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CHAPTER I

Introduction

I maintain, my friends, that every one of us should seek out the best teacher whom he can find . . . (Plato, Laches)

The rise of graduate education in the United States has been a complex dialectic between often conflicting demands. The tension between the classical and the scientific, the practical and the theoretical, teaching and research, the elite and the populist, and the professional and the scholarly have all contributed to the dynamic that is graduate education in the United States. Often graduate schools have been caught in a position where they try to be all things to all people. In 1950 Abraham Flexner observed:

The great American universities which shall be discussed are composed of three parts: They are secondary schools and colleges for boys and girls; graduate and professional schools for advanced students; “service” stations for the general public. The three parts are not distinct: the college is confused with the “service” station and overlaps the graduate school; the graduate
school is partly a college, partly a vocational school, and partly an institution of university grade.¹

Graduate education has vacillated between the three parts elucidated by Flexner throughout its history and continues to do so. The term "graduate education", like the term "university", is fraught with misconceptions and misapplications. The purpose of this study is to examine in a historical and philosophical manner the meaning of the "specialized culture" of graduate education.

Although this study has elements of an institutional history, it is intended to be more than that. Rather than engaging in the fulsome abstract praise that marks many institutional histories, these essays will endeavor to place the early history of the University of Georgia Graduate School in an administrative, cultural, historical, and social context. Only by understanding the developments in graduate education in the United States, in general, and in similar institutions, in specific, can one appreciate the developments of the early University of Georgia Graduate School.

This study has been limited to the period of 1803-1940. Bernard Berelson has divided the development of graduate education

education into five phases:

The Pre-history: to 1876

The University Revolution: 1876-1900

Consolidation and Standardization: 1900-World War I

Growth and Diversification: World War I to World War II

Revival and Reappraisal: Since World War II

The growth of graduate education at the University of Georgia does not fit exactly with Berelson’s timeline. Due to specific conditions and events at the University of Georgia, the period 1876-1940 can be divided into only two parts: before the founding of the Graduate School in 1910 and after. The academic year 1940-1941 is important as a dividing point for a consideration of graduate education and the Graduate School at the University of Georgia. In 1940, the first two Doctor of Philosophy degrees were granted and the Graduate Council and Graduate Faculty were formed. The University of Georgia was slow to recover from the hiatus of World War II and would not enter the university boom until the early 1960s. However, the three events mentioned significantly changed the nature of graduate education at Georgia making the 1940-1941 academic year a natural dividing point.

This study concentrates on the development of degrees and degree requirements. In a sense a definition of graduate

---

2 The Graduate Council assumed its present status as a representative body of the Graduate Faculty, rather than an appointed body.
education is: “whatever the degree requirements are.” Degrees and degree granting mechanisms are, certainly, the administrative heart of graduate education. The study of degrees also gives us a frame of reference in which to understand the developments and conflicts in graduate education. Changing degree requirements illustrate the development of the notion of graduate education from enhanced “general culture” to “specialized culture”.

On a purely pragmatic level, degree requirements are a major reason there is a Graduate School in the first place.

It is essential for graduate deans, and, indeed, anyone involved with graduate education to understand the historical and philosophical issues involved in graduate education. George Santayana’s dictum: “Those who cannot learn from history are condemned to repeat it” is certainly true in the sphere of graduate education. Perennial problems, such as lack of facilities and resources, enrollment, calls for new degrees and modified requirements, and faculty research and workloads are nothing new, but constitute the essence of the history of graduate education. Thus, this work should serve on several different levels. It can inform and stimulate consideration and discussion on graduate education; it documents the early history of graduate education and the Graduate School at the University of Georgia; and, one hopes

---

4 The discussion of Joseph LeConte’s ideas on graduate education in Chapter IV will expand on this topic.
it suggests that administration of graduate education requires not just rules but a shared vision as well. Although this work is primarily concerned with the University of Georgia Graduate School, there may be truths about graduate education and its governance to be learned from this example.

This work is divided into seven chapters which set forth the context and history of the University of Georgia Graduate School. Chapter II provides an outline of graduate education in the United States from the early nineteenth to the early twentieth century. Special attention in this section is on the development of degrees and degree requirements. This section also traces the growth of the notion of graduate education as something distinct from professional and undergraduate education. The notable institutions in this regard are the Lawrence Scientific School at Harvard, the Department of Philosophy and Arts at Yale, and foremost, Johns Hopkins University. Another trend that is examined in this chapter is the notion of higher education as a vehicle for the creation of virtuous citizens for the Republic. In this context, the *honoris causa* Master’s degrees of the antebellum period take on quite a different meaning than the “time served and fee paid” nature that has been supposed of them.
The growth of graduate education at three representative Southern universities is examined in chapter III. Although institutionally very similar, the progress of graduate education at each has been distinctly different. These institutions, which are also very similar to the University of Georgia, set the context in which the development of graduate education and a Graduate School at the University of Georgia may be understood. Each institution had its own specific problems, but, largely, the issues were similar yet solved in quite different ways. Issues such as the move away from the strict classical curriculum, the postbellum demand for agricultural and mechanical training, and the poverty of the South after the war each exerted immense, often conflicting, pressures on Southern universities.

A philosophical context for understanding graduate education is offered in chapter IV. This chapter analyzes several articles by Joseph LeConte concerning higher education. LeConte, who achieved international fame in the field of geology, is a pivotal figure when discussing graduate education at the University of Georgia. Indeed, he is a nexus through which many of the threads of ante and postbellum graduate education converge. LeConte was a graduate of the University of Georgia; the first Georgia faculty member who had done advanced graduate study (under Louis Agassiz at the Lawrence Scientific School); a professor
at the University of South Carolina; one of the founders of the University of California at Berkeley; an associate of Daniel Coit Gilman; a cofounder of the Sierra Club, and one of the first American scientists to achieve international renown.6

LeConte and his ideas are part of what Burton Clark called the institutional saga: “a unique development that has deeply stirred the emotions of participants and descendants.”7 This is the notion that the ideas of one person can, through multiple channels, percolate down to become part of the institutional culture. Many of the ideas brought forth in his “The Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College, and the University” had already been formulated by him while a faculty member at the University of Georgia in the 1850s. LeConte’s close association with prominent Georgians, particularly members of the University of Georgia Board of Trustees, assured that his ideas on higher education influenced postbellum developments at the university. In addition, many members of the faculty in the latter nineteenth century had been his students. Thus, LeConte’s writings reflect not only a general view but also one that became ingrained in the development of graduate education at the University of Georgia.

6 LeConte records in his autobiography the tremendous reception he got from scientists and universities on a trip to Europe in 1892. See Joseph LeConte, The Autobiography of Joseph LeConte, (New York, Appleton and Company, 1903), 302-316.
The development of graduate education and degrees at the University of Georgia is examined in chapter V. As with many antebellum institutions, the earliest form of graduate degree was the *honoris causa* Master’s degree. This chapter examines various attempts before and after the Civil War to reorganize the university and offer advanced graduate study. The pressure to offer agricultural and technical programs of graduate study in the latter nineteenth century resulted in the creation of specialized Master’s degrees apart from the traditional Master of Arts. The offering of the Master of Science, Doctor of Education and, ultimately, the Doctor of Philosophy mark the move to a true graduate program.

One of the central functions of any graduate school is to guarantee the integrity of the degrees offered. A graduate school exists as a regulating mechanism between the interests of departments, faculty, research, students, and the university. This chapter examines the degree requirements established by the nascent Graduate School and the gradual refinement of those requirements up to 1940 as demonstration of the regulating mechanism. Apparent in this development is the continuing tension between the classical liberal arts tradition and what Joseph LeConte called the “specialized culture” of true graduate education.
Chapter VI examines the members of the faculty who taught the first graduate courses after the formal establishment of the Graduate School. Taken into consideration are the biographical, academic, and scholarly qualities of the faculty members. These biographies give insight into the changed nature of the professoriate from the early twentieth century to the present time. Central to this examination is the examination of Willis H. Bocock, the first Graduate Dean. Bocock, who served as Graduate Dean for eighteen years, set the tone for the fledgling Graduate School. This chapter also discusses the curriculum offerings of the Graduate School. It will be seen that the basic offerings remained largely unchanged from 1910-1940.

The Graduate Council, Graduate Faculty, Summer School, Library, and Phelps-Stokes fellowship are discussed in chapter VII. These factors had profound influence, in a positive and negative sense, upon the growth of graduate education and the Graduate School. A graduate school is not a monolithic administrative entity, as these examples show. Graduate schools must be always engaged in conversation with the institution and society at large.

A work such as this is always the product of research from many sources. However, debt is owed to the typescript manuscript *History of the University of Georgia* by former
University of Georgia Registrar, Thomas Walter Reed, the Georgia Alumni Record, and the Athens Banner-Herald obituaries for information on the early members of the graduate faculty. The finding of typescript and handwritten memos and minutes of the Graduate Council and the Graduate Faculty from 1935-1941 was a true boon to understanding the development of these two organizations and the struggle to establish the Doctor of Philosophy degree. The University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, issued from 1910 to the present, particularly the volumes 1910-1940, were a font of useful information. In this same vein, The University of Georgia Commencement Programs from 1910-1954 were an invaluable asset in tracking the granting of degrees. Finally, Thomas G. Dyer’s The University of Georgia: a Bicentennial History, 1785-1985 and Lester D. Stephens’ Joseph LeConte, Gentle Prophet of Evolution served as inspiration and models of elegance and erudition.
CHAPTER II

The Beginnings of Graduate Education in the United States

What is it that distinguishes graduate education from the undergraduate course of study? Is it rigorous training for a learned profession? If that is the case, graduate education has existed in North America since the founding of Harvard in 1636. Soon after the new settlers in New England had secured the necessities of survival: “one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches, when our present ministers shall lie in the dust.”¹ The ministry belonged to the traditional triad of “learned professions” along with medicine and law. Indeed all of the earliest institutions of higher education in North America, Yale, Princeton, William and Mary, were started with the primary goal of producing an educated clergy.

Jonathan Edwards in his sermon: The Importance and Advantage of a Thorough Knowledge of Divine Truth stated:

That there are two kinds of knowledge of the things of divinity, viz., speculative and practical, or in other terms, natural and spiritual. The former remains only in the head. No other faculty but the understanding is

¹ *New England's First Fruits* (London, 1643).
concerned in it. It consists in having a natural or rational knowledge of the things of religion, or such a knowledge as is to be obtained by the natural exercise of our own faculties, without any special illumination of the Spirit of God. The latter rests not entirely in the head, or in the speculative ideas of things; but the heart is concerned in it: it principally consists in the sense of the heart.²

Faith and learning, in Edwards’ sermon and in the colonial college, were inextricably linked. It is the duty of the clergy to be highly educated since: “there can be no spiritual knowledge of that which there is not first a rational knowledge.”³ Edwards emphasized the connection between learning and faith by equating discipleship with scholarship: “Consider yourselves as scholars or disciples. . . .”

Likewise, the notions of graduate study and the university are inextricably linked. The definition of what constitutes a university is a matter of some debate. Abraham Flexner pointed out in 1930 that: “For an American educational institution to be a university it is sufficient that it be so called.”⁴ Even within institutions containing graduate and professional schools: ‘the graduate school

---

³ Ibid.
⁴ Abraham Flexner, *Universities, American English, German,* 45.
school is partly a college, partly a vocational school, and partly an institution of university grade."

Obviously, in a situation such as that described by Flexner, it is difficult to define graduate studies. Mary Bynum Pierson makes the amusing, but sadly too often true, comment that: “graduate work is that work so classified in the catalogue.” Many early leaders in the development of graduate studies in the postbellum period struggled with the distinction between the professional, the scholarly, and the technical aspects of post-baccalaureate education:

The hazy line between graduate education as pure learning and graduate education as professional training was in debate even before graduate education began. . . . There has been a continuing argument over the years between those who perceive graduate education as primarily “academic” and those who perceived it as primarily “professional” (in the narrower sense) - between graduate education and graduate training.

If one views graduate education as primarily professional, then graduate education has existed in North America since the founding of Harvard University in 1636. Training for the ministry was, certainly, the graduate training alluded to above. However, if we assert the primacy

5 Ibid.
of the academic component, pure learning, the emergence of identifiable graduate schools has a much more intricate, more convoluted development. Central to the discussion of early graduate education is the nature of the early Master’s degree. In 1642 Harvard established a system whereby a second degree, the Master’s, could be obtained for study of one year past the baccalaureate. The granting of the degree also had a moral requirement: “and of godly life and conversation.” A written “thesis” was also required: “giveth up in writing a System, or Synopsis, or summe of Logick, Naturall and Morall Phylosophy, Arithmetick, Geometry, and Astronomy. . . .” Further, it appears that a defense of the written work was required. It is unclear whether this was oral, written, or both but the tendencies of the period would be toward oral defense. All of this seems very contemporary. In 1734 the requirement that the student hold the baccalaureate was relaxed to allow those who had not completed the first degree to obtain the Master’s. The next permutation at Harvard would set the common theme for the Master’s degree in the antebellum period: any graduate was entitled to a Master’s degree if he was of proven good moral character for three years after graduation and paid a requisite fee. Many other institutions shortened the time frame to one year after

---

graduation, which became the standard in the early nineteenth century.

The Master’s degree devolved from an earned degree in 1642 to, basically, an honorary degree in 1825. There was still evidence at other institutions of the existence of earned Master’s degrees. Princeton, Yale and King’s College granted earned Master’s degrees with very slight academic requirements in addition to the honorary degrees. The first state institution to grant the Master’s degree was the University of South Carolina (then the College of South Carolina) in 1808. Other state institutions followed. The 1803 “Laws of the College of Georgia” proposed:

Masters and Bachelors of Arts, who shall signify to the President their purpose of residing at the College or in Athens with a view of pursuing literature, under his direction, and under the government of the College, and give sufficient bond to the Board of Trustees for the payment of their quarter bills shall be considered as resident graduates and students of the College.¹⁰

This system of directed study provides evidence of the desire to have an earned degree beyond the baccalaureate. It does not seem that this system was ever implemented. The Master’s degree at The University of Georgia in the antebellum period was similar to that of English and American universities, a

¹⁰ Bulletin of The University of Georgia Graduate School, (Athens, Ga, 1940), 5.
Master’s degree granted *honoris causa* after three years of good behavior and the payment of a fee. The president of South Carolina College reported in 1843 that he had six post-baccalaureate students who were pursuing a directed reading program similar to that outlined for Georgia above.

The University of Virginia granted a Master’s degree beginning in 1831. However, this was not a Master’s degree in either the modern sense or an *honoris causa* degree. The degree did not require a prior baccalaureate but was granted to a student who: “had been awarded diplomas in the ancient languages, mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry and moral philosophy . . . with the right reserved to the student to make his choice of any two.” 11 Modern languages was soon added to this list. This is an intriguing notion, almost equivalent to a modern “double-major” and was a type not repeated elsewhere. What is also interesting is that this Master’s could be entirely in science: natural philosophy and chemistry. The influence of ideas about the Master’s degree brought change to the old triumvirate of professional degrees: medicine, law and theology. In 1844 Mercer University in Macon, Georgia began requiring students applying to the theological seminary to have a baccalaureate degree before they would be admitted. The University of North Carolina followed the orthodox *honoris causa* Master’s

approach in the antebellum period. There is evidence that earned Master’s degrees may have also been offered at North Carolina in the antebellum period.

Hampden-Sydney is a rather remarkable example of an institution that granted both earned and honorary Master’s degrees in the nineteenth century and then abandoned graduate education in the twentieth century. In the College By-Laws of 1784 the honoris causa Master’s degree is defined as: “After a space of two years, they who have taken their first degree in the arts, may be admitted to the degree of Master’s.” By the 1880s the length of time for applying for the honorary degree had increased to 3 years. The earned Master’s degree was instituted in 1788. The early graduate students’ working on the earned Master’s were, generally, employed as teachers in the Hampden-Sydney grammar school. As in many other institutions, the program of study was directed by the president of the college.

Jonathan P. Cushing, who became Hampden-Sydney president in 1821, had a keen interest in graduate education. He saw graduate education as not merely a way to obtain inexpensive teachers for the grammar school, but as a way to confer

---

12 Hampden-Sydney is particularly relevant to this study since the fifth president of the University of Georgia, Moses Waddel, was educated there (H-S class of 1791) as was the first Dean of the University of Georgia Graduate School, Willis Bocock (H-S class of 1884).

prestige on the institution. In 1822 the announcement was made: "graduates of this institution or any other who may resort here to study any of the learned professions or make further advancement in literature and science shall enjoy such advantages as this institution can afford. . . ." A prescribed 3 year course of study was required for the earned Master’s degree. Twelve men who were graduates of Hampden-Sydney and other prominent colleges had received the earned Master’s degree by 1833. A thesis requirement for the degree was put forward in the early 1880s. President McIlwaine, who had a Master of Arts degree from the University of Virginia, was not satisfied with the conditions of the Master’s program and set about systematizing it and making it more rigorous. The M.A. was available to any student who took every course the college offered and who had obtained a grade of 87 or better. It was in this basic form that the earned M.A. would remain at Hampden-Sydney until its demise in 1920. It generally took students at least an additional year to complete the requirements for the degree. As course offerings grew, the student working on the M.A. would take the alternate courses he had not taken as an undergraduate. The student was also required to complete courses in three languages, one of which had to be an ancient language. The

14 Ibid., 104.
15 Represented were graduates of Middlebury, Union, Princeton, Hamilton, Amherst, and Centre.
16 Purely optional courses such as Bookkeeping, Civil Engineering and Commercial Arithmetic were excluded from this.
17 For instance: an undergraduate could choose Economics or Political Science, or two of the three: Biology, Chemistry, and Physics.
last earned M.A. was conferred in 1916. In 1920 the graduate program was discontinued and the college became exclusively undergraduate.

In addition to Hampden-Sydney, several other institutions granted earned Master’s degrees in the antebellum period including Furman, the University of Richmond, and Wake Forest. There is no doubt that earned Master’s degrees were, if not prolific, at least available before the Civil War. The major difference between the antebellum and postbellum earned Master’s degrees was the informality of the former. The honoris causa Master’s degree is especially problematic when discussing graduate education in the nineteenth century. As shown above, there was often not a clear demarcation between the earned and the honorary degree. Further, can a degree which was granted for good behavior and a fee qualify as graduate education? In the postwar development of the Master’s degree the notions of prescribed curricula, programs of study, examinations, residency, and thesis and defense would allow the earned Master’s to gain ascendancy over the honoris causa degree.

One notable early attempt to extend graduate education beyond the Master’s degree was the Lawrence Scientific School founded at Harvard in 1847. In chapter IV we will meet Joseph LeConte, graduate of the University of Georgia and
later, professor at Georgia who studied under Louis Agassiz at the Lawrence Scientific School. Faculty and administrators at several institutions in the 1850s were becoming alarmed at the prospect of students going to Europe to continue their education since suitable programs were unavailable in the United States. Further, there was a growing dissatisfaction over the honorary Master’s degrees. This is exemplified by Benjamin Peirce, professor of astronomy and mathematics at Harvard’s dictum:

Judging . . . from a conversation I had a few years ago with one of our oldest graduates, I fear that they will meet with the opposition of uncompromising conservativism, which is disposed to claim for every blockhead, who is a graduate of three years standing, a vested right to the title master of arts.

Peirce, obviously, recognized that creating a new form of graduate education was going to be an uphill battle. Peirce’s solution was to establish a new independent school.

Peirce was asked by Harvard president Edward Everett to create a conceptual scheme for the scientific school. Peirce’s scheme proposed a separate school, mainly serving college graduates, who wished to continue their studies in theoretical and practical science. In addition to the sciences, history, geography and rhetoric were also offered.

Benjamin Peirce, incidentally, was the father of the famous philosopher and logician, Charles Saunders Peirce.
In languages, French and German: the entering student was expected to be already proficient in the ancient languages. In 1847 Harvard was ready to move ahead and a Board of Faculty for Direction of the Scientific school was created. The policy was established that students would receive a diploma after a specified residency and study program determined by the faculty. The strong influence of German universities was felt with the inclusion of philology and classics in addition to the scientific program.

A gift from Abbott Lawrence of $50,000 to further scientific education at the university not only gave the school its name but also determined its character. The department became the Lawrence Scientific School, no mention was made of letters or philology. Everett had conceived of the department as being a broad-based organization for advanced study: “The original project . . . included all the branches of academic learning, and of course comprehended the literary and philosophical branches, as well as the scientific.” It is clear that Everett intended an educational experience quite distinct from the undergraduate: “philological education should be carried farther than is practicable in the four college years.” Alas, philology, the cornerstone of the nineteenth century German university, would not be part of the Lawrence Scientific School. The

20 Ibid.
presence of Louis Agassiz at the university guaranteed that the scientific aspect of graduate education would be assured primacy. The earlier plans to include programs in engineering quietly disappeared.

The true innovation at Harvard during this period which would have massive repercussions for the future of graduate education was the creation of the Bachelor of Science degree. As Frederick Rudolph points out, the Bachelor of Science degree was intended as a lesser degree than the Bachelor of Arts. The Bachelor of Science degree had lesser entrance requirements and a shorter period of residency than the B.A. Further, there was a general attitude that those taking this degree were the intellectual inferiors of the BA aspirants. In the B.A. and B.S. degrees we find the crux of tension in the ante-bellum college: the desire to expand the curriculum to embrace new subjects versus the desire to maintain the classical curriculum of the BA as the only degree worthy of respect. The Lawrence Scientific School had originally been conceived by Peirce and Everett as a center of literary as well as scientific studies. The benefaction of Lawrence and the status of Agassiz turned the department toward a purely scientific bent. This effectively ended the rise of a university on the German model. That other nexus of graduate work: between graduate education and graduate training;

between the scholarly and the professional, is apparent in
the growth of the Lawrence Scientific School. Charles W.
Eliot wrote of the Lawrence Scientific School:
An impression prevailed at the outset, that a scientific
school was to be a professional school in the same sense
as a law or medical school, and that graduates of the
colleges would continue their studies in the scientific
schools precisely as they do in the schools of law,
medicine, and theology.\textsuperscript{22}
Whatever its actual deficiencies as a true university or
graduate school in the modern sense, on the theoretical side
the Lawrence Scientific School brilliantly illustrates that
advanced thinking about graduate education was taking place
in the antebellum period.

The disruption and poverty of the South after the war
did not create an environment amenable to the development of
advanced graduate education. Many southerners joined their
colleagues from other parts of the United States in attending
German universities, particularly Göttingen, Heidelberg, and
Berlin.\textsuperscript{23} The wave of Americans attending German universities
had begun early in the nineteenth century. Harvard president
John Kirkland sent three of his promising young faculty
members: George Bancroft, Edward Everett, and George Ticknor

\textsuperscript{23} It has been estimated that as many as ten thousand Americans attended
German universities in the nineteenth century. See Berelson, \textit{Graduate
Education in the United States}, 11.
to Göttingen in 1815. Kirkland’s hope was that the training would increase the intellectual rigor of Harvard. Apparently he was quite successful in this regard as the fame of German universities spread throughout the republic. The establishment of Johns Hopkins University, with its graduate only program and offering of the Ph.D. degree, in 1876 sounded the death knell for the informal antebellum system of graduate education. The demise of the *honoris causa* Master’s degree would be slow and it would linger on into the 20th century. The introduction of the Ph.D. degree would not only expand graduate education but forced systemization upon the Master’s degree.

The Ph.D. made an appearance in the United States earlier than founding of Johns Hopkins. In the same year as the founding of the Lawrence Scientific School at Harvard the groundwork was laid for the establishment of the Department of Philosophy and the Arts at Yale. The projected department would offer advanced study in literature, history, philosophy, natural science, moral science, applied science, and philosophy. Notable in the proposal was the stipulation that moral science would not include law and theology, and that natural science would not include medicine. Here we see an effort to create a new form of graduate education apart from the traditional three learned professions. Graduates of

---

24 For a full treatment of the fascinating subject of nineteenth century Americans at German Universities see Carl Diehl, *Americans and German Scholarship, 1770-1870*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1978).
other colleges as well as Yale graduates were eligible to attend. The Department was announced in the 1847-48 catalogue. Unlike at Harvard, the literary subjects were not crowded out by the scientific, but were integral to the mission of the Department. James D. Dana, professor of natural history proposed that with the Department of Philosophy and Arts, Yale had an opportunity to create a true American university:

Only a little wider expansion of the scheme, such as is contemplated, in fact, and it will cover the highest branches of literary as well as scientific education, adapted to carry forward the graduate study of the College, through a full university system of classical or other studies. Let there be one or two years course of lectures and instruction arranged, which shall include general history, philology, ethnology, belles lettres, the history of philosophy, and other intellectual studies, and the number of resident graduates would greatly increase, and a new era dawn upon American learning.  

Dana went on to say that until such a scheme is realized, Yale would have difficulty preventing students from seeking such an education in Germany.

25 James D. Dana quoted in Storr, The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America, 57
In 1860 the Department offered that great innovation of nineteenth century higher education: the Ph.D. As in Dana’s proposal, it would require two years work in two distinct departments. Proficiency in Greek and Latin was assumed, so that those who sought admission with a B.A. were required to pass an examination. The completion of the Ph.D. degree required the submission of a thesis and a final examination. The first doctorate awarded in the United States was granted by Yale in 1861. By 1869 13 doctoral degrees had been granted. Although few in number, the Ph.D. at Yale had herculean ramifications as Eliot noted:

The changes in the Yale school since 1860 have all had one aim, namely to raise the grade of the school by getting in a better class of students, and then teaching them more and better. The methods of a professional school have been abandoned as unsuitable, and those of the college taken up: but the apparent declension is a real elevation. For a loose jointed, one-sided scheme has been substituted one which is both methodical and comprehensive.26

Eliot’s phrase: “methodical and comprehensive” not only perfectly encapsulates the innovations at Yale, but the entire breakthrough in nineteenth century higher education. Certainly, many of the persons who pursued earned Master’s by doing directed readings under the college presidents, such as at Hampden-Sydney and South Carolina, did extensive and

concentrated work. However, it is the systemization of thesis, requirements, prerequisites, examinations, programs of study, and scholarly as opposed to professional training that came with the advent of the Ph.D., that marked the turning point toward modern graduate work.

In his inaugural address as first president of Johns Hopkins University, Daniel Coit Gilman defined a university thus:

The University is a place for the advanced special education of youth who have been prepared for its freedom by the discipline of a lower school. Its form varies in different countries. Oxford and Cambridge universities are quite unlike the Scotch, and still more unlike the Queen’s University in Ireland; the University of France has no counterpart in Germany; the typical German universities differ much from one another. But while forms and methods vary, the freedom to investigate, the obligation to teach, and the careful bestowal of academic honors are always understood to be among the university functions.27

This small quotation is rife with advanced ideas about higher education in general and graduate education in particular. One point Gilman makes is that each university is distinctive. Further in the address he states that while

there is a wide consensus about the abstract aspects of a university, practical exigencies dictate that there can be no "cookie cutter" approach to creating a university. We have seen above that while there were many similarities between institutions in the antebellum period there were significant differences. One has only to compare the Lawrence Scientific School and the Yale Department of Philosophy and Arts.

Gilman includes "the obligation to teach" as one of the essential university functions. Later in the essay he expands on this by stating: "The best investigators are usually those who have also the responsibilities of instruction, gaining thus the incitement of colleagues, the encouragement of pupils, the observation of the public." and "The best teachers are those who are free, competent and willing to make original researches in the library and the laboratory." Freedom figures prominently in Gilman's description of the university. The freedom to inquire, the freedom of teaching methods, freedom of students to choose courses and conduct their research as individuals not as classes. It is the obligation of the university to be careful in its bestowal of academic honors: "Universities should bestow their honors with sparing hand; their benefits most freely." Clearly, this is a call for rigorous and systematic qualification for and granting of academic degrees. The old honoris causa M.A.

28 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
granted for time served and fee paid, is out of the question. In the latter part of the phrase just quoted, Gilman finishes the triune mission of a modern university: research, teaching, and service.

The Ph.D. as the highest academic degree, the birth of the idea of the research university, and the establishment of graduate education as a central part of any university marked the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Not everyone was delighted with the ascendancy of the doctoral degree, President Abbott Lowell of Harvard remarked:

President Eliot’s one mistake (establishing the Ph.D.), if it was a mistake; and if so, it was certainly not his alone... If his main object was to develop original thinkers, men expected to contribute deeply to knowledge, who cannot be very numerous in any generation, he would have done better to confer on them no degree and let the productions speak for themselves.30

Lowell was in an ultimately doomed minority. The prestige of the Ph.D. and its efficacy as a demonstration of systematic scholarly endeavor assured its adoption. Graduate studies encouraged the foundation of new institutions: such as Johns Hopkins and Chicago. The call for graduate studies demanded expansion of older institutions such as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and at the state universities which had been

30 Abbott Lawrence Lowell, quoted in Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States, 10.
invigorated by infusions of funds from the Morrill Act: such as North Carolina, University of California, Berkeley, and Wisconsin. Each institution had its own character as Gilman had predicted.

Gilman’s university, Johns Hopkins, represented the unique experiment in the postbellum period and the fount from which inspiration would flow to all latter nineteenth century graduate programs. Hopkins was founded with an endowment from a wealthy industrialist with the intention of creating a graduate-only institution. The notion of starting with a clean slate, particularly for graduate education, has a great deal of appeal. Unencumbered by the need to provide for undergraduates, the faculty and students at such an institution can achieve an intensity of purpose not easily accomplished in the world of sports, social life, undergraduate survey courses, and general distribution requirements that mark undergraduate education. Essentially, the ideal graduate school would be a monastery of research. Indeed, Andrew F. West, Dean of the Graduate School at Princeton would use the word “monastery” to describe his vision of the new graduate college, a place of “ideal academic seclusion.”

Andrew F West, quoted in Lawrence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1965), 247. West actually conceived of the Graduate School as a monastery with graduate students and faculty dining in academic robes and saying Latin grace in the refectory!
existing institution is always going to be colored by the established culture at that institution.

If Johns Hopkins also aspired to the monastery of graduate education ideal its physical location was anything but West’s ideal seclusion. Housed in several remodeled downtown Baltimore buildings, Hopkins was the forerunner of today’s “urban university.” Gilman’s earlier career at the University of California had been marked by a conservative “make haste slowly” attitude toward innovation. Some of his ideas had taken an innovative turn by the time he interviewed for the presidency of Hopkins:

I incline more and more to the belief that what is wanted in Baltimore is not a scientific school, nor a classical college, nor both combined; but a faculty of medicine, and a faculty of philosophy . . . that each head of a great department, with his associates in the department . . . shall be as far as possible free from the interference of other heads of departments, and shall determine what scholars he will receive and how he will teach them; that advanced special students be first provided for; that degrees be given when scholars are ready to be graduated, in one year or ten years after their admission.\textsuperscript{32}

Of course, this ideal of graduate education would require

\textsuperscript{32} Daniel Coit Gilman, quoted in Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, 160.
modification to be a practical undertaking, but the early years at Hopkins were marked by spontaneity and innovation. However, in spite of his association with the Hopkins experiment he remained, at heart, very much dedicated to the idea of education as, ultimately, moral training: the ideal of the antebellum period. He was not alone in this regard; several of the great university presidents of the latter part of the nineteenth century, such as James McCosh at Princeton and James B. Angell at Michigan, still embraced this notion. Hopkins in the early years was filled with a palpable excitement among the faculty and students which heightened the monastic concentration. Veysey observes: “the Hopkins atmosphere combined two important qualities: a sense of freedom and at the same time of driving dedication.”

Hopkins, at once, shunned utility and embraced it fully. The tension between utility and pure scholarship began to be felt in the late nineteenth century. Some of this was due to increased industrialization. The establishment of the land-grant institutions was also responsible. As subjects such as agriculture and engineering moved into the classroom, utility came to the forefront. Hopkins was more concerned with pure research. Gilman skillfully showed the public that such work was not desiccated scholarship but the actual driving force behind progress. Gilman declared: “The university . . .

33 Woodrow Wilson studied at Hopkins from 1883-86. He received his Ph.D. in 1886 and always spoke fondly of his time there.
34 Veysey, The Rise of the American University, 164.
renders services to the community which no demon of
statistics can ever estimate." 35 Thus was born the idea of the
research university.

The influence of Hopkins was a formidable force in creating modern graduate education. Eliot wrote of the Hopkins experiment:

The graduate school of Harvard University . . . did not thrive, until the example of Johns Hopkins forced our Faculty to put their strength into the development of our institution for graduates. And what was true of Harvard was true of every other university in the land which aspired to create an advanced school of arts and sciences. 36

The graduate programs at the major private and state universities, invigorated by the Hopkins example, would soon surpass Hopkins in the size, breadth, and number of graduates but the spark started in those small buildings in downtown Baltimore would light the flame of modern graduate education.

The world of graduate education in the early nineteenth century is a strange one, indeed. There are germs of the ideas which would reach fruition in the creation of the research university; there are familiar notions of intense

study and close faculty/student interaction, and yet, there is that strange beast: the *honoris causa* Master’s degree.

Certainly, to this day honorary degrees are still being granted by institutions all over the world, but not for the “time served and good behavior” of the nineteenth century American college. We are apt to dismiss the *honoris causa* Master’s as merely an ornament or affectation today. It can be argued, though, that the honorary Master’s was a powerful statement of the purpose of higher education in the nineteenth century. Above all else, higher education in the nineteenth century United States ascribed to Plato’s notion that good education makes good men and that good men are good citizens. John Abercrombie in his *Moral Philosophy*, a book popular in the antebellum college, echoed this sentiment:

> Finally, he may [the good citizen] zealously exert himself in increasing the knowledge and moral habits of the people—two of the most important means by which the conscientious man, in any rank of life, may aid in conferring a high and permanent benefit on his country. 37

Thus, the honorary Master’s degree was a public statement that the education had been successful; that virtuous citizens had been created for the Republic. The degree was as much an honor to the institution as it was for the individual receiving it. Even Gilman, an advanced thinker, held the

notion that the moral training aspect of higher education was its highest goal, as mentioned above.\textsuperscript{38} The Senatus Academicus of the University of Georgia defined the moral qualifications for the honorary Master’s degree thus:

No candidate for the second degree may expect the honor of the same, unless he shall have preserved a good moral character, and previously to the commencement, shall have signified to the president, his desire of the same.\textsuperscript{39}

Viewed in this light, the honoris causa Master’s degree was a statement that the antebellum colleges were in service to the nation by producing virtuous republicans.

Berelson makes an interesting point about the increasing emphasis of graduate education on science as opposed to liberal arts.\textsuperscript{40} This is a result, he believes, of the age in which graduate education had its inception and in which it has grown up. The latter part of the nineteenth century was a period of rapid scientific and technological development that has not slowed since. Further, he argues that most Americans attended German universities in the period in which science

\textsuperscript{38} "The object of the university is to develop character - to make men. It misses its aim if it produced learned pedants, or simple artisans, or cunning sophists, or pretentious practitioners. Its purport is not so much to impart knowledge to the pupils, as whet the appetite, exhibit methods, develop powers, strengthen judgment, and invigorate the intellectual and moral forces. It should prepare for the service of society a class of students who will be wise, thoughtful, progressive guides in whatever department of work or thought they may be engaged." Gilman, Inaugural Address, http://www.jhu.edu/125th/links/gilman.html .

\textsuperscript{39} Senatus Academicus minutes quoted in E. Merton Coulter, College Life in the Old South, (New York, Macmillan, 1925), 186.

\textsuperscript{40} Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States, 12.
had begun to assert primacy over literature. We have seen how letters were excised from the Lawrence Scientific School, but still held the central focus of the Yale Department of Philosophy and Arts of the same period. At Hopkins, as well in the early period, the library had equal status with the laboratory. However, the pressure was on, the admission of agriculture and engineering to the world of graduate studies would shift the balance toward the utilitarian and scientific. The classics would still have their place of honor in graduate education, though, as we shall see, the first dean of the University of Georgia Graduate School, Willis H. Bocock, was a professor of classics and classics figured prominently in the first Graduate Bulletin of 1910.

The rise of graduate education in the nineteenth century United States is the story of the establishment and standardization of degrees. It is the congealing of the notion of graduate education as something discrete from undergraduate. It is about the expansion of science and utility. In the next section we will examine, briefly, the rise of graduate education and a graduate school at three southern institutions: the University of Virginia, the University of South Carolina, and the University of North Carolina. These three institutions are in many ways similar to the University of Georgia. However, there are delightfully
different nuances between each illustrating the amazing richness of early graduate education in the United States.
CHAPTER III
The Rise of Graduate Education at Three Southern Universities

On desperate seas long wont to roam,
Thy hyacinth hair, thy classic face,
Thy Naiad airs have brought me home
To the glory that was Greece
And the grandeur that was Rome.

-Edgar Allan Poe "To Helen"

Poe spent one year at the University of Virginia drinking in the glory of Greece and the grandeur of Rome. The glory and grandeur of Mr. Jefferson’s architecture was joined by a reverence for the ancient cultures and languages and a curriculum based on the classical trivium and quadrivium. All higher education in the early nineteenth century United States was based on the classical model but nowhere was this conscious retrospect to Greece and Rome so strong as in the American South. The following section discusses the rise of graduate education in three Southern universities. The architecture of their campuses bears testimony to their dedication to the classical ideal. Graduate education began at these three universities as a deeper introspection into the classics: a closer reading of Thucydides, a deliberation on Plutarch.
Naturally, this reverence for classical culture was not limited to the South. The Yale Report of 1828 asserts:

Familiarity with the Greek and Roman writers is especially adapted to form the taste, and to discipline the mind, both in thought and diction, to the relish of what is elevated, chaste and simple. The compositions which these writers have left us, both in prose and verse, whether considered in reference to structure, style, modes of illustration, or general execution, approach nearer than any others to what the human mind, when thoroughly informed and disciplined, of course approves, and constitute, what it is most desirable to possess, a standard for determining literary merit.¹

The study of the ancient authors not only elevates the aesthetic sensibilities, it forms the moral character as well. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the grand aim of higher education in the early nineteenth century was to instill not just good, but superior, moral character. The graduates of institutions of higher education would be the leaders of the Republic, their moral character would form the moral character of the nation. Quoting again from the Yale Report:

he who is not only eminent in professional life, but has also a mind richly stored with general knowledge which gives him a commanding influence in society, and a

¹ Trustees of Yale University, Reports on the Course of Instruction in Yale College, (New Haven, Yale University, 1828), 35.
widely extended sphere of usefulness. His situation enables him to diffuse the light of science among all classes of the community. Is a man to have no other object than to obtain a living by professional pursuits? Has he not duties to perform to his family, to his fellow citizens, to his country; duties which require various and extensive intellectual furniture?

Obviously, the author of the above passage was well versed in classical rhetoric, but in order to understand the beginnings of graduate education and the struggles it underwent in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, one must understand the civic function of all higher education during this period.

Although founded the latest of the three, the University of Virginia, demonstrates most strongly the advantages, and pitfalls, that came from adhering to the Classical curriculum and outlook in the development of graduate education. Although each institution has its own distinctive history and character, we will see many similarities between them and, later in the study, the rise of graduate education at the University of Georgia.

\footnote{Ibid., 15.}
The Beginning of Graduate Education at the University of North Carolina

In the antebellum period the University of North Carolina (UNC), like many institutions of the time, awarded the Master’s degree without a systematized program of study or examination. The degree was *honoris causa*, awarded for both scholarly and non-scholarly accomplishments. In the 1853-54 University of North Carolina Catalogue the first codification of earned graduate education makes its appearance at UNC:

those students who seek for a professional education may leave the Academic course at the end of the first term of their Senior year, and devote themselves entirely to their own special studies during a period of eighteen months. At the end of six months they will receive the degree of Bachelor of Arts along with the rest of their class, and at the end of their fifth year the degree of Master of Arts.\(^3\)

The first recorded earned graduate degree at UNC was awarded to Needham Bryan Cobb in 1856. It appears that his degree was granted after an additional year of study: a practice fairly common at the time. There is little evidence that Cobb

---

Laura Micheletti Puaca, *Pioneer to Powerhouse: The History of Graduate Education at Carolina*, (Chapel Hill: UNC Graduate School, 2003), 2. The degree program thus described is not very different from some offered today, such as the Honors Program at the University of Georgia. In the Honors Program a student may do work towards an M.A. or M.S. while working on their Bachelor’s.
followed a strictly prescribed program of study or was required to submit a thesis.

The informal approach to the Master’s degree described above continued until 1876 when Kemp Plummer Battle became president of UNC. Battle instituted a program which required both examinations and a thesis. Further, most students were required to have completed the Bachelor’s degree before entering the graduate program. This marked the beginning of graduate education as a distinct entity at UNC. UNC established a Ph.D. program in 1877, just one year after the first Ph.D. program in the United States had been established at Johns Hopkins. William Battle Phillips earned the first Ph.D. degree from UNC in 1883. The degree was conferred, as the 1877 Catalogue phrased it: “upon rigid examinations on prescribed courses.” The UNC requirements are those of a recognizable graduate education: prescribed programs of study, examinations, and terminal research papers. The UNC Graduate School admitted women to postgraduate courses in 1897. In the period from 1883 to 1900, UNC conferred 7 Ph.D. degrees: 4 in Chemistry, 2 in Classics and 1 in English.5

The graduate programs were run individually from the various departments without any central university authority.

4 Ibid., 5.
5 Pierson, Graduate Work in the South, 223.
Thus, the offerings, quality, and rigor of the various programs was inconsistent. In spite of the seeming decentralization of control of graduate study all members of the faculty were required to supervise and approve each student’s work! Francis P. Venable, who became UNC president in 1900, recognized the need to systematize the graduate program. Venable, who held M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Göttingen, applied the German model to the improvement of graduate education at UNC. Venable expanded the university’s physical assets and hired several new and prominent faculty members. The improvements allowed the expansion of course offerings which were: “now numerous and important enough to form a distinct department.” Charles Alphonso Smith was appointed the first Dean of the “Graduate Department” in 1903.

Soon after assuming the post of Dean, Smith eliminated the last vestige of the antebellum “honorary” Master’s degree. All Master’s students were required to fulfill a one year residency requirement. Smith organized the “Committee on Graduate Study” whose charge it was to establish university guidelines for examinations, theses, and dissertations. Smith’s innovations had the desired effect: the number of graduate courses had increased from forty-five in 1903 to

---

Puaca, Pioneer to Powerhouse: The History of Graduate Education at Carolina, 7.
seventy-seven by 1914. The “Graduate Department” was reorganized as the Graduate School in 1907. Smith was succeeded in 1910 by Charles Lee Raper. One of Raper’s major accomplishments was the development of the university library into a collection befitting the UNC Graduate School’s aspirations. An enormous bequest to UNC by Mary Lily Kenan Flagler Bingham made possible the establishment of several endowed chairs: the Kenan professorships. As UNC president Edward Kidder Graham expressed in 1916: “the faculty is the heart of an institution’s life. . . .” The Bingham bequest added vigor to the heart of graduate education at UNC. In the period 1900-01 through 1913-14 the University of North Carolina conferred nine Doctor of Philosophy, twenty-four Master of Science, and one hundred six Master of Arts degrees.8

The Graduate School at the University of North Carolina, fortunately, was steadfastly supported by the university presidents in the early 20th century. President Harry Woodburn Chase declared in 1920:

There is nothing which so adds to the vigor and vitality of an institution of learning, and which so well reflects the aims and ideals for which university education should stand, as a graduate school of real

---

7 Average enrollment in graduate programs averaged twenty-seven students in the first decade of the 20th century. See Puaca, 15.
worth and power. From a larger point of view, it must always be kept in mind that it is precisely that spirit of the ardent pursuit of truth for its own sake which finds expression in the graduate school which, animating minds and hearts of men in laboratory and study, has literally made modern civilization a possibility. ¹

This very eloquent pronouncement is testimony to the support the university felt for the graduate school. Indeed, would not every graduate dean, even today, wish for such an accolade from the university president?

Edwin A. Greenlaw, who succeeded Raper in 1920 as Dean, infused the graduate school with the energy of the roaring 20s. Greenlaw felt that the distinction between undergraduate and graduate education and the place of the Graduate School must be put in sharp focus:

"We are trying to see it clearly, its place in the structure of the University; its relation to the advancement of learning, and its relation to the life of the state. We approach this task not from any feeling that the past history of research at the University gives cause for regret, and least of all from any feelings that reforms are necessary. It is rather with a sense of responsibility for carrying on work already

¹ Harry Woodburn Chase in Wilson, The University of North Carolina 1900-1930, 416.
under way, with only such changes as befit the greater University that is in building.”

Although Greenlaw’s pronouncement tried to strike a consonance between advancement and tradition, reform was clearly on his mind. The duties and powers of the Committee on Graduate Study were expanded. The Board codified the procedures of admission, examinations, candidacy, and thesis and dissertation. The Board also created a graduate faculty and graduate fellowships. The founding of the University of North Carolina Press and the publications of the journals: Research in Progress and Journal of Social Forces provided a stage for graduate education and research at UNC.

Greenlaw’s successor, James Finch Royster, labored to increase funding opportunities for graduate students. It is notable that he was concerned that the existing fellowships were too time and labor intensive to permit full attention to studies. During the 1920s graduate enrollment increased from 73 at the start of the decade to 286 in 1930. In 1928 the American Council of Learned Societies published the survey: Research in the Humanistic and Social Sciences. According to the survey: “The leadership in the new research movement in the South is traceable to one institution, and to certain men and women in it, namely, the University of North Carolina.”

Puaca, Pioneer to Powerhouse: The History of Graduate Education at Carolina, 16.
Frederick A. Ogg in Wilson, The University of North Carolina, 1900-1930, 462.
By 1930 the UNC Graduate School was a modern, prestigious institution. In all phases: administration, curriculum, research, policy, and faculty UNC was a leader in graduate education.

The Development of Graduate Education at the University of South Carolina

The first state university to grant the AM degree was the University of South Carolina (then the College of South Carolina). Edward Hooker and Thomas Park were awarded honorary Master’s degrees in 1808. One year before South Carolina granted 4 honorary D.D. degrees and 1 honorary LL.D. One of the D.D. degrees went to Moses Waddel, future president of the University of Georgia. The next A.M. degree was not granted until 1816. Honorary Master’s degrees were conferred until 1873. As in many other institutions of the antebellum period, organized graduate study consisted of directed reading under the supervision of the college president. In 1843 it was reported by the president of South Carolina that he had six resident graduates studying under his direction.

Waddel, at this time, operated the famous Willington Academy in South Carolina. The school, which owed much to his alma mater, Hampden Sydney, was an archetype of the Presbyterian "log academy." John C. Calhoun was one of Waddel’s students at Willington.

Edwin L. Green, A History of the University of South Carolina, (Columbia, State Company, 1916), 467.
In 1835 the trustees of the College of South Carolina reorganized the college around a new set of bylaws. The impetus for this reorganization had been, primarily, a furor about “infidels” being appointed to the faculty. As well as addressing this issue, which had become a public relations problem for the college, the bylaws had the happy consequence of systematizing instruction. In the area of graduate work the bylaws established criteria for awarding the Master’s degree. The requirements, however, were anything but extraordinary: they were the familiar three years after graduation, good character, and payment of a fee:

Every bachelor, in the third year after his first degree; if he shall have sustained a fair character, and shall perform such exercises as may be assigned him shall be entitled to the degree of Master of Arts; for which he shall pay the same perquisites as the first degree."

The section above about performing the assigned exercises is intriguing: perhaps an early form of continuing education? The bylaws permitted the degree to be taken “in course” or “in residence.” To obtain the degree “in-residence” a student had to remain at the college for one year after the first degree and follow a course of study assigned by the president and faculty. Those who fulfilled these requirements would be granted the Master of Arts, good character was, naturally, assumed.

"Ibid., 195."
The honorary degrees, such as that presented to Waddel, were honorary degrees in the modern sense: bestowed on individuals as a recognition of accomplishment by the college. However, when we consider the Master’s degrees (not the D.D. and LL.D.), the issue becomes somewhat nebulous. Green provides separate lists for honorary degrees and the Master of Arts degree. It would seem that many of the persons listed on the Master of Arts table received their Master’s honoris causa, since the degrees were granted three years after graduation. However, there are a number of persons who received the degree one year after completion of the first degree, indicating that they may have been resident graduates. In 1846, for example, six out the thirteen persons receiving the degree, had received their first degree the year before. Unfortunately, the fate of the six resident graduates mentioned by the president in 1843, is unknown. William Royal received the Master’s degree in 1859, eighteen years after receiving the first degree.

Daniel Hollis points out that the catalogs of 1835-1841 make reference to several resident graduates. The bylaws of 1835, make no mention of programs of study or examinations for the Master’s degree. Yet, the fact that the presence of graduate residents is mentioned on many occasions and the

15 Ibid., 434. Green states that the trustees minutes make no mention of any of the six, and the faculty records from the period are lost. 1846 is the next year for which there is a record.
16 Daniel Walker Hollis, University of South Carolina, (Columbia, S.C., University of South Carolina Press, 1951), 129.
granting of the Master’s to individuals one year after their first degree is strong evidence that earned degrees were not uncommon at South Carolina in the antebellum period. The last Master’s degree of the antebellum period was granted in 1860 to Henry C. Mitchell of the class of 1857. The College closed its doors throughout the period of the Civil War. It reemerged as the University of South Carolina in 1866.

The postwar University of South Carolina adopted a division of studies in specialized schools, much as had been done at the University of Virginia. Students were given a great degree of freedom in the way they pursued their first degree. They were permitted to enter the specialized schools in their junior or senior year. The schools were: Ancient Languages, Chemistry, English Literature, History, Mathematics, Mental and Moral Philosophy, Modern Languages, Natural Philosophy, Political Philosophy, and Rhetoric. To receive the A.B. degree, a student had to be a graduate of any two literary and any two scientific schools. The requirements for the M.A. degree were that the student graduate from any eight of the schools, write an essay on a literary or scientific topic, and pass an examination before the faculty. Unfortunately, this system proved too rigorous for the postwar students and although graduate students were enrolled every year, none ever obtained the degree.
The entire system of the university, including the requirements for the Master’s degree, was overhauled in 1882. The Master of Arts degree now required: “at least one year of resident postgraduate study, with distinction in a postgraduate course in not less than three studies.”\textsuperscript{17} The first Master’s degree under this system was conferred in 1884. Also in 1882 mining and civil engineering graduate programs appeared with mechanical engineering following in 1885.\textsuperscript{18} However, these innovations in the expansion of studies were not enough to assuage the critics. The University of South Carolina was assailed from two quarters: denominational colleges and from proponents of a college of agriculture. The denominational colleges claimed the free tuition system at the university siphoned off their prospective students; the agriculturists claimed the university was a misuse of Morrill funds. The university was according to one detractor: “agricultural and mechanical when money is to be received; it is classical and literary when money is to be spent.”\textsuperscript{19}

Not all the opposition was antithetical to the classical tradition of the university. The leading protagonist for a separate state college of agriculture, Benjamin R. Tillman stated:

we want the College as it used to be in Dr. Thornwell’s time, as an alma mater for those who desire to study the

\textsuperscript{17} University of South Carolina catalog, 1882-83 quoted in Hollis, 112.  
\textsuperscript{18} The first engineering degree was awarded in 1888.  
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 134.
classics and literature or fit themselves for a profession. . . . it would be a pity to shock the sensibilities of the old regime left among us by desecrating those classic halls in applying them to the degrading uses of an agricultural and industrial school. . . . That institution is not and can never be a fitting temple for our sun-burned Goddess, Agriculture. She now occupies, thus, the position of a bond slave and is only tolerated because of her dower.²⁰

The struggle would continue between the University of South Carolina “agriculture annex” and the drive for a separate agricultural and mechanical institution. The issue would finally be resolved with the founding of Clemson Agricultural College in 1889. However, the decade long struggle was typical of the conflicts that would plague state universities in the postbellum period. These conflicts were quite pronounced in the impoverished South, where the Morrill funds seemed like a godsend for the colleges.²¹

The conflict, and the reallocation of Morrill funds, restricted the growth of graduate education at South Carolina

²⁰ Benjamin R. Tillman in Hollis, 137. James H. Thornwell was College of South Carolina president from 1852-1855. No doubt Tillman had other motives in his flattering portrayal than the advancement of classical learning at the university. Tillman was a skillful politician and the fact that he would make such a pronouncement indicates that it was a persuasive one to the legislature and faculty.

²¹ The animosity at South Carolina was fueled by 80 years of conflict between low-country “aristocrats” and upcountry “farmers.” Tillman asserted: “South Carolina University, Citadel. . . . These pets of the aristocracy and its nurseries are only hoping that the people will again sink into their accustomed apathy . . . .” Hollis, 157.
until the Graduate School was organized in 1907. The graduate school was, unfortunately, not put under the administration of a dean. Degree requirements at South Carolina remained amorphous. From 1906–1922 one hundred seventy-four Master of Arts degrees were conferred but South Carolina president William S. Currell lamented: “the present M.A. is too cheap, as has several times been noted by various members of the faculty.”22 Currell was appointed dean of the graduate school in 1922 after he left the presidency. He set about instituting a system of strict requirements in programs of study, examinations and theses. In 1923 the requirements for doctoral degrees were established and Ph.D. degrees were conferred on Gilbert P. Voigt in English and Mason Crum in Education. The doctoral degrees were at first restricted to education, English and history and would remain so until 1944. Certainly, South Carolina had its own peculiar political struggles but it also had much in common with its peer institutions. As with other institutions, South Carolina struggled with the conflict between the scholarly, professional, and technical; the drive to standardize degree requirements, and the move toward centralized authority in the form of a graduate school and graduate dean.

22 Ibid., 306.
Of the projected University of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "This institution [the University of Virginia] will be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it." The University of Virginia was founded to be an institution apart: free of denominational influence, innovative in teaching, and architecturally distinctive. Jefferson’s original conception was a collection of eight schools, each independent and free to develop its own policies and requirements. The eight schools were: anatomy and medicine, ancient languages, law, mathematics, modern languages, moral philosophy, natural history, and natural philosophy. Jefferson had also planned for schools of commerce, diplomacy, and manufacturing, but these schools were not established due to lack of funds. The system was of a pure elective nature, students were free to pursue whichever school interested them. The regulations required that a student follow a course each session consisting of three subjects. There was no established degree program, degree, or class rank. Further, there was no diploma conferred by the university as a whole, the individual

---

schools awarded their own diplomas or “certificates of completion.”

Problems soon became apparent in this very liberal system. Many students failed to return after the first year. After all, one could be called a graduate of the University of Virginia after completing one year and three subjects just as well as a person who remained four years and held diplomas from all eight schools. Without a prescribed program of study or prerequisites, young men tended to find themselves in studies for which they were inadequately prepared or had no interest. As a model for mature graduate students, Jefferson’s plan had a great deal of merit; as a scheme for undergraduate instruction, however, it had serious flaws. In 1831 the university attempted to address the problems of the elective system by establishing requirements for the M.A. degree. The degree would be awarded upon receipt by the student of diplomas from five schools: ancient languages, chemistry, mathematics, moral philosophy, and natural philosophy. In 1833 a diploma from the school of modern languages was added to the requirements. An oral examination was required covering all the schools from which the student had received diplomas. Rudolph argues that the degree emerged as a Master’s rather than a Bachelor’s in deference to Jefferson’s high minded aspirations for study at the

\[24\] The problem with immature students would be used later in the century, by James McCosh and others, as an objection to the developing elective system.
institution. He comments that the university: “thought of itself as a graduate institution--such an institution was a remarkable feat of the Jeffersonian imagination.”

The honorary degree, in the modern sense, bestowed upon an eminent person was very much antithetical to Jefferson’s taste. Jefferson’s: “distrustful attitude towards honorary degrees was characteristic of a man who had struck fiercely at all artificial distinctions and was suspicious of men’s disposition to create them where they did not already exist.” Undoubtedly, this also explains Jefferson’s reluctance to have any degrees at all. The diplomas from the various schools were evidence of work and study, a degree was too redolent of a title, an artificial distinction. Similarly, the honoris causa Master’s degree, discussed above, also fell under this proscription. Continuing study and good character, the normal requirements for the honoris causa Master’s, were expected from graduates of the University of Virginia. Unfortunately, reality did not correspond to theory and the university was rocked by numerous incidents of student unrest. The problem was the immaturity of the students:

he [Jefferson] expected the University founded by him to be patronized, not by raw boys, shirking their studies

---

26 Bruce, History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919, 137.
27 One such incident lead to the shooting death of John A. G. Davis, professor of law by a student in 1840.
and running after irregular pleasures,
but by sedate young men, who were to engage in graduate
work in general for some active pursuit in life.\textsuperscript{28}
Jefferson’s principle that the “government governs best which
governs least” did not seem to be applicable to
undergraduates. Jefferson’s notions of intensive, self-
directed study would have to wait until 1876 with the
founding of Johns Hopkins.\textsuperscript{29}

The fact that the Master of Arts degree was an earned
degree from a fairly rigorous program conferred upon it a
great deal of prestige. Dean James Southall Wilson reminisced
in 1944 that: “I believe that it may be regarded as a
commonly accepted fact of thirty years ago that no American
degree had a higher reputation, especially in the South, than
the Master of Arts degree at the University of Virginia.”\textsuperscript{30}
Wilson also points out that it was not a Master’s degree in
the modern sense because it did not require a prior
Bachelor’s degree. Perhaps not, but it did have the
distinction of being one of the few Master’s degrees in the
antebellum period that had established systematic earned
criteria for its conferral. The requirements were not
entirely rigid though; variations on the requirements of

\textsuperscript{28} Bruce, Volume III, 259.
\textsuperscript{29} Indeed, Daniel Coit Gilman referred to the University of Virginia as
one of his influences for Johns Hopkins. See Veysey, The Emergence of
the American University, 160.
\textsuperscript{30} James Southall Wilson in Pierson, Graduate Work in the South,35.
Wilson was dean of the University of Virginia Graduate School from 1937-
1951.
diplomas from the six schools mentioned above occurred. For example, in 1845 Matthew Harrison was permitted to substitute law for modern languages in application for his M.A. degree.\textsuperscript{31}

The Master’s degree at the University of Virginia in the antebellum period received some criticism that its requirements were not broad enough. Why not include botany, geology, law, economics etc.? This points out another area where the antebellum University of Virginia Master’s degree was not like the modern degree. This was a degree predicated on the notion of general culture, not specialization. It was a degree designed to create Jeffersonian polymaths who would assiduously pursue learning throughout life. By the year 1859, one hundred seven Master’s degrees had been conferred.\textsuperscript{32}

The “Jeffersonian” Master’s degree would continue after the Civil War but the calls for specialization and scientific intensity would render it antique. It continued as a “gentleman’s degree”, but clearly, the University of Virginia would have to offer graduate degrees consonant with other institutions. Change would not come easily: the degree was treated reverentially by the faculty and alumni, to criticize it would be akin to criticizing Mr. Jefferson himself. The first sign of change in the postbellum years was to reduce the oral examination to any two schools from which the student obtained a diploma.

\textsuperscript{31} Bruce, Volume III, 63. 
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
Reverence gave way to reality when enrollment suffered a drastic drop in 1879-1880. The solution proposed would create several new degrees to cover different permutations of scientific and literary endeavor. The degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Letters, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Philosophy were designed to address the need for a strong first degree, something which had always been neglected in the shadow of the Master of Arts. The graduate degrees were Master of Arts, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Science, and Doctor of Letters. This scheme proved to be overly elaborate and the faculty committee countered with a proposal that only three degrees be offered: Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, and Doctor of Philosophy. The Doctor of Philosophy degree required the student to have obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree before entry; the Master’s persisted as it had in the past as a first degree. The Master’s degree continued as a general culture program, but the Doctor of Philosophy would be awarded to a student who completed a full course in two scientific or two literary schools. Whether the student entered the Doctor of Philosophy program with a Bachelor’s or Master’s from Virginia or from another school, he had to have received a diploma from the University of Virginia school or schools in which he intended to do his graduate work. The endeavor to modify the beloved Master of Arts degree to be more useful to students met resistance:

A student . . . might become a master of arts without
any knowledge of chemistry, or physics, or psychology, or logic; and with only knowledge enough of Latin and French to pass the intermediate classes. Was it becoming the dignity of the University to confer its highest degree upon one who had shown no scholarly knowledge of the languages, ancient or modern, and might not have stood a single examination in pure mathematics? Are not standards being sacrificed to supposed means of increasing numerical attendance upon the institution? \(^{33}\)

One of the fundamental problems was the weakness of the Bachelor’s degree. This degree was commonly looked upon as an admission of failure, of being unable to ascend the heights of the vaunted Master of Arts, the “gentleman’s degree.” It was as if many people would not admit that every student could not emerge like Mr. Jefferson endowed with supreme adroitness in literature, art, and science.

By 1894, the Doctor of Philosophy degree had been codified to require that the candidate had a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree from Virginia or a recognized institution, have passed examinations in graduate work in his two fields of study, and had submitted a dissertation in his field of study. The two fields of study is an oddity to modern eyes, but the doctoral degree at Virginia was coming more in line with other institutions. The Master of Arts degree, however, remained defiant. In 1896, the doctoral requirements were

\(^{33}\) Ibid., 401.
amended to require three fields of study: the major subject, a coordinate minor, and an independent minor; a three year minimum residency requirement, a reading knowledge of French and German and comprehensive examinations on the three fields of study after the third session.\textsuperscript{34} The Department of Graduate Studies was formed in 1904 with Richard Heath Dabney becoming its first dean in 1905. Also in 1904 the university was elected a member of the Association of American Universities: the only institution south of the Ohio and Potomac rivers to have this honor. The Master’s degree was modified in 1907 to require three subjects, rather than the previous four as well as not requiring a baccalaureate degree before admission to the Master’s program. The Master of Science degree was created as a continuation of the Bachelor of Science degree which had recently been established. In the period 1904-1915, one hundred fifty-eight Master of Arts and thirty-one Doctor of Philosophy degrees had been granted.\textsuperscript{35}

The period of the Dabney deanship saw the thesis requirement instituted for Master’s degrees. Dabney felt that the university paid insufficient attention to the needs of the graduate program, but university president Edwin A. Alderman remained more impressed with the undergraduate and professional schools. Physics professor L. G. Hoxton complained of: “a certain attitude of indifference amounting

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., Volume IV, 313-314.  
\textsuperscript{35} Bruce, Volume V, 163.
to hostility toward research, particularly on the part of the older and influential members of the faculty."\textsuperscript{36} The shade of the "gentleman’s degree" had again made its appearance. When John C. Metcalf succeeded Dabney as Graduate Dean in 1923, the state of graduate studies at Virginia was at its nadir: the university conferred more than twice as many Doctor of Philosophy degrees than any other southern institution, yet its graduate program did not even appear in a nationwide poll of professors ranking graduate programs. As outside funding started coming in to support research, President Alderman had a change of heart about the Graduate School stating effusively that it was: “the supreme contribution of the university to society.”\textsuperscript{37} The new found support had a positive effect in the pre-World War II era. The standards and reputation of the school climbed. The Metcalf years saw graduate enrollment grow from one hundred in 1924 to five hundred in 1934.

The University of Virginia presents us with several lessons regarding graduate education. As mentioned above, the Master of Arts degree became such an object of reverence that it lived on far beyond its time. Further, the degree itself became identified with Mr. Jefferson, so that to question the degree was to question the great founder himself. The degree also was imbued with the notion of being a "gentleman’s

\textsuperscript{36} Virginius Dabney, \textit{Mr. Jefferson’s University: A History}, (Charlottesville, Va, University of Virginia Press, 1988), 80.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 83.
degree" which created a snobbery about hindering the development of not only other graduate degrees but also the Bachelor’s degree. It was not without its merits though. As shown in nebulous curriculum and degree requirements of the antebellum period at North Carolina and South Carolina, it was very well organized and regulated. The breadth of the Virginia Master of Arts degree was a perfect reiteration of the “extensive intellectual furniture” of the Yale report with which we began this chapter. Of the original Master of Arts degree UVA Graduate Dean James Southall Wilson would assert: “I do not think it too strong a statement to make that the importance of the Master’s degree in American education was due to a large extent to the fame of this degree.”38 Perhaps, but it is also true that the degree stayed around far too long, to the detriment of the development of graduate education at the University of Virginia.

Science had always been an integral part of the UVA Master’s degree but it was not the type of scientific training that the latter nineteenth and early twentieth century would demand. It was an Albertian, a Jeffersonian conception of scientific training for the “universal man.” The era after the Civil War was a move to the specialized man: the breadth of the Master of Arts degree was admirable for a gentleman farmer but hopelessly superficial for the

38 James Southall Wilson quoted in Pierson, Graduate Work in the South, 35.
scientists and engineers the new era demanded. South Carolina too had its struggle between the tradition of classical education and the demands of the new practicality. The creation of Clemson Agricultural College allowed the classical to rule for a bit longer into the late nineteenth century, but deprived the university of needed Morrill Act funds. Of the three institutions, North Carolina was the most successful at making the transition to the new realities of postbellum graduate education. Frederick Rudolph describes the changing focus in the late nineteenth century university thus:

The old professionalism was characterized by a serious regard for the liberal studies and by the degree to which the central subject of every liberal study was man himself. The new professionalism, on the other hand, studied things, raised questions not so much about man’s ultimate role and his ultimate responsibility as it did about whether this or that was a good way to go about achieving some immediate and limited object.39

The passages above from the Yale Report and the original Master of Arts degree at the University of Virginia are clearly on the side of the old professionalism. If universities are to survive, they must adapt to the changing needs of the times. The three institutions in this chapter

39 Rudolph, The American College and University, A History, 342. Although Rudolph in this passage is speaking specifically about the three traditional professions: Law, Medicine, and Theology his comments are applicable to the entire changing face of graduate education at the turn of the twentieth century.
demonstrate that. However, there is the nagging notion that in our rush to the new professionalism we may have left something important behind. The civic minded humanism of the antebellum college and the “extensive intellectual furniture” might still have a place in graduate education. At the beginning of a new millennium, it is profitable to reexamine where we are and where we have been.
CHAPTER IV
Joseph LeConte on the Nature of the University

In his notable book, The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore, Burton R. Clark introduces the notion of the “organizational saga.” Clark defines this notion thus: An organizational saga is a collective understanding of unique accomplishment in a formally established group. The group’s definition of the accomplishment, intrinsically historical but embellished through retelling and rewriting, links stages of organizational development.

The organizational saga exists in a confluence between history and belief. It is a retelling of history which treats events as purposefully working toward a great and unique end. Events can be recast in a light amenable to the saga or embellished to fit the grand design. Members of an organization may develop a devotion to the institutional spirit, since they too, are part of the continuing story. The organizational saga: “includes affect that turns a formal place into a beloved institution, to which participants are passionately devoted.”

3 Ibid.
The organizational saga can arise in many different types of enterprises, but those that arise in the context of an educational institution, according to Clark, are among the most durable. Since educational institutions have a “genetic” nature that is not found in most organizations, this makes sense. After graduation some students return to the institution to serve as faculty, staff or administrators. Alumni participate in sporting events and other activities and their children may go on to attend the institution. Thus, there are definite lines of transmission, and embellishment, of the saga. The saga may go on to inform decision making and become part of the formal organizational structure of the institution.

Clark proposes that sagas arise through two phases: initiation and fulfillment. The saga is initiated by: “a strong purpose, conceived and enunciated by a single man or small cadre whose first task is to find a setting that is open, or can be opened to special effort.” The strong purpose can be exerted in a new organization, an organization in decay, or one in crisis. In the context of higher education the initiator of the saga is frequently a strong college/university president. This is not always the case though, the status of Thomas Jefferson at the University of Virginia demonstrates the apotheosis of the institution’s founder. Similarly, a particularly popular, influential, or

Ibid., 180.
famous faculty member, coach, or alumnus can become the initiator of the institution’s saga. In a new organization, the initiator sets the standards and precedents, in a decaying organization, the initiator is a revolutionary who turns his back on all that has gone before and failed. In the organization in crisis, the initiator is the great physician who binds the wounds and relieves the suffering.

The fulfillment of the saga in institutions of higher education may center in five places, according to Clark: the personnel, the program, the external social base, the student subculture, and the imagery of the saga. The personnel of an institution, particularly the faculty, are in a uniquely powerful position as guardians of the saga. A president may initiate a saga, but its fulfillment depends on creating a priesthood of believing faculty members:

The faculty cadre of believers helps to effect the legend, then to protect it against later leaders and other new participants who, less pure in belief, might turn the organization in some other direction.

Fulfillment in program describes the organizational practices that an institution believes make it unique. These are: “a set of communal symbols and rituals, invested with meaning.” Alumni are the premier holders of the social base of the saga. Since they are not involved in the daily operation of

---

5 Ibid., 181.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
the institution their version of the saga is idealized and romanticized. The student subculture, according to Clark, must be imbued with the ideals of the saga for the saga to grow and be perpetuated: "When the students define themselves as personally responsible for upholding the image of the college, then a design or plan has become an organizational saga." As the imagery of the saga evolves: "believers come to sense its many constituent symbols as inextricably bound together, and the part takes meaning from the whole." The imagery is the "spirit" of the institution that may be felt by participants and outsiders.

Clark framed his notion of the organizational saga in quasi-religious terms. Indeed, it is a belief system that creates a frame in which to interpret people and events, a civil religion. The organizational saga is, according to Clark, a valuable resource. To a believer in the saga there is pride in the organization and pride in oneself for being part of it. The saga is an asset which contributes to the happiness of the organization and the individuals involved with it. The organizational saga is more than administrative structures, fight songs, and tailgate parties. The college/university saga is also composed of ideas about the nature, purpose, and goals of higher education. These ideas feed into an "institutional memory" which informs and guides

---

8 Ibid., 182.
9 Ibid., 183.
future developments. The original genesis of the ideas may become obscure because they have been ingrained into the outlook of the institution. In the past chapters we have seen two excellent examples of this: Daniel Coit Gilman at Johns Hopkins and Thomas Jefferson at the University of Virginia. The ideas of Gilman still live as a “Hopkins way” and those of Mr. Jefferson as a “UVA way.”

This chapter examines the ideas of a prominent University of Georgia alumnus, Joseph LeConte, in the field of higher education, particularly that pertaining to the nature of graduate education. Although LeConte served on the faculty of the university for only three years, his reputation, ideas, and scientific outlook profoundly affected his students, colleagues, and prominent members of the community. William E. Boggs, who would become President of the University of Georgia from 1889-1899, studied under LeConte at South Carolina College. It was during the Boggs administration that many of the faculty members who would compose the first graduate faculty were hired, including the first Dean of the Graduate School, Willis Bocock. It is interesting to note that the two essays by LeConte discussed here: “The Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College, and the University” and “Mutual Relations of Intellectual and Moral Culture” were originally composed by LeConte in 1857, less than one year after he left
the faculty of the University of Georgia. Thus, they reflect some of the ideas about higher education that he must have embraced while still at Georgia.

It is a truism that “nothing succeeds like success”, and this is definitely true about the reputation of Joseph LeConte at the University of Georgia. His accomplishments in life made even those who had disagreed with him while he was a faculty member at Georgia look at him in a new light. Of course, he had many close friends and family members who were associated with the University of Georgia so he never lost touch with the institution. Joseph LeConte is the most famous faculty member in the saga of the University of Georgia and one of the few after whom a building is named. Although there had been a scientific element at the university since the second university president, Josiah Meigs, it was the LeContean mixture of science, practicality, and liberal learning that informed the early Graduate School. Many of LeConte’s ideas on higher education were shared by his contemporaries, such as his associate Daniel Coit Gilman. The LeConte essays are important for several reasons: they are an

11 LeConte and his brother John, were attacked by University of Georgia President Church and his supporters for trying to subvert Christianity by their scientific work. LeConte remained a professing Christian all his life. See E. Merton Coulter, College Life in the Old South, (New York, 1928), 252-258 and Lester Stephens, Joseph LeConte, Gentle Prophet of Evolution, (Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1982), 45-52.
12 Actually two buildings were named LeConte Hall. The first, built in 1905 was later renamed Meigs Hall when the name LeConte Hall was transferred to a new building in 1937.
exposition of ideas about higher education that were current with advanced thinkers of the late nineteenth century; their ideas enter into the institutional sagas of both the University of Georgia and the University of California, and they provide an integrated way to think about undergraduate, graduate, and professional education.

Graduate Education and Practicality

What is the primary characteristic that distinguishes a university from a college? Although the difference has become increasingly nebulous in recent years, the distinction is real and important. The notion of graduate education is the fundamental distinction between a college and a university. Joseph LeConte summed up the nature of the university as:

The true university, therefore, is a collection of the highest professional schools gathered about and united to a system of the highest general culture - a cluster of fruit-bearing branches crowning the solid trunk of the educational tree.13

To LeConte, the essence of the university is the continuation of what he calls “general culture”, undergraduate education, into “the highest of all professions, viz., the profession of scholar and thinker.” The postgraduate student is engaged in a preparation, at once, scholarly and practical. The

13 Joseph LeConte, “The Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College, and the University”, Princeton Review, (Princeton, NJ, April 1883) 204.
different branches of scholarly endeavor, although differently articulated, are a unity with and a culmination of the undergraduate culture.

LeConte’s call for the integration of the scholarly and the practical is consonant with Ralph Waldo Emerson's dictum: “Inaction is cowardice, but there can be no scholar without the heroic mind.” Action, to Emerson, is the true nature of scholarship:

There goes in the world a notion, that the scholar should be a recluse, a valetudinarian, - as unfit for any handiwork or public labor, as a penknife for an axe. . . . Action is with the scholar subordinate, but it is essential. Without it, he is not yet man. Without it, thought can never ripen into truth. . . . The preamble of thought, the transition through which it passes from the unconscious to the conscious, is action. Practicality and action were hallmarks of early graduate education in the United States. One must not, however, confuse the practicality of which Emerson and LeConte speak

15 Ibid.
16 In contrast to the attitude at contemporary Oxford, Newman quotes the Edinburgh Review: "Classical Literature is the great object at Oxford. Many minds, so employed, have produced many works and much fame in that department; but if all liberal arts and sciences, useful to human life, had been taught there, if some had dedicated themselves to chemistry, some to mathematics, some to experimental philosophy, and if every attainment had been honored in the mixt ratio of its difficulty and utility, the system of such a University would have been much more valuable, but the splendour of its name something less." “Idea of a University”, Discourse VII, 4.
as a call for pure vocational education. LeConte makes clear that it is: “culture as a preparation for activity in the highest of all fields; it is culture as professional training for scholars, thinkers, investigators, teachers of the human race, leaders and directors of the thought of the age.”

It is in this spirit that graduate education at The University of Georgia was conceived. As will be discussed below, the Emersonian/LeContean notion of scholarly practicality that guided early graduate education at Georgia was quite distinct from the pure practical vocationalism of schools of agriculture, commerce, law or medicine.

The Academic Career of Joseph LeConte

Joseph LeConte holds the distinction of being the first graduate of The University of Georgia to complete an advanced graduate degree (Lawrence Scientific School, Harvard University, 1851). Of him, his mentor Louis Agassiz wrote: “I would not hesitate to nominate him as the ablest candidate to fill any Professorship . . . in any of our colleges North or South. I have never known a better student.” LeConte wrote glowingly of his time at Harvard:

Think of the galaxy of stars in Harvard at that time! LeConte, “The Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College, and the University”, 204.

LeConte already possessed the A.B., A.M., and M.D. degrees. He was awarded an LL.D. degree from The University of Georgia in 1879.

Agassiz, Guyot, Wyman, Gray, Peirce, Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes, and Felton - with all of whom I was in almost daily contact on the most intimate terms. Emerson I saw sometimes, but not often. The effect of this intellectual atmosphere was in the highest degree stimulating, giving incredible impulse to thought. 20

This passage conveys not only the excitement of the new graduate education, but illustrates how similar it is to our concepts (and practice) today. LeConte left Harvard to assume a professorship at Oglethorpe University in Midway, Georgia. LeConte lamented that, like many junior faculty, his time was entirely occupied by teaching. He was given the duty of teaching all sciences, except zoology. This was an interesting turn of events, as the majority of his prior scientific work had been in zoology. However, he considered this a windfall in later life: "for it kept alive my interest in all departments of science, which is especially necessary in geology, which was to become my chief study." 21

One year after assuming the post at Oglethorpe, LeConte accepted a position at his alma mater, The University of Georgia. After the intellectual stimulation and freedom he had enjoyed at Harvard, he was shocked by the rigidity at Georgia. LeConte and his brother John, who was also on The

21 Ibid., 155.
University of Georgia faculty, and many other members of the faculty chafed under the rule of President Alonzo Church. Church had been president of the University for nearly 30 years and was not receptive to new ideas in scholarship, teaching or administration. LeConte commented: "Agassiz had introduced an entirely new mode of studying and teaching zoology, and my preparation was entirely ahead of the times; the colleges were not ready for the new method."\(^{22}\) LeConte was quick to point out, however, that he considered several of his faculty colleagues and members of the community to be men of great intelligence. Thus, The University of Georgia in 1852, was in a tension between the forces of traditionalism and intellectual forment.

The conflict between Church and the faculty came to a boil in 1856 when the Board of Trustees dismissed the entire faculty.\(^{23}\) John and Joseph LeConte and Charles McCay, professor of mathematics, accepted positions at South Carolina College in Columbia, South Carolina. The essay: "The Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College, and the University" was originally composed in 1857 at South Carolina. The essay was published with augmentation and revision in the \textit{Princeton Review} of April, 1885. It is interesting to note that the main body of the essay was composed by LeConte while he was still at the University of Georgia.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., 157.

\(^{23}\) LeConte’s nephew, William Louis Jones, who had also studied under Agassiz, succeeded him as professor of chemistry and natural history at The University of Georgia. A further discussion of the conflict between the LeContes and Church appears in Chapter V.
work was composed when the memory of Louis Agassiz and graduate work at Harvard was still fresh in LeConte’s mind.\textsuperscript{24}

LeConte remained at South Carolina until 1869.\textsuperscript{25} By 1869 he and his brother had decided prospects for their future careers lay elsewhere. They briefly considered emigrating to Brazil or Mexico. Upon hearing of the proposed University of California, both brothers determined that they wished to be involved in the endeavor. The brothers were elected to professorships at the University of California and assumed their duties in 1869.\textsuperscript{26} The years at the University of California were successful and productive for LeConte. He published his \textit{Elements of Geology} in 1877 and it became a standard textbook in the field. From its beginnings in 1869 with thirty-eight students the University of California at Berkeley grew to three thousand students in 1901, two hundred of whom were postgraduates. Daniel Coit Gilman, President of the University of California wrote in 1883:

\begin{quote}
It is thus that a university is developed;
First, there must be wise plans;
Second, sufficient funds;
Third, powerful teachers.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ibid.}, 172.
\textsuperscript{25} The College was closed from 1863–1866 during the war. LeConte served as the Chemist of the Confederate Niter and Mining Bureau during this period. He chronicles some harrowing adventures during this period in his autobiography. See LeConte, \textit{The Autobiography of Joseph LeConte}, 178–228.
\textsuperscript{26} John LeConte served briefly as President of the University of California before the election of Henry Durant in 1870. Durant was succeeded two years later by Daniel Coit Gilman.
Then will come -

Fourth, many students;
Fifth, great collections;
Sixth, world wide influence and renown. 27

The first principle, according to Gilman, is wise plans. What, according to LeConte, are the wise plans for graduate education?

Joseph LeConte’s Notion of the University and Graduate Education

During the course of his career, LeConte developed a theory of the tripartite division of education. This theory was expounded in numerous lectures and several articles. To illustrate the foundation of education he wrote:

To summarize my views in a single example, taken from my own department: If I desired to make a pupil of mine an accomplished practical geologist, I would first of all make him a thoroughly cultured man i.e., I would give such general culture as would be suitable as a basis for activity in any intellectual pursuit. He must choose for himself which. 28

General culture, or culture for culture’s sake, is divided

27 Gilman, Daniel Coit; “Half a Dozen Words from Baltimore to Berkeley”, Overland Review, (Volume 1 (Second Series) Number 1, January 1883) 9.
28 LeConte, Joseph, “Mutual Relations of Intellectual and Moral Culture”, Overland Monthly, (Jan-June 1883, Vol I (Second Series)).
into three parts: Science, Art and Philosophy. Science begins with mathematics and progresses through the biological and physical sciences. Philosophy starts with logic and moves up through ethics, metaphysics, and theology. Art proceeds from language to literature and fine art, to history. It is interesting to note that the basic course in each of the divisions is of a deductive nature, the fabrication of tools which the student can use in the following inductive inquiries. Certainly, this progression of study reflects the "faculty psychology" approach derived from the Scottish tradition which dominated higher education in the United States in the antebellum period. It also represents something quite new: the imprint of scientific method and evolutionary theory. LeConte would go on to become a leading exponent of evolutionary theory.

The three divisions rise up, evolve, through their various levels to converge "where all human knowledge and effort ought to meet, on the lofty plane of Sociology, and thus combine to form the perfect beautiful triune arch of perfect human culture." Daniel Coit Gilman expressed the same sentiments as LeConte when he wrote: "The best scholars will almost invariably be those who make

---

29 LeConte sometimes calls the Art course the "Language-Art" course. viz. "Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College and the University."

30 LeConte’s evolutionary beliefs have been termed "Neo-Lamrackism." Stephens comments: "LeConte articulated and popularized the peculiarly American brand of evolutionism. Perennially optimistic, he held an almost undeviating faith in the idea of progress, which served as a key term in his philosophy of organic and social life." Stephens, Joseph LeConte, Gentle Prophet of Evolution, 217.

31 LeConte, "Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College and the University." It must be remarked here that LeConte is referring to "Sociology" in the Spencerian sense.
special attainments on the foundation of broad and liberal culture.”

Once the fundamentals, what LeConte calls “general culture” are inculcated into the student, the next phase is “special culture.” If the student has chosen to follow the course of science, the first step in “special culture” would be to train him as a “general scientist.” We see here the reflection of LeConte’s own experience. As mentioned above, his primary interest early in his career had been in zoology. Upon assuming his professorship at Georgia, he was compelled to immerse himself in the other sciences, which led to the great passion of his life: geology.

The third division might be called “specialized special culture.” If the student in the example had completed the general scientist level of his education and had decided to specialize in geology:

I would strive to make him an accomplished geologist; i.e., I would concentrate his strengthened and disciplined powers upon this department. And, finally I would complete the work by practice in the museum, the laboratory, and the field.

General culture, according to LeConte must precede special

---

culture and provide the basis for “success in the higher intellectual pursuits of modern life.” 34 The general culture corresponds to the first two years of higher education, the general specialist to the second two years and the specialized specialist to graduate level studies. The quote above still serves as a good embodiment of the essence of graduate education.

Education, to LeConte, is preparation for active life. In this he clearly echoes Emerson. However, he stresses, “active life” does not indicate that education should only be utilitarian. Education should have two goals: culture and utility, the liberal and the practical. This is precisely what Emerson points out: “The scholar may lose himself in schools, in words, and become a pedant; but when he comprehends his duties, he above all men is a realist, and converses with things.” 35 LeConte’s method aims to inculcate the sense of duty into the scholar. Thus, specialization should only occur when the individual has been given a thorough and sturdy foundation of general culture. LeConte uses the analogy of an edifice. The portion corresponding to the “general science” phase above forms the major body of the structure, and the specialist phase: “the crowning glory

34 Ibid.
of all—the sky-lighted dome and the heaven-pointing spires. . . .”

The college as distinguished from the university is, according to LeConte: “essentially a continuation of the general culture of the school, on a higher plane, using different methods and cultivating different faculties.”

LeConte likens the college to a gymnasium wherein “intellectual strength and symmetry” are cultivated. The three divisions of study at the college: science, art and philosophy have what LeConte terms individual “correlative functions.” The correlative function is an intellectual development that arises apart from the actual subject matter of the course. For instance, the scientific course has an appreciation of truth for its own sake as its correlative function. It also teaches patience and systematic investigation. The philosophic course brings forth alacrity and keenness of thought. The correlative function of the art course (or language-art) is the power to transform thought

---

36 LeConte, Joseph, “Mutual Relations of Intellectual and Moral Culture.” It must be remembered that to LeConte, as with Emerson, true intellectual and moral growth are one and the same. Education does not end with a diploma but is a life long activity.

37 LeConte, Joseph, “The Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, The College and the University”, 196. In another version of the analogy he likens it to a central building, philosophy, with a wing on each side, science and art.

38 Further demonstration of LeConte’s belief in the evolution toward progress of society and intellectual endeavor: “Doubtless it is conceivable that the phenomena of the the inner world of consciousness shall eventually become so thoroughly understood, the methods of Philosophy so sure and her progress so steady, that the function of the course will become similar to that of Science, only on a far higher plane . . . .” Ibid.,191.
The college, then, should be concerned with the development of general culture. As we have seen, this includes the beginnings of specialization, but only in a broad sense. The muddiness of the distinction between a college and a university is not a new phenomenon. A common misconception, LeConte points out, is that the university is a continuation of the college on a higher plane. If we accept LeConte’s tripartite division this is obviously not so. The nature of a university is of a distinct character from a college:

The mind so long occupied with culture for culture’s sake must now devote itself to culture for use in some special but noble field of activity. The pupil must now concentrate his disciplined powers in preparing himself for some special but highly intellectual pursuit. In one word, the characteristic of the university as distinguished from the college is that it is a
collection of professional schools, unified and ennobled by the general course continuing; although even the general course itself, as we shall show, has now a different significance, i.e., a direct reference to active life.\(^\text{39}\)

In LeConte’s analogy the school is the root, the college is the trunk, and university is the fruit-bearing limbs. The limbs may all bear different fruit, but they are united by the continuing (though diminishing) central trunk of general culture. It is essential to keep in mind that the “professional schools” of which LeConte speaks are not just law, medical, veterinary schools. As he states: “the highest of all professions, the profession of scholar and thinker.”\(^\text{40}\)

Thus, it includes all that we would today consider graduate disciplines.

LeConte proposes that higher education fails more and more if it does not reach its apex in the university. To use his analogy of the tree, if it does not bear fruit it cannot scatter the seeds of scholarship throughout the world. Higher education is, in LeConte’s view, a tension between pure intellectual life and active life, ideal and practical, reflective and perceptive, enlarging and contracting. The further one rises in the educational life, the more one is carried away from the active. The trunk of the tree separates

---

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 196.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 204.
into two which grow apart from one another making passage from one to other increasingly difficult. At the level of a high school graduate this transition is not difficult to bridge: "Still, no distinct school, but only a short apprenticeship is necessary to make the transit easy and successful. The so called business college, however, seems intended to meet a want here."\textsuperscript{41} When we reach the level of a college graduate, or especially of a university graduate when the university is merely a continuation of the general course, the transition requires a special culture.

It is the function of special culture to make the transition between pure intellectual life and pure active life. All the scholarly pursuits require special preparation which is not given in the general culture of the college (or of a university which is merely a continuation of the general culture). LeConte asserts: "between the highest college culture and the corresponding grade of active life there is an immense and ever increasing chasm. . . ."\textsuperscript{42} One of the primary functions of a true university is to construct the bridges between these chasms, between the trunk and the outlying branches. The bridges are the professional schools. Professional schools of theology, medicine and law have long been recognized. However, equally intellectual disciplines such as teaching, engineering, journalism and, according to

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 197.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 197.
LeConte: “noblest of all, writer, thinker, and scientific investigator” are worthy of their own professional schools.\textsuperscript{43}

The description sounds very much like a contemporary university. The inclusion of schools of journalism and engineering seems prescient. The business school, alas, did not meet LeConte’s standards.

LeConte states that the true embodiment of a university has not yet been reached in any country (1885). Of course, there were many at the time who would beg to differ with him. Gilman, the president of the University of California at the time LeConte’s article appeared, wrote a glowing essay on the German universities, particularly Göttingen. The organization of Göttingen and, indeed, Johns Hopkins at the time would not have corresponded to LeConte’s call for the sturdy central trunk. However, Gilman does share LeConte’s basic concept of the nature of the university:

The university is the most comprehensive term which can be employed to indicate a foundation for the promotion and diffusion of knowledge—a group of agencies organized to advance the arts and sciences of every sort, and to train young men as scholars for all intellectual callings of life.\textsuperscript{44}

Gilman goes on to point out that the name “university’ has been extensively misapplied to what is a mere college. Around

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44} Gilman, Daniel Coit, “The Building of the University”, Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine, (volume 9, issue 6, December 1872).
the core of the traditional college must arise "the schools of advanced and liberal culture in all the great departments of learning." 45

Two major errors distort the way most people define a university. The first error is to define the university as the continuation of the general culture, but on a higher plane. The second error is that a university is nothing more than a collection of practical schools, as LeConte says: "a mere collection of handicraft schools." He cites Cambridge and Oxford of his time as examples of the first error. Indeed, he points out, both institutions scorn the idea that they represent anything other than general culture. LeConte remarks: "Its [Cambridge and Oxford] pride and boast is that it prepares for no special pursuit unless it be that of a Parliamentarian." 46 Half-hearted attempts at reform of these institutions have not struck at the heart of the problem: the lack of training for specialized culture. LeConte feels the English institutions are incapable of reform if they continue to think of themselves as: "finishing schools for the young nobility." If an institution conceives its mission as preparation for refined society rather than practical action, the institution will never be able to be a true university. The influence of Cambridge and Oxford also has the

45 Ibid., 564.
46 LeConte, "Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College and the University", 199.
The German university of the nineteenth century is often cited as the model for the modern university. There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that many of the prominent academic leaders of the postbellum period did not consider the German model as appropriate for higher education in the United States. Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, Andrew White of Cornell, and James McCosh of Princeton, among others, seem not to have been overly impressed by the German model.47 Gilman, in his work at Johns Hopkins, was clearly an adherent of the German approach. LeConte, as with many of his contemporaries in higher education in the United States, was not totally enthralled by the German system. However, he grants:

Undoubtedly it is in many respects an admirable system. Nowhere else do we find such enthusiasm for learning, such intellectual activity both in teachers and pupils, as in the German university. The fruits of this intellectual activity which are constantly pouring forth from the German press is simply amazing. Judged by these fruits, surely it is the most efficient system in the world.48

47 Vesey, Laurence R., The Emergence of the American University, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1965) 95.
48 LeConte, "Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College and the University", 200.
The German model is, LeConte argues, not without its faults and not the direct path to the future ideal university. The German educational system, LeConte believes, is partially at fault. It begins the differentiation from general to specialized culture much too early. Thus, it produces individuals with impressive abilities in a specific field but lacking the “balance and symmetry of mind” that should mark the truly educated man. Utilizing again his tree analogy of the university: “The trunk separates into branches before it is strong enough, and therefore the branches fail to bear the best fruit.”

The primary fault with the German model is a product of the society which created it. The hierarchy of aristocracy has permeated the German universities. The traditional professions of theology, law and medicine have joined with scientific and scholarly pursuits such as chemistry and classics to form an intellectual aristocracy that disdains of technical pursuits. Although of equal intellectual rigor these practical pursuits are banished to technical schools: “Thus thought and action, the ideal and the practical—a twain that should be joined in an indissoluble marriage, are forced into an unnatural divorce to the loss and injury of both.” The reunion, LeConte believes, would be of immense benefit to both. The technical professions would be filled

---

49 Ibid., 200.
50 Ibid., 201.
with the “lofty spirit” of liberal culture, liberal culture would be suffused with the energy and frisson of practical research and endeavor. The technical fields would gain a soul; liberal culture would gain a vigorous body.

The American university was in the ideal position to synthesize the best features of the English and German models into an ideal university. Unencumbered by tradition and societal strictures the American university could realize its full potential. LeConte states that most so-called universities in the United States at his time, were basically, colleges in the English mode with several features of the true university appended to them. A true university must have a complete integration of general and specialized culture, liberal and practical. LeConte points out that schools of the traditional and technical professions are arising in several of the great institutions in the United States. To travel in the proper direction to the true university we must always hold in our mind the concept of the ideal university:

There is one thing, however, absolutely necessary to carry out the true ideal; the professional schools must all of them be essentially postgraduate--i.e., they must require of the applicant a grade of culture equivalent to A.B., Ph.B., or S.B.. [italicization LeConte’s] LeConte asserts that institutions of higher education should

Ibid., 202.
have, on the undergraduate level, a course in high general
culture which would permit of modification and leading to the
various undergraduate degrees. This program would constitute
what would properly be called a college. The addition of
various postgraduate courses which would lead to professional
degrees and a continuing course in general culture which
would lead to an A.M. degree would correctly be called a
university. Not all colleges should aspire to be
universities: “smaller denominational colleges might well act
the part of the college proper preparatory to separate
institutions on the unmixed university plan, such, for
example, as the Johns Hopkins University.”

One of the primary foundations of LeConte’s notion of
the university is that the graduate programs be integral with
the undergraduate. He asserts that the continuity is of
mutual benefit to both phases of education as opposed to the
German model of separation. LeConte mentions that the ideal
delineated above, might be dismissed as impossible to
achieve. However, we should never lose sight of the ideal due
to the exigencies of practicality. It may not be possible:
“to carry it out fully. Doubtless the urgency of the duties
of active life will compel many to accept a shorter and more
direct road to professional life.” His solution is the
elective system, a system which was just beginning to attract

52 Ibid.
53 Ibid.
interest at the time "Essential Characteristics" was published. Several courses of study which became further differentiated as they progressed (again, the metaphor of the tree) would diminish the primary mission of the college as inculcator of general culture. This method would have the benefit of preparing students for the graduate programs and shortening the time needed to complete such programs.

A less developed version of this system, LeConte points out, was in operation at the University of California. At the University of California there were six colleges: Letters, Agriculture, Mechanic Arts, Civil Engineering, Mining and Chemistry. Letters was divided into Classical and Literary, the former much like the traditional college with its emphasis on Greek and Latin, the latter having an emphasis on modern languages. The scientific colleges differentiated themselves by the emphasis of their particular discipline in classroom and laboratory. LeConte emphasizes: "in order to make a real university according to the ideal explained above, each of the several colleges must have a postgraduate and strictly professional course leading to a corresponding second degree."  

The tree of higher education has only budded: "they can become fruit-bearing only in a true university--i.e., in

"Ibid., 203."
post-college courses."\textsuperscript{55} Higher education is like a sequoia, not a palm or a scrub bush. Its powerful trunk supports numerous branches, uniting them and growing ever upward. LeConte’s use of the metaphor of the tree is both original and instructive. The analysis he makes of the university clearly shows the relation between the undergraduate course and the graduate; the general culture and the specialized. LeConte’s writings teach us two lessons: first, for graduate education to be successful it must possess the specialized culture that he described: the transition between pure intellectual life and pure active life, the fruit-bearing branches. This issue is illustrated by the University of Virginia Master of Arts degree of the nineteenth century. The Virginia degree was modeled on the notion of giving further augmentation to the general culture curriculum of the undergraduate program. Thus, since it did not contain any elements of true specialized culture, it would not be considered a graduate program by LeConte.\textsuperscript{56} True, there was some opportunity to specialize, but this was of a level similar to the “general scientist” mentioned by LeConte.\textsuperscript{57} The graduate student: “must now concentrate his disciplined

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{56} LeConte did propose: “a continuing course in general culture that would lead to an A.M. degree . . .”, this is a general culture course, not specialized and is, perhaps, a nod to his belief in broad liberal education. Ibid., 202.

\textsuperscript{57} This is not to disparage the Virginia Master of Arts degree, but it was not a true graduate program in the modern sense. However, it did form the basis and inspiration for honors and Great Books programs. See William Noble Haarlow, Great Books, Honors Programs, and Hidden Origins: the Virginia Plan and the University of Virginia in the Liberal Arts Movement, (New York, Routledge Palmer, 2003).
powers in preparing himself for special but highly intellectual pursuit."\(^5^8\)

The second lesson is that graduate education is not an activity that is separate from the undergraduate program. In order to become a successful specialist, LeConte points out, one must have the tools that a broad-based general culture training gives. It should not begin specialization too early: the fault LeConte found with the German educational model. A true university should have the continuity between the general undergraduate and specialized graduate programs: the trunk and the branches. The relation between the undergraduate and graduate programs is of benefit to both. The graduate program informs the undergraduate in structuring its curriculum. The undergraduate then produces students who are prepared with the necessary tools for graduate specialization.

A university thus integrated returns us to the notion of the organizational saga. One of the happy byproducts of a vigorous graduate program is institutional pride. The fruits of research and service confer their benefits on the entire university in the form of institutional pride. This pride gives inspiration and direction to the undergraduate program, increases institutional recognition and appreciation of research, and spurs alumni and donors to support increased

\(^5^8\) LeConte, "Essential Characteristics and Mutual Relations of the School, the College and the University", 196.
research activity. Accomplishment begets pride and pride begets further accomplishment. The organizational saga is, like LeConte’s university, an organic entity. Both are subject to growth and response to environmental changes, yet they both are transcendent in their “lofty spirit.”
CHAPTER V

The Development of Graduate Degrees at the University of Georgia

*Universities should bestow their honors with sparing hand; their benefits most freely.*

From the inception of the University of Georgia the Master of Arts degree was offered. M.A. degrees were conferred in 1804 to Elijah Clarke, John Forsyth, Henry Meigs, and William Prince. The Laws of the College of Georgia in 1803 stated:

Masters and Bachelors of Arts, who shall signify to the President their purpose of residing at the College or in Athens with a view of pursuing literature, under his direction, and under the government of the College, and give sufficient bond to the Board of Trustees for the payment of their quarter bills shall be considered as resident graduates and students of the College.

It appears, however, that all Master of Arts degrees granted in the antebellum period were *honoris causa*. The requirements for the Master of Arts degree were: to be an alumnus of at least three years, payment of four dollars, and that the

1 Gilman, Inaugural Address, http://www.jhu.edu/125th/links/gilman.html
2 *University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin*, 1911, 1.
candidate “shall have preserved a good moral character, and previous to the commencement, shall have signified to the president his desire of the same.”

Josiah Meigs added the requirement that: “The young Gentlemen who graduated in this University in 1804, are requested to attend the Public Commencement, prepared for the exhibition of proofs of their qualifications for the honor of the second degree.” According to E. Merton Coulter, this exhibition would, most likely, consist of orations or debates.

The operation of the University of Georgia would continue along the lines established in 1803 until the 1850s. During the decade of the 1850s increased dissatisfaction with the status quo at the antebellum University of Georgia came to the fore. William L. Mitchell, chairman of the university Prudential Committee presented to the Board of Trustees a plan for sweeping enhancement in 1859. The Programme of an Enlarged Organization of the University of Georgia called for the University to consist of juniors, seniors, and graduate students only. Freshmen and sophomore undergraduates would attend a separate institution, modeled after the German “gymnasium” where they would be closely supervised. Those who entered after completing the freshman and sophomore years at

---

7 Coulter, College Life in the Old South, 186.
8 Ibid.
9 The graduation ceremony in the antebellum period was much more than an academic ritual. Coulter notes: “The Georgia commencement was not an educational exhibition alone; it was a political institution dear to the leaders and statesmen of Georgia . . . ” (Coulter, 187) and “There was no end to oratory in the antebellum South.” (Coulter, 163).
the “gymnasium” would be emotionally, academically, and intellectually better prepared. This would address a problem that had plagued antebellum colleges: the immaturity and uneven preparation of the students. Much of this had been anticipated by the objections of John and Joseph LeConte in 1855. The LeConte brothers asserted that the duty of a professor was not to police the students. Further, John LeConte argued that the additional hours that he served in the laboratory should relieve him from this duty. President Church did not agree stating: “With our small faculty we need men who are willing to labor--and who will submit to the drudgery of instruction, and to the disagreeable service of sustaining the discipline of the institution.”  

The LeContes were joined by other faculty members who demanded a revision of academic standards, a honor code, and an end to the in loco parentis doctrine.

John LeConte left the University of Georgia in 1855 to accept a position at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York. The LeConte brothers were reunited within a year when both received faculty positions at the College of South Carolina. The president of the College of South Carolina at the time was Charles F. McCay, another refugee from the Church administration at Georgia. In all, seven faculty members departed in the period 1850-1856. The majority were

---

6 Alonzo Church in Coulter, *College Life in the Old South*, 253.
7 Joseph LeConte called Church “a bigoted, dogmatic, and imperious old man” LeConte, *Autobiography*, 156.
younger faculty members who were professors of science or mathematics. The departure of these talented and dynamic faculty members certainly had a negative effect on the University of Georgia. It is remarkable that in a period when tradition seemed to have trumped innovation, that a document such as the reorganization plan would have been presented. Apparently, the ideas of the LeContes and the other young faculty had percolated into the minds of many people associated with the university. Even the popular press was clamoring for change: “We are now living in a different age, an age of practical utility, one in which the State University does not, and cannot supply the needs of the State. The times require practical men, civil engineers, to take charge of public roads, mines, scientific agriculture & etc.” We see here the two, often opposing, forces behind the Programme. On the one hand, the LeContes and other progressive faculty and community members, on the other, the call from the general population for an institution offering practical education. These same tensions would arise again after the Civil War in the South with the advent of Morrill Act funds. As we have seen at the University of South Carolina, the inability of the institution to balance these two poles resulted in the creation of Clemson and the loss of funds and prestige to South Carolina.

1 Many of the leading citizens of Athens and members of the University Board of Trustees, such as Joseph Henry Lumpkin, Wilson Lumpkin, Thomas R. R. Cobb, were close personal friends of the LeConte brothers.
2 Federal Union, Feb. 24, 1857, quoted in Coulter, College Life in the Old South, 260.
In addition to the splitting of the undergraduates in upper and lower division institutions the proposal had other progressive proposals. A first step was made by establishing a professorship of modern languages: French, German, and Spanish. French had long been taught at the university but had always been accorded second-class status. Now it was proposed that the university establish schools of medicine, law, agriculture, engineering, and applied mathematics. Of these, the only school to be in operation before the war was the law school. The faculty consisted of Joseph Henry Lumpkin, Thomas R. R. Cobb, and William H. Hull: all Georgia alumni. With the School of Law there should be connected:

a course of instruction for merchants and other business men, embracing the law of agency, of partnerships, of bailments, of bills of exchange and promissory notes, of insurance, of shipping and other maritime concerns, together with the law of sales and other contracts.

Although this program is still grounded in the legal aspects of business, the germ of commerce as a distinct discipline is apparent.

---

10 Joseph LeConte, in his autobiography, comments: “To my disgust I learned that geology and botany were not considered enough for one man and that French would be tacked on. French had always wandered from one professor to another, seeking rest but finding none . . .” LeConte, The Autobiography of Joseph LeConte, 156.
11 Of course, the Medical College of Georgia already existed in Augusta. At the time it was a private institution.
12 Programme of an Enlarged Organization of the University of Georgia, (Athens, Ga, 1859).
The proposal called for the following degrees to be offered: Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Bachelor of Laws, Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Divinity, and Doctor of Laws. However, the degree requirements were an odd mix of the old and the new. The degree of Master of Arts degree would be conferred: “to all graduates of this or any other College, being of three years standing and good moral character, who have passed one year in the University and maintained good morals.” These are exactly the same as the requirements for the M.A. in 1803. The Doctor of Philosophy degree would be awarded: “to such students in the University Schools as shall spend two years therein and become proficient in at least three of the schools.” The influence of the University of Virginia Master of Arts program may be seen in the proposed Doctor of Philosophy degree. The Doctor of Divinity and Doctor of Laws were honorary degrees “conferred on men of eminence as the highest literary honor in our power to bestow.” Included in the Programme were recommendations to establish scholarships, fellowships, and endowments. Sadly, the implementation of this interesting plan would be stopped by the Civil War. Many of the recommendations of the Programme would be realized after the war, but it remains an intriguing “what if.”

13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
The resumption of classes at the end of the Civil War brought an end to the *honoris causa* Master of Arts degree.\textsuperscript{16} Honorary degrees were now entirely “honorary” in the modern sense, all other degrees must be earned.\textsuperscript{17} The new earned Master of Arts degree required the student to have been granted a Bachelor of Arts degree before embarking on work toward the Master’s. A prescribed course of study was given to the student which, upon completion, would entitle him to the Master of Arts degree. The M.A. program normally took an academic year (nine months) to complete. Classics still had the position of prominence. A student might spend the year reading Lucretius or Thucydides, but they might also study an eminent French or German writer, art criticism, or study physics or calculus. Although not a polished and perfected system of graduate study, the new M.A. represented a great advance toward the standardization of degree requirements. Further, there is the recognition that true graduate work must be of a concentrated and specific nature: the specialized culture that LeConte deemed essential for graduate students. The first recipients of the earned M.A. degree were Washington Dessau, Walter B. Hill, later Chancellor of the University of Georgia, and Burgess Smith in

\textsuperscript{16} The year was 1868.

\textsuperscript{17} An honorary Ph.D. was presented to University of Georgia president, Patrick Hues Mell in 1880. Another honorary Ph.D. was bestowed on Walter LeConte Stevens in 1882.
1870. An engineering school was established after the war and the graduate degrees of Civil Engineer (C.E.) and Civil and Mining Engineer (C&M. E.) appear in the 1872-73 university catalog. The C.E. degree required the Bachelor of Engineering degree as a prerequisite to admission. The C&M. E. degree was an advanced degree based on the C.E.. The C.E. degree would be offered until the removal of the Civil Engineering Department to the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1934.

The Master of Agriculture (M.Ag.) degree was first offered in 1875 and the Master of Science in 1890. The M.Ag. degree was awarded for the first time in 1876 to M. L. Morris of Henry County, Georgia. The M.Ag. degree was changed to Master of Science in Agriculture (M.S.A.) in 1910. For admission into the M.Ag. or M.A.S. program a: "reputable baccalaureate degree" was required. Marion M. Hull was granted the first Master of Science degree in 1892. By the time of the establishment of the Master of Science we see the standardization of degree requirements that would continue until 1935: an academic year-long major course and at least one minor. Departments from which one could choose their major and minor courses were: mathematics, chemistry,

1871 in College Life in the Reconstruction South: Walter B. Hill's Student Correspondence, University of Georgia, 1869-1871, edited by G. Ray Mathis, (Athens, Ga, University of Georgia Libraries, 1974).
geology, physics, astronomy, physiology, zoology, and botany. The requirements for the Master of Arts was similar. A student pursuing the M.A. was required to do one major and at least one minor in the following departments of study: philosophy, education, history, political science, rhetoric, English literature, English, German, Latin, Greek, romance languages, and mathematics. For both the M.A. and the M.S. a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science was a prerequisite. The C.E. and M.S.A. degrees are interesting in that the student was free to choose minor courses from: "minor graduate courses, or certain undergraduate courses, offered in other departments of the University." Naturally, the choice of a minor was subject to the approval of the major department.

The Master of Science in Forestry (M.S.F.) degree was established in 1917, the requirements were like those of the C.E. and M.S.A. degrees. The School of Commerce, which had been founded in 1912, offered its first graduate degree, the Master of Science in Economics (M.S.E.) in 1923. In the choice of minor classes, candidates for the M.S.E. degree were required to choose from those in the School of Commerce or in the Department of History and Political Science. The teaching of economics had begun in the History department with Robert Preston Brooks. By 1923, Brooks had become the Dean of the College of Commerce. The major course offered in
Commerce in 1923 was “Studies in Industry and Economic Geography.” Minor classes were: “Industrial Development of the American Peoples”, which covered the United States and Latin America, “History of Economic Thought”, “Auditing and Cost Accounting”, and “Advanced Accounting Problems and Income Tax Accounting.” The M.S.E was changed to the Master of Science in Commerce (M.S.C.) in 1929 and to the Master of Business Administration in 1941. The 1925-26 Graduate School Bulletin offered the Master of Science in Home Economics.

The Department of Home Economics had played a central role in the integration of women into the student body. The department was formed in 1918 with Mary E. Creswell as its head. Creswell would, the next year, be the first female to receive an undergraduate degree (B.S.) from the university. The Graduate School anticipated this move by granting an M.A. to Mary D. Lyndon in 1914. The University Trustees had voted in 1911 to allow women to earn the M.A. in the Summer School, which we shall discuss in more detail below. In the 1913-14 session of the Summer School there were 6 women enrolled, although Lyndon was the only one pursuing a degree. Lyndon would later go on to become the university’s first Dean of Women. Chancellor David Crenshaw Barrow was a proponent of higher education for women and had been surreptitiously
allowing women to enroll in classes.\textsuperscript{20} The formal admission of women came in 1918 when the Board of Trustees voted 12 to 11 to allow women full status as undergraduate and graduate students. In the 1925-26 session when the degree of Master of Science in Home Economics was instituted, thirty-two women were enrolled in graduate degree programs.\textsuperscript{21} The women were enrolled in many disciplines: English, history, Latin, mathematics, sociology, and zoology, not just education and home economics. In the History Department ten out of nineteen graduate majors were women.

The degree Master of Science in Chemistry (M.S.C.) was first offered in 1932. This was a rigorous degree program: “For students who are assistants this degree requires a minimum of two years of graduate work, the second year being devoted primarily to research.”\textsuperscript{22} The Bulletin emphasized that this degree was for those who wished to pursue chemistry as a profession and/or pursue a doctoral degree in the field. It was not to be confused with the Master of Science with a major in chemistry. Students were required to have a reading knowledge of both French and German. Written and oral comprehensive examinations on inorganic, organic, analytic,

\textsuperscript{20} This is how Creswell was able to accumulate many of the credit hours towards her B.S. degree. Barrow was not, at first, a proponent of coeducation. However, by 1922 he opined: “In my opinion women will be better trained in solving modern problems in co-operation by co-education than in any other way.” David Crenshaw Barrow quoted in Thomas Walter Reed, \textit{David Crenshaw Barrow}, (Athens, Ga, 1935).

\textsuperscript{21} Out of a total of 81 students making women 40 percent of the graduate students.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin}, 1932-33, 8.
and physical chemistry were required “prior to the second quarter preceding graduation.”\textsuperscript{23} This was not a degree for the lazy or faint-hearted: “Any candidate who fails to pass at least two of the written examinations or who fails to pass any re-examination will be requested to withdraw as a candidate for this degree.”\textsuperscript{24} A written thesis was required along with a successful oral defense of the work. The M.S.C. degree shows the movement towards a more advanced degree than the M.A. or M.S. which would culminate in the offering of the Ph.D. in 1935.

The Master of Science in Social Work (M.S.W.) was offered beginning in 1934. The Bulletin describes the M.S.W. as: “This is a professional degree requiring six quarters, three in class and three in field work. The thesis which is required may be developed in connection with some problem growing out of the field work.”\textsuperscript{25} In 1937, the Master of Science in Education and Master of Science in Agricultural Engineering were added to the degree offerings. The Master of Science in Education was a distinct degree from the Master of Education (M.Ed.) which was first offered in the 1930-31 academic year. The M.Ed. was a professional degree requiring two years of study (eight courses): “The aim of this degree is preparation for the high careers of the profession.”\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24} University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1932-33, 9.
\textsuperscript{25} University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1935-36, 7.
\textsuperscript{26} University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1930-31, 4.
The M.Ed. required not only a Bachelor’s degree with specialization in education as a prerequisite but also that the candidate have two or three years teaching experience prior to entering the second year of study. The Master of Science in Education, by contrast, required four major courses and two minors of two courses each. It was projected that this degree would take one year to complete. The Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) in either art or music was offered in 1939. The prospective candidate for the M.F.A. degree was advised that: “Emphasis will be placed on a high degree of technical and artistic accomplishment.” Students could present a written thesis or a creative project of high quality.

As mentioned above, the course of study outlined in the 1910 Bulletin was one major course and two minor courses, taken during the Fall, Winter, and Spring sessions. The major course was to occupy half of the student’s time, the minor courses one quarter of his time each. In 1930 the regulation was instituted that a student must complete one of the minors from outside his department. Of course, prior to this, such a rule was unnecessary, since many departments offered only one major and one minor class. It also betrays a reluctance to abandon the idea of general culture for the specialized culture required for graduate education. Similarly, the listing of departments and courses in the Bulletin was not in

---

*University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1939, 11.*
alphabetical order until 1926. Until 1926 Greek and Latin were first in the list. Theses submitted for degree requirements were expected to show independent thinking and logical structure. A proper bibliography and accurate annotation of sources was expected as was proper use of language: “Candidates are expected to show correctness and good taste in their English, both oral and written.”

Even in the graduate science, engineering, and agriculture programs the power of language skills and rhetoric still held sway.

All degrees, except the Master of Science in Agriculture and Master of Science in Home Economics required a reading knowledge of French and German. When the Master of Social Work, Master of Forestry, and Master of Agricultural Engineering degrees were created they were also exempt from the French and German requirement. A committee of three faculty members was appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School to supervise and approve the thesis, written, and oral examinations. After review by the student’s committee, the written examinations were passed to the Faculty Examining Committee, a five member board appointed by the Chancellor. The student was given an oral examination by this committee and questions: “on a major course may go outside of the

28 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1918-19, 5. “Any student who shows notable weakness in English composition, either oral or written, in his work in any course in the University of Georgia, shall, at the request of any instructor, be required to do special work under the direction of the Department of English.” Beginning in 1940, theses as well as doctoral dissertations, were deposited in the university library.
formal limits of the course and include fundamental matters that may have been treated in undergraduate courses.” This basic system of degree requirements would survive into the 1950s. A concerted effort was mounted by members of the College of Education faculty in 1941-42 to substitute two five hour courses for the Master’s thesis requirement. The members presented a petition to the Graduate Dean with twenty-three signatures. The petitioners argued that:

In view of the extraordinary world conditions which will necessitate the induction into the armed forces of several graduate students before the end of the 1942 Summer quarter; the curtailment of travel; the possible loss of accrediting facing the University; and the fact that other universities of the South are granting masters’ degrees without requiring theses, we respectfully request that two five hour courses be made an optional requirement for granting the master’s degree from the George Peabody School of Education.30

The petition was accompanied by an extensive listing of institutions that did not require a thesis for the Master’s degree. The Dean and Graduate Council turned the petitioners argument back on them arguing: “War Conditions are not such as to justify any changes.”31 The matter was dropped at this time but the non-thesis M.Ed. would appear in the 1945-46

---

30 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1926-27, 3.
31 Petition to the Graduate Dean and Executive Committee of the Graduate Council, June 12, 1942, unpublished typescript.
31 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Graduate Council, June 12, 1942, unpublished typescript.
academic year. The only major change in the Master’s degree requirements before World War II came in 1935, when the degree required the completion of eight courses and a thesis: four in the major and two in each minor. As with the previous system, a one-year (three quarter) residency was required. In 1940, one hundred Master’s degrees were conferred, over one-third of them to women.

The Doctor of Philosophy Degree

Although the Prudential Committee Programme of 1859 had proposed the creation of the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in 1859, it was not until 1933 that the Board of Regents authorized the establishment of the degree. The formal offering of the degree at the University of Georgia did not occur until 1935. However, it was not until 1937 that any departments made provision for doctoral students. Citing the limited library and laboratory resources of the university, the Graduate School offered the Ph.D. only in biological sciences, chemistry, history, and a planned major in “Rural Sociology”. The following year the offerings had been reduced to biological sciences, chemistry, and history. A Ph.D. was initiated in education in 1940 as was a joint Ph.D. degree program in history and English: “a combination dealing with the life of Georgia and the Southeast.” The Bulletin lists two reasons for the establishment of the Ph.D. degree: “To

---

University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1940, 4.
train students for research and for other scholarly activity” and “To train teachers and administrators for high schools and colleges.” The second justification, to train teachers and administrators, and the above mentioned Rural Sociology program are clearly a response to pressures from the newly formed Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. Both topics are specifically mentioned in the Regent’s 1936 annual report as was the call for “a graduate school of high standing.”

The 1935 Bulletin requires that the Dean and Executive Committee be satisfied that the applicant for the Ph.D. degree “is a person of proper attainments and promise” and “That the courses and proposed program can be adequately given.” The dual limitations of library and laboratory facilities, mentioned above, would hamper the growth of doctoral programs at the University of Georgia. Into the late 1940s the Bulletin was advising: “The student who contemplates coming here for work leading to the Ph.D. degree should confer with the prospective department and the dean of the Graduate School in advance.” Only the education and the history and English combination program had admitted candidates by 1948. The departments of Biological Sciences and Chemistry had been authorized: “to accept candidates for

---

33 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1938-39, 6.
the degree as soon as members of the staff in these fields agreed that the conditions essential to a high quality of advanced graduate work had been met."\textsuperscript{37}

Prior to admittance to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree, the student was required to submit to the Graduate School a program of study during the first year. This program detailed the classes the student would complete and a preliminary dissertation proposal. The program outlined three years of study with not less than three consecutive quarters spent in residence during the second two years. The Ph.D. degree of 1935 was still modeled on the old system of a major and two minors. Students were required to have a reading knowledge of French and German before being admitted to candidacy. Preliminary examinations were conducted by the major professor, the chairman of the department, and a third faculty member chosen by the Dean of the Graduate School. Upon successful completion, the student was admitted to candidacy. The student’s examination committee reported to the Graduate School when the student successfully completed his examinations and thesis.\textsuperscript{38} The student would then be required to successfully complete an oral or written comprehensive examination given by no less than five faculty members, two of which must be from outside the student’s

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 8.
\textsuperscript{38} The terminal paper was termed a thesis, not a dissertation.
department. Other members of the faculty were welcome to
attend and question the candidate.

The degree requirements had become more refined by 1938. The advisory committee of three was appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School at the beginning of the student’s work for the degree. Gone is the requirement for two committee members from outside the student’s department. The terminal paper is now called a dissertation, not a thesis. Further, Graduate School policy spelled out that the final oral examination was: “upon the dissertation and the general field of the major and minor subjects.” The candidate for the Ph.D. was required to:

- present a dissertation, or thesis, on some subject connected with his major field of study. It must give evidence of original research, independent thinking, scholarly ability, and technical mastery of some field. Its conclusions must be logical, its literary form must be good, and its contribution to knowledge should merit publication.

Three typewritten copies of the dissertation, together with an abstract, were to be filed with the Graduate School at least four weeks before the student’s anticipated graduation for the use of the examining committee. When the dissertation was approved, three bound typewritten copies were to be presented to the Graduate School. The system of presenting

---

University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1938-39, 7.
three bound copies to the Graduate School would remain until mandatory electronic submission of theses and dissertations in 2001. A particularly startling requirement was that the student was required to provide the university with another 150 printed copies of his work! The first Ph.D. degrees conferred by the University of Georgia were granted to Horace Montgomery and Joseph Simeon Jacob in 1940.

The Doctor of Education Degree

The Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree was first offered at the University of Georgia in 1938. The stated aim of the degree was to train “master teachers” and “master administrators”. Again, this reflects the call of the Board of Regents for better trained teachers and administrators in Georgia public schools. The Doctor of Education degree:

- takes its ultimate purpose from the continuous need for leadership in the administration and supervision of educational institutions: and also from the continuing need for teachers who have broad scholarship, intimate knowledge of learning processes, and a definite understanding and appreciation of the needs of our

---

40 “One hundred and fifty printed copies of the dissertation, or approved portions thereof, must be presented to the University. In case it is not practical to print before graduation, the candidate must deposit fifty dollars with the Treasurer of the University to insure publication. This amount will be refunded in case the dissertation is published within three years after graduation.” Ibid., 1938-39, 7.

41 Horace Montgomery’s dissertation was entitled: “The Crisis of 1850 and its Effect on Political Parties in Georgia”, Joseph Simeon Jacob’s was entitled: “The Prediction of the Outcome-on-Furlough of Dementia Prae-cox Patients”.
social-economic-political life. . . .\textsuperscript{42}

The requirements for the Doctor of Education degree were similar to those of the Ph.D. outlined above. The Ed.D. program would only admit students “who give promise of the power to do original or creative work on educational problems of more than minor or temporary significance.”\textsuperscript{43} The French and German language requirement could be waived if the candidate demonstrated proficiency in “research techniques applicable to education.”\textsuperscript{44} The Graduate Council could also be petitioned to require only two quarters of residence instead of three provided the student was doing approved field work the third quarter (such as teaching).

A dissertation was required of all candidates for the Ed.D.: “The subject chosen must be definite and of limited range, the method of investigation must be exactly formulated, and the value of the sources employed must be determined, and the conclusions must be supported.”\textsuperscript{45} Candidates wishing to pursue administrative work were advised to include a minor in social sciences. Those who desired to pursue teaching should have a minor in the field for which they are preparing. Students with demonstrated ability, the Bulletin asserts, will have much freedom and special facilities available for their research. The first Doctor of

\textsuperscript{42} University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1938-39, 8.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 9.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 8.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
Education degree was conferred on Joseph Anderson Williams in 1948.\textsuperscript{46}

Conclusions

The growth of graduate education at the University of Georgia suffered from several hindrances from the post-Civil War period until the entry of the United States into World War II. Among these were lack of funds, faculty, library holdings, and laboratory facilities. In 1941 graduate education at the University of Georgia suffered another setback: a brief loss of accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The revocation of the accreditation was due to political interference in the running of the University by Georgia Governor and UGA alumnus, Eugene Talmadge.\textsuperscript{47} It is remarkable that the first earned Ph.D. was conferred at the University of North Carolina in 1875 but the first conferred Ph.D. did not occur at Georgia until 1940. As mentioned, as late as 1948, the Bulletin stated that the Ph.D. degree in chemistry and biological sciences would only be instituted when the faculty felt they: “agreed that the conditions essential to a high

\textsuperscript{46} Williams would go on to serve the University of Georgia in several capacities. He would eventually become Dean of the College of Education in 1963.

quality of advanced graduate work in these fields have been met.”

Obviously, these are laboratory intensive fields which explains why only the fields of History-English, Education, and Mathematics granted Ph.D. degrees in the first twenty years after the Doctor of Philosophy degree had been authorized. There was another factor which limited doctoral work during the early years of the Ph.D. at Georgia. In the August 5, 1941 Minutes of the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee we read:

Doctor Boyd raised the question of the University’s acceptance of students for candidacy for degrees beyond the masters degree. The Committee decided to recommend for the approval of the President that we accept no more students for the doctorate. Of course we are already committed to the few students and we will have to carry out the contracts."

The resolution by the Committee was approved by university President Harmon W. Caldwell. Laurence DeFee Haskew would be granted the Ph.D. degree 17 days later. The next Ph.D. degrees would not be conferred until 1950. Anxiety about the involvement of the United States in the war already raging in Europe certainly was a motivation for the resolution. However, the less than enthusiastic embrace of the Ph.D. program by faculty members and departments certainly factored

---

48 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1948-49, 8.
49 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty, unpublished manuscript, August 5, 1941. George Hugh Boyd, who would become Dean of the Graduate school in 1943, was the presenter of the resolution.
in. There were several issues at play in this. The 1940 Graduate Bulletin requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree states: "For the present the library and laboratory equipment of the University justify the offering of majors only in Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Education and in History and English. . . ."\textsuperscript{50} So, facilities were a problem but so was graduate faculty workload. The Graduate Faculty Committee on Research recommended:

that the Graduate Faculty consider what work should be the normal teaching load for a man who directs graduate work. It is agreed that little research could be expected or accomplished if 15 hours remained the normal load.\textsuperscript{51}

Attitudes, facilities, policies and current events would hamper the growth of the Ph.D. degree at the University of Georgia. From 1935 to 1954 thirteen Doctor of Philosophy degrees were conferred.

It is a credit to the leaders of the University of Georgia that they made a concerted effort to integrate agricultural education into the university. The M.Ag. degree instituted in 1876, is evidence of this. Advanced training in agriculture had been part of the Programme of 1859, but it is to Chancellor Walter B. Hill (1899–1905) that much credit must be given for the development of agricultural education.

\textsuperscript{50} University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1940, 7.
\textsuperscript{51} Minutes of the Graduate Faculty Committee on Research, unpublished manuscript, February 20, 1941.
Hill recognized that progressive, scientific teaching and research in agriculture, such as that at the University of Wisconsin, was the wave of the future. In contrast, in many Southern states such as Alabama and South Carolina, agricultural education was barely tolerated as a means to support the classical curriculum. This accounts for the creation of separate institutions such as Auburn and Clemson. The status accorded to agriculture in the Hill and Barrow chancellorships established an excellent precedent for the growth of agricultural graduate education. Of the fifteen full-time graduate students in 1913, six were in agriculture. In 1940, nine Master of Agriculture and one hundred fifty-three Bachelor of Agriculture degrees were conferred.

Many of the procedures established in 1910 remain in effect today. Items such as committees being appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School had to be phased out for logistical reasons as enrollment grew. It was not until 1953 that the Master’s degree requirement for two minors outside the department, and the Doctor of Philosophy requirement for one would be eliminated. Although the University of Georgia was not alone in this requirement, it demonstrates a reluctance to accept what Joseph LeConte called the “specialized culture” of graduate education. The Jeffersonian “gentleman’s degree” was still not completely separated from the intensive specialization the new age required.
The next chapter will discuss the members of the first graduate faculty. It is not a Graduate Faculty, per se, a formal administrative organization. That organization would not occur until 1940. These individuals were the central element in the development of graduate education at the University of Georgia. At an institution that was severely deficient in library and laboratory facilities, it was upon the abilities of the faculty that the onus of the graduate program rested. We will examine their biographies, academic qualifications, and scholarly accomplishments.
CHAPTER VI
The First Graduate Faculty

An institution of higher education is only as good as its faculty. A university may have an extensive physical plant, superb students, and first rate equipment but without an outstanding faculty, it can never achieve greatness. Conversely, an outstanding faculty can overcome physical and equipment deficiencies and motivate students to excellence in spite of physical surroundings. The graduate facilities of Johns Hopkins opened in downtown commercial buildings but within a decade became the major force in graduate education in the United States. The key to Hopkins' success was an outstanding faculty. Daniel Coit Gilman wrote:

It is on the Faculty more than on any other body that the building of a university depends. They give their lives to the work. It is not the site, nor the apparatus, nor the halls, nor the library, nor the Board of Regents, which draws the scholars—it is a body of living teachers, skilled in their specialties, eminent in their calling, loving to teach. Such a body of

1 This is reminiscent of James Garfield's famous aphorism: "I am not willing that this discussion should close without mention of the value of a true teacher. Give me a log hut, with only a simple bench, Mark Hopkins on one end and I on the other, and you may have all the buildings, apparatus and libraries without him." Address to Williams College Alumni, New York, December 28, 1871. Although certainly an elegant expression, as we shall see in the next chapter graduate education needs the buildings, apparatus, libraries, and Mark Hopkins.
teachers will make a university anywhere.\textsuperscript{2}

In this section we will be examining the members of the first official members of the University of Georgia graduate faculty. It was upon the abilities and talents of this first group that the success of the Graduate school was built.

When examining the careers of these gentlemen, one must bear in mind that the nature of the professoriate was markedly different in the nineteenth and early twentieth century than it is today. There was no organized system of promotion and tenure. At most institutions, the only method of advancement was to accept a position elsewhere. Universities did not have large support staffs. Professors were expected to assist in registration, record keeping, student housing, finance, and clerical work in addition to teaching and committee duties. All the functions of a modern university such as academic affairs, registrar, bursar, student affairs were actually managed by the faculty themselves, with very little assistance. Further, the notion of free time to do research was ill-defined or nonexistent. In our contemporary "publish or perish" academic world the scant amount of publications by the faculty seems odd. The centrality of teaching to the activity of the university at this time must also be recognized: the primary function of research was to inform and improve a professor’s teaching. It

\textsuperscript{2} Daniel Coit Gilman, “Inaugural Address of the University of California”, 1872, http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/calhistory/inaugural.gilman.html
is clear from examining these academic careers that there was a massive amount of dedication to the institution, many serving more than 30 years. In most cases, the institution of organized graduate education created more work for the professors: the graduate courses were added to the undergraduate sections the professor already had to teach. It is obvious that all of these activities left little time for any research. Yet they did do research, they somehow found the time and energy to explore and augment their disciplines.

The first decades of the twentieth century saw the Ph.D. degree requirement for faculty gain ascendency. The quiet, parson-like nineteenth century image of the professor was replaced by the dynamic research oriented holder of the doctorate. The Ph.D. degree was: “the label of academic respectibility, the mark of professional competence, the assurance of a certain standard sameness of training, experience, and exposure to the ideals, the rules, the habits of scientific German scholarship.”3 There were murmurs of dissent concerning the rising supremacy of the Ph.D. degree. In 1903 William James wrote “The Ph.D. Octopus” for the Harvard Monthly. James decried the increasing demand of institutions for faculty with the Ph.D. as: “a sham, a bauble, a dodge, whereby to decorate the catalogues of schools and colleges.”4

James implied that the increasing emphasis on the Ph.D. degree was a mortal danger not only to higher education but to the United States itself. He declared:

And is individuality with us also going to count for nothing unless stamped and licensed and authenticated by some title-giving machine? Let us pray that our ancient national genius may long preserve vitality enough to guard us from a future so unmanly and so unbeautiful!\(^5\)

The quest for the Ph.D., according to James, would not encourage development of conscientious scholars but would create a: "class of American social failures."\(^6\) One of the central arguments of "The Ph.D. Octopus" is that the Ph.D. is an undemocratic title redolent of European aristocracy. This is precisely the same argument that Thomas Jefferson had put forth against conferring any degrees at the University of Virginia. One of the ways universities can break the "Doctor-Monopoly" is to: "give up their unspeakably silly ambition to bespangle their lists of offices with these doctoral titles. Let them look more to substance and less to vanity and sham."

James was fighting a losing battle. Institutions were not merely impressed with the Ph.D. as an affectation or "bauble", as James argued. The Ph.D. provided a means of quality control and a demonstration of professional competence as Rudolph asserted. At larger and wealthier institutions faculty with the Ph.D. were in the majority by

\(^5\) Ibid. 8.
\(^6\) Ibid. 5.
the end of the first decade of the twentieth century. The influx of Ph.D. holders accelerated changes in the role of faculty. Demands for research time and facilities, systematic promotion and tenure procedures, and an end to faculty involvement in clerical work and student policing became more strident. The ascendency of the Ph.D. holders marked a gradual turning away of faculty from strict allegiance to the institution toward department and discipline specific fealty.

Although it would be twenty-five years after the founding of the University of Georgia Graduate School before the Ph.D. degree was offered, there was from the beginning the conviction that graduate education was not merely expanded undergraduate work. Three members of the first graduate faculty were holders of the Ph.D. degree from Johns Hopkins. One member of the faculty, J. H. T. McPherson studied under Herbert Baxter Adams at Hopkins. Adams is generally credited with creating the modern conception of the graduate seminar in the United States. The graduate seminar is today the cornerstone of most graduate programs. In the discussion of McPherson, Adams' notion of the seminar will be introduced. Emerson wrote: "All history becomes subjective; in other words there is properly no history, only biography." Understanding the biographies of the faculty gives insight into the nature of early graduate education and the Graduate School at the University of Georgia.

*Emerson, The Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, "History", 85.*
Willis H. Bocock, A.M., LL.D. (Honorary), Hampden-Sydney

Willis Henry Bocock was appointed the first Dean of the newly formed University of Georgia Graduate School in 1910. Throughout his career, Bocock maintained a reputation for excellence in scholarship and leadership. Bocock was, as we shall see with many members of the first graduate faculty, a Virginian. He was born in 1865, the son of a prominent Presbyterian clergyman. He attended school in Lexington, Virginia and at the Kemper School in Boonville, Missouri. Bocock entered Hampden-Sydney College in 1881. He graduated in 1884 with the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Letters. After his graduation from Hampden-Sydney he spent a year at the University of Virginia and obtained diplomas in Latin and Greek.

Bocock spent the year after he left the University of Virginia in Richmond as a school teacher. He was offered the position of professor of Greek at Hampden-Sydney in 1886, a position which he gleefully accepted. Hampden-Sydney president J. D. Eggleston wrote of Bocock: “I doubt whether Hampden-Sydney has ever had a more brilliant teacher than W. H. Bocock. He was elected full professor when he was twenty-one.” Bocock also attended the University of Berlin in the period 1892-93 and traveled throughout Europe. He was offered

---

7 Bocock’s uncle was headmaster of Kemper. Kemper had been founded by Bocock’s maternal grandfather, Frederick Thomas Kemper.
8 J. D. Eggleston in Brinkley, On This Hill, 612.
the chair of Professor of Ancient Languages at the University of Georgia in 1889. In 1894 separate professorships of Greek and Latin were created. Bocock assumed the professorship of Greek and William Davis Hooper, another Hampden-Sydney graduate, assumed that of Latin.

With the formation of the University of Georgia Graduate School in 1910, and Bocock’s appointment as dean, he assumed demanding administrative duties as well as maintaining excellence in teaching. Bocock’s career illustrates the problem with the lack of publications by nineteenth and early twentieth century faculty. Bocock was a talented and assiduous researcher, what he did not have is free time to compile his research. Reed comments about this problem:

that the inability of the University of Georgia and other Southern institutions to provide enough members of their faculties to make it possible for some members to have time in which to prepare and publish articles and books of great value, has resulted in a loss to American literature of many valuable contributions. ¹⁰

This is certainly true of Bocock, although he made regular contributions to journals such as: Studies in Philology, Classical Review, and American Journal of Philology, he was never able to publish any extended work.

¹⁰ Reed, History of the University of Georgia, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/reed/ page 1151.
Bocock developed an interest in international relations as a result of World War I. He was named Lecturer on International Relations by the University of Georgia Board of Trustees in 1931 and was a popular and prolific lecturer on this subject. Bocock served as Dean of the Graduate School for eighteen years. In his tenure enrollment rose from twenty-four graduate students in 1913 to over two hundred in 1928. He stepped down in 1928, at the age of sixty-three, because he felt it was time for a younger man to assume the leadership role. He was succeeded by Roswell Powell Stephens of the Mathematics Department. Bocock continued teaching and at his retirement in 1945, had served the University of Georgia for fifty-six years. He was noted as an exacting and systematic scholar. It was this outlook that he brought to the systematization of graduate education at the University of Georgia.

Bocock and R. L. McWhorter taught, in 1910, a major graduate course in Greek which consisted of literary selections and exercises in grammar, written and spoken Greek, history, and poetry. The course description points out a problem with early graduate education at the University of Georgia that was common with many other institutions: "studied from sources so far as the library resources of the University permit." Bocock also taught, by himself, "An Introduction to New Testament Greek." These classes were in

"University of Georgia Graduate Bulletin, 1910-11, 3."
addition to undergraduate teaching and his duties as Dean.
The New Testament Greek class was not offered after 1913 and
after 1923, Bocock taught the major Greek class by himself.
Bocock often decried the declining interest by students in
Greek, symptomatic of this is the fact that the 1931-32
Graduate Bulletin notes: "For courses in Greek Literature,
consult the professor."12 After 1931, the Greek Literature
class would be transformed into "Introduction of European
Literature" which had a prerequisite of three years of
college-level Latin. Greek literature was no longer studied
in the original language but was now "Greek Literature in
Translations." In a memorial to Bocock in 1948, Robert
Preston Brooks wrote:

Mr. Bocock was an altogether charming companion. Few men
were so perennially delightful. The depth and variety of
his knowledge of literature, ancient and modern, and of
world history and contemporary affairs was impressive;
and he invariably expressed his views in perfect
English. No one was ever bored in his presence.13

Bocock continued to serve the Graduate School after leaving
the deanship. He served as a member of and advisor to the
Graduate Council into the 1940s.

12 University of Georgia Graduate Bulletin, 1931-32, 23.
13 Georgia Alumni Record, April 1948.
Robert Preston Brooks, Ph.D., Wisconsin

Robert Preston Brooks was born in Milledgeville, Georgia in 1881. He graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Georgia in 1904. Brooks was the first Georgian to be awarded a Rhodes Scholarship. Brooks studied history at Brasenose College, Oxford and received the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1907. He was appointed Assistant Professor of History and Sociology at the University of Georgia in 1907. Brooks took a leave of absence from the university in 1911 and spent the next year and a half completing a Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin. In 1914 he was appointed DeRenne Professor of Georgia History. However, economics came to fascinate Brooks more than history, and he resigned his position at the university to take one at the Fourth National Bank of Macon, Georgia. The promise of being named Dean of the new School of Commerce at Georgia lured Brooks back into the academic fold.

Brooks was instrumental in organizing the Georgia Historical Association in 1917. Other activities were organizing the Georgia Alumni Society and the Southern Economics Association. Brooks received an Albert Kahn Foundation fellowship and traveled extensively in Asia, writing many reports for the Foundation such as: “The Independence Movement in India.” In spite of all his other
activities, Brooks was a prolific writer; composing numerous articles and books. Some of his best know titles are: *The Agrarian Revolution in Georgia, 1865-1912*, *The University of Georgia Under Sixteen Administrations, 1785-1955*, and *An Elementary History of Georgia*. According to Reed, Brooks: “contributed more articles for publication than any other member of the faculty throughout the long history of the institution [1945].”

In the 1910 Bulletin, Brooks is listed as teaching the “History of Georgia”: “The student will receive training in the use of original sources, and will be required to familiarize himself with all the primary and secondary sources of the history of the State.” He is also listed as assisting McPherson with the English Constitution class. In 1915 he introduced the “History of the South” class. The class was strongly oriented toward economic and political history. Each student was required to present a thesis based on original sources. The final course Brooks taught in the History Department was “Civil War and Reconstruction” in 1919. His next appearance was in the College of Commerce, of which he was the dean, teaching “History of Economic Thought.” Brooks taught this class until 1932.

---

14 Thomas Walter Reed, *History of The University of Georgia*, Chapter XIII, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/reed/docs/reed_c13c/
15 *University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin*, 1910, 5.
John Pendleton Campbell, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins

John Pendleton Campbell was a Johns Hopkins graduate like J. H. T. McPherson. A Maryland native, he attended Johns Hopkins and received an A. B. and Ph.D. in 1885 and 1888 respectively. Also like McPherson, he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa. He was appointed professor of biology in 1888 and organized a new department at Georgia. Campbell spent his summers doing biological research in Europe, Jamaica, and Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Campbell’s “Advanced Animal Physiology” class in the 1910 Bulletin was four class hours and six hours of laboratory work in physiological chemistry and experimental physiology. This class would be joined by “Vertebrate Comparative Anatomy” in 1914. Campbell was: “quiet and unobtrusive in his manner, popular with those who came to know him well, his whole soul wrapped up in his dream of a great biological department for the university.” 16

Campbell died in 1918 at the age of fifty-five, it would be five years before the university offered another graduate course in biology (zoology, 1923-24).

R. J. H. DeLoach, M.A., Georgia

Robert J. H. DeLoach was a native of Statesboro, Georgia. He attended the University of Georgia and received

16 Thomas W. Reed, Uncle Tom Reed’s Memoir of the University of Georgia, (Athens, Ga, University of Georgia Libraries, 1974), 99.
the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1898 and the Master of Arts degree in 1906. After the completion of his undergraduate degree he worked as a school teacher for several years in Swainsboro, Georgia, and Fort Sill, Oklahoma. DeLoach served as a botanist for the Georgia Experiment Station in Griffin from 1906 to 1908. He was appointed to the faculty of the University of Georgia in 1908 and remained at Georgia for four years. DeLoach specialized in cotton agriculture. He was a friend of the great naturalist, John Burroughs, and brought Burroughs to Athens, much to the delight of the students. DeLoach wrote a book about his experiences with Burroughs: *Rambles with John Burroughs*, which was published in 1912. DeLoach was also the author of *Agriculture for the Common Schools*. He collaborated with William Davis Hooper, of the Latin Department, in the Loeb Library translation of Cato and Varro’s works on agriculture. DeLoach left the University of Georgia in 1912 and took a position with the Armour company in Chicago as Director of Agricultural Research. He returned to Georgia in 1928 and devoted himself to agricultural research.

DeLoach taught two classes while at Georgia: “Cytological Aspects of Plant Breeding” and “Experimental Plant Breeding.” Both classes were classified as minors or a major if both were taken. If the student took the classes as

---

17 Burroughs was awarded the honorary Litt.D. degree by the University of Georgia in 1915.
a major: “The student will be required to work out some
definite problem in cotton breeding and present a thesis
thereon.” These courses were not confined to the practical
aspects of cotton culture only. The students were required to
read Darwin and Spencer on the “Pangenesis Theory”, Mendel’s
Principles of Heredity, Plants and Animals Under
Domestication by Darwin, The Foundations of Zoology, Mutation
Theory (in two volumes) and several other works dealing with
genetics and evolution. Clearly, there was advanced
scientific material being discussed in DeLoach’s classes. The
curriculum of these two classes was very much at variance
with the common conception, at that time, of the College of
Agriculture as a “trade school.”

John Richard Fain, B.S., Tennessee

John Richard Fain came to the University of Georgia in
1907 to head the Department of Agronomy. Fain rejoined his
colleague, Andrew M. Soule, with whom he had worked at
Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Soule had been appointed the
head of the newly created Georgia State College of
Agriculture, the successor to the Georgia College of
Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. In 1932 the pretense of being
a separate institution would be dropped and the college would

18 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1910, 8.
be completely absorbed into the University of Georgia. Fain was born in Tennessee in 1873. He attended the University of Tennessee and received the B.A. degree in 1900. He briefly attended Ohio State University, but did not take a degree. He left Ohio to work at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and then to the University of Georgia, as mentioned above. Fain was appointed head of the Department of Agronomy by Soule. He would remain as department head until his retirement in 1938.

Fain was a dedicated researcher and helped develop the cotton variety dubbed: “College No. 1.” This was a hearty and high-yield variety which was of great benefit to Georgia agriculture. Fain offered “Soil Types of Georgia” as a major in 1910 and “Improvement of Seed Corn” as a minor. Two other minor courses would soon be added: “Physical Properties of Soils” and “Fertilizers”, these two courses taken together would constitute a major. As additional faculty members were added to the Department of Agronomy, Fain was able to branch out to teach “Farm Economics” and “Farm Management.” These classes would eventually expand into the Department of Agricultural Economics.

However, it took until 1950 to integrate all the agricultural functions: teaching, research, and extension under one dean. See C. C. Murray, et al., History of the College of Agriculture of the University of Georgia, (Athens, Ga, University of Georgia College of Agriculture, 1975), 82 passim.

Fain was a true “farm boy” as well as a researcher and educator. It took him nine years to complete his undergraduate degree since he had to intersperse periods at the University of Tennessee with periods on the farm. He returned to his family farm in Tennessee when he retired in 1938. Sadly after six years of retirement, the federal government took the farm by eminent domain for a TVA project.
William Davis Hooper was born in Virginia in 1868. He received his early education in Alabama and entered Hampden-Sydney College in 1886. Hooper received his A.M. degree from Hampden-Sydney in 1889, first teaching at Southwest Georgia A&M in Cuthbert and then appointed Instructor in Greek and Latin at the University of Georgia in 1890. Latin became a separate department in 1896 and Hooper was appointed head. He remained as head of the Latin Department until 1945. Together with his colleague, R. L. McWhorter, Hooper taught a major Latin class and a minor class in Roman drama. Hooper would teach these two classes until his retirement. The major Latin class, which presupposed an undergraduate background in Latin, consisted of exercises in grammar and writing and readings in Catullus, Lucretius, Juvenal, Seneca, and Pliny. As such, it was very much like the undergraduate Latin course which had been a cornerstone of the antebellum college. Hooper provided the translation for the Loeb Classical Library’s edition of the agricultural works of Marcus Porcius Cato and Marcus Terentius Varro. He also published the work: *Cicero’s Religious Beliefs* (1934). Hooper was another Hampden-Sydney graduate, like his contemporary, Willis H. Bocock, and fifth University of Georgia President. 

---

21 The University instituted a retirement system for the faculty in 1945, which may explain the many retirements that year.
Moses Waddel, that rendered dedicated service to the University.

Joseph Lustrat, Bachelor es Lettres, University of France

Joseph Lustrat was one of the most colorful personalities on the first University of Georgia graduate faculty and was the only foreign-born member. Lustrat was born in Vichy, France, in 1858. He received the Bachelor es Lettres degree from the University of France and a law degree from the Sorbonne. He was a barrister in France for 19 years before coming to the United States. Lustrat taught at Shorter College in Georgia when he first arrived in the United States in 1893. He was appointed Instructor in the Department of Romance Languages at the University of Georgia in 1897. Lustrat rose through the ranks to professor and department head.

Lustrat received a decoration from the French government for work he had done during WW I translating secret documents. As with all other language courses offered in the early years of the graduate school, Lustrat’s class concentrated on literature in the original language. The student was expected to have mastered the language: Latin,

22 Boney points out that Lustrat began his teaching at Georgia just as Leon Henri Charbonnier, professor and native of France, was retiring after thirty-seven years at the school: “Thus the connection with France continued unbroken . . . ”. See F. N. Boney, A Pictorial History of the University of Georgia, (Athens, Ga, University of Georgia Press, 1984), 56. Lustrat also taught Italian and Spanish at the undergraduate level at Georgia.
Greek, French, or German, as an undergraduate. Lustrat offered two courses in the new Graduate School: “History of Dramatic Literature of the 17th Century” and “The Novel in France in the Second Half of the 19th century.” The Dramatic Literature course required: “readings of about 5000 pages of text.” Both classes were conducted in French. Lustrat also taught a graduate course in Spanish which covered readings and grammar, which was offered as a minor. Lustrat would teach these classes until his death in 1927.

Thomas Hubbard McHatton, Sc.D. (Honorary), Spring Hill College

Thomas Hubbard McHatton was born in Brooklyn, New York while his mother was there visiting relatives. The McHattons moved to Macon, Georgia. At the suggestion of Robert Toombs, the eminent Georgia politician, who was a close friend of McHatton’s father. McHatton attended Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama and was granted the Bachelor of Science degree in 1903. He then spent 4 years at Michigan State College and Cornell studying horticulture. He was granted the Master of Horticulture degree from Michigan State College in 1922. McHatton accepted a position at the Georgia State Experiment Station in 1907 and the following year was

---

23 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1910-11, 4.
24 Soon after Lustrat’s death his wife, Eleanore, presented the Professor’s silver headed walking stick to his friend, Thomas Walter Reed. Reed was never without it for the rest of his life: “I carry it with me and think of the kind friend now gone”. See Reed, History of the University of Georgia, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/reed/.
appointed to the faculty of the University of Georgia. He was promoted to full professor in 1913. He married the daughter of University of Georgia romance languages professor, Joseph Lustrat.

He was instrumental in creating the entomology and landscape architecture programs at the University of Georgia. McHatton was a productive writer who was published in many professional and popular periodicals. One of his specialties was peach growing, his thesis at Michigan State University was entitled: The Peach Industry of Georgia. The Horticulture Department offered three classes in 1910: an undergraduate course with additional readings and research for graduate students, and two sections of “Advanced Pomology”: one a minor, the other a major. If the “Advanced Pomology” was taken as a major, the student was required to submit a written thesis: “This thesis is to call for not less than three laboratory periods per week and is to consist of research work to be chosen by the student with the assistance of the instructor.” 25 The pomology classes, like the plant breeding classes mentioned above, were heavily laden with scientific theory in genetics and evolution. 26 It was not until the 1916-17 session that any graduate classes were offered in ornamental horticulture rather than fruit culture.

In that year “Landscape Gardening” was announced as a major

---

25 *University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin*, 1910, 10.
26 The reading list contained two texts by Charles Darwin: *Origin of the Species* and *Heredity*. 
course requiring a thesis. This is the first sign of what would later evolve into the Landscape Architecture Department. McHatton would remain department head of Horticulture until his retirement in 1950 after forty-two years of service to the University of Georgia.

John Hanson Thomas McPherson, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins

J. H. T. McPherson served as professor of history at the University of Georgia for forty-four years. In his tenure he built the UGA History Department into a strong presence in the field. Notable colleagues during this long academic career were E. Merton Coulter and Robert Preston Brooks. McPherson was a native of Baltimore and attended Johns Hopkins as an undergraduate, receiving his A.B. degree in 1886. He continued his studies by entering the doctoral program and was a colleague of Woodrow Wilson, who was also studying history at Hopkins during this period. At Hopkins, McPherson studied under Herbert Baxter Adams who was an innovator in introducing scientific method into advanced historical studies as well as coining the term “political science.” Adams, who received his Ph.D. from Heidelberg in 1876 was one of Johns Hopkins’ first fellows along with such luminaries as Josiah Royce and Henry C. Adams. Adams was a master of the lecture and seminar. His jovial and often light-hearted approach to historical topics enlivened and
stimulated interest in obscure historical topics. Adams’ seminar room at Hopkins bore the motto emblazoned on the wall: "History is past politics and politics present history."  

It is worth quoting Adams’ own comments about the nature of the seminar since they would have such a lasting impress on a generation of academic historians and on the very notion of the centrality of the seminar in graduate education:

It is easy thus to outline a few external characteristics of the seminary, but difficult to picture its inner life. Its workings are so complex and varied that it cannot be confined within walls or restricted to a single library . . . for every member is engaged upon some branch of special research . . . prosecuted upon the economic principles of division of labor and cooperation. This cooperation appears, not merely in the interdependence of student monographs, but in every day student life. A word is passed here, a hint is given there. . . . Individual ambition is undoubtedly a strong motive in student work, but there is such a thing among students everywhere as ambition for others, call it class spirit, esprit de corps, good fellowship, or good will to men. . . . They are all pushing forward.  

As an aside, Reed has a delightful story about the decoration of a lecture room that McPherson used in the University of Georgia’s Academic Building. Apparently the ceiling was decorated with a large, fine mural depicting the stages of evolution; no one could remember how it got there or why it was put there. See Reed, *Uncle Tom Reed’s Memoir of the University of Georgia*, 97-98.
McPherson would experience the Adams style of seminar for four years at Hopkins, receiving his Ph.D. in 1890. The lessons learned at Hopkins under Adams’ tutelage in the fields of historical method and teaching technique would be used by McPherson at Georgia to great effect. McPherson joined the faculty of the University of Georgia in 1892. True to his heritage as Adams’ student, McPherson added the studies of political science and economics to the History Department: fields which were not being taught at Georgia.29 McPherson was the author of several books such as The Government of the People of the State of Georgia (1898) and History of Liberia (1901) as well as work on taxation. McPherson is also remembered as the founder of the University of Georgia chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. McPherson’s son, Robert, joined the University of Georgia History Department and was a faculty member for many years, carrying on the family tradition.

The 1910 edition of the University of Georgia Graduate Bulletin list McPherson as teaching two courses: “The English Constitution to the Reign of Henry VII”, given during the first half of the year, and “The English Constitution Since Herbert B. Adams, The Study of History in American Colleges and Universities (U.S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1887). McPherson’s stature as the founder of Political Science at the University of Georgia was acknowledged by the students who called him “Poly” McPherson.
the Reign of Henry VII", given the second half. Both courses are rated as a minor individually, if taken together they constitute a major. The student taking the English Constitution as a major was required to present: "a dissertation involving original investigation", much like Adams’ monographs mentioned above. The catalog advises that each course has supplementary reading "tested by frequent examinations."\textsuperscript{30} A course in economic theory taught by McPherson is listed as a possibility if sufficient interest is shown. the other offering by the History Department is the history of Georgia, taught by McPherson’s colleague, Robert Preston Brooks.

In 1915 William Oscar Payne took over the duties of teaching the English Constitution classes and McPherson offered a class in Ancient History, co-taught with Willis Bocock, Graduate School Dean and Professor of Greek, William Davis Hooper, Professor of Latin, and Robert Ligon McWhorter, Adjunct Professor of Latin and Greek: an early example of interdisciplinary "team-teaching." McPherson’s name is absent from the Graduate Bulletins of the 1920s, although he is listed as a member of the Committee on Graduate Courses. He reappears in the 1931-32 Bulletin teaching a class on U.S. Constitutional development and continued to do so until his retirement in 1945.

\textsuperscript{30} University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1910, 5.
Robert Ligon McWhorter taught classics at the University of Georgia for forty-two years. McWhorter, a Georgia native, completed his A.B. in 1902 and his A.M. in 1906: both at the University of Georgia. McWhorter began his teaching career at Georgia in 1906, becoming full professor in 1925. Latin and Greek were combined in 1935 as the Department of Classics (they had been separate since 1893) and McWhorter served as head of the department from its inception until his retirement in 1948. As with many of his colleagues, McWhorter was an academically versatile individual. University Chancellor Charles M. Snelling commented that McWhorter could easily teach not just his own field but also English, History, French, German, and Mathematics. In 1910, McWhorter assisted Hooper in teaching the Latin class. He would also assist Willis Bocock in teaching the Greek and New Testament Greek classes.

John Morris, A.M., Randolph-Macon

John Morris was the son of a University of Georgia professor of English, Charles Morris. His brother, Sylvanus Morris, was professor of Law and Dean of the Law School at Georgia. John’s father left the University of Georgia for a

---

There were two Robert Ligon McWhorters at the University of Georgia. The one other than our present subject was a Professor of Law from 1923.
position at Randolph-Macon College and it was from Randolph-Macon that young Morris received his A.B. and A.M. degrees. Morris went on to receive a law degree from Georgia in 1885. After completing his law degree, Morris attended the University of Berlin and several other German institutions. Morris joined the University of Georgia faculty in 1893 as professor of German.

Morris was dedicated to the study of comparative English-German philology and published *The Organic History of English Words* in 1909. The German Classics course offered in the 1910 *Bulletin* was a selection of writings from Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, and other authors and commentaries. The class could be taken as a major or minor and undergraduate experience in German was assumed. To take the class as a major, approximately eleven hundred pages of German reading was required, as a minor, seven hundred. Morris was known as a strict taskmaster and judging by the works the class covered: such as: *Die Leiden des Jungen Werther*, *Jungfrau von Orleans*, and *Nathan der Weise* the students worked hard for their credits. In addition, four conferences weekly for majors, two weekly for minors were required (no doubt carried out, at least partially, in German). German Classics was joined in 1914-15 by a two hour German Composition class. As with many of his fellows of the first generation of graduate school faculty at the University of Georgia, John Morris retired in 1945. He
died in 1955, having served the University of Georgia for fifty-three years.

Robert E. Park, Litt.D. (Honorary), Alabama

Robert Emory Park was from a family with close ties to the University of Georgia. Park’s father was the first honor graduate of the university in 1857. Park, an Alabama native, entered West Point in 1887. However, he soon decided that a military career was not to his liking, so he entered the University of Alabama in 1889, receiving his B.A. in 1892. He received the Master of Arts degree from Alabama the following year. Park did graduate study at Chicago and Oxford, but did not receive a degree from either institution. The University of Alabama conferred upon him the honorary degree, Litt.D. in 1905.

Park began his teaching career as superintendent of the Gainesville, Georgia schools. He moved from that position to serve as principal of a private school in LaGrange, Georgia. Park was invited in 1899 by University of Georgia chancellor, Walter B. Hill to assume the professorship of English at the university. Park was an enthusiastic and well liked professor. He was also a bit of an archetype of the “absent minded professor” and many tall tales were told about his
eccentricities.\textsuperscript{32} Park was instrumental in raising an endowment of one million dollars for the university in 1921.

Park taught a graduate course in English drama in 1910, he continued to teach this class for the next twenty years. The class covered the development of English drama from medieval morality plays, through Shakespeare up to the twentieth century. It is noted that: “careful attention will be given to the history of the times in which the various works appeared.”\textsuperscript{33} Park served the English Department and the university until his death in 1942. Of his character, Reed wrote:

Kind, gentle, cultured, loyal Bob Park. I never came in contact with a more royal soul. Some day some University student may glance at these lines. He will learn that years before the University of Georgia had in its faculty not only a learned professor of English, but also a worthy exemplar of the best there is in life.\textsuperscript{34} Many of Park’s colleagues and students echoed this sentiment.

William Oscar Payne, A.M., Georgia

William Oscar Payne, professor of history, was born in Carnesville, Georgia in 1879. He attended the University of

\textsuperscript{32} Reed’s manuscript has several delightful stories about Professor Park. See Reed: History of the University of Georgia, \url{http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/reed/docs/reed_c12/021.jpg} passim.

\textsuperscript{33} University of Georgia Graduate Bulletin, 1910-11, 5.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., \url{http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/reed/docs/reed_c12/024.jpg}
Georgia and was awarded the A.B. degree in 1900 and the M.A. in 1902. While working on his M.A. degree Payne served as University Librarian and remained in the post until 1904.

Payne did postgraduate work at several institutions: Chicago, Harvard and Columbia but did not take any further degrees. He was first employed by the university as a tutor in history in 1901 and was granted full professor status in 1919. Payne served as Faculty Chairman of Athletics. The chairmanship was formerly occupied by S. V. Sanford, Payne was given the post when Sanford ascended to the university presidency. Payne was an active member of the History Department until his death in 1944. Payne taught the English Constitution class along with professors McPherson and McWhorter. In 1917 he offered a class in The French Revolution and Napoleon “emphasis placed upon the constitutional experiments of the French Revolution.” Payne continued to teach this popular course until his death. Other graduate courses taught by Payne were Tudor, Stuart, and modern British History.

Roswell Powell Stephens, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins

Roswell Powell Stephens, the second dean of the University of Georgia Graduate School, was born in Barnesville, Georgia in 1874. Stephens was educated at the Gordon Institute in Barnesville and entered the University of Georgia in 1894. He received the Bachelor of Arts degree from
the university in 1896. After graduation, Stephens taught in the public schools of Smithville, Georgia, and Andrew College in Cuthbert. Stephens received a scholarship to attend Johns Hopkins University in 1902 from which he received the Doctor of Philosophy degree in 1906. He served as an instructor in mathematics at Wesleyan College in Georgia and joined the faculty of the University of Georgia in 1907. Stephens was promoted to full professor in 1918 and served as head of the Department of Mathematics beginning in 1925. In 1928, Stephens was appointed Dean of the Graduate School, upon the resignation of Willis Bocock. During the Stephens tenure, the first Ph.D. degrees would be offered by the Graduate School. Stephens resigned as Dean of the Graduate School in 1943 and died in 1954.

The initial offerings of the Department of Mathematics at the graduate level were: “Differential Equations”, “Vector Analysis”, “Projective Geometry”, and “Theoretical Mechanics.” In order to major in mathematics, a student would have to take any three out of the four offerings. An original paper on a subject assigned by the department was also required. Two more classes would be added before the end of the decade: “Theory of Functions” in 1917-18, and “Analytical Geometry” in 1918-19. These courses would form the core of the mathematics graduate offerings until the late 1950s.
Charles Morton Strahan, C&M E, Sc.D. (Honorary), University of Georgia

Charles Morton Strahan headed the University of Georgia’s Civil Engineering Department for a remarkable forty-three years. Only the removal of the Civil Engineering program to Georgia Institute of Technology in 1934 would force the man to relinquish a department he helped create and loved. Although born in Virginia, Strahan came to Athens when he was fourteen. He entered the University of Georgia and graduated in 1883 with the degree of Civil and Mining Engineer. After receiving his degree Strahan served as a tutor in both English history and chemistry, according to Reed.\textsuperscript{35} This versatility continued when Strahan was appointed to the faculty. He served in the departments of ancient languages, modern languages, history, chemistry, English, mathematics, and civil engineering. The University of Georgia awarded Strahan the honorary degree of Doctor of Science (Sc.D.) in 1912.

Strahan also served as chairman of the State Highway Department and was responsible for drafting much state legislation on highway improvement. This versatile man, known to the students as “Little Charlie”, was also responsible for designing three well known buildings on the University of Georgia campus: Terrell Hall, LeConte Hall (now Meigs Hall),

\textsuperscript{35} Reed, \textit{Uncle Tom Reed’s Memoir of the University of Georgia}, 101.
and Academic Building. Strahan’s 1910 class in civil engineering covered many facets of engineering: masonry, bridges, irrigation, concrete, and roads. The student was required to present: “various essays and designs.” This class was the only one offered in civil engineering until 1927-28 when “Foundations and Dams” and “Special Reinforced Concrete Structures” were added, both classes were minors or could be a major if taken together. All the classes were taught by Strahan except for a class in Architecture which made a brief appearance taught by Ernest Lee Griggs, who had completed an engineering degree at Virginia Military Institute and an architecture degree at Columbia. As mentioned above, in 1934 the civil engineering program was moved to the Georgia Institute of Technology and Strahan moved to the Mathematics Department. As with so many of his colleagues of the first graduate faculty, Strahan retired in 1945 after sixty-two years of service to the university.

Henry Clay White, Sc.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (Honorary), Georgia

Henry Clay White was yet another native of Maryland who rendered valuable service to the University of Georgia. He served the institution for over fifty-five years, until his death in 1928. White graduated from the University of Virginia in 1870, White was the recipient of many honorary degrees: a Ph.D. from Virginia and one from Georgia, a D.C.L.

*University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1910,7.*
from the University of the South, LL.D. degrees from Illinois and Columbia, and a Sc.D. from Michigan. He taught chemistry for a year at the Maryland Institute in Baltimore, and then for another year at St. John’s College in Annapolis. He was appointed full professor of chemistry at the University of Georgia in 1872 at the age of twenty-four.

White was one of the pioneers of science in the postbellum South. When he arrived at the university he was confronted with a lack of enthusiasm and equipment. White stressed the connection between chemistry and agriculture, a move that ingratiated him to the public and assured the success of his department. As well as teaching, White served as State Chemist from 1880 until 1890. He was a member of numerous national and international professional associations, such as the American Chemical Society, and the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Due to his interest in agriculture, White was appointed president of the State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts at the University of Georgia in 1890, a position he held for seventeen years. It was due in large part to his effort in this position that the College of Agriculture was not separated from the University of Georgia, but became an integral part of it.
The first chemistry class offered by the newly formed Graduate School was an independent study class: "Opportunity is offered to a limited number of qualified students to pursue advanced work in chemistry... The nature of the advanced work will be determined by individual conference."  

The 1912-13 academic year saw the Chemistry Department offer two classes: "Analytical Chemistry: Quantitative Analysis" as a major, and "Analytical Chemistry: Qualitative and Quantitative" as a minor. The difference between the two courses is, for one, the difference in lab hours required. The major class required twenty-four hours of lab work per week and frequent conferences with the professor, the minor required twelve hours of lab work and conferences. The major course is also the more theoretical: "Although skill in manipulation is, of course, required, stress is laid upon mastering the chemical principles involved in Analytical Chemistry, rather than a proficiency in mechanical methods."  

White made numerous contributions to scholarly and professional journals and wrote a biography of University of Georgia founder, Abraham Baldwin: Abraham Baldwin, One of the Founders of the Republic, and Father of the University of Georgia, the First of American State Universities.

---

37 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1910, 7.
38 Ibid.
Thomas Jackson Woofter was born in Virginia in 1862. He determined that his interests lay in education and received an L.I. (Licensed Instructor) degree from Fairmont Normal College in West Virginia and an LL.B. from the University of West Virginia. He was granted the Master of Arts from Peabody College in 1893 and the Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1900. He worked as an educator in West Virginia and Mississippi before coming to Georgia in 1893 to assume the chair of mathematics at Mercer University in Macon. He left Mercer to become Professor of Psychology and Pedagogy at Georgia Normal and Industrial College in Milledgeville. He was offered the professorship of philosophy and education at the University of Georgia by university president Walter B. Hill in 1903. Woofter accepted the position and remained with the university until his death in 1938.

Although Woofter was a man of many interests: philosophy, mathematics, and psychology his real passion lay in the field of education. As the head of the newly created Department of Education, Woofter worked tirelessly to procure funding for the program. His greatest success in fund raising was receiving funds from the George Peabody Trust. in his request to the Peabody Fund he made the case for training in education at the university level rather than at a normal
school: “The state normal schools prepare teachers for only the elementary schools and now many high schools are springing up in our systems, and these demand college graduates as teachers.”

Woofter’s drive to obtain Peabody funding, not only for the University of Georgia and his alma mater Peabody College, but for the establishment of schools of education in colleges throughout the South, brought him into the presence of Theodore Roosevelt. Woofter sent a letter to Roosevelt outlining his ideas and plans and was invited to the White House. Roosevelt was sufficiently impressed with Woofter to be instrumental in obtaining Peabody funds for Georgia, which set up the Peabody School of Education. With the construction of a new building for the School of Education, Peabody Hall, Woofter’s title was changed from Director of the School of Education to Dean of the School of Education in 1911. He remained Dean of the College of Education until his retirement in 1934. Woofter published many articles and policy statements on education throughout his career as well as a textbook on plane and solid geometry.

Woofter’s first graduate offering in 1910 was a class simply entitled “Philosophy”. Judging by the content, this class was oriented more toward contemporary theories of

---

39 Thomas Jackson Woofter, quoted in Reed, History of the University of Georgia, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/reed/docs/ 2202.
education and sociology, such as Tufts and Dewey, rather than classical metaphysics and epistemology. Graduate education classes appear for the first time in regular session (as opposed to the Summer School) in 1915-16. Although under the heading of philosophy, classes such as "Education in the United States", taught by Woofter, are clearly in the realm of education as a discipline. Woofter offered a class in "Advanced History of Philosophy" in 1918-19, and this class seems to be more in line with what we would expect in a philosophy course: Plato, Bacon, and Marcus Aurelius and the notable inclusions of Spencer and Darwin. In the same year Woofter offered "Education in the United States" and "Public School Administration." In the 1922-23 session, George A. Hutchinson took over the duties of teaching philosophy and Woofter moved more in the direction of education, offering "Educational Sociology" in 1923-24.

Woofter had been a vocal proponent of the admission of women to the university. As he quite correctly pointed out: in a field such as education most of the practitioners were women. In Fall 1918, women were admitted to the College of Education.  Woofter was also the prime mover behind the University Summer School, which was primarily aimed at allowing school teachers to pursue continuing education. The classes could be taken on campus or by correspondence, or as

---

40 Women had been able to enroll in graduate classes from at least 1910. However, they were not eligible for a degree. The 1912-13 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin lists six women as graduate students.
the Graduate Bulletin puts it: *in absentia*. Woofter’s vision and dedication established the University of Georgia College of Education as one of the leading institutions in the South.

Conclusions

First, what of the men themselves? They were all Southerners (including the border states of Maryland and Kentucky); most of them were Virginians or Georgians; many of them would serve the University of Georgia for more than thirty years; only two of them, Joseph Lustrat and Thomas McHatton, were not Protestants, and all of them were married with children. Eight of the seventeen faculty were graduates of the University of Georgia. The fact that nearly half of the faculty was “home-grown” was not unusual at the time. As late as 1930, the University of Wisconsin had over 75 percent of its faculty that had received all or part of their graduate education at Wisconsin. The University of Chicago and Cornell University were similar with over 50 percent of their faculty home-grown.  

Five members of the first graduate faculty at the University of Georgia in 1910 held the Ph.D. degree. John Campbell (1888), John McPherson (1890), and Roswell Stephens (1906) received their doctoral degrees from Johns Hopkins

University. Robert Brooks (1911) and Thomas Woofter (1900) received their doctorates from Wisconsin and Chicago respectively. The majority of institutions listed in Edwin Slosson’s 1910 review of American higher education, Great American Universities, had moved to requiring faculty members to be holders of the Ph.D.. 42 At the University of Georgia in 1910, the percentage of graduate faculty holding a Ph.D. degree was 30 percent. It would hover around this level for the next two decades. 43 In 1941 the University of Georgia Graduate Council approved the resolution: “appointment to the graduate faculty be generally limited to persons who have a record of research continued beyond the Ph.D., or equivalent degree, as evidenced by publication through recognized scholarly channels.” 44

No members of the 1910 agriculture graduate faculty were holders of the Ph.D.. However, all of them were accomplished practitioners in the field, such as Fain in agronomy and McHatton in horticulture. The graduate courses in agriculture reflected the public service and outreach concepts instituted at the University of Georgia by Chancellor Walter B. Hill after his trip to the University of Wisconsin in 1904. Many leaders of Southern institutions, such as Hill, “embraced the elements of Progressivism in a concerted effort to make their

43 For instance, in 1920 there were thirty-two faculty members, eleven of which held the Ph.D. degree.
44 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Graduate Council, unpublished typescript, 1941.
institutions part of a process of state and regional economic recovery.” In such a milieu, the practical practitioner was to be preferred over the theoretical researcher.

The spirit of Progressivism had its downside too. In the quest of the useful and practical pure research may seem a waste of time. Certainly, the economically disadvantaged Southern institutions had to pursue a different tack than fabulously endowed institutions such as Harvard or Yale. James had asked: “Will any one pretend for a moment that the doctor’s degree is a guarantee that its possessor will be successful as a teacher?” Perhaps not, but the question posed by James has much in common with a view of a university as a generator of the useful and practical. Both viewpoints ignore the fact that the university had, by the early twentieth century, evolved beyond merely a place of instruction or a workshop. The pure research conducted at universities was becoming as much a form of public service and outreach as a new fertilizer or variety of cotton.

John Thelin points out that: “The Southern state universities did not have the luxury of pursuing advanced scholarship or doctoral programs. Rather, they focused on building a foundation of useful fields, primarily at the undergraduate level.” This was, certainly, a commendable

---

approach during the period 1880-1920. However, ideas such as this have an unfortunate way of becoming embedded in the institutional psyche. Just as James had failed to recognize that the university had evolved beyond its teaching mission, some adherents of the Progressive era view of higher education did not recognize the new age of graduate education and pure research. In this new world, the Ph.D. was not an affectation or a bauble. It was as Rudolph contended: a mark of scholarly competence and research skill.48

The “college culture” of the 1920s with its fraternities, football games, and raccoon coats glorified the undergraduate experience. Graduate students were marginalized by undergraduates and alumni as “grinds.”49 Indeed, society at large was enamored of the undergraduate experience as demonstrated by the enormous popularity of college novels in the 1920s. Thus, graduate education and research in the 1920s until after World War II had to compete and coexist with the demand for practical service and the overarching dominance of undergraduate education. This was certainly true at the University of Georgia. Not until the Cold War era would pure research, particularly of a scientific nature, gain prestige at universities. With this prestige Ph.D. holding faculty become the norm at institutions of all sizes.

There were many reasons that the graduate faculty, particularly the percentage of Ph.D. holders, did not increase markedly in the pre-World War II era at the University of Georgia. Georgia was a small, relatively poor, regional institution with limited facilities. This made it difficult to attract new faculty from the “great American universities.” Further, the cultural climate in the 1920s tended to favor the outgoing, popular, “booster” type of professor rather than the meticulous researcher. The notion of practical service to the state, advanced early in the twentieth century by Walter B. Hill, seems, by the late 1920s and early 1930s, to have ossified into a reluctance to do anything whose practicality was not immediately apparent. This was certainly a factor in the slow development of the Ph.D. degree at the University of Georgia and the growth of the graduate faculty.

In the next section we will investigate some of the aspects of the University of Georgia that affected the growth of graduate education. In the context of physical facilities the most important was the library. The formation of the Committee on Graduate Courses in 1910 and the establishment of the Graduate Faculty in 1940 were important developments. We will also discuss the Summer School from its beginning as continuing education for teachers to its eventual integration into the Graduate School.
The creation of the Graduate School in 1910 established a central authority to regulate and develop graduate education at the University of Georgia. This chapter will discuss four elements that directly influenced the Graduate School, for better or worse, during its early years. The Summer School, which started as continuing education for elementary and high school teachers, came under the aegis of the Graduate School in 1910. The Summer School represents an early effort by the Graduate School and graduate programs to provide public service to the state of Georgia: in this instance, to the elementary and high schools of Georgia.

The Graduate Council was a formalization of the Committee on Graduate Studies which had existed since the late nineteenth century. The Council was directly responsible for the development of the Doctor of Philosophy degree and early attempts at research promotion and funding. The development of the Graduate Faculty in 1940 provided a further distinction between graduate and undergraduate education, created a formal system of faculty involvement in
and governance of graduate matters, and added another dimension toward assuring the quality of graduate degrees.

The university library, while not a part of the Graduate School, was and is an integral part of graduate education and research. Unlike the three other elements in this chapter, the library situation had a negative effect on the growth of graduate education in the 1910-40 period. The quality and quantity of the collection limited course offerings and curriculum and hindered the development and growth of the Doctor of Philosophy degree. As will be seen, the problems with the library were the result of a complex set of variables. Fortunately, at the end of the period of the study, strong steps were taken to ameliorate the library problems.

The Phelps-Stokes Fellowship is notable for several reasons. The fellowship represents the earliest graduate fellowship at the University of Georgia. It represents a fellowship which has produced a useful body of research and has aided in the development of the careers of many prominent individuals. The Phelps-Stokes fellowship’s focus is on the problems facing black people in Georgia, particularly in rural areas. Thus, as with the Summer School, it represents a awareness that graduate education should not be merely an
academic, abstract exercise but that it should address and help remediate social problems.

The Summer School

University of Georgia Chancellor Walter B. Hill is reported to have asked rhetorically: “Why should the educational plant be idle all summer, the only product being a crop of hay?” What was later to become the University of Georgia Summer School actually had origins that predated the Hill Chancellorship. University Chancellor Boggs had proposed to the Board of Trustees in 1892 that funds be allocated to establish a five week long summer training session for teachers. The teacher training session was supported by the Gilmer Fund, George Peabody Fund, and $500 from the city of Athens. The summer session were established in “Rock College”, a facility several miles from the main campus. This structure had been started in 1859 to house the lower division students as part of the reorganization outlined in the Programme of an Enlarged Organization of the University of Georgia. After the Civil War, it served as the University High School. In the era before efficient transportation and communication, the summer training sessions would prove invaluable to the state’s teachers. The summer training sessions at Rock College were conducted from 1892 to 1894. The foundation of the State Normal School at the Rock College

1 Walter B. Hill reported in Thomas W. Reed, typescript page 2001A.
facility ended the University’s direct supervision with summer teacher training for several years, although many of the classes continued to be taught by university faculty members.

There remained a pressing need in the state for continuing education for teachers. In 1903, under the guidance of Hill, the University Summer School was founded. Again, the people of Athens came to the aid of the summer programs and helped to make the idea a reality. Hill appointed a Board of Directors to supervise the Summer School. David C. Barrow, who would succeed Hill as Chancellor, Mildred Lewis Rutherford, headmistress of the Lucy Cobb Institute, G. G. Bond, Athens Superintendent of Schools, E.R. Hodgson, a prominent businessman, and John H. Holder, editor of the Jackson Herald were named to the Board. The President of the State Normal School, Eugene C. Branson, was appointed Superintendent. The Summer School, as exemplified by its board members, would be a cooperative venture between the university, the State Normal School, and the community. The faculty of the Summer School were members of the University and State Normal School faculties, supplemented with leading educators from Georgia and other states. The success of the 1903 and 1904 sessions convinced the State to contribute five thousand dollars annually to the maintenance of the program. Thomas J. Wootter, who would go
on to found the University of Georgia College of Education, was appointed Superintendent in 1906. He would serve in this capacity for thirteen years. The length of the Summer School term went from five, to six, to eight, to nine, and then became a full 11 week term when it became integrated into the normal University academic year.

The Summer School was placed in the sphere of the newly founded Graduate School in 1910. The 1912-13 Bulletin states:

The University does not undertake to provide graduate courses in the Summer School, such provision being in the hands of the Board of Directors of the Summer School. But the University guarantees the quality of such graduate courses as are given.

The above statement, ostensibly written by Willis H. Bocock, also delineated the process by which a graduate degree could be obtained through the Summer School. The student would have to attend at least three Summer Sessions, which did not have to be contiguous. During the remainder of the year, the student was expected to carry on his or her studies under the direction of the professors of the respective courses. The professors were expected to submit to the Committee on Graduate Courses a report on the work done by the student in

---

2 Woofter's Superintendentship was not contiguous: In 1915, while Woofter was in Europe, Professor J.S. Stewart held the post. Howard W. Odum was Superintendent in 1918 and 1919. Odum would go on to attain great distinction as the founder of the University of North Carolina Department of Sociology. Woofter served again as Superintendent in 1920 and 1921.

3 University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1912-13, 13.
class and in absentia. When approved by the Committee on
Graduate Courses, the program of study needed approval by the
university faculty. Thus, even though Bocock’s statement
above endeavors to minimize the involvement of the Graduate
School, the gatekeeping function (and quality control)
ultimately rests in the Graduate Dean’s office. Students
pursuing an M.A. degree in the Summer School were expected to
write a thesis in connection with each major course.

Each major summer course which was completed counted as
one third of a major. The divisions of material were set up
so that a student could enter during any session: they did
not have to follow a lockstep process. The “History of the
South” course taught by Robert Preston Brooks is a good
example of this:

The history of the South has been divided into six
periods, and for each period three standard works are
listed. Each student will select one period and be
required to prepare for examination in the books listed
in that group.¹

The course was counted as one third of a major, so, after
three summers the student would have completed a full major
with a different area of focus each session. The proviso is
given in the course description: “The seminar work is
designed to familiarize the student with the important
sources of southern history, so far as the University library

¹University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1913-14, 16.
facilities permit. . . .” Also notable is that the class is advertised as a “combination of the ordinary lecture course with seminar work.” There were two hours of seminar per week. The seminars would consist of students reading papers on subjects that had been assigned to them and a group discussion of the paper and topic. There were four lecture hours per week and a total of twenty lecture topics.

Other classes offered during the initial years of supervision of the Summer School by the Graduate School were “History of the English Drama to the End of the Elizabethan Period”, “History of Early English Civilization”, “Modern English Syntax”, and “Principles of Education” as majors and German, French, Latin, and zoology as minors. “Principles of Education” was on a three year cycle, as with all the majors. In 1913, “The Psychological Basis of Education” was offered followed in 1914 by “The Biological and Organic Basis of Education, and “The Social Principles and Basis of Education” in 1915. “The Biological and Organic Basis of Education” course has a marked Spencerian/Social Darwinism bent that is typical of the period:

A study of the principles underlying the biological foundations of education and the evolution of society, with special reference to education and growth. 1. Genetic Philosophy of education [sic]. 2. The Biological Foundations of Education. 3. Primitive Education and

Ibid.
Folk-Ways and Folk-Life. 4. Eugenics, Heredity, and Education. 5. Organic Education—the organic unity of the body and the mind of the individual and society.

Courses in American history, agriculture, and mathematics joined the offerings during the first decade of Graduate School oversight, all on the three-year cycle. As mentioned in the section on degrees, Mary D. Lyndon was the first woman to be a recipient of a degree from the University of Georgia. She has granted the M.A. degree in 1914 as a result of Summer School work. Lyndon majored in English literature with minors in education and history. In the Summer 1914 session 6 of 18 students pursuing a graduate degree were women.

In 1935 the Summer School ceased to be an independent entity and became an official part of the academic year as Summer Quarter. Degree-seeking enrollment in the Summer School had gone from eighteen in 1914 to two hundred fifty-two students pursuing six different Master’s degrees in 1934. The Summer School by 1934 had evolved but its focus was still continuing education for teachers. Hill’s stated aim of giving year-long use to the educational plant and implied aim of increasing the university’s outreach out to new populations had been realized.

One unfortunate consequence of the absorption of the Summer School into the regular academic calendar was a new stringency about the residency requirement. No longer would students be able to count three consecutive summer sessions as a fulfillment: the quarters now had to be consecutive. For the Master’s degree:

The general residence requirement for the master’s degree is one academic year, or three quarters, with a minimum attendance of thirty weeks. This residence requirement may not be decreased by extension work or by work done elsewhere.¹

There could be exceptions though, as in the Ed.D. degree:

The Graduate Council may also modify the residence requirement in individual cases so that only two consecutive quarters in residence will be required provided that approved field work for the third quarter be accepted in lieu of a regular quarter in residence.²

Teacher training would continue in the summer but its nature would be that of certification and continuing education rather than degree seeking. Naturally, by 1935 the availability of higher education in Georgia had changed from what it had been during the early days of the Summer School. When the Georgia Board of Regents was formed in 1932 there were three universities, six senior colleges, three junior colleges, three colleges for Blacks, and nine A&M schools.

¹ University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1938, 12.
² Ibid., 1938, 8.
Five of the institutions were specifically Normal Schools/Teacher’s Colleges.⁹

The Summer School shows the recognition that graduate education should be available to people who could not be full-time scholars and that graduate education often requires a flexibility that would be impractical at the undergraduate level. Since the main focus of the Summer School was advanced training for teachers, there is also the recognition that providing graduate education served a definite public service component. The Summer School had helped graduate education at the University of Georgia reach outside the state’s borders: 12 students enrolled for Summer 1934 were from out of state. For most of the years between 1910-1934, Summer School graduate enrollment was twice that of the regular session. The large enrollment at Summer School helped offset years when regular enrollment was pitifully small, such as 1918 and 1919 which had, respectively, six and two students. The large enrollments during summer gave viability to the graduate program as a whole.

With the creation of the Graduate School in 1910, the Committee on Graduate Courses which had existed since the nineteenth century came under control of the Dean of the Graduate School. The Committee, whose size varied from seven to twelve members in the years 1910-1940, was chaired by the Dean. The members were appointed by the President/Chancellor from the various divisions of the university: agriculture, education, liberal arts, science, and later, commerce. However, this was not a hard and fast rule. In 1936, for instance, two members were from the Department of Chemistry. The major functions of the Committee on Graduate Courses were: the approval of course proposals, the codification of degree requirements, the review of candidates for degrees, overseeing admissions, allocating funds, and hearing student petitions. The Committee was also involved in admissions decisions: "Admission to the Graduate School is granted to graduates of colleges of good standing. Other persons of suitable age and attainments may also be admitted by special permission of the Committee on Graduate Courses." ¹⁰

The Committee on Graduate Courses was a stepping stone to the position of Dean of the Graduate School. George Hugh Boyd, who succeeded Roswell Powell Stephens as the third

¹⁰ University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1920-21, 2.
Dean, served on the Committee from 1936 until he assumed the deanship in 1945. The names: Committee on Graduate Courses, and Graduate Council, were used interchangeably during the early 1930s. In the 1932-33 Bulletin both titles are used. After 1934, the term: Committee on Graduate Courses, ceased to be used. The offering of the Ph.D. in 1935 made it apparent that a more complex organizational structure would be needed to supervise advanced graduate studies. The Graduate Council officially became the twelve member Graduate and Research Council in 1938 (although the term Graduate Council continued to be used in most instances). During the 1940-41 academic year, the informal subcommittee structure of the Council became standardized as: the Executive Committee, the Thesis Committee, and the Research Committee.

The deliberations of the Graduate Council in 1935 concerning the newly offered Doctor of Philosophy degree are an interesting insight into the issues facing the institution. Former Dean, but still Council member, Willis H. Bocock, proposed that thorough documentation of the departments offering the Doctor of Philosophy degree be carried out. The documentation should include the academic biographies of the faculty, complete accounts of the research carried out in the department, plans for course offerings leading to the degree with supporting minors offered by other departments, an accounting of additional personnel, library

---

"University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin, 1932-33, 1."
and laboratory facilities, and costs to support the degree offering. Bocock proposed that a special committee be formed to analyze similar programs at sister institutions and prepare a paper for the Board of Regents reporting this information and the standards set by the Association of American Universities, American Council of Education, and the American Association of University Professors. The special committee might: "Possibly ask the Regents for an adequate survey by Amer. Council of Educ. as to our qualifications. Finally after all this report to Grad Council + Faculty [sic] and report resolutions."\(^{12}\)

Council member George Hugh Boyd echoed Bocock’s recommendations but also asked that departments that wished to offer the Doctor of Philosophy present reasons why their department should offer the degree. Boyd also expressed concern that departments offering the Ph.D. degree: "avoid crippling of undergraduate work or retarding restoration of salary scale."\(^{13}\) Austin Southwick Edwards, of the Psychology Department, suggested that departments offering the degree delineate the prerequisites for entry into the degree program.\(^{14}\) As with the other members of the Committee, Edwards expressed concern over facilities, faculty, and staff resources. An interesting point was brought by by Council

\(^{12}\) Handwritten memorandum of the Graduate Council, 1935.

\(^{13}\) Ibid.

\(^{14}\) Edwards and Greene would serve on the Graduate Council for over fifteen years: 1935-1951.
member James Edward Greene, the committee should study: "State + regional [sic] supply of and demand for trained workers in several fields." Greene also expressed concern for the: "Prospective relative social utility" of the doctoral offering. Greene echoed Bocock’s call for documentation of the academic qualifications of the department wishing to offer the Ph.D. degree. He also called for an evaluation of the department faculty’s research and publications, and their aptitude and interest in supervising doctoral work. From the above it is obvious that the decision to offer the Doctor of Philosophy degree presented the Council with formidable challenges. No longer would the Council be able to concern itself only with the University of Georgia; it had to think on a regional and national scale. The Council also had to confront the primary issue that would retard doctoral education at the University of Georgia for the next twenty years: the lack of faculty and facilities.

A major consequence of the recognition of the demands of graduate education was the formation of the Graduate faculty in 1940. In 1910, the faculty was so small that it would have been ridiculous to demarcate undergraduate and graduate faculty. Many departments consisted of only one full-time faculty member. Where there was more than one, the senior member would teach graduates. A decade later, in 1920, there

---

15 Handwritten memorandum of the Graduate Council, 1935.
16 Ibid.
were still only 32 full-time faculty members. The expansion of degree offerings and faculty in the late 1920s and early 1930s created the need for a system of faculty involvement in governance. Again, in the early years there was no need for this, faculty members were intimately involved in all aspects of the university: admissions, housing, registration, records, finance, and student discipline as well as academic concerns. The Graduate Faculty was established to address those concerns specific to graduate study. The appointment to the Graduate Faculty followed a process similar to that of today. The members of the Graduate Faculty in a department made a recommendation to the Dean of the Graduate School that an individual be named to the Graduate Faculty. The Graduate Dean reviewed the nomination and, if approved, sent the nomination to the President. The President, if satisfied with the nomination, made the appointment to the Graduate Faculty. One criterion for membership in the Graduate Faculty was that the individual "have a record of research continued beyond the Ph.D., or equivalent degree, as evidenced by publication through recognized scholarly channels." The Graduate Faculty approved an emendation to this requirement that allowed the Dean to set aside the Ph.D. degree requirement upon recommendation of the Executive Committee.

---

17 Recommendations to be Proposed for Consideration by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty, unpublished typescript, 1941.
18 If this regulation had been strictly enforced, it would have excluded the former Graduate School Dean, Willis H. Bocock and the future Dean, George Hugh Boyd from the Graduate Faculty. Bocock’s highest earned degree was an M.A., Boyd’s was an M.S.. Bocock had an honorary LL.D. and Boyd an honorary Sc.D..
Committee also proposed: “That the teaching load for members of the Graduate Faculty be limited to 10 hours per week and that further limitations be made where such faculty member has other University duties.”  

The formal establishment of the Graduate Faculty adopted the organizational structure for the Graduate Council which had been informally instituted in 1935. The Graduate Council, whose members, save for the Graduate Dean, would now be elected by the Graduate Faculty had three major committees: the Executive Committee, the Thesis Committee, and the Research Committee. The report of the Special Committee on Graduate Faculty Reorganization also recommended: “If feasible, a subcommittee of the University Library Committee will act as a Graduate Library Committee.”

The Executive Committee was charged with making: “recommendations concerning the policy of the Graduate School and general rules governing that school.” The specific duties of the Executive Committee were:

a. To recommend regulations governing admission of students to graduate study.

b. To advise the President and the Dean concerning additions to the Graduate Faculty.

---

19 Ibid.
20 Report of the Special Committee on Graduate Faculty Reorganization, unpublished typescript, January 29, 1941.
21 Ibid.
c. To recommend policy toward, and relations with, other educational institutions in the state.

d. To approve the various degrees offered in the Graduate School; that is, to review old degrees and approve new ones.

e. To review all old and new courses in the Graduate School.

f. To pass on graduate scholarships and fellowships.

g. To pass on all candidates for graduate degrees; to approve granting of graduate degrees.\textsuperscript{22}

The functions of the Executive Committee are today divided among several standing committees of the Graduate Council of the University of Georgia Graduate School.\textsuperscript{23}

The Thesis Committee and the Research Committee were the other two subcommittees of the Graduate Council. The duties of the Thesis Committee were: “the approving of all thesis subjects and the plans proposed for treating those subjects.”\textsuperscript{24} Another charge of the Thesis Committee was an examination of current thesis procedures with an eye to systematizing, updating, and creating a uniform style and format for University of Georgia theses. One interesting aspect of the Thesis Committee’s duties was: “To advise with the director of any thesis the subject of which involves

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{23} See Graduate Faculty Bylaws, http://www.gradsch.uga.edu/For_Faculty/Graduate_Faculty_Bylaws.html.

\textsuperscript{24} Report of the Special Committee on Graduate Faculty Reorganization, unpublished typescript, January 29, 1941.
matter’s outside the director’s special knowledge.”

No doubt this was due to the limited size of the faculty which left lacunae in many areas of specialization within a department. The Executive Committee put forth in 1941 a resolution that all theses must be supervised by a member of the Graduate Faculty. A related resolution proposed that only Graduate faculty members be permitted to teach graduate courses. However, the exigencies of the time moderated the adoption of these resolutions:

Members of the University Faculty who are not members of the Graduate faculty may give courses for graduate credit provided special approval be given by the Executive Committee on the request of the Dean of the College.

Similarly, non-Graduate Faculty members of the University faculty would be permitted to direct theses if approval was obtained from the Executive Committee on the request of the Dean of the respective College. This variance was to be only for the 1941-42 academic year: "The concessions made above are for the purpose of giving the schools and colleges ample time in which to try to bring all of their work up to the new standards." However, due the onset of World War II, the concessions were continued until after the war.

25 Ibid.
26 Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty Minutes, February 12, 1941, unpublished typescript.
27 Ibid.
The function of the Research Committee: “will be chiefly concerned with encouraging and aiding research at the University.”\textsuperscript{28} Its duties were:

a. To keep on file a record of all local research and publications, reporting periodically to the Graduate Faculty on the progress of research at the University.

b. To assist research workers in getting material and equipment for their investigations and in publishing the results of their work.

c. To recommend to the authorities some plan for lightening the teaching load of instructors engaged in serious research.

d. To coordinate, whenever desirable and possible, research activities in different branches of the University System.\textsuperscript{29}

The Research Committee made a number of recommendations to the Graduate Faculty early in 1941 which were approved. Most of these were to establish the logistics of research funding. Some of the funding for faculty research was to come from that already allocated for graduate assistants and visiting scholars. Publication of research results was an important issue for the Research Committee. Requests for funds required a detailed statement of needs and expected results, approved by the head of the department and then sent to the Research Committee.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.
Committee. The Research Committee then directed approved requests to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Research Committee recommended the publication of a bibliography of works by members of the University Faculty. University President Harmon Caldwell allocated three hundred dollars for the production of the bibliography.  

The establishment of the Graduate Faculty and the refinement of the Graduate Council into an organization with established rather than ad hoc subcommittees marked an important step in distinguishing graduate from undergraduate education at the University of Georgia. The development of these two organizations demonstrates an understanding of the growing importance of research to the university and in graduate education. The majority of research authority would remain with the Graduate School and the Graduate Council until the creation of the position of Vice-President for Research in 1967.

30 Research Committee Minutes, February 20, 1941, unpublished typescript.
31 Dean George H. Boyd in a memorandum to the Georgia Board of Regents in 1943 proposed: "1. That the position of the Dean of the Graduate school, as provided in the Statutes, be changed to that of Dean of the Graduate School and Director of Research. 2. That all requests for funds for the specific support of research in the University be made through the Graduate School. 3. That all money allotted to research in the University be set up as a part of the budget of the Graduate School. 4. That the administration of all research funds which are not earmarked for any specific college, school, department or individual in the University be at the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Graduate faculty." These proposals were approved by the Board of Regents. George Hugh Boyd, unpublished typescript memorandum, 1943.
32 In 1960 the Graduate School instituted a Associate Dean and Director of Research position. Robert Anderson McRorie would hold this position until the formation of the Office of the Vice President for Research in 1967.
Erasmus commented about the Oxford University of his time:

It is wonderful what a harvest of old volumes is flourishing here on every side; there is so much of erudition, not common and trivial, but recondite accurate and ancient, both Greek and Latin, that I should not wish to visit Italy, except for the gratification of traveling.\(^\text{277}\)

Indeed, the library has always been the center of institutions of higher learning. From the Library and Museum of Alexandria through the great Medieval and Renaissance universities of Bologna, Paris, and Oxford to the present day the university library has been the locus of higher research. In discussing the nature of the emerging research university in the late nineteenth century United States Rudolph commented:

A commitment to the needs of scholarship meant that the universities expressed their purposes no longer in chapel, no longer in the senior year with the president on moral and intellectual philosophy. That course was now a half-dozen subjects spread throughout the curriculum, and beginning to overshadow the chapel itself were the science laboratories and the libraries,

as necessary to the new dispensation as the chapel had been to the old.\textsuperscript{34}

As central to the mission of the research university as the library may have been, most institutions in the late nineteenth century had woefully inadequate holdings. This inadequacy would continue to plague many institutions into the twentieth century. In 1914 Professor Robert Preston Brooks of the University of Georgia advised prospective students for his "History of the South" course that historical sources would be investigated: "so far as the University library facilities permit. . . ."\textsuperscript{35}

In 1804 University of Georgia president Josiah Meigs reported to the Trustees that a small library had been started at the institution. The books were purchased with an allocation of one thousand dollars that the Trustees had granted in 1800 for books and scientific apparatus. The university received permission from the Georgia Legislature in 1806 to hold a lottery to raise money to purchase more books. It does not appear that the lottery was ever held and Meigs' scientific bent had biased the acquisitions to a scientific rather than literary scope.\textsuperscript{36} The University of Georgia Library grew slowly in the antebellum period. Sporadic purchases and gifts of books such as that from Georgia governors George R. Gilmer and James Jackson, and the

\textsuperscript{34} Rudolph, \textit{The American College and University, a History}, 348.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin}, 1914-15,16.
\textsuperscript{36} Coulter, \textit{College Life in the Old South}, 52.
British government increased the collection. The university boasted in 1840 that, aside from the University of Virginia and the University of South Carolina, it had more books than any other college in the South or West. The library contained thirteen thousand volumes in 1860.\footnote{Ibid., 53.}

However, the university library apparently did not entirely satisfy the needs of the students. The two literary societies, Phi Kappa and Demosthenian, devoted large parts of their resources, time, and pride on their respective libraries. The literary society libraries were more varied in their holdings than the university library. The holdings of the Phi Kappa library showed a decided preference for literary subjects (including history and philosophy) over scientific topics. In addition, the literary society libraries maintained subscriptions to periodicals such as the Edinburgh Review, Harper's Monthly, the Southern Literary Messenger, the Spectator, and the Tattler. In contrast to the friendly and settled nature of the society libraries, the university library did not receive a permanent home until 1861. The new building which housed the library, as well as a large lecture hall and the university museum, was an elegant three story structure in the Greek Revival style. The library room, which measured sixty by fifty feet, was encircled by built-in bookcases and alcoves.\footnote{The building survives today as the north end of the Academic Building.}
Unfortunately, the completion of the new library building coincided with the start of the Civil War. Although official university operations ceased in 1863, the library remained open and used by the public. University Chancellor Andrew A. Lipscomb provided the staffing remarking: “I have generally spent six or eight hours each day in the service of the library, giving such assistance to readers and students as I deemed in accordance with the duties you had assigned me.” Although some losses were reported by the society libraries and the university library during and immediately after the war, the bulk of the collections remained on campus. Financial constraints prohibited any additions to the library for a long period after the war. In 1874, University Board of Visitors commented:

The College library, we are sorry to say, is inadequate for the wants of the institution. There has been almost no increase in the number of volumes since the war. It is impossible for either officers or students to keep pace with the rapid advancement of science in these modern days without constant accessions to the library. To be ten years behind the times in this period of amazing progress is an evil not to be endured.

One proposal to alleviate the financial constraints was to charge each student a five dollar per year library fee. This

---

39 Andrew A. Lipscomb to the University Trustees, quoted in Elizabeth LaBoone, “History of the University of Georgia Library”, (M.A. thesis, the University of Georgia, 1956), 42.
40 Report of the Board of Visitors to the University of Georgia, July 1, 1874 as quoted in LaBoone, History of the University of Georgia Library, 65.
proposal was adopted in 1875 and yielded one thousand twelve dollars that year. The five dollar library fee would have a long life, lasting until the late 1920s. For several years after the introduction of the library fee, a portion of the money raised was given to the departments to purchase specialized books for their own use. This resulted in widely distributed, specialized collections and did not enhance the general library. The University Library Committee proposed in 1899: “that the small funds produced annually by the fees paid by the students should in justice be spent on the general library, and not on technical books which cannot be handled by undergraduate students.”

As the library grew in the late nineteenth century it became apparent that the room in the 1862 Library Building was inadequate. The university library had absorbed the collections of the literary societies and the move was made to absorb the departmental libraries into the general collection. Further, there was a growing feeling that: “many of the volumes were valuable only as curiosities, and rightly belonged in the museum, rather than the library.” As on so many other occasions, George Foster Peabody came to the aid of the university. Peabody, through the General Education Board, gave fifty thousand dollars for the construction of a new library building. The new building, which opened in 1904,
was designed to hold sixty thousand volumes as well as work and study areas. The university appointed the first professional librarian, Duncan Burnet, in 1905 and he was given faculty rank, an unusual distinction at the time. The new library opened with a collection of about thirty thousand books. However, a great many of them were the “curiosities” mentioned above rather than current works. Twenty years later the collection had grown to sixty thousand but it was still marked by uneven quality. The 1925-26 annual report by the Librarian bemoaned the fact that the university’s holdings were less than half of what would be expected in institutions of similar size. The library fee, which had remained constant since 1875, had not kept pace with increasing prices yet this was the primary source of book purchasing funds. In the late 1920s only the University of Mississippi of twelve principal Southern universities had a smaller book purchasing budget than Georgia. The ten other institutions had book purchasing budgets from two to six times that of Georgia.

The inadequacy of the library was a serious impediment to the growth of graduate education at the University of Georgia. There was much discussion in the late 1920s about offering the Doctor of Philosophy degree but how could a library which could not even support Master’s programs satisfy the needs of doctoral researchers? Of course it could not and this was painfully clear to University Chancellor
Acceptance into the Association of American Universities was questionable due, to a large extent, the meagerness of the library and laboratory facilities. The Board of Visitors had pointed this problem out in 1915, five years after the formation of the Graduate School: “This university can never be expected to do the graduate work it is fitted to do in every way except as to library facilities, until the library facilities are supplied.”43 The situation had not changed for the better by the late 1920s. Not only did the lack of library resources hinder graduate education, it also limited faculty research. Any aspirations to be a research university would be dashed by the lack of facilities for graduate student and faculty research.

The 1910 Graduate Bulletin lists over 100 periodicals which were available on campus to “advanced students.” The periodicals covered a wide range. Many were prominent journals still published today. Commendable as the journal offerings were, this was only a small segment of what was needed for serious research. But by the late 1920s the library had begun to outgrow the 1904 library building. The collections had grown from donations but many of the books were old editions or works not of interest to contemporary researchers. What the library needed was not gifts of private

43 Report of the Board of Visitors of the Trustees of the University of Georgia, June, 1915, 8-9.
libraries of older books, but money to buy new books. Former Graduate School Dean Bocock recognized this problem and set up the Willis H. Bocock Fund in 1933. The income from the fund was to be used to acquire books in the field of international relations, a field which had become an avocation of Bocock in his later years. Other benefactors, such as the Alumni Society, presented the library with generous gifts. Some of the money from the benefactors was used to purchase Georgiana and documents pertaining to Southern history, including the Confederate Constitution, which were, certainly, commendable expenditures.

The library building was given a much needed extension in 1937 but the increased floor space did nothing to alleviate complaints. The small staff was often criticized for incompetence, the card catalog was described as antiquated, and the noise level: "so noisy that only a stone deaf person could study. . . ."44 The Georgia Board of Regents requested a study of the library facilities at the University of Georgia in 1938.45 Prominent among the investigating committee was Louis Round Wilson from the University of North Carolina. Wilson was the founder of the School of Library Science at North Carolina in 1931. The committee was charged by the Regents with discovering the problems and their causes

44 Red and Black, March 31, 1939.
45 In 1938, the University of Georgia, Agnes Scott College, Columbia Theological seminary, Emory University, Georgia School of Technology, and the High Museum and Art School drew up an agreement for the sharing of library and laboratory facilities. See Pierson, Graduate Work in the South, 113.
and formulating a plan to eliminate them. The most shocking aspect of the report by the investigating committee revealed that there was no formal structure in place to administer the library. There was the Faculty Library Committee, but its duties were ill-defined and its meetings infrequent. There were still nine departmental libraries which had never been integrated with the collection of the general library as well as three satellite libraries. In the 1932-37 period the University of Georgia library acquisitions were at the bottom of the list of thirteen Southern institutions, representing only three and one third percent of the university budget.

The major recommendation of the committee was that the library should be brought into the general administrative structure and policy of the university. Further recommendations were that the chief librarian report to the university president; that the Faculty Library Committee have a definite scope of responsibility and serve as the liaison between the library and the faculty; the library should receive seven percent of the university budget for several years to bring the collection up to an acceptable level; a new building should be planned; and library staff should be expanded and better paid. A new Director of Libraries, Ralph Halstead Parker, was appointed in 1940. Parker immediately recognized that the funding for the library was totally inadequate. A large deficit was created when a special grant
from the General Education Board was withdrawn. Parker appeared before the Executive Committee of the Graduate Council in August 1941 to request funds from the Special Graduate Fund. The Executive Committee approved the request with the three provisions that:

1. This action to be taken only as a last resort after other means have failed.
2. No publicity be given this for fear the Regents may think the special fund is not needed.
3. Dr. Parker so arrange his 1942-43 budget that he make up for the 1941-42 loss in purchases.  

It would continue to be an uphill battle: the library would work the next two decades to realize the recommendations of the investigating committee.

The Phelps-Stokes Fellowship

The Phelps-Stokes Fellowship was the first graduate fellowship or scholarship established after the founding of the Graduate School in 1910. Caroline Phelps Stokes was a wealthy heiress who was born in New York City in 1847. Stokes grew up amidst the dedicated philanthropy of her parents. The Stokes family was involved in abolition, temperance, biblical tract societies, and education for blacks. Miss Stokes never married but devoted her life to service,  

Graduate Council Executive Committee, Minutes August 5, 1941, unpublished typescript.
contributing to institutions as diverse as the Tuskegee Institute and the Constantinople Women's College. When she died in 1909 she left the bulk of her estate to establish the Phelps-Stokes Fund for the improvement of tenements and the education of minorities and poor whites. Caroline Phelps Stokes' sister, Olivia, became a major contributor to and guiding light of the Fund until her death in 1927.

The Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund approached the University of Georgia in 1911 to establish a fellowship for the study of the conditions of Southern blacks. The Trustees voted to direct the treasurer, as soon as the condition of the treasury warrants it, to pay the sum of $12,500 to the Treasurer of the University of Georgia and the same amount to the Treasurer of the University of Virginia for the establishment of Fellowships for the study of the negro, on the terms of the following resolution: . . . it is the conviction of the Trustees that one of the best methods of forwarding this purpose is to provide means to enable Southern youth of broad sympathies to make scientific study of the negro and his adjustment to American civilization.47

Under the conditions of the proposal the University should appoint annually a Fellow to pursue advanced studies in the area indicated above. The Fellow would be appointed by the

47 Minutes of the University of Georgia Prudential Committee, December 8, 1911, unpublished typescript.
President of the University and work under the direction of
the departments of Economics, Education, History or
Sociology. Initially, the Fellowship yielded five hundred
dollars and the Fellow was required to prepare a thesis or
paper on the results of their research.48 The work would be
published with the assistance of the Fund.

The Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund granted the
President of the University of Georgia: “The right to make
all necessary regulations, not inconsistent with the spirit
of and letter of these resolutions. . . .”49 Four years after
the commencement of the Fellowship, it was to be restricted
to graduate students only.50 The first Fellow, Thomas Jackson
Woofter Jr., was appointed by University Chancellor David C.
Barrow in 1913.51 Woofter, a 1912 graduate of the University,
was placed under the direction of Robert Preston Brooks of
the History Department. Woofter decided to base his research
on: “The Negroes of Athens, Georgia.” The nature of Athens as
a university town provided, to Woofter, a unique area of
study.

Woofter studied 1224 families in 1018 homes, or 4798
persons. In his study he investigated home ownership, health

48 The fellowship had its first increase to in 1969 to $900. The stipend
is currently $5000.
49 Minutes of the University of Georgia Prudential Committee, December 8,
1911, unpublished typescript.
50 The first Phelps-Stokes Fellow who completed a graduate degree while
a fellow was Hoke Smith O’Kelley who received his M.A. in 1915.
51 The first Fellow was the son of University of Georgia Professor of
Philosophy and Education, Thomas Jackson Woofter.
conditions, schools, finances, labor conditions, and social organizations. The book was well received and the University received many requests for it. Woofter would go on to write several other books on the race issue in his later career such as *Negro Migration; Changes in Rural Organization and Population of the Cotton Belt* (1920), *The Basis of Racial Adjustment* (1925), and *Negro Problems in Cities: a Study* (1928). Woofter set a trend for the recipients of the Phelps-Stokes Fellowship in the following years. The next four fellows continued Woofter’s investigation of blacks in Athens and Clarke County. In 1920 Ruth Reed became the first woman to receive the Fellowship and reached outside of Athens and Clarke County to study “The Negro Women of Gainesville, Georgia.” In subsequent years the studies reached outside of Georgia and became concerned with general issues.

In later years the Phelps-Stokes Fellowship would be extended to the departments of Agricultural Economics, Political Science, and Social Work. The Phelps-Stokes Fellowship is the oldest fellowship at the University of Georgia. It has fulfilled its founders’ intentions and has helped create a body of useful research. Further, it has encouraged the careers of individuals such as Woofter, and later recipients such as Ruth Reed (1920), John William Fanning (1927), and Rollin Chambliss (1934), to continue research in the field of sociology after completing the

---

1985.
Fellowship. Reed went on to publish such works as: The Modern Family (1929), The Illegitimate Family in New York City; its Treatment by Social and Health Agencies (1934), and The Single Woman (1942). Fanning’s Phelps-Stokes essay Negro Migration, marked the start of a lifetime of work that would be devoted to rural development. Fanning later served as the University of Georgia's first Vice President for Services, founder and first director of UGA's Institute of Community and Area Development, and cofounder of Leadership Georgia. The Phelps-Stokes Fellowship continues to be one of the most prestigious fellowships offered by the University of Georgia Graduate School and has remained true to the wishes of its founders.
CHAPTER VIII

Conclusion

The turmoil of the years before the entry of the United States into World War II had a profound effect on the development of graduate education at the University of Georgia. This coupled with the threat of and eventual loss of accreditation led Graduate Dean George H. Boyd to summarize:

The Executive Committee of the faculty immediately passed a resolution that no more students would be admitted to candidacy for the doctor’s degrees until that situation [loss of accreditation] was cleared up. The war emergency has made it necessary to continue that regulation and at the present time no persons are being admitted for candidacy for these degrees.¹

The university, which had granted its first two Doctor of Philosophy degrees the previous year had now suspended further work on the degree. The decline in graduate enrollment and activity was not unique to the University of Georgia. University of North Carolina Graduate Dean William

¹ George Hugh Boyd to Mary Bynum Pierson, in Pierson, Graduate Work in the South, 113. Robert Oliver Nelson was bestowed with the degree Doctor of Philosophy in August, 1943. He had already been admitted to candidacy before the resolution of the Executive Committee. There were three thousand two hundred ninety Doctor of Philosophy degrees conferred nationwide in 1940. In 1900 there had been three hundred forty-two conferred, in 1910, four hundred nine, in 1920, five hundred thirty-two, in 1930, two thousand twenty-four. See Henry G. Badger, Summary of Statistics of Higher Education, 1939-40, (Washington, D.C.; U.S. Office of Education, 1942), 2.
Whatley Pierson remarked: “It would seem that demand for war services and teaching services has caused a ‘raid’ upon graduate students.”  

Figures at Georgia would bear out Pierson’s assessment. The Spring, 1941 commencement had seventeen students upon whom graduate degrees were conferred. The Spring 1943 Commencement conferred degrees upon seven students. Regular Session enrollment went from one hundred thirty one in the 1941-42 academic year to sixty-two in the 1942-43 year to forty-one in the 1943-44 year. Due to falling enrollment and wartime conservation, the University of Georgia Graduate Bulletin was not published for the 1944-45 academic year.

In 1940 there were twenty-one Southern institutions, including the University of Georgia, that offered graduate degrees through an organized graduate school. As mentioned above, the first two Doctor of Philosophy degrees were conferred by the University of Georgia in 1940. For comparison, the University of North Carolina granted thirty-three doctorates that year, the University of Virginia, twenty-six, and the University of Florida, four. Southern institutions, uniformly, still suffered from lack of funds and cultural isolation from northeastern institutions up to World War II. The formation of the Conference of Deans of Southern Graduate Schools in 1927, of which the University of

---

Georgia Graduate School was a founding member, was a recognition of specific regional problems related to graduate education. One of the first actions of the Conference of Deans of Southern Graduate Schools was to formulate administrative, qualitative, and quantitative standards for graduate degrees. Dean Pierson of the University of North Carolina Graduate school summed up the problem facing Southern institutions:

the difference between Southern graduate schools in my judgment is not so much in requirements and procedures, but in the quality of the work accomplished, the fidelity with which standards of excellence are observed in daily practice, in the graduate tradition that is established in several institutions, in the graduate competence and activity of faculties, in the size, richness and research character of their library collections, in their laboratory equipment, in their funds for aid of research and for publication of their productive output. In a word, the difference among them and between them and certain leading institutions in the country is in comparative excellence.³

³ The Conference of Deans of Southern Graduate Schools was dissolved in 1963. The members felt that the founding of the national Council of Graduate Schools was sufficient to represent all phases of graduate education. However, by 1972, it was recognized that a regional organization was needed and the Council of Southern Graduate Schools was founded. See Thomas A. Langford ed., Graduate Education in the South, A History of the Conference of Deans of Southern Graduate Schools and of the Conference of Southern Graduate Schools, 1925-1991, (Lubbock, Texas, Conference of Southern Graduate Schools, 1991).

⁴ William Whatley Pierson quoted in Pierson, Graduate Work in the South, 187.
Just prior to World War II, the Conference of Southern Graduate School Deans received a grant of $12,000 from the General Education Board for the “improvement of graduate work in the South.” Alas, the war would intervene and the study was not carried out until after the cessation of hostilities. In essence, the problem was not in disparate degree requirements between institutions but in varying institutional definitions of what constituted excellence.

Pierson touched on several points which were an impediment to the growth of the University of Georgia Graduate School in the pre-World War II era. The library and laboratory facilities were inadequate to even the Master’s level programs, much less any aspirations to extensive doctoral level work. The Graduate School, university, and Georgia Board of Regents had acknowledged this fact with the establishment of the Library Board of Visitors discussed in chapter VII. The Georgia library holdings in 1938 were one hundred twenty-eight thousand volumes compared to three hundred forty-four thousand at the University of North Carolina and two hundred eighty-four thousand at the University of Virginia. Up until the mid 1930s most laboratory facilities were housed in buildings from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Although certainly not old buildings in an absolute sense, the demands of

laboratory research, particularly at a doctoral level, had far outstripped their facilities.  

Another limiting factor on the growth of the University of Georgia Graduate School was the faculty. The quality of the faculty was not the issue, the problem was the quantity and the workload. Most the members of the Graduate Faculty taught undergraduates as well as graduates. The total enrollment in the academic year 1940-41 was 3631 students. Graduate enrollment was 131 students in the regular session and 502 in the summer session in that same year. Although support personnel had been augmented since 1910, the faculty was still intimately involved in the day-to-day operations of the university. The newly formed Graduate Council had addressed the problem of expecting research activities from faculty who barely had enough time to perform their regular duties: “It is agreed that little research could be expected or accomplished if 15 hours remained the normal load.” Some departments had released faculty members from part of their teaching load for research. This was on an informal basis, not university policy, and varied from department to department.  

---

6 The Chemistry Department was housed in Terrell Hall and the Biology Department was located in LeConte (today Meigs) Hall. Both buildings were designed by faculty member Charles Strahan and built in 1905. During the 1930s several new buildings were constructed on the campus with WPA funds. One of them, which took over the name LeConte Hall, was the new home of the Biology and Chemistry Departments. It opened in 1937.

7 Graduate Council Committee on Research, Minutes February 20, 1941, unpublished typescript.

8 Ibid.
expertise and specialization in departments. Dean Bocock and Chancellor Snelling actively pursued admission of the University of Georgia into the Association of American Universities in the 1920s. However, it became clear to both men that the conditions at the university made that aspiration remote. To this day, the University of Georgia has not joined the AAU.

On the Master’s level the university had some fine programs which were beginning to attract attention, such as those in education and agriculture. To be a true university, particularly in the sense of the term in 1940, the university needed a vigorous doctoral program: something it did not have. Research and publication funds were low: twenty five hundred for the 1940-41 academic year. Some of these funds were redirected from allocations for graduate assistants. The attempt to improve one area of graduate education would hinder another part. All was not gloomy though, the university had done a great deal with the limited resources. In 1940 there were twelve separate Master’s, the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), and the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees offered by the Graduate School. That same year, one hundred Master’s degrees and two Doctor of Philosophy degrees were conferred. The equivocation and reticence of the

---

*The degrees are: Master of Arts, Master of Science, Master of Science in Agriculture, Master of Science in Forestry, Master of Science in Commerce, Master of Science in Home Economics, Master of Science in Education, Master of Education, Master of Science in Chemistry, Master of Science in Agricultural Engineering, Master of Science in Social Work, Master of Fine Arts.*
Graduate School in regard to the Doctor of Philosophy degrees stemmed from a realistic appraisal of the resources, not from a lack of interest. Statements in the Graduate Bulletin from 1910-1940 make clear the Graduate School’s frank appraisal of the situation. Bocock, Stephens, and the faculty had developed programs at the Master’s level which showed standards of excellence, as mentioned by Pierson. To attempt extensive doctoral education when the resources were not available would imperil the established programs.

The Graduate School in 1940 had not abandoned its attachment to the old liberal arts tradition. The requirements of both Master’s and doctoral degrees for two minor areas of study demonstrates a reluctance to embrace the “special culture” of graduate education fully. The requirement for minors would not be discontinued until the mid 1950s. However, the Graduate School had created an efficient and modern system of graduate education governance, which certainly was not the norm in 1940. Degree requirements were carefully delineated and monitored by the Graduate School. A rudimentary system of graduate assistantships and

For instance, *University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin*, 1913-14, 16; *University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin*, 1935-36, 4; *University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin*, 1947, 8.

Another example of this dedication to the classical liberal arts tradition, as mentioned in Chapter V, is that it was not until 1926 that department course descriptions in the Graduate Bulletin were listed in alphabetical order. Prior to 1926 the listing began with Greek, Latin, English, and History.
fellowships had been established.\footnote{In 1940, The Henry L. Richmond Fellowship was offered in Chemistry, it paid a stipend of five hundred dollars. The Phelps-Stokes Fellowship, discussed in Chapter VII, paid $500. A limited number of University Fellowships were available in Chemistry, Education, English, History, and Zoology. The stipend varied from $127.50 to $427.50. Several assistantships were available as tutors or assistants. The stipend was from $150 to $500 dollars.} The Graduate Council and Graduate Faculty ensured faculty involvement in decisions pertaining to graduate education. In addition, the Graduate Council created a mechanism for the promotion and funding of research activities. The administrative procedures in place in 1940 are the basis of current University of Georgia Graduate School practice. To use an automotive analogy, the Graduate School had an effective chassis, what it needed was more horsepower. Still, the “graduate tradition” had been established on firm footing.\footnote{The “graduate tradition” mentioned by Pierson above is certainly akin to Clark’s “organizational saga”.

What general lessons about graduate education does the early history of the University of Georgia Graduate School teach us? The primary lesson is that to have an effective graduate program an institution must have adequate facilities. The library and laboratory facilities at the University of Georgia in the pre-World War II era were inadequate for the undergraduate programs, much less doctoral programs. An undergraduate class may be served by the demonstration of an experiment by the professor, or use an anthology for its reading list, but this will not do at the graduate level. Joseph LeConte noted that in specialized
culture/graduate education that in addition to the lecture: "I would complete the work by practice in the museum, the laboratory, and the field."\(^{14}\) Here LeConte is using the field of geology as an example, but the analogy can be extended to any discipline. To the graduate student in history, for example, the library is like the laboratory for the student of chemistry. A poorly stocked library is like a laboratory without glassware or reagents. The specialized culture of graduate education must be a "hands on" experience. There is a direct correlation between facilities and the quality of graduate education. Naturally, an activity as complex as graduate education cannot be reduced to materialist considerations. One must also take into account the faculty, students, and the "graduate tradition" or enthusiasm. When Johns Hopkins opened in 1876 it did not have tradition but it did have enthusiasm. It also had first rate faculty, students, and facilities. Superior facilities will not ensure superior graduate education, but the lack of them will, certainly, hamper aspirations in that direction.

Another lesson is that faculty must be actively encouraged to pursue research. This can be accomplished by providing funds, facilities, and release from teaching loads. Gilman wrote: "The best teachers are those who are free, competent and willing to make original researches in the library and the laboratory" and "The best investigators are

\(^{14}\) LeConte, "Mutual Relations of Intellectual and Moral Culture", 10.
usually those who have the responsibilities of instruction, gaining thus the incitement of colleagues, the encouragement of pupils, the observation of the public."¹⁵ As Gilman notes, the best research is done by those who are also teaching and the best teachers are those who are researchers. A vehicle for the dissemination of faculty research, such as a university press, can be a tremendous asset. In the days before television and the internet, the University of North Carolina Press (founded in 1922) helped North Carolina to become a leader in graduate education and research. The Graduate Council minutes discussed above and in Chapter VII, show that the University of Georgia Graduate Council was aware that research publication was an important tool for institutional prestige and funding. The $300 allocated for publishing a bibliography of faculty research in 1941 was a start, albeit a small one. The Graduate Council was also struggling with reduced teaching loads and time off for research. Adding further expectations to already overburdened faculty members was not going to be productive. These issues would have to be resolved before the Graduate School could make a significant excursion into research.¹⁶

To begin offering the Doctor of Philosophy degree in 1935 was a big step for the Graduate School and the University of Georgia. In many ways, it was a more difficult move than it had been at Johns Hopkins in 1876 and at North Carolina in 1877. In the intervening years, other institutions had created precedents, standards, and expectations in doctoral education that many Georgia faculty, frankly, thought the university could not meet. Hopkins had started out, if not tabula rasa, at least with the field more open to innovation. All the members of the Graduate Council in 1940-41, except future Graduate School Dean George Boyd, held the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Dean Stephens held a Johns Hopkins doctorate. These were individuals who had intimate personal knowledge of doctoral education. Their guarded approach to the offering of the Doctor of Philosophy degree was an admixture of realism about faculty and facilities, a desire not to compromise quality of the undergraduate and Master’s programs as well as the doctoral degrees, and normal human caution. Thus, several seemingly contradictory lessons can be learned from this example. Graduate Schools need to temper their desire for prestige and expansion with realism. Never sacrifice high quality for innovation. In any decision of great academic magnitude, such as the institution of a Ph.D. program, the involvement of the

The members of the Graduate Council represented a wide spectrum of disciplines: Agricultural Economics, Business Administration, Chemistry, Education, English, History, Mathematics, Plant Pathology, Psychology, Political Science, Romance Languages, Sociology, and Zoology.
faculty and the entire university community is an enormous asset. At the same time, the introduction of new programs or initiatives can invigorate an institution. The bold move to seriously offer doctoral programs at the University of North Carolina during the Reconstruction era paid great dividends for the institution.

One might ask: what if the University of Georgia had offered a Doctor of Philosophy degree earlier, would graduate education have advanced in a similar fashion to that of North Carolina? Every institution has its own peculiar problems, assets, goals, leaders, and history: its own organizational saga. It was not until the 1960s that the University of Georgia had the facilities and faculty to offer large scale doctoral education. However, by 1940 the university had developed an efficient and flexible system of governance and regulation of graduate education: the Graduate School. When the other parts of the equation were ready, the plan for extensive doctoral education would come together. The development of the Graduate School and graduate education at the University of Georgia has been an interesting journey of personalities, progress, and pitfalls. As Plato wrote:

The soul takes nothing with her to the other world but her education and culture; and these, it is said, are of the greatest service or the greatest injury to the dead man, at the very beginning of his journey thither.  

18 Plato, Phaedo, 107.
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APPENDIX A

Enrollment Figures and International Students: 1910-1940
### Degree Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Degree Name</th>
<th>First Year Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Agriculture</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ. Eng.</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Econ.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Economics</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.F.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Forestry</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Home Economics</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Commerce</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Master of Education</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Chem.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Chemistry</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.S.W.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Social Work</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag. Eng.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ed.</td>
<td>Master of Science in Education</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates reflect first actual enrollment in degree programs. See Chapter V for dates when degrees were first offered.
Total student enrollment and international student enrollment, by year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>International Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrolled Graduate Students

Year


Number of Students

0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700

31 36 28 47 43 20 23 37 49 70 72 81 95 101 199 355 299 298 388 298 416 411 411 525 664 434
1913

International Students: 1

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Lavras, Minas Geraes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, totaled by degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ. Eng.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1914

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ. Eng.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1915

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1916

International Students: 1

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Courland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, totaled by degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1917

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.Ag.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1918

International Students: 0

Registered students, total: 20
(data not available for individual degrees)

1919

International Students: 1

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Peking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, total: 23
(data not available for individual degrees)

1920

International Students: 2

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Honan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Peking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, total: 37
(data not available for individual degrees)
1921

International Students: 3

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Nantung-Chon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, total: 49
(data not available for individual degrees)

1922

not available (according to note: see: LXJ1 .G352b no. 324)

1923

International Students: 1

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Hangchow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, total: 70
(data not available for individual degrees)

1924

International Students: 1

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chekiang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, total: 72
(data not available for individual degrees)
1925

International Students: 0

Registered students, total: 81
(data not available for individual degrees)

1926

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Econ.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.F.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1927

International Students: 1

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Changsha, Hunan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, totaled by degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1928

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Summer Session</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counted twice</td>
<td>(-27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (individual students)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Because individual students may be enrolled in multiple sessions, and maybe even in multiple degrees, these totals refer to total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students. Only the grand total for all graduate students is an accurate count of individuals.

1929

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Summer Session</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counted twice</td>
<td>(-48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (individual students)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>299</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.
1930

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Summer Session</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counted twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (individual students)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>298</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.

1931

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Summer Session</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counted twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (individual students)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>355</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.
1932

International Students: 0

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Summer Session</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.F.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counted twice</td>
<td>(-20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (individual students) 388

1 Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.

1933

Not Published?

1934

Not Published?
1935

International Students: 2

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, totaled by degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Chem.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.S.W</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonCand.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>416</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1936

International Students: 5

International Student Addresses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Dijon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Rio Piedras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Chem.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag. Eng.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.F.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>346</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total individuals</strong></td>
<td><strong>411</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.
1937

International Students: 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Dijon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Bourges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Kwangei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Munich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Home Economics</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag. Eng.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.F.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>381</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total individuals** 441

\(^1\) Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.
1938

International Students: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Maresque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Tourman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Geltou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Suiyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Kwangsei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Munich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Home Economics</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag. Eng.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.F.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ed.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.P.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.J.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>430</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total individuals</strong></td>
<td><strong>525</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.
1939

International Students: 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Peiping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Marburg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Chem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag. Eng.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ed.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>534</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total individuals</strong></td>
<td><strong>664</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.

2 As reported in the Bulletin summary. The column actually totals to 539.
1940

International Students:

Student addresses not reported in the Bulletin for this year.

Registered students, totaled by degree and session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Summer Quarter</th>
<th>Regular Session</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Chem.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.H.E.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag. Eng.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ag.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Ed.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total registration</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>434</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total registration for a given degree, not total numbers of individual students, unless noted otherwise. See note for 1928.

2 As reported in the Bulletin summary. The column actually totals to 96.
APPENDIX B

Portraits of the Deans of the University of Georgia
Graduate School
Willis Henry Bocock
Dean of the Graduate School, 1910-1928
Department of Classics, 1889-1944
Roswell Powell Stephens
Dean of the Graduate School, 1928-1943
Department of Mathematics, 1907-1945
APPENDIX C

Graduate Faculty Information: 1910
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Earned Degree 1</th>
<th>Institution 1</th>
<th>Earned Degree 2</th>
<th>Institution 2</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Year Hired at UGA</th>
<th>Year Retired from UGA</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willis H. Bocock</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>Hampden-Sydney</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Hampden-Sydney</td>
<td>Classics (Greek)</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Lexington, VA</td>
<td>Graduate Dean 1910-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Preston Brooks</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>History/Commerce</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Milledgeville, GA</td>
<td>First Dean of the School of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert DeLoach</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Agriculture (Plant Breeding)</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Statesboro, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Richard Fain</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Davis Hooper</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Hampden-Sydney</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Hampden-Sydney</td>
<td>Classics (Agronomy)</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lustrat</td>
<td>Bachelor es Lettres</td>
<td>University of France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Vichy, France</td>
<td>Married Lustrat’s daughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hubbard MchAtton</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Spring Hill College</td>
<td>M. Hort.</td>
<td>Michigan State College</td>
<td>Agriculture (Horticulture)</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. T. McPherson</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ligon McWhorter</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Oglethorpe County, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morris</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Randolph-Macon</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Randolph-Macon</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Athens, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Park</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Oscar Payne</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Carnesville, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roswell Powell Stephens</td>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Barnesville, GA</td>
<td>Graduate Dean, 1928-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Morton Strahan</td>
<td>C.&amp;M. E.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Clay White</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jackson Woofter</td>
<td>LL.B.</td>
<td>University of West Virginia</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>First Dean of the School of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>