

ROLLINS COLLEGE: A CENTENNIAL HISTORY

Dr. Jack C. Lane

College Historian and Weddell Professor of American History, Emeritus



Copyright, 2009 Jack C. Lane. Rollins College is granted a non-exclusive license by the author to make this digital copy and make it accessible via the Olin Library website. Any further reproduction or distribution, beyond fair use (U.S.C. Title 17, §107), is governed by a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/us/>).

Table of Contents

Preface		2
Chapter 1	The Founding	4
Chapter 2	From Convocation to Crisis, 1885-1893	28
Chapter 3	The Struggle for Survival, 1892-1903	55
Chapter 4	The Search for Stability, 1903-1925	80
Chapter 5	The Holt Era: A New Beginning, 1925-1931	108
Chapter 6	The Rice Affair: The College in Crisis	140
Chapter 7	Growth in the Midst of Depression and War	170
Chapter 8	The Wagner Affair: Legacy of the Holt Era	198
Chapter 9	The McKean Era: Restoring the Holt Legacy	234
Endnotes		258

PREFACE

In 1984, President Thaddeus Seymour appointed me College Historian with the charge of writing the history of Rollins College in time for the centennial in 1985. After spending several months in the college archives researching and writing I had completed a first draft of the history. In the days before computers I had written the work on a typewriter and thus the manuscript needed extensive editing. In the meantime I returned to full teaching and had limited time to work on the manuscript. Later, when there seemed to be no possibility of publication, I abandoned the manuscript and turned to other research projects.

When I retired from teaching in 1999 I transferred the manuscript to digital form but did very little editing. At the same time I placed a hard copy of the manuscript in the college archives. Now, in lieu of publication, it seems appropriate to put the manuscript on the college archive's website in order to make it available to a wider audience. Although reluctant at first to make public the unedited manuscript, I have been persuaded that my account, however flawed, ought to be available to the public.

Two final points: The readers will see that the accounts of the two presidents following President McKean are very brief. There are two reasons for this: First, the staff of the College Archives has not had time to organize the records sufficiently for a detailed account and second, even the staff had organized them I had used my allotted time and could do no more work on the manuscript.

The second point: Shortly after I began researching the history I came to see that the college, particularly after the 1920s, played an important role in the history in higher

education. Rollins was the first college intentionally to build a curriculum around the theories of progressive education. Thus I felt compelled to write not just a celebratory history, that is, one that would simply celebrate the college's successful development; I thought it essential to write a traditional historical account that would do justice to such an important institution of higher education in the nation. I wanted to show how a struggling, somewhat isolated little college achieved national prominence by placing itself on the cutting edge innovative progressive education. Therefore, to move the history beyond a limited celebratory work, I chose to deal with what the material in the archives revealed: a college slowly building character from adversity as well as successes, from failures as well as accomplishments, from controversy as well as community, guided by administrators and faculty who were at times less than competent and at other times almost heroic. But the readers will readily see that this history, as with all history, is interpreted. It is my interpretation. Another historian (some wish there had been one) might have written it differently. Undoubtedly, some time in the future another "College Historian" will write and publish the bicentennial history of the college. When that time comes I hope this manuscript will serve as a foundation for that effort.

Jack C. Lane, Weddell Professor of American History, Emeritus
2009

CHAPTER ONE:

THE FOUNDING

The minutes and hours move with maddening slowness for the handful of Local inhabitants of Winter Park, Florida on an April-spring day in 1885, as they awaited news from the representatives of the Florida Congregational Association meeting in Orange City. The members of the Association had charged the representatives with the responsibility of selecting the site for Florida's first college. Confident that their town would be chosen, the residents of Winter Park had prepared for a joyous celebration. They had constructed a miniature altar composed of "fat pine" logs on empty barrels covered with boards and buried in sand just North of Interlachen Avenue. The women had baked cakes and fixed lemon juice; speakers had prepared speeches with appropriate rhetorical flourishes; and a well known writer-in-residence, Emily Huntington Miller had composed a commemorative poem. The Congregational Association voted in the early morning at Orange City, but it would be well past noon before Winter Park would receive the news. With no direct rail communication between Orange City and their town, Winter Park's representatives had to travel by wagon to the St. Johns River, by boat down to Sanford, and by wagon again to reach little hamlet on the outskirts of Orlando.

In mid-afternoon, the courier arrived with the expected good news, and, as planned, the bell on the tiny, unfinished Congregational Church pealed the happy tidings of victory. Before the roaring bonfire of "fat" pine logs, several prominent residents made short but

enthusiastic speeches, and the evening was climaxed by the reading of Miller's poem, which ended with a vision of the future:

Lo! Down the years our fancy strays to see,
The wondrous picture of the days to be,
When, her broad foundations wisely laid,
Her fair halls clustering in their quiet shade,
By the blue lake, our college towers shall rise,
And lift their heads to greet the smiling skies.

Afterward people "from far and near" gathered at the home of Frederick Lyman, Winter Park's spokesman at the Orange City meeting, for a victory celebration. As eighteenth century Chinese lanterns illuminated Lyman's home on the corner of Interlachen and the Boulevard, and as dying bonfires glowed in the ¹streets, the celebrants ate cake, drank lemonade, sang songs and listened to more congratulatory speeches. When one orator for the first time spoke of "Rollins College," the term received a loud round of applause. All sensed that a new era had begun for their little hamlet on the Florida frontier.(1)

Although unique in its particulars, the founding of Rollins College in 1885 strongly resembled the formation and establishment of other small liberal arts colleges throughout the nineteenth century. During most of the century an indiscriminate college-building mania swept the nation, one that produced perhaps as many as seven hundred colleges by the outbreak of the Civil War. This incredible orgy of college founding continued in the latter half of the century, leading one ante-bellum supporter to describe America as a "land of colleges."(2) Such indiscriminate building promoted, however, a high mortality rate. Perhaps as many as seven hundred failed between 1800 and 1860. They rose, one contemporary noted, "like mushrooms in our luxurious soils, are duly lauded and puffed up for a day and then sink

to be heard no more." In most cases survival, not academic attainment, was a major achievement.(3)

These small liberal arts colleges emerged as a result of several converging forces. From the founding of Harvard in 1636 to the end of the 19th century and a bit beyond, almost all colleges were frontier institutions. They were established in pioneer communities, created to serve frontier needs of the local residents and, as with other American institutions, they followed and adjusted to the perpetually advancing frontier.

Within the frontier framework, several forces converged to create a surge toward college building in the 19th century, but three of these forces stand out as the most significant: religious denominationalism, community boosterism, and real estate entrepreneurism. Denominationalism involved the desire of all Protestant sectarians to assure their children a Christian education. Congregationalists and Presbyterians, with the tradition of Yale and Princeton behind them, were most active in college building in the early 19th century, joined in the mid-century by Lutherans, Dutch Reformed and Unitarians. Methodists and Baptists followed these later. These religious sects accounted directly for the founding of eleven colleges in Kentucky, twenty-one in Illinois, and thirteen in Iowa before 1860. And this was only a fraction of the total. Clearly, as one student of higher education has noted, denominationalism was a key factor in covering the country with colleges in the 19th century. (4)

Community pride, or what Daniel Boorstin calls the "booster spirit," became a second prime mover in college building. As Boorstin points out, no one lived in a village or a hamlet or even a town in the 19th century West. Regardless of its size, and some were only two or three houses, pioneers called their place cities.

Three institutions were thought critical in shaping the destiny of such a city: a newspaper, a hotel, and above all, a college. No self-respecting village could be without these institutions, and the last especially was a mark of distinction.(5)

Closely tied to this community boosterism spirit was real estate entrepreneurialism. Throughout the 19th century land speculation represented the most popular and profitable form of economic endeavor. Those who owned property in a village, which included almost everyone, perceived the growth of their town in economic terms. As the town grew, so did the value of their property. Those who owned great tracts of land often became real estate promoters. With their well-being contingent on an increase in land value, they sought to foster their town's growth with various kinds of promotional schemes. The quickest way to establish the identity of a little village-- in some cases of literally putting it on the map-- was to found a college in its environs. Colleges inevitably meant increased population, made the village more attractive to settlers, and for both the real estate promoters and the inhabitants, meant increased value of their property. Thus, it was not difficult to convince village property owners of the pecuniary advantages of an institution of higher learning.

The convergence of these three forces provided a dynamic impetus for college building in the 19th century, creating a peculiar pattern repeated many times over. Invariably a circular letter inviting communities with geographic and economic appeal to submit "inducement" bids accompanied a denomination's announcement of its intention to found a college. Real estate entrepreneurs then took the leadership in mobilizing financial campaigns in the villages, appealing to community pride and to not a small amount of economic gain. Several villages and some towns submitted bids, and as with any other entrepreneurial

endeavors, the college went to the highest bidder. As one contemporary wrote: this convergence of these forces resulted in "a magnetic chain of reciprocal influences, by which light flashes from college to the community, and life streams back again from the community to the college, so that while the college redeems the community from ignorance, the community preserves the college from an undue tendency to monkish corruption and scholastic unprofitableness."(6)

It was precisely these historical, long-established forces that led to the founding of Rollins College in 1885. All the elements mentioned above -- the frontier environment, denominationalism, boosterism, and entrepreneurism -- were present in the founding of Rollins. In 1885, Florida represented America's last frontier. Since the Civil War, Northeaster tourists had been pouring into the state in ever-increasing numbers, and enterprising hotel and land developers followed them. Still, in 1885, much of Florida contained frontier characteristics. Central Florida was sparsely settled, dotted here and there with small villages. People the local inhabitants called 'crackers' worked pioneer farms. As with most frontier regions, communication was primitive; transportation consisted of wagons crawling over crude dirt roads, small steamships plying the St. Johns River and a narrow gage railroad connecting Sanford and Orlando. Tourists saw their vacation in Central Florida as an adventure which allowed them to enjoy warm weather and excursions thorough unspoiled land, while settlers came with the frontier spirit of starting over again.(7)

Several denominations began to make their way into this virgin, primitive territory, but none was more active than the Congregational Church, having established by 1880 thirteen churches in north and central Florida. Considering the condition of education in the state at

that time and given the church's historical interest in such affairs, not surprisingly the first topic discussed in the initial meeting of the Congregational Association was the need to found a college. Apparently, Lucy Cross first placed the matter before the Association. Miss Cross, after graduating of Oberlin (one of the Congregational Church's oldest co-educational institutions), teaching several years at Wellesley College in 1880 came to Daytona, Florida, where she established an active, private elementary school. Concerned with the lack of educational opportunity in the state, in her own words, "hope sprang in (her) heart and an idea in {her} mind" when she learned of the initial meeting of the General Congregational Association to be held (prophetically) in the little hamlet of Winter Park. Miss Cross made her appeal to her pastor, C. M. Bingham, a delegate to the Florida Association. At the Winter Park meeting, Bingham, the moderator, took advantage of his position to read Miss Cross's paper even though the subject of a college was not on the agenda. "I dare not go home and face Miss Cross if I do not read this," he cagily told the assembled members. (8)

In the paper Miss Cross made an appeal for the founding of a college in Florida so that children of the state could be educated by Floridians. It seemed foolish, she said, for the Florida families to send their children out of the warm weather of Florida to the cold, sickly climate of the north. The youth of Florida and the sons and daughters of tourists, said Miss Cross, deserved the "soundest moral and religious teaching" that the church could provide.

Accepting Miss Cross's suggestion, the Association appointed a committee to report at the next annual meeting on the educational conditions in Florida. We have no evidence that the committee ever studied the Florida educational system; at least, they never made a

report to the Association. But if it had made such a study, the committee's report could not have been encouraging. In 1884, Florida possessed only eight county high schools, ones so meager in their course offerings and in session such a short time that the state was forced to establish three publicly supported academies to prepare young men for college. These included the East Florida Seminary at Tallahassee, Florida Agricultural Academy at Lake City. One observer described educational conditions in gloomy terms: the elementary and high schools were "running from two to five months per year with little classification and wholly inadequate facilities." Most of the "crackers or poor whites" could not read; "forty-five of every one hundred voters," he concluded, "are illiterate." (9)

Several private academies were scattered throughout the state: a Baptist school at Deland, a Christian Church academy at Starke, Catholic Church academies at St. Augustine, Tampa, Key West, and Jacksonville. Florida could claim no institution of learning in 1884, creating just the kind of virgin educational field that had been historically so appealing to the Congregationalists' sense of mission. These conditions served as a magnet that attracted such lay missionaries as Lucy Cross, who had fully committed to the Congregational missionary goal and such religious missionaries as those forming the membership of the General Congregational Association.

As a way of presenting a report to the Association, the committee persuaded a newly arrived minister, the Reverend Edward P. Hooker, pastor of the Winter Park Congregational Church, to prepare a paper for the 1884 annual meeting on the subject of Florida education. The records do not show why Hooker was chosen for this important task, but the choice could not have been more appropriate. He had only recently come to Florida under the auspices of the Home Missionary Society to

found a Congregational Church in Winter Park. The fifty-year old Hooker, a pious New England Congregational minister, and a descendant of the famous independent-minded Colonial minister, Thomas Hooker, had received his BA from Middlebury College in Massachusetts in 1855 and an MA in 1858. Ordained by Andover Theological Seminary, a leading seminary in New England, Hooker preached in several Congregational Churches in Massachusetts, and later in his former college town of Middlebury. While at Medford, Massachusetts, Hooker's wife became ill and died. Later he married his second wife, Elizabeth Robbins, the daughter of a missionary, who bore him six children. In 1882 Hooker developed arthritis problems that led him to accept an opportunity for home missionary work in the warmer climate of Florida. He was assigned to work with Reverend S. F. Gale, director of the Florida Home Missionary Society, who sent Hooker to Winter Park to found a Congregational Church.(10)

When he and his large family arrived in Winter Park in 1883, they found no churches at all in the little hamlet. Hooker therefore began holding union services in a hall over the village's only store while plans were being laid for building a Congregational church. In addition to preaching union services in Winter Park, Hooker spent several Sunday afternoons carrying the gospel to outlying rural areas. These trips on horseback allowed him to become familiar with, in his daughter's words, "the strange pioneer world to which he had come, so different from the long-established order of New England." She recalls his speaking of the crudeness and ignorance prevailing throughout the area and worrying about the role the church should play in "building a wholesome order" in Central Florida.

At this point he received an invitation to speak on Florida education at the forthcoming meeting of the Association.(11) Hooker's

paper, entitled "The Mission of Congregationalism in Florida," was a powerful articulation of the Congregational Church's historic educational mission and a moving plea for an institution of higher learning in Florida.(12) He began by summarizing what he called "Congregationalism's mission of Christian education," wherein he documented the historical college-building tradition of Congregationalism. Hooker then turned to the immediate issue: no area of the nation, he proclaimed, was more in need of an institution of higher learning than Florida. Europeans settled Florida, he noted, fifty years before the Plymouth settlement; then why was Florida so far behind? Hooker's answer repeated a traditional New England Puritan litany: while New England has grown, Florida has remained static because its progress has been retarded by a Spanish papal and aristocratic legacy that "forced the torch of learning downward." "Has not the time come," Hooker asked the ministers, "to reverse the torch and bid it burn and illumine the forests with the free [Protestant] gospel and the college...."

In a more practical vein, Hooker argued that the growth and prosperity of Florida could not be assured simply by planting more orange groves. Prosperity depended just as much on educational institutions because no industry would attract families, he declared, without educational opportunities for their children. Families of the north, he warned, were waiting for an answer, but they would not come without educational opportunities. Hooker then ended with a final rhetorical flourish:

The outlook is grand and glorious. A few of us stand on these early heights of the new time. We love the State to which we have come; these genial skies, these clear, sparkling lakes, the souls of the people who dwell among the forests. We rejoice at the arrival of those who crowd the steamboats and cars. We are a little before them and we bid them welcome. We rejoice in the privilege

of laying foundations for the future. Has not the hour struck for the courage, wisdom and devotion of our Fathers?

He pleaded with them to found a Christian college and announce it at the present meeting.

Moved by this powerful exhortation, the Association appointed a committee to consider Hooker's stirring proposal.(17) The following day, January 29, 1885, the committee reported that it agreed with Dr. Hooker that the time had come "to take initiatory steps toward the founding of an institution for higher education in the state of Florida." To accomplish this end, the committee recommended that another group be appointed to receive "inducements" for the location of the college and at the appropriate time to present those inducements to a special meeting where the Association would then select the "most suitable location." The association accepted the proposal and appointed a committee of five: Dr. Hooker and Frederick W. Lyman of Winter Park, Reverend S. F. Gale of Jacksonville, Reverend C. M. Bingham of Daytona Beach, and Mr. R. C. Tremain of Mount Dora. The initial historical step had been taken; denominationalism had sparked the process of college building on the Florida frontier.(13)

The news that the Congregational Association planned to found a college was initially received with some skepticism throughout the inhabited areas of the state, but within a week newspapers were spreading the word that the Association was "in earnest" in its determination to build a "first class college." The Orange County weekly newspaper reported that "assurances have been received" "from northern friends to the undertaking that important pecuniary aid" was forthcoming.(18) The Jacksonville TIMES-UNION, the most widely circulated newspaper in the state, was even more optimistic. The Congregational Association, it declared,

has the means to carry out its plans and the school would doubtless, if located in a center of population and wealth, be a credit to the Association and the state, and a great boon to our young people who cannot afford to go to Yale or Harvard. (15)

These assurances combined with the news that a committee was asking for inducements, caused an outburst of community boosterism. Editors and promoters, religious and secular, moved to awaken their communities to the "great advantages to be derived from the presence of such an institution." Reverend Bingham and Lucy Cross spurred Daytona to action; businessmen and land promoters in Mt. Dora began accumulating inducements; Dr. Nathan Burrows, later a charter teacher and Trustee at the new college, led the activity in Orange City. (16) The ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER touted Orlando as a railroad, manufacturing, and commercial center. "Why not an educational center?" the paper asked. (17)

But Jacksonville, in the state's northeast corner, appeared to lead all other aspirants. With a population of almost eight thousand and a thriving riverport, it was the hub of economic activity in the state. The most prominent churchman in the state, the Reverend S. F. Gale, director of Florida Home Missionary Society, led its cause. Finally, the state's largest newspaper was published in Jacksonville, and its editor aggressively advocated the site. In an editorial printed in early April, he minced no words in his boosterism:

Here is a chance for our Jacksonville property holders to make a point. They can get this school here if they will do as several places in south and central Florida propose doing; give lands and money to the enterprise. Colleges cannot be bought ready-made like saw mills and cotton gins. They are the slow growth of years and they never flourish except in centers of population. If the Congregational Association wants to build up a flourishing and influential school their best plan is to locate it here in Jacksonville where the population is dense and where from eighty thousand to one hundred thousand northern people annually come in search of pleasure and health. Many of these people have young men and women they are educating.

The school will be under the eyes of thousands of wealthy people and doubtless get large volunteer donations for its support. It is utterly useless to locate colleges in out-of-the-way places and in sparsely settled communities. Scholastic studies are no longer pursued in monkish cells or in the solitude of caves and mountain fastnesses.(18)

There was much logic and common sense in the editor's argument, but it was historically incorrect. "Sparsely settled, but out-of-the-way places" so disparaged by the editor were precisely the location of most liberal arts colleges in the nineteenth century. And, as it turned out, for the very same reasons that in the final analysis Jacksonville would not be chosen. That coastal city did not depend for its identity on establishing a college. With or without a college Jacksonville would grow and prosper, and its citizens could not be mobilized with cries of desperation. For Jacksonville's competition, a college could very well provide the key to their destinies. Daytona was a small village of a few hundred souls huddled along the ocean; and Mt. Dora and Orange City were small inland communities with no distinguishing features. But in terms of size, no community could have been more desperate for an identity than Winter Park.

Despite its small size and lack of population, Winter Park possessed two advantages over the other competitors. Two of its residents, Reverend Hooker and Frederick W. Lyman, were members of the committee chosen to receive inducements and were therefore able to gauge the strength of the competition. Both men had established themselves as outstanding leaders in their community and the state, and both had strong personal reasons for wanting a college in Winter Park. Even without considering his moral commitment to Christian education, Hooker must have understood that his education and background made him a principal candidate for the presidency of the new college. Almost assured of that position if the college was located in his community,

he therefore took a more than normal interest in raising subscriptions in his little village.(23)

Hooker's co-worker in this endeavor was entrepreneur Frederick W. Lyman, who nurtured an even greater personal and professional stake in locating the college at Winter Park. And Lyman proved to be a host unto himself. The son of a New England Presbyterian minister, the product of self-education, Lyman at the age of twenty-two moved to Minnesota where he prospered as a wholesale druggist. In his early thirties, because of his wife's asthma, he abandoned his successful business in Minneapolis and moved to Florida in search of a milder climate. Interest in land development led him to Winter Park, where he soon became involved with two real estate promoters Loring Chase of Chicago, and Oliver E. Chapman of Massachusetts, who had recently bought six hundred acres of land between Maitland and Orlando bordering Lake Osceola and Lake Virginia. Chase and Chapman had purchased the land, a newspaper reported, for the purpose of "creating a first class resort for Northern and Southern men of wealth, where amidst orange groves and beautiful lakes and luxuries that every enterprise and wealth can devise and command, a community of grand winter homes {would arise}, a resort second to none in the South."(20)

Before Lyman arrived, the two promoters already had a real estate scheme underway. After platting the land at their own expense, they constructed a railroad station on the South Florida Railroad line running through their prospective village. One of the three large lots on Lake Virginia had been set aside as the location of a large resort hotel. They called the area, including the settlement of Osceola, Winter Park, and in 1882 took the important step of securing a post office. By the time Lyman arrived, Chase had constructed a two-story building near the railroad station, with the lower floor housing a

grocery store, and the upper floor being used for community and church services. In addition, they had given a lot to one A. E. Rogers who had built and was operating a small hotel.(21)

Lyman, a "natural organizer," as one contemporary saw him, quickly grasped the possibilities in Chase's and Chapman's real estate schemes.(22) He joined the group shortly after arriving in Winter Park, incorporated their efforts into the Winter Park Company with himself as the president, and under Chase's direction, laid out a town along the railroad tracks. Well before the advent of city planning and zoning, they designed an entire city complete with a park, straight and curving avenues, special sites for a business center, for a school, and for hotels and villas, and even a separate area for the "coloreds," as Northeasterners called the black citizens. Prices on the lots were intended to attract people with moderate to substantial incomes. After devising "an expensive and alluring" advertising campaign, the company in February 1885, began construction of a large hotel designed to entice easterners and mid-westerners to its new development. To be known as the Seminole Hotel, it was made possible by a large investment from Francis B. Knowles, a recent addition to the Winter Park Company and later a generous benefactor of the new college. (23)

Just as he joined the company, Lyman learned of the Congregational Association's interest in founding a college in Florida and apparently was struck by inspiration: a college was precisely what Winter Park Company needed to complete its resort and real estate plans. Although the evidence is indirect, it seems likely that Lyman was the first to suggest such an idea to Dr. Hooker, who was Lyman's pastor. At any rate, in the persons of Lyman and Hooker, entrepreneurship had joined hands with denominationalism to arouse community boosterism. (24)

With refreshing openness, Lyman later recalled how he and his colleagues mobilized the community: Winter Park became the center of the most intense

activity and a house-to-house canvass was made. Everyone was expected (pressured?) to give. No sum was too large to ask for and none too small to receive. Every loyal Winter Parkite felt that no place in the state could offer natural advantages comparable to hers; Providence had done its part with lavish hand, and they must do theirs no less freely. Day by day the roll of honor lengthened as signature followed signature on the subscription list, till eight figures became necessary to express the total pledge in dollars and cents. The whole amount subscribed was kept a profound secret, as it was feared that should other places learn what Winter Park would offer they would redouble their efforts and the prize therefore [would be] lost. (25)

But Lyman's greatest contribution came when he persuaded a fellow land developer, Alonzo Rollins, who was failing in health and soon died, to offer land for the location of the college and two large orange groves (one on Lake Osceola and one in Palatka) as a part of his initial gift of fifty thousand dollars.

On April 14, 1885, the Association held a special meeting in Mt. Dora to receive the inducement proposals. At a meeting five towns submitted proposals: one each from Jacksonville, Mt. Dora, Daytona, Orange City and Winter Park.

Again, Lyman's and Hooker's membership on the proposal committee worked to Winter Park's advantage; they arranged to have their proposal presented last so as to gauge the strength of the other inducements. The host town, Mt. Dora, presented a substantial initial proposal. It offered a ten-acre wooded lot on Lake Dora, cash, lumber, and over seven hundred acres of land for a total of \$35,564. The impressed delegates immediately recessed to tour the location the proposed site. (26)

Next, Bingham and Lucy Cross presented Daytona's proposal with a \$11, 500 total inducement that fell woefully short of Mt. Dora's. Sullivan F. Gale represented Jacksonville, but he could offer only an inducement of \$13, 000. Most of his time was spent pressing the advantages of locating the college in a population center. To Lyman's relief, the last town, Orange City, submitted an inducement smaller than that of Mt. Dora. Lyman later described the drama of the meeting when Winter Park made known its inducement:

As one proposal after another was read it became evident to [me] who alone knew what its subscription was -- that other towns were hopelessly distanced, and [I] was cor-
resoundingly elated, but managed to maintain a calm exterior, perhaps even to assume an aspect of gloom, which was misleading. When [my] turn came and [I] presented the pledge from Winter Park, there was consternation and deep despair on many faces.... (27)

Winter Park had offered \$114,180, a sum that easily eclipsed other bids. Included were an attractive high-ground site on the shores of Lake Virginia, pledges for cash, stock in the Winter Park Company and finally a critical gift of \$50,000 from Alonzo Rollins. Stone-faced, Lyman had held his cards close to his vest, playing them like a master poker player to achieve an overwhelming moment of drama.

The size of Winter Park's proposal stunned the delegates, particularly those from Mt. Dora, who had been overly confident of their inducement. As one participant noted: "The discussion grew hot and bitter and full of suspicion misrepresentation." Several representatives claimed that the college site offered by Winter Park was covered by water most of the year. Lyman vehemently denied this accusation, but the concerned delegates postponed a final decision until they could visit not only the Winter Park site but also that of the third highest bidder, Orange City. They journeyed to the

village the following day and toured the proposed site, finding it fully acceptable. As Lucy Cross described it:

The ride from Mt. Dora to Winter Park, a distance of twenty-five miles was, as far as Apopka, through hilly country full of small lakes; beyond Apopka it was quite level until we reached the vicinity of Winter Park where it is rolling. We were given a pleasant ride through the town and out to the proposed site of the college; this rises fifty feet above Lake Virginia, across which some pleasant looking residences and grounds were in sight, giving a pretty view. The college site is a handsome piece of property valued at \$23,000 and overlooks Lake Virginia. (28)

The delegates then proceeded to Orange City where the town residents turned out a large welcome. "Young ladies greeted us with wavy handkerchiefs," Lucy Cross wrote, "and led us into the midst of a joyous social where an excellent supper was served." (28) But these efforts of Orange City citizens were to no avail. On April 17, after touring Orange City's proposed site, the Association met in session for a formal vote. The results were: Mt. Dora 2, Orange City 9, and Winter Park 13. Dr. Nathan Barrows made a motion that the Association unanimously declare Winter Park as the location of the new college, and the motion passed without dissent. (30)

The representatives from Winter Park had pulled off an incredible feat. In their visions they could see a group of stately buildings clustered around Lake Virginia, forming a beautiful addition to their little town. What they could not see, of course, was the future and the strain and stress, the burden of anxiety and debt, the days and nights of struggle that lay ahead. When the euphoria of college founding had worn off, the awful weight of college building descended. Lyman later captured the morning-after realities:

What a simple thing it seemed to build a college. The enthusiastic company in and existence, the sorrow and travail of the years ahead. (40)

The unanimous vote of the Association did not satisfy everyone by any means. Some were skeptical of Winter Park's ability to raise the promised money. Others still considered that Winter Park was an unsuitable location. With obvious bitterness the SOUTH FLORIDA TIMES of Orange City adamantly maintained that the college's chosen site was "surrounded by swamps and about nine months out of the year the hooting owls hoot to the few families that will forever be the only inhabitants." (31) The JACKSONVILLE TIMES-UNION admitted that the site was probably acceptable but still argued that large sums of money would be thrown away "in building a schoolhouse where there are not enough pupils to fill it," (32) Orlando's ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, as might be expected was lyrical in its approval. "The moral atmosphere {of Winter Park}," it said, "is as pure as the breezes from the crystal lakes and the scenery of the sort to assist in the development of the moral and good in the nature of the pupils." (33) The SANFORD HERALD carried a stinging rebuttal to the attackers: Jacksonville and its editor had no right to complain, because, in a fair competitive bidding, Florida's largest city could not raise as much as a single citizen did in Winter Park. "A magnificent bid of over \$100,000," the paper declared, "is not to be weighed against the pitiful offer of Jacksonville with a sum of money in just about a sufficient amount to buy a bell." No one, the article continued, hardly had reason to complain when "a more enterprising community captures an influential institution by reason of its superior public spirit and liberality." As the editor so pointedly suggested, Jacksonville and the other communities were simply "out-boostered" by a little frontier village.(34) But Winter Park citizens were much too busy celebrating to be concerned with the envious criticism.

After the vote was taken at Orange City, on April 17, the delegates in their last act of the meeting, elected eighteen (later increased to twenty-one) charter trustees for the college. Lyman, who took responsibility for formal incorporation, held a preliminary meeting at his bank in Sanford on Tuesday, April 27, 1885. The four charter trustees who attended the meeting--Lyman, who served as chairman, S. D. Smith, J. A. Tomlin and Hooker--issued a call for a formal meeting to form "a corporate body for the purpose of establishing a Christian College at Winter Park, Orange County, Florida, to meet in the Directors' Room of the Lyman Bank in Sanford, Florida on Tuesday, the 28th day of April, A.D. 1885 at 9 o'clock in the morning." (36)

Ten days after the Congregational Association had voted to locate a college in Winter Park, the same trustees, with the addition of H. D. Kitchell, adopted a constitution and by-laws. The constitution or charter provided that the corporation name be Rollins College and that it be located in Winter Park, Florida. It then stated the college's purpose:

Its object, which shall never be changed, shall be the Christian education of youth and to this end it proposes to provide for its students the best educational facilities possible and throw about them those Christian influences which will be adopted to restrain them from evil and prepare them for a virtuous, happy and useful life. (37)

To fulfill this purpose the trustees proposed to establish preparatory, industrial, normal, and collegiate departments and any professional or graduate education "as present or future exigencies may require." The charter also vested the government and management of the college in five offices: President, Vice-president, Secretary, Treasurer, and Auditor. The By-laws created a five-member Executive

Committee of the Trustees and authorized it to "transact any ordinary business during the interval between the regular meetings" of the trustees. The By-laws further established a faculty comprised of professors, tutors, and a president. The faculty, headed by the president, was made responsible for governing the institution, for determining admission standards, and for constructing a curriculum embodying "a classical course which {gives} extensive attention to the liberal arts." In addition, the faculty was to be responsible for rules and regulations governing of student conduct and "for promoting in the highest degrees their health and decorum, their mental, moral and spiritual welfare, giving the institution, as far as possible, a parental influence and the atmosphere of a Christian home." Finally, the By-laws required that members of both the trustees and the faculty proclaim connection with some evangelical church.(38)

The incorporators then elected the following officers: F. W. Lyman, President, C. M. Bingham, Vice-president, A. W. Rollins, Treasurer, Nathan Barrows, Auditor, S. D. Smith, Secretary, and Reverend Edward Hooker, President of the Faculty. They authorized Hooker "to engage such professors and teachers for the ensuing year as, in his judgment may seem best." Hooker, Lyman, Knowles and Fairbanks formed a building committee with powers to erect the necessary structures for the new college.(39) Although the minutes are silent on the matter, apparently the Executive Committee decided to open the college in the coming fall. The local paper reported on the day following incorporation that work would begin in the summer on the classroom building and dormitory cottages. Dr. Hooker and others, it noted, would go north at once to raise funds and seek "the best teachers that can be found."(40)

The newspaper article did not begin to describe the enormous task undertaken by Hooker and the Executive Committee in the spring of 1885. In a period of six months they planned to construct buildings, enroll students, find or build quarters for the students, locate and hire teachers, order textbooks from distant places, publicize the college, and, most urgent, raise funds to support these requirements. Within a few weeks Hooker was on his way north seeking money, professors and if possible, students for the new college. In this first effort Hooker began a process that would characterize the college's efforts in this realm for many decades. Although a college located in the South, Rollins would draw not only its inspiration but also its basic resources-- students, teachers and finances -- largely from the northeast, or from those who lived there but wintered in Florida. Hooker early articulated this condition in a letter to Noah Porter, President of Yale University in 1885:

We intend that Rollins College shall be such that you might step into any department of it and think you were in New England. The teachers, the standards, the methods, are all to be Northern. Rollins College will be a sample of New England educational institutions in the South. How can we, as lovers of country, make this land one without changing the civilization of the South and making it in education like the North? Florida will be the first Southern State to become Northern in its civilization, and the College will be the right hand of this true progress. (41)

In turn, northerners depicted Rollins's founding as the planting of a New England institution in another area of the country. The BOSTON HERALD noted Hooker's initial visit to the northeast with a typical, slightly patronizing comment: "New England has taken Florida captive as a pleasure and health resort, and the question [is], why cannot a New England college be planted in the heart of the state?" The editor saw no reason why, and predicted that Hooker would make a successful fund-raising effort because a "those who know the importance

of giving southern youth a New England education are emphatic in commending Dr. Hooker's mission.(42)

In fact, Hooker did realize success on his first call. One of the trustees, Francis B. Knowles, a wealthy Massachusetts industrialist, had earlier indicated a special interest in helping to open the college. During the founding campaign he pledged one thousand dollars and promised four thousand more if the college was located in Winter Park. In March, he suggested that Hooker come Massachusetts and "beg" for money among Knowles's friends in his hometown of Worcester. Hooker had little luck with Knowles's friends, but the old industrialist himself added five thousand dollars to his original pledge, the a total of \$10,000 for the purpose of building a classroom. The assurance of a classroom building, destined to be named in honor of the donor, finally made the college a reality. Within a few weeks, Hooker collected enough pledges to begin construction of a dormitory.(43)

With money pledged and with Hooker and Lyman in the north seeking funds, Loring Chase, a charter trustee, assumed responsibility for getting construction underway. Fortune continued to smile on the undertaking for a while at least, as George Rand, Boston architect residing in Winter Park, volunteered to draw up plans for the new buildings and George Rollins, son of Alonzo, who was building the Seminole Hotel, agreed to superintend the project. Work began in mid-summer, but even under the best of circumstances they had a very short period to construct a building in time for an October opening.(44)

In the meantime, Hooker secured faculty members for the new undertaking. On August 12, he announced the first members of the charter faculty: Dr. Nathan Barrows, as professor of Mathematics and Physics, and Annie Morton, Instructor in History and later Principal of the Training Department. A few weeks later, he hired William M. Lloyd,

Professor of Ancient Languages and Principal of the Preparatory School, and Louise Abbot, Assistant Principal of the Training Department. Others would be added during the year, but this little band of teachers would greet the students on opening day.(45)

As that day approached, the realization dawned that nothing would be ready. Hooker therefore advanced opening date to November 4. On October 6, Barrows arrived to relieve Chase of the preliminary work of opening the college, just as students began registering in surprisingly large numbers. Chase wrote to Lyman that Orlando was sending a "big delegation almost everyday." But as late as the middle of October the college officers still had no place to house or teach students. Knowles had sent \$2,000 but that fell far short of present needs. Chase reported that George Rollins could work only ten men on the classroom building and none on the dormitory. "If we had funds," he lamented, "we would put on more men on the college building, and it is a great pity {because} if we had been READY I think we should have had 150 pupils." Under the circumstances only seventy students had registered.(46)

The college had no place to accommodate even this number of students. Chase later acknowledged that as the day of opening drew near he and Hooker were at their "wits' end." The weeks before opening found Hooker and Chase scurrying around Winter Park, arranging for rooms and trying to locate classrooms. On the evening before opening day, Chase wrote Lyman with some relief that things were "fairly fixed, meaning that they had secured White's Hall above the Ergood Grocery store for classroom space, the Larrabee house at Morse Boulevard and New York Avenue for the boys' dormitory and had rented the Ward cottage on Osceola Street near the college for the girls. At the eleventh hour yet another serious problem arose: the plastered partitions of White's

Hall completed at the last moment were not dry. Chase deemed the room unsafe but suggested that since the unfinished Congregational Church had no pews (only boards set on small barrels), it might serve as a temporary classroom. Hooker agreed, and as Chase later described it: "Tonight as I write (10 p.m.) our whole force of carpenters is there setting up desks and partitions." Sometime in the late evening hours they had made the spare little gothic building ready for Rollins's first classes.(47)

Opening day on November 4, 1885, according to the ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, proved to be a "typical Florida fall day, with sunny skies and mild temperatures." The weather may have been pleasant, but panic seized William Lloyd, one of the new professors, when he entered the Congregational Church an hour before students were scheduled to arrive. The newly order school desks were still sitting in freight car several blocks away. Lloyd quickly organized a crew of young men, moved the church pews to the sidewalls, and unloaded the desks, just in time for the arrival of the first students. Promptly at 9:00 a.m. the Congregational Church bell pealed the beginning of a new era. In addition to the sixty-six students and five teachers, twenty friends of the institution had gathered to launch the new enterprise. The program was a simple one: the audience sang a hymn to open the convocation program, and a prayer followed. President Hooker and Reverend Sullivan F. Gale, destined to be an indefatigable worker for the new college, gave "interesting addresses," at the conclusion of which Hooker called the roll of students, and formally announced the beginning of classes. The SOUTH FLORIDA SENTINEL bannered a sentiment common to all who gathered in the little Congregational Church on that fall day in 1885: "Joy to the Park, the school's begun!"(48)

CHAPTER TWO

FROM CONVOCATION TO CRISIS, 1885-1893

In an article on Rollins in 1892 the editor of the ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, in answering those who questioned the worth of a college education, cogently summarized a prevailing nineteenth century Victorian sentiment. The true purpose of college education, the editor declared, was to enlarge the "mind and character" of young people: "a mind to understand difficult things, able to appreciate finest things; a character simple, pure and strong -- these are the results of education. They put the youth on a high plane of thinking and of living".(1)

Rollins College was founded in an era when such views were taken quite seriously, in an era one historian of higher education has termed the "Age of the College." The phrase meant more than simply that small colleges were the principal institutions of higher learning in the United States. By the late 19th century it encompassed the social, academic and even religious life where which students lived and studied. The "collegiate way" included not only a rigidly prescribed curriculum and special methods of teaching it, but also the belief that these alone did not make a college. The college way of life also included "an adherence to the residential scheme of things," in a "quiet, rural setting," a dependence on dormitories and dining halls, and a sense of protective nurturing captured in the phrase in loco parentis. Residential colleges literally served as parents to its young charges. In the words of President Charles Eliot of Harvard, college

was an ideal place for young men going through the "critical passage from boyhood to manhood." Dormitories according to the "collegiate way" were more than places to sleep; they represented opportunities for young men (and in a few colleges, young women) to share communal living, to learn virtues of common decency and respect for the well being of others. In this sense, the dining halls were appropriately called the "commons," a place where the collegiate family (including the president and many of the faculty) shared its meals. And, finally, permeating and undergirding the collegiate way, was a jealous paternalism that made the college responsible for the total well-being of the students--their studies, their discipline, their problems, their successes.(2)

Perhaps the most striking characteristic of the collegiate way was its classical curriculum. Inherited from Europe, modified slightly to fit American needs, the classical curriculum became by the advent of the Civil War the keystone of a college education. It proposed to do more than impart knowledge; it sought also to instill piety and build character and to produce a cultured, refined person. These goals could be achieved, it was argued, through a study of mathematics, Greek and Latin grammar and classical literature, but the study of these subjects had the added value, according to the proponents of the classical curriculum, of sharpening the students' mental faculties. The famous Yale Report of 1828 declared that these fields of study provided "the discipline and the furniture of the mind; expanding its power, and storing it with knowledge. A commanding object, therefore, in a collegiate course should be to call into daily and vigorous exercise the faculties of the student." Nineteen-century educators proposed that ancient languages and literature of Greece and Rome could best achieve these purposes. Rhetoric and disputation--training in writing

and speaking English--merited some attention, and by the Civil War natural philosophy (physics and chemistry) and natural history (geology and biology) had been added, but these new courses remained appendages to the more important program in ancient languages. The senior course on moral philosophy, usually taught by the President who sought to pull together four years of learning, invariably capped the classical curriculum.(3)

Recitation, a pedagogy that demanded of the student memorization of passages from a required text, represented the standard teaching method employed in this prescribed curriculum. Teachers evaluated students on their ability to recite verbatim assigned passages of their texts. The philosophical rationale behind this pedagogical method known as faculty psychology, argued that the mind was a muscle requiring daily exercise, that intellectual acumen came from training, habit, routine, and hard work. As one contemporary stated it, recitation and study of the classics "improve the memory, strengthen the judgment, refine the taste, give discrimination and point to the discerning faculty, confers habits of attention, reasoning and analysis -- in short, they exercise and cultivate all the intellectual powers."(4)

In the first three decades of the 19th century such beliefs solidified into orthodoxy and became firmly cemented into the college curriculum. No reputable college would dare deviate from their norm historically set by Ivy League colleges. Yale particularly became a kind of universal model. When many colleges (including Rollins) advertised that they were built on the Yale model, they meant that they had reproduced Yale's classical curriculum and were emphasizing the recitation method. This imitative process produced incredible unity and continuity in American higher education that lasted throughout most of

the 19th century. But it also created a static institution in the midst of society undergoing dynamic change.

A society involved in the practical progress of modern industrialization, urbanization and professionalization had difficulty in seeing the relevancy of the classical curriculum with its emphasis on ancient (dead) languages and literature and its rigidly prescribed courses. Elements in the society began pressuring higher educational institutions of higher learning to offer courses--English, history, politics, and applied sciences--that seemed more related to real life. Emerging state universities responded to this pressure not only by offering a greater variety of courses but also granting a larger number of degrees, everything from Bachelor of Science to Bachelor of Agriculture. The colleges resisted these changes, but even such traditional institutions as Yale, headed by conservative Noah Porter, conceded to a scientific course of study, not, however, as part of the classical curriculum, but instead placed parallel to it, and with another degree, the Bachelor of Science. In this way purists kept the A.B. degree unsullied. As usual, other college followed Yale's lead and began to diversify courses of study.(5)

Thus, in the mid-1800s, the decade of Rollins's founding, American higher education was in a transitional period, involving in a process of redefinition. The curriculum that Hooker and the charter professors devised for the college reflected the prevailing educational conditions: a classical curriculum anchored the program, but founders also included some moderately bold responses to changing education patterns and, like other colleges beginning in the 19th century, the practical needs of a frontier community. The first prospectus proclaimed that, because Rollins College was dedicated to meeting "the

great and diversified educational needs of Florida," its program of study would include four departments:

1. The Collegiate Department, with its course of highest standard in the ancient classics, in modern languages, in mathematics and physics.
2. The Preparatory Department, which must do important work for the present, at least, in fitting students for the college.
3. The Training Department for teachers, which will instruct those who would teach in public schools and elsewhere. To this end children will be received into this Department and placed under the instruction of Normal students.
4. Industrial Training Department, in which the young ladies and gentlemen of other Departments can choose some useful line of practical industry and while the mind is cultivated can acquire knowledge and skill in the industrial arts.(6)

Obviously the last two departments seriously departed from the traditional classical course of study, but Rollins, like other colleges, had ways of accommodating itself to such abnormalities.

The Collegiate Department represented the traditional liberal arts program with the kind of modifications that other colleges developed after the Civil War. Drafted primarily by the classicist, William Lloyd, it not only provided for the prescribed classical curriculum, but also a "scientific" course of study. The latter resembled the classical curriculum in almost every respect, except for a slight reduction in ancient languages. In the freshman and sophomore years, students in this course of study could substitute an English history course, a history of the English language, and a history of civilization course in place of three Latin courses. Otherwise, the two courses of study were precisely the same. They included three years of Latin, two of Greek, four of mathematics and one of Moral Philosophy.

The college also distinguished the Collegiate Department from the other areas in its exceptionally high admissions requirements, probably as high as those of any other liberal arts college. Only a listing can do justice to the level of prior work required by students entering the collegiate department:(7)

Latin Grammar, Four Books of Caesar, Six Orations of Cicero, Six Books of Virgil's Aeneid, Jones' Latin Prose Composition, Translation of Latin at Sight, Three Books of Anabasis, Three Books of Homer's Iliad, Herodotus, Greek Prose Composition, Translation of Greek at Sight, Chardenal's 1st and 2nd Courses in French, Corneille's Le Cid and Victor Hugo's Hernani, Arithmetic, Metric System, Wentworth's Complete Algebra, Wentworth's Plane Geometry, Physical Geography, Elementary Rhetoric, United States History, Roman and Greek History, Life and Mythology, and Ancient and Modern Geography.

By reserving the bachelor degree solely for the collegiate department the college, or course, maintained the prestige of a liberal arts education. But it almost certainly guaranteed a low enrollment. With no high schools or private academies in the immediate area and with very few even in the state, not many students could meet such high requirements, and those who could very likely resided in the northeast where many old established colleges were readily available. Thus, in an effort to achieve immediate respectability, Rollins, as had countless other frontier colleges, had reproduced the traditional classical curriculum "on the Yale Model" with its stringent requirements and prescribed courses. In the process had created for itself a serious problem: few local students could meet the requirements, but the college could not reduce those requisites to meet local needs for fear of being considered a substandard institution. Therefore, the college attempted to solve the dilemma in two ways: first, it attached a preparatory department to the college structure and frankly proclaimed that its purpose was to fit students for the college; second, it made

an appeal to northeastern students who wanted to prepare for the college but whose health required them to spend "a considerable portion of the year in a more genial climate to pursue their studies, and at the same time confirm their health." If this scheme had produced the desired results (it did not) Rollins might have been have been a college of convalescents.

The Preparatory Department's curriculum corresponded to the Collegiate Department's classical and scientific course of study. The College admitted students graduating from the preparatory school directly without further work while others had to meet the requirements listed above. The preparatory curriculum stressed Latin and Greek grammar but also emphasized the essentials of English grammar with attention to composition and penmanship. In 1888, the college added an "Academic Department" to the preparatory school for those who were uninterested in further study or those who could not complete the classical or scientific course of study. The Academic Department curriculum contained no Latin or Greek but still included heavy doses of mathematics, science, English literature, and history. In fact, it greatly resembled the curriculum that would emerge in the late 1890s when more colleges, including Rollins, abandoned the classical curriculum.

Rollins made a pragmatic bow to local needs by including a normal school and vocational courses. The former, called the Training Department, served two purposes: it allowed the college to broaden its purposes and meet the need for teachers in the state, and it also offered a primary or sub-preparatory education, and all of this in turn provided training for students in the normal (education) school. Requirements for enrolling in the normal school were much less difficult than either the collegiate or preparatory department.

Candidates were required only to pass an examination in reading, spelling, geography, United States history, language, arithmetic and elementary algebra, and in addition, they had to present "satisfactory testimony as to moral character and general scholarship." The three-year program included "two recitations daily and constant drill in practical pedagogics." The department expected students to spend two hours each day teaching primary classes under the direction of the Normal school principal. Upon completion of the Normal program, students received a certificate of graduation.

The Industrial Training Department, obviously an effort to meet practical frontier needs, served as an appendage to the college. All students could take courses in the department, although no list of courses ever appeared. The By-laws even provided for a director, but no one ever held that position. In fact, by 1895, the department had simply disappeared from college literature without apparently ever having come into existence.

Instead, in 1890, the college created the Music Department which, although more in accord with a liberal arts program, nevertheless served somewhat the same purpose as the moribund industrial department: it gave students an opportunity to work on an A.B. degree and a professional certificate at the same time. The program, providing for instruction in piano, voice, and music theory in groups and on an individual basis, was such a success that in 1896 the college turned it into a separate school and allowed it to offer a Bachelor of Music diploma(9)

For obvious reasons, the college corporate officers--the Rollins Board of Trustees--set the cost of education at Rollins at the lowest

possible level. The 1886 catalogue established rates for a twelve-week term as follows:

Tuition in Collegiate Department	\$18.00
Tuition in the Preparatory Department.....	\$12.00
Tuition in Training Department.....	\$ 9.00
Board.....	\$48.00
Furnished room, with lights.....	\$12.00

Each student was required to bring two pairs of sheets for a single bed, two pillowcases, two blankets, a comforter, towels and table napkins. The annual cost for a boarding college student totaled \$231 and for boarding preparatory and sub-preparatory students a trifle less. Two years later, 1887, the college reduced this already low cost by reducing board charges to \$36, almost a thirty percent drop.

These charges fell far below the cost of running the institution, but again Rollins acted in concert with other private liberal arts colleges. It met the bulk of its expenses by private donations, but these were almost never adequate. Under such conditions, the trustees had two alternatives: they could charge the students the difference, or they could cut expenses. Given the problems of enrollment, the trustees surprised no one with its choice. The Board established tuition at the lowest possible level, and to make up the difference between income and costs that this rate caused, it offered charter faculty members salaries significantly lower than any of their contemporary professionals. As with most 19th century colleges, when it came to the choice of paying the faculty or charging the students, the trustees invariably chose the latter course. From the over \$20,000 collected in student fees during the first year, less than one-fifth went to faculty salaries. Only President Hooker was paid as much as \$1,000 per year.(10)

Of the original sixty students, only two--Clara Louise Guild and Ida May Misseldine--entered the college, the rest enrolling in the

preparatory and sub-preparatory departments. These enrollments reveal much, because not only do they indicate the great gap between the collegiate way and Florida's educational resources, but also because they show quite clearly the prevailing community requirements. The community urgently needed quality elementary and high schools, yet it received a college with preparatory and sub-preparatory schools attached, the latter two created to meet not the community's but the college's needs. As mentioned earlier, all departments, including the preparatory, served as appendages to the collegiate department. In fact, for almost four decades after the founding of the college, the reverse held true. The appendages prospered while the college barely limped along with only a few students. Ten years after its founding the college claimed a total of thirty-four students while the other departments reported 139, and this ratio in 1895 was one of the highest in the college's first decade. Significantly, the preparatory departments carried the college during its infancy and years of early growth until in the mid-1920s when the institution matured sufficiently to function without them.(11)

The founders of the college believed that the institution would appeal to a national constituency, but in the first decade it remained primarily a local college. Students from outside the state enrolled; but the great majority listed their residences as Florida, and even in this group most were from Central Florida. Many were within walking distance of the college, but a significant number used the South Florida Railroad for transportation to and from classes. In September, 1886, the college reached an agreement with the railroad whereby the company issued "school tickets" allowing children attending Rollins to ride at a reduced rate: under twelve, one-half cent per mile; over twelve, one cent per mile. The charge for a round-trip from Sanford was

twenty-four cents, a reasonable rate, but riding the train made for a long day. It ran from Sanford to Orlando only twice a day, arriving in Orlando at 7:00 a.m. and leaving for Sanford for a return trip at 6:00 p.m., when it was on time, which, according to the students, was a rare occasion.(13)

Many of the students boarded at the college, which caused a problem because at the opening of school neither the classroom building nor the dormitory was completed. However, by the middle of the first school year, the college made the major step of moving to its designated campus. Because for the first time the institution would have the appearance of a college with substance and roots, the trustees planned an elaborate dedication celebration for the opening of Knowles Hall in March 1886.

In the meantime, George Rollins finished construction of the girls' cottage named Pinehurst. The administration emphasized the "cottage" concept of boarding because it wanted to distinguish it from the large dormitory system of lodging becoming popular in the large universities. The dormitory system, claimed the college brochure, placed together in one building students with various characters and habits. Rollins offered cottages of moderate size, where a matron or member of the faculty who lived in the cottage would closely supervise students, each with a private room. "Social relations between ladies and gentlemen," the college literature emphasized, would be supervised by the matrons who would make certain that the "inmates" studied properly and engaged in "wholesome recreation." In essence, the college promised that the cottage system would create a benevolent paternalism, one that would "surround the student with the influences of a cheerful, well-ordered Christian home."(14)

On March 9, 1886, the trustees dedicated Knowles Hall, a two-story

structure containing classrooms for recitation, and a hall capable of seating three hundred people for chapel services, exhibitions, and entertainments. Dedication exercises, beginning at 3:00 p.m. contained the usual music, prayers and orations, followed by the principal speaker A. J. Russell, Florida Superintendent of Schools. Frederick Lyman, president of the corporation, again displayed his flair for business dramatics. After formally presenting the keys of Knowles Hall to President Hooker, Lyman seized the occasion to seek sorely needed funds. Pinehurst required furnishing, he told the audience and financial assistance seemed forthcoming. The trustees had spent many hours puzzling how to finance boys' dormitory and to furnish the girls' cottage with appropriate furniture when, at the last moment, Lyman declared, a solution had appeared. Just before the dedication ceremonies, he had been handed a note from Mr. Francis Knowles, stating that if sufficient funds were subscribed at this meeting to furnish the thirty-four rooms of the ladies' cottage at sixty dollars per room, Mr. Knowles promised to finance the men's dormitory. Incredibly, the funds were raised within fifteen minutes. The audience then praised "God From Whom All Blessings Flow," but clearly Lyman's ingenuity played no small role.(15)

Knowles Hall quickly became the college landmark and center of campus activity. The large hall was used for recitations, assembly, and daily chapel services. A large veranda served as a central gathering place for students between and after classes and also as the preferred backdrop of annual class pictures. But it was the two-story bell tower, which gave Knowles its greatest distinction. Purchased from Cincinnati in June 1886, the bell served as the college timepiece, awakening the students in the morning, sending them to bed at night, and in between marking marking their classes and mealtimes. One contemporary remembered

it as "the finest and most melodious toll bell ever bought." With a good east wind and a bright sunny day, Orlando residents could hear its peal five miles away.(16)

Before the first year was over, two more buildings had been constructed on the campus: Lakeside cottage, the men's dormitory finished in time for the 1886-1887 school year at a cost of over \$10,000, and the Dining Hall, also a gift of Knowles, costing over \$7,000. Until the completion of the dining hall, boarding students took their meals in a small lean-to kitchen attached to the south end of Pinehurst with meals served in two former bedrooms on the west end of the first floor. The dining hall, described as a "bright, cheerful building with a kitchen in the rear," released the former kitchen space for use as the college library.(17)

Thus, by the end of 1887, four imposing buildings stood on the east side of the horseshoe shaped commons, and Rollins had indeed begun to resemble a permanent institution of higher education. Hooker had made significant gains but incredibly, the first president managed even more. In 1891, using funds gathered by his diligent effort, the college constructed another and larger women's hall, later called Cloverleaf, placing it on the horseshoe opposite Knowles Hall. Although called a "cottage", Cloverleaf was an impressive the three-story, ninety room, three-winged structure much more resembled a large dormitory. Hooker and the trustees discovered it was far less expensive to construct a single, large building than several smaller ones. Men were now housed in Pinehurst, which, along with Lakeside, gave the college two male dormitories. Finally, with money donated by Frederick Lyman, the college constructed a gymnasium, placing it on the lake between Lakeside and the Dining Hall. Lyman Gymnasium contained a fifty-by-seventy exercise room and an inside gallery guarded by an ornately

decorated balustrade. With Lyman Hall, the college completed its initial building phase. A graphic drawing in the 1892 catalogue, though somewhat misleading in its placement of the buildings on the campus, nevertheless correctly gave the feeling of permanence to the fledgling little college.(18)

Academic and social life in the early years at Rollins very much resemble life in other "old-time" colleges of the 19th century. As one of the early students later recalled, the misnomer "gay nineties" hardly described the "sober and sedate" life of college students.(19) Most all teachers were remembered as "strong disciplinarians," not a surprising characterization for 19th century pedagogy assumed the mind had to be disciplined in order to absorb knowledge. Learning was a matter of hard work. Like physical training, academic endeavor required vigorous exertion that few would describe as pleasurable. As mentioned earlier, recitation served as the principal pedagogical method for exercising the mind, and most Rollins professors almost invariably employed it in their classrooms. Recitation, wrote Latin professor L. A. Austin in the college catalogue, "is an excellent discipline for the mental faculties," because it demands "accuracy in thinking." The study of Greek, declared Professor John Ford, gave students skill in forming "such mental habits as exact observation and generalization and will be of value to him in all intellectual work." The "topical method of recitation" was employed in history courses while German literature would be "read and committed to memory."(20)

Science courses offered a welcome relief from the routine of recitation. The instructor, Eva J. Root, required some recitation from textbooks in botany, zoology, physiology and astronomy, but she also encouraged much "hands-on" work: dissection, work with manikins and charts, use of microscope and telescope, the latter given to the

college by George Rollins, the brother of Alonzo. As Professor Root noted in the catalogue, she gave students "the advantages of practical work." One of Root's students later praised her for opening the "scientific world of plants and animals that most of us had known only superficially."(21)

Perhaps the most innovative practitioner of the new methods was Thomas R. Baker, who came in 1891. Although retired from Pennsylvania State University, Baker at fifty-three was still an energetic, exciting teacher. But for its location, Rollins would not have attracted such an outstanding educator and scholar in the prime of his teaching. Baker, who had already established a national reputation as a teacher of the experimental method with the publication of a textbook, made good use of the method in the classroom. The object of the experimental method, Baker wrote in the catalogue, was "not only to fix in the minds of pupils the facts that are presented them, but to teach them how to use this method to the best advantage." He introduced a course entitled "Practical Chemistry," designed to give students "a more practical knowledge of chemistry than can be gained by merely studying the theory of the subject." Despite such innovative efforts, years would pass before the Rollins catalogue showed any significant changes in pedagogical methods.(22)

Socially, small 19th century colleges tended logically to reflect and serve as extensions of the prevailing concepts of family life. Colleges were small, financially insecure and paternalistically authoritarian. Like the family, its central purpose was socialization, with an enormous amount of energy expended closely regulating unruly young people. The administration and faculty of the college assumed full responsibility for developing a student's character as long as he or she remained at the institution. Thus, when Rollins established a

rigid code of behavior for all students, it left no doubt as to its socialization function: "The object of the school's discipline is to protect the student from temptations and bad habits, to secure the proper improvement in behavior and produce a well-ordered life. Those who cannot give a willing and cheerful assent to the regulations of the school should not seek admission to its privileges."(23)

In December 1885, the faculty constructed a detailed list of student regulations and rules. Rules for religious observances headed the list. Without exception, it required students to attend Sunday church services ("at the church of their choice",) but actually in the early years, limited their choices to the Congregational, the Episcopal, and the Methodist churches. Students were also confined to their rooms on Sunday mornings for the purpose of studying Sunday school lessons. Finally, daily morning devotionals were mandatory for all students.(24)

The faculty considered study time a vital part of academic life, and they set study hours at any non-class time from 8:30 A.M. to 12 noon, from 1:30 P.M. to 4:30, and in the evening from 7:00 to 9:00. During these periods, they prohibited students from visiting each other's rooms, although after nine o'clock in the evening, students were allowed thirty minutes for socializing before lights out at 10:00. Between study hours on Friday evenings, gentlemen were permitted to make calls in the parlor rooms of the ladies' cottage for two hours, and also were given the opportunity to escort young ladies to church on Sunday, provided they returned directly to the campus afterward. After much debate, the faculty in 1889 agreed that both boys and girls might perform gymnastics in the same building; at the same time, this Victorian generation anxiously attempted to subvert temptation by separating the sexes. Male students were convinced that the threat of

temptation dictated dormitory policy as well. They reckoned that the Cloverleaf cottage was divisible by three: the college put all the pretty girls on the third floor--out of reach of the boys, all the middling girls on the second floor, and on the first floor it placed girls "whose faces protected them"(25)

Several 19th century vices were absolutely forbidden. The greatest of all these evils was alcohol, and of course Rollins students could not possess or use liquor either on campus or in the vicinity. The college faced an early moral dilemma on this matter after Winter Park Company built the Seminole Hotel. The hostelry sold liquor, and the college held stock in the company. One trustee annoyingly persisted in pointing out this moral inconsistency until finally the trustees corrected it: they retired the complaining trustee. (26) Other vices received almost equal attention. The College prohibited the use of tobacco "on campus, on the streets, or in the vicinity" of the college; after long debate, the faculty decided to prohibit card playing on the grounds that it was a "sedentary game unsuitable for students and tending toward immorality"; and forbade other acts including loitering at the railway station on Sunday, throwing water on beds, stealing, keeping firearms, using profanity and keeping a dirty room.(27)

The College issued demerits for an infraction of these rules and weighed them according to the college's perception of their importance. Absence from Sunday services and from class drew two demerits each; from Sunday school study hours and for tardiness, one demerit each. Eight demerits in one term resulted in a reprimand; twelve, a letter to the parents; and fifteen demerits led to dismissal. Most students, accustomed to this rigid discipline of their behavior at home, rarely rebelled. Yet, in another sense, all these rules and regulations that succeeded in small ways, achieved much less success in large matters.

Young people who ordinarily would have lived under the watchful and authoritarian eyes of parents now sought a limited kind of freedom in college despite the faculty's intentions and found adventure in breaking institutional rules. At almost every faculty meeting one or more recalcitrant student appeared to explain some violation, the most common being the use of profanity in some form. Faculty minutes abound with notations: "dismissed on account of licentious talk." Many infractions, of course, went undetected. Frederick Lewton, later a prominent botanist in the United States Agriculture Department and curator of textiles in the Smithsonian Institution, recalled how one night he slipped out of his room in order to observe the constellation Leo, visible only after 1:00 A.M. He burst to share his observances with someone but held it all inside for fear of receiving demerits for breaking the ten o'clock curfew.(28)

Innumerable infractions undoubtedly resulted because the regulations were too restrictive to irrepressibly energetic youth. Such was the case of Rex Beach, later to become a popular novelist and one of Rollins's most famous and loyal alumni. Beach, a genuine free spirit, refused to be bound by restrictive Victorian mores. A natural athlete, he took a much more casual approach to academic life than 19th century academicians were willing to accept. Beach saw college as a place for good companionship, an opportunity for good fun. In the Victorian mode, the college prohibited frivolous activity on Sundays. Beach, who viewed regulations not as restrictions but as challenges, along with four other boys were seen sailing on Lake Virginia one Sunday morning. They were brought before the faculty for explanation and later "personally admonished" by the President. Ten O'clock curfew was also a challenge for Beach. As he readily admitted, most buildings did not offer many escape routes: "It took a trapeze performer to get

out {of Pinehurst} and a post-graduate course in porch climbing to get back in." The athletic Beach apparently managed the feat quite often, because in March 1893 he was suspended "for open defiance" of the curfew rule. Two weeks later after a letter of apology the faculty allowed him to return. Despite such leniencies Beach never graduated. In fact, he posed a mystery to the Victorian faculty who thought he lacked the qualities of a serious scholar. Most doubted that he would ever amount to much, and later expressed surprise that Beach could write novels. (29)

To manage and to instruct these sometimes unruly youngsters, the college drew together an unusually talented group of educators. Because the remote little college could hardly expect to attract noted educators, Hooker used the institution's favorable environment as an inducement for securing qualified teachers. Few of the early instructors came to the area specifically to teach at Rollins. Almost all were already in Florida for one or another reason unrelated to teaching. Nathan Barrows, a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Western Reserve, had been a physician for years in Cleveland when he decided to embark upon a new career in citrus, and therefore, he had been living in Orange City before the founding of Rollins. As the college's most outstanding charter faculty member, the tall, powerfully built doctor with white hair and a full, flowing white beard made an impressive appearance. Even at middle age, he was an active, energetic man, a great proponent of physical exercise and a lover of nature. Free hours found him walking for miles in the woods or rowing long distances on the chain of lakes. He rowed across Lake Virginia to Rollins each day. In addition to teaching mathematics, Barrows also served on the Board of Trustees, the only person ever to hold a position on the faculty and on the Board at the same time.(30)

The other original faculty members--Louise Abbott, William Lloyd, and Annie Morton--were in retirement in Florida when Hooker hired them. As with so many Victorians, Morton had come south with the forlorn hope that warmer weather would help cure a chronic illness, but she died of cancer only six years after she arrived at Rollins. In the second term of the first year Lewis Austin, a former classmate of Dr. Hooker, joined the faculty to teach Greek and Latin. But after a short time gave up teaching for travel in Italy and Greece. During the second year, the college added instructors in natural science, English literature, music, art, and two Normal school instructors, for a total of thirteen. Two of these appointments proved fortunate. John H. Ford, a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Oberlin, was named professor of Greek. Ford, whose wife was the sister of Governor Peter Altgeld of Illinois, had sought the warmer climate of Florida in the hope of relieving what he thought was tuberculosis. Because he lived on campus in a home directly behind Knowles Hall, Ford assumed an unusually active role in the college's community life, entertaining students and even holding classes on his front porch.(31)

Miss Eva J. Root also joined the faculty in the second year as the college's its first instuctor in natural science. Miss Root, a perfect example of the versatility demanded of college teachers, served first as principal of the sub-preparatory department and after two years, the college hired her to teach botany, zoology, biology, and comparative anatomy in the preparatory department and physiology and astronomy in the college. In addition, she taught French in both the preparatory and collegiate departments. As a part of her responsibilities, she was matron for Pinehurst after it became a boys cottage. (32)

Two PhDs joined the faculty in 1890 and 1891. The first, Dr. Carl Hartman, a native of Germany hired to teach German and Spanish proved

to be a disaster. A few weeks after school opened in 1890, Hooker admitted that Hartman was "an unfortunate appointment." Possessed an acerbic, thoroughly disagreeable disposition that immediately upset faculty harmony and school routine. Hartman alienated most of the college community, particularly several members of the faculty, whose lives, according to Hooker, "were beyond reproach". His harsh and even violent manner brought on several serious incidents. The climax came at the end of the year when, during an argument with two male students, Hartman pushed both down the stairs of Knowles Hall, slightly injuring one. At the faculty meeting convened to discuss the matter, the irate professor lashed out at everyone, including Hooker. He was not asked to return the following year.(33)

Hartman's dismissal opened the way for the appointment of one of the early college's most prominent professors: Dr. Thomas Rakestraw Baker, PhD from University of Goettingen. Baker, an established scholar and teacher, not only provided freshness to the study science, he breathed new life into the teaching of German, employing what he called the "natural method." The student, he wrote in the catalogue, would spend more time "in reading German than in studying the technicalities of grammar." Baker who remained at the college for over two decades, proved a scholarly inspiration for the college. His impressive shock of white hair and Lincolnesque beard gave him a deceptively sober manner, but in the classroom or in student groups his wit and infectious sense of humor and willingness to try new methods brought unusual vitality into the traditionally somber, sometimes lifeless, Victorian educational process. (34)

The leader and animating influence for this band of pioneer educators was the president himself, who, from the beginning, became as deeply involved in the academic as in the administrative aspect of the

college. Although somewhat stiff in appearance--his dress invariably included a Prince Albert coat, white tie and silk hat--the kindness of his voice and eyes softened an otherwise formal exterior bearing. He had the eye, one student remembered, of "an other-worldly religious leader, almost a living beatitude." Many spoke of Hooker's gentleness, his love for all living things. The family cat became so attached to him that each morning the pet followed him down Interlachen as he walked from the parsonage to the college. Viewing the college as an opportunity for home mission, by example and by direction he infused a spirit of dedicated service into the early college community. He loved working with students, making ministerial visits, promoting prayer groups, counseling those with problems, even at times taking into his own large family students who found it difficult to adjust to life away from home. His letter book is filled with notes to parents assuring them that their children were doing well. "Your son is homesick," he wrote in a typical letter, "but is getting over it. Stand by the authority of the school in your letters and we shall be able to help you make your son a noble man."(35)

No deans or assistants were available to deal with the countless administrative matters. The president relied on the faculty to help administer the college. Academic decisions--requirements, courses, teaching loads, as well as student affairs--everything from dormitory regulations to granting permission for special student activities--fell within direct faculty responsibilities. Through weekly committee meetings the faculty ruled on such varied matters as course schedules, demerit assignments, and commencement programs, student dismissals, and absences. By 1887, the little democratic faculty meetings had apparently become quite lively, forcing the president to invoke new rules of order. He allotted each faculty member three minutes to make

his case denying him further speech until everyone had been heard. Yet, except for the Hartman affair, little dissension among the faculty developed during Hooker's presidency. (36)

From the beginning, Hooker's most troublesome problem was not administering the college but finding funds to keep the educational endeavor functioning properly. In this area, he relied on the Board of Trustees, particularly the executive committee. Frederick Lyman provided much of the financial leadership in the early years. Because most of its assets were in land and stocks and most of its initial cash went into buildings, the first academic year found the college in debt. Lyman borrowed over \$2,500 in his own name during the summer of 1886 and told Hooker that the college needed \$4,000 more before it opened in October 1886. "I do not like to do this," Lyman wrote Hooker. "I do not feel that I should be expected to, but I cannot see the work stop as it would otherwise." (36) In October 1886, Lyman borrowed \$4,000 from his cousin, which he thought would carry the college until it could sell some of its orange grove property, but even so, during the fall term the college drifted further into debt, probably as much as \$8,000. The executive committee sold a college-owned orange grove in Palatka, but that provided only temporary relief. Within a year, Hooker was again without money to pay college expenses. Lyman, who was in New England at the time, borrowed a sum from a New York bank but (unnecessarily) warned Hooker to be cautious with expenditures: "I do not know where we can get another dollar." (37)

Still, despite Lyman's pessimism, the college did receive a steady trickle of funds. Professor John Ford agreed, for a small stipend, to raise money in the State during the summer months, and Hooker went north each summer for the same purpose. More importantly, periodic

grants from the Congregational Educational Society totaling more than \$74,000 proved to be the margin between survival and collapse. (38)

Under normal circumstances these funds would have been sufficient, if only barely, to allow Rollins to break even. But those involved in college building in the late 19th century had learned that there was no such condition as normal. Each day, month, and year brought new crises, some created by the colleges themselves, others beyond their control. Rollins was no exception. Trouble on the Board of Trustees exacerbated the college's financial troubles. Dissension between the ministers, led by Sullivan Gale, and the businessmen, headed by Lyman, had been brewing for some time. However grateful for Lyman's and his colleagues' contribution to the college, the ministers were not happy with their methods in two respects. They deplored the use of the college in the Winter Park Company's land development schemes, and decried the college's advertising brochure as lacking in dignity. At the February 1887 meeting, the ministers secured an assurance from the executive committee that "the newspaper advertising of the college {would} be confined to a simple statement in regard to the college."(39)

At the commencement meeting in 1888, the ministers brought the matter to a head. After two lengthy discussions, Lyman as president of the corporation, and two other trustees resigned from the board. These resignations opened the way for a new set of by-laws that combined the two offices of President of the Corporation and President of the Faculty into one office: President of the College. The trustees named Hooker to the new office. Bruised feelings notwithstanding, Lyman departed with no animosity, issuing a characteristically generous statement: "Having the interest of the college at heart," he noted in his statement of resignation, "and thinking that those interests may be

advanced at this time by such actions, I hereby tender my resignation as President of the Corporation."(40) Lyman moved to California shortly afterward, but he continued his loyal support of the college. In February 1890, he contributed funds for the construction of a gymnasium, completed the following year.(41) The college had no truer friend than Frederick Lyman. More than any single person he was responsible for its founding and with indefatigable effort he guided the college through its first few years. The gift of the gymnasium after he left showed the real character of the man.

If the internal political struggle of these early years had little financial repercussions, two natural catastrophes had immediate effect. In 1887 and again in 1888, yellow fever epidemics ravaged the state of Florida. The dreaded disease, its cause not discovered until 1900, struck both Key West and Tampa in May 1887. Although the epidemic never reached Central Florida, the population viewed it as a threatening plague and large numbers left the state. Enrollment at Rollins dropped, through only moderately. But the following year a more serious outbreak occurred in Jacksonville, debarkation port for northerners arriving in Florida. Authorities reporting over five thousand cases and four hundred deaths, quarantined the city, and halted travel and in or out of the area. The college sent out ten thousand brochures that year claiming that "no locality was more healthful than Winter Park," but under the circumstances the words sounded hollow indeed. In September, the college postponed its 1888 opening until October. Doomsayers on the board of trustees predicted the end.(42)

Nevertheless, the college did open, albeit with reduced enrollment, and during the year registration for 1889-1890 academic year showed an encouraging increase, leading Hooker to project even more registrations than the college could accommodate with its two

dormitories. Reluctant to turn away qualified students, the trustees agreed to the expensive practice of housing the overflow of students off-campus, and then to meet what appeared to be a dramatic increase in college enrollments, they voted to construct a new dormitory, a fateful decision because as construction began, the nation's economy began a decline that would take it into the depression of 1893. The trustees had counted heavily on local money but they soon learned that frontier communities feel the effects of an economic downturn more quickly than other areas. When they attempted to borrow funds locally, they found themselves in the unenviable position of carrying more loans than deposits.(43)

Banks in the northeast provided some money, but not sufficient enough to pull the college out of what Hooker called its "hard place." The president pleaded with the Congregational Educational Society for a loan, but unsuccessfully. He desperately tried to sell another college grove, but to no avail. By July 1891, the college was over \$11,000 in debt and the new dorm remained uncompleted. Hooker gloomily wrote to a friend: "The college treasury is empty of funds for ordinary running expenses. We are spending heavily for buildings and furniture, and we shall have all we can this summer" to open the college."(45)

Yet, as before the college did open in 1891. But as the financial situation continued to worsen, Hooker became more despondent. Florida was a poor country, he wrote a colleague, where most of the people just kept their heads above water and could not be solicited for another subscription. "It is a critical time with us," he wrote, but with stubborn optimism he continued: "the darkest hour is before the morning and faith and success are apt to go together." But eventually even his cherished homilies could not sustain him. In December, he told a friend that the "burdens of the college in its stage of growth and necessary

expansion are so heavy that I sometimes regret that I did not resign the College Presidency instead of the Pastorate."(46) At the February 1892 trustee meeting, Hooker submitted his resignation. He had overtaxed his strength, and the health that he had come to Florida to recover was failing again. The trustees accepted his resignation with "thankfulness to Divine Providence" for the invaluable service he had rendered the college as one of it's chief founders and its first president".(47)

CHAPTER THREE

THE STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL, 1892-1903

After President Hooker's resignation in 1892, the college began three decades of instability caused by a host of problems ranging from low enrollment and annual indebtedness to absence of leadership. During the period from 1892 to 1925, national crises such as the severe economic depression of 1893-1896 and the debilitating effects of World War I made fund raising extremely difficult. But Rollins's most severe test followed the great freeze of 1894-1895. Below freezing temperatures destroyed the state's citrus crop and devastated the area's economy, sending large numbers of students home for an indefinite period. Moreover, the freeze destroyed orange groves owned by the college, wiping out a significant portion of the institution's projected income.

Faced with these calamities, the trustees tried desperately to find someone who could save the college from what seemed impending disaster. When Hooker resigned in February 1892, the trustees elected Frederick Lyman as Acting President with the understanding that he would serve only until the next meeting of the executive committee. Three days following that meeting, the committee, relieved Lyman of his duties and after, appointing Professor John Ford Acting President, officially began a search for a new president. They also tackled the problem that precipitated Hooker's resignation, calling a special meeting of the trustees on March 22, 1892, "to consider the financial condition of the college and take such action as may seem wise..."(1)

Chairman of the Board Lyman presented repeated an earlier treasurer's prediction that in 1892 the college would experience a

deficit of over fifteen thousand dollars.(2) After debating the problem all day, the Board decided to take a well-worn path: Acting President Ford and Lyman would "solicit subscriptions in Winter Park and the vicinity to carry the institution through the current year." Hooker had already rejected this idea on the basis that his office had only recently been canvassed Winter Park for support of new dormitory, and, he had noted, many subscriptions still remained outstanding. The trustees surely were grasping for straws, and yet, with incredible optimism, they instructed the executive committee to direct any surplus raised in the campaign toward reducing the current debt. The board also authorized the executive committee "to mortgage or sell any portion of the property now owned or claimed by Rollins College on such terms and for such price as to them may seem advisable." Such a sale, in effect, would constitute disposal of the college's only income-producing endowment. Finally, the trustees authorized the executive committee "to employ a financial agent for the college on such terms, and under such instructions as said committee may decide upon." This practical step was the college's first attempt to provide for the institution's long-range financial needs, and an indication of the trustees' desire for a more systematic approach to college financial management. Unfortunately, they never found an effective fund-raiser to fill the position.(3)

John Ford accepted the temporary position of Acting President with some misgivings. Satisfied with his role as a professor of Latin, he did not look forward to the pressures inherent in the office of the president, nor the myriad demands expected to be made upon him. Still, he shouldered his new responsibilities with a stoic sense of duty that possibly derived from years of teaching Greek civilization. Despite the

temporary nature of his appointment, he acted aggressively and positively to improve college life.(4)

The most pressing need, of course, was in finding funds for immediate college operating expenses. Following the trustees' suggestion, Ford undertook a thorough canvass of the Winter Park area, reporting a paid \$3,788 subscription at the May commencement meeting of the trustees. In addition, he and the executive committee achieved some economies through administration reorganization. They replaced housemothers in the dormitories, with female teachers and when the principal of the Ladies Department retired because of ill health, Ford assumed the duties of that office. The executive committee made further savings through reducing each faculty's annual salary by one hundred dollars.(5) Ford noted in his first annual report that such cutbacks along with the \$5,000 given each year by the College and the Congregational Educational Society of the Home Missionary Association, the college possibly could get through the 1892-1893 school year without adding to its debt.

By December 1892, Ford had actually succeeded in reducing the debt from \$10,000 to \$6,000. The treasurer estimated that the college would accrue a four thousand dollar deficit between January and October 1893, an estimate that later proved correct. In December 1893 he reported a total debt of \$10,000 calculated by adding the 1892 debt of \$6,000 to the \$4,000 projected 1893 loss. The most disturbing aspect of his report however, was the treasurer's estimated additional loss of \$5,000 between January and October 1894, which would bring the total college debt to \$15,000.(6)

Despite Ford's courageous efforts, the college desperately needed a permanent officer at the helm in who could halt this drift toward financial insolvency. By October 1893, the trustees were certain that

they had identified that person. The executive committee, acting as a search committee, had been pursuing several candidates without satisfaction, until they found George F. Fairchild, then president of Kansas State A & M College in Manhattan, Kansas. After extensive investigation by the executive committee, the Board of Trustees voted unanimously at a special meeting in April 1893, to offer Fairchild the presidency. But Fairchild, apparently aghast at the financial state of the college, withdrew his name, despite the trustees' effort "to impress on him the importance of the Rollins presidency." (7)

In September 1893, several prominent men in Chicago put forth the name of Charles Fairchild, the nephew of the previous candidate. Fairchild, formerly a science professor at both Berea and Oberlin Colleges, had a strong background in education. His father had been president of Berea College, and two uncles served as presidents of Oberlin and Kansas State Colleges. Charles Fairchild not only had taught science at Berea and Oberlin, but also acted as part-time financial agent at both colleges. He was particularly successful at Oberlin where he tripled the endowment in nine years and obtained funds for six major building projects. Such fund-raising successes undoubtedly made him very attractive to the Rollins trustees.

On September 20, 1893 the executive committee issued a call for a meeting of the Board of Trustees, urging everyone to attend because, the committee announced, "it now seems possible to elect a new president." As a measure of the college's fundamental problems, the call for a critical meeting scheduled for October 4, 1893 did not elicit a quorum. The executive committee managed to collect its required number for a meeting the following day, and the Board of Trustees elected Charles Fairchild to the presidency. Fairchild was in town to accept the offer, but business interests in Chicago prevented

him from assuming office until the New Year.(8) In the meantime, Ford stayed on as acting president.

Fairchild's inauguration in February 1893 seemed to presage a brighter financial future for the college. The new president, the executive committee noted, was a "man of large acquaintances in both the east and the west," and was judged capable of using those acquaintances to good benefit for colleges. But as Fairchild would soon learn, seeking funds for a college with an established reputation and dedicated alumni such as Oberlin and the chore of rescuing a small isolated institution from the brink of financial ruin presented two different problems. At Fairchild's inauguration, Acting President Ford precisely voiced the college's desperate hope for the new chief's success:

You have been engaged in the financial part of college work, having raised several hundred dollars for colleges. You have planned college buildings, you have had opportunities to study and compare different colleges and acquaint yourself with the economies and details of college management. We have reason to believe that in you, a man of affairs, we have a president as this young institution needs at this hour.(9)

Fairchild's appointment may have created unwarranted optimism among the Rollins faculty and trustees, but the new president recognized his responsibilities from the outset. In his inaugural address, he identified the college's most persistent problem: Northerners, he noted, perceived that Rollins was located in a climate where little learning could take place. They envisioned Florida as the land of perpetual afternoon, and to the mind of northerners an "afternoon sense of languor" did not lend itself to serious study. Leaving the biting airs of the north, Fairchild continued, northerners expect to find "in latitudes rarely visited by frost that which soothes and enervates and predisposes to dreams all romance. A most valuable

education is thought to come from the stern struggle with the long winters of snow and ice, and this education must of course be wanting when genial and equable airs give perpetual summer." Fairchild pointed out this was nonsense. Florida rested on the same global parallel as the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Greece and Rome, which, he asserted, proved that there was no special relationship between "latitude and lassitude."⁽¹⁰⁾ Still, he noted, the college had to deal with perceptions.

The new president's argument was convincing, but its most telling aspect lay in the fact that he had raised the question it at all. Many of Rollins's financial worries in this early period arose from its being a transplanted New England college dependent on northeastern resources while finding those donors unable to take seriously a college located in the land of "perpetual afternoon." To little avail, the college had tried to overcome this negative Northern perception, persistently proclaiming that its course of study accorded with rigorous New England standards. Even before arriving, Fairchild had listened to this sentiment and understood its effects on the college's ability to raise funds in the North. Knowing he would be shortly visiting that section of the country, he directed his inaugural speech to countering the view he was bound to encounter in the future.

Despite the subdued tenor of the address, the college community clearly expected impressive results from Fairchild, waiting anxiously in the first few months of his presidency for signs of a forthcoming miracle. Making a single brief, unproductive trip North in March 1894, Fairchild presented little encouragement to their anxious hopes.⁽¹¹⁾ In May, 1894, the executive committee apparently in an effort to prod him along, voted "that the President be requested to take up the financial task for the college in such a way and in such places as to him may

seem wise." A few days later at the commencement meeting, the Board of Trustees endorsed the executive committee's demand that the president "push aggressively the financial work of the college during vacation."(12) The record fails to document the nature of Fairchild's efforts in the summer and fall of 1894, although the executive committee minutes do indicate that he was absent from the campus all of November and part of December. But the results were apparently disappointing. The Treasurer's report for the fiscal year ending December 1894 listed a \$19,000 dollar deficit, a debt increase of \$6,000 over the previous year. Under Fairchild, the college was not only not progressing financially, it was falling even further behind.(13)

In December 1894, catastrophe struck. Following an unusually benign winter, a severe cold front dipped down into Central Florida four days after Christmas, plunging the temperature to a low of eighteen degrees. The thermometer reached twenty degrees around midnight, dropped to eighteen around four A.M. and remained there until mid-morning. For two additional days, the killing frosts and freezing temperatures persisted. By the time the cold front had passed, virtually the entire Florida citrus crop lay rotting on the ground. One observer left the following description of the landscape after three days of frost:

The whole country looked as if swept by fire. The orange trees were black, the fruit lumps of yellow ice. As for pineapples, bananas, mangoes and other tropical plants, they were all dead. The frozen oranges began to fall. In one great grove I saw as many as four thousand boxes of magnificent fruit on the ground. Groves, for which a week earlier two thousand dollars had been asked, could now be bought for twenty.(14)

Still, there was a "ray of hope in this hour of gloom." Although the freeze had destroyed the fruit crop and the leaf growth, the trees themselves remained unharmed. Tropical weather returned, sap flowed

into the outer layer of bark, and the denuded trees put forth new growth. Then, on February 7, barely a month after the December freeze, an even more severe cold front settled on the peninsula. When temperatures plummeted to fourteen degrees, the recently flowing sap turned to ice, expanded, ruptured the bark and virtually exploded from the trees. A later resident, who interviewed witnesses, graphically described the scene in his history of Orange County: "The trees stood bare, gaunt, pathetic; the ground beneath was already covered with fallen fruit in layers and the air was laden with the stench of decaying oranges; the people were shocked, disheartened, bankrupt, and helpless." Overnight the citrus industry, the source of most of the income in Florida, had been wiped out. Hundreds of people simply packed their belongings and left the state as banks failed and business came to a virtual standstill.(15)

Most civic institutions lay paralyzed by the economic calamity, few more so than a privately funded college with tuition-paying students. Shortly after the freeze, Rollins students began to leave in large numbers, the exodus continuing throughout the school year. The financial deterioration of the college rapidly accelerated. When bills for the month of January went unpaid, several businesses threatened to sue the institution. In desperation, Fairchild, along with Treasurer William O'Neal, hurried to New York seeking a note from friends of the college. They returned with a \$3,000 loan, which eased the immediate problem but in the long run merely added to the college's indebtedness. While in New York, they heard the College and Educational Society of the Congregational Association offer assurances that funds would be forthcoming, but the northeast itself was in the grip of a deep economic depression, and the Society failed to keep its promise.(16)

On March 18, 1895, devastated by the mounting pressure and persistent pressure, Fairchild suddenly resigned his office, informing the executive committee that "stress from various directions but preeminently in the financial field" had become more than he could bear. "I have not aided you as yet," he continued, "and I do not see how I can aid you in the near future." He asked that his resignation become effective on March 31.(17) What had begun as an administration filled with high hopes and cheery optimism had ended in less than year in a grievous disappointment. With his proven fund-raiding abilities, Fairchild had seemed a perfect candidate for a college in deep financial trouble, but he proved unable to translate his successes in two well-established colleges to an infant frontier institution. The freeze did not cause Fairchild's failure; it simply provided the coup de grace to an already failing effort. The national depression of the early 1890s, the devastating freezes, the college's poor financial foundation, along with its relative obscure and misunderstood location, and perhaps Fairchild's own personality, all combined to make his tenure as president the briefest in Rollins history.

The executive committee once more turned to John Ford, asking him to assume again the post of acting president until a new executive could be found. He and the committee immediately turned their attention to the crisis brought on by the freeze. With no funds at all available to meet teacher's salaries for the of April, the committee persuaded each instructor to accept a twelve-month college note at eight percent interest in lieu of the April and May salary payments. Contracts for the 1895-1896 school year were a second urgent problem, because teaching responsibilities and salary promises were traditionally negotiated in April. On April 5, the executive committee made drastic salary reductions; three senior faculty members (Ford,

Austin and Barrows) suffered cuts of \$200 each in their salaries. The committee reduced Eva Root's salary by \$150 and other instructors accepted \$100 cuts. In its most drastic action, the committee proposed not to "reengage" four faculty members, including the very popular Thomas R. Baker.(18)

In a further effort to forestall bankruptcy, the executive committee sold the college grove and borrowed six thousand dollars from trustee F. E. Nettleton of Lake Helen. The two actions, plus the postponement of salary payments to instructors, allowed the college to carry on through the spring term. It was hardly surprising that by May rumors abounded that when the college closed its doors for the summer, it would never open them again. But at the last chapel exercise just prior to commencement, Acting President Ford announced to a relieved audience that "the trustees had voted unanimously to open as usual in October."(22)

During the summer, the college made every effort to assume on a sanguine demeanor, issuing optimistic reports on the prospects for the coming year.(23) True to their word, the trustees opened the college in October 1896, but the college had sustained a fifty percent decline in enrollment, amounting to over \$1,000 in lost receipts. In December 1895, the treasurer reported a deficit of \$20,000, double the sum one year earlier. Ford wrote a frank, graphic depiction of this malaise in his February 1896 annual report:

The last school year closed in gloom. Both the internal and external conditions of the institution conspired to produce a situation almost utterly hopeless. The going out of the President with his family and some special friends from the school had a disrupting effect. The fact that some members of the faculty was not to return and salaries of others were cut down was dispiriting to the faculty themselves and ominous to the public. There were persistent rumors that all the faculty would leave and that the institution would close. It is not strange

that but a few rooms were reengaged for the coming year. Out in the field of our Florida constituency, the people were beginning to realize the sudden poverty that had come upon them from the freeze the preceding February. It was not hard for the public to believe that the college, or anything else in Florida, would stop. We received notification from some of our patrons regretting their inability to send their children another year. In addition to these troubles, it was the misfortune of the institution to be under more burdensome debt than before.(20)

Such a gloomy picture brought desperate suggestions from the trustees. One wanted to suspend instruction in the collegiate department for the 1896-1897 academic year, but Ford demurred. He warned that such an effort would be "dispiriting to all departments--to our entire educational cause." Because the temporary nature of his appointment prevented him from making more stopgap efforts to halt the downward slide, Ford urged the trustees to make haste in finding a permanent president.(21)

In fact, since the resignation of Fairchild, the executive committee had been considering several names. By February 1896 the name of George Morgan Ward, a recent graduate of Andover Theological Seminary, had surfaced as the most probable choice. The trustees later brought Ward to campus, and after a trip by Frederick Lyman to Boston, for further interview and discussion the trustees offered Ward the appointment. When he accepted, Rollins had its third president and many thought its sole hope for the future.(22)

George Morgan Ward came to Rollins with little educational background, but he did arrive with some administrative experience and a reputation for energetic, dedicated work. Although only thirty-seven years of age in 1892, he had accumulated a rich and varied background. After graduating from high school in Lowell, Massachusetts, he had entered Harvard University in 1879, transferring after his sophomore year to Dartmouth College where he graduated Phi Beta Kappa in 1882.

While reading law with a Boston judge, he accepted a position as general secretary of the United Society of Christian Endeavor, an evangelical organization with a national reputation for religious service. He also served as the editor of the society's publication, THE GOLDEN RULE. After resigning this position because of ill health, he entered the mercantile business in Lowell, Massachusetts. Later he resumed his work in Christian service before attending Andover Theological Seminary, one of the leading theological schools of the northeast. Just prior to receiving his Bachelor in Divinity from Andover in 1896, both Rollins and Washburn College of Topeka, Kansas began considering Ward for their presidencies. He accepted the Rollins offer on May 9, assuming his duties as President and Professor of Economics and Law on May 29. Undoubtedly, Ward's mind was spinning from the whirlwind of circumstances that descended on him in those few short weeks. Within a month he had received a B.D. from a prominent theological seminary, was ordained a Congregational minister, offered the presidency of two liberal arts colleges, and just before leaving for Florida, had Ward married Emma Sprague, daughter of a Massachusetts Congregational minister.

Although a novice to college administration, the young Ward did bring to Rollins a wide and varied experience, and he had shown as secretary of the Christian Endeavor that he could raise money for worthy causes. Expectations arose that the contacts he had made in the organization and as a New Englander would serve him and the college well. Above all, Ward was blessed with a magnetic, compelling personality and a commanding appearance. At medium height, with a full head of hair and a curling mustache, both turning steel gray, Ward had the rugged good looks that one of his acquaintances described as "the Gibson type," a very high compliment of these late Victorian times.

Many spoke of what one admirer called his "flashing eyes" that could both burn an opponent and melt a friend.(28) In the colorful academic gown he so often wore, Ward effortlessly captivated audiences with his deep, resonant and appealing voice. His youthful good looks set him up as an idol of the students. In his first address to them, he promised to serve them openly and personally, a pledge he made good in the following years.

Students reciprocated with adoration most vividly manifested in the custom of meeting the new president and his wife at the train station. After the president returned from official trips, several college men invariably met the Wards' train, waited until they were comfortably seated in their two-horse shay, and then quickly removed the horses and proceeded to pull the vehicle themselves to Pinehurst (which the Wards shared with boarding men students) with "rousing hurrahs" from the students along the way.(23)

Ward came to Rollins with no illusions. Although the trustees may have left out a few details (he later recalled: "They told me in the north that Rollins College did not owe any money. Well, I reckon it didn't. But the Trustees owed \$5,000.") but he understood that the college faced a financial crisis.(30) But Ward also indicated to the Board of Trustees in no uncertain terms in his acceptance letter that he intended to be a college president not an absentee fund-raiser. He would accept the position of president only with the "full understanding" that if he needed help in raising funds, the trustees would provide him with a financial assistant. "I am not called upon," he bluntly informed them, "to neglect or abrogate the executive duties of the presidency or to delegate the matters of administration and management in order that my own time may be devoted to fund raising." The trustees assented to these terms, knowing full well what Ward would

soon learn: his view of the presidency was idealistically naive because the college's survival depended on annual subscriptions, and only the president could raise the necessary funds. Even when the trustees provided him with a financial agent as they had promised, Ward did most of the fund raising himself.(25)

Ward approached the immediate financial crisis from a much broader perspective than simply as a matter of raising funds, although that remained an essential concern. To the new president, underlying Rollins's financial woes lay an academic malaise brought on by the outmoded and impractical classical curriculum. Whatever its education values, and Ward even doubted those, the classical curriculum with its emphasis on ancient languages and higher mathematics barred otherwise well-qualified students from attending Rollins. Rural schools, he argued, simply could not prepare its students in the classical languages, and those who attended Rollins's academy were not pursuing the classical course of study in large enough numbers. Moreover, those who took the classical course of study in the preparatory department often chose colleges in the northeast. A large portion of Rollins's financial problems could be solved, Ward thought, by increasing the number of tuition paying students in the college, but that increase could come only if the college broadened its course of study.(32)

Ward laid the groundwork for such a curriculum change in his 1896 commencement address, his first major speech to the college community. He spoke on specialization, approaching the topic not in the circuitous manner so typical of 19th century liberal arts presidential addresses, but in words considered anathema to supporters of the classical curriculum. "Life is too diverse in its varied interests," he proclaimed, "for any person to have a working knowledge of sufficient breadth, to enable him to be of real assistance to the world in more

than one department." In addition to a broad course of study, colleges ought to give the student the opportunity to become a specialist in a special field of endeavor.

Ward's remarks clearly foreshadowed a major change in the course of study, because under no circumstances could the classical curriculum embody such views. In fact, after working with faculty on just such a modification, Ward announced in the summer a major curriculum revision for the 1896-1897 academic year. It proposed two fundamental changes. In place of the rigidly prescriptive classical curriculum that required all students to take the same course of study, the revision introduced the concept of electives, a program that allowed "pupils to choose their own courses in order that their education may be designed to their tastes and chosen vocations." Thus, whereas the classical curriculum had divided the course of study according to class year--freshman, sophomore, junior and senior years--and prescribed the courses students would take in each of the years, the new curriculum separated the course of study into four divisions called the General Courses and the Special Groups, Thesis and Additional Electives. General Courses included English, Moral and Political Sciences, Modern Languages, Natural Sciences, Mathematics and History. Students were required to take at least one course in each of the areas, but since several courses were offered in each area, they were given the opportunity to exercise the elective principle. The same options were open in the eight Special Groups, where students could select one of the eight groups and devote an entire year (spread over four years) to the subject. Another requirement included a written thesis "on some subject connected with the special group and embodying the results of original investigation." Finally, the students chose almost one-third

of their courses as free electives with "no restrictions whatsoever on the selection."(26)

Thus, Rollins had cast aside the hoary classical curriculum, replacing it with a general framework within which students made considerable choices in determining their course of study. The ancient languages no longer occupied a central role in the college. Latin remained a prominent subject, but was not required. Graduates could now receive a Bachelor of Arts degree without a single course in Latin. Greek was relegated to near obscurity and soon disappeared altogether. Entrance requirements, revised drastically to meet the new curriculum, also reduce the importance of classical languages, replacing knowledge of a long list of Greek and Latin works with new requirements that emphasized English, Modern Languages, science and history. Rollins required no Latin or Greek for entrance. Ward publicly proclaimed the new changes in November, 1896: "We have eliminated the old idea that the promoting of higher education must necessarily be the application of some years of Greek, Latin and higher Mathematics. While we are prepared to teach these courses, we do not require study in them as requisite to a degree of Bachelor of Arts." (27)

With the new curriculum Rollins had made a radical shift in its approach to education. The founding fathers had perceived a dichotomy between the Florida rural educational conditions and the requirements of a classical education, but as long as the academic world judged the quality of an institution on the rigor of its requirements in classical languages and higher mathematics, the college could not meet this contradiction by lowering requirements for fear of being stigmatized as academically substandard. New developments, however, gave the Rollins community the courage to fly in the face of conventional educational wisdom. The financial crisis created a sense of desperation that seemed

to offer them a choice between change and possible survival or no change and certain demise. But in another sense, the curriculum revision was much less radical and innovative than appeared on the surface. By the 1890s, 19th century classical education was everywhere crumbling. Following the lead of Harvard University under President Charles Eliot, many colleges were in the process of replacing the classical curriculum with precisely the kind of elective course of study devised by Rollins. New forces in the late 19th century--increase in the average age and seriousness of students in college, industrialization and urbanization, the increase and democratization of public high schools and universities, the rise of new professions and finally, the emergence of wholly new areas of knowledge such as the natural sciences and social sciences--all placed unbearable strains on the old, classical curriculum with its elitist reputation. By 1897, Harvard University required only English composition, while Yale, the bastion of classical education, had reduced its requirements in ancient languages by over one-third and mathematics by one-half. Even so most colleges introduced the elective process piecemeal; few undertook the wholesale revision that Rollins made in 1896. The almost reckless abandon of Rollins's revision was perhaps more a gauge of its desperation than its innovative courage.(29)

In line with the new curriculum movement, Rollins's course of study still provided for a heavy dose of general education (including the ancient languages as an option), but the Ward administration chose, for public relations reasons, to emphasize the areas of the elective and specialization. In its literature the college stressed how the "practical" side of the program would "fit students for earning a living." According to one announcement, many students "are anxious to attend school but have only a limited time for such a privilege and

wish to make their studies count toward a livelihood." For all such interests, the announcement proclaimed, "practical courses are arranged." Accordingly, the college revived its business and teacher's education programs, this time with a genuine conviction. The Normal School provided for not only a prescribed course of study including a Model School, comprised of students from six to twelve years of age, where the Normal School students received experience in practical teaching. Upon completion of the course of study, the college awarded the graduate not merely a certificate (as had been the case with the original Normal School) but a somewhat more prestigious Bachelor of Pedagogy.(29)

The business school, a revival of the aborted earlier plan for an Industrial Training Department, was, in its barely veiled vocationalism, perhaps the college's most drastic departure from the liberal arts. It included courses in bookkeeping, commercial law, banking, shorthand, typewriting, and letter writing. The college equipped several rooms in Pinehurst with "modern appliances," devoted exclusively to the use of the Business School, where "the air of the counting room and office rather than the classroom" prevailed. Students who completed the prescribed courses received a Diploma in Business.

Ward considered the revisions educationally sounder than the old classical curriculum, but his primary aim was to open the college to a wider population of tuition-paying students. A record of the enrollment figures from 1896 to 1902 reveal mixed successes in this effort. Total college enrollment did increase during this period from a low of about fifty students immediately after the freeze to of almost 200 by 1900, but it is difficult to determine whether this increase can be attributed too the new curriculum's relaxed requirements or to the

general improvement in the economy as central Florida began to recover from the freeze and the nation from the depression. The new programs in education and business did attract more students, but only in moderate numbers. Students taking business courses averaged between fifteen and twenty in this period, while Normal school enrollment reached eighteen and then dropped drastically after 1898. The new changes allowed students in the college and academy to take courses in the Normal and Business schools as they had done in art and music, but the allied programs did not attract more students to the regular college program.(30)

Moreover, the new curriculum with its less restrictive entrance and course requirements did not fulfill its promise of higher enrollment in the Liberal Arts College. Between 1896 and 1902, students in the college numbered between fifteen and twenty, not a significant increase compared to eleven in 1894, the year before the freeze. In fact, because of the growth of public schools, the number of students in the preparatory department never reached the level of the 1894 enrollment of one hundred. Thus, although the college recovered from the catastrophe of 1895, the highly touted curriculum revision played a moderate to small role in that recovery.

More than anything else the revision gave the college a psychological boost. Without students, without leadership, and seriously short of funds, clouds of defeatism had settling in upon the college community after the freeze. The college seemed hopelessly doomed to extinction. The youthful, energetic Ward and his reforms dispelled those clouds and brought a breath of fresh optimism to the campus. The changed curriculum, symbol of a new birth for the college, showed an institution not only alive but vitally alive and in tune with national academic trends. For years the infant college had proclaimed

adherence to the "Yale Model"; now it advertised itself as following in the wake of Harvard and Cornell, thereby allowing it to discard the traditional course of study without a loss of prestige.(31)

Ward's soon directed his energies toward improving the physical plant of the college. The interior of buildings were renovated, the exteriors painted, grounds were completely landscaped, new physics and chemistry laboratories installed in Knowles Hall and the library moved from Knowles to four connecting rooms in Pinehurst, with furnishings of newly-purchased tables and chairs.(32) These changes, plus the new president's contacts and engaging personality, succeeded in attracting new donors to the college. No new friend was more significant than Frances Knowles, daughter of Rollins's greatest benefactor. The Knowles family had lost contact with Rollins after the death of Francis, but Ward renewed the relationship in a rather dramatic fashion.

During his first year, Ward had made little progress in raising funds because of his concern with curriculum revision. He paid many of the college's bills with his personal funds, but this source was also exhaustible. Just before Christmas of 1896 he learned that much of his holdings had been lost through the failure of a firm in which he had heavily his funds. As his wife described the calamity: Ward came home to Pinehurst on Christmas Eve lamenting that he was at the end of his rope. "My money is gone and there is nothing in the college treasury to meet the bills which come due on Monday. I have prayed over this matter continually. If this is God's college and he wants me to stay He must make it manifest in some way. You can pack our trunks and we will go north." Emma persuaded him to wait a few days before making the final decision.

In fact, even at that moment a check from New England was in the mail. Frances Knowles, apprised of the college's financial problems, made a generous contribution. When Ward opened his mail the following day, a check for \$5,000 fell out on the desk. The donation afforded unexpected salvation to Ward's immediate problem, but more important, it marked the revival of a relationship between the Knowles family and Rollins College that was to prove long and fruitful.(33)

The \$5,000 windfall was a turning point in Ward's quest to stabilize the college's finances. In 1897, the college not only met its annual expenses but also started to reduce the size of its burdensome debt, and in 1898, the college treasurer made one of the first optimistic financial reports that trustees had heard in several years. "The institution's financial condition is excellent," O'Neal proudly declared, "with all expenses paid up to date, and every provision made for next year." The college had reduced the debt from over \$20,000 to \$2,400. By the end of Ward's administration in 1902, the college had not only satisfied that deficit, but was showing small surplus.(34) At almost every meeting, the trustees voted some accolade to Ward, as typified by the 1899 commencement meeting:

On the motion of Rev. S. F. Gale, it was unanimously voted that it is the sense of the Board that the President brings to the College that energy, vision and judgment, which is raising up a larger number of friends than has ever been known in its history; is placing the institution on that high plain which merits the support of all persons interested in education; that we, by this vote, express our full confidence in and approval of his management of its affairs.(35)

These changes and improvements served well Ward's purpose to present the college to the public as a vibrant, growing institution. But they had not been achieved without some traumatic perturbations within the college community. Not all the faculty agreed with Ward's

curriculum revisions. Ward's public claim that he wanted to breathe new academic life into the college implied that what the instructors were doing at the time was somewhat lifeless and irrelevant. In fact, he later commented with some condescension that when he arrived at Rollins he found a failing institution: a college in debt, with a collection of run-down, unpainted buildings and "a faculty composed largely of professors of classics, mathematics, and history." (45) Ward apparently operated on the assumption that a rejuvenated college required a change of personnel and that many of those presently employed with the college were inadequate for the new regime. The cook and the matron of the dining hall were the first to go, followed by the matrons of the women and men's dormitories. By 1898, the leading faculty of the old, classical course of study. Nathan Barrows, Eva Root and Lloyd Austin, all charter faculty, had resigned, leaving only Thomas Baker, who had returned in 1893, Caroline Abbott and John Ford of those who had come during the Hooker administration. (46) Ford presented a special problem to Ward. As professor of Greek, he seemed to have no place at all in the new curriculum, and except for his loyal administrative service when the college was without leadership, Ward would have removed him earlier. According to William O'Neal, the new president took an immediate dislike to the aging professor, probably because Ward saw the former acting president as a threat, a fear that was perhaps justified when Ford understandably showed little enthusiasm for a new curriculum that virtually eliminated Greek. (36)

At the May 1900 meeting, the executive committee seriously discussed Ford's reappointment as professor of Greek but stopped short of a conclusion. "Our difficulty," the committee wrote Ford, "consists in our ability to convince ourselves of your willingness to give the school the hearty support which we must require of all those connected

with Rollins College." The committee left Ford's future to the president, who agreed to reappointment, but because of the "undue expenditure of the Department of Greek," reduced Ford's annual salary from \$800 to \$500. Surely Ford's days were numbered, and a laconic statement in the Trustee minutes of April 10, 1901, noted without passion: "Voted that Prof. J. H. Ford be not reengaged."

It was a sad ending for someone who had been so selflessly dedicated and loyal to the college. He had served the institution twice as acting president without an increase in salary or a decrease in teaching load, who had spent his summers, while others were on vacation, traveling the state searching for students and funds.(37) But unfortunately the academic world that Ford knew and loved had ended. Any change that demoted the classics to obscurity was bound to affect the old professor. Still, one senses his contributions were not appropriately appreciated.

Ward's relationship with the rest of the faculty was mixed. He admired and respected Baker from the beginning. After the college released him in 1895 the trustees rehired him a year later when he agreed to return at a considerably reduced salary. Upon discovering the salary discrepancy, Ward raised it immediately to equal the other professors. Baker, who fit well in the new course of study, later had high praise for the Ward administration. But the president's relationship with other faculty was less clear. Ward was not comfortable with the Hooker and Fairchild practice of governing through the faculty, and following the curriculum revision, discontinued faculty meetings without reviving them until 1898. Faculty meetings, he told O'Neal, only produced friction. Even after reinstating them, he rarely chaired the meetings. Other than Baker's cheery opinion, there seems to be no written estimate of Ward by other faculty, but the

record suggests that his relationships with them were no more than correct.(38)

In February 1902, without prior notice Ward submitted his resignation. The announcement seemed precipitate but it was not unexpected by the Board of Trustees. Two years earlier, Henry Flagler, a Florida rail and hotel tycoon, had offered Ward the summer pastorate at his chapel in the Royal Poinciana Hotel in Palm Beach, a resort for wealthy winter residents. Ward had demurred at the time stating that he did not relish preaching "soft nothings to the rich." Flagler persisted, promising that he would also help the college, and as a token of his sincerity, offered to contribute \$1,000 toward Ward's salary of \$2,500. Although this meant losing a president for the entire summer, the thought of tying Flagler money to the college persuaded the Board of Trustees to give its approval.

The arrangement proved unacceptable from the beginning. The trustees placed academic affairs in the hands of the Dean of the College, Clarence Hill, and made the treasurer, William O'Neal, responsible for administrative affairs, but the institution could not be managed three months out of the year without its president. With Ward absent during the critical months when ordinarily he would be soliciting funds, and when Flagler contributions, other than the \$1,000 annual salary, never materialized, the financial condition of the college began to deteriorate. Notwithstanding trustee protestations, Ward resigned unconditionally in 1902.(39) In accepting his resignation, the Board of Trustees characteristically heaped effusive praise on his presidency: as they noted, he had worked with "unflagging zeal, and by his great wisdom and diplomacy" had "obliterated practically all the college's indebtedness; interested new and wealthy friends and established the institution upon a substantive basis."(40)

The acclaim was not overstated. It verified Ward's success in infusing new life into the college, allowing it to face the future with considerably more optimism than in those dark months when he arrived six years earlier. As events developed, Ward was by no means finished with Rollins College.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE SEARCH FOR STABILITY, 1903-1925

The search for George Morgan Ward's successor was unexpectedly brief. When Ward told the trustees that he definitely would not return after the 1902-1903 school year, J. H. Wittmore, a Connecticut industrialist who had supported the college from its beginning, put forward the name of William Freemont Blackman, a professor of Sociology at Yale University. The Executive Committee investigated his background, found him interested in the position, and recommended him to the Board of Trustees in January 1903. The following month, at the same meeting Ward submitted his final resignation, the Board appointed Blackman as the fourth president of Rollins with a salary at \$2,500 per year. (1)

Unlike the other three presidents, Blackman had acquired no administrative or fund-raising experience, but he brought to Rollins a solid educational background, a scholarly reputation and a brilliant mind. He held a B.A. from Oberlin (1877) and, after receiving a B.D. from Yale Divinity School in 1880, he served for ten years as Congregational minister in Ohio, Connecticut and New York. While he was pastor of the Congregational Church in Ithaca, New York, he had worked on a doctorate at Cornell University, and in 1893, he had graduated with a PhD in Sociology.(2) Following a year of study in Germany and France, he accepted a position as Professor of Christian Ethics in the Yale Divinity School. In 1901, Yale Graduate School appointed him lecturer in Social Philosophy and Ethics, a position Blackman held when Rollins called him in 1902.

Blackman brought with him to Rollins not only a sharp intelligence and a scholarly reputation(3) but also an active and interesting family that in its own right would leave an indelible stamp on the college. His wife, Lucy Worthington Blackman, whom he met and married while a pastor in Stubenville, Ohio, was a woman of varied talents. Although born and reared in provincial Stubenville, she had been educated in private schools and had traveled widely in the United States and Europe. Her gracious touch transformed the President's house into a cultural center for the college and the community, a place where educated and artistic folk gathered frequently for teas, receptions and musical recitals. By all accounts a superb hostess whose tea parties and dinners were memorable social events in Winter Park, Lucy Blackman immediately distinguished herself as an active worker on behalf both the college and the town. Shortly after arriving, she formed the Ladies Auxiliary of Rollins College, forerunner of the Rollins Womens Association. In one campaign, the auxiliary raised over \$2,000 for the college endowment fund. Mrs. Blackman served on the executive committee of the Florida Audubon Society, was Vice-President of the Winter Park Women's Club, and in good Victorian fashion, she devoted a large portion of her time serving her husband "with selfless devotion."(4)

While they were in Connecticut three children were born to the Blackmans: Berkley in 1886, Worthington ("Win) in 1888, and Marjorie in 1889. With less than four years separating the oldest and the youngest, the three children were close companions, but they were also gregarious children who made friends easily outside the family circle. At New Haven, their home had been a center for all children of the neighborhood, and this tradition changed little in Winter Park. The President's in house in Winter Park became a beehive of perpetual activity as friends of all three children moved freely in and out.

Still the close-knit family made time for themselves. In the morning and almost every evening the family gathered around the piano to sing hymns and other favorites, with the president playing, while the others formed a vocal quartet. In fact, the Blackman quartet became an institution in the Winter Park community, Lucy sang soprano, Marjorie, alto, Win tenor and Berkley bass. During the summer months they sang for funerals: "I wish I had a dollar," Marjorie wrote later, "for every time we stood at a yawning grave and sang 'Sleep Thy Last Sleep Free From Care and Sorrow.'"(5)

With its large, spacious rooms, and its rambling veranda, along with its cooling shade trees, the President's home (the old Frederick Lyman house at the corner of Interlachen and Morse Boulevard) was an ideal setting for entertainment and relaxation. Lucy, queenly and gracious, and President Blackman, dignified and scholarly, endowed the home with its warm-hearted atmosphere. One visitor described the home as "not prim but orderly. There were large easy chairs, piano open with music on it, books lying about, not books on display, but books to be read and reread. It was a home of a cultured American family." (6) The SANDSPUR depicted a student's view of the home shortly after the Blackmans arrived: "The hospitality of Dr. and Mrs. Blackman adds greatly to the social life of the college." the editor wrote and singled out one special evening of entertainment: "Japanese lanterns illuminated the veranda and the visitors enjoyed the spacious grounds sloping to Lake Osceola where launches were waiting for boat-loving guests.(7)

Given Blackman's lack of college administrative experience, one could reasonably assume that the Trustees had been attracted to the new President because of his scholarly, educational background, and therefore they saw in him the opportunity to raise the academic

prestige and quality of the institution. Either the Trustees told him or he and his family assumed (the records are not clear on this point) that fund-raising would NOT be his primary concern. According to his daughter, he was led to believe that "he would devote his brilliant mind, his fine education, his forceful personality to administrative duties, to lecturing about Rollins through the state, to increasing the number of students, and especially to raising scholastic standards.(8) Ward had come with similar assumptions, leaving a lingering suspicion that at least some Trustees, anxious to secure a president, did not discourage such misconception. Blackman's vision of himself as simply a college administrator and a scholarly spokesman received a rude awakening even before he properly assumed office. On the morning prior to his inauguration (scheduled for the afternoon of April 2, 1903), the Trustees at the request of a wealthy physician and eccentric philanthropist named Daniel K. Pearsons, called a special session of the Board. At that meeting, Pearsons presented the Board with a stunning proposal:

"I will give you \$50,000 if you will raise \$150,000. I will give you one year to raise the money. This money is for a permanent endowment, only the income can ever be used. The original sum of \$200,000 must be kept intact forever for the use and benefit of Rollins College."(9)

After a brief discussion, the Trustees unanimously accepted Pearson's offer. Along with the acceptance statement the Board offered this stirring conviction to Blackman: Rollins College, it said, "has vindicated its right to existence by noble history: its field of usefulness is rapidly extending, and the need for it is more imperative than ever." The Board made an appeal for assistance and characteristically shifted the incredible burden of raising \$150,000 in one year on the shoulders of the new President. Blackman, who had not

seen himself as a fundraiser, nevertheless cheerfully accepted the challenge. He probably had no other choice. The gift did indeed seem to offer a golden opportunity to create a much-needed endowment, but in the end, both financially and for the college as well as personally for Blackman, it proved to be an unusually mixed blessing.

In a period when former presidents had struggled mightily to raise as much as twenty thousand a year from gifts, Blackman was expected to find over seven times that amount in the same period of time. True, the original gift from Pearson could act as a spur for a matching gift campaign, but the prospect facing a new president who did not expect to be deeply in fund-raising must have seemed overwhelming. Throughout the following year Blackman received able assistance from Oliver C. Morse, a fundraiser hired during the Ward administration, and Treasurer William O'Neal, but the burden was his. He scarcely had the opportunity to tour the campus before he was "money-grubbing," to use his daughter's phrase. "In person and by letter, entreating, begging, pleading, exhorting, traveling to knock on hard doors, and harder hearts, wearily sitting in anterooms to talk to the wealth and various foundations, taking disappointment and even humiliation," Blackman doggedly sought the funds to meet Pearson's proposal. Through almost constant effort, by February he managed to raise all but \$40,000 of the required sum. In his first annual presidential report he reminded the trustees that the college was still short of the goal, and he also issued a warning: "failure would create a psychological effect that would be fatal to the college." Despite this plea, on the deadline of April 14, 1904, the collected funds for matching were still \$20,000 short. Morse, O'Neal and Blackman spent the day searching desperately for pledges, and when the day ended, the entire sum had been collected or guaranteed.(10)

Upon the arrival of Pearson's check, the president called for a rousing celebration. Classes were dismissed, games and entertainment were organized throughout the day, and a celebration dinner concluded the day's activities. At the dinner, President Blackman noted that the Trustees contributed half the funds, while the rest came from seventy-three separate contributors. He then read a letter from Pearson congratulating the college on its success, proposed a toast to Pearson and then led the community in a college yell.(11) With its first endowment the college had taken a giant step toward financial stability, and the long-range psychological and economic benefits were to be impressive. But the benefits did not come without immediate cost. Although Ward had managed to make significant improvements in the college's financial condition, Blackman had nonetheless inherited a \$7,000 deficit, and during his first year he was unable to devote his attention to that problem. In fact, the matching funds campaign left him no time for raising money to meet the college's day-to-day operating expenses. Consequently, at the end of Blackman's first year the deficit had doubled to over \$15,000. This "perplexing debt," as Blackman described it, would plague his administration from the beginning to the end. Not a little of that burden was attributed to the diversion so much of the college's energy to raising the matching funds for Pearson's magnanimous gift. The annual deficit was but one of the complications attending the Pearson gift; the Blackman family had to accommodate the additional burden of Pearson himself. The old philanthropist was in the process of disposing of five million dollars and thus he remained a potential source of income for the college. When, in October 1906, Pearson wrote the Blackmans hinting that he would like to stay at their home when he next visited Winter Park, they were scarcely in a position to refuse.

Blackman wrote in a generous tone that he and Lucy would "welcome no one more heartily than yourself." Pearson having inveigled the invitation announced his further wishes: "I am an old man," he said, "who wants quiet. I do not like a crowd. I seek rest and perfect quiet. I do not wish to get acquainted with anyone. I know more people now than I desire to."(12)

The Blackmans would never forget that winter season when Pearson stayed with them. Lincolnesque in appearance with a tall spare frame, a granite-like face with a jutting nose, Pearson spoke in a gruff manner that never included the social amenities of "please" and "thank you." Though probably an understatement, "eccentric" was the most common adjective used to describe his personal habits. The Blackmans had constructed a separate bathroom especially for their guest, but as far as the family could tell, Pearson never used it for any purpose that entire winter. Every morning after breakfast he stuffed a handful of toilet tissue in his coat pocket and vanished into the woods behind the President's house. No one heard him taking a bath that entire season nor saw him change his old fashioned black garments which were, according to Marjorie, "liberally embroidered down the front with a ghost of vanished meals." But no description of Pearson can match Marjorie's account of his most disgusting idiosyncrasy:

Doc had a full set of dentures. After every meal he removed them, dunked them up and down in his water glass, shook them onto the table cloth, and shoved them back into his cavernous mouth. The first time this happened I made a mad rush to the bathroom where I lost my breakfast. (13)

As a measure of their Christian character, it is noteworthy that the members of this cultured New England family accepted this "eccentric" old man with a resolute cheerfulness. Ironically, except for a small gift to help build the library, Pearson never gave the

college another cent. In more ways than one the Blackmans had paid heavily for that \$50,000 gift.

Academically, the new President found the young college reasonably sound. The new curriculum earlier inaugurated by Ward retained high academic standards in line with major northeastern colleges, and yet was flexible enough to provide for a modest increase number of students in the college department from nine in 1900 to over 30 ten years later. Even so, the threefold increase failed to give the collegiate department a dominant position because the number of students increased also in other departments. Despite the curriculum change and an active recruiting effort, the college continued to depend on the success of the academy and the special programs; without these programs there would have been no Rollins College at all. As Blackman pointed out in his inaugural address, the state's woefully inadequate public school system was largely responsible for the college's plight. It still maintained only a few high schools and only a scattering of fully equipped grade schools. Inadequate one-room schools dotted the rural areas. A 1907 Rollins graduate remembered that she could have gotten a teacher's certificate at the age of 14, and she was urged to do so by her well-meaning teacher.(14)

But revealing the state's sorry public school condition was hardly a solution to the college's problem. Blackman knew that Rollins must draw from those areas that did prepare young people for college and to attract those prospective students the college needed to establish a national academic reputation. Unfortunately no commonly acceptable standards for judging academic quality existed. The Rollins president could proclaim loudly the college's high level of admissions and graduation requirements; he could extol the qualifications of its faculty and declare that Rollins students transferred easily into the

northeast's major colleges and universities, but few paid any heed. The college needed a clear manifestation of this quality. In 1906, Blackman thought he had discovered a way to demonstrate publicly Rollins's academic quality. In that year Andrew Carnegie startled the world of higher education by announcing his funding of a new philanthropic institution: the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The organization proposed several means of advancing teaching, but the proposal that aroused the most attention was the Retiring Allowances Fund, which made available pensions for retiring college professors. Because most colleges found it a challenge to afford reasonable salaries, much less provide for a retiring allowance, these pension grants seemed heaven-sent. When the Foundation set requirements for granting the allowances grants would be based on a set of academic quality requirements, college presidents began to consider the funds a means of quickly achieving a national reputation.

Henry S. Pritchett explained in detail the Foundation's proposal in a May, 1906 article in the OUTLOOK magazine. The Foundation, viewing the pensions as privileges, not as rights, outlined on specific rules for granting retiring allowances. The applicant college was required to meet specific standards: a college must employ "at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work, [provide] a course of four full years in Liberal Arts and Sciences and require for admission not less than the four years of academic or high school preparation or its equivalent." Furthermore, pensions would go only to those colleges not under state or religious control. Even further, a participating college could not require its officers to belong to a specific religious sect.

Colleges meeting these requirements would be placed on an accredited list of the Carnegie Foundation, and professors meeting age

and time in-service requirements would be automatically eligible for retirement allowances. Professors from institutions not on the accredited list would be dealt with individually by the foundation. The original accredited list included thirty of the leading colleges and universities in the northeast and Midwest, but only two Southern schools (Tulane and Vanderbilt) made the list.

Two weeks after the article appeared in the OUTLOOK, President Blackman, perceiving the great benefit to Rollins faculty and the potential academic respectability inherent in the pension proposal, wrote Pritchett inquiring about application procedures.(16) When the foundation returned a copy of the rules governing retiring allowances, Blackman quickly saw Rollins's problem: because the college departments were so small that professors could not teach full-time in the college; a portion of their teaching load had to include courses in the Academy. When Blackman made application, he sent, along with a statement on the College and its catalogue, his inaugural address, he said, dealt with certain phases of "the Southern problem." "It may," he suggested, "throw light on whether Rollins ought to be placed on the accredited list of the Carnegie Foundation."(17) In that address, Blackman had detailed the inability of the public school system to provide the college with qualified students. When the president's son Berkley passed the examination for a Rhodes scholarship, Blackman also rushed this information to the foundation as further evidence of Rollins's quality. It was all to no avail. In March, Blackman received a polite rejection from Pritchett: "I think our only question about the admissions of an institution like Rollins College," he explained, "is that notwithstanding its high standard of admissions, it is for at present mainly a preparatory school with a good but very small college department at the top."(18) That evaluation struck directly at the

heart of what had been the college's problem since it's founding; it would continue to plague the college until the late 1920s.

In the rejection letter Pritchett did imply that the Foundation would deal generously with individual applications and although disappointed with second-best, Blackman applied for a pension for Professor Frances Ellen Lord, a 72-year old Latin teacher who had been at Rollins for eleven years. But even here Rollins ran afoul of the foundation rules: though entirely free from denominational control, the college, in order to guarantee an annual grant had made an agreement with the Congregational Educational Society to maintain a Majority of Congregationalists on the Board of Trustees. Again, Blackman tried to explain away an annoying hurdle. "Rollins is in a rather unfortunate predicament," he complained to Pritchett. "I always advertise her with much emphasis as an undenominational college--and thus offend the sectarians. On the other hand, the Carnegie Foundation treats her as a denominational college and cuts her off from help." At the request of the Board of Trustees, the Educational Society released Rollins from the agreement, but it also cancelled a \$10,000 Endowment Grant earmarked for the college. "Thus we are martyrs in a good cause," Blackman dejectedly wrote Pritchett. The break with the Congregational Association allowed the Carnegie Foundation to consider individual Rollins professors. Between 1908 and 1921, four of them --Frances Lord, Susan Longwell, Thomas Baker and James Hoyt -- received Carnegie pension grants. By the time Rollins qualified for the accredited list, the original pension program had been replaced by another retirement organization (Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association) that required no special qualification for membership.(19)

Even though the Carnegie Foundation refused Rollins's initial request for acceptance to the accredited list, the possibility of

receiving a future grant continued to exert considerable influence on the college's academic development. The Ward administration had introduced such pre-professional programs in music, arts and business, and Blackman not only had accepted these diversions from the pure liberal arts but also had encouraged others. In 1904 he had encouraged his wife Lucy to establish a Department of Domestic and Industrial Arts, which included courses in cooking, basketweaving, sewing and dressmaking. Such programs were necessary, Blackman explained, for Rollins "to fulfill the vocational needs in Florida." In addition to encouraging vocationalism, the administration also relaxed slightly its admissions requirements. Heretofore those entering the college were required to have a certificate from the Rollins Academy or to pass an examination on subjects selected by the college. In 1905, acknowledging the improvement in public education, the college began allowing students who had successfully completed the "standard course of study for the Public High Schools of Florida" to enter without examination.

(20)

But the Carnegie Foundation's requirements for membership changed this trend. The pre-professional programs continued, but the administration began to emphasize the liberal arts nature of the institution. In a speech to the college later distributed to the newspapers, Blackman implored students to avoid over-specialization; instead they should set their faces "like a flint to becoming an educated man to knowing something of everything." A more explicit and official statement appeared in the 1910 catalogue under the heading, "Note With Reference to Technical and Professional Studies":

Rollins is a college, as distinguished from the university or the professional, the technical or the agricultural school. Its mission is to provide for those who come to it for a liberal education, a generous culture and a thorough training in the physical, intellectual and

moral nature. It believes in the value of a full college course as a preliminary to technical studies and it is opposed to all shortcuts into the professions.

In 1908 the college dropped its automatic admission waivers to Florida high school graduates and reinstated the examination requirement. None of these additional efforts succeeded in getting Rollins on the Carnegie accredited list, but the prospects of being accepted had led the college to reverse the trend of relaxing its standards.(21) Students who did attend Rollins during the first two decades of the 20th century differed little from those of the earlier period. Their numbers were greater in both the academy and the college but most still came from central Florida with sizable numbers from outside the area and a smattering from other states. Those who attended the college almost invariably had certificates from the Rollins Academy. The college was given an international flavor by the entrance of a sizable number of Cubans beginning in the late 1890s, and 1900 enrolled twenty-five. They came as a result of disturbances on the island in the mid-1890s, and their numbers reached as high as twenty-five by 1900. Although the College was forced to spend money on special English classes for the Cubans, the more cosmopolitan air more than compensated for the extra expense. However, by the time Blackman became president, the Cuban presence began to jar Southern racial sensibilities. Several local parents threatened to withdraw their children, so the college bowed to the pressure and imposed a limit on Cuban admissions. Blackman sent a form letter to all applicants from the island: "the state of public opinion is such in the South that we cannot accept Cuban students if there is in them any admixture of colored blood and we will be obliged to send him away in case he were to come to us through any misunderstanding." Nevertheless, the college, did graduate many Cuban

nationals who later valued their educational experience at the college.(22)

Given the small size of the student body, it was inevitable that the three brilliant Blackman children would have a real impact on their peers. When they arrived in 1902, Berkley was sixteen and entered the senior class of the academy; Worthington was fourteen and entered the sophomore class; and Marjorie at thirteen was placed in the freshman class of the Academy. Berkley, a campus leader who was visibly active in the athletics, social and academic life of the campus, played halfback for the football team, was a member of the debating team and the Glee Club. After a series of examinations in 1902, he was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship--the first given to a graduate of Rollins and only the second to a Florida student. Upon completion of his studies at Oxford, Berkley returned to Rollins as an instructor in physics and chemistry, and in 1911, he replaced the retiring Thomas Baker as Professor of Natural Science, a position he held until his father retired in 1915. Berkley Blackman thus ranks high among the outstanding graduate of Rollins.

While Worthington and Marjorie were also exceptional scholars, both graduating from Rollins, they were much more likely to be involved in the lighter side of college life than Berkley. Both, in fact, were quite mischievous, constantly embarrassing their father with youthful pranks that often set the college and Winter Park community buzzing for weeks. April Fool's Day was a time for legitimately violating Victorian restrictions, and each year the president and the faculty braced itself for some outrageous prank. Rarely were they disappointed. The minutes of the faculty meetings following each April First are full of stories and pranks, resulting in reprimands and occasionally suspensions. In 1905, students removed from Knowles hall the college bell, which was

later found at Clay Springs, causing the college considerable difficulty in announcing mealtime and recitation periods. A perennial April Fool's prank involved greasing the Dinky Line tracks, which prevented the little train from moving past Rollins.

One incident in 1908 gave heart tremors to not a few administrators. As related to the faculty: on the night of April 1, Messrs. Walter Frost, Walter Bettis and Hollam Donaldson came across the field, apparently quarreling, much excited, and using very unseemly language. As they reached Cloverleaf Cottage, three pistol shots were fired. "Someone is shot," a voice cried. Groaning was heard by teachers and students in Cloverleaf. When residents of Cloverleaf poured out onto the lawn to give aid to an apparently injured student, they discovered the April Fool's joke. Although the students later apologized for their "profane language before ladies" and claimed that their joke was without "malicious intent," the faculty voted to suspend them for the rest of the year.

No April Fool prank, however, caused so much embarrassment to the president and the college community as the one concocted by Worthington and Marjorie Blackman. During the dinner hour, on the eve of April Fool's Day in 1904, shortly after the Blackmans arrived, Marjorie surreptitiously collected panties from the girls' rooms in Cloverleaf, later passing them along to Worthington. The next morning the faculty awakened to gales of student laughter: there in the middle of the Horseshoe for all the world to see, an assortment of female panties, complete with identification tags, were strung neatly on the flagpole, flapping briskly in the spring breeze. The following day President Blackman called a special faculty meeting to consider "a serious case of misdemeanors, to wit: the flying from the flagpole on campus of certain articles of personal property." After careful consideration,

Worthington Blackman and Frank Stodderman were "debarred from participating in all social and athletic activities for the remainder of the year." Marjorie's role in the caper, forever called "Undie Sunday," was not known until years afterward.(23)

The Blackman administration was the first to make organize sports an integral part of campus life. In addition to the traditional gymnastics, tennis, golf, and basketball became favorite intramural activities, but none attracted sufficient interest to warrant organization into an intercollegiate sport. Still, they were popular because both males and females could participate. The college fielded its first intercollegiate football team in 1905, but lost all its games that first year, suffered several losing seasons thereafter, and football altogether disappeared as an organized sport in 1912. Baseball remained a major organized activity in the pre-World War I period, but the college had difficulty in fielding a respectable team. With no association to enforce recruitment rules, Florida institutions of higher learning openly hired professional athletes to play for them, and Rollins was no exception. In 1903, pitcher George Edward "Rube" Waddell appeared on campus ready to play and coach the baseball team. Waddell, who had steered the Philadelphia Athletics to an American League pennant in 1902, claimed to be taking classes at Rollins in 1903. Actually, he never saw the inside of a classroom, although the professional catcher he brought along did attend one or two classes in the academy. Rollins won all its games with this battery on the diamond, but when Waddell and his catcher left after the Christmas holidays to begin spring training, the team collapsed. While college presidents deplored this sorry state of professional in college athletics, few made any attempt to correct it. Professional methods

were necessary, stated an editorial in the SANDSPUR, because "it is the case of survival of the fittest."

During the first decade of the thirteen-year Blackman administration, the college realized substantial growth in all areas. The total number of students averaged around 170 annually while the college itself hovered around 30 most of the years, a three-fold increase since 1900. The campaign connected with the Pearson grant created an initial endowment that rose to over \$200,000 by 1912. Most spectacularly, Blackman added three large buildings to the campus. Chase Hall, the result of a gift from Loring Chase, one of the co-founders of Winter Park and a major founder of the college, was a two-story brick building finished in 1908. Chase Hall, the first non-wooden structure built on the campus, contained fourteen rooms, a large common room and a terrace overlooking Lake Virginia. For over a half century the building was used to interpret the unique setting of the college in the institution's literature. (25)

One year later the prominent American philanthropist Andrew Carnegie offered a matching grant for the college's first library. The two-story, sand-lined brick building with a red tile roof contained an interior richly decorated with stained, carved wood. The first floor housed a library reading room and space for bookshelves, while the second floor contained administrative offices, including the President's. Blackman and the trustees felt that the library should be placed near the center of the campus, and surveying the grounds, they came to the conclusion that Cloverleaf occupied that spot. Cloverleaf was therefore moved to the southeast of its original location, and Carnegie Hall was constructed in its place. The third building came as a result of the fire that destroyed Knowles Hall, leaving left the college without recitation rooms. The college replaced the first

Knowles with an additional small gift from Carnegie, and with money from the Frances B. Knowles family. Placed on the east side of Cloverleaf, Knowles II contained, in addition to classrooms, a large chapel and science laboratories.

Despite, or perhaps because of, this growth in the physical plant and other areas, Blackman failed to solve the problem of financial indebtedness that had plagued the college since it had admitted its first students. The Pearson gift had forced the administration to devote its time to raising matching funds, thereby neglecting the college's operating needs. The Carnegie gift also required raising matching funds for the building of the library. Blackman saw in this second gift another mixed blessing. "After the increasing struggle of the past five years to meet conditional offers of this sort," he stated in his 1909 President's report, "I feel both depression and elation in the view of the tasks set before us."⁽⁴¹⁾ He could raise the money for the grant, but such work left him no time for seeking current expense funding. The college faced a curious paradox: at the time that it was growing and its assets ever increasing, operating expenses were driving the college deeper and deeper into debt. By 1912 that debt had risen to \$48,000.⁽²⁶⁾

The academic year 1912-1913 brought two further financial disappointments. The first was the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation's rejection a Rollins request for a \$50,000 grant. Correspondence between the College and the General Education Board concerning this grant points up an essential problem facing the college in these early years. The college began and the founders advertised it, as a northern college carrying forward the traditional northern educational mission, a stance designed to attract funds and students from the northeast. But the General Education Board had

established a policy to aid Southern schools, a factor that led the college to picture itself as a thoroughly southern institution. The result appeared often comical, sometimes pathetic, but in reality was quite serious, because it uncovered a systemic schizophrenia. Although of Northern origin and thinking of itself as a northern school, the college was situated in a Southern state, surrounded by southern culture, with a predominantly southern, student body. When seeking northeastern money, the presidents depicted the college as northern; when seeking Rockefeller Foundation money, they emphasized its southernness. During the period the Board was deliberating the Rollins grant, Blackman inundated the Foundation with evidence of its southern characteristics. In one letter the college attempted to show how it could "take the most ignorant, lazy, unimaginative and unadjustable Florida cracker and make something of him." The college indeed had admitted a redheaded cracker whose preacher wanted him to get away from a drunken father, and though he was having trouble adjusting, the administration told the Board, "we are doing our best to make something of him." Blackman also informed the Board that one of the college's missions was to solve "the Southern problem," meaning that the college "was making a conscientious effort to penetrate the Southland with those ideas and ideals which have vitalized education in New England."

But the Board seemed unimpressed by this patronizing approach. As one Foundation visitor noted: Rollins "is really a northern school on southern soil. The courses of study are considerably better than is usual in southern colleges and the faculty is quite good. But the influence and patronage for this school is primarily from the north and it is therefore not sufficiently in touch with the people and the educational movement in the State." As if to pour salt on the wound, at the same time that the Board turned down Rollin's request, it

approved as \$75,000 grant to the college's rival, Stetson University. Blackman complained bitterly to a friend that it paid "to be a Baptist" when was one negotiating with the General Board of Education, meaning that Rockefeller himself was a committed Baptist. (27)

On the heels of the Board's rejection came the second financial disappointment when former President Ward's confidant Henry Flagler had died. Contrary to all assurances received over the years from Ward who felt certain once he began preaching in Flagler's Chapel he could convince the old railroad magnate to designate Rollins as a beneficiary in the college, the institution was not in his will. To make matters worse, Blackman was told that Rollins was in the will at one time but had been removed. He felt betrayed by Ward who had virtually promised him eleven years earlier that the college would receive money from the Flagler estate. Again, heaping insult upon injury, the newspapers reported that Flagler had given \$75,000 to Stetson University. (28)

In early 1914, Blackman persuaded the trustees to hire a financial assistant who would bear sole responsibility for raising uncommitted funds. The solicitor was expected to raise not only \$8,000 a year for the college's current expenses but enough to cover his own salary. The outbreak of war in Europe in the summer of 1914 effectively destroyed any chance the new solicitor might have had. "I had the most confident anticipation when you decided to join our forces," Blackman wrote the financial agent in 1914, "and that my burden would be lightened. This hope has not been realized though through no fault of yours; we must place the responsibility on the German Kaiser and this frightful war." (29)

The tone of Blackman's letters during this period reveal a sense of dejection and defeat. Like Hooker before him, he had simply worn himself out in a fruitless and seemingly endless search for the elusive

dollar. On February 24, 1915, thoroughly humbled by his failure to improve the college's financial condition, he submitted his letter of resignation. The years of fund raising, the prevailing "disturbed business conditions caused by the war in Europe," he lamented to the trustees, had simply drained him of all his energies. He believed that once economic conditions improved the college could find the funds it needed, but he could no longer "endure the strain of it." Blackman admitted that he was suffering from chronic nausea and a "haunting" insomnia brought on by the worry and strain of the presidency. For several months prior to his resignation he had realized only an "hour or two of sleep at the beginning [of each night] and then a lighted lamp and wakefulness most of the time until welcome daylight." Marjorie Blackman wrote later that her mother invariably "read him to sleep every night, and as long as he could hear her voice, he slept peacefully. But when from sheer weariness her book fell from her hands and her eyes closed, he was wide awake again, worrying."(30)

Blackman's resignation returned the burden of the college's problems on the Board of Trustees. In a letter to Frederick Lyman, Blackman pointed out this problem such a situation created: he had raised ten thousand dollars during the 1912-1913 academic year but the members of the Board had provided only two thousand of that. Blackman himself had given five hundred for repairs to the president's home and Mrs. Blackman had raised three hundred from her social organization. The rest had come not only from outside the Board but from outside the Winter Park community. Now that same board was entrusted with the responsibility of keeping the school open while it searched for another president. The prospects did not seem promising. Despite the fact that Blackman had given the board sufficient notice that he would be retiring in 1915, the members had made only a token effort to find his

replacement. With no one to administer the school when it opened in October, 1915, the chore fell by default to Dean of the College Arthur Enyart and Treasurer William O'Neal, who served as co-acting presidents without formal designation. In the meantime, the trustees were begging George Morgan Ward to return to the institution.

Ward refused at first, but when the trustees persisted, he agreed to return for one year, but only if the Board would accept some stringent conditions.(32) He asked a trustee promise to pay off the \$64,000 debt so that he could devote time to providing for new expenses, reorganizing the college, and searching for a permanent leader. Thus, he lectured the members, if he was willing "to mortgage the next year of his life," he expected them to show good faith by meeting his conditions. Incredibly, the trustees agreed to these harsh terms by appointing Ward as acting president. As he promised, Ward had the college back on its financial feet within the year. The trustees retired the debt, the accumulated unpaid bills of 1915-1916 were paid, and the acting president raised and spent \$17,000 for 1916-1917. The college closed the year without a deficit for the first time in ten years. Having assured the college of "its continuance during distressing times throughout the world," Ward resigned his position in June 1917, in favor of a recently appointed permanent president, Dr. Calvin Henry French.(33)

French came to Rollins with encouraging qualifications. Between 1898 and 1913, he had served as president of Huron College in South Dakota, where he virtually built the institution from scratch, constructing several buildings and raising a \$500,000 endowment. At Rollins French spent a large portion of his time developing a plan to "save" the college from financial demise. In February 1919, he presented his fantastic proposal to the Board of Trustees: he would

turn the college into a major university with a three million-dollar endowment. French was not just casting about for ideas; he tied his presidency to this plan, informing the trustees that if they could not accept it, he would resign. The Board was astounded. American intervention in the European War in April 1917 had drawn large numbers of male students from the college. Raising funds simply to meet current expenses was again a major undertaking. In the face of these uncertain conditions, French wanted the board to approve a multi-million dollar campaign to transform the college into a university. With heads still reeling from hearing such a plan, the members of the Board flatly rejected French's plan and accepted his resignation. Ward, who had been serving as chairman of the Board, again became acting president while they looked for another executive.(34)

Ward spent the remainder of the academic year at Rollins but, because of commitments to his Palm Beach church, he persuaded the trustees to hire James Brooks as his assistant. Brooks, designate Chancellor of the college, had been serving as secretary of the national Young Men's Christian Association. He came to Rollins in the summer of 1919 to assist (in his words) "in the rehabilitation of the college after the somewhat disastrous effects of the World War, "a chore, he thought, that involved "the establishment of an improved morale on the campus, expulsion of some unruly elements, and measures to increase attendance." With the help of Ward, and also with the approval and encouragement of the Board of Trustees, Brooks undertook a one million-dollar endowment campaign. As a way of giving the effort an initial boost, Charles Morse, a local trustee, pledged \$100,000 if the board would raise \$400,000 by October 1, 1920. On October 1, even with the help of a \$168,000 gift from the George Rollins estate, the college was \$60,000 short at the deadline date. At that point Morse

withdrew all conditions and gave the \$100,000 "as an expression of his appreciation of the generous response of the people of Florida." The campaign had increased the endowment by over \$503,000.(35)

While this surprisingly successful effort significantly improved the endowment fund, the college debt again rose. In 1919, the treasurer reported a \$2,831 "deficiency in operation"; in 1920, it was \$3,175. He made no report in 1921, but one year later an audit showed that the college debt had risen to almost \$86,000 and by 1923 it was over \$102,000.(58) This downward slide led Ward for a third and last time to resign from the presidency, complaining that he was "no longer able to spare the nervous energy necessary to carry the responsibility for the institution." The trustees offered the position to Chancellor Brooks, and when he declined, they turned to the recently appointed Dean of the College, Robert Sprague.(36)

The appointment of Sprague was an act of pure desperation, for the trustees could hardly expect the new president to do what Ward and Brooks had failed to accomplish. In fact, the college's options were getting fewer and fewer. Some trustees suggested that the college should become a preparatory school arguing that the academy department had realized far more success over the decades than the college. Such a move would mean abandoning the founders' dream and sacrificing the labor of four decades. Led by William O'Neal, the trustees pulled back from that drastic decision.(60) Still, because of the competition provided by the state's growing public school system, the college would require more resources for the academy, a move that invariably would deprive it of needed funds. In the face of this dilemma the trustees in 1921 decided to drop its preparatory schooling, placing the announcement in the 1921 catalogue:

In the years past the academy has done much to

supplement the public school system of Florida, especially in those communities where it was impossible to maintain high schools. Now that junior and senior high schools are rapidly established throughout the state, this need is slowly decreasing. The administration has, therefore, formed a policy of a gradual elimination of the preparatory work of the institution.

The last academy class graduated in 1923, ending what had been a happy and even necessary marriage between the preparatory department and the college. But now for better or for worse, the college would have to stand or to fall on its own merits.

Another option for the college in the immediate post-World War I era was to search for what Sprague called a "super-president." But, in fact, the trustees had been in search of this ideal for several decades. In their visions such a president would know rich friends who would gladly and generously fill the college coffers. He would be an astute administrator who would direct the college's academic future, and he would be a scholar who would give the college the academic prestige that in turn would attract qualified students and faculty. Such an educational utopia would relieve trustees of responsibility for the college's well being. They could then vacation in Winter Park, Florida once or twice a year, listen to this super-president extol the college's wonderful prosperity, enjoy the lavish entertainment, and then return home to bask in the prestige of being a trustee of a flourishing educational institution. Why such an outstanding educator would wish to come to a failing college, no one tried to explain, especially in view of the fact that the Rollins presidency had been handed around so casually in the past few years that it was, in Sprague's words, "something of a joke." But because it would have been the simplest solution to a complex problem, and again would have

allowed them prestige without responsibility, the trustees never abandoned hope that such a person could be found.(37)

Acting President Sprague provided a more sensible option that the trustees ultimately pursued: he proposed to join with the Southern Presbyterians who seemed determined to build a college in central Florida. In the plan, the Florida Presbyterian Synodical Committee would promise to add half a million dollars to Rollins's endowment and to build several new buildings. In return, Rollins would agree to elect one-half of its members to the Board of Trustees from the Presbyterian assembly. When the Florida Congregational Association protested this drastic shift from Congregationalism, Sprague countered with a proposal for a Rollins Union governed jointly by the Presbyterians and the Congregational churches. Such a union, Sprague argued, would make Rollins "one of the great centers of Christian liberal education in the South." The Congregational Association consented to the union, but at the last moment the Presbyterians balked. Despite extensive campaigning by Sprague, their final decision was against the combination.(38)

The failure of the union plan left the college in far worse condition than before, because many of its old friends had opposed the change. Most significantly, when he learned that the trustees intended to change "the character of the college," George Morgan Ward threatened to resign from the board. He opposed, he said, changing the college from "a free, independent, Christian college with a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees, the ideal of its Founders, to a denominational institution governed by a denominationally appointed Board of Trustees."64) Many others who opposed the union refused to fulfill their pledges for contributions. Thus, as long as the proposal remained active, not surprisingly, the financial situation of the college continued to deteriorated at an alarming rate. At several consecutive

trustee meetings the board authorized the treasurer to negotiate a loan with some bank. The college struggled simply to meet daily expenses, as indicated by a query from the treasurer to Sprague: "Next week the faculty pay-roll amounting to \$2,513 comes due. How are we going to meet it?"(39)

Because the failure of the union plan made Sprague's position untenable, the board appointed another presidential search committee, which, between May and July, 1924, presented three names to the board. All were offered the Rollins presidency, and all turned it down. Finally, a candidate was found who was willing to take on the work. The records do not show how William C. Weir, former president of Pacific College in Oregon (1922-25), came to the attention of the committee or who recommended him. Except for his undistinguished work at Pacific, he had little to recommend him for the serious task awaiting him at Rollins. But obviously, the trustees were in no position to be selective.(40)

Weir seems to have surprised everyone with his administrative qualities and his capacity for strong leadership. He immediately laid plans to meet the college's financial and academic problems, encouraging many to believe that they might lead the college out of its malaise. He pursued energetically new contributions, and began restoring discipline in the student body, while lifting morale among the faculty.(41) Suddenly, inexplicably, his presidency was over. A cryptic note in the trustee minutes on May 22, 1925 declared Weir the victim of a "serious illness": four days later the Board announced that he would be incapacitated for a long period; then two days later, on March 28 another terse statement: "On motion, it was voted that the following notice be sent to Dr. W.C. Weir, President: 'The Executive

Committee in conference with the Trustees of Rollins College deem it for the best interest of the college that you resign.'"(42)

The trustees reappointed Sprague acting president and once again began what had by now become a perennial occupation: the search for a college president.(69) Fortunately for the future of the college it was to be the last presidential search for over twenty years. The trustees finally found that super-president who could stabilize the presidency, halt the slide into academic oblivion and set the college on a course that would lead it to the top of American academia. The trustees discovered Hamilton Holt.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE HOLT ERA: A NEW BEGINNING, 1925-1931

The Trustees voted formally on Holt in October 1925. Hidden behind the laconic statement in the October Trustee minutes--"Dr. Holt was declared unanimously elected"--was a two-month struggle over his appointment.(1) Given the past decade of problems with the presidential succession and considering the recent refusals by qualified candidates, why didn't the trustees leap ecstatically at the opportunity to hire a man of Holt's stature?

Ironically, Holt's very prominence led the trustees to suspect he was "too big a man for the job."(2) Born to a substantial New York family, a graduate of eastern preparatory schools and Yale University, Holt had risen, after college, to the editorship and ownership of THE INDEPENDENT, a family-owned prominent and influential turn-of-the-century magazine. He had become a national leader in the pre-World War I international movement, helping to establish the prestigious League to Enforce Peace. Immediately after the war, he worked closely with the Woodrow Wilson administration on the League of Nations. Holt's name was linked with Wilson, former President William Howard Taft, and Republican presidential candidate Charles F. Hughes, while he counted as personal friends other luminaries such as Franklin Roosevelt, Bernard Baruch, and Colonel Edward House.

Holt's background revealed a man whose views seemed wholly at odds with traditions of the college and also with the conservative outlook of most trustees. After assuming the editorship of THE INDEPENDENT, Holt had turned the magazine into a liberal journal of opinion, which espoused most of the political and social causes of the Progressive

Movement in the first two decades of the 20th century. He wrote many articles himself supporting liberal reforms and at one time even flirted on the edges of socialism. In 1920 he failed in his bid for the United States Senate seat in Connecticut, losing at least in part because his opponent succeeded in depicting him as a radical. If Holt's recent background reflected his true views, nothing in Rollins's past, some trustees felt, could prepare the college for such leadership.(3)

Finally, many trustees doubted that the college could financially afford Holt. The well-known writer, Irving Bacheller, now a resident of Winter Park who had recently come on the Board of Trustees, wrote Holt inquiring of his interest in the college, mentioning a salary of \$5,000 plus a home.(4) Holt's reply could not have been encouraging to the board: he was committed until December to promotional work on behalf of internationalism, he wrote, but he would accept a "preliminary" call to the presidency on the college's terms, that is \$5,000 and a home from December to May which would give him time "to study the problem, consider present and future policies and work out a program." Then came the stunning statement:

"If after the Board wants me to continue on a permanent basis, I will do so for not less than \$10,000 a year and a home although my income for the past decade has varied from \$21,000 to \$28,000 a year. I could not accept terms you offer as I am unwilling to have any permanent connection with an educational institution that is compelled to underpay its Presidents or Professors."

Holt admitted he lacked "the requisite educational equipment for the task," but he argued that he had proven fund raising experience. "The real question," he bluntly told the trustees, "is whether your Board is such as can be depended upon to get enthusiastically behind a sane, liberal expanding program." But, he

told them, both his interest and the trustees' commitment could be gauged during the preliminary period.(4)

The salary demand by Holt was wildly out of line with past presidential salaries, and as Bacheller noted, "certain small businessmen had been frightened at that amount." The Board had paid Sprague only \$4,000 although to their distress they had been forced to offer Weir \$6,000. Moreover, in 1925 the highest paid faculty salary was \$2,000 and that sum went to the Director of the Music Conservatory. The average faculty salary was just over \$1,000. Former President William Blackman, who supported Holt's candidacy, gently warned Holt that a "too wide gap between the amount paid the President and the salary given Professors" could create serious morale problems.(5)

For all these reasons, when the Trustees met on August 7, 1925 to discuss presidential candidates, Holt's candidacy was laid aside in favor of another prospect named S. Water McGill, who was an executive member of a Southern Presbyterian Association. Several trustees were attracted to McGill for two reasons: one, he had a proven record of successful fund raising campaigns for Southern Presbyterian Colleges, and two, as President he could perhaps revive the effort to unite the college with the Presbyterian Association. Raymond Greene wrote (with a syntax that must have bothered the former editor) Holt that he had learned that trustees believed the college "needed a man that can get money rather than a big personality." The trustees negotiated unsuccessfully with McGill for two weeks after the August 7 meeting. The records do not indicate the nature of his reluctance. For whatever reason, McGill withdrew his name. Rejected by McGill, the trustees had only one alternative: Hamilton Holt. After a conference with him in October, the trustees confirmed his appointment on November 8, on the terms originally set by the new President himself.(6)

Still, while many trustees were only lukewarm about Holt's candidacy and others were anxious about him, they were undoubtedly relieved when they found the reports of his radicalism wildly exaggerated. In fact, typical of early 19th century progressives, Holt's reformism rarely stretched beyond democratic political reform for making government more responsible to the people and social reform aimed at making American society more just. He flirted intellectually with socialism but never really embraced seriously. Throughout the progressive period, Holt remained devoted to the Republican Party, even voting for Republican William Howard Taft in 1912, when he had the choice of two self-proclaimed progressive candidates, Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt. A Connecticut editor perhaps stated Holt's essential moderateness: though outwardly an outspoken and seemingly radical progressive, the editor wrote, Holt was in fact quite sane and "a fine type of educated man of today who takes an active part in everything that leads to the better education in the modern world." (7)

The final question concerning Holt's candidacy is why did such a prominent public figure decide to accept the leadership of what appeared to be a failing educational institution? The answer is that the call from Rollins came at a critical period in Holt's career. He had turned THE INDEPENDENT from a religious magazine into a respected and influential secular journal, he increased circulation from 20,000 to more than 150,000, but it was never a financial success. The magazine lost money almost every year, and when he left it in 1922, Holt personally was \$33,000 in debt. After the war, he held a leadership position in a new international organization, the League of Nations Non-partisan Committee, but in the era of post-war disillusionment such effort proved fruitless. In 1924, Holt entered the United States Senate race as the Democratic candidate in Connecticut

but lost to a well-organized Republican machine candidate. In debt, in declining health because of a mild diabetic condition, concerned that in the past decade he had been seriously neglecting his family, by 1924 Holt was searching for more remunerative work and a more stable life style. Even prior to the Rollins call, Florida had attracted Holt's attention. Attracted to the Florida land boom of the early 1920s because it seemed to offer the possibility of quick wealth, Holt earlier had considered spending the winter months in the state and getting involved in real estate investment. Not surprisingly, then, Holt found the Bacheller proposal of July quite appealing. Though the salary in his counter-proposal was smaller than he anticipated, it would be steady and dependable and could perhaps be supplemented with lucrative land investments. Thus, like so many others who came to Rollins, in the end it was the college's location that attracted him. Holt admitted later that he would not have accepted the presidency of such an institution in any other state, because Florida, he thought, was synonymous with achievement and creation. The Rollins position provided a more settled life style that would allow him to meet his family obligations, and finally, the position presented Holt the challenge of turning a failing college into a respectable institution of higher learning. With typical New England aplomb, Holt drove a hard bargain, but he too experienced relief when the trustees accepted his proposition.(8)

The public reception of Holt's appointment undoubtedly dissipated any lingering trustee concern, as congratulations from high places came pouring into the college. Political notables as Florida's Senator Duncan Fletcher and former President William Howard Taft, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, sent felicitations; congratulations from the academic world came from presidents of America's leading colleges:

J. K. Kirkland of Vanderbilt, James Angell of Yale, John Greer Hibben of Princeton, Henry King of Oberlin, and Glenn Frank of Wisconsin.(15) In its forty-year history, no other Rollins appointment had aroused such national interest. The mere announcement of Holt's appointment had given the college the kind of public recognition that four decades of tireless effort by other presidents had not been able to achieve. At their April meeting the trustees gratefully offered Holt a permanent position at a salary of \$12,000 and a home ("much more than he had expected", he wrote his father) and the authority to hire a new Treasurer and to replace the present Dean.(9)

Whatever the trustees may have thought earlier of Holt's candidacy, they surely understood that when appointed, he intended to bring fundamental changes to the faltering college. In the past decade the leadership crisis had dealt a serious blow to the college's prestige and the attendant list of problems was growing. The institution was several thousand dollars in debt, and its most popular program, the preparatory academy had been dropped, leaving the college department to its own resources. The previous administration had virtually lost control of the institution. The Dean of Women submitted a special report to the Board in August 1925 complaining of the "lax methods of discipline." Academic standards, long the pride of the college, had declined dangerously. Students cut classes at will without much repercussion. One parent, on paying a late bill, complained he was throwing his money away anyway since his daughter did little in the past term but "hang around with football players." The owner of a local pharmacy in Winter Park which sold college's textbooks, reported in July, 1926 that he was left with over half the textbooks ordered by the faculty; an investigation revealed that many professors did not require students to purchase them. Both Holt and the trustees understood that

only drastic reorganization could save the college from extinction. At the appointment meeting in October 1925, the board gave Holt carte blanc authority to devise a reorganization program "as to curriculum, professors, grounds and buildings for a student body not to exceed 700."(10)

Holt's first goal was to strengthen the college sufficiently to receive by the Southern Association of Colleges, the region's principle accrediting agency. No one--students, professors or donor--would take the college seriously until accreditation was accomplished. Unfortunately, the Association had turned down the college's application two years earlier. To gain accreditation Holt decided to hire a reputable Dean of the College with experience in this area. After an extensive search, he found such a person in George Carrothers. Carrothers had earned a PhD from Columbia University in education, was teaching at Ohio University and was serving as consultant for the a Midwestern college association. After looking at the condition of the college, the new dean predicted it would take three years to gain accreditation. Actually it would take only two, but not without an academic transformation.

But in October 1925, Holt had no earthly idea what that program would be. Little in his background had prepared him for this new work. He later termed his final plan an "adventure in education", but the term more aptly applied to his own decision at the age of fifty to enter the field of education. He frankly admitted to the trustees that he might not have the requisite educational equipment for the task. The outcome of his presidency was problematic, uncertain.

Still, Holt possessed personal qualities that counter-balanced his lack of educational experience. Above all, he was a supremely self-assured person. After overcoming a period of insecurity at Yale, his

experiences in journalism and the peace movement had given him a sense of achievement and built self-confidence, particularly in areas of leadership and administration, two qualities so necessary to a successful presidency. Most important, in the past few years, Holt had given some thought to the state of American education, and he believed he not only knew what was wrong with it, but he was self-confident enough to believe he could find a way to improve it. Holt had formed his views on education during his not altogether happy experiences as a student at Yale and on the lecture circuit where in fifteen years he visited over 300 hundred colleges over the United States.

He left Yale with an intense dislike of the prevailing pedagogical methods of lecture and recitation. In his early years at Rollins he told anyone who would listen that the lecture system was the "worst pedagogical method ever devised for imparting knowledge because though a lecturer may serve to inspire a student who has some familiarity with the subject, it invariably discloses the personality--good or bad--of the lecturer." "The assumption," Holt argued, "that knowledge may be poured into another and assimilated without the other going through something of the same process of preparational study is perhaps the greatest fallacy of modern pedagogical psychology." Through his two decades of talks to hundreds of campuses, Holt became convinced that the chief fault of American education was its "insatiable impulse to expand materially." The passion for expansion, Holt concluded, was a failing most American institutions, but for colleges it had become the end not the means of education with college devoting "its chief energies to drumming up students and multiplying buildings [while] the students and professors are ground between the millstones of materialism."(11)

Holt's vaguely unfavorable impressions of American higher education. were further solidified when he edited a series of articles for THE INDEPENDENT written by his friend Edwin Slosson, whose findings fully reinforced Holt's attitude on the bankruptcy of American education. After visiting several American universities including Yale, Harvard and the University of Chicago, Slosson found a monotonous similarity of pedagogical methods--the lecture, the recitation--which had changed little since Holt's days at Yale. Students sat like automatons in lecture classes oblivious to the efforts of the professors to engage them in the learning process. Slosson's sweeping indictment of higher education came from a rather limited investigation, but because his conclusions reinforced Holt's own predisposition, he accepted them without questioning their validity.(12) Holt first revealed his thinking on higher education in an article in THE INDEPENDENT in May, 1920 entitled, with unintended prescience, "The Ideal College President." Holt's ideas were not earth-shaking: the ideal college president should decide on the size of student body, get it approved by the trustees, build a proper physical plant and raise enough money to pay the faculty more than any other institution, discharge or pension deadwood professors and attract quality students. No evidence exists that Rollins trustees had read the editorial, but if they had, they could not have been reassured by such generalities.(13)

Thus, although Holt brought no educational experience to the Rollins presidency, he did possess an active, eclectic mind sharpened by his editorial work in previous years, and he was alive to the need for educational change in higher education. Perhaps more importantly, growing out of his participation in progressivism, he brought a powerful belief in the need for and possibilities of meaningful change

and reform in traditional and static institutions. He was convinced that there existed a powerful need in higher education to create somehow conditions that would allow for more human contact between teacher and student.

He came to this insight by comparing his experiences in the editorial offices at THE INDEPENDENT, where he seemed to have learned so much, with his classes at Yale where he claimed to have learned so little. The reason, he concluded, was the methods of teaching. Meeting students only in the lecture room, Yale professors had had no opportunity to help shape their character or personality. On the other hand at THE INDEPENDENT, he worked in close contact with associates who not only taught him the complexities of the editorial room but also helped him mature. It seemed incredible to Holt: "My colleagues in the editorial room who never had thought of teaching me anything taught me everything while my professors at Yale and Columbia that were paid to teach me taught me virtually nothing." The difference, he felt, was in the sense of association, the idea that learning was a cooperative effort. Thus the solution to the problems of American education, it seemed clear to Holt, lay in somehow transferring the associational experience of the editorial room to the classroom.(14)

In essence, Holt wanted to socialize education by bringing the professor and the student into a closer relationship and by making that relationship as important as the subject matter. In this sense both teacher and student would actively participate in the educational process. Apparently on his own, Holt had arrived at an insight that formed the foundation for a new American educational movement termed Progressive Education. Led by educational philosopher John Dewey, who would later guide Rollins in a curriculum revision, Progressive educators stressed a humanized system that placed the student at the

center of the educational process. Within a short time after assuming the presidency of Rollins, Holt became a full convert to Progressive Education, a decision made easier because he had earlier worked out its basic principles himself.

As many educators before and after discovered, the turning educational ideals into an educational program was no small task. Holt had the additional handicap of inexperience, but, as we have seen, he had the wisdom to secure an able and experienced Dean. George Carrothers would be a key player in the creation of what they would call a "New Rollins" because he would be the one responsible for turning Holt's innovative ideas into an academic program that would be acceptable to the Southern Association.

No sooner had Carrothers accepted the position than Holt began bombarding him with his ideas for pedagogical reform, much of which Carruthers later admitted shocked him. To implement his idea on teaching reform, Holt wanted professors to develop courses designed to attract interested students for half a day at a time, and to collect in their classroom all the required books, sources, references, equipment. The student would then select courses that interested him, moving from one professor to another as his interests guided him. Carruthers had difficulty taking seriously such an unorthodox system, but on a trip to Rollins in the latter part of April 1926, he found Holt determined to carry it through. Disturbed, Carruthers made a second trip at commencement and, after hours of discussion, persuaded Holt that the Southern Association would never accept such an informal arrangement and would certainly reject the requirement that professors remain so long in a classroom. The normal requirement, Carruthers reminded Holt, was one hour in the classroom and one hour of study outside the classroom. Well then, Holt suggested, why not have the students spend

both hours in the classroom--one hour for classroom work and one hour for study under the supervision of the professors. Carruthers agreed that such a plan was possible, and thus was born the TWO HOUR CONFERENCE PLAN. Much more orthodox than Holt had originally envisioned, it nevertheless contained his essential principle of close association between professor and student. The plan provided for the possibility of constant interaction as the professor advised and supervised the student during the two hours in the classroom, thus permitting the structuring of Holt's dream of cooperative learning.

(15)

Throughout the summer of 1926, Holt and Carruthers worked out the details of the plan. The end product established a four-period day, with two hour classes meeting three times a week (Monday, Wednesday, Friday or Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday: 8-10, 10:30-12:30, 1:30-3:00) and with a supervised fourth period, 3:00-5:00, devoted to varied activities as field trips, laboratory work or physical education classes. Students registered for and professors were required to teach three courses each term with all work required accomplished in the classroom. Teachers would assign no homework although students were encouraged to undertake additional study. Moreover, in the classroom period students would proceed at their own speed; the more mature, intelligently capable students would be given the freedom and opportunity to explore more complex material, while the slower students might require more supervision from the professor. In its ideal the plan promised "the free exchange of thought between pupil and teacher in personal conference during which the student is helped over difficulties, shown how to study, and given an illustration of a scholarly attitude for knowledge."(16)

A few professors had worked with Holt and Carruthers during the summer months, but the majority of the faculty had not seen the plan until they returned for classes in September. The calendar for 1926-1927 called for the first faculty meeting on September 17, and for student class registration on September 27. It seemed unlikely that the Holt-Carruthers plan could be voted on and implemented for the 1926-1927 academic year, yet at a special faculty meeting called on September 24, three days before registration, the faculty began debating the two-hour conference plan. "After many phases of the matter had been considered," many faculty members remained skeptical. Professor Lyle Harris of the English Department proposed introducing the new plan gradually during the morning periods. Instead of considering that proposal, the faculty voted on a motion by Professor of Chemistry Frederick Georgia that the college adapt entirely to the two-hour period. The motion carried unanimously. (17)

With classes already scheduled and only two days remaining before students were required to register for them, the new program created a registrar's nightmare. That evening and the next two days, Dean Carruthers and his staff worked furiously to revise class schedules, and incredibly, by the time the students arrived on September 27, the administration had succeeded in preparing the new class schedules.

Holt and Carruthers believed that the new two-hour conference plan would represent more than simply a change in the number of hours students spent in the classroom. They intended that the two-hour reform would provide a more meaningful structure within which new and innovative teaching would take place. They hoped the expanded time would give professors the opportunity and the framework to design a variety of activities for the students, ranging from research to reading, from writing to oral reports, from general discussion to

individual conferences. Although Holt consistently maintained that the plan abolished the lecture system, many professors later made a case for the lecture as one of the class activities. (18)

During the course of the first term, both the president and the dean defined the rationale and possibilities of the plan. Holt tended to articulate the purposes of the plan in practical terms. The purpose of the two-hour plan, he stated more than once, "Was to put academic life on a more practical basis by placing class attendance on par with the hours and duties of a business office or editorial room." To Holt the most significant aspect of the new two-hour plan was the opportunity for a maximum of interaction between professor and students where immature and untrained students would receive systematic supervision from qualified trained teachers. In his vision Holt saw "the chief departments of the college domiciled in large, lighted study rooms, attractively furnished, eventually with open-air connecting piazzas." As Holt envisioned it: "The students would have their desks and easy chairs in this room where they would study under his supervision and in [the professor's] presence. For the brighter students it would be enough to assign them their reading and writing under direction. The slower students would have to be coached when necessary, but there would be little of the old style of recitation or lecturing in the common workroom. The professor would know what the students were doing or not doing, and in the course of their studies if they came to difficult problems, he would be at their elbow to help them. Under this system there would certainly be sufficient work, both intellectually and physically, but under conditions where the impact of the teacher's mind is at its maximum than under the system where the professor sits on the throne in a repugantly furnished classroom for a

few hours a week and lectures the students before him a large portion of whom are trying to get by with the least possible effort."(19)

As the plan developed, Dean Carruthers particularly began to gain new insights into its possibilities. If the faculty approached the plan with a spirit of open-mindedness, Carruthers noted, significant, perhaps even profound, innovations could be developed. The two-hour classroom period, he thought, allowed professors to recognize student individual talents and differences. Students could be allowed to move at their own paces and to work in various directions. A sense of freedom could pervade the classroom with students involved in a variety of activities, some studying individually, and others studying in groups, leaving and returning to the classroom as if it were a workshop. Learning then, rather than being enclosed within a recitation room and restricted by a lecture and a textbook, would be limited only by the imaginations of students and the professor. To guide the professors toward these possibilities, Carruthers directed a long letter to the SANDSPUR in January 1927, suggesting a host of creative approaches. The conference plan, Carruthers explained, may mean individual or group discussion, it may mean some students working in the library while others are working in the classroom; it may mean "a complete break in the continuity of all group and individual activity and the sending of the entire class to the open air for a relaxation; it may mean leaving breaks and study time to the discretion of the individual students." These ideas, Carruthers hastened to add, were merely suggestive; "no administrator could or should state in detail just what [would take place] in the classroom." The decision should be made by the instructor but with the cooperation of the students".(20)

Earlier the national elective movement had unshackled the students from the restrictive structure of the old prescribed curriculum, but

few academic institutions were prepared to offer students this much freedom in deciding how they would learn. Although neither Holt nor Carruthers gave an indication that they were familiar with the new theories of education, they were attempting, nevertheless, to implement one of the basic principles of progressive education-- the recognition of individual differences in students and of the need to provide students with the freedom to express those differences. Later, when Holt began to perceive the similarities between the two-hour conference plan and the most exciting innovative education of his time, he would move swiftly to place the college firmly in the mainstream of progressive education. For the time being he and his staff found themselves on the cutting edge of excitingly new innovative educational reforms.

The hasty inauguration of the plan gave professors little opportunity to readjust their teaching methods, which resulted a mixed bag of teaching efforts. Some like Leland Jenks in history, dropped the lecture method altogether and began experimenting with discussion and conferences; others made a partial attempt by lecturing one hour and trying other methods in the second hour; some professors, unable or unwilling to break old habits, simply lectured for two hours. The administration expected this mixed outcome. Holt had predicted that they were likely to encounter difficulties they could not initially perceive, and working from this assumption, the administration arranged "experience meetings" where professors could share accomplishments and problems. Three faculty meetings were used as forums for experience sharing. In addition, less than a month into the term, the administration called for a evaluation of each class wherein the students were asked to state what changes had been made, how they were responding, and what improvements could be made. A majority of the

students expressed enthusiasm for the new plan. Comments from the classes in which the professors had attempted to revise their teaching methods indicated that the students were having new and stimulating educational experiences. The student's most frequent criticism was required homework despite the claim that they could complete all the necessary work in the classroom. (21)

In his history class, Professor Jenks abandoned lecturing, conducted brief discussions, and allowed most of the time for supervised study. Professor Frederick Georgia's chemistry classes were built around a kind of self-paced study with one student on page 170 of the textbook while another had reached only page 75. Professor Grover's class on the History of Books was held in an "ideal environment" with students seated at a round table and before a wall lined with books. Following the student evaluation reports, the administration held an all-college meeting to discuss the two-hour system. Although student representatives voted enthusiastically for the plan, when Carruthers urged them to criticize the plan if they desired, he opened the door for a barrage of complaints, primarily centered on the fact that some professors were not changing their methods and that many were requiring work outside the classroom. Still, the meeting ended with a sense that although improvements were necessary, the new system was working. By the end of the first school term, the two-hour system was firmly in place at Rollins and most faculty were either adjusting their teaching methods to the new system or had reconciled themselves to its continuing existence. (22)

The graduation exercises in May 1926 concluded one of the most fruitful academic years since the college had opened forty years earlier. In one short year the college had set itself upon a course that within a decade would make it one of the most talked-about schools

in the nation. The two-hour conference plan had furnished a catalyst for a reawakening of community. Faculty and students who had fallen into a kind of academic stupor suddenly came alive to the excitement and possibilities of community learning, and Holt made certain it was a community effort. He and Carruthers, with the help of a few faculty members, had devised the plan, but the entire college became involved in its implementation.

Faculty meetings, traditionally a time for discussing such day-to-day institutional trivialities as course and examination schedules, student discipline, and grade problems, were transformed into three-and-four-hour forums for debating pedagogical methods. Students, who had passively accepted an academic structure as something sacred handed down from on high, found themselves not only expressing their own views on the new changes, but also encouraged to participate in its revision. In the prior systems, student discontent usually manifested itself in some rules violations; in the new system they were encouraged to voice that dissatisfaction with their education with some assurance that their voices would be heard. The all-college meeting on October 16 served as a turning point for not only the two-hour conference plan but also the future of the college. With generations of enforced silence about their own education behind them, most students understandably gave glowing support for the new system, but more than a few students spoke out forcefully against the college policy with both administration and faculty present. Clearly the administration had successfully convinced the students that a new day of openness and community involvement had arrived. In many ways the sense of open community would be the most significant development that would evolve from the academic reform. It not only gave Rollins singularity in the

1920s and 1930s, it would form the foundation upon which the college would grow and develop in the decades ahead.

As the student discontent in the surveys and the all-college October meeting indicated, the community had not created an unblemished system. The two-hour conference plan contained two potential flaws. In the first place, it treated structural reform--from one to two-hour classes--as substantive change. The term conference included in the designation implied potential pedagogical innovations, but ultimately change in teaching methods rested with individual faculty members. Academically inexperienced, Holt assumed that the change in classroom hours would influence and effect changes teaching methods -- that through this change the faculty could suddenly shift gears from the hoary lecture and recitation tradition to the discussion-conference method. The editor of the SANDSPUR observed a specific problem: "Professors who have thirty years of teaching have acquired a habit of instruction not so varied by an idea. Now they are expected to supervise their outside preparation in the classroom but that elaborate system of research reference and reading is so boring that they will not happily oversee its preparation."

The administration had emphasized a structural change; but no attention was given to the equally significant task of retraining professors or of even training the new ones who would be hired. Because the teachers still planned and taught the courses within the two-hour structure, the ultimate success of the system depended upon their effectiveness in discussion and conferences. Otherwise, they would simply bore students two hours instead of one. Holt seemed to think that simply by "placing class attendance on par with the hours of a business office" consultation and cooperation between teacher and student would magically occur. (23)

Another flaw flowed from the same structure over substance problem. The most innovative aspect of the two-hour conference plan was its effort to place the student closer to the center of the educational process. Early brochures proclaimed that Rollins had "shifted its emphasis and its focus of responsibility from faculty to the students." But in a sense the two-hour system, rather than providing a framework for implementing that idea, conflicted with it. It not only confined students to a traditional, pre-structured class but also now placed them there for twice the length of time of the old system. Moreover, the division of the day into two-hour blocks further restricted the goals of self-directed individual education. Leland Jenks, Professor of History who enthusiastically supported Holt's innovation and immediately grasped the student-centered nature of the changes, maintained that Holt had the right idea but had placed that idea in too rigid a framework. Why not, he argued, schedule class times and then allow the student and professor to arrange the conference times. "My suggestion," he wrote the administration, "is that the student work out his own schedule for individual self-directed activity subject to the special limitations of announced conference hours and of the instructor's giving part-time instruction." But Holt never seemed to grasp the incongruity between rigid structure of two-hour blocks within which all learning would take place and the goals of self-directed education, which recognized individual differences. In a few years he would seek to broaden the curriculum structure, but to the end of his presidency he was unshakable in his beliefs that all teaching-learning should function within two-hour periods.(24)

In the meantime, Holt used his publicist talents to advertise to the world that a small provincial college in central Florida had undertaken "an adventure in common sense education," the title of a

speech extolling the successes of the two-hour conference plan. He published virtually the same text in WORLD'S WORK, SCHOOL AND SOCIETY, TEXAS OUTLOOK, HIGH SCHOOL QUARTERLY, and the BOSTONIAN. In addition, between 1907 and 1929 he wrote over a score of articles for such national journals as REVIEW OF REVIEWS, JOURNAL OF EDUCATION, FORUM, SCHOOL AND SOCIETY, and the NATION. Carruthers wrote four articles himself, and stories concerning the plan appeared in newspapers throughout Florida as well as in the Boston Globe, the New York Times, the New Republic, and in newspapers throughout the state.(25)

Holt was particularly adept at coining catchy phrases to describe his "Adventure in Common Sense Education," for example; Rollins has abolished "lock-step education"; at Rollins the professor is not a "lecturer but a guide, a philosopher, and friend"; and his most oft-quoted statement, "Rollins has put Socrates on an eight-hour day." Perhaps Holt's most ambitious effort was his article published by THE NATION as part of a series entitled "On the College Frontier" which dealt with educational experiments in higher education. (26) Holt's article, "The Rollins Idea," indicates how thoroughly the college community had embraced progressive ideas: At Rollins, Holt declared,

we hold the belief that the individual student's growth and development are the all-important things, and that to justify itself, every course, by its subject matter and manner of being taught, must deepen and broaden the student's understanding of life and enable him to adjust himself more quickly and more effectively to the world in which he lives. This theory assumes an approximation of college life to normal living as well as a correlation of subjects to be studied.

On this premise, we have shifted our emphasis and our forms of responsibility from faculty and administration to students. We find that because young people really accept responsibility willingly and carry it well, because they like being treated as adult, reasonable beings, they seem to lose, if they have it on entrance, the average student's resistance to things academic. They learn to recognize education for the thing we believe it should be: a joint adventure and a joint quest.

Holt closed his article with the statement that the college was prepared to explore some of the alternatives suggested by progressive theories. In the past five years, he explained, the faculty at Rollins had been experimenting with new progressive teaching methods. Now that those methods had become firmly established, the college was embarking on a study of the courses themselves with a view to making a major curriculum revision. For that purpose, he said, he had called a curriculum conference comprised of leading national educators to advise the college on its revision. Holt proudly announced that he had persuaded progressive education's leading theoretician, Professor John Dewey, to head the conference. It was scheduled for the middle of January 1931.

The college community had already conducted an intensive study of the curriculum prior to the opening of the Curriculum Conference. A Standing Curriculum Committee, chaired by chemistry professor Frederick Georgia, had been studying a number of suggestions for a "comprehensive reconstruction of the curriculum," and before the summer break of 1930, had presented the faculty with a preliminary draft. The committee's tentative report included proposals for dividing the college into lower and upper divisions, for providing that all required courses be taken in the lower division and for allowing students to construct their own course of study in the upper division. At the second faculty meeting for the 1930-1931 academic year, Holt took the unprecedented step of asking the faculty to approve a Student Education Committee, comprised of eleven students, who would be given a course credit for the purpose of making an independent study of the curriculum. With faculty approval, the student committee met during the fall of 1930, presenting its report in January 1931.

Another group calling itself the Independent Student-Faculty Committee, "stimulated by an interest in the subject of education . . . , and by the prospect of the conference in January," began meeting in November, 1930, and it also presented a curriculum report in January, 1931.(27)

Chaired by the president's son, George Holt, the student committee presented a report differing from the faculty report only in style, organization and emphasis. Like the faculty curriculum proposal, it suggested a two-part division of the college (Junior and Senior) and similarly it made the student responsible for his course of study in the last two years. But it also introduced a host of general requirements that showed more concern with physical and mental health and with career goals than the faculty revision.

The report reflected student excitement over a recent speech given at the college by Goodwin Watson, a young progressive professor at Teachers College, Columbia University. Watson, an early proponent of a branch of progressive education called "life adjustment", called on the college to abandon the old academic departments and create new "functional" ones based on such areas as health, home participation, vocation, leisure and citizenship. All student activity, he proclaimed, should be worthwhile and important to life."

Thus, in addition to calling for traditional academic program, the student report proposed an additional course of study designed to prepare students for living--to prepare them to "become diligent and efficient workers, intelligent and socially-minded citizens, tolerant husbands and wives, fathers and mothers." They specified such courses as "Health -- Mental and Physical; Value of Money and Time; The Individual and the Family; The World We Live In." (28)

An additional interesting approach came from an independent group comprised Malcolm Forbes and Edwin Clarke, who had earlier written a

minority report to the faculty proposal, and five students. The Independent Student-Faculty Report endorsed the bulk of the general proposal of the faculty, but the members of the group argued that the faculty proposal had fallen short of a truly progressive educational program.(29) The problem, they said, rested with "diversities in philosophy of education which place our emphasis apart from theirs." The independent group, influenced by the thought of John Dewey and other progressive education theorists, sought to shift the emphasis in the educational process from course content to student interests. The first prerequisite for any learning situation, they argued, was the interest of students in what they were learning. Otherwise, education degenerated into forced memorization. Thus, all courses of study and all teachers' efforts should be directed toward discovering student concerns and in giving free rein to those interests. In their earlier minority report to the Curriculum Committee proposal, the two faculty on the Independent Committee issued a ringing manifesto to this centerpiece of progressive education: "We believe that interest is a very basic and important factor in the progress of education and of getting an education. It is extremely difficult to train a person in something in which he is not interested. We therefore, wish to have the interests of the student discovered, in order that he may study those things which interest him and thereby have his learning properly motivated. Our emphasis on interest must not be misunderstood. The word may be taken in two senses: it may mean the interest of the moment..., or it may mean such an interest as that which sustains for years We stress the importance of this latter sense. We believe that in college we should allow a student to select his subject of major interest and that done, we would require him to study and master those courses and subjects which are essential to his major subject, even though he

sometimes has no interest in the particular topic at hand. We endorse a certain limited required distribution of courses because we know that by this device the student often discovers interests of which he would not otherwise become aware and because we believe that the function of the teacher is to awaken and develop interest in the student. But we would not require the individual to study any subject other than those that bear an essential relation to their subject of major interest, and those that are clearly basic and essential to everyone."

The Independent report then stressed four principles around which a curriculum should be drawn: 1) specific learning, meaning that all courses should be worthwhile in themselves rather than for some ulterior purpose as improving mental processes; 2) individual differences, meaning that a curriculum ought to take into consideration that no two people are alike in mental capacities, interests, attitudes or needs; 3) interests, meaning that a curriculum ought to provide for the fact that there is more learning, retention and continuation of interest in a subject chosen voluntarily than one that is prescribed; and 4) use, meaning that a curriculum ought to provide a structure for the implementation of these principles.

Thus, by the time Holt convened the Curriculum Conference in January 1931, the Rollins College community was already embarked on an exciting and profoundly meaningful debate regarding the nature of progressive education, and the degree to which the college should adopt its principles.

Holt had pulled off a major coup when he secured John Dewey chair the conference, for this star of progressive education quickly attracted several progressive satellites. Holt and the conference organizer, Frederick Georgia, constructed a list of leading progressive educators. Although a few such as Frank Aydelotte, President of

Swarthmore, wanted desperately to come but had other commitments, the final list included a stellar constellation of progressive stars. John Dewey, of course, headed the list. In 1931 he was Professor Emeritus of Philosophy in residence at Columbia University with duties that included counseling graduate students and consulting with his colleagues. Dewey had not only originated a branch of philosophic pragmatism called instrumentalism, he had written extensively on the nature and meaning of education. In *SCHOOL AND SOCIETY* (1896), already a classic in educational literature, he had expounded the basic principle for what later became known as progressive education--namely, that human experience should provide the motivating force for all educational programs. In *DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION* (1916) he asserted that the development of individual freedom ought to be the goal of all education. Between 1896 and 1904, Dewey successfully tested these theories at the University of Chicago Experimental School (which he organized) where he directed his thought and efforts toward elementary and secondary schooling. The call from Holt gave the aging philosopher his first opportunity to put his fertile mind to work on higher education. So far as the record shows Dewey's only specific ideas on undergraduate education came at the Rollins Conference.

Next to Dewey, the conference's most important participant was James Harvey Robinson. He and Dewey were colleagues at Columbia, were close friends, and were both involved in organizing the New School of Social Research, a kind of progressive graduate school. In addition to enjoying a reputation as the creator of a new school of historical writing called "progressive history," Robinson had written two important books on education: *MAKING OF THE MIND* (1921), where he argued for the need of creative thinking about human behavior and *HUMANIZING OF KNOWLEDGE* (1923) in which called for abandoning the old

conservative ways of teaching and constructing instead educational systems that freed individuals for a life of creative thinking.

Joseph K. Hart, Professor of Education at Vanderbilt University, and perhaps the third brightest star at the conference, had established a well-deserved reputation in educational scholarship. Considering himself a "working colleague" of Dewey, Hart emphasized in his works the Deweyian perception of education as a community endeavor. In a study entitled DISCOVERY OF INTELLIGENCE (1924), he wrote that the salient issue in education was not in training children; it was "the problem of making a community within which children cannot help growing up to be democratic, intelligent, disciplined to freedom, reverent to the good life, and eager to share in the tasks of the age. A school cannot produce this result; nothing but a community can do it."

In addition to Dewey, Robinson and Hart, the conference membership included Henry Turner Bailey, a nationally recognized innovator in creative arts in the schools; A. Caswell Ellis, author of books on educational psychology and an authority on adult education; John Palmer Gavit, an associate editor of THE SURVEY, who had recently surveyed over thirty colleges in preparation for a widely-read article on education; Goodwin Watson, whose recent talk mentioned earlier had stimulated the Rollins community's interest in curriculum reform; and three college president: Arthur Morgan of Antioch, an institution involved in an innovative educational experiment; Constance Warren of Sarah Lawrence, a new two-year women's college constructed on progressive principles; and Rollins's Hamilton Holt.

The conference convened at 9:30 A.M. on Monday, January 19, 1931, at the Masonic Temple, a large meeting hall near the campus.(30) The members held the conference under unique conditions. The conferees sat at tables at one end of the room on a raised platform while visitors,

most from the college but many observers from Winter Park and from other colleges, filled the remainder of the hall. The visitors, daily numbering almost one hundred, watched and occasionally participated in six to eight hours of always interesting, sometimes very profound discussions on the nature of higher education. When discussing students' interests or affairs, the conferees often requested opinions of the Rollins students. At times students and faculty spontaneously joined in the discussion.

On the first day, under the direction of Dewey, the conferees divided their chores into six areas: The Functions of the Liberal Arts College, Students' Interests, Teachers and Teaching Methods, Appraisals and Tests of Achievement, The Place of Liberal Arts in Education, and the Curriculum. In their subcommittee reports on these areas and in their discussions in the plenary sessions, the members continued and enlarged upon the college's recent debate on the nature of progressive education. The conference exposed lively disagreements on many matters but in the end the members agreed on some general progressive principles essential to any curriculum:

1. Education is a lifelong process. Colleges should not try to crowd a lifetime of education in four years. On the contrary, it ought to prepare students in ways that will allow them to continue profitable learning after college.

2. A college should construct entrance requirements based, not on arbitrary secondary school units, but on evidence of the student's maturity to function successfully in college work.

3. The college should provide students with the opportunity to pursue their interests, not at some arbitrarily predetermined period as the last two years, but whenever their minds were ready and eager for it. Likewise, the

college should encourage broadening experiences throughout the four college years and prepare the students for further broadening experiences after college.

4. The college should discover and foster the values and significance of the individual and social life by organizing and transmitting knowledge, by awakening and developing individuals' interests and by inspiring students "to consecrate their unique personalities to the common good." Colleges should reinstitute the unifying and life-directing features of the old mental and moral philosophy that had been formerly taught by the minister-president.

5. The college should break down the traditional barriers between vocation and culture because the growing world complexity requires learning in both the sciences and the arts. "Study in a student's vocational preparation is an important means of freeing and liberalizing the mind. The liberal arts college will render service in proportion as it recognizes this fact."

6. Finally, "It is the first business of the college to ascertain, with respect to each individual student, whether interests exist, what they are founded upon, how motivated, and generally, the interplay of interests and aptitudes." Interest considerations inexorably condition the whole relationship between the student and his education; without interest that relationship is sterile.

The conference report then ringingly endorsed the overarching principles of progressive education: the immediacy of individual differences, the primacy of individual interests, and the intimacy of the relationship between education and life. Most of the conferees had espoused these ideas in their published works, but the Rollins conference gave them their first opportunity to apply these principles

to the liberal arts. Dewey estimated the special value of the Conference in his closing remarks:

It is significant that while many conferences have discussed problems of secondary and primary education, and some groups have taken up social problems of college teaching and curricula, this conference is, so far as I know, unique in devoting itself to the fundamental principles of college education as distinguished from those both of lower schools and of the university. While differences of opinion marked some phases of the conference ... we have precipitated the essentials necessary to further development of the college of liberal arts.

The Conference had willed Rollins College a set of guidelines for constructing a progressive curriculum and accordingly in May, 1931, the faculty passed a final version of the new curriculum. It was essentially the same proposal, with but a few minor changes that the Curriculum Committee had submitted one year earlier. But, influenced by the curriculum conference, its general thrust and tone had shifted dramatically. Within the framework of the original proposal, the college now pushed interest and individual differences to the foreground--what the college called "Individualization in Education." In an explanation of the new document, the catalogue proclaimed that the revised course of study would "substitute learning for instruction," would "encourage intellectual curiosity and enthusiasm," and most important, would "develop the individual in the manner best suited to him." Individualization became the centerpiece of the new curriculum. It would be achieved by having admission requirements emphasize individual character and student achievement in secondary school rather than some fixed number of units studied; by assigning each student an adviser who would guide and nurture him through his education; by allowing the student, with advice, to pursue his own special interests, especially in the upper division. Even in the lower division, which required some nine specific courses, the curriculum

allowed the student some flexibility in devising a plan to meet requirements for entrance into the upper division. In recognition of individual differences, the curriculum placed no time limit for completion of work within either division. Finally, the college determined a student's qualifications for graduation not by the number of course credits he accrued, but by the student's "accomplishments, intellectual ability and degree of application."(31)

Starting with the freshman class of 1931, the college community placed itself firmly in the ranks of small colleges that had embarked on new and innovative progressive experiments in higher education. Indeed, with its individualized curriculum, the college could (and most loudly did) proclaim that it was in the forefront of progressive higher education, basking proudly in its national reputation of an institution eager to experiment with fresh educational ideas. The most immediate outcome of the new curriculum, however, was the intellectual ferment that engulfed the campus during the early thirties. The faculty, the students, the independent curriculum reports, and finally, the Curriculum Conference kept the entire college community involved for over a year in an intensive debate over educational ideas. This debate gave was itself a significant learning experience at Rollins, and it precipitated a dialogue that would last for over two decades.

In this sense, the spirit of the educational reforms meant more than the substance of the academic changes. One could (and many did) debate the pedagogical worth of the two-hour conference plan or even the originality of the curriculum revision. The real and more permanent heritage of the educational experiments in the early years of the Holt era came not only from the introduction of innovative pedagogical devices or the construction of a new curriculum, but also from emergence of a new spirit of reform and the sense that true education

came from a mutual friendliness and helpfulness between faculty and students. More than anything else, the creation of a democratic educational community, where innovation and change were everyone's responsibility, proved to be the greatest legacy of the Holt era.

CHAPTER SIX THE RICE AFFAIR: THE COLLEGE IN CRISIS

By the early 1930s, Holt's dynamic leadership and Rollins's commitment to progressive education had attracted to the campus a group of highly qualified and able administrators and professors. These included Thomas Bailey, a Phi Beta Kappa and a PhD in Philosophy and Psychology from the University of South Carolina, who had written works on race orthodoxy in the South; Charles A. Campbell, Dean of the Chapel and sympathetic student counselor and outstanding preacher; Edwin Clark, Phi Beta Kappa from Clark University with a PhD in Sociology from Columbia University; Royal W. France, a professor of Economics, a specialist on labor who became a kind of socialist in residence during the 1930s; Frederick Georgia, PhD in Chemistry from Cornell who, as we have seen, had established himself as an innovative teacher and a leader; Ralph Lounsbury, a lawyer and graduate of Yale University in Holt's class, who turned out to be an excellent teacher and a faculty leader; Edwin O. Grover, Holt's personal friend, a prolific writer with wide experience in publishing whom Holt named as the world's only Professor of Books; Fred Pattee, a Phi Beta Kappa from Dartmouth, author of several books on American literature; Willard Wattles, Professor of English, a Phi Beta Kappa, University of Kansas who established himself as a kind of poet-in-residence; and Theodore Dreier, a Harvard Phi Beta Kappa and a Professor of Physics. But the gem in the collection of "golden personalities," as Holt preferred to call them, was a professor of classics named John A. Rice.

In the summer of 1930, Holt traveled to England in search of a Rhodes Scholar; he returned with John Rice. The classical scholar, a

graduate of Tulane University, had taught Greek at the University of Nebraska and Rutgers before accepting a Rhodes Scholarship to Oxford University. He had early married the sister of Frank Aydelotte, President of Swarthmore College, who recommended Rice to Holt. Typically, Holt made the appointment without thorough investigation or without consulting his Rollins professors. Had he conducted a more thorough evaluation, he might not have hired the classicist at all, for the brilliant scholar, the engaging teacher possessed some unfortunate traits. Because of his enthusiastic but superficial assessment of John Rice, the President knew nothing of these unpleasant characteristics. In time he would rue that oversight.(1)

Holt attracted these substantial talents to the campus not only with more-than-adequate salary offers, but also with the help of an institution on the cutting edge of innovative education in America. After hired these dynamic faculty members took seriously the college's headlong drive to build a new and innovative education system. When Holt spoke of the humanization of teaching and the individualization of instruction--of what he called "a liberal forward-looking college"--when he enthusiastically sponsored a meeting of nationally-known progressive educators, his golden personalities assumed all this was not mere rhetoric but a serious commitment to the principles of progressive education. Such principles included the recognition of student individuality and freedom to develop personally and academically according to their own interests and goals.

It also implied at least a democratic community, which tolerated even celebrated individual differences and beliefs in the faculty and students. To a great extent this proved to be the case. AS we shall see, Holt courageously stuck with Royal France despite the local criticism that the college harbored socialists and communists.

Surrounded by Southern prejudices against Blacks, Holt welcomed the novelist/playwright Zora Neal Hurston to the campus, allowing her to present her play based on Negro folklore. Rollins was the first predominantly white institution of higher education to offer Mary Bethume Cookman an honorary degree. In the 1920s the college fought hard to prevent the Florida legislature from passing a law preventing the teaching of evolution in public schools. But the democratic ferment created by the curriculum reforms did not end with the passage of the new progressive academic program. Many faculty kept pushing the reforms forward and in so doing ran head on into some of President Holt's sacred cows.

In spite of the reformist ferment pervading the campus, as it turned out certain portions of the community remained impervious to change. Even some parts of academic life seemed at variance with at least the progressive "spirit" of the Rollins plan. In the aftermath of the curriculum reform, particularly during the 1932 academic year, a group of faculty boldly moved to alter aspects of college life as yet untouched by the reform efforts. In their attempts they consistently clashed with the President of the College. Thus, for all its significance as a revitalizing force on the campus, the reform movement also served as a catalyst for a debilitating conflict, one that would rob the college of its best talents and seriously threaten its drive toward progressive education.

The first trouble erupted in the spring of 1932 when several faculty members chose to criticize the fraternity system as unrepresentative of the new Rollins democratic spirit. In response to these complaints, Holt appointed a special committee of faculty to investigate, naming John Rice as chairman, and authorizing the committee to state its objections to the fraternity system. What Holt

expected to come from such an effort remains unclear, but what he received was a thorough indictment of college fraternities in general and the Rollins system in particular. The committee members, all of whom were former fraternity pledges, insisted that fraternities did not accord with Rollins's new progressive changes. Because it "fostered elitism, exclusiveness, snobbishness, superiority, and promoted an unnatural and unhealthy relationship and even social discrimination," the Greek system, the committee flatly declared, was "undemocratic and therefore out of harmony with Rollins College life." Moreover, The Committee charged, in contradiction to Rollins's educational ideals, the fraternities subordinated individuality to the group. "We preach here," the Committee declared, "the gospel of individual development. We then proceed to nullify it by tolerating a fraternity system, which of necessity submerges the individual in the group, which at most produces types not personalities. If it be our serious purpose to produce a fraternity type, let us frankly admit the fact and advertise it accordingly." An independent and individual character cannot reach "best development within a fraternity," the committee flatly stated. Additional charges were leveled at the disorganizing tendencies of "Rush," the immaturity of oaths of secrecy and pledges, the division of loyalty between fraternity and college, the distortion of campus politics by the fraternities' clannish interests, and the emphasis of social over academic aspects of college life.(2)

Holt, in transmitting the report to various fraternities, asked for their reply to the charges. The committee's criticism ruthlessly hit the organizations like an explosive and spawned an all-out effort at rebuttal. With responses pouring in, Holt named Edwin Grover and Ralph Lounsbury as a committee of two to digest and summarize them. To Holt's surprise, even here controversy arose. Grover and Lounsbury

could not agree, and therefore wrote separate reports. Grover claimed that the student reply satisfactorily answered the committee charges; Lounsbury steadfastly maintained that even in their replies, the fraternities attested to their undemocratic nature. (4)

Holt seemed anxious to stand above this controversy, serving as a kind of broker between the various factions, but he strongly supported the fraternity system and had encouraged its growth in the years since he came to Rollins.(6) Between 1925 and 1932, the college had authorized the establishment of fifteen fraternities and sororities, and in the face of disapproval of the committee on Fraternities, Holt recognized a new Rollins sorority even as the committee was preparing its report, obviously seeing no incongruity in the decision. Although he was concerned with some of the excesses of hazing and wild parties during the rush period, Holt undoubtedly did not anticipate such a virulent attack on the entire system and he flatly rejected the committee's recommendation to abolish the entire system. After the initial brouhaha subsided, Holt simply allowed the whole issue of fraternities to die quietly. But the incident proved a prelude to things to come.

Another more serious crisis followed closely on the heels of the fraternity controversy. In the January, 1933 faculty meeting, the Curriculum Committee proposed, without previous notice, to abolish the two-hour classes and the eight-hour day arguing that the schedule was "incompatible with the new Rollins plans." If the new curriculum was based on achievement rather than time, and if it was designed to "enable the individual to develop in his own way and along the lines of his own interests as fast as his ability will admit," then, the committee argued, the college needed class periods elastic enough to "permit more hours in class, less hours in class or no hours in class."

Holt, shocked that a group of faculty would view the new curriculum as a basis for abolishing his cherished two-hour plan, failed to see a conflict in the two innovations. The President immediately suggested, and the faculty voted in favor of, a motion to table the resolution until the calling of a special faculty meeting to thoroughly discuss the whole matter.(5)

Holt was surprised and stunned by the curriculum committee's proposal even though the details of it had been clearly outlined in the minutes submitted to Holt several days earlier. He later admitted he had not read the minutes carefully. A few days before the special faculty meeting, the President, in meeting with committee members at his home, told them that the efforts to make basic changes in the curriculum in effect usurped his authority. The powers of the faculty to choose the curriculum derive directly, he said, from his presidential powers. He warned the committee that if the resolution passed, either he would resign or a certain group of faculty would have to go.

At the special faculty meeting, Holt delivered a long and forceful argument for the conference plan, the two-hour class period and the eight-hour day, arguing that they did not conflict with the new Rollins plan. Following Holt's speech, the faculty voted to table indefinitely the Curriculum Committee's resolution.(6)

Even as it prepared its challenge to the eight-hour plan, the Curriculum Committee challenged the President's authority in two other areas. On January 18, the committee, "as a committee and as individuals," protested the administration's practice of convening the students at 10:15 and then allowing convocation to extend into the 10:30 class period. They particularly protested "the action in allowing the 10:30 classes of Tuesday and Wednesday to be disrupted, and in fact

disbanded, by a convocation of doubtful value to the college." Additionally, the committee chided the administration for allowing a meeting on the college bleachers to listen to tennis professional Bill Tilden, whose sole purpose was "to advertise and exhibition tennis professionals."

Holt, taken aback by the sharp and condemning tone of the protest, admitted the administration's mistake in infringing on class time but added a poignant retort: "The slur of your phrase concerning tennis professionals implies a motive on the part of the administration that I am sure on reflection you will wish to withdraw." (7)

Clearly the campus was on the brink of turmoil. Many of Holt's golden personalities, caught up in the excitement of this reformist fermentation, were pressuring the administration to make changes that they argued coincided with the new progressive reforms. They argued that the new Rollins plan implicitly foretold a more democratic community and particularly a more democratic governance of the college. From their point of view, the fraternity controversy, the curriculum proposals and the complaint of over-extended convocations depict a faculty asserting itself into the college governance system.

How would the administration--particularly Hamilton Holt--react to these growing assertive tendencies? Like the progressive curriculum reforms, these were uncharted waters. Throughout the nation the presidents had traditionally governed small colleges, with the faculty playing a supporting role. Were these faculty efforts simply a logical extension of the academic reform, and therefore a way of making a transition from a traditional to a progressive college governance system? Or was this faculty assertiveness a challenge to Holt's presidential authority? Holt's answer came on February 23, 1933. He fired John Rice, leader of the progressive faction.

It is impossible to separate the personalities of Hamilton Holt and John Rice from the sequence of events that led to Rice's dismissal, to his subsequent appeal and to the crisis that ensued. Holt developed a rather expansive view the office of college presidency because from the beginning he was perceived as the only one who could turn the failing provincial institution into a nationally recognized college. He seemed to have succeeded. Demoralized trustees, administrators, and faculty happily bowed to his dynamic leadership, and Holt responded by treating individuals with generosity and civility and with a grim determination to lead the college out of academic mediocrity. An enlightened patriarch (but a patriarch nonetheless), Holt demanded sweet harmony among the members of a community he was so painstakingly nurturing in Winter Park. So long as an issue was undecided Holt encouraged the widest possible debate. But once the president or the community had decided, Holt deemed further discussion not only unnecessary but also counter-productive. Such was the case on the issues of the fraternities, the two-hour plan, and convocations.

Holt treasured loyalty above all other virtues. For faculty members serving under him, loyalty meant cheerfully acquiescing when the community supported changes (the conference plan) and just as cheerfully accepting the Status quo (fraternities and the eight-hour day). For in fact, two souls beat in the breast of Hamilton Holt. On the one hand, there was the twentieth century progressive Holt: honest, broad-minded, forthcoming, openhearted, liberal, humorous, generous and kind--a delightful and lovable person. On the other, there was a 19th century presidential Holt: possessive, assertive, paternalistic, and, like most 19th century fathers (and college presidents), demanding authority within his realm. Holt vaguely sensed these two souls as when he once puzzled how Rice had made him, a lifelong liberal, appear

conventionally conservative. Rice seemed to bring to the surface the patriarchal soul of Holt that turned a single faculty dismissal raging crisis.

Rice's own personality contributed to and shaped the affair that shook the campus in the spring of 1933. No one doubted that Rice was Holt's brightest golden personality. Many of his colleagues at Rollins and a sizable number of students, realizing they were in the presence of a profound mind, sought and enjoyed Rice's company. More than frequently he displayed a sharp, biting wit as, for example, when the Dean of Academic Affairs of Nebraska asked why he came to that university. "Dean, I've been trying to figure that out ever since I came here," Rice caustically replied. During formal and informal faculty discussions, Rice consistently raised challenging and interesting questions, and more than often offered plausible answers. Within a year of his appointment, Rice had become a major campus figure, serving on several important committees (even chairing one of them), and acting as a kind of catalyst for academic reform that swept the college shortly after he arrived.

When he wished, Rice he could teach a class in a manner many students had never before experienced and would never forget. One day he walked into a class and pinned on the wall a calendar pinup drawing of two scantily clad females. After two days, when one student asked about the purpose of the drawings, Rice turned the question on him. "Why, don't you like them?" The student's negative answer launched the class into a two-day profound discussion of the meaning of art. With such Socratic methods Rice prodded students into more profound thought than many believed themselves capable.(8)

He was probably Rollins's greatest teacher, but he was not a wise one. The college hired him to teach the classical languages but

his mind was much too brilliant and eclectic to remain mired in the mechanics of an ancient language. In fact, he rarely taught Greek or Latin, preferring instead to roam somewhat aimlessly in the larger fields of Greek art, literature and philosophy. These were subjects the college undoubtedly needed, but it was questionable whether Rice was the man to teach them. Besides, many students who needed and wanted to learn Latin and Greek left his classes virtually as ignorant of the two languages as when they entered. Rice casually ignored their needs thereby breaking his contract with both the college and the students. He rationalized this questionable behavior by criticizing other professors who did teach their assigned subjects as dull pedagogs who were wedded to textbooks. Some were probably guilty of these charges, but that hardly justified Rice's teaching methods.

Rice's casual approach to contractual agreements revealed another side of the man's personality, for like Holt, he too possessed a second self. He was himself (and reveled in the perception) an iconoclast--a man intent upon exposing the sham and contradiction of society's sacred institutions, beliefs and values. His greatest enjoyment came from shattering beliefs of pious, self-righteous people and he received great joy from shock indignation of those he attacked. His favorite target was the Christian religion.

Shortly after he arrived, the college held a religious conference on the topic of "The Place of the Church in the Modern World." Leading scholars from throughout the country attended. Rice's performance at one of the meetings, set town-gown relations back several years. Rice had refused Holt's invitation to participate but did agree to attend and ask "thought-provoking" questions. At a very crowded discussion, Rice dutifully rose to speak: "I live in Winter Park," he declared, "and I should like to ask a question that has to do

with the churches in Winter Park and those of us who live here. The question is: If I should come along Interlachen Avenue tomorrow, Sunday morning, and instead of churches I should find green grass growing, what difference would it make and to whom?" When one indignant preacher jumped to his feet and retorted that the Congregational Church had founded Rollins, Rice noted sarcastically that now he understood to whom it would make a difference, and would someone answer the first part of his question? No one ever did to his satisfaction. The pious never forgot John Rice's performance that day and Holt grew weary of explaining to them why he continued to retain a blatant atheist on the Rollins faculty. (9)

A similar Rice incident later rocked the Rollins community. As the college's place of worship, and as Holt's most treasured achievement, nothing could have been more sacred than Knowles Chapel. Built in 1932 in a style resembling a Spanish cathedral, the Chapel was Holt's pride and joy. At the opening service, Rice would barely control his wrath as he watched what he described as contrived non-denominational services conducted in a Catholic-style chapel. Harmony, he proclaimed, required a balance between the form of worship and the physical form of the building. He sat in aesthetic agony through the Chapel's first Christmas service that ended with an artificially lighted star glowing in a darkened Chapel. As the audience filed out of the vestibule Rice, in a loud voice, called the service "obscene." It was the one Rice indiscretion that Hamilton Holt never forgot or forgave.(10)

Although delightfully humorous, witty and likable, more than often Rice displayed a pathological tendency toward outright meanness. He disrupted faculty gatherings and committee meetings with long, rambling, monotonous harangues or issued an outrageous and even vicious

attack against a faculty member that went beyond the bounds of human respect. The Dean of the College regularly received complaints from faculty members charging Rice with unwarranted attacks on their character. Rice pursued these attacks on individual faculty members into his classrooms, often disparaging individuals by name as "incompetent" or as "old-fashioned pedagogues who were wedded to a book." He verbally attacked one member of the faculty with such vehemence that many expected the incident to erupt into violence.(11)

More seriously, Rice treated some of his students in much the same manner. He attracted a small group of disciples who viewed him as generous with his time and caring with his advice. But many students feared and disliked him intensely. Less than brilliant students or those who found his teaching methods or his spicy language objectionable became a victim of his venom and rancor. He spoke disparagingly of them in class and often badgered them unmercifully. Rice could be incredibly arbitrary. His students appearing before the Board of Admissions to the Upper Division received the most solicitous treatment; but those he disliked could expect a rigorous examination and were, at times, subjected to malicious personal criticism. In his personal relations Rice seemed lacking in that sense of moderation and proportion that the civilization of his own field of study valued so highly. Those he liked, he wrapped in kindness, but those he disliked were treated with disdain and disrespect. (12)

If all this were not sufficient, Rice's personal habits grated against a village and college community still guided by cramped 19th century Victorian mores. He paid little attention to his personal appearance and, as he once admitted, sometimes looked like a tramp. Many complained of his immodest dress. At a time when men still wore swimsuits covering most of their bodies, Rice often appeared at the

college beachhouse at New Smyrna dressed in very brief swim trunks, so skimpy by any standard of the day that he was later accused of parading around in nothing more than a jockstrap. Rice often greeted unexpected visitors at his home in dress considered inadequate by any standards. One professor never tired of repeating a story of his utter embarrassment while escorting a prim female potential donor around the campus. They came upon Rice in his own backyard (Rice lived in college housing) dressed in extremely revealing underwear. Unconcerned, Rice stood for fifteen minutes conversing with them as if fully dressed. To the chagrin and disapproval of the administration and not a few parents, Rice frankly discussed sex in his class and openly criticized what he called the "prude Victorian" views toward the subject. It was rather commonly believed he was "having an affair" with one or more students.(13)

Thus, both academically and socially, Rice was an extremely unsettling presence on the Rollins campus. The college community had been moving toward a more liberated educational system but far from one that would tolerate such unorthodox behavior from one of its faculty members. Rice seemed unwilling to moderate that behavior to conform within a basically conventional institution located in a conservative village. In this sense Rice's dismissal was probably inevitable. The ensuing turmoil came not because Holt had insufficient reasons for the firing, but because in a professed democratic environment his methods appeared arbitrary to a large number of the faculty.

In meeting on February 23, Holt informed Rice that faculty and students had been coming to him for the past year complaining of Rice's intolerance, insulting and unethical conduct, intemperate language and immodest dress and behavior. Holt concluded his review by suggesting that Rice undertake "an old-fashioned religious conversion; that is,

get love in your heart and banish hate." Rice protested that he did not hate people, that he would be willing to see the school psychologist, and implied that he would change his ways if Holt would reconsider his decision. Even though, as he admitted later, he had no intention of changing his mind, Holt agreed to postpone his decision for a few days. The postponement proved a fateful one. (14)

The news that the President intended but had not finally decided to fire Rice hit the campus like a bombshell, splintering the college into factions. Those who had been deeply hurt by Rice formed the largest group. They pledged their loyalty to the President and strongly encouraged him to remain firm in his determination to fire Rice.(15) Another large group, particularly fearful of their jobs, faded into the background and quietly watched the whole affair from a safe distance. A smaller but highly vocal faction supported Rice but for a variety of reasons. A number of the students (including campus leaders such as George Barber, editor of the SANDSPUR, and Nathaniel French, President of the student body) reacted strongly against Rice's dismissal. Many had come to the college because of its progressive tendencies and acknowledged Rice as the leader in progressive experimentation. They aligned themselves with a group of progressive faculty, headed by Frederick Georgia, who viewed the Rice dismissal as a serious setback for innovative education. Still another group, of which Ralph Lounsbury and Georgia were the most important members, worried about the methods employed by Holt. Influenced by the recent democratic developments at Rollins and the national effort of all faculties in higher education to assume more authority in college governance, they saw the Rice dismissal as arbitrary and unjust in its procedures and potentially threatening to every faculty member who disagreed with administrative policy. Except for the students, no one in these groups was

particularly friendly with Rice, although none seemed to hold animosities toward him as did some of their colleagues. For different reasons, every faction elevated the Rice dismissal to a *cause celebre*.

After hearing all sides of the case and after talking with Rice on two separate occasions (one a long meeting at Holt's home that lasted from eight in the evening until midnight), and convinced that Rice would never conform, Holt sent a formal letter of nonreappointment on March 21. "I have listened to all who care to see me in regard to my decision," Holt explained, "keeping my mind completely open and free from all rancor or personal ties, but I have now come to the final and definite conclusion that I cannot reconsider my decision, and I write to inform you of this fact." He offered Rice the dignity of resignation provided he tendered by March 23. In the meantime, Holt had sent out letters advertising a teaching vacancy in Greek and Latin.

One such was directed to a professional organization of college teachers called the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Organized in 1915 to "enhance the security [of] and dignify the scholar's calling throughout the country," the AAUP in its first two decades concentrated on promoting the principles of academic freedom and tenure, and of promotion and reappointment. By 1933, it had established criteria for these principles and had begun the process of persuading universities and college administrations to accept them. Even though the organization had reached a membership of over 5,000 in more than 200 institutions, it still had persuaded only one-half of the institutions to accept its criteria. Still, it did carry on institutional investigations, and it published in its bulletin the results of these inquiries, placing violators on its list of unacceptable institutions. Although few colleges and universities paid

heed to such censure, most felt uncomfortable with being held up to public scrutiny as an institution with internal problems. (17)

In late March, 1933, almost simultaneously with Holt's advertisement of the vacancy, the AAUP headquarters received notice that Rollins College was experiencing tenure problems. When the General Secretary, H. W. Tyler, answered Holt's advertisement, he informed the Rollins president that the Association had learned that "tenure conditions" were not satisfactory "and that the particular vacancy in the Department of Classics may be due to dismissal not in accordance with our principles." Holt quickly explained Rollins's reappointment policy: instructors and assistant professors were all on one-year appointments; associate and full professors who served in those ranks for three full years were given "automatic reappointments." In the case of the professor in question, he had not served those three full years, Holt told the Association. (18)

Logically assuming that a Rollins faculty member had informed the AAUP of the Rice dismissal, Holt began a personal search for the culprit. He sought out only those members supporting Rice and even interrupted Rice's class to ask him if he had written to the Association. All denied writing the AAUP, but Holt remained convinced that one or more of them had perpetrated what he considered "an act of great disloyalty." In fact, they were telling the truth. Knowledge of the dismissal came to the Association from a source outside the college family: Rice's brother-in-law, President Aydelotte of Swarthmore. (19)

Up to this point, Holt apparently believed that his statement of dismissal to Rice on March 21 and his reply to the AAUP had settled the matter, but supporters of Rice worked to keep the question alive. Students and faculty raised the issue in the classroom and in community forums where they openly criticized the President as authoritarian.

They held almost nightly meetings in Rice's home. No one missed the meaning in a chapel speech by Professor Allan Tory, a Rice supporter, entitled "The Faith that Rebels" when he spoke of the need to struggle against authoritarian decisions. Repeatedly, Holt and other administrators cited this "agitation" as additional justification for Rice's dismissal.(20)

Rice himself brought the situation to a head on April 24, 1933, when he informed Holt that he had submitted his case to the AAUP. The news only served to harden the President's resolve. The following day Holt persuaded the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees to issue a statement that destroyed any lingering doubt as to who governed the college:

Resolved that the Board of Trustees of Rollins College has sole authority to make all rules and regulations for the conduct of college and to delegate and revoke such authority. That the President of Rollins College is the executive representative of the Board of Trustees with full authority to oversee and conduct the affairs of the corporation in the intervals between meetings of the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee.

The President further reported to the Executive Committee that "in view of the above authoritative ruling" he now officially fired Professor Rice, and then he added an ominous caveat: "It is of course obvious that any further agitation for the reinstatement of Professor Rice on the part of any employee of the college, among each other or with students or outsiders, either individually or in groups, will be an act of disloyalty to Rollins College and must be dealt with summarily." A final resolution formally dismissed Rice "for the remainder of the academic year 1932-33 effective this date." It also required him to remove his personal effects from the campus by noon April 28, 1933. Holt later claimed that Rice's agitation--not his appeal to the AAUP--led to the Executive Committee's decision. Privately, he told a friend,

if Rice insisted on "appealing to those outside, he must fight the College from the outside."(21)

That same day, on the afternoon of the 26th, Holt called to his office thirteen faculty members considered opponents of Rice's dismissal. They included Frederick Georgia, Ralph Lounsbury, Allan Tory, Edward Clark, Royal France, Richard Fuerstein, Rhea Smith, Cecil Oldum, and Theodore Dreier. Holt told them that the Executive Committee had relieved Rice of his teaching duties and ordered him off the campus by April 28. Holt explained the "constitutional legitimacy of his authority and tenure" and told them that the Rice case was closed. When he welcomed any suggestion on how to bring the Rollins community into closer cooperation, the faculty members suggested that Rice deserved an impartial hearing. They requested that Holt invite the AAUP to come down and, to their surprise, Holt agreed. But before the interview was terminated, the president handed each of them a loyalty form to sign! They were dumbfounded. Finally, after a long period of silence, Lounsbury spoke: "Look, Hammy," he said in a soft voice, "you don't want to do anything like this. If you take my advice, you'll collect these forms and not let anyone else see them." The president hesitated, and then quietly went from one member to another collecting the forms. When Dreier and Clarke later requested copies, Holt refused. He also left no copies of the form in his papers. (22)

A few days later Holt sent a letter to Secretary General Tyler of the AAUP, inviting "representatives to visit Rollins for the purpose of permitting me to place before your Association all the material at my disposal on which we based our decision."(23) Two weeks later, on May 16, an investigative team comprised of Arthur Lovejoy of Johns Hopkins University and Arthur Edwards of the University of Georgia arrived in Winter Park to begin an eight-day investigation of the Rice dismissal.

Lovejoy, an established scholar in philosophy and a founder of the AAUP, took charge of the investigation, interpreted the findings, and wrote the final report while Edwards remained unobtrusively in the background.(24)

Rice's appeal to the AAUP charged the administration with violating the Association's tenure principles that before dismissal, every professor of associate rank or above should be entitled to have the charges against him stated in writing, to have a fair trial on those charges before a faculty-elected judicial committee, and to have the opportunity to face his accusers. At the initial meeting, Lovejoy in answer to Holt's question concerning the scope and purposes of the Committee of Inquiry, proposed to take up the whole issue of professional tenure. Holt protested. Lovejoy agreed to leave the tenure question until after the committee investigated the Rice dismissal. Holt later claimed that "the question of tenure was never taken up again formally between us," but they did discuss tenure near the end of the hearings. Holt simply denied the committee's right to determine any Rollins policy. But Lovejoy always maintained that the committee would undertake the twin aims of investigating the Rice dismissal and the college's tenure policy or an absence of it.(25)

The investigation consisted of daily hearings in the sacristy of the Chapel where Holt (along with Treasurer E. B. Brown and Dean Winslow Anderson) presented evidence against Rice, who was supported by Georgia and Lounsbury. Day after day Holt read letters and signed statements from students and from faculty, staff and towns people critical of Rice for one reason or another. Altogether, Holt listed a dozen charges against Rice, including claims that rather than teaching Latin and Greek, he had spent class periods on irrelevant topics of religion, sex, and unconventional living; he punished students who did

not hold his ideas; he influenced students to leave fraternities and sororities; he bullied students who came before the Board of Admissions of Upper Division; he "scoffed" at services in the chapel and criticized the churches of the town; he did not carry out the two-hour plan as scheduled; he was at times "immodest in dress" and he "destroyed youthful ideals without inculcating anything equally constructive and commendable in their place." Rice, who was initially shocked at the accumulation of condemning evidence on the table in front of Holt, relaxed considerably when he heard the charges, because he was certain that in their particulars they were often distorted, trivial or entirely false. In Rice's mind, Holt's efforts to articulate Rice's pernicious influence on the campus seemed nothing more than disagreements over policy, or petty differences over lifestyles. Did Holt personally look into Rice's teaching of Greek and Latin? asked Lovejoy. Well, no, said Holt, but he had considerable information from students. Did Rice characterize a chapel service as obscene? Rice admitted he had, but for good reason. Form should follow form, Rice argued, "you can't put on a vaudeville show, pink spotlight, and start winging with a choirmaster standing with his back to the altar in a Catholic style chapel without incurring the charge of obscenity." Didn't Rice encourage student disloyalty to the college? "My students," Rice replied, "are loyal to Rollins as they want it to be but not necessarily as it is, that is an unwise loyalty." Rice also denied he "dressed immodestly." Did you parade around the beachhouse in a jockstrap? Holt asked. "No," Rice replied, "I don't own a jock strap." And so it went for several days: Holt reading charges from signed affidavits, Rice either disputing them or trying to explain them away. Occasionally Lovejoy, Lounsbury or Georgia would interpret comments or ask questions.

Finally, although Holt wanted to avoid the matter, Lovejoy brought the hearings around to the heart of the matter. Did Rollins have a tenure policy, and were Rice's rights violated under that policy? Holt could answer only in general terms, because in fact the college had no specific policy.(40) Responding to faculty concern several months earlier, Holt persuaded the Trustees to issue a policy statement on tenure:

Until Rollins College achieves a greater measure of financial stability, Trustees find it impossible to establish permanent standards for tenure of office. Therefore, while it is necessary to continue assistant professor and instructors on the one-year appointment basis, the Trustees are glad to assure professors and associate professors who have served in this rank for three or more years that the policy of the Trustees will be to continue their services without annual notification unless reasonable notice be given to the contrary.

Lovejoy would later argue that this last statement (which applied to Rice who was a professor) appeared to establish a tenure policy, but actually required only that the administration to give the professors and associates "reasonable notice." How, Lovejoy asked, did Holt reconcile this last sentence in the Trustee resolution with his claim to General Secretary Tyler that "automatic reappointment is assured in the case of all associate or full professors?" "Expectation," Holt replied, "did not constitute a contract of permanent tenure." Holt argued that he had fulfilled terms of the college's tenure policy by giving Rice reasonable notice of non-reappointment. (26)

Lovejoy and Edwards left on May 24. Several months would elapse before they completed their report, but Holt knew by the manner of Lovejoy's handling of the hearing, by the tenor of his questions and comments that it would be critical of the administration's handling of the Rice dismissal. In fact, before the hearings ended, Holt determined that Lovejoy had placed not Rice, but the President and the college on

trial. He thought Edwards "a fair investigator," but was convinced that Lovejoy was devious and prejudiced.(44) Though not surprised, Holt felt betrayed when Lovejoy handed a "preliminary report" to local newspapers before he left town. It criticized the college's "rules for tenure" as "ill-defined" and found in the Rice case "nothing seriously reflecting upon either the private character or scholarship of Mr. Rice or on his ability as a teacher."(27)

With the investigation completed, Holt now prepared to play out what he called "the fourth act in the great college drama, Rollins versus Rice"; to deal summarily with Rice's friends.(46) One by one he called the Rice supporters into his office and asked them all the same question: "Will you give your loyalty and support to reducing the cleavage on the campus and in carrying out policies of the Trustees, the faculty or acts by myself or any others in authority even though you may intellectually differ with them?" Those who replied affirmatively found their positions secure. Those resisted answering forthrightly were dismissed. Allan Tory, an English historian and Oxford graduate, told Holt he would work to repair campus rifts, but would refuse to be a 'yes man.' Despite a previous verbal contract, a promotion to Associate Professor and appointment as a faculty representative to the prestigious international club, Tory was fired the following day. The President wanted to fire physics professor Theodore Dreier but hesitated, since Dreier's aunt, Margaret Robbins, was an influential Trustee. Holt informed Dreier he "could come back next year" but would not be asked to return the following year. Drier resigned. Bingham and his wife, and Cecil Oldham, professor of history, all had resigned earlier for reasons growing out of the Rice affair, and despite Holt's pleading, William Wunsch, brilliant associate professor of theater, quit in July. Total casualties, including

resignations and dismissals, stood at eight faculty members, all Rice supporters in one form or another. The college had lost one-fourth of its faculty.

Frederick Georgia and Ralph Lounsbury presented Holt with special problems. An important force in Holt's rebuilding program, chairman of several major committees and organizer of the curriculum conference, Georgia had held his professorship for over seven years and certainly seemed protected from dismissal. Lounsbury had completed three years as professor and had only recently (March 11) received a letter from Holt stating "though professors who have held a professional rank three or more years need not be notified of their reappointment I am writing you this personal note for I hope you will continue at Rollins where you have made an enviable reputation for yourself." In a letter to his Dean, Holt frankly admitted that, because the college had no case against the two professors on "specific grounds," it must reply on the fact that they "were disturbing elements and we must have harmony." On June 6, the day after commencement, the Executive Committee asked Georgia and Lounsbury to resign with one-half salary. Both men refused, arguing that the settlement was inconsistent with the policy of due notice. Their contract for 1933-34 must be honored, they said. The Executive Committee voted not to re-employ Georgia and Lounsbury for the following year, and one month later, the Board of Trustees upheld that vote. (30)

Lounsbury's case was perhaps the saddest. The President's closest personal friend since their college days at Yale, a political and economic conservative, Lounsbury seemed curiously out of place among the liberal and progressive supporters of John Rice. Yet, he sympathized with their professional educational goals, saw much inflexibility in the two-hour classes but most of all believed

principles should guide a man's life. More than any of the others, he supported Rice, not out of sympathy with the eccentric iconoclast but because he thought such a dismissal struck a devastating blow against the integrity of the teaching profession. Lounsbury never doubted the administration's authority to fire Rice, but he very strongly questioned Holt's dismissal methods. Try as he might, Lounsbury could not make Holt understand the correlation between his loyalty to the college and his support of Rice. He had written in mid-March of his concern that Holt saw his efforts to improve policies or methods as evidence of his disloyalty. "I have gone and shall doubtless continue to go upon the supposition that loyalty does not call for mere subserviency or for clothing an honest expression of opinion. College professors who are willing to surrender lightly the thing which is very fundamental to their profession -- namely their mental integrity -- are not apt to be of any value to Rollins." Two months later when the Rice dismissal became a crisis, Lounsbury vainly tried to clarify his (and also his colleagues') position in a letter to the president: "I should be sorry if you thought that our opposition to some things and our efforts to help another had any personal aspect towards you. We have been fighting not Hamilton Holt as an individual and friend but for what we believe to be the integrity of our profession; and may I say that no man who will not fight for that has any business to be in [a profession]" He added a poignantly moving plea: "So Hammy please try to overlook my failings and believe that whatever I have of head and heart is devoted to even a bigger and better Rollins. If the roads by which we seek that result seem now and then divergent, I know that we are both trying to attain that goal and I beg you to believe it too."(31)

Sadly the Rice dismissal need not have degenerated into a crisis. Particularly during February and March the President might have diffused a potentially explosive situation.(32) He had only to turn the Rice dismissal over to an appropriate faculty committee, to charge it with conducting hearings and to use its findings simply as recommendations. Given Rice's behavior, the committee undoubtedly would have recommended dismissal, but even if it had not, the President could still have acted independently, certainly with no more unfavorable consequences. Many faculty members and at least one trustee had suggested this solution. Professors Tory and Edwin Clark thought such a committee would create "a new morale and hope for the future." The most perceptive advice along these lines came from Board of Trustees member, Margaret Dreier Robbins. A childhood friend of the President, a liberal reformer and a militant leader of the Women's Labor Movement in the 1920s, Margaret Robbins tried in several letters and with a personal visit to divert Holt from a collision course with his faculty. She begged Holt to elect a faculty committee to consider the discipline and dismissal of professors. In that way, she sagaciously contended, rather than Holt's shouldering the entire burden, the faculty would bear with him the brunt of that decision. Admittedly, the method was unconventional but, she asked, wasn't such an effort simply an extension of "your own liberal policies?" "My dear Hamilton Holt," she pleaded, "why not add this jewel to your immortal crown?" Holt never answered her question.(33)

Thus, in the area of college administration, Holt was much more conventional than Mrs. Robbins supposed. With prodding from the AAUP, a few institutions had established systems giving the faculty a greater role in college governance, but in the overwhelming majority, employer-employee concepts still characterized president-faculty relationships.

Few held more strongly to this attitude than Hamilton Holt, who consistently described his efforts at Rollins in business terms. Like businesses, his two-hour class system would place education on an eight-hour day; students must be responsible in attending classes in the same way, as workers were responsible for showing up at work. Holt treated INDEPENDENT reporters and Rollins professors in much the same way. He respected their professionalism, but in the final analysis he was their boss. As President he held the authority of a conventional employer who could personally hire and fire employees. When, in the midst of the Rice affair, some faculty questioned that authority, he promptly persuaded the Trustees to issue an interpretation that provided him with unlimited authority in matters of faculty discipline and dismissal: "Subject to the approval of the Trustees it is the duty of the President to appoint or dismiss all employees of the college including the faculty." Holt's personal management attitude may have been summarized most clearly in a letter explaining to the Southern Association of Colleges why he had dismissed the Rice supporters: "It is fundamental of [the] employee's duty that he should yield obedience to all reasonable rules, orders or instructions of the employer." More to the point when asked why he would not allow a faculty review committee, Holt replied, "When you fire a cook you don't go out and get a committee of neighbors to tell you what to do."

Obviously, Margaret Robbins's advice was unpalatable to Holt, so he turned to other more supportive suggestions. He found them in Trustees John Goss and Milton Warner, Holt's classmates at Yale, now successful businessman, and to William O'Neal, local businessman who had been a trustee at Rollins since its founding. All interpreted the Rice affair as a power struggle between a group of liberal dissident faculty and the president. They all advised that Holt should stand firm

in his authority, or else he would lose complete control of the college governance. Throughout the crisis, Goss, particularly influential, wrote long pages of advice that Holt followed almost to the letter. At one time or another, Goss advised Holt to "go at this Rice matter firmly, decisively, and without hesitation": "to get the Rice supporters together and make them pledge themselves to be loyal," and after the AAUP hearings, "to clean the decks just as quickly as possible of all disloyalty and of all disintegrating influences personal or otherwise that have surrounded this Rice problem."(34) Holt seemed to find this advice reassuring and reinforcing. He was so receptive to Goss's advice, in fact, that more than once he repeated one of Goss's curious aphorisms: "When principle and right conflict, throw away your principles and do what is right."(35)

By the beginning of the new school year in September 1933, the Rice affair had receded beneath the surface of Rollins's academic life, and a new faculty harmony returned to the campus. The Rice affair resurfaced, however, in November, when the AAUP published Lovejoy's report in its bulletin. The report conceded that Rice "had unquestionably much disturbed the harmony of the local community," had "fallen into some serious errors of judgment and some of taste," but it also concluded that Rice's dismissal "eliminated from the faculty a teacher who appears on the one hand to have done more than any other to provoke questioning, discussion and the spirit of critical inquiry and on the other to have aimed with exceptional success at constructive results both in thought and character." (36)

The Lovejoy report accused Holt of exceeding his authority, of autocratically interpreting the college bylaws, of demanding excessive personal fealty, and of expecting more harmony and likemindedness than should be found in the college. It further accused him of

hypocritically proclaiming liberal ideals but of practicing the opposite. The report further abhorred the mass dismissals subsequent to the Lovejoy hearings citing them as evidence of the President's "autocratic powers contrary to academic customs and principles of this profession and not sanctioned by the college charter or bylaws." The association placed Rollins on its ineligible list indicating to its members that the college did not accept AAUP principles of academic freedom and tenure.(37)

Maddened by the report, Holt struck back. In December, he and the Executive Committee published a report entitled, "Rollins College versus The American Association of University Professors," charging the Committee of Inquiry with "attempted coercion if not bribery; [with] misrepresentation if not defamation of character of bias; and [with] prejudice if not malice and suppression of evidence." The report further lashed out at "the small body of willful men who controlled the Association in the year 1932-33" and also belittled the organization which approved "the attack of a prejudiced and hostile investigator." The college then distributed several thousand copies of the report to college and university administrations throughout the country. This accomplished Rollins administration finally allowed the Rice affair to rest. In February 1934, Holt wrote a friend with some relief that "the storm through which our academic ship of state passed is now over, and we are now in calm waters."(38)

The Rice affair produced another and more positive outcome. When Rice, Georgia, Lounsbury, and Dreier gathered during the summer to consider the future, they were drawn to the idea of putting in practice what they had been preaching. Why not start their own college, one of them suggested, and though in the midst of a deep economic depression the idea at first had seemed absurdly naive, they agreed to explore the

possibilities. By August, they had found a ready-made campus, the Baptist Summer Retreat in Black Mountain, North Carolina, and enough funds to make a beginning. In September 1932, four of the dismissed Rollins faculty members opened Black Mountain College, destined to become in the next decade one the nation's most exciting and significant experiments in American higher education.

Rather than resentment, Black Mountain College evoked considerable pride from the Rollins community. Many sensed an affinity with its efforts, believing correctly that Rollins had provided the educational spawning grounds for the experiment. The Rice affair thus seemed to be ending on a much more pleasant note than the President's strident reply to the AAUP report.(39)

The struggle also left behind two unfortunate casualties. The first was Ralph Lounsbury who died unexpectedly in 1933 of heart failure. Previous attacks had led him into what he thought were the peaceful confines of academe. More than a few of his colleagues at Black Mountain believed that his row with Holt and his subsequent dismissal had contributed to Lounsbury's untimely death. The second casualty was the incipient progressive educational reforms begun with such high optimism in 1930. The college did not abandon its progressive posture, but the Rice affair had diverted the community's energy into an unproductive struggle that substantially smothered a fledgling spirit of change. As Holt indicated in the aftermath of the Rice affair, by 1934 the academic ship of state had retreated from the stormy seas of conflict, into the more calming waters of academic conventionalism. Unfortunately, the secure haven into which Holt had anchored his vessel protected it as well from the excitement, the adventure, and the promise of the high seas of innovative education.

The final and ironic chapter of the Rice episode was written several years later in 1938. In that year Black Mountain College refused to reappoint John Rice on grounds similar to those that had led to his dismissal at Rollins, and the same year the Rollins Board of Trustees adopted the AAUP statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure. In December 1938 the Association removed Rollins from the unapproved list.(40)

CHAPTER SEVEN GROWTH IN THE MIDST OF DEPRESSION AND WAR

However unfortunate the Rice affair, it could neither obscure nor diminish the college's substantial accomplishments in the first decade and a half of the Holt administration. That this growth occurred in the midst of the most devastating depression the nation had ever known was astounding. Because of the economic downturn, the college suffered from a chronic shortage of operating funds, but even that did not prevent the carrying forward of teaching and educational reforms, the doubling of faculty numbers along with improving its teaching effectiveness. The college attracted a larger number of students with higher academic qualifications and built virtually a new campus of five new dormitories and a theater-chapel complex, all constructed in Spanish-Mediterranean architectural style. While these changes evidenced the transformation of a small, provincial college into a nationally recognized institution, only a deeper exploration can convey the drama of an institution undergoing such a profound and often wrenching metamorphosis.

In the firm conviction that the faculty was the keystone of the academic structure, Holt devoted much of his and the college's resources to this area in the early years of his presidency. He first cleared the community of what he perceived to be "academic deadwood"-- that collection of poor teachers and aged professors, which he had inherited. In their places he sought "golden personalities." As defined by Holt, these personalities would be teachers with a fund of knowledge, combined with the creative and engaging styles that make learning interesting, exciting, and worthwhile. "It is professors who

make a college great," Holt proclaimed repeatedly, "and yet how rare a great teacher."

GPs, as students irreverently dubbed them, were those "rare souls whose personality appeals to young men and women, who possess the gift of teaching and the nobility of character to inspire youth." These generalities hardly provided tangible measures of competency such as advanced education and graduate degrees, qualifications Holt also considered. He tended, therefore, to rely on his own intuition in hiring his "golden personalities," and because he alone interviewed and hired most of the faculty in those early years, that intuition played a vital role in forming a competent faculty.(1)

For the most part, Holt's personal judgment served him well. Within five years he assembled a well-qualified and interesting group of "golden personalities," certainly the most impressive faculty the college had ever gathered, but also one that compared favorably with that of quality colleges in the northeast and Midwest. Eleven of his appointments possessed earned doctorates from Cornell, Columbia, California and Pennsylvania and such foreign universities as Dublin and Heidelberg in an era when PhDs were scarce. The group also included seven Phi Beta Kappas. Several of the professors had published or would make important scholarly contributions later in their careers. Willard Wattles, Professor of Literature, had already published several volumes of poetry when he arrived in 1927 and subsequently wrote two more. Leland Jenks, Professor of History, published several scholarly articles on Cuba while at Rollins and, after leaving in 1931, completed an important study on Cuban-American policy. Holt also managed to hire three graduates from Oxford University: Cecil Oldam, Allan Tory, and the Rhodes Scholar, John Rice.

Even so, the president remained adamant that a collection of graduate degrees and a list of publications did not necessarily add up to good teaching. He valued the "universal gift of teaching" as more important than research and student testimony on professors more than the praise of his colleagues. Having himself entered academia without a graduate degree, Holt downplayed its significance in effective teaching. "While no one cares less for a degree than I," he wrote John Rice in 1930, "I rather hope you can arrange to get your M.A. from Oxford. It looks good in the catalogue and is supposed to be an academic plus." Holt's patronizing, if not unfriendly, attitude toward the academic professional led him to seek "golden personalities" outside the educational sphere. One of his first appointments was Edwin Osgood Grover, former editor-in-chief of Rand-McNally and a former colleague in the publishing world.

Apparently Grover's academic qualifications included an honorary Bachelor of Literature degree from Dartmouth, a few publications of his own private press, and a knowledge of publishing--not much different from Holt's qualifications. Since Grover possessed no conventional academic area of expertise, Holt created for him the Department of Books with Grover holding the unique title of Professor of Books. College literature proclaimed it the one and only such professorship in the world, a statement never challenged. Holt also appointed the famous Georgia writer, Cora Harris, as Professor of Evil. When she became ill after teaching three classes, no one dared remark on the obvious conclusion. Only the failure to uncover supporting funds kept Holt from naming a Professor of Hunting and Fishing.(2)

These quixotic notions aside, Holt did make some successful faculty appointments from outside academe. Ralph Lounsbury was one, but Royal France may have been one of Holt's most important appointments.

France came to Rollins after a successful career as a New York attorney and as president of two large corporations, one of which was Triangle Film, a company that distributed the films of Thomas Ince, D. W. Griffith and Mack Sennett. Paramount Pictures later absorbed the company. Through Joseph Irving France, his brother and an U. S. Senator from Maryland, Royal moved among the highest levels of Washington and New York talent. He knew personally both Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt. Despite this conservative background, France had developed over the years an increasingly liberal outlook on life, which made him more and more uncomfortable in the corporate world. An earlier experience with a progressive preparatory school had interested him in education, and in 1928 he wrote Holt, whom he knew from the peace movement, an inquiry: "I think that one who has majored in Economics and Law in college and has practiced both, ought to be able to teach those subjects better than someone who has just read about them in books." Holt found this simple logic appealing, met France in New York, and characteristically hired him on the spot to teach economics.(3)

France became not only an outstanding teacher, his presence added immeasurably to the college community because, like Lounsbury, he was a highly principled man. While he supported Rice from the beginning, publicly and privately criticizing Holt's methods, France consistently proclaimed his loyalty to the president. For reasons that are not quite clear, Holt accepted this fractured loyalty never seeing France as a threat.

In the national election of 1932, France worked for the Socialist candidate Norman Thomas, and afterwards became chairman of the Socialist Party of Florida. If this were not enough to disturb the sensibilities of conservative Central Florida, he became an active and public critic of the southern segregation system. An admirer of Zora

Neal Hurston's artistic endeavors, France opened his home, to the disgust of his neighbors, whenever Hurston visited the area. More than once France brought notoriety to the campus, but even so, Holt reappointed him in 1933, and continued to support the professor's right to speak out on controversial issues. In 1951, at the age of 70, France left the "comforts of his home" in Winter Park, and the comparative calm of Rollins College for the civil liberties struggles of the McCarthy era. At a time when men and women summoned before the inquisitorial committees of Congress found it difficult to find lawyers courageous enough to defend them, France was both a friend and a counselor. In the 1950s, he gained national prominence for his defense of a Communist hauled before the House un-American Activities Committee. In 1952, he presented an amicus brief in an effort to reduce the death sentence of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. At the time of his death in that year, he was organizing a rally to protest the McCarran Internal Security Act.

The early Holt era also brought an increase in the quantity and quality of students. When he arrived in 1926, the college reported a total of 368 students. Holt envisioned increasing that number to 700, but the depression, cause of many college woes, created a nationwide decline in student enrollment. Thus, ten years after Holt arrived, enrollment stood at 470. This number remained relatively steady until the outbreak of World War II when it dropped precipitously.

If the college failed to reach the optimum number Holt wanted, its educational reforms did attract higher quality students and particularly students intensely interested in the kind of education they received at Rollins. Many came to the college specifically because of progressive reforms. The statement of Carol Hemingway, sister of Ernest, was commonly subscribed to: "My first impression of

Hamilton Holt came from an article I read of his describing the Conference Plan. I determined to go to Rollins because of that article."(4) Because they arrived at the campus with an interest in education, they sought to take an active part in the entire educational process. The college encouraged this participation by periodically asking students to evaluate the Conference Plan, and involving them in the curriculum revision. As a result, students at Rollins directly participated in the educational process. Students responded to their new opportunities with a zeal surprising to all campus visitors such as Dr. Charles H. Judd of the University of Chicago. Judd, who visited the campus on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation, exhibited less than ardent support for college progressive programs, but he could not deny the positive attitude of Rollins students: (5)

"There is evidently a spirit of the greatest enthusiasm for the college among the students. The Rollins conference plan is discussed even in class exercise and is thought of by the students as a unique and very inspiring undertaking I would say is apart. Some of the students characterized American college education elsewhere as a failure, and declared that in their judgment the Rollins plan is destined to replace all types of organization. The whole community seems to be alive in a kind of enthusiastic ecstasy."

Because of Holt's interest in literature and the arts and because several reputable artists and writers who wintered in the "Park" admired the college, the institution began to attract imaginative, creative students. Their talents and enthusiasm soon became evident. They transformed the SANDSPUR into a regular-sized newspaper organized on the format of the NEW YORK TIMES and restructured it to include editorials, reviews of books and movies, and various essays. In 1930 and 1931 it played an important role in encouraging a college dialogue on the curriculum revision. In 1927, a winter term seminar on fiction and poetry was created with writing taught by nationally known poets

and novelists including Irving Bacheller (also a Rollins trustee), Cale Young Rice and his wife Alice Hegan, as well as Clinton Scollard and Jesse Rittenhouse.

Perhaps the most significant creative endeavor of this period was THE FLAMINGO. This monthly "literary magazine of the young generation," first published in March 1927, contained original poems and short stories. Students edited the magazine and contributed most of the material. As a creative and intellectual venture, THE FLAMINGO attracted wide attention, reinforced the reputation of the colleges as a progressive, creative institution, and popularized Rollins as a home of fine literary talent. Writers such as Majorie Kinnan Rawlings and editors as Maria Leipes of Simon and Schuster praised the stories and poems from the magazine as of "immensely high caliber." In the 1935 edition, a short story entitled "The Key" received critical acclaim and won for its student-author, Frances Perpente, first prize in a national short story contest. A winter visitor from the Rockefeller Foundation stated that "anyone wishing to gain an estimate of the kind of work done by the better students at Rollins should examine THE FLAMINGO." Holt once remarked that the magazine had become a "veritable sport on the campus," the kind that encouraged community-wide creativity.(6)

Holt was correct. THE FLAMINGO set the tone for a burst of creative energy that permeated the entire campus. Holt hosted poetry readings and discussions every Sunday in his home on Interlachen Avenue, and similar activity often spilled over into evenings at professors's homes or on campus. Students gathered at Rice's house almost nightly; Theodore Dreier, a physics teacher, often escorted students on excursions to explore nature's aesthetic delights around the campus; and Richard Fuerstein, who taught German, directed impromptu drama in the evenings. The completion of the theater in 1932

brought quality drama to the campus for the first time. At the helm was a star of the legitimate theater, Annie Russell, for whom the theater was named. Productions that year, which included Russell's own MAJOR BARBARA, were simply one of the manifestations that Rollins College had suddenly blossomed forth as a cultural center of the Southeast. The spirit of progressive experimentation had clearly unleashed latent talent within the community transforming the college into a creative workshop.(7)

Based on literary and artistic talents and productions, Rollins students in the Holt era would have competed well on any academic quality scale. But the Great Depression and World War II had begun to take its toll. Despite his optimism and self-confidence, Holt had not been able to turn around the deplorable financial situation he had inherited in 1925. He had raised over one and half million dollars for various peace organizations in the pre-and post-World War I period; surely, if he could raise that much for something as abstract as peace, he could attract sufficient funds to endow a small college. Failing that, he was certain he could rely on his eminent acquaintances among the wealthy and powerful men of the Northeast. The perennial and burdensome college deficit that had leveled several former presidents appeared to Holt as a bully good challenge, and his first effort at fund-raising simply reinforced his confidence in his ability to meet that challenge.

In 1926, Holt persuaded an old peace movement friend, William Short, to join the college as treasurer. That summer and fall Short reorganized the institution's the financial structure, and in April, 1926, he launched a campaign in Orange County to raise \$300,000 to pay operating expenses of \$60,000 annually for the following five years. The administration, relieved of the chore of raising funds for

operating expenses, devoted its full efforts to increasing the endowment to five million dollars. If the college expected those outside Florida to donate funds, Holt argued, it must first garner local support. The administration began solicitations on April 13, 1926 and one week later announced cash pledges totaling \$304,000, an over subscription of \$4,000. Subsequently, Holt's first attempt to raise funds outside the state brought \$25,000 for student loans from President Elbert Gary of the United States Steel Corporation. Thus, the college seemed financially well secured for the future even before the trustees had held formal inauguration for the new president. This early rush of success swept the Holt administration with a wave of optimism.

(8)

But just as quickly as it had appeared, the early successes were swept away by a sudden economic disaster. In the summer of 1926 a destructive hurricane destroyed millions of dollars in property and had the effect of collapsing the land boom that had brought Floridians unprecedented (though, as it turned out, false) prosperity. Within a fortnight of the land crash, the real estate given to the college during the campaign could not be sold at any price. Countless pledges simply could not be collected. Subscription pledges for the 1926-27 academic year by January totaled only \$20,000, one third of the anticipated \$60,000. On January 13, 1927, Treasurer William Short presented Holt with a dismal "analysis of Rollins College's finances." Not only would the college not retire the \$61,000 debt Holt had inherited but by summer would add \$48,000 to that debt for a \$109,000 deficit by summer. Even more frightening was the \$28,00 in current bills that urgently must be paid within a matter of days. Short's predictions proved equally discouraging: Local banks were reluctant to make loans to the college until after it had collected the February

tutions, he explained, "because they know we have no further income." Besides, he said, local banks also had fallen on hard times. This critical financial situation was further complicated by the fact that in the halcyon days of the previous summer, Holt had ordered a \$45,000 deferred maintenance program. The true total of the deficit would likely stand at almost \$150,000.(9)

In the midst of this financial crisis, dissension developed within the administration. Short's concerted efforts to collect tuition angered students and his methods jarred the conservative sensibilities of the crusty former treasurer, William O'Neal, the college's oldest and most powerful trustee. O'Neal was incensed by Short's insistence on continuing repairs during the financial crisis. Unwilling to endure the bitter crossfire of criticism, Short resigned in June 1927. Holt, who had conjoled Short into coming to Rollins in the first place, deeply regretted his old friend's resignation. "If I had my own feelings to consider," he wrote later, "I would never have let him left Rollins. He suited me there absolutely. His going was one of the griefs of my life." (10)

At O'Neal's suggestion, Holt replaced Short with Erwin T. Brown, an experienced and competent treasurer, but even so the old trustee was not placated. He proposed shocking Draconian measures: "cut expenses at every corner, reduce salaries, make no repairs not absolutely necessary." The college had completely drained its Florida recourses, O'Neal claimed, because every president had conducted a local canvassing campaign promising that "if a given amount was subscribed it would be ample for present needs." In his judgment, held told Holt, "it would be impossible to raise anymore money in Orlando and vacinity" for sometime to come. And do not rely on the trustees he warned. He had seen them "shut up like clams..." saying "it is heartbreaking [that

this is happening to the college] but that's the way of the world." His final advice: "close the college until endorsement interest revives." Holt's answer to all this unsolicited advice was that although he valued O'Neal's "concrete suggestions" he had accepted the call to Rollins to build not to destroy.(11)

Thus on the premise that the best defense was an all-out offense, in June, 1928, Holt and Treasurer Brown presented the Trustees with plans for a two and one-half million dollar endowment fund raising campaign. The Trustees authorized the fund raising firm of Tamblin and Brown of New York to conduct the campaign if the President could raise the \$250,000 necessary to guarantee payment to the firm.

In face of the college's day-to-day operational problems, the endowment campaign was a bold, aggressive, and some thought foolish, move. In August 1928, Brown wrote Holt, who was summering at Woodstock, that he could not meet even necessary maintenance costs and had no idea how he would pay faculty salaries for September. In December, the college borrowed \$4,000 from a Winter Park bank and \$9,000 from the Tamblin-Brown fund for faculty salaries. To add to these problems, Brown discovered over one-third of the enrolled students had failed to pay fees and tuition. Despite this need for daily operational funds, Brown supported the new endowment campaign because, he told Holt, "there is only one direction we can go: forward," and because "I have faith in you and that faith has caused me to stay at Rollins another year." Holt's former classmates at Yale, John Goss and Milton Warner kicked off the guarantee fund by contributing \$25,000 each, but contributions came in a maddening dribble thereafter. It was not until February, 1929, that a last minute gift of \$48,000 from William Bingham enabled the administration to complete the guarantee fund. (12)

While the administration strained every effort in the fund campaign, college deficits from operating costs continued to mount at an alarming rate. Having expended \$73,000 of the guaranteed fund to reduce the debt, Brown still estimated an incredible \$350,000 deficit to be paid before a cent could be raised in the campaign. To use Holt's metaphor: a "financial sword of Damocles," suspended tenuously by the "gossamer thread," swung menacingly over their heads. It was an enormous gamble, for a failed campaign would drag the entire institution down with it. Nevertheless, in February 1929, the Board of Trustees authorized the President to instruct the firm of Tamblyn and Brown open the two and one half million-dollar campaign. Unfortunately, in another bit of pure bad luck, the campaign announcement coincided the stock market crash of October 1929. Even a gift \$125,000 gift from H. H. Westinghouse (the college's largest gift ever) failed to brighten the dark cloud that spread over the campaign after the crash.(13) Then, just at that darkest hour, while Holt was canvassing furiously in Pittsburgh, there came a sudden burst of hopeful, financial light. On January 31, 1929, Holt received a stunning telegram from his old and close acquaintance, Dr. John Gering, physician and financial advisor to philanthropist William Bingham II:

"On this last day of the first month of the year the word of the Lord came to a certain Samaritan saying write my servant Hamilton Holt offering the sum of \$500,000 and send it now but with no publicity save to the Trustees." (14)

Kenneth Wilson, a Tamblyn and Brown agent working with Holt in Pittsburgh, later recalled Holt's stunned reaction to the news. "As he stared at the message his cheeks flushed and his body became rigid. He seemed almost paralyzed by the news." Wilson suggested that Holt prepare a reply to the incredible message, but when Holt tried to put his appreciation into words, the potential implication of the gift came

flooding in on him, and according to Wilson, the President "broke down and wept."(26) Only later did Holt learn how the momentous decision had been made. Gering, with little success, had been bringing the college to Bingham's attention for several months, but then, Gering reported, on the morning of the 31st, Bingham "came to me to inquire as to the welfare of Rollins College followed by a declaration that he would like to give a half a million dollars toward it."(27) As the first of the college's major gifts since his arrival, (it almost doubled the endowment), Bingham's donation was valued more highly than any other, because Holt believed it proved that his new educational plan could attract financial support. In a letter of appreciation to Bingham, the President spelled out its meaning to the college:

Rollins was reaching a turning point in its career. I had about exhausted every available liquid asset short of mortgaging the campus and I feel that this great and most timely aid will bring me safely past the first big milestone and give every friend renewed courage and strength for the tasks ahead in upbuilding the little college I have learned to love.

In Holt's mind the gift saved the college, and he celebrated its anniversary every year.

Still, he understood that the new funds offered no long-term panacea for Rollins financial woes. The increase in endowment income could satisfy the college's financial needs--needs that had been increased enormously by Holt's determination to maintain small conference classes, to hire more teachers and at higher salaries and to make major improvements in the physical plant. As the depression deepened, drying up the college's normal resources, the campaign lagged and finally atrophied. On February 18, 1931, the Trustees canceled the Tamblin contract. The campaign had netted just over \$900,000, a sizable

amount but still far short of the two and one-half million-dollar goal. As Holt wrote a friend, he and his staff were "going it alone."(15)

For their part some Trustees wondered whether the college could raise more funds than the firm of professional Tamblin and Brown. Their spokesman, William O'Neal, had submitted a statement to the Trustees reiterating his earlier call for retrenchment in the face of the economic depression. It would seem wise, he counseled, "to restrict our enrollment to the maximum figure possible to handle without adding materially to our faculties or our plant." He also criticized the administration for spending too much of the current income on capital improvements, branding such expenditures "a major cause" of the college's alarming deficits (projected over \$300,000 by the end of the summer, 1932). "As a policy," O'Neal chided, "this is bad."(16)

Holt simply ignored O'Neal and his followers and plunged ahead with an aggressive development program that included stabilizing the size of the student body at a relatively high 500, building in 1930 a new dormitory (Rollins Hall) costing \$15,000 more than the Bingham donation, submitting plans for a new library, an infirmary and four new housing units and adding six faculty members. Already the contractors were breaking ground on a new chapel-theater complex, the one made possible by a major grant from the Knowles family, the other by a donation from the Bok foundation. Even more incredibly, in a time of high unemployment and wage cutting, and in the face of a growing college deficit, Holt persuaded the Trustees in May 1931, to increase virtually every faculty member's salary by \$100 to \$500. The President himself received no raise in 1931, possibly because the Trustees had set his salary just the year before at \$15,500, a \$3,500 increase.(17)

But as the irascible O'Neal predicted, unless large sums of money suddenly began pouring into the college coffers, something had to give.

That "something," coming at the end of the college year in 1932, was faculty salaries. The payment of salaries in June 1932, had completely emptied the college treasury, and with a debt destined to soar over \$300,000, banks declined to loan until the next academic year. With salaries for the summer months soon to be paid, Holt gave faculty the cheerless news: the college would withhold fifty percent of all salaries through the summer months. The Trustees added an even more ominous note to the announcement: "If adverse financial conditions continue, faculty members may be requested a) to donate to Rollins College on or before October 15 a given percentage of the payments withheld as defined above, or b) to accept a percentage reduction in salaries for the year 1933; c) or to face a possible reduction in personnel." During the summer months, Holt and Fred Hanna, the president's new assistant, made valiant efforts to forestall any of these alternatives. "We have been wearing out automobile tires and shoe leather," Holt wrote a friend in August, "chasing around the country seeking whom we can financially devour. I confess it is gall and wormwood to beg in this strenuous way. I have gone to some of my real personal friends which I swore I would never do."(18)

By combination of hard work and good luck the administration managed to meet the July, August and September payrolls, but with no further prospects, it decided to make additional economies. Following a meeting of the trustee finance committee in Connecticut on August 11, Holt wrote the faculty informing them that their salaries would be reduced by thirty percent in the coming year.(36) The trustees hoped to repay this reduction, but Holt warned the faculty not to count on it. He deeply regretted the action and assured the faculty that no one would blame them if by leaving Rollins they improve their personal situations. The "retain" caused serious hardship among the faculty who

were receiving an average of only \$1,800 per year, by Holt's own admission, a sum well below that of southern sister colleges and less than half the average salary of Northern institutions.(19)

The faculty members, without exception, chose to remain at Rollins but not without some grumbling. In autumn, 1932, the local AAUP delivered a pointed letter to the President complaining that extensive capital outlays, not large faculty salaries, had created the college's precarious financial predicament. The committee letter bluntly set forth the charge that "an underpaid faculty now faced the prospect of paying for capital improvements made in the past by accepting a salary scale below their present living cost. The obligations of the college are thus being converted into private obligations of faculty members." Holt bristled at the tone of the letter and the barely hidden accusation that his extravagant spending policy had caused the college's financial problems, but made no reply. Many, including Holt, were later to believe the fifty- percent loss of income through retainage in the summer of 1932, followed by an outright reduction in their salaries, laid the basis for the faculty disaffection during the Rice affair. Significantly, in the midst of that episode after Holt had fired Rice and several of his colleagues, the administration announced that the 20 per cent salary retain would now be now be entered on the books as "donation" from the faculty to the college. Not a single voice of protest arose from the faculty ranks.(20)

Certain that he had exhausted every outside resource, available to the college and particularly after the Rice affair, determined that the faculty would not further shoulder the burden of college finances, Holt decided that the students would pay a larger share of the cost of their education. In the fall of 1933, the administration announced its innovative tuition program called the Unit Cost Plan. Starkly

simplistic, the plan divided the annual operating budget by the estimated enrollment producing a unit cost per student. In the year 1933-1934, with a budget of \$675,000 and an estimated 500 students, the new unit cost came to \$1,350, an increase of \$400 per student over the previous year. Endowment income of \$67,000 per year assisted students unable to pay the higher fees. With the nation at the nadir in an economic depression, it was a bold (some would argue potentially disastrous) move to increase tuition so drastically, but the college had prepared a compelling, if somewhat equalitarian, explanation for its "simple and scientific and concrete" new plan. In the past, society had justified meager student contributions (half of the actual cost) because graduates entered some form of public service such as the ministry of teaching. In the 20th century, the college argued, students attended college for personal or professional considerations. "It would seem therefore that under these changed conditions, the well-to-do students should be expected to pay for the benefits received, and the endowment income in gifts heretofore distributed equally throughout the student body should go to those unable to pay the full cost of education."(21)

In another rationalization, the administration depicted the unit cost plan as "the third noteworthy step in Rollins's progressive educational development." The college described the conference plan as the humanization of teaching, the new curriculum as the individualization of instruction, and the unit cost plan ("our third academic departure from existing college practices") as the democratization of college financing where the burden of cost was shared by those able to pay.(22) In this sense the college had completed the progressive circle.

Theoretically, the additional monies accruing from increased tuition would balance the budget, but, in fact, the plan never lived up to its expectations. Probably because of the higher fees, student enrollment dropped by 100 in 1933-34, with a corresponding \$40,000 loss in anticipated funds. Moreover, the college had promised exemption from the rate increase to currently enrolled students who could show that they would have to "leave the college if required to meet the increase." That number proved much higher than expected (most likely because many students whose families COULD afford \$1,350 tuition too easily convinced the administration they could NOT pay), further diminishing anticipated income. In addition, two-thirds of the student body received some kind of aid. Altogether, the total income from students actually fell by over \$50,000 in 1933-34, and in this first year of the Unit Cost Plan the college ran a deficit of over \$46,000. But for an unexpected gift that deficit would have amounted to \$96,000.

By 1936, Brown had proclaimed the unit cost plan less than a success. "We adopted it too soon," he told Holt. "Our clientele was not firmly enough established; we did not have uniform housing conditions, and in general we had no physical attraction to justify such a move." Enrollment had dropped by twenty-five percent, meaning a loss of \$50,000 in income.(23) Even after these measures, Brown predicted another deficit of \$60,000 at the end of the academic year.

Disturbed by the cancerous nature of this deficit, Holt finally succumbed to a solution he had long avoided: he sought to pry loose some endowment funds. When philanthropist William Bingham consented to the use of his gift for a purpose other than endowment, the Treasurer Brown transferred \$500,000 to a reserve fund, and the Trustees immediately liquidated the college debt of \$250,000.(45) It was to be, however, only temporary relief, as operating deficits began

accumulating again in 1935 and continued with relentless monotony. A memorandum from Holt in the summer of 1939 carries a tone of despair:

TO THE FACULTY OF ROLLINS COLLEGE:

Due to the fall of Rollins securities and the interests on our endowments the last few years of the depression, we are about at the end of our borrowing capacity and if Rollins is to get "over the hill" in 1939-1940 we must have an increase in the number of full paying students. It seems to me the faculty, whose future employment and salaries depend upon the success of the college, could devote sufficient time this summer to securing one such student.

Despite this plea for help among its own members, the college suffered a severe drop in enrollment during the 1939-1940 academic year, the institution descended to a new financial low point. With seventy-five percent of the \$500,000 annual budget projected from student fees, six percent (\$35,000) came from endowment, and nineteen percent (\$100,000) from gifts, the drop in enrollment proved disastrous.(24) An increase in enrollment in the fall of 1941 raised hopes but the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December dashed all optimism overnight. As male students left campus in large numbers for military service or defense jobs, the college faced even darker days than during the economic depression. Throughout the war years, the college community battled simply to remain open. The slow enrollment decline of 1941-1942 became an avalanche in 1943, and in 1945 only 250 students registered for the fall term. In that year, fewer than thirty graduates received Bachelor of Arts degrees from Rollins. None of them was male. Heavily populated with females, the college enrollment remained constant at about 200 during the last years of the war.(25)

The administration began its own war on the declining enrollment and decreasing funds. Retrenchment was the keyword. Through retirement, leaves of absence, and non-reappointment, the faculty was cut from 80 to 40, and course offerings were trimmed to bare essentials. The list

of courses in the 1940 catalogue covered nearly forty pages; in 1949, it occupied only 17. In November 1942, Holt asked the faculty for a \$20,000 "retain," assigning to a faculty committee the determination of apportionment. These reductions, plus a cut in maintenance funds, permitted Holt to reduce the budget by 23 per cent. The college then embarked upon a campaign, which Holt dubbed the War Adjustment Financial Program, a title suspiciously similar to the familiar national war agencies. The \$250,000 drive ultimately brought in \$125,000 through the sale of debenture bond and \$100,000 in cash. (26)

Finally, the administration attracted army and navy training units to the campus, a move that meant not only desperately needed funds, but also a male constituency during the war years. The training personnel occupied several dormitories and used Pinehurst as military headquarters. Service men marching to and from classes and holding retreat on the Horseshoe in the evening brought the Community face to face with the reality of war. Despite the valiant efforts, the ubiquitous debt accumulated, but doors remained open during what even Holt admitted were the college's darkest hours. Several times Holt stood against the pressure of the O'Neal group to close the college for the duration. The commencement of 1945, just after the surrender of Germany and two months before Japan's capitulation, graduated only 32 females and 2 males. The college carried a burdensome debt, but still alive, it was poised to take advantage of four years of suppressed educational demands.(27)

With war's end in August 1945, students inundated the college with applications. The fall term began with the largest freshman class in the history of the institution, and by January 1946, total enrollment reached a record high of 534. One year later it stood at 640. For a decade the administration had been laboring toward just such

a favorable situation, but it proved a mixed blessing. The sudden increase caught the college woefully unprepared. Even before the war, one half of Rollins's students had lived in substandard housing, and little money went for repairs in the years thereafter. The college faced skyrocketing enrollment with not only a housing shortage, but also with the pressing needs of deferred maintenance. Expanding the faculties and providing the necessary repairs, all at inflated prices, placed expenses far beyond even the increased income from the surge of new students. Moreover, to align its tuition and costs; more nearly with similar institutions, Rollins discontinued the Unit Cost Plan, lowering tuition and room and board charges from \$1,350 to \$1,100.

An embattled Holt prepared another and, as it turned out, his final financial offensive. Judged by its stated aims--rehabilitation of neglected facilities and expansion of college physical plant--the Victory Expansion Program was to be Holt's most successful campaign effort. He raised over \$200,000 for restoration projects, and by 1948 he had received pledges from Frances Knowles Warren for a new administration building, from philanthropist Henry Strong for a new dormitory, from Citizens of Orlando for a new classroom building, and from the Davella Mills Foundation for a new library. From the present perspective, the Rollins community must be thankful for Holt's energetic efforts to expand the college physical plant, but from a financial point of view, the Victory Expansion campaign came frighteningly close to bankrupting the college. However, valid the argument for these new structures, their construction greatly increased the college's operating costs, already soaring skyward because of inflation. Then, too, the administration had been devoting most of its efforts to the post-war campaign while neglecting demands of day-to-day operations. The annual deficits soared along with costs, reaching an

ultimate high of \$174,000 in 1948. Since 1945, the college had accumulated a quarter of a million dollars of debts. Holt admitted in December 1947 that many questioned his "recurring drives" for funds and were pressuring for "a continually integrated program designed to meet current needs and increase the endowment." Funds for scholarships, student aid and faculty improvement, they argued, should have precedence over projects for new buildings. Given the never-ending problem of the deficit, Holt reluctantly agreed. Rollins, he said, had passed through "a period of development and growth." Now the college must consolidate its gains.(28)

With a burgeoning \$250,000 debt, was it too late? No one knew the answer to that question, but patently, Holt had brought college to the brink of cruel irony. While enjoying an apparently healthy growth-increasing enrollment, an expanding plant and a successful financial campaign--Rollins was slipping into an abyss of financial ruin. Ultimately, disagreement on how to solve this dilemma split the college community into factions. On the one hand were Treasurer E. T. Brown and the Board of Trustees on the other, the president, the faculty members and the students. Brown, supported by the Trustees, thought the college ought to make no further costly physical expansion commitments. More importantly, he urged deep cuts in the 1947-1948 budget, particularly in the "educational, instructional and academic division of the college." Holt, backed by the faculty and students, argued that even moderate cuts in this already depleted area could cause irreparable damage to the college's academic life. These differences first surfaced in April 1948, in a conflict between the students and the Treasurer over the management of the Student Center. In itself quite trivial--an assistant manager was fired-- the incident catapulted to serious proportions, because it was the last straw in a perennial friction

between Brown and the students. A generation of students had complained not only of his tactless methods but also his autocratic, somewhat superior, manner so out of keeping with the college's professed democratic and cooperative spirit. In June 1948, the student council unanimously voted "no-confidence" in the treasurer. (29)

Holt tried with some success to mediate between the students and Brown in the student center issue, but differences over the 1948-1949 budget found the President himself in a face-to-face conflict with the treasurer. Brown, again supported by the Trustees, insisted that the college should make no more costly physical plant commitment and above all, it should eschew any increases in the 1948-1949 budget. "To stop this imminent descent into financial oblivion," he warned in his report, "we must first set up a balanced budget for 1948 and then proceed with the more difficult task of carrying it out." He recommended a \$70,000 decrease from the 1947-1948 budget. While Brown conceded a \$25,000 increase for faculty and staff salaries, he proposed a drastic budget slash, which included a \$43,000 cut in instructional expenditures. Dean of the College Wendell Stone vocally protested the large cut in the instructional budget, but to no avail.(30)

Ironically, the subsequent controversy focused not on Brown' cuts but on his proposed faculty salary increases for the faculty. At the February, 1948 meeting after the Trustees had approved Brown's budget, Professor of English Charles Mendell presented to the Board a faculty report requesting a thirty percent increase of \$34,000 for the 1948-1949 budget and \$5,000 for the remainder of the current year. Inflation, the faculty report stated, had risen by thirty percent since 1946; most faculty were in "desperate financial straits"; many could not pay living expenses from their salaries and several made ends meet

by taking a second job. During this time, twenty-nine faculty members had received no more than three-percent increases while some realized raises in excess of thirty per cent. One half of the faculty had received no increase at all. From these facts the report concluded, "it has become apparent that not only is there a desperate need for increases to more than half the faculty but there are also inequities where some have received an increase and others have not." After a brief discussion, the trustees voted an increase, although that the vote contradicted an their earlier decision to balance the budget.

Brown bristled at this trustee turn around. "This merely means," he complained, "that we shall have to raise \$123,000 to balance the budget for 1948-1949 instead of the \$100,000 which I recommended." But his anger with the trustees paled in comparison to his reaction upon he receiving a report from the Faculty Salary Committee (approved by the Dean of the College) setting forth the distribution of the faculty increase. Brown exploded. Under what authority did "faculty assume responsibility for their own salary distribution?" he demanded to know. The February trustee resolution, the Dean told him, which read: "the faculty and staff salaries would be increased in accordance with the report of the Faculty Committee." Brown replied that there was "a grave misunderstanding." The trustees did not intend by that resolution to delegate its powers to a faculty committee. Such a "blank check" interpretation, he angrily declared, "ignores the line of authority delegated to the President, Treasurer and Executive Committee in the bylaws of the college." Holt told Brown he would assume responsibility for the faculty committee act, but Brown demurred: "Your generous offer does not relieve me of the fundamental responsibility placed upon me by the Bylaws." The Treasurer refused to make salary payments until the Board of Trustees reviewed, clarified and determined the matter.(31)

By this time the issue had mushroomed into more than simply personality and policy conflicts. As in the Rice affair, Holt found himself in a power struggle, this time with his own treasurer who, according to the bylaws, was responsible not to the president but to the Board of Trustees. Unless the trustees intervened, the treasurer, as Brown had shown in the salary issue, could thwart the President's wishes. Sensing this potential conflict in 1947, Holt had tried unsuccessfully to place the Treasurer under his authority. Now with the support of the students and the faculty (the faculty also passed a no-confidence vote against Brown in early fall 1948), Holt chose to bring the matter to a head at the special Trustee meeting in New York on June 28, 1948.

No one questioned Brown's loyalty, dedication or capabilities, Holt told the Trustees at the special meeting. But in his personal relations Brown had alienated a large portion of the college community, virtually destroying the peace and harmony of the campus. Holt asked the Trustees to discharge Brown and then to amend the bylaws making the treasurer responsible directly to the President. Because a large majority of the Trustees were Holt's nominees, and because he had the support of virtually the entire college community, the President undoubtedly felt assured of a favorable vote.

Unfortunately, he did not reckon with Brown's twenty-five years of devoted service, his strong standing in the Winter Park community, nor the Treasurer's support on the Board of Trustees. In a close vote the Trustees not only rejected Holt's by-law amendment but also answered his demand for Brown's dismissal with a resounding resolution proclaiming "complete confidence in the Treasurer's professional ability and competence." Stunned, Holt delivered an impassioned extemporaneous speech accusing the Trustees of ignoring the

"unanimous opinion of the students and of the faculty and now of myself. I respect your right to vote for or against me but, honestly, I do not think I can come back to the campus and do much good. When students and faculty comes to me next fall asking about his meeting today, I do not want to be put in a position of feeling I have to defend you. I cannot defend you. I take my stand right here and now with the faculty and students and as I have lost confidence in you and you have lost confidence in me, I think it's better that I ask you to release me from coming back to Rollins next year. This is the hardest thing I have had to do in my life but I do not believe you would respect me if I did not do it."

The trustees, facing the unwelcome possibility of starting a school year with a vacant presidential office and a disgruntled college community, moved quickly to salvage a suddenly deteriorating situation. One of Holt's supporters moved and the Board adopted a resolution stating that the trustees interpreted the bylaws to give the President "final authority over all activities and personnel of the college." When the Board also voted for a motion affirming the right of the faculty and students to free assembly and free speech, Holt agreed to return in September.(32)

But Brown would return also, and this fact plus the uncertainty of the authority resolution left Holt with an unsettled feeling. Convinced the arrangement would not work, he once again offered his resignation to a reconvened Board of Trustees on September 8. Brown himself untied the Gordian Knot. The Board's secretary presented the treasurer's decision to resign effective December 15, 1948. Holt agreed to the Board's request that he remain for one more year and further not to press for revision of the bylaws. (33)

The President had won the power struggle with the Treasurer, but it proved a Pyrrhic victory. The college still faced a seemingly unmanageable financial crisis. In order to carry it through the summer of 1948, Brown had borrowed \$250,000 from banks using student tuitions

for the fall term as collateral. As bills began to pile up, the lame duck treasurer barely met the monthly charges. Shortly before he left in December, Brown informed the Executive Committee that the college had no funds to meet the January payroll.

In the meantime, Holt had hired an acting treasurer. John M. Tiedtke, a businessman with holdings in Florida, who for several years had taught a course in economics at Rollins in the spring term. Tiedtke found the financial situation almost hopeless. Local banks refused to make further loans to the college. With no place else to turn. Tiedtke and Holt "went north," and after a few weeks, with the help of trustees, they negotiated a loan of \$500,000 with Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company. The college paid its debts for the year, surmounting what Holt called "the gravest crisis that has ever confronted Rollins College." Holt always believed that John Tiedtke's "leadership and devotion saved Rollins" in his hour of desperation. In complete agreement, the trustees named Tiedtke treasurer of the college.(34)

However critical the financial crisis, Holt always thought outcome of his struggle with treasurer Brown his most satisfying victory if for no other reason than that he had the college community solidly behind him. Coming on the heels of the Rice incident, where he seemed to be battling former friends and students, the Brown affair had provided Holt with a stage and an opportunity to display dramatically his best qualities. He always believed his spontaneous speech before the Board of Trustees on June 28 where he courageously placed his career on the line to be his finest hour. He sent the speech to Wendell Stone and contemplated circulating copies to students and faculty as well. "I would like them to know some way," he mused, "that it was largely because I have tried to fight their battle that I have taken

the stand that I have." When he returned in September, he found the college community more affectionate and loyal than at any time during his presidency.

However, Holt had fought his last battle. Already the Board had formed a Trustee Alumni Faculty Committee to search for the old prexy's successor. Holt's call to service almost thirty years earlier was coming to an end. The academic year 1948-1949 would be his last at Rollins.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE WAGNER AFFAIR: LEGACY OF THE HOLT ERA

Unusual circumstances surrounded the election of Rollins's ninth president, a fact not surprising to those who knew Paul Wagner as an extraordinary person. A mere accounting of his meteoric career before assuming the presidency of Rollins College at the age of thirty-three left most people breathless. With eyesight severely weakened at an early age by a measles attack, he struggled through elementary and secondary school by listening to his mother read to him and by taking all of his examinations orally. Nevertheless, he graduated with high grades at the age of sixteen. His sight weakness outgrown, he completed four years of work at the University of Chicago in three years, acquiring his B.A. degree the age of 19. While teaching English in a Chicago secondary school during his senior year, Wagner drew wide attention with his innovative use of audio-visual material. Impressed by the young teacher's effort, the head of Chicago's Department of Education offered Wagner a teaching position at the university's experimental high school. He remained in Chicago for three years, left for a year to earn a master's degree at Yale and returned to the university as an instructor. Throughout these years, he had been experimenting with the use of film and other visual aids in teaching. When the war broke out in 1941, Wagner offered his services to the Great Lakes Naval Training School where he perfected the use of graphics in training recruits. Learning of his work, the Navy Department in the spring of 1942 commissioned him to the Naval War College to introduce audio-visuals into the school's instruction. At Newport, Wagner created the Navy's first audio-visual laboratory where

he developed training aids and made hundreds of indoctrinational motion pictures. Enthusiastic with the results he had achieved in the new teaching medium, Wagner accepted a position after the war with a leading photography company, Bell & Howell.

But education remained his great love. In the summer of 1949, when he learned that Rollins was looking for a new president, on an impulse Wagner flew to Florida, arriving at Holt's office unannounced while the President was interviewing a prospective candidate. It was an awkward moment. Holt did not see Wagner until later that evening, expecting to dismiss what seemed to be an impulsive individual, who to Holt very much resembled a brash, egotistical, super-salesman. Instead, after a single hour of conversation, Holt decided to recommend Wagner to the search committee. That committee thoroughly investigated Wagner's background, sounding out over one hundred individuals who knew him. When in a series of interviews Wagner won the approval of the faculty, students and the trustees, the committee enthusiastically recommended his election. At the May 31 commencement meeting, the Board unanimously elected Wagner President of Rollins College.(1)

The public announcement of Wagner's appointment created a considerable stir in the national academic world. The tall, rather handsome new President, with a movie star smile and a winning personality, resembled more a fullback on the college football team than the institution's prexy. His position as the nation's youngest college president sent a ripple of comment through academe. Only the University of Chicago's Robert Hutchins, Wagner's mentor, had been younger (age 30) when he assumed the presidency. In fact, most news reports of Wagner's appointment drew implicit comparisons between the two men. NEWSWEEK made Wagner's appointment its major educational story of the week. In a three-page article, COLLIERS magazine called him

"Education's New Boy Wonder." It depicted him in very flattering terms as a dynamic even brilliant young man full of novel ideas of how to make Rollins a better college. Wagner's inauguration attracted over fifty college presidents including, appropriately, Robert Hutchins as the keynote speaker. Wagner surely seemed a worthy successor to the beloved Hamilton Holt.(2)

During the first months of his administration, Wagner appeared to exceed these large expectations. In his inaugural address and in his formal and informal conversations with the faculty and students, he talked of continuing the principles of Hamilton Holt, particularly the concept of Rollins as a progressive, innovative educational community. A January 1950 editorial in the SANDSPUR concluded he was practicing these convictions: "Dr. Wagner has already achieved his goal of establishing a friendly sort of basis between himself, the faculty and the students." Most faculty members in retrospect invariably commented on the favorable impression Wagner made in these early months.(3)

Only a couple of early incidents clouded the bright beginning for the young president. In the fall of 1949, in the midst of football season, Wagner decreed the demise of that program. The announcement sent a small tremor through the campus. Had not the President traveled with the team, diagramming a few plays at half time and hadn't he told some students that Rollins would have a football team as long as he was President? He had, but having found it impossible to balance that enjoyment and those statements with the sport's \$50,000 annual deficit, he persuaded the trustees to drop football after the 1949-1950 season. He even threatened to discontinue other intercollegiate sports after January 1951 if they too caused deficits.

The students reacted much less vociferously than expected, partially at least because Wagner diffused the explosive issue at a

two-hour meeting with the entire student body. He not only convinced them that the sport was not worth the deficit, he also sold them on the idea of a substitute program of life-long useful sports such as golf, tennis, swimming, sailing, and perhaps even chess. Initially hostile, the students who had entered Annie Russell Theatre burst into applause after this model exhibition of salesmanship.(4)

A second ripple of concern came in the first year as Wagner began to shape his own administrative staff. Almost immediately friction developed between former President Holt's Dean of Men, Arthur Enyart, and the new President. The 68-year old Dean who had been at Rollins since 1911 and who was thus Holt's rival for the title of "Mr. Rollins" had trouble adjusting to Wagner's youthful style. After a stormy meeting where Wagner shouted that he was tired of Enyart's constant "infantile" behavior (he was particularly speaking of Enyart's opposition to dropping football), the old dean announced his resignation. However much Wagner may have had reasons for losing his patience with someone who perhaps should have retired earlier, his attitude toward Enyart alienated many of the Dean's friends, some of whom were influential alumni who held deep affection for him.

With Enyart gone, Wagner made what he called "several shifts in administrative responsibility." He relieved Wendell Stone of his Dean of the College responsibilities and gave him the task of conducting "lengthy and exceedingly complicated" surveys of the college's economic and academic condition. He appointed Tollefson, the current Director of the Library, as his executive assistant and "coordinator" with the duty of promoting efficiency. Tollefson also served as acting president when Wagner was absent from the campus. Wagner appointed Alexander Waite, a psychology teacher and former assistant football coach as Dean

of Men in Enyart's place and later Dean of Administration with responsibilities formerly held by Stone.(5)

None of the changes could be viewed as unusual or threatening because a new president characteristically creates his own administrative team. But after these changes, Wagner's administrative style changed. He seemed less inclined to use the college governance structure (faculty committees and faculty meetings) as a method of developing and implementing policy and turned to a rather small staff for advice and sustenance, frequently presenting the college with a *fait accompli*. The community never debated, for example, the wisdom of the continuing football program. Wagner simply informed faculty and students of the necessity for abolishing the sport with the result that, although few objected, many remained unconvinced that it could not have been saved.

A similar uneasiness rose over Wagner's effort to undertake a curriculum revision. Correctly assuming that the college ought to redefine or at least restudy its academic goals, Wagner launched an "educational aim study" project in the summer of 1950. By his own admission, his approach was unconventional. Rather than following the traditional method of appointing a special faculty committee for such a study, he asked each faculty member to submit a report based on an outline of "what every educated adult should know about ... factual information, general knowledge, attitude, appreciation, techniques." Many faculty members resented this extra burden heaped upon them during the summer vacation and became irritably impatient as they tried to grapple with what one called "a rigid, inelastic, superficial approach that left out vast areas of learning." Stone himself thought it showed a lack of understanding of the liberal arts. More important, they sensed that in the areas of traditional faculty prerogatives, their

only contribution would be merely to provide information to the administration, with the significant educational policy decisions in the being determined by the president rather than the faculty.(6)

Then, in the fall of 1950, came rumblings of serious financial problems. Despite its knowledge of the college perennial deficit during the Holt era, the faculty was surprise. The new administration had consistently issued cheery financial reports in the past year. As late as the September 1950 meeting, Treasurer John Tiedtke had announced "that the position of the college was financially sound and that it had been for two years." But underneath the optimistic facade, the administration was deeply worried about the college's future. Two external pressures on enrollment caused concern. First, as with most institutions of higher learning, rampant inflation threatened to deplete the college's already meager treasury. Between the end of World War II and 1950 the cost of operating a college had soared nearly seventy percent, causing even prestigious institutions to run deficits as high as one million dollars. Second, the number of World War II veterans--the groups so responsible for swelling college enrollments--suddenly decreased, leaving many colleges such as Rollins dangerously over-expanded in programs, buildings, staff, and faculty. The entire problems were exacerbated by the outbreak of the Korean War. A call for military manpower mobilization threatened to deprive the college of an additional portion of its male population.(7)

As the college opened the 1950-1951 academic year, all these forces plus an inherited debt of a quarter of a million dollars began to weigh heavily on the mind of the youthful president. Because uncertainty characterized the Truman administration mobilization policy, Congress had authorized only a partial manpower mobilization with exemptions for qualified college-bound young men. But what this

meant for college enrollment, no one knew. In December, Wagner attended a Washington conference for 400 college presidents and returned with a pessimistic report. The Defense Department warned that after the election in November, Congress would authorize the drafting of all 18-year olds. Still, Wagner reported to the faculty, many politicians disagreed with the Defense Department's predictions. All this, he noted, made "crystal gazing very difficult." The report left Rollins's future very much in the air, and Wagner inserted yet another uncomfortable thought: "In the event that we should lose 200 of the 356 men to the draft," Wagner warned, "there are several possible but undesirable answers including a reduction of faculty and staff." At the end of his report to the faculty he added that the United States Commissioner of Education had told him that nothing in the past fifty years would affect higher education as greatly as a national mobilization.(8)

During the fall of 1950, Wagner tried to meet this impending crisis in two ways. He presented a suggestion to the United States Department of State that it bring 400 to 600 Latin American citizens to Rollins for a period of six months where they would be taught American traditions and values. In this Cold War era, the State Department predictably seemed interested, encouraging the college to submit a detailed proposal. The Meet America Program (MAP) involved almost all faculty members and cost the college hundreds of man-hours of labor. In the end it came to naught. Somewhere in the labyrinth of the State Department bureaucracy, it simply disappeared.

In the meantime, Wagner began preparing for less pleasant contingencies. In December 1950, he gave Wendell Stone the responsibility of collecting and analyzing information on the college's probable economic condition for the 1951-1952 academic year.

Specifically, he wanted Stone to determine probable enrollment for the following year by investigating the validity of draft deferments and by estimating the dropout possibilities for winter. Working with the Dean of Admissions, John Rich, Stone was expected to "plot the probable number of men and women we can reasonably expect to be admitted next fall." With these estimates Wagner wanted Stone to determine the probable income for 1951-1952. This was enough work to keep Stone busy for the rest of the year, but Wagner handed the Dean an even more startling charge. The college, he said, must "play it safe by assuming that the total amount of student fees will be the operating budget for the coming year." The college, he stated, would not depend on endowment that fails to cover even debt payments; nor would it rely on "gifts of free money" because such funds constituted an exceedingly doubtful factor. Wagner also told Stone not to count on State Department MAP contracts or the possibility of obtaining a ROTC unit. Finally, he told Stone, to estimate the next year's operating costs and to determine what cuts would be required in order to balance the budget. Wagner left no doubt that on the basis of this proposal some faculty and staff would be dismissed. The actual number would depend on the size of the gap between the operating budget and income from student fees. The president then gave Stone the most painful charge: on the assumption that cuts were necessary, Stone was to construct "a system of related values for determining who would be dropped."

Wagner admitted to Stone that much guesswork would be involved in this survey but "if we err," he told the Dean, "I hope it would be on the side of being too pessimistic rather than too optimistic." The college could always hire or rehire additional faculty and staff, but "the opposite surprise would leave us in an embarrassing position of having contractual obligations we would not be able to fulfill." Wagner

asked Stone to finish the survey by February 1, so that he could "digest, discuss and articulate it to the Board of Trustees at the February 1951 meeting." Through a Herculean effort by working night and day, Stone, with the invaluable help from Cynthia Eastwood, presented to Wagner by February 1 what the new President expected--a very pessimistic report on the present and future conditions of the college. John Tiedtke's equally gloomy financial predictions gave Wagner the final information he needed to present the Trustees a comprehensive plan.(9)

At the February 27 meeting of the Board of Trustees, Wagner found himself again in the familiar role of the super-salesman. True to his reputation, he gave the board a truly virtuoso performance. Armed with a plethora of visual material (graphs, charts, scales) and spontaneously constructing his own charts and messages on large sheets of paper, ripping and casting them aside as he talked, Wagner completely awed and overwhelmed the trustees with his apparent grasp of the present and future prospects of the institution. Not in war nor peace or depression had the college ever faced such a crisis, Wagner told the trustees. As in the business world, he told them, the college must face decisions in a "tough minded way." Businessmen, he said, lived not in a "romantic" but a "realistic" world and a college "is in effect a business." We are in, he said, a corporation selling a highly competitive commodity, college education." Looked at from this perspective then, he argued, the college must balance its budget in the following academic year. It must reject the financial philosophy of "embrace deficits and pray for gifts" or "pay now and pray later," and make once and for all the tough-minded decision to spend no more than its income. Regretfully, he said, eighty-eight percent of that income came from student fees, and the recent national draft policy had made

student enrollment highly volatile. Thus, in determining the budget, he concluded, the college must start with admissions. With his graphs and charts he presented the board the dismal enrollment predictions he had perceived from his Washington trip and from the admissions office. All colleges, including Rollins, expected a thirty- percent drop in enrollment, he said. The admissions office reported an already-serious decrease of twenty-five per week in applications from last year. Thus, Wagner told the Board of Trustees, he was planning for a total of 449 students, a decline of twenty-nine percent or 200 students. He thought these not "hysterical figures"; if anything, they were too optimistic. "If you ask me to swear that we will get more than this number, I just wouldn't; if you ask me to swear that we will not get more than this number I will swear it." Finally, Wagner told them that these were not short-term conditions. He predicted the situation would last seven years.

All these figures and predicted data led Wagner to his major point. If the 1951-1952 budget depended entirely on income from student fees, then given the precipitous drop in student enrollment, the college faced a sizable decrease in income. In fact, Wagner estimated a decrease of over \$150,000. To balance the budget would require a \$150,000 cut in expenditures. John Tiedtke, he said, after decreasing the budget by \$39,000 last year, had figured out a \$77,000 cut for 1951-1952. The only area of expenditures that had not felt the cutting knife was the educational program budget. Now, Wagner argued, the time had come to make one of those tough-minded decisions: he recommended decreasing the educational budget by \$87,000, a move requiring the release of fifteen to twenty faculty members.(10)

The trustees seemed stunned by Wagner's performance. The president's argument seemed logical, but most trustees found it

difficult to sort out all those figures and statistics in their minds. Several times Wagner had scribbled figures on large newsprint, ripped it from the board, crumbled, and threw it on the floor. He presented, however no information in the form of a typed report, nor did he offer alternatives. He told the trustees that he had explored other plans and except for the one he presented to them, all wanting were found wanting.

Tiedtke and Stone followed Wagner's performance, but neither had advance knowledge of the President's proposal. Wagner had turned their research to his own purposes. Tiedtke conceded that, because of the perennial deficit, the college had lost or would soon lose its borrowing power. He admitted, too, that Rollins could not achieve financial credibility without a balanced budget. "I understand," he told the Board, "the terror of trying to raise money when you have gone the limit to your ability to borrow." He believed that if "the college ran into that situation again," it would surely go under. But Tiedtke was also concerned with the effect retrenchment. Rollins, he said, offered premium education. "We have a Cadillac assembly line and we cannot turn out Cadillacs without fenders or radiators or wheels; nor can we turn out Fords for we are not built that way." Worried that by dismissing professors and reducing courses the college would lose its reputation for quality education, Tiedtke sought to leave the Trustees with some sense of their responsibilities. None of this, he pointed out, considers the human suffering that would ensue from a retrenchment policy.

The treasurer had no solutions to offer, but he asked the Trustees to consider all of the ramifications of a deep faculty cut, again offering a stark analogy: "I look at this very much like a cancer. To save your life you may have to amputate your hand, but it's

a serious matter to amputate your hand." He could not predict faculty reaction to a cut but he did warn of a possible "kickback from the students." In general, Tiedtke presented a less-than-cheery report whose tone and even substance supported Wagner's basic premises.(11)

Stone, who also knew nothing of the details of Wagner's previous report to the Trustees, presented a picture of faculty hardship brought on by low salaries. Many, he said, moonlighted simply to make ends meet. Here again, as in Tiedtke's report, the dismal presentation reinforced Wagner's report, because the President had argued that his plan would allow the college to raise the salaries of those faculty who remained.(12)

After two days of discouraging reports and gloomy forecasts, the trustees voted unanimously in favor of Wagner's proposal. They then prepared an ominous public statement:

Because of present conditions which seriously impair the financial security of Rollins as well as other colleges, it has become necessary to curtail expenses. The Board of Trustees reluctantly instructs the President to reduce the faculty in the various divisions to conform to the budget voted by the Board according to the following plan: Faculty members aside from the following exceptions shall be retained in accordance with seniority in their area of study.

Exceptions to the seniority factor:

1. Part-time instructors may be retained if it appears financially advisable to do so.
2. All regular faculty members who could retire with Social Security at the end of the academic year 1951-1952 where a man is the only one in a division qualified to teach a particular subject that is considered essential.

Having dispensed with the matter of the budget and faculty cuts, the Board's executive committee members, who had prior knowledge of Wagner's proposal and unanimously supported it, moved abruptly to

solidify Wagner's position at the college in preparation for predictable unfavorable reaction against this plan. As a way of recognizing Wagner's labors of the past year the Board of Trustees unanimously voted the President a \$2,000 raise beginning in March, 1951 and promised him a \$500 annual increase until his salary reached \$15,000. Additionally, they voted a resolution that "recognizes and appreciates the intelligent and thorough manner in which Dr. Wagner has carried on the work of his office, has analyzed the problems of Rollins and has presented constructive plans for the future of the institution." The following day (February 28), the executive committee handed the Board of Trustees two additional motions. The first recommended that, in order to protect the president against possible opposition to the retrenchment policy, Wagner be given a ten-year contract. Several board members vigorously opposed this unprecedented step, but eventually agreed to a compromise of a five-year agreement, commencing July, 1951. As a final bulwark, the board reinforced the authority of the president in a by-law amendment, stating that the office "shall have the sole power to hire and discharge employees and to fix administrative and educational policies of the college subject to the veto of the Board of Trustees." Although several trustees seemed dazed by the effort to cover the president with monetary awards and verbal accolades, and to enormously increase his power and authority, they did not oppose the motions. Some few, however, salved their consciences by recording their abstentions. Many left that February meeting with an uneasy feeling about the propriety, perhaps even the ethics, of raising a president's salary and handing him a five year contract, and simultaneously voting to deprive twenty-five faculty members of their sole means of support.(13)

Although they had discussed the methods of faculty dismissal, the board chose to leave the selection of individual choices to the President. Wagner thought to involve the faculty in the decision process, but he reconsidered when it became obvious that the number would exceed earlier expectations. Asking the faculty to dismiss one-third of its membership, he concluded, would "have created an impossible psychological situation." He now began to study the report provided by Wendell Stone. Stone's a survey of the personal financial conditions of most faculty members, indicated that from fifteen to twenty were financially secure or able to survive a year's leave of absence. He also provided the President with an analysis of departmental conditions, pointing out those areas where dismissals would most harm the college academically. In addition, Wagner requested from Tiedtke a list of faculty he expected to be financially secure following dismissal, but the Treasurer found himself in unfamiliar territory submitting a list only after considerable prodding from the President. With this information and with the criteria stipulated by the Board of Trustees, Wagner began constructing a list of faculty who would be asked to leave the college at the end of the academic year.(14)

In the midst of this effort, the President appeared before a regularly scheduled faculty meeting on March 5. In an abbreviated performance of his Trustee appearance, Wagner informed the faculty of the trustees' new retrenchment policies. The Board, he told them, had voted to cut the present budget by \$164,000, to cut scholarship aid from \$90,000 to \$37,000, to reduce faculty salaries by a minimum of \$87,000, to ask Mr. Tiedtke to make additional operational reductions totaling \$77,000. Even so, the budget would carry a \$21,000 deficit and would allow for no contingencies. Some faculty would have to be let go.

He presented the Board's three criteria for dismissal, terming them a "mathematical formula" designed to obviate the need to make judgments on a personal basis. He added a chilling warning: for obvious reasons there would be "no appeal and no discussion" following the announcement of the dismissals. Dean of the Chapel Theodore Darrah closed the meeting with a prayer and the faculty filed out--like the trustees somewhat dazed by the news they had just heard.(15)

The President's performance, his array of figures and his logical presentations, too, had overwhelmed them. But again like the trustees, they had seen nothing on paper, nothing concrete to ponder and analyze. Wagner permitted no questions, but if he had, the faculty would have been unprepared for queries. They understood the desperate financial situation; they sensed that an \$87,000 decrease in faculty salaries meant a large cut in their number of, but the whole situation seemed so abstract. What did the criteria for dismissal mean? Who, in fact, could remember those criteria? In this condition of uncertainty and confusion, each faculty undoubtedly searched for and found reasons to believe he or she did not fit the predetermined criteria. At the Monday meeting, Wagner had promised to issue letters of dismissal immediately. But the first letter was not forthcoming until late Wednesday afternoon, and the majority of them did not appear until Thursday. In the interim faculty members hovered before their mailboxes in extreme personal anxiety. As Royal France later expressed it: "For two breathless days the axe hung suspended over faculty heads, no one knowing who was to be decapitated and soon anger rose alongside fear."(16)

The ax fell on Thursday, March 8, and the thudding of heads falling reverberated throughout the community. Initially, the sheer numbers startled the faculty; the dismissals totaled 19 full time and

four part-time faculty members or one-third of the entire faculty. As names became known, the shock deepened.

Thirteen of those dismissed had earned tenure, and most had served Rollins for fifteen to twenty years. The President had dismissed the only two men who could teach German and Calculus, both courses required for pre-medical majors. Dismissals included all faculty members in education and business, thereby abolishing those departments. Five of the seven full-time English professors received dismissal notices, leaving the department with two full-time professors and two part-time instructors to teach required English composition to 400 students. Included in the English group was Professor Nathan Starr, perhaps Rollins's most distinguished scholar and one of its most popular teachers. In addition, those dismissed included Paul Vestal, a Harvard PhD in Biology and an outstanding teacher, Angela Campbell, and Audrey Packham, both Holt appointments in the early 1930s, Rudolf Fisher, a talented professor who taught German and also violin in the Music Conservatory, and both intercollegiate coaches, Joseph Justice and John McDowell. As an alumnus wrote one of the trustees, Wagner could have gotten away with a few select dismissals, because many realized that some of those cuts actually strengthened the college, "but he went too far" and therefore showed a serious "lack of wisdom." Moreover, those who received notices of reappointment did not feel secure because they were given only one-year contracts. Gloom and dread hung heavily over the campus by the end of "Black Thursday."

That afternoon, Thursday May 8, the local AAUP called a meeting for 8:15 in the Art Studio where the faculty began discussing alternatives for avoiding the cuts in their numbers. Wagner appeared in the midst of the meeting, turned the gathering into an official faculty meeting and gave the faculty another lecture on the necessity of making

tough-minded decisions. The President agreed to hold another faculty meeting on Sunday, May 11, to listen to any practical suggestions as to how to solve the financial problem. (L7)

The news that massive dismissals were forthcoming spread like a brushfire through the college community. On Friday, March 9, as Wagner began at his home the process of personally informing each dismissed faculty member of the reasons for his dismissal, the students gathered for the first in a series of spontaneous reactions to the rumors of massive faculty cuts. A group of students met in the dean's and the treasurer's offices on Friday morning to discuss the ways they could help save money; suggestions included student participation without pay in maintenance, dormitory and dining room work. The following morning, Saturday, September 11, a large unofficial group of students gathered in the student center to discuss the dismissal issue. At this meeting the student mood originally positive and optimistic, turned sour when a delegation returned from the President's home with the news that Wagner would not see the students, because he was still interviewing dismissed faculty members. The gathering broke up after the student leaders pledged to persuade the President to attend yet another meeting on Sunday evening at 7:00 P.M. Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning, the campus boiled with activity. Small groups of students and faculty met informally and spontaneously here and there on the campus, seeking to find out what was happening and what could be done about it. (L8)

By mid-Sunday afternoon, the time set for the pre-arranged faculty meeting, the mood of the college community had shifted from a mixture of shock, fear, and uncertainty to one of anger and resentment. Given Wagner's personalized approach to the issue, those feelings quite predictably began to center on the President himself. Students felt he was consciously snubbing their efforts to open a dialogue on the

dismissal problem. They saw his unwillingness to meet with them in the student center on Saturday, March 10, as typical of his tendency to ignore the college's most important constituency. A student's letter to the editor a year earlier on the football issue had revealed latent student concern and discontent:

Dr. Wagner:

You probably need not be told that you are being talked about in terms varying from four letter adjectives to their intellectual equivalents. This situation will continue until the student body has at least an idea of the aims and policies of the college. The unrest over dropping football lies in the fact that it manifests a more general concern about the future of Rollins. Could this be cleared up? How about a consumer's report.

No report was forthcoming. Nor did the President attempt to close the communications gap that was obviously creating uncertainty on the campus. Consistent with his earlier behavior, he simply ignored the problem when he announced the faculty dismissal policy. The students learned of the cuts in bits and pieces, from second and third hand sources. By Sunday, March 11, they were in an ugly mood.(19)

Much the same emotions swept over the faculty. Initially stunned and shocked, given time to absorb and deliberate the methods and consequences of the dismissal decision, they grew angry and resentful that they had been given no role in the decision so radically shaping the college's future. Like the students, they felt they had been handed a decree with no opportunity to discuss its worth or to determine its validity. Hadn't Wagner told them that there would be no debate, no revision of this proposal? What had happened to the democratic community that was so much a part of the college's tradition, so loudly intoned in the college literature and so reverently proclaimed by Wagner himself? At a rump faculty meeting after chapel on Sunday, March 11, a large group of faculty for the first time openly attacked

the President and his proposal. As time neared for the 3:00 p.m. scheduled meeting, they were primed for action.(20)

At the meeting, a motion that "the president right here and now rescind the dismissals and begin work with the faculty and students on alternative proposals" passed overwhelmingly. The president quietly remarked that he had no authority to revoke a decision made by the Board of Trustees. The faculty then elected a special faculty committee to confer with the Board "on the whole problem and to resolve the situation." Preparatory to discussing what they wanted that committee to tell the Board, the faculty asked the President to leave the meeting. In a now closed meeting, Nathan Starr introduced a motion that precisely expressed the mood of many faculty members: "The faculty feels that the present situation within the college has been handled improperly and could have been avoided. Our confidence in the Presidential leadership has been irreparably damaged." A long discussion of this 'no confidence' resolution ended at 6:30 that evening when the meeting recessed with a vote to reconvene "without the President" on Tuesday, March 13.(21)

As the faculty filed out of Dyer Hall, a crowd of estimated at 600 had already gathered in the student center. In retrospect, this Sunday evening meeting proved critical for the Wagner administration. The President apparently perceived the significance of the meeting, because he brought with him the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees (Frances Warren, Louis Orr, Eugene Smith, Raymond Greene and Webber Haines). For reasons not quite clear, he also invited the mayor of Winter Park, William McCaully. It was perhaps Wagner's last opportunity to keep the dismissal problem from boiling over into a full-fledged crisis. Student president Kenneth Horton opened the meeting with a plea for calm and restraint. "Nothing constructive," he

cautioned, "could be achieved through emotional upheaval." Other student leaders echoed Horton's plea for a rational discussion, but one student, Hal Suit, a veteran of World War II who had lost a leg at the Battle of the Bulge, began asking obviously hostile questions. The dismissals, Suit stated bluntly, lowered the quality of education at Rollins College and in effect "broke student contracts." Trustee Eugene Smith rather than the President attempted to answer Suit, stating that to the contrary, the President and the Board of Trustees were upholding college standards by forestalling financial bankruptcy. Smith implied that the students ought to be thankful for Wagner's wise leadership in these difficult times. But Suit would not be put off. If the college was in such desperate financial straits, Suit asked Wagner, why was so much money spent on decorating the President's office and in furnishing the President's home with expensive furniture? Wagner, who to this point had remained silent, reluctantly replied that the Board of Trustees wanted constructive answers not insulting questions, and in any event, Treasurer John Tiedtke was present to answer such questions. A groan from the audience brought from Wagner the irritated response that he had made a \$75,000 cut in administrative services during the last two years. Before the President could resume his seat, another student asked why he had refused to accept faculty offers to teach without financial compensation. When the President replied that no one had offered, the student brandished a list of five faculty names. "Let me see those names," Wagner demanded, but the student refused. At that point, Wagner suddenly turned on his heel, and, with the Trustees, walked out of the meeting.(22)

The President had missed a golden opportunity to provide badly needed leadership in an impending crisis. A persuasive speaker, he might have calmly convinced the students of the wisdom of his policy as

he had done when he cut the football program. Alternatively, he might have offered a compromise plan to diffuse the issue of faculty dismissals by involving both the faculty and students in that decision. Instead, he assumed a monarchical pose, pushing others forward to answer questions, taking the podium reluctantly only after the meeting began to deteriorate. The students wanted to discuss their own proposal for saving money, but the President never heard it, because he walked out before they could present it. Wagner's behavior at this meeting united faculty and students into a solid core of opposition and, in turn, drove a wedge between the President and the college community. Subsequently, both sides edged the college to the brink of a disaster that left a residue of hate and resentment alive even today.

The battle analogy by no means exaggerates as a description of what became known as the Wagner affair. After the student meeting on Sunday, March 11, the opposing lines formed: the President, his staff, the executive committee of the Board of Trustees and later a coalition of Winter Park citizens on one side; and on the other, the faculty, students, a majority of the Board of Trustees and the alumni. Retiring to their appropriate redoubts, they gathered ammunition for their causes and began hurling accusations, resolutions, and press releases at each other.

The faculty initiated its first skirmish on Tuesday, March 13, again without the President. They listened politely but without sympathy to impassioned speeches by the President's staff that professed loyalty to the President and faith in "his honesty, sincerity and integrity." After the staff had concluded their personal statements, a faculty Committee elected in the prior meeting, offered a resolution for faculty approval. Many faculty members wanted Starr's 'no confidence' resolution submitted to the Board of Trustees.

Instead, the faculty passed a statement lauding the President's and the Trustees' "tireless efforts" but also taking exception to specific aspects of those efforts, to wit: the faculty should have been previously advised of the retrenchment policy, and the President should have asked for suggestions before taking such a drastic step; the dismissals represent a violation of the spirit and letter of Rollins's rules on academic tenure; the dismissals would, in fact, lower Rollins's educational standards; and the savings effected by the faculty dismissals would be offset by student withdrawals. The statement ended with a pointed criticism of Presidential leadership: "We deplore the failure to take advantage of student sentiment. The shock to the student body was profound. With youthful idealism the students are asking for guidance and advice as to how and where they can help and will be bitterly disappointed if it be not forthcoming."

On the same day, almost simultaneously, the Executive Committee prepared its own statement stating that "present conditions,"--not disapproval of any particular faculty--had led to the "difficult task of organizing a small college." The natural distress over the loss of valued members had led to insinuation and charges of personal vindictiveness. But, the Committee argued, the President simply had followed Trustee instructions. "The existence of this college is at stake," the statement concluded. "Personal consideration and personal feelings, important as they may be, must under such circumstances be subordinated to the preservation of an institution in the value of which we so strongly believe."(23)

Both the faculty and the Trustee resolutions were circumspect in language, but each revealed some hardening positions. In the following days both sides met frequently, but there was no meeting of the minds. The President and the executive committee were more than willing to

allow the special Faculty Committee "to make recommendations about the release of their own members," but the Faculty Committee was working feverishly on means to save those faculty members. Neither side was willing to move from its original positions.(24)

During the following month, both elements tore the campus asunder attempting to force the surrender of the other. Through the public relations office, the President issued to local newspapers news releases supportive of his cause. A student committee began meeting with a faculty counterpart and called meetings almost daily in the student center. The SANDSPUR editor, expressing student attitudes through his weekly editorials, accused Wagner of breaking his word and of taking Rollins "down the rocky road of ruin."(35) Then, on March 16, the Alumni Executive Committee headed by Howard Showalter took a decisive step that must have been in the minds of many opposed to Wagner's policies. The committee announced it had lost confidence in the President's "judgment and leadership" and called upon the Board of Trustees to remove Wagner. On the same day, Winthrop Bancroft, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, took an action that would lead ultimately to the end of Wagner's presidency: he appointed Trustees George Carrison, Chairman Milton Warner, and Eldridge Haynes as a special committee to investigate the campus upheaval.(25)

The Rollins row now had begun to dominate local news, and by mid-March it had been picked up by the national wire services. THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR carried a story of the faculty cuts and discontent in its March 12 issue, and on the 18th, THE NEW YORK TIMES cited the Rollins incident in an article on the effect of the war on higher education. One week later the two leading national newsmagazines, TIME and LIFE carried the news of the Wagner affair, both placing it in the context of a national educational malaise. Some

aspect of the affair appeared almost daily on the front page of the ORLANDO SENTINEL.(26)

The Carrison Committee convened on Wednesday afternoon, March 21, seeking to hear all who had made previous appointments. The meetings ended on Sunday noon, March 25. Time had been spent with all the major groups, including several hours with the Faculty Committee, and a total of 107 hours with individuals. On Thursday morning the 22nd, the Committee received a group of 34 faculty members. As they filled the room, one of members, Hugh McKean spoke: "We are some of the members of the faculty who think that Mr. Wagner should resign as President. We do not wish to take up your time with conversation, we just wish to show ourselves and make this statement." Carrison asked that everyone who concurred raise his hand. All thirty-four responded. Several reported they held proxies of others who could not attend. The demonstration greatly affected the committee members, especially Eldridge Haynes, who was Wagner's choice for the committee and who, prior to that moment, had been leaning to Wagner's position.(27)

On Thursday afternoon the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees invited (Carrison thought it more like a command) the Special Trustee Committee to a meeting in the president's office where they heard Wagner read several letters from students, faculty and alumni supporting him as president. In addition, Wagner made a lengthy speech accusing his opposition of using "communist and fascist tactics." The committee departed much disturbed by the President's behavior. After along evening discussion, they met again with the President and the Executive Committee at one o'clock on Friday, when Eldridge Haynes presented them with the committee's findings and recommendations. The overwhelming evidence proved, Haynes told them, that Wagner could not continue under prevailing conditions as President of Rollins College.

Haynes then spelled out the committee's recommendations to the President:

He should immediately call a meeting of all faculty members, students and alumni and tell them in his best manner that he and the Board had misjudged the tremendous response that would be made by the Rollins family and the force that could be utilized for the solving of the college problems. He should say that in response to such a display he would accept the challenge and recommend that the Board reverse itself and also accept the challenge. He would say that all faculty would be reinstated; that we would gamble on our ability to get students, raise money and keep Rollins as we know it. He would say further that he would get out on the firing line to do what he could do which was raise money.

The committee required that the President carry out the program in "good faith through every aspect." If he refused or tried and did not succeed, then the Trustees should ask for his resignation. Several Executive Committee members, all pro-Wagner, spoke in favor of the recommendation, but Wagner burst into a long, agitated speech charging "character assassination" and condemning the persecution he had to endure. Pressed for a reply, he promised to give an answer in a few days. The committee spent the next few days preparing its report to a special Board of Trustees meeting called by Chairman Bancroft and awaited the answer from Wagner. None ever came.(28)

Just prior to the April 14 meeting, Wagner's cause was dealt a severe blow. On April 10, Hamilton Holt wrote his young successor that, as far as he could tell from a distance of a thousand miles, his cause seemed hopeless. Holt said that he understood Wagner's sincerity, but that the young president must look realistically at the fact that he had lost the support of the faculty and the students. No president, he declared, could succeed without these two constituencies. Holt advised Wagner to resign. When the President resisted this suggestion, Holt sent his letter to the ORLANDO SENTINEL that published it on April 12

as a front-page headline. It was one of Holt's last acts on the part of the college. He died a few days later. (29)

Tension and drama bounded when Winthrop Bancroft opened the special trustee meeting on Friday, April 14. After dispensing with some preliminary matters, the chairman asked for the Carrison Committee report. Before making his presentation, Carrison called for Wagner's resignation but received only a cold stare from the President. Carrison then detailed the evidence presented to his committee by the college community, informed the Board of Wagner's failure to answer their proposal, and then solemnly recommended the President's dismissal. After a brief silence, the room erupted into a cacophony of heated accusations and unstructured debate. As one trustee later remembered: "Everyone was furious. Everyone was shouting. Ray Maguire (college attorney) was pacing up and down, shouting things no one had asked him to say and no one was listening to." Some were calling for adjournment, others protesting they were leaving town that evening. Finally, after Bancroft restored order, the Board agreed to adjourn until the following morning, hoping to resume deliberations with calmer nerves and less violent emotions.(30)

That night both pro- and anti-Wagner forces prepared strategy for the Saturday morning meeting. The President and the Executive Committee members wanted a vote on the dismissal, because with only fourteen of the twenty-three members present, they were assured of a majority. On the other hand, the anti-Wagner trustees, realizing they could not get a favorable vote, decided on a postponement. To their good fortune the chairman was in their camp. When Bancroft called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M. on Saturday morning, two trustees simultaneously asked to be recognized. By prearrangement, Bancroft recognized Miller Walton who moved an adjournment until the Board could reconvene on April 27 in New

York City at 10:00 A.M. in New York City. Throughout Walton's reading of the motion, Wagner was shouting "Point of order, Point of order." He wanted a debate, but the chairman ruled the motion not debatable. On the vote, Bancroft broke a seven-seven tie in favor of the motion to adjourn. Ignoring the college lawyer's argument that the vote violated ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER, Bancroft declared the meeting adjourned and with the other trustees, left the room.(31)

In the two weeks before the New York meeting, Wagner and the Executive Committee worked feverishly to strengthen the President's position. Wagner called an all-college assembly to present his side of the story, but his monologue, left the community even more sullen than before. At the suggestion of Mrs. Frances Warren, who provided the necessary funds, the Executive Committee invited two college presidents--William Stevenson of Oberlin College and John Caldwell of Alabama College and Provost Philip Davidson of Vanderbilt-- to hold hearings on the campus upheaval and to make recommendations. The group arrived on April 24, but immediately ran into a stonewall of silence. The Special Faculty Committee refused to talk to the commission, claiming only the trustees would solve Rollins's problems. Convinced that the division was so deep that it could make no progress, the commission left after two days. The entire mission had ended in embarrassment. In the meantime, college attorney Raymond Maguire branded the planned meeting in New York illegal, because trustees could not conduct important business out of the state of Florida. The ORLANDO SENTINEL announced that "Local Trustees Would Shun the New York Meeting."(32)

Although neither President Wagner nor the Executive Committee members appeared at the April 27 New York meeting, a bare quorum of eleven trustees did assemble. By the time of the meeting, several

trustees had worked out a face-saving plan to create and finance a "Commission To Study the Financial Problems of Liberal Arts Colleges" with Wagner as chairman. Naturally, he would be asked to resign the Presidency to accept the chairmanship. The assembled trustees then gave Wagner until May 3 to accept or reject the offer. In the event he failed to resign by that date, they authorized a group of Winter Park trustees to issue an order of dismissal. The Board asked Alfred J. Hanna, who waited outside the meeting room, to serve as acting president, but Hanna declined for personal reasons. The Board then undertook an "exhaustive discussion" regarding "possible persons who might be able to save the college from ruin." Finally, George Carrison nominated and the trustees elected Hugh McKean, Rollins art professor and husband of Trustee Jeannette Genius McKean. Mrs. McKean asked to be excused from voting, but when the members explained that "it would be wise that no action at this meeting be taken which was not unanimous by all Trustees present," she acquiesced, voting for her husband. Hugh McKean, who also was waiting in the wings, was charged with finding alternatives to the college's financial problems and with bringing the community factions back together in a harmonious working relationship.(33)

Eldridge Haynes assumed the responsibility of reporting the Board's proposal to the beleaguered President Wagner who was also in New York at the time. Wagner seemed genuinely interested in the prospects of heading such a commission yet he kept repeating to Haynes, once with tears in his eyes, that he wanted more than anything else to be President of Rollins College. Haynes could not convince him of the impossibility of that alternative. When the exhausted trustee left in the early morning hours, Wagner had agreed only to give the matter serious thought.

One week later, on the May 3 deadline, Wagner still had not given the trustees an answer. McKean automatically became acting president, but because Wagner still occupied the President's office in Warren Hall, McKean set up shop in Morse Art Gallery. Rollins now had two presidents: one clearly intent upon resisting ouster and still occupying the physical seat of power, and the other with no real authority looking on from the outside. Moreover, Wagner's supporters undertook measures that looked suspiciously as if they intended to keep him in office for a long time. Louis Orr, a local trustee, announced publicly his firm support for Wagner; the SENTINEL reported that Mrs. Warren, a dedicated Wagner supporter, wanted the college community to reunite behind Wagner, and a local "Citizens Committee for Rollins College" placed a full-page advertisement in the SENTINEL asking everyone to rally to Wagner's side in these times of crisis.

Nonetheless Wagner's authority began to crumble under his feet. On May 10, a majority of the students walked out of classes and refused to return until Wagner resigned. Wagner called a faculty meeting the following day to determine "what action the faculty wished to take toward the student strike." Never had a president faced a more hostile faculty. Following a motion to refer the problem to a special committee, the faculty adjourned. The meeting had lasted fifteen minutes. Two days later all the deans announced that "in order to restore harmony," they would begin working with McKean rather than Wagner. (34)

Finally, a group of trustees headed by George Carrison gathered in Winter Park on May 13 prepared to serve Wagner an ultimatum and end the intolerable divisive upheaval. Along with trustees Arthur Schultz and Jeannette McKean, he arranged a face-to-face meeting with Wagner at the home of trustee Eugene Smith, a member of the Executive Committee

and a Winter Park resident. Carrison later recalled in great detail the pitiful demise of the Wagner presidency:(35)

I opened by addressing Mr. Wagner as 'Paul.' I tried to be friendly. I said that we were at this point, that we were merely in a matter of serious disagreement which we should be able to handle as ladies and gentlemen, and that the point was this: that he thought Rollins could get along better with him as president, and we thought it could get along better with him not as president and away from Winter Park: and that, since he was contesting our action and since we wished to do the proper thing and work no hardship on him, to the best of our ability, we Rollins with personal dignity and should compensate him for any financial loss that he might sustain by reason of leaving Rollins. He seemed to be very friendly and as I recall said, "Yes, Yes, that was about it"; that it was a difference of opinion," and that he thought Rollins could get along better with him as president than without. So I said, "Well, be that as it may be," and I read him our proposal [essentially the same one made at the New York meeting]. Then, Mr. Wagner got up and came over and said, "May look at it?" I showed [the proposal] to him. I didn't want to give it to him, but he reached out and put his hand on it and gave it a over a piece of paper, so I let him have it, feeling that after all, what damage is done? So then he sat back in his chair and read the proposal. Then he said that we couldn't expect him to give us a decision without consulting his attorney, that after all, he had "placed himself under the protection of an attorney."

So I said, "Well, call him. Dr. Smith must have a telephone here." and he said: "I would prefer to talk to him privately." And I said, "We will all leave the house." Dr. Smith said, "I think it is all right. Go ahead, Paul." So Paul Wagner went to the phone and

we three left the house. We stood outside for about fifteen minutes and were joined by Dr. Smith. We joined in a conversation with Dr. Smith, telling him that we would give Mr. Wagner any kind of "whitewash resolution."

Although his would place the Board of Trustees in an unfavorable light we still were willing to do that, to let Mr. Wagner leave Rollins with a clean slate and with dignity. Dr. Smith returned to the house and we waited approximately 10 or 15 minutes more. Finally, recognizing that Wagner might be stalling us again, we went up on the porch where we were joined by Raymond Greene. Presently Mr. Smith walked toward the door and we could see him through the glass so we got up and went on in. We all resumed the same chairs we had before, and Mr. Wagner proceeded to launch into a discussion of technical details. He held our proposal in his hand and pointed out that he could not be sure this would be done or that would be done and he continued to try to find flaws whereby he would not have to give us an answer.

Finally, I said to him: "Paul, we are not getting anywhere, this way. There always comes a time in human behavior where people have to carry on their program and cannot continue farther to negotiate. I ask you, finally: Do you, or do you not, accept this proposal in PRINCIPLE? If you accept it in principle, we will take care of the handling of any and all legal details that you might wish put in this proposal that will assure you that it will be carried out. All you have to do now is, tell us that you accept it in PRINCIPLE.

Mr. Wagner still would give us no answer but went back to the proposal and started talking of legal technicalities which were so frivolous that I do not remember them. Finally I said: "Well, it is obvious you will not give us an answer; so I must deliver this communication to you." The communication was a formal notification of

his dismissal as President of Rollins College, by the Board of Trustees, and was signed by Mr. George Johnson as Secretary of the meeting of the Board in New York on April 27th.

Mr. Wagner would not put his hand on the communication, which was in an envelope, but raised his hands above his shoulders asking "What is this? What is this?" I said: "This is a letter to you, which I am personally delivering." He still would not accept it, so I said, "Well, since you won't take it, I will read it to you."

Whereupon I read it to him, then tendered it again. Again he refused to take it, and said: "Give it to Dr. Smith." I then turned to Dr. Smith to hand it to him. Dr. Smith said, "I see no reason why I should accept it for him." So I turned back to Mr. Wagner and said: "Well, here it is." He still would not take it, so I laid it on the table and then Mrs. McKean, Mr. Schultz and I walked out.

Dr. Smith followed us to the door. I was the last one going out and he said something like this: "I hope that this thing can be settled amicably. I still think he might accept. I hope you will not do anything that will hurt the College." I said, "Dr. Smith, you know we will not do that." I reiterated that we had reached the end of our patience; then I looked at my watch and said: "We are going to Mrs. McKean's residence, directly from here, and will leave there in 15 minutes. So, if Mr. Wagner in that time wishes to call on the phone within 15 minutes, and tell us that he has accepted, then we will come back."

We went to Mrs. McKean's. In 14 minutes, Dr. Smith called and told me that Mr. Wagner had not accepted but had left and had gone to the administration building where he said his wife was and there were a lot of students milling around and he was fearful for her safety. I said, "Well, Dr. Smith, I am awfully sorry. We will go ahead with our

plans." Whereupon, we three left and went to the Morse Gallery of Art, where a press conference had been arranged and a rather sizable group of faculty, students, and alumni and the press were assembled.

At Morse Gallery, Carrison held a brief session where he read the announcement formally dismissing Wagner and appointing Hugh McKean as acting president. As the crowd at Morse Gallery began to disperse, they learned of an unusual, almost bizarre, event taking place at the administration building. Wagner had arrived on the campus after the meeting at Eugene Smith's house to find the administration building surrounded by students and guarded by Winter Park police. With his staff he began removing boxes of material from the president's office, and as they moved from office to the cars, students had formed a corridor silently watching their every move. Following Mr. and Mrs. Wagner departure under police escort, Dean of the Chapel Theodore Darrah delivered a solemn and impassioned speech telling the students that the place to celebrate that night would be on their knees, praying for the future of Rollins College.

The next day, acting President McKean called an all college meeting where he, Tiedtke, and Carrison gave victory speeches to a joyously applauding audience. When they emerged from the Annie Russell Theatre, the students spontaneously lifted Hugh McKean on their shoulders and walked with him through the campus shouting cheers of victory. The gesture was to make deep imprint on the McKean presidency.(36)

On May 15, all students returned to classes anxious to restore conditions to normal. At this point, the Wagner affair should have receded mercifully into the past, but the Executive Committee, Wagner and his local friends. would not concede defeat. On May 16, THE ORLANDO SENTINEL-STAR front-page headline proclaimed that "Wagner Says Still

President," explaining that the deposed President refused to recognize the action of the April 27 Trustee meeting and other later actions as legal. The Executive Committee held a special Board of Trustee meeting to discuss the matter but failed to secure a quorum. The pro-Wagner citizens committee, after holding a large meeting in the Winter Park Country Club on May 14 began publishing a series of advertisements in the Orlando papers questioning the legal authority to fire Wagner. The first, entitled "Who Owns Rollins College?" listed the names of those Trustees who attended the New York meeting and implied that they had acted illegally. A second, entitled "Fair Play The American Way," accused the Trustees of defaulting on their promise to back Wagner after the February 1951 decision. An anti-Wagner group responded with its own full-page advertisement, explaining "What Rollins Is Trying To Achieve." On May 21, Wagner filed a \$500,000 suit against the eleven Trustees who had voted his dismissal.(37)

This disruptive, though relatively harmless, newspaper and legal war suddenly took a serious and dangerous turn. On Thursday afternoon, May 24, the campus received the startling news that the Florida Legislature had passed a bill ousting all out-of-state members from the Rollins Board of Trustees. Local representatives had introduced the measure as a traditionally non-debatable local bill at the request of the Citizens Committee, whose members argued that the Trustees were hopelessly deadlocked, that out-of-state Trustees would not take time to attend meetings, and that the only solution was to create a board of trustees willing to devote time to the college. "It is the duty of the Legislature," the Committee declared, "to remove this valuable asset of the state from the grasp of a small group of selfish and irresponsible men from other states and their rabble-rousing followers on the campus and put it under the control of open minded capable people close to the

situation and aware of the interests of Central Florida and the whole state."(38)

The news of the bill threw an only-recently-subdued campus into turmoil once again. A hastily called general meeting of faculty, students and townspeople created a "Friends of the College Committee" that began organizing opposition to the bill. At 11:00 that evening over 200 people left by buses and motorcade for Tallahassee to persuade the Governor not to sign the legislation. In the meantime, important townspeople, trustees and college officials began exerting pressure on Central Florida representatives in the legislature. In addition, from throughout the state came indignant protests against the Legislature's unprecedented and potentially dangerous interference in the internal affairs of a private institution of higher learning. In the face of mounting pressure, representatives of the Florida Legislature asked the Governor to return the bill for a second consideration, and on May 28, both houses unanimously rescinded their original legislation. The college was holding an honors day program when the news arrived and embraced triumphantly this added cause for celebration.(39)

The following day, May 29, the trustees held their regularly scheduled and now critical, commencement meeting. The vote here would either reconfirm or reverse the special New York meeting's decision. When the members arrived at their usual meeting place, the conference room of Knowles Memorial Chapel, they found Paul Wagner and his attorneys already seated. Chairman Bancroft gaveled the meeting to order, called the role (fifteen members present), and then declared a recess. The Chairman then asked Wagner and his attorneys to leave the meeting, but they remained firmly seated in their chairs. Bancroft then called the meeting to order again, declared an adjournment to Morse Art Gallery, and barred Wagner and his attorneys from the building "unless

they used force to enter," but the ex-President made no effort to follow the Trustees to Morse Gallery. Before they left the campus, Raymond Greene, Louis Orr, Eugene Smith, and Raymond Maguire all resigned from the Board of Trustees. Reconstituted, the Trustees moved quickly to affirm the decisions and resolutions of the April 27 meeting and formally removed Wagner as President of the college, "effective instantly." They also reconfirmed Hugh McKean as acting President and, in addition, elected Alfred J. Hanna as first Vice-President and John Tiedtke as second Vice-President and Treasurer of the college.(40)

Still Wagner remained adamant. Refusing to accept the legality of any of these acts, he continued with his \$500,000 suit against eleven Trustees present at the New York meeting. The suit dragged on through months of desultory activity until in 1953, both sides agreed to a \$50,000 out-of-court settlement. Wagner hovered around the campus for a few days following the May 29 meeting, watching from a distance the college's commencement exercises on June 1 (diplomas having been signed by Acting President Hugh McKean). Under pressure from college attorneys, he finally relinquished the keys to the President's office on Friday, June 8. Five days later, Hugh McKean for the first time entered the office in the administration building as Acting President of Rollins College. At least symbolically, the Wagner affair had mercifully come to close (41)

CHAPTER 9
THE MCKEAN ERA:
RESTORING THE HOLT LEGACY

The McKean administration coincided almost precisely with the transformation in American education that some writers have termed the "academic revolution." If, as others think, the term exaggerates educational development in the first two decades after World War II, everyone agrees that fundamental changes did occur between 1945 and 1970. "Cautious egalitarianism" represented the most important of these developments. The Commission on Higher Education, appointed by President Harry Truman, concluded in 1947 that approximately 50% of the American population possess "the mental ability" to succeed in college if society would remove economic, geographic, religious and racial barriers barring their way. Through the creation of more schools, increased scholarship funds and the process of desegregation, many of these barriers were eliminated or at least lowered by 1970. A massive increase in enrollment resulted, a development initially stimulated by the passage in 1944 of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act, commonly known as the GI Bill of Rights that sent over two and a half million veterans to over 2,000 institutions of higher learning at a cost of 5.5 billion dollars. Veteran enrollment lagged after 1955, effecting an economic recession in higher education, but then in the early 1960s the children of the war and postwar "baby boom" came pouring into colleges, again creating unprecedented enrollment increases. Prior to World War II, forty percent of the college -age population went to college, but by 1945 that figure had risen to sixty percent. Between 1955 and 1968, student enrollment doubled from just over Three million to six and a half million.

The flood of students drastically altered American higher education. With greatly increased numbers of applications, stable colleges could raise their requirements for entrance. Prestigious institutions, and even those a bit less than prestigious, demanded higher and higher scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and higher rank in class. The federal government and foundations began pouring funds into higher education, allowing institutions to enlarge their physical plants to meet the burgeoning demand. This growth also accelerated a process of faculty specialization that had been underway since the turn of the century. By the mid-1960s the PhD had become an essential preparation for college teaching, and colleges soon found themselves in intense competition for faculty with certified doctorates. Faculty salaries rose precipitously; moreover, this faculty began to demand and receive more responsibility in college governance. The president remained a dominant figure in his institution, but without the authority characteristic of the pre-World War II academic world. More and more the college president was forced to share authority with, and in many cases, to abdicate academic authority entirely in favor of administrative deans and faculty committees.

This sudden broadening of responsibility and authority in American higher education proved a mixed blessing for the academic world. A few institutions, seizing upon this development, sought and secured aggressive admissions and development officers and deans who then drastically raised the quality of the educational programs and sought the necessary funds to support those programs. Several colleges and universities emerged from mediocrity to the elevated status of prestigious. A few others simply would not or could not respond to the post-World War II changes; unable to meet the competition, they fell by

the wayside or managed to limp along in academic commonplace. A large group of institutions, perhaps even a majority, comprehended the nature of the changes taking place, responded partially, but for a variety of reasons failed to take full advantage of the favorable conditions. They improved the quality of the faculty and students; they reformed and improved the academic programs, but when "revolution" was over in the late 1970s, they had been strengthened but not transformed. Rollins College was among this group.(1)

In the academic year after the Wagner affair, the administrative triumvirate of McKean, Hanna, and Tiedtke was most concerned with the immediate challenge of returning the college to normal. The president and the two vice presidents took pains to emphasize their long and continuous association with the college. Hanna, a 1917 graduate, pointed to his work as secretary to President Blackman, as alumni director, as chief confidant of Hamilton Holt, as instructor of history, and as a scholar in Florida history. Indeed, the SANDSPUR characterized him as a hometown boy who had made good. Tiedtke, although not a graduate of Rollins, could claim connection since 1936 and, more important, was viewed as a congenial financier who exacted every ounce of efficiency from income. Even more than these two, McKean provided a much-needed sense of continuity. McKean had studied, then taught in the beneficent shadow of Holt, and no one had absorbed the Holt spirit more than he had. He made every effort to emulate his idol's style by reestablishing harmonious relationships and intimate contact with faculty and students. Having taught at Rollins for two decades, his governance assumed a "faculty point of view," and having graduated from Rollins in 1930, he could claim a close affinity for the student point of view. McKean embodied, therefore, not only a powerful

sense of continuity but also a virtually undisputed sense of the college's mission.

McKean's demeanor helped immeasurably to quiet the hysteria of the previous spring and summer. A soft-spoken, artistic man with a penchant for philosophizing on any subject from the art of fishing to the meaning of art, McKean with a gentle, unassuming manner seemed an especially appropriate leader for the college in the post-Wagner years. There was a certain romantic appeal to this picture of an uncomplicated man, happily teaching art and suddenly propelled into the presidency with an urgent mission to wrest his alma mater from the throes of deep crisis. He admitted with modest candor that he lacked experience and perhaps would not measure up to the responsibilities. "As a college president," he wrote a friend, "I am a rank amateur. I have the additional handicap of being almost an unwilling one. I taught art at Rollins for twenty years and that is what I should be doing now."

In the wake of Wagner's aggressive self-assuredness, McKean's self-effacement and inexperience were viewed as virtues, and to counterbalance McKean's novitiate, there was the long-term experience of Tiedtke and Hanna. The SANDSPUR editor apparently spoke for the entire community when he noted in the first issue of the 1952-1953 academic year that "our new administrators" had brought peace and harmony with simple "sincerity and courage."(2)

The McKean administration sensed the impending changes in the academic world almost from the beginning. To the increase of military personnel in the Central Florida area, it responded immediately by introducing a course entitled, "Orientation for the Armed Forces." More significant, through an educational arrangement in 1951 with Patrick Air Force Base in Cocoa Beach, Rollins professors began conducting college credit classes for service personnel and their families. During

the first semester, 168 students attended the seven courses offered, and by 1970, the effort had grown three-fold and blossomed into full-fledged, branch campus program, realizing for the college thousands of dollars in income. In addition, the administration inaugurated an adult education program in Winter Park in 1954 that mushroomed into several thousand students by 1970, and like the Patrick program provided the college with a sizeable amount of uncommitted income. (3)

Both in response to the Wagner affair and to the growing academic professionalization, the administration moved to introduce democratic procedures into college governance. In his first faculty meeting, McKean called for a revision of the faculty bylaws to provide more governing responsibility to the faculty. The change, passed in December 1951, gave each department responsibility for its new appointments and reappointments. The faculty as a whole was made solely responsible for "devising and administering curriculum studies" for graduation requirements, the academic calendar, and for maintaining "good order and discipline." It also acquired the authority to "devise and revise salary scales and systems of promotion in rank," the right to be consulted in matters "involving the possible freeze or lowering of salaries," and the right "to study the facts before a final decision is made by the President to the Board of Trustees." The revision of bylaws reiterated faculty commitment to the principles of tenure outlined by the 1940 statement of the AAUP, a move intended to avoid unexpected and unexamined policy decisions of the sort that led to the Wagner dismissals. (4)

Although by the end of the first term the college seemed well on its way to recovering from the previous spring's upheaval, uncertainty still hung over the community. The triumvirate held their offices only temporarily, the trustees having appointed each man for only one year.

McKean, in an early act of abnegation, had submitted his resignation to be effective on or before commencement, 1952. The Board in response had appointed an all-college search committee, but by October the committee had submitted only the names of several "possible candidates," and at the end of the spring term, it had made not a single formal suggestion. Meanwhile, the triumvirate reported that the college was now "restored to its former thriving condition," and they therefore requested "an early release from administrative duties." Relying on their "experience as members of the faculty for many years and as interim administrators for nine months," the triumvirate proposed a list of qualities the "new leader should possess." Included were a sympathy with the conference plan of teaching, the humility of "well-informed and wise men," a known support for quality education, a capacity for satisfaction derived from helping young people. Notably, the triumvirate proposed that the new president should be "an educator with adequate training and experience as teacher and administrator and he must be prepared to go to work immediately." (emphasis added) The triumvirate "wished to point out that the present condition of Rollins achieved by the cooperation [among] and headed by an artist, an historian, and a farmer is an indication that the task of finding a president should not be as difficult as many might suppose." (5)

The list of qualities in no way eliminated McKean; in fact, the statement not surprisingly described the acting president himself. Yet, during the fall term, McKean had refused every effort to make himself a candidate, a refusal puzzlingly contrary to his comportment as acting president until it was suggested that while McKean would not offer himself as a *candidate*, he might readily accept the presidency if asked. (6)

The suggestion proved to be correct. In the February, 1952 meeting, after offering a vote of thanks "for his splendid achievement the past year," the trustees "in recognition of his overall general knowledge of the college and its problems" unanimously voted his appointment. The Wagner affair had thus left its second legacy to the college.(7)

Now secure in his office, McKean turned his thoughts to Rollins's future. His annual reports for the next ten years show a president struggling to make sense of the coming academic revolution. In his 1955 report he told the trustees that "within four or five years there will be tremendous pressure on all of us to increase the size of the college," predicted a "groundswell of applications," and cautioned that the type of student Rollins attracted and held in the next decade would shape the college's future. Serious scholars would avoid Rollins, he warned, if the college acquired the reputation of "taking weak students," and good students would not stay if the academic departments were weak. Therefore, he noted, "the admission picture is clearly related to the quality of the faculty."(8)

A few years later, McKean's philosophical emphasis had altered. The academic explosion had created "impersonal education," with grades and test scores the major criteria for student selections. Professors using "loudspeakers and television screens" simply provided students with information. Rollins, McKean admonished, should "stand against this trend, should maintain its small size with a continuing concern for the individual," seeking "both average students and those with highest scores" but demanding superior personal qualities.

With much insight, this report looked into the future of American education and Rollins's place in that future. He envisioned "a complex of institutions" with the undergraduate college at the center. For the

liberal arts college he made no specific predictions, but for the other areas of the complex McKean offered incisive ideas. An early proponent of "non-traditional" education, McKean called for an "external college," a new institution designed to offer varied and rich educational programs to anyone within academic reach of the college. Through communication techniques -- "radio, television, learning tapes, etc." -- the college would confer "external bachelor degrees on any candidate who qualified by passing a very complete written examination." The traditional practice, McKean wrote with prescience, of satisfying the nation's educational needs by educating only teenagers is a relic of another era. The future of colleges lay not with education designed exclusively for teenagers, not with education for a few who are especially privileged, not with education, which is completed in a few years, but with 'life-long' education. "This country must have continuous high level education for everyone all of the time. The day is past when an education is completed." Ironically, it was an education program with which Paul Wagner would have had little quarrel.

This was Hugh McKean at his best, a philosopher-president reminding the college of the wider scope of its educational responsibilities. But the most profound philosophy could not solve the serious problems the triumvirate had inherited, nor was it a substitute for meaningful, aggressive admission strategies and faculty recruitment policies. Above all, in order to prepare for this growth, the institution needed a well-constructed development policy that would accumulate the funds necessary for creating a higher-quality institution. In a period of high faculty demand and rapidly rising faculty salaries, the college could attract and hold first-rate faculty only if it paid salaries competitive with other institutions and, in

some cases, competitive with government and business. In a period when public institutions provided both excellent education and low tuition costs, Rollins could grow only if it offered an attractive educational program supplemented by scholarship funds to attract quality students. Clearly, the opportunities to realize the perennial goal of improving quality was never greater, but even more than in earlier periods, the key to success lay with the college's ability to attract necessary funding.

The college under McKean strove mightily to meet these challenges, and after a decade and half, the president and his colleagues could look back with justifiable pride at their 15 years of service to the college. The institution was not faced with a perennial financial crisis as it had been in the 30s and 40s. Under the triumvirate, it had weathered the debilitating Wagner affair with an even stronger sense of community and had attempted to address many of the issues raised by the academic revolution. Rollins had increased the size of its physical plant to meet the needs of a burgeoning student population (by 1966 total enrollment exceeded 1,000), and even more importantly, had improved the quality of its students. During this period, the admissions office undertook an aggressive program that significantly increased the application pool. By 1966, four applications were received for each one accepted, and that year Dean of Admissions, Spencer Lane reported an average SAT of 565 verbal and 575 math. The Class of 1968 represented the high point of the admission accomplishments and indicated the college's potential drawing power. Choosing three hundred and twenty students from 1200 applicants, the admissions office closed enrollment on May 1, with an acceptance rate over sixty percent. SAT scores averaged 550 in math and verbal with

seventy percent of the entering students ranked in the upper two-fifths of their high school classes. It was the most encouraging report on academic quality in the college's history.(16)

During the next four years the Class of '68 provided the college with much excitement in almost every field of endeavor. Theater majors Bill McNulty, Bill Millard, Nancy Yardlow, Ray Edwards and others presented four years of outstanding plays; editor Mark Billson produced quality newspaper journalism in what many considered the best SANDSPUR ever printed at Rollins; Fred Giddes and Al Holland provided the college with intelligent and imaginative leadership in student government. In the academic realm the History Department was particularly blessed -- one-third of the 1968 seniors were history majors. When the Class of '68 graduated, over half continued in graduate study, six receiving Woodrow Wilson Fellowships and one, Norman Friedland, receiving the prestigious Root-Tilden Scholarship for study at New York University School. The Class of '68 revealed clearly the college's potential for academic quality, and several other classes during this period came close to matching that quality.(17)

In addition to achieving higher standards of quality as reflected in the classes of the late 60s, credit must be given to the informal, personal, and sensitive style of Hugh McKean which helped reestablish the sense of harmony and community that had been so much a part of the early Holt years. Fox Day typified, perhaps even symbolized, this aspect of McKean's presidency. In 1956, the president created a full day of celebration centered around a statue presented to the college in 1934 by Deland lawyer, Murray Sams. Actually, Sams had donated two statues -- a fox and a cat -- for display on the campus, but when a student prank destroyed the cat, Holt had stored the fox for safekeeping. A year after assuming the presidency, McKean secretly

brought the fox from hiding, placed it on the library lawn, and announced that the fox had decided to return one day each spring to proclaim a celebration. Upon his appearance, classes would be dismissed, and the Rollins family would "just take it easy," going to the beach or participating in organized activities. The celebration ended with an all-college picnic and a special commemorative meeting in the Chapel. The day brought together the college family in an informal and relaxed way, nurturing a community spirit that might have been threatened by the greatly increased size of the college. McKean's Fox Day proclamations, poetically melding the college's natural beauty with the joy of learning, created nostalgic memories for students and invariably captured the essence of the day. The proclamation for 1959 typified McKean's easy-going, relaxed style.**[need a quotation here]** In this realm Hugh McKean seemed truly the protégé of Hamilton Holt.

But President McKean was unfortunately suffered through the same plague financial development as his mentor. In fact, in many ways the McKean administration was the products of, to some extent the captives of, the Holt era. Consciously or unconsciously, in fund raising, the McKean administration either emulated the Holt administration, or reacted against it. The president's initial ideas on development, presented in his 1953 President's Report, included a broad statement that set the tone of his future development philosophy. The administration, he wrote, was considering "a 7-year plan designed to present the aims of Rollins College to thoughtful persons with such clarity and force that they will wish to give it the financial support it must have." One year later McKean declared further: "When I became President I said that I would ask no one to contribute to support the college but that if the facts about the college were good and reasonable and if they were presented to the friends of the college in

a way that they could be thoroughly understood, it was my opinion that the college could win its own support." In 1955, after he assumed personal responsibility for fund-raising, he admitted with characteristic self-effacement some uncertainty in this field. "I do not know if I will succeed but I will try," he told the Trustees. "My policy will continue to be that of speaking frankly about the college and making no direct requests for funds." (10)

Convinced that the merits of the College would attract the necessary funds to assure its future, McKean made no further development plans, despite the Trustees' suggestion that he hire a development officer who could construct a systematic fund-raising policy. After eight years, McKean felt constrained to admit his program "had not been a great success." He had predicted that by 1960 for the college to reach would require annual (income, gifts, and funds) of ten million dollars, but in that year, he was able to report only half that amount raised. It was not, he conceded, "a dazzling record," but he hastened to add, it had "been accomplished without high pressured solicitation and without a development officer."(11)

In the face of the college's slow financial growth, the Trustees began pressing for a management study that would, as one of them argued, "help set goals and point out areas for improvement."(12) In response, McKean included a long section in his 1961 annual report entitled, "Appraising Rollins' Development Program." He admitted that his philosophy and methods differed from "the more or less standard methods" and that his plan contained no provisions for development professionals. In his administration Rollins had "employed no development officer ...[set] no goals, [had] no solicitation, no teams." McKean reminded the trustees that if the college followed the

standard development approach, a fund-raising firm "would expect the them to contribute at least fifty percent of the goal on the theory that the Trustees who are at the college cannot expect others to contribute if they do not lead the way." In evaluating his own program, the President reported: "We did not expect to have raised the funds in the usual sense of the word," expecting that the bulk would come in wills and trusts. Determined to change the image created in the Holt era that Rollins was "always begging and always spending more than its income," he had constructed a development program based on "winning support rather than solicitation" and such an approach might take a long time.(13)

Finally conceding in 1962 that his "development program was lagging," the president reluctantly accepted the management study suggested the previous year. In the spring of that year the Trustees signed a contract with the American Institute of Management, a New York firm that had recently completed an impressive audit of a college in Pennsylvania. A representative arrived at Rollins in September, 1962, completed his study by December, and submitted his report in January 1963.

The report began by praising several aspects of the McKean administration's efforts. Its academic goals were correct; it was defining and redefining the educational philosophy of Hamilton Holt; it was improving the quality of students and teachers; and it was relating the college to its own geographical area. The report particularly praised McKean's efforts to create a new community role for the college through the general studies program, through the Patrick Air Force Base program and through a proposed research institute in space science. It further praised the administration for holding these programs to a secondary function, leaving the liberal arts program at the center. It

did recommend that the college appoint a Dean of Community Programs and that these programs be tied more closely to the college by using its own faculty and building and by bringing the standards of the program to the college's level, recommendations that almost precisely parallel those of a planning committee some 15 years later.

The report only mildly criticized the academic program. It cited fewer applications from and lower standards for men than for women, a situation that was, and the report noted, a source of other problems. Fewer and less-qualified men created social difficulties, which, no doubt, exacerbated an already-high female attrition rate: only forty percent of the entering females graduated from Rollins. In addition, the report identified as a serious financial drain the high level of scholarship aid not covered by endowment. The AIM report suggested that the college give serious thought to these problems, but on the whole, the institution was judged academically sound.

The investigators felt the most pressing administrative problem was the development program, and its advice was specific. First, it suggested appointing a permanent development officer with the status of a vice president whose sole function would be to organize and direct the development effort of the college. It also recommended short-term (three to five years) and long-term (ten to fifteen years) plans that would provide the college with a sense of direction. The development officer should construct a program based on this plan that would involve all possible sources of support: alumni, trustees, local business and industry, national business and foundations, the community, parents and friends of the college. Finally, the report noted, the development officer should make a continuing effort "to improve the college's national and local image." In the matter of financial support the investigators focused their attention on the

alumni contributions, an area wherein he found little to praise. The college claimed over 6,000 alumni, he reported, some of whom had achieved impressive business records since graduation, but the Alumni Office could generate only \$8,000 annually. Less than twenty-five percent of the alumni body gave financial support to the college, a small amount in relation to comparable colleges. Although a few alumni gave with regularity, these gifts appeared unrelated to any organized effort.

The report then presented what the investigators thought was the heart of the problem: the Rollins Alumni Corporation, the organization responsible for alumni affairs and contributions, remained an *independent* entity with its own board of directors and executive director. The Institute's report did not try to disguise its disapproval of this arrangement:

The continued independence of the Alumni organization today is anachronistic, purposeless, and damaging. Certainly the Alumni organization can have no reason for existence except support of the College. Yet its separateness denies it the benefit of direct guidance by the administration and Trustees that could improve its support of the College.

The Institute suggested that the Trustees should change "this awkward arrangement" but thought the alumni themselves should reunite "their organization with the college it was founded to serve." Having achieved this reunification, the administration should then aggressively seek alumni support. Whatever its reluctance to pressure outside groups, the administration should not apply this standard to alumni who had "an obligation to support their institution." It was the responsibility of the Alumni association to convince the alumni body that their education was in great part subsidized; their schooling being underwritten by friends of the college through contributed funds,

by teachers willing to teach without adequate compensation, and by administrators and staff who worked for low wages. For each graduating class, the report noted, the difference between actual cost and tuition "represented a debt to the College in personal terms apart from the idealistic consideration of the needs of higher education." The Institute ended its study with an optimistic prediction for Rollins's future if the college moved forcefully to deal with its quite manageable problems. It listed 60 suggestions on how this could be done.

Moving into the administrative evaluation, the report directed attention to the management of the institution. The organizational structure, it said, created serious imbalances, with the Dean of the College shouldering the bulk of the administrative burden while the First Vice President held only one or two responsibilities. Moreover, the report registered disapproval of the recent proliferation of committees, stating that the system (15 standing committees and 8 special committees) produced not democratic governance as intended but rather, decision-making without responsibility. "Much more important is the *accomplishment* of established committees," the report concluded, "and we suggest that the administration of Rollins review all committees on that basis, carefully defining their functions and specific responsibilities."

The Institute had presented the college with a challenging analysis and evaluation, one that could have served, had the administration chosen to use it, as the basis for a planning document on the institution's future development; but an administration that neither requested nor desired the audit did not embrace enthusiastically a report full of implicit criticisms. After a few polite bows to the report's suggestions, the administration shelved the

document, deeming the criticisms unwarranted and unspecific. Besides, it argued, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools had just directed a self-study evaluation that already outlined the college's problems and needs. This was true, but the problem with this argument was that normally the Association's studies are more designed to make certain a college has maintained its accreditation standards, rather than probe deeply into its needs. The Southern Association study had merely noted that the President's "high degree of informal" administration created uncertain lines of responsibility and communication; it chided the college for not maintaining higher standards in its peripheral programs, but primarily, it lauded the college's "personalized education," its improved science program, and its beautiful campus. Understandably, to the administration, the report described the college's "true condition." (15)

One of those "true conditions" of which the administration was most proud was its annually balanced budget, and after years of deficit financing during the Holt era, the achievement was not an inconsequential one. Unfortunately, this balanced budget did not allow the college to pay faculty salaries competitive with comparable institutions. This factor led to some faculty discontent helped contribute to high faculty attrition. Between 1952 and 1963, over eighty faculty members left Rollins, most for higher salaried positions. Each annual report of the President contained a section entitled, "Serious Losses to the College," wherein he listed talented faculty and staff who had left for more lucrative positions; in 1963, for example, he cited a typical case of a faculty member with a salary of \$5,700 who left Rollins for a position which paid him \$3,000 more. Almost every annual report mentioned faculty complaints that

astronomical raises elsewhere in academia were not being matched at Rollins.

It was in the area of faculty recruitment, ironically one of the administration's successes that led to serious problems in late 1960s. The higher-quality faculty and student body inevitably turned critical eyes on an administration, which they felt was lagging behind the times. Steeped, moreover, in the values and mores of pre-World War II America, McKean and his staff moved uneasily in the Vietnam generation world of drugs, mini-skirts, long hair, sexual freedom, political activism and anti-establishment attitudes. Efforts by the administration to resist these new modes of behavior brought only derision. A typical editorial in the January 19, 1968, SANDSPUR scored the administration for its over-protective *in loco parentis* policies. A small infraction "of general conformity in appearance," wrote the editor, "brought letters of protest to the students' parents." Over the Christmas vacation parents of several male students received letters from the Dean's office "complaining about the length of their son's hair."

Thus a new generation of students anxious to break down the administration's parental attitude and a group of aggressive, young faculty discouraged by low salaries and disappointed with the administration's failures to fully realize the college's academic potential, began exerting tremendous pressure on McKean for some sense of direction. When the Trustees arrived for the 1968 commencement meeting, they found the campus in mild turmoil. Just prior to the end of the spring term, the firing of three popular faculty members for improper personal conduct shook the community. Although most of the college community supported the dismissals, many of the faculty attributed the dismissals to a lack of leadership. Even earlier, McKean

seemed to sense growing serious discontent. He admitted frankly in his 1969 annual report that the faculty believed his administration to be "ineffective in fund-raising and that this was the college's chief problem." In May, 1969, meeting with several trustees as they arrived for the commencement meeting, a faculty group expressed a loss of confidence in the President's leadership. Sensing an impending crisis, the Trustees began negotiations with McKean for his resignation. They seized upon the beleaguered president's suggestion in his February report for a college reorganization that would create the position of a Chancellor responsible for endowment development. The Trustee negotiators offered that position to McKean, and he agreed.

Immediately a search committee began the process of finding a new president, and in July, after interviewing three candidates, the Trustee Executive Committee appointed (confirmed by the Board of Trustees in December, 1969) Jack Barron Critchfield. McKean formally resigned during the same meeting.(18)

Despite his significant achievements, McKean's presidency ended amid feelings of unfulfillment. The faculty, many of them close personal friends of the president, had admired his sense of humanity and his genuine sensitivity to faculty and student needs. But they were also deeply disappointed with his impressionistic administration and his inability to give dynamic financial and academic leadership to the college. The president's last annual report revealed his own sense of frustration. In the report he proclaimed that he, as well as the faculty, knew that Rollins College *should be* standing alongside the best Northeastern and Midwestern small liberal arts colleges. He, as well as the faculty, knew that the college was worthy of the same financial support that had helped make these colleges great. Eighteen years after he assumed the presidency, Hugh McKean was still searching

for that greatness. He could depict that role in poetic visions, but it always seemed just out of his grasp. It was a sad story of good intentions, missed chances, and lost opportunities. While many small liberal arts colleges took advantage of the all too brief period of cornucopia educational abundance, Rollins made only moderate advances. Under McKean the college had held its own as a good liberal arts college, but the important elements of the community never considered that sufficient. In a situation maddeningly familiar to Rollins supporters, the college seemed perpetually poised on the edge of greatness. With great reluctance the aging president admitted that he could not take the college to its rightful place at the top, and in May 1969, he passed that quest on to his successor. (19)

The 36-year old Jack Critchfield, an education graduate of the University of Pittsburgh and associate provost there when he accepted the Rollins presidency, approached that quest with a youthful enthusiasm reminiscent of Paul Wagner. He did, in fact, view the problem from a Wagnerian perspective. While McKean saw the struggle for greatness as a personal matter, believing quality would speak for itself, Critchfield approached it as a management problem. The college community agreed, which may explain why a man with Critchfield's personality and background was hired in the first place. After the intensely personal and paternalistic style of President McKean, the community was ready for the more objective, more predictable and professional management approach to college governance. With his background in educational administration, Critchfield seemed to fit precisely the college's needs.

True to this perception, Critchfield acted quickly to restructure college governance. In his first year he spearheaded a revision of faculty government that led to the creation of the college senate

headed by a faculty president, vice president and secretary. The revision also created the new office of Provost that, along with the faculty senate structure, placed academic affairs completely outside the president's office. This represented a major shift in the college's traditional governance process; even with a Dean of the College, the President had posed as the academic leader, presiding at faculty meetings, keeping involved sufficiently with academic affairs so that he could represent intelligently the college's academic program. Whether accomplished consciously or unconsciously, the new structure isolated the president from academic affairs and, in turn, from that essential core of the college community, the students and the faculty. Unaccustomed to such a structure and unprepared to assert its new authority, the faculty had difficulty filling the void created by the absence of presidential academic leadership.(20)

Thus, during the Critchfield era, the academic program and hence the college, drifted from one point to another with little sense of direction and, as the new President unhappily discovered, donors were loathe to assist colleges whose educational mission seemed vague and uncertain. Critchfield faced a perennial lack of funds that in five years accumulated into a \$----- deficit. By 19__, the manager-president had found Rollins's presidency unmanageable. Like his predecessors, he began with no systematic development program, took the burden of fund-raising on his own shoulders, and was overwhelmed by so heavy a load. In 19__, after a brief tenure of __ years, he informed a faculty/staff gathering of his decision to accept the presidency of the Winter Park Telephone Company.(21)

The announcement sparked a presidential search that ended with the appointment of Thaddeus Seymour as Rollins's twelfth president.

For the first time since the Blackman era, the Trustees appointed a man with a long and successful background in academia both in teaching and administration. With a doctorate in literature from the University of North Carolina, Seymour had taught at North Carolina and Dartmouth College. In 1959 he was appointed Dean of the College at Dartmouth and ten years later accepted a call to the presidency of Wabash College in Indiana, where he remained until coming to Rollins. Seymour quickly perceived both the potential and the problem facing the college. In his Inaugural speech he projected that potential: "By November 4, 1985 [the college's one hundredth birthday], our aim is to know ourselves and to be known by others as the finest small liberal arts college in the Southeast, standing among the finest colleges in the country." "The future destiny of Rollins College," he expounded later, "depends upon its excellence -- the quality of the educational experience, the quality of the students and faculty, the quality of individual performance and the quality of our life and work together." In one of his first acts President Seymour initiated the process that pointed the college toward that potential. He persuaded the trustees to establish a College Planning Committee, charging it with "the responsibility to organize and implement a comprehensive planning effort which will engage the participation of all elements of a college community." In particular the charge asked the committee to:

1. articulate the institutional mission of the college
2. propose an institutional structure and program which reflect this mission
3. develop appropriate objectives for each division of the college
4. recommend allocation of funds, physical resources and personnel
5. determine the needs and goals of a development effort to coincide with the college Centennial.

The committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Daniel R. DeNicola, Professor of Philosophy, presented a mission statement early in its work that set the tone for its report and the college's expectations: "For nearly a century the primary mission of Rollins has been to provide excellent liberal arts education for students of ability and promise. It is and should remain a small independent co-educational institution serving a national constituency."

After eighteen months of exacting labor, the committee produced a detailed study of this "set of imposing tasks," including recommendations for implementation. With the publication of the Planning Report, a wave of optimism and expectation swept the campus. This document's recommendations, if carried out, showed the way to the condition of greatness that had stubbornly eluded so many previous generations. Moreover, the timing seemed right. As the Planning Committee expressed it: "Rollins College occupies a unique position among institutions of higher education today. We have the unusual combination of a distinguished history, important natural advantages, and a wealth of untapped potential." With confidence and optimism the report concluded, "Nothing emerges so clearly as the perception that Rollins is ready to move forward."

The committee concluded its report with an appropriate quotation from Shakespeare's HAMLET: "Readiness is all", but perhaps the ancient Biblical psalmist more poetically captured the real meaning of the college's potential as it approached its one hundredth birthday: "The lines have fallen for me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage." As Rollins College celebrated its one hundredth anniversary in 1985, no one doubted the permanence of that heritage. Perhaps it was the trials of all those struggles as much as the joys of its successes

that provided the institution with its strong character and optimistic sense of purpose. That long historical succession of committed presidents, administrators, students, staff, and faculty had poured their love and labor into making Rollins great, and consequently had, by 1985, prepared the college to take its place among the fine liberal arts institutions in the nation.

ENDNOTES

CHAPTER 1

1. This narrative is constructed from the following sources in the Rollins Archives: Frederick Lyman, "Early Days at Rollins," ROLLINS COLLEGE BULLETIN V (October, 1911); Kitchell Diary, SOUTH FLORIDA SENTINEL, April 18, 1885; ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, April 18, 1885.
2. Donald Tewksbury, THE FOUNDING OF AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR (1962), 4-8; Frederick Rudolph, THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY (1962), 48-50.
3. Quoted in Tewksbury, FOUNDING, 24.
4. Rudolph, AMERICAN COLLEGES, 49.
5. Daniel Boorstin, THE AMERICANS: THE NATIONAL EXPERIENCE (Vintage edition, 1967), 152-160.
6. Quoted in IBID.
7. Maurice O'Sullivan and Jack C. Lane, "Introduction", THE FLORIDA READER: VISIONS OF PARADISE (1991).
8. Lucy Cross, "The Beginning of Rollins College," Manuscript, Rollins Archives; Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the General Congregational Association of Florida, 1883. (Hereafter cited as Minutes, GCAF).
9. George Cary Bush, HISTORY OF EDUCATION IN FLORIDA (1899). 50-54; Edward Hooker to Noah Porter, September 1, 1885. Hooker Papers.
10. Minutes, GCAF, 1884; "Biographical Sketch of Edward Hooker," in Hooker Papers.
11. Elizabeth Hooker, "Edward Hooker." Manuscript in Rollins Archives.
12. Copy in Hooker Papers.
13. Minutes, GCAF, 1884.
14. ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, February 19, 1885.
15. FLORIDA TIMES-UNION, April 5, 1885.
16. IBID, April 9, 1885.
17. February 19, 1885.
18. FLORIDA TIMES-UNION, April 9, 1885.
19. For a hint of Hooker's ambitions see Elizabeth, "Hooker."
20. SOUTH FLORIDA JOURNAL, September 8, 1881. Copy in CHASE SCRAPBOOK.

21. William F. Blackman, HISTORY OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA (1927), 167-71.
22. William O'Neal, "Recollections," Manuscript, Rollins Archives.
23. Blackman, HISTORY, 172; Frederick Lyman, "Early Days of Rollins," ROLLINS COLLEGE BULLETIN, V (October, 1911).
24. IBID.
25. IBID.
26. Minutes, GCAF, 1885.
27. Lyman, "Early Days."
28. Cross, "Beginnings of Rollins."
29. IBID.
30. Minutes, GCAF, 1885.
31. April 22, 1885.
32. April 21, 1885.
33. April 23, 1885.
34. April 27, 1885.
35. Lyman, "Early Days."
36. Minutes of the Rollins College Board of Trustees, April 27, 1885. (Hereafter cited as Trustee Minutes).
37. IBID., APRIL 28, 1885.
38. IBID.
39. IBID.
40. SOUTH FLORIDA SENTINEL, April 29, 1885.
41. Hooker to Porter, September, 1, 1885. Hooker Papers.
42. BOSTON HERALD, June 21, 1885. Copy in Hooker Papers.
43. Knowles to Lyman, March 27, 1885. CHASE SCRAPBOOK.
44. ORANGE COUNTRY REPORTER, July 30, 1885.
45. CHASE SCRAPBOOK.
46. ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, August 12, 1885.
47. CHASE SCRAPBOOK. At the same time, Chase was supervising the

construction on Winter Park Company's Seminole Hotel. "I am overwhelmed with work and get no such thing as rest," he wrote" Lyman who was in the northeast trying to raise funds for the college.

48. IBID.; ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, November 5, 1885.

CHAPTER TWO

1. November 10, 1892.
2. Frederick Rudolph, THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY (New York, 1962), 88. See also a brief but perceptive description in Christopher Jencks and David THE ACADEMIC REVOLUTION (Anchor Book Edition 1969), Chapter 1 and 2; and George Schmidt, The LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE
3. Rudolph, THE AMERICAN COLLEGE, 108-109.
4. Excerpts from the Yale Report of 1828 published in Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION (1961), 275-291. For a good discussion of the classical curriculum see Frederick Rudolph, CURRICULUM: HISTORY OF AMERICAN UNDERGRADUATE STUDY (1977). For an analysis of the Yale Report see Jack C. Lane, "The Yale Report of 1828 and Liberal Education," HISTORY OF EDUCATION JOURNAL, (27) Fall 1987, 325-338.
5. Rudolph, CURRICULUM, 68-73.
6. Rollins College Catalogue, 1885. (Hereinafter cited as Catalogue).
7. IBID.
8. IBID., 1888.
9. IBID., 1890, 1896.
10. Trustee Minutes, 1887.
11. Catalog, 1895.
12. Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Wisconsin New York, Ohio, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia. Catalog, 1890.
13. Trustee Minutes, 1886; SOUTH FLORIDA SENTINEL, September, 15, 1885; Walter Howe, "Recollections," Manuscript, Rollins Archives.
14. Catalogue, 1891.
15. I have reconstructed the ceremony from ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, November 11, 1886; CHASE SCRAPBOOK, Rollins Library; "Address" by William O'Neal, 1935, Rollins Archives.
16. Elizabeth Hooker, "Edward Hooker," Manuscript, Rollins Archives; Frederick Lewton, "Autobiography," Manuscript, Rollins Archives

17. Lewton, "Autobiography."
18. Trustee Minutes, 1889, 1890, 1891; Catalogue, 1893.
19. Lois Parker Meyers, "Recollections," Manuscript, Rollins Archives.
20. Catalogue, 1892.
21. Lewton, "Autobiography."
22. Catalogue, 1892.
23. Jencks and Reisman, ACADEMIC REVOLUTION, 28; Catalogue, 1894.
24. Faculty Minutes, 1886. Rollins Archives; Hooker to Martha Weld July 19, 1891. Hooker Papers. Rollins Archives.
25. Henry Mowbray, "Recollections," Manuscript. Rollins Archives; Faculty Minutes, 1889.
26. Trustee Minutes, May, 1889.
27. Faculty Minutes, 1890.
28. Ibid., 1889; Lewton, "Autobiography."
29. Rex Beach, "Recollections," Manuscript, Rollins Archives; Faculty Minutes, 1890; Emma Root Van Buskirk, "An Appreciation of Miss Eva Root," ALUMNI RECORD (June, 1931).
30. For a description and evaluation of the charter faculty see Lewton "Autobiography"; CHASE SCRAPBOOK; Thomas Baker, "Twenty Years at Rollins" Manuscript, Rollins Archives
31. Chase to Lyman, November 7, 1885, CHASE SCRAPBOOK; Trustee Minutes, February, 1893.
32. Van Buskirk, "Eva Root".
33. Hooker to E.K. Forte, October 17, 1890. Hooker Papers; Faculty Minutes, December 1890.
34. Mary Blackman Wallace, "Recollections," Manuscript, Rollins Archives; Baker, "Twenty Years".
35. For example see Hooker to E. V. October 15, 1889. Hooker Papers.
36. Faculty Minutes, October 1887.
37. Lyman to Hooker, October 7, 1886; December 7, 1887; For early financial problems see Lyman to Alonzo Rollins, October 5, 1886; and Hooker to Lyman, September 10, 1886. Hooker Papers.
38. Trustee Minutes, February and May 1888.

39. IBID., February, 1889' O'Neal, "Recollections," Manuscript, Rollins Archives.
40. IBID., May 1889.
41. IBID., May 1890.
42. O'Neal, "Recollections"; ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, September 21, 1888; LOCHMEDE, September 1888; Faculty Minutes, October 1888.
43. Hooker to C.M. Hutchins, December 18, 1891. Hooker Papers.
44. Hooker to Reverend Maile, October 28, 1891. IBID.
45. Hooker to Katy Beck, July 24, 1891.
46. IBID., December 5, 1891.
47. Trustee Minutes, February 7, 1892.

CHAPTER 3

1. Trustee Minutes, March, 1893.
2. Treasure's Report in IBID., December, 1892.
3. IBID. Income from the orange groves averaged about \$1,000 per year, but had reached \$2,000 in 1891. Hooker to Hutchins, October 10, 1891.
4. Ford to Classmates, May 10, 1893. Ford Papers.
5. Trustee Minutes, May, 1893.
6. IBID.; Executive Committee Minutes,
7. Trustee Minutes, April 17, 1893; April 26, 1893; O'Neal, "Recollections."
8. Trustee Minutes, September, 1893; October, 1893.
9. Copy of Speech in Ford Papers.
10. Fairchild Papers. Rollins Archives.
11. The Executive Committee Minutes show that Fairchild was on campus from January through May, 1894. See an article in ORANGE COUNTY REPORTER, March 15, 1894 for a discussion of Fairchild's trip north.
12. Trustee Minutes, May, 1894.
13. Treasurer's Report, Trustee Minutes, December, 1894.

14. Herbert Webber, "The Two Freezes in Florida, 1894-1895. YEARBOOK, Department of Agriculture, 1895.
15. William F. Blackman, HISTORY OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDIA (1927), 77-89.
16. O'Neal, "Recollections"; Thomas Baker, "Recollections." Manuscript, Rollins Archives.
17. One of the "stresses" arose from Fairchild's racial attitudes. Shortly after arriving from Oberlin College (which before the Civil War was a hotbed of abolitionism), Fairchild made it clear that should a Negro apply to Rollins he would judge the applicant on his qualifications, not on his color. This statement incensed several trustees, particularly Frederick Lyman, who warned Fairchild that he (Lyman) would withdraw his support of the college if it ever admitted a "colored" person. The incident left lingering hard feelings. In addition, Fairchild had personal financial problems. With nine children to support, the president's salary barely allowed him to make ends meet. For the controversy over racial policy see O'Neal, "Recollections." For Fairchild's resignation see Trustee Minutes, March, 1895.
18. Trustee Minutes, April, 1895.
19. See for example, FLORIDA TIMES-UNION ,September 28, 1895.
20. President's Annual Report, 1896. Ford Papers.
21. Trustee Minutes, February, 1896.
22. For background on Ward I have used William Shaw, THE EVOLUTION OF THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR. (1924); Thomas Baker, "George Morgan Ward," ALUMNI RECORD, IV (December, 1925); and various biographical pieces in the Ward Papers, Rollins Archives.
23. Interview with T.W. Lewton by Kay Lehman, July 31, 1956. Ward Papers; on student deception see Baker, Ward."
24. Ward Speech, February, 1930. Manuscript, Ward Papers. Ironically it may have been the college's financial plight that attracted Ward to Rollins rather than to Washburn College. If the college went under Ward could argue that it was unsalvageable; if the college's financial situation improved, he would be seen as a savior. He later candidly admitted as much: "I could do Rollins no harm; I could not hurt the the situation." Ward to Brown, June 5, 1896.
25. Ward Speech, June, 1896.
26. "Change at Rollins College." Supplement to the Catalogue of 1896. The "special groups" were: Moral and Political Sciences; History of the English, the Latin and the Greeks; and Natural Sciences.
27. IBID.
28. Frederick Rudolph, CURRICULUM: HISTORY OF THE COURSE OF STUDY IN

- AMERICA (), 191.
29. Catalogue, 1897, 1898.
 30. IBID., 1900.
 31. Ward Speech, February, 1930; Emma Ward to Fred Hanna, 1938. Copy in Ward Papers.
 32. Trustee Minutes, February, 1898; May, 1899.
 33. Ward Speech, 1930.
 34. O'Neal, "Recollections."
 35. Trustee Minutes, 1899.
 36. Ward Speech, 1930; O'Neal "Recollections."
 37. Trustee Minutes, 1901.
 38. O'Neal, "Recollections"; Faculty Minutes, 1901; 1902.
 39. Flagler to Ward, August 12, 1902; Emma Ward to Fred Hanna, March 21, 1938. Ward Papers; Trustee Minutes, February, 1902.
 40. Trustee Minutes, February, 1903.

CHAPTER 4

1. Trustee Minutes, January 12, 1903; February 18, 1903.
2. The preceding and following biographical history of Blackman is reconstructed from short biographical manuscript sketches in the Blackman Papers.
3. Blackman's dissertation--"The Making of Hawaii: A Study in Social Evolution", a model turn-of-the-century sociological study in what today would be called a third world nation, was published by Macmillan in 1899.
4. Marjorie Blackman, "Whom God Has Joined: The Story of William and Lucy Blackman," Manuscript, R.C. Archives.
5. IBID.
6. Speech by Hamilton Holt at Lucy Blackman's Memorial Service, 1942. Holt Presidential Papers.
7. SANDSPUR, 1903.
8. Blackman, "Whom God Has Joined."
9. Trustee Minutes, April, 1903.

10. Blackman, "Whom God Has Joined."; President's Annual Report, 1904.
11. ORLANDO STAR, April 29, 1904.
12. Pearson to Blackman, October 3, 1904; Blackman to Pearson, October 29, 1904; Pearson to Blackman, November 19, 1904.
13. Blackman, "Whom God Has Joined."
14. Patty Howe, "Rollins Twenty-five Years Ago," ALUMNI RECORD, 5 (1928).
15. Henry S. Pritchett, "Mr. Carnegie's Gift to the Teachers," OUTLOOK, 83 (MAY 4, 1906), 120-125.
16. Blackman to Pritchett, May 22, 1906.
17. IBID., August 2, 1906; February 28, 1907. Copy of Blackman's inaugural address in Blackman Papers.
18. Pritchett to Blackman, March 15, 1907.
19. Blackman to Pritchett, April 9, 1908.
20. President's Annual Report, 1904; Catalogue, 1905.
21. Blackman's Speech, October, 1906; Catalogue, 1907, 1908, 1910.
22. Faculty Minutes, October, 1901; Blackman to Dr. S.J. Cuervo, October 22, 1906.
23. Faculty Minutes, April, 1908.
24. IBID., April, 1904; Marjorie Blackman, "Recollections"; Anthony Morse, "Recollections," Manuscripts, in Blackman Papers.
25. My information on sports has come mostly from the weekly SANDSPURS.
26. See President's and Treasurer's Annual Reports for this period.
27. Fred Ensminger to General Board, January 2, 1902; Blackman to General Board, October 20, 1905; General Board to William Baldwin, November 7, 1903. Rockefeller Foundation Archives. Copies of extensive correspondence between the Blackman administration and the General Board in the R.C. Archives.
28. Blackman to Morse, June, 1903; Morse to Blackman, June 9, 1913; Blackman to Frederick Lyman, June 14, 1913.
29. Blackman to Pratt, October, October 3, 1914.
30. Blackman, "Whom God Has Joined"; Trustee Minutes, February, 1915.
31. Blackman to Lyman, October 17, 1913.

- 32.[Trustee] Edward Bower to Ward, April 17, 1916; Ward to Board of Trustees, April 12, 1916; Trustee Minutes, February 16, 1916.
- 33.Ward to Board of Trustees, January 25, 1916; Trustee Minutes, February, 1918.
- 34.Trustee Minutes, February, 1919.
- 35.IBID., November, 1919; TAMPA TRIBUNE, February 18, 1921.
- 36.Treasurer Annual Reports, 1920,1921; Trustee Minutes, November, 1921.
- 37.President's Annual Report, 1923.
- 38.IBID., 1924; Trustee Minutes, FEBRUARY, 1924.
- 39.Memorandum to Sprague, March 7, 1924. Sprague Papers.
- 40.Trustee Minutes, May,. 1924.
- 41.IBID., 1925.
- 42.IBID.

CHAPTER FIVE

1. Trustee Minutes, October 15, 1925.
2. Raymond Green to Holt, August 7, 1925. All the following Holt correspondence found in the Holt Presidential Papers, Rollins Archives.
3. Holt's background is well covered in Warren Kuehl, HAMILTON HOLT
4. It is not clear who authorized Bacheller to write Holt or whether he simply made the approach on his own impulse. His promise that he could get Holt "an unanimous call from the Board," proved to be unfounded. Bacheller to Holt, July 3, 1925; Holt to Board of Trustees August 2, 1925.
5. Bacheller to Holt, August 10, 1925; Trustee Minutes, March, 1925; Blackman to Holt August 12, 1925.
6. Trustee Minutes, August, 1925; October, 1925; Green to Holt, August 7, 1925.
7. Quoted in Kuehl, HOLT, 62.
8. IBID.; Holt to Morgan Gress, June 29, 1925; to William Blackman, June 30, 1925 and Bacheller, June 30, 1925.
9. Trustee Minutes, April, 1926; Holt to Father, April 27, 1926.

10. Trustee Minutes, October, 1925; William Short to George Carruthers, July 17, 1926; August 16, 1926.
11. Kuehl, HOLT, ; Hamilton Holt, "Rollins in the Making," ROLLINS COLLEGE BULLETIN, 19 (March, 1926); Holt, "Ideals For the Development of Rollins," ROLLINS COLLEGE BULLETIN 19 (June, 1926).
12. Edwin Slosson,
13. Holt, "The Ideal College President," INDEPENDENT 102 (May, 29, 1920), 285-287.
14. Holt, "Adventure in Commonsense Education," WORLD'S WORK 55 (February, 1928), 423-24.
15. Carrothers to Friend "Jack," August, 1958. Copy in Holt Presidential Papers.
16. Memorandum to the Faculty, "The Two Hour Study Plan," November, 1926.
17. Faculty Minutes, September 24, 1926.
18. IBID., October 25, 1926.
19. Holt, "Ideals For Rollins."
20. Carrothers, "Freedom in the Two Hour Plan," SANDSPUR, June 27, 1927.
21. Faculty minutes, September and October, 1926; SANDSPUR, October 1, 1926.
22. SANDSPUR, October 15, 1926; Memorandum, Dean's Office, "Report of the Students on the Two Hour Plan."
23. IBID.
24. Holt, "The Open-Air College of America," ROLLINS COLLEGE BULLETIN 25 (March, 1930); Leland Jenks to Dean Short, January 21, 1927.
25. See Warren Kuehl, "Holt Bibliography," copy in Holt Presidential Papers, for a complete listing.
26. Holt, "On the College Frontier: The Rollins Idea," NATION 131 (October 8, 1930.), 322-373.
27. All three reports were printed in "The Curriculum for the College of Liberal Arts," ROLLINS COLLEGE BULETIN 26 (February, 1931).
28. Student Curriculum Committee Report in IBID., 24-31. Watson's speech was published in SANDSPUR, November 10, 15, 1930 and republished in PROGRESIVE EDUCATION (December, 1930.)
29. Independent Student-Faculty Report in "Curriculum for the College of Liberal Arts," 31-39.

30. The following discussion of the conference is based on the verbatim typescript compiled in three volumes located in the Rollins Archives.
31. Catalogue, 1931-1932.

CHAPTER SIX

1. For Rice's background and his own description of how he was hired see John Rice, *I CAME OUT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY* (1942). Holt's version, not significantly different from Rice's, may be found Holt Memorandum on the Rice Affair, May 1933.
2. Holt to Rice, March 16, 1932; Rice to Holt, March 18, 1932; "Report of the Committee on the Fraternity System," March, 1932.
3. Memorandum from the President to the Fraternities, March 26, 1932.
4. Grover to Holt, April 10, 1932; Lounsbury to Holt, April 10, 1932.
5. Curriculum Committee Report, January, 1933; Faculty Minutes, January, 1933.
6. Holt to Howard Bailey, January 22, 1933; Faculty Minutes, January, 1933; Curriculum Committee Report.
7. Curriculum Committee to President Holt, January 18, 1933; Holt to Curriculum Committee, January 19, 1933.
8. Rice, *I CAME OUT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*, 306-08; Martin Duberman, *BLACK MOUNTAIN COLLEGE* (1972), 3.
9. Rice, *EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*, 301.
10. Duberman, *BLACK MOUNTAIN COLLEGE*, 4.
11. Willard Wattles to Holt, March 10, 1933; Dean Anderson's Memorandum on John Rice to President Holt, March 1933.
12. *IBID.*, where Anderson cites student and faculty complaints against Rice.
13. Interview with Rhea Smith; Carol Hemingway Gardner to author, February 10, 1979; Dean Anderson's Memo.
14. Holt's Memorandum on Rice Affair.
15. For example see Wattles to Holt, March 10, 1933.
16. Holt to Rice, March 21, 1933.
17. Holt to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) March, 1933.
18. Tyler to Holt, April 8, 1933; Holt to Tyler, April 18, 1933.

19. Interview with Theodore Dreier; Statement by Arthur Lovejoy, "Rollins College Report," BULLETIN OF THE AAUP, 19, No. 7 (November, 1933).
20. Tory's speech printed in SANDSPUR, April 8, 1933. Wattles warned Holt of the agitation in a letter on April 10, 1933. See also Winslow Anderson's Report on the Rice Affair.
21. Rice Holt, April 21, 1933; Executive Committee, Trustee Minutes, April 22, 1933; Holt to Rice, April 22, 1933; Holt to Asa Jennings April 27, 1933.
22. Rice, I CAME OUT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, 307. Interview with Theodore Dreier.
23. Holt to AAUP, May 6, 1933; Holt Memo on the Rice Affair, May, 1933.
24. Printed in AAUP, "Report on Rollins College," Appendix A, 439.
25. I have reconstructed the following discussion of the hearings from hand written notes kept by E. B. Brown, Holt Papers; from Rice, I CAME OUT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY; from Holt Memo on the Rice Affair and from the AAUP, "Report on Rollins College."
26. AAUP, "Report on Rollins College," 423; Trustee Minutes, February, 1932; Notes kept by E.B. Brown on the Rice Hearings.
27. Holt to Beard, May 24, 1933; ORLANDO SENTINEL, . May 25, 1933; AAUP, "Report on Rollins College," 439.
28. Memorandum on Conference with Rice Followers, June 2-5, 1933.
29. IBID.
30. Holt to Lounsbury, March 11, 1933; Trustee Minutes, June, 1933; Holt to Anderson, June 21, 1933.
31. Lounsbury to Holt, March 16, 1933; May 7, 1933.
32. Holt to Beard, May 24, 1933.
33. Margaret Dreier Robbins to Holt, May 24, 1933.
34. Trustee Minutes, April, 1933; Report of the Southern Association of Colleges [no date], copy in Holt Papers; Holt's testimony Before the AAUP Hearings, copy in Holt Papers.
35. John Goss to Holt, May 15, 1933; Holt to Goss, May 26, 1933.
36. AAUP, "Report on Rollins College, 427.
37. IBID. 429.
38. Printed in ROLLINS COLLEGE BULLETIN 29 (December, 1933).

39. The Black Mountain College Papers in the State Archives, Raleigh, North Carolina contain several letters from Rollins faculty wishing the new college well. Also interview with John Tiedtke.
40. Memorial statements by Theodore Dreier and Frederick Georgia, Black Mountain College Papers.

CHAPTER SEVEN

1. Holt to Gehring, October 29, 1928; Holt, "Ideals For the Development of Rollins College."
2. Holt to Dewitt Keech, May 10, 1926; Holt to John Rice, June 13, 1930; Holt to George Kirchway, June 15, 1931.
3. France to Holt, January 10, 1928; I have reconstructed France's career from his autobiography, MY NATIVE GROUNDS (1957).
4. Carol Hemingway Gardner to Author, October 3, 1979.
5. Report of Charles Judd, January 27, 1930. Rockefeller Foundation
6. Catalogue, 1927; Comment by the authors in FLAMINGO, 1927; H.E. Hawkes Report on Rollins, January 27, 1930. Rockefeller Foundation Archives; Holt to Gehring <no date>. Dee Brown from George Washington University and later the author of the best selling book BURY MY HEART AT WOUNDED KNEE, won THIRD prize that year.
7. Carol H. Gardner to author.
8. Trustee Minutes, April, 1926.
9. Treasurer's Report, 1927; Holt to Milton Warner, November 8, 1927.
10. O'Neal to ; Holt, July 16, 1927; Holt to O'Neal, July 25, 1927.
11. Trustee Minutes, June 6, 1928.
12. Brown to ; Holt, August 2, 14, 1928; December 15, 1928; O'Neal to Holt, November 22, 1928; August 2, 1928.
13. President's Annual Report, 1929; Trustee Minutes, December, 1919.
14. Gehring to Holt, January 31, 1929; Kenneth Wilson, "Recollections" Manuscript, Holt Papers; Holt to Bingham, February 8, 1930; Holt to Gehring, January 31, 1930.
15. Holt to Harold Strong, April 29, 1931.
16. Trustee Minutes, February 19, 1930.
17. IBID., May , 1931.
18. IBID., October, 1932.

19. IBID., October, 1932; President's Annual Report, 1933
20. Rollins AAUP Committee to Holt, January 21, 1933; Holt's Statement on Rice Affair, April, 1933.
21. Holt seems to have first conceived the idea of the Unit Cost Plan after hearing from the Rockefeller Foundation. College literature claimed that the plan was a "program entirely new in college finance." President Robert Leigh of Bennington College quickly informed Holt that his college had used the method since 1928. Leigh to Holt, March 13, 1934; Holt to Leigh, April 19, 1934.
22. ROLLINS RECORD, November, 1933.
23. Carlton South to Dean Anderson, June 18, 1934; Brown to Holt, August 7, 1934.
24. Treasurer's Report, 1934; Trustee Minutes, April, May, 1934; Bingham to Holt, May 14, 1934; Brown to Holt, May 23, 1935.
25. Catalogue, 1940-45.
26. IBID.; Professor George Waddington to Holt, November 10, 1942; "Brochure" WAP, March, 1942; SANDSPUR, March 18, 1943; Brown to O'Neal July 31, 1942; Holt to Anderson, October 13, 1943; O'Neal to holt, July 22, August 8, 1943.
27. Catalogue, 1946.
28. Trustee Minutes, March, 1948.
29. Treasurer's Report, 1948; Holt to Trustees, December 12, 1948; Mrs. Stanley Cleveland to Mrs. Warren, May 30, 1948; Brown Memo to Trustees. June 19, 1948.
30. Report from the Faculty Administration Board, February, 1948.
31. Trustee Minutes, February, 1948.
32. IBID., June, 1948.
33. Holt to Wendell Stone, July 2, 1948; Holt to Trustees, July 2, 1948; Trustee Minutes, September, 1948.
34. Treasurer's Report, 1949.
35. Holt to Stone, July 2, 1948.

CHAPTER 8

1. Trustee Minutes, May 31, 1950. For Wagner's background, I have used material from the biographical file in the Wagner Papers, Rollins Archives and from Hartzell Spence, "Education's Boy Wonder," COLLIERS (January 13, 1951).
2. Spence, "Boy Wonder"; NEWSWEEK (August 8, 1949); NEW YORK TIMES, June 8, 1949.
3. Faculty Minutes, January 7, 1950; SANDSPUR, January 18, 1950.
4. SANDSPUR, October 10, 1950; Trustee Minutes, October, 1950.
5. Faculty Minutes, April 10, 1950; Enyart Statement Concerning the Wagner Affair <no date>. Rollins Archives. As evidence of the animosity created by the Wagner affair, the records for this incident for years were stored not in the Archives but in the basement of old Mills library vault, in a file cabinet that was securely locked. I believe I was the first person to see these records since they were placed there.
6. Memorandum to the Faculty, July 15, 1950; Wendell Stone and Nathan Starr Statements. Wagner Affair Records.
7. Faculty Minutes, September 25, 1950; Trustee Minutes, October 1950. For the national problem see "Crisis in the Colleges," TIME (June 29, 1950).
8. Faculty Minutes, October 30, 1950.
9. Wagner to Stone, December 15, 1950; Trustee Minutes, February, 1951.
10. I have reconstructed Wagner's performance from several trustee depositions located in the Wagner Affair Records. As evidence of the animosity created by this affair, these depositions were stored under lock and key in the vault of the old Mills library. I believe I was the first person to see them since they were placed there.
11. Trustee Minutes, February 27-29, 1951.
12. IBID.
13. IBID.
14. Public Relations News Release, March 17, 1951; Stone Survey, February 1, 1951.
15. Faculty Minutes, March 5, 1951.
16. France Statement in the Wagner Affair Records.
17. SANDSPUR, March 10, 1951; Kay Lehman to George Carrison, March 15, 1951.

18. This and the following discussion of faculty activity is reconstructed from several faculty statements in the Wagner Affair Records.
19. SANDSPUR, March, 1951.
20. Statement by Flora Magoon, Wagner Affair Records.
21. Faculty Minutes, March 11, 1951.
22. My account of this meeting is reconstructed from statements by students, faculty and trustees in the Wagner Affair Records, and a special issue of the SANDSPUR, March 12, 1951.
23. Faculty Minutes, March 13, 1951; Faculty statements in the Wagner Affair Records.
24. Trustee Minutes, March 14, 1951.
25. IBID., March 16, 1951.
26. See ORLANDO SENTINEL, March 12-20, 1951 for almost daily coverage of crisis; SANDSPUR, March 17, 1951; Alumni statements in the Wagner Affair Records; Bancroft and Carrison in the Wagner Affair Records.
27. TIME, March 19, 1951; LIFE, March 26, 1951.
28. Carrison Statement.
29. Trustee Minutes, March 29, 1951.
30. Holt to Wagner, April 10, 1951; ORLANDO SENTINEL, April 12, 1951.
31. Trustee Minutes, April 14, 1951; Statements by Trustees in Wagner Affair Records.
32. IBID.
33. SANDSPUR, April 15, 1951; Trustee Minutes, April 16, 1951; Visiting Committee Report, May 9, 1951; ORALNDO SENTINEL, April 26, 1951.
34. Trustee Minutes, April 27, 1951; Trustee Statements in Wagner Affair Records.
35. SANDSPUR, May 10, 1951.
36. Reconstructed from Statement by George Carrison in Wagner Affair Records.
37. IBID., and statements by faculty and trustees in Wagner Affair Records.
38. Trustee Minutes, May 15,17, 22, 1951; ORLANDO SENTINEL, May 17, 20, 1951.

39. Telegram to Florida House of Representatives, May 24, 1951; ORLANDO SENTINEL, "Central Floridians to Run Rollins," May 25, 1951.
40. For statewide protect see for example TAMPA TRIBUNE, May 27, 1951.
41. Trustee Minutes, April 27, 1951.
42. Wagner to McKean, June 7, 1951.

CHAPTER NINE

1. The national educational account was reconstructed from Christopher Jencks and David Reisman, THE ACADEMIC REVOLUTION (1962), 28-50. Report of the Presidents Commission on Higher Education, 1947, 41-51; Frederick Rudolph, CURRICULUM, 282-285.
2. McKean to Lester Sutler, January 24, 1952; SANDSPUR, September 27, 1951.
3. President's Annual Report, 1954.
4. Faculty Minutes, January 7, 1952.
5. Trustee Minutes, July 11, 1951; Report to the Trustees, February, 1952. Emphasis added.
6. Trustee Minutes, February 23, 1952.
7. IBID.
8. President's Annual Report, 1955; 1956.
9. IBID., 1965.
10. IBID, 1953,1954,1955.
11. IBID., 1960.
12. IBID.
13. IBID., 1961; Faith Conger to McKean, January 6, 1952.
14. Report of William Reich for the American Institution of Management, January, 1963.
15. Report of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, February, 1963.
16. President's Annual Report, 1966, 1967, 1968.
17. Information garnered from IBID.
18. Trustee Minutes, May, 1969; December, 1969.
19. President's Annual Report, 1968.

