living and learning that had been the college's primary value in the colonial period. Of particular force in securing residential housing at the midwestern universities were the graduates of the eastern women's colleges. As they assumed the deanships of women at the new institutions, these graduates gently but firmly pushed the new universities toward the domestic sociability they had known at their alma maters. (10)

And a third continuity between the old and the new institutions was their Christian character. Though they prided themselves on their nonsectarianism, many of the new state universities turned to presidents of visible, even exaggerated, religiosity, many of them ministers, and maintained compulsory daily chapel services until the turn of the century. In more areas than we have been led to believe, the line separating the liberal arts colleges and the newer universities was nonexistent. (11)

It should be obvious by now that much more of our conventional

ideas about American higher education deserves close scrutiny. Professor Hofstadter's *Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* must, like all seminal works, be taken from its pedestal and critically examined, because, as Emerson warned us long ago, "genius is always sufficiently the enemy of genius by overinfluence." (12) By its particular perspective and literary assertiveness, it should have stimulated the serious study of American higher education and engendered its own competition, but instead it has only bedazzled us into mindless acquiescence. Even for a man who did not relish intellectual combat, Professor Hofstadter must have looked on the supine reception of his educational works with a touch of surprise.

As a small beginning toward such a reassessment, I would like to suggest some ways in which we might go about writing the history of higher education that would be at once fair to the past and helpful to the present. The first thing we must do is to ask several new questions, seemingly simple questions perhaps, but questions to which we do not have satisfactory answers, only polemical tub-thumpings or unexamined assumptions. The one that suggests itself first is, what were the antebellum colleges really like? Were they, as David Potts asks below, the victims of a debilitating sectarianism? Were they, as David Allmendinger questions, bastions of suffocating paternalism? Were they, as Professor Hofstadter insists, luxury items in an expanding economy? And if so, what other social and cultural roles did they play? By burying it in a subordinate clause, Professor Hofstadter minimizes the extent to which "college training was an advantage" before the Civil War. For instance, in 1893 Charles Thwing published a study of American leadership, based on some fifteen thousand entries in *Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography*, that showed that a disproportionately high number of leaders in the major professions were college graduates. In medicine, where normally about one doctor in twenty had a college degree even as late as 1893, forty-six percent of its *leaders* were graduates, as were half of the outstanding lawyers, who normally had one degree for every five practitioners. (13) The colleges were clearly instruments of social mobility but to just what extent only career-line studies of the graduates of many individual colleges will tell. (14) If they were not, as Professor Hofstadter insinuates, it is difficult to see why America's practical-minded settlers invested so heavily in them in the years after independence.

There is also the danger that in concentrating on their economic value we are overlooking the predominately religious and cultural impulses that founded the vast majority of the colleges before the Civil War and kept an amazing 182 institutions alive into the twentieth century. Equally we must distinguish carefully between the kinds of colleges in existence at the time. Perhaps the older eastern colleges and the newer frontier colleges, distinguished more by function and founding ideal than geography, served widely different functions in different subcultures of the country.

Another question that arises after reading any survey of American higher education is, what was the "university revolution" of the nineteenth century? And when did it occur? — at President Eliot's inauguration in 1869, at the founding of the University of Berlin in 1810, or sometime after 1890? How typical were Harvard, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins of the new universities? Is it fair to contrast university mountains and college valleys? If we focus on institutions of the same period — and only for comparison, not competition — how large, how advanced, and how free were the universities as compared with the colleges?

As I have suggested, before 1885 or 1890 the differences are much smaller than we have been led to believe by the Whig champions of Harvard and Cornell. In 1881, for example, about 26 institutions had enrollments of 200 students or more; of these, 17 were colleges in fact or in name. Amherst was as large as Wisconsin and Virginia, Williams was larger than Cornell and Indiana, and Bowdoin was the near-equal of Johns Hopkins and Minnesota. Yale with 687 students was much larger than Michigan, Missouri, or the City College of New York. And if we assume that the elective system meant some sort of advancement, then library size becomes important as an indication of the scope available to unprescribed, nontextbook scholarship. Even on this scale the new universities do not fare much better. Cornell's rapidly growing collection of 41,000 volumes was the best of the new universities, but it could not match the older libraries of Yale, Dartmouth, Princeton, and Brown. Amherst and Wesleyan each had more books than Missouri, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, or Minnesota. (15)

The elective system is often said to constitute the major difference between the colleges and the new universities, but Albert Bingham's study in 1897 showed that several universities still required that their

students take a number of subjects — as many as twenty-four at Rutgers — while many colleges, such as Oberlin, Amherst, and Bowdoin, required as few as Chicago, Michigan, and New York University. Since the content of the requirements was as various as the number, Bingham could only exclaim, "the disagreement of the doctors is wellnigh complete." (16) There is even reason to believe that the universities did not so much choose the elective system as a principled defense of academic freedom as they were forced into it by the poor preparation of their students. A large proportion of the students at Wisconsin and Illinois, for example, were so ill prepared for the regular college course that they were either committed to remedial "preparatory departments" or permitted to elect on a hit-and-miss basis courses in which they had some interest or hope of passing. (17) In this light the university's halo begins to tarnish a little.

A final set of questions concerns the way in which colleges responded to the social and intellectual forces that created the new universities after 1865. To what particular forces did they respond? Did they respond negatively, as some of the New England colleges seem to have, or positively? Who or what was instrumental in pushing them to change — students, faculty, alumni, poverty, wealth? I say "push" because, taking a cue from cultural anthropologists, we might well make continuity and conservatism our working assumptions about societies and the educational institutions they create to preserve and transmit their ideals and social character. (18) That way we will, like the majority of people at the time, place the burden of proof for change on the innovators and reformers, and not automatically fall into the Whig trap of assuming that "new makes right."

The second thing I think we must do to improve our history of higher education is to pay much greater attention to the person on the other end of Mark Hopkins's proverbial log — the student. The neglect of students has been so pervasive in educational history that it now enjoys the status of a veritable "historical tradition." In spite of the fact that the students have probably been the "most creative and imaginative force in the shaping of the American college and university," they "constitute the most neglected, least understood element of the academic community." (19) One of the problems, of course, has been our long-standing idea of education as basically a *teaching* process, in which the prime mover is a knowledgeable instructor and

the students are passive receptacles. But our recent change of perception of education as essentially a *learning* process should give us the necessary freedom to proceed with a more sensitive kind of student-centered history.

In such a history the extracurriculum, "the most sensitive barometer of what is going on at a college," will receive as much attention as the course of study. To focus only on the student's experience in the classroom would be to seriously distort the history of his education. Oscar and Mary Handlin's recent essay on "socialization as a function of higher education" is a suggestive foray into this neglected subject. (20) But the model for all further efforts is still Robert Fletcher's incredible *History of Oberlin College*, published almost thirty years ago. (21) Although two volumes are devoted to only thirty-some years of the college's past, there is not a bit of fat. And the main reason for that is that fully three-fourths of its pages are devoted to the full cultural and intellectual history of its students, in their relations with the faculty, the community, and the nation. If there were more individual histories of its kind, we would be in a position to write a significant history of higher education in the nineteenth century and to answer many of the questions I have posed.

Professor Fletcher's history brings me to a third suggestion, which is that we must find an important context for our essentially institutional history. Twenty years ago Richard Storr suggested that one integrative perspective for the history of higher education is the culture of academic life, the values, ideas, and practices that individual colleges and universities share that distinguish them from other social institutions. That is a viable perspective, as Laurence Veysey's history of *The Emergence of the American University* has shown, but it is still fundamentally "house history," the story of what goes on *inside* academia. If the history of education is to have any significance at all, it must attempt to describe the complex relationships between society and its educational processes, between what a society wants of its young and what they actually become. Accordingly, the history of higher education will have to describe academic culture as part of a larger social culture, and to place its colleges and universites in the context of the whole process of both the socialization of the young and the production and diffusion of knowledge in the society. It must consider at the very least the students who came — their socioeconomic back-

ground, expectations, career plans, maturity, and scholastic preparation; the students who graduated — where they went, where they wanted to go, what value their particular collegiate education held for their later lives; and the faculty who also came and went. We could certainly profit from studies of faculty families such as James Blackwood's engaging portrait of the Comptons of Wooster at the turn of the century, but we also need, as Lawrence Stone has urged, a quantitative analysis of whole generations of students and faculty through the methods of prosopography, if for no other reason than as an antidote to the Whig preoccupation with the unusual and the bizarre. (22)

The final suggestion I would like to make is that we must fully integrate women's education into the history of education, not in lonesome chapters called "High Seriousness in Bloomers," but as a continuous, important thread. (23) Next to students in general, women have been the most neglected and certainly the least understood element of the academic community for over a hundred years. It is time we stopped repeating Lyman Beecher's poor jokes about the amalgamation of the sexes and tried to understand what social and cultural impact women have made on our colleges and universities, and vice-versa.

In the face of so many unanswered questions, perhaps we can take some comfort in the memory of our Christian predecessors who asked in times of intellectual crisis, "What must I do to be saved?" and turned to the Good Book for an answer. In my mildly evangelical way I am asking that we do the same thing, with but one difference: we have to write one first.

Notes

1. Richard Hofstadter, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York, 1955), pp. 209, 223; Hofstadter, *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States* (New York, 1952), pp. 20-21; Ernest Earnest, "Death and Transfiguration," *Academic Procession* (Indianapolis, 1953), ch. 5.
2. George P. Schmidt, *The Liberal Arts College* (New Brunswick, 1957), p. 146; William Brickman and Stanley Lehrer, eds., *A Century of Higher Education* (New York, 1962), ch. 3; Hofstadter, *Development and Scope*, p. 48; George E. Peterson, *The New England College in the Age of the University* (Amherst, 1964), p. 3.

3. Hofstadter, *Development of Academic Freedom*, pp. 222-38; Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, eds., *American Higher Education: A Documentary History* 1 (Chicago, 1961): 251-391; Hofstadter, "The Revolution in Higher Education," in *Paths of American Thought*, ed. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. and Morton White (Boston, 1963), pp. 270-71 (italics added).
4. Ibid. (italics added).
5. Daniel Boorstin, *The Americans: The National Experience* (New York, 1965), pp. 152-61.
6. Hofstadter, *Development and Scope*, p. 11; Richard Storr, "Academic Culture and the History of American Higher Education," *Journal of General Education* 5 (October 1950): 12; Lawrence Stone, " 'The Ninneversity,' " *The New York Review of Books*, January 28, 1971, p. 24. John Talbott makes a similar point in "The History of Education," *Daedalus* (Winter 1971), pp. 142-43.
7. Frederick Rudolph, "Neglect of Students as a Historical Tradition," in *The College and the Student*, ed. Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Washington, 1966), p. 53.
8. Thomas Le Duc, *Piety and Intellect at Amherst College, 1865-1912* (New York, 1946); George W. Pierson, *Yale College: An Educational History, 1871-1921* (New Haven, 1952); George E. Peterson, *The New England College in the Age of the University* (Amherst, 1964); John Barnard, *From Evangelicalism to Progressivism at Oberlin College, 1866-1917* (Columbus, Ohio, 1969); Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago, 1965). There is also the possibility that the colleges and the universities were responding to two different questions or sets of questions, in which case R. G. Collingwood's advice is pertinent. You cannot discover a man's meaning, he said, simply from his written or spoken statements, even when he is perfectly articulate and honest. "In order to find out his meaning you must also know what the question was (a question in his own mind, and presumed by him to be in yours) to which the thing he has said or written was meant as an answer." Furthermore, as Richard Storr has warned, "even when vocabulary does not change, meanings do; and where denotations are static, connotations may be fluid" (Storr, "Academic Culture and the History of American Higher Education," p. 11); Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 37-38.
9. Storr, "Academic Culture and the History of American Higher Education," p. 11. See also Robert A. Nisbet, *Social Change and History* (New York, 1969), pp. 267-304.
10. W. H. Cowley, "The History of Student Residential Housing," *School and Society*, December 1-8, 1934, pp. 705-12, 758-64.

11. A study in 1913 established that thirty-two of sixty "representative" colleges, including large state and private universities, maintained compulsory chapel (Henry T. Claus, "The Problem of College Chapel," *Educational Review* [September 1913], pp. 177-87). Of Wisconsin's three presidents after the Civil War, one was a minister and two had studied theology without entering the ministry. At Minnesota, Cyrus Northrup "sanctified" the "godless institution" left to him by his predecessor with a nonsectarian but effective "evangelical religion" (Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin, 1848-1925* 1 [Madison, 1949]; James Gray, *The University of Minnesota, 1851-1951* [Minneapolis, 1951], pp. 83-85).
12. Ralph Waldo Emerson, *An Oration, Delivered Before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Cambridge, August 31, 1837* (Boston, 1837).
13. Charles F. Thwing, "College Men First Among Successful Citizens," *The Forum* (June 1893), pp. 494-503. See George W. Pierson's recent study of *The Education of American Leaders* (New York, 1969) for a comparison.
14. A study of the career choices of seven Yale classes between 1860 and 1920 reveals that significant numbers of sons of fathers in lower status occupations, such as farming and the ministry, chose and were able to choose professions at graduation one or two levels higher on the current status scale, especially law and business (Sam Scovil, unpublished seminar paper, Yale University, 1970).
15. Charles F. Thwing, *American Colleges: Their Students and Work,* 2d ed. (New York, 1883), pp. 202-10.
16. Albert Perry Bingham, "Present Status of the Elective System in American Colleges," *Educational Review* (November 1897), pp. 360-69.
17. Winton U. Solberg, *The University of Illinois, 1867-1894* (Urbana, 1968), pp. 105, 130, 235; Curti and Carstensen, *Wisconsin,* 1: 399-402.
18. Nisbet, *Social Change and History*; Philip Bagby, *Culture and History* (London, 1958); A. L. Kroeber, *Anthropology* (New York, 1948); George F. Kneller, *Educational Anthropology: An Introduction* (New York, 1965).
19. Rudolph, "Neglect of Students as a Historical Tradition," pp. 47-58.
20. Oscar and Mary F. Handlin, *The American College and American Culture* (New York, 1970).
21. Robert Fletcher, *History of Oberlin College* (Oberlin, 1943).
22. James R. Blackwood, *The House on College Avenue: The Comptons at Wooster, 1891-1913* (Cambridge, 1968); Lawrence Stone, "Prosopography," *Daedalus* (Winter 1971), pp. 46-79.
23. Ernest Earnest, *Academic Procession,* ch. 6.