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A TROUBLED TRANSITION:
FROM PRESIDENT MORGAN TO PRESIDENT WAUGH

Dickinson College's twentieth-century journey has been marked primarily, though not entirely, by gains: increases in numbers of students and faculty, advances in the quality of the program offered, and a general broadening of opportunities for those enrolled in this program. Specific advances have been identified with particular presidential administrations, and have been gracefully limned by Charles Coleman Sellers's general history of the college.

For those interested in the academic policies of Dickinson College in this century, one administration stands out for the potential it embodied, but did not realize: the administration, in the early thirties, of Karl Tinsley Waugh. Waugh's brief tenure at Dickinson offers a case study in the kinds of tensions and frustrations which can spring from any effort to orchestrate change, and it is presented here as a vignette of Dickinson history. Because of its brevity, Waugh's administration was not a landmark in Dickinson history. But it might have been, and deserves on that account to be better known. To understand President Karl Tinsley Waugh and his travails, however, it is essential first to introduce his immediate predecessor and ultimately his nemesis, James Henry Morgan, and to place each of their presidencies, as well as their personalities, in the context of the other.

The evening prior to Morgan's selection as acting president of Dickinson College, in the spring of 1914, following the nearly disastrous administration of Eugene Noble, one of the college faculty ruminated about the prospective choice. "All wires," he wrote to a friend, had been "oiled" for Morgan, then dean of the college. "They [the trustees] feel the Dean is safe—has been on the job for thirty-two years, has been an efficient dean, we all will give them that, and is a safety valve, has a very few years before he goes on. . ."1

This somewhat cynical appraisal was close to the mark in some respects. Morgan was indeed the obvious and safe choice to head the college in a time of trouble. He was an organization man of immense energy and unstinting loyalty to alma mater.2 These were important assets in the minds of the trustees. As Boyd Lee Spahr, one of the trustees who had advocated Morgan's selection, recalled two decades later:

everyone felt that the situation required a man thoroughly familiar with the condition of the College and one who would conserve every dollar to maintain proper standards, and who was willing to work in the summer time to bring in students, and one who would restore harmony and hopefulness in the faculty, both of which were sadly lacking.3

In choosing Morgan the trustees were getting a known quantity.4 He had been associated with, and lived for Dickinson much of his life. Born in rural Delaware in 1857, Morgan had entered Dickinson in 1874. The college at that time was reeling from a faculty purge engineered by President McCauley, and the entering class of which Morgan was part comprised only sixteen students, nine of whom graduated four years later. Morgan did not let this depress him. He excelled in his studies and particularly stood out in the class scraps so much a part of college life at that time.
Upon graduation he taught for some time in Methodist prep schools before returning to his alma mater in 1882 to head the Dickinson College preparatory school. Two years later he was named adjunct professor of Greek and given duties in the small college library.

As a teacher Morgan was forceful rather than learned, too forceful for some students. Nonetheless, he brought the classics alive, and quickly became one of the personalities with whom generations of Dickinsonians have identified the "Old College": there was Morgan the participant in class fights (a proctor, he enjoyed wading in and evening matches up a bit); Morgan the disciplinarian; Morgan the proponent of prohibition; Morgan the booster of Dickinson College. His enthusiasm, and his penchant for discipline, led to promotion to freshman class dean in 1893 and dean of the college ten years later. Named president in 1914, Morgan determined to prove the trustees' instincts right.

The college which Morgan was chosen to lead was in several financial straits. A debt of $126,000 under President George Reed had grown to $135,000 under his successor Noble, and creditors were growing impatient. More ominously, enrollment had declined to some 259 students in the 1913–1914 academic year. Three priorities
stood uppermost: eliminate the debt, bring in more students, maintain academic standards. In short, survival.

Morgan achieved all this and more. In five years of persistent economizing, Morgan reduced the debt by more than half, and despite World War I and the drop in enrollment it provoked, he managed to eliminate the debt completely by 1923. Enrollment was increased, slowly but steadily, to a record 529 by 1924—and this in spite of a stiffening admission requirement. Faculty salaries remained abysmally low, but Morgan determined to rectify the situation as soon as feasible, and by the end of his presidency had in fact made reasonable strides in the direction of adequate compensation for Dickinson's faculty and staff.

Morgan had revered President Reed, but nourished no visions of Dickinson as a great university. His aim was to stress the advantages of Dickinson's smallness and to make the college a first-class small college. "Quality rather than quantity should be our aim" was his refrain.

This meant a new seriousness about academic standards. Students who could not meet college requirements were to be quickly dropped. In 1919, three years before Frank Aydelotte of Swarthmore introduced his famous honors program, Dickinson inaugurated one of her own. Between 1919 and 1922 some twenty students took advantage of the opportunity to do additional work equivalent to eight semester hours and a thesis on a subject of their choosing. Recognizing that this was an age of increasing specialization, the college required that all students map out major and minor fields.

At the same time, what was considered valuable in the traditional college was to be maintained. Recitation sections would be continued and "kept small." Liberal arts would remain the foundation of the college course, and the classics, rather broadly construed, the foundation of the liberal arts. Business and engineering programs were disdained by Dickinson's president.

Morgan's central theme was that Dickinson was primarily a teaching and learning institution. If the ideal of Mark Hopkins and the log was largely outdated even in Hopkins's own day, the student-teacher relationship nonetheless remained vital, in Morgan's view, to the educational experience. The college was after all a meeting of minds, and what better means than in small classes taught by a faculty that really cared about students. As Gilbert Malcolm, editor of the Dickinson Alumnus, reflected in an article on Morgan's policy of "limited enrollment" in 1926:

"Among Dickinsonians there are many who would . . . preserve the college with its intimacy between student and teacher, its campus compactness, its student body democracy, its neighborliness, and the great service it renders as a result of all there."

Was this kind of environment conducive to first-rate scholarship? Morgan believed so. He was fond of citing cases when representatives of prestigious graduate, medical, and law schools told him that Dickinson students ranked with the best they had accepted. These words, not surprisingly, were music to the ears of the trustees. Morgan drew less unanimous applause for his old-fashioned notions of the purposes of the college. Although his paens to Dickinson's concern for "the things of the spirit" was acceptable as rhetoric, Morgan's stress on the college's production of
teachers and ministers was irritating to some. “Only four colleges anywhere supplied the state with more teachers than Dickinson,” Morgan told the trustees in 1921. “For two years in succession we have had more men in our theological seminaries than any of the three larger colleges of the church by which we are surrounded, Allegheny, Syracuse, and Wesleyan.” When Boyd Lee Spahr, a trustee who envisioned the college more in terms of a pre-professional school, protested against this kind of boasting, Morgan backed down a bit, but his mind was probably not much changed.12

During Morgan’s long tenure the students were engaged in activities which had traditionally held their fancy. To judge by the Dickinsonian, athletics remained the prime campus interest with social and fraternity life as absorbing as ever. Fraternities were ascendant; the literary societies, by contrast, were able to maintain a feeble grasp on life only because the college mandated participation for students to achieve honors at graduation. Student government and an honor system had been instituted at Dickinson during the Morgan years, but neither received much attention from the student newspaper, except in times of internal disarray or confrontation with the president. Students’ interests remained insular. From their perspective, the major problem the college faced was that its teams were not winning enough. The issue concerned President Morgan as well, though not exactly in the same way. Aware that Dickinson could never keep pace with the expenditures of rival schools in intercollegiate athletic programs, and troubled by what he perceived to be overprofessionalization in college sports, Morgan moved to tone down the emphasis on athletic competition at Dickinson. He never got the chance, however, to effect any real reforms in this realm.13 In early 1928 at age 71, Morgan suffered a physical breakdown, and realized it was time to slow down. He had not had a vacation in fifteen years. Morgan retired in the summer of 1928, satisfied with his achievement and pleased that he would be succeeded by his own Dean, Mervin Filler. Filler, the first nonclergyman to head the college (Morgan had a D.D. though he never served actively in any ministerial capacity), was an alumnus, and a man who had been by Morgan’s side for thirty years.

In his inaugural address Filler pledged to carry on in the Morgan tradition.14 This he did, though inklings of change, at least among the students, were evident. Dickinsonian editorials began to comment (rather ponderously, it must be said) upon trends in higher education. Specifically discussed were “liberal culture,” “the liberal arts college movement,” and the merits of small colleges in the education of American youth.15 Another indicator of a new student mood was the increase in library book circulation and the institution, at student behest, of Sunday hours. During the Filler years there was no noticeable interest evinced in the depression, but on the whole it seems that students, while still strongly conservative for the most part, were growing rather more serious.16

Filler himself did not have much opportunity to leave his imprint on the college. Already a seriously sick man when he took over the presidency, he died in the spring of 1931, less than three years following his inauguration. His death brought Morgan back into the presidential chair on a temporary, nonsalaried basis. It also necessitated a new and more wide ranging search for a president. Convinced that the new president should this time be an outsider, the trustees worked from a short list
of five potential choices, concluding their deliberations with the selection of Karl T.
Waugh, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts of the University of Southern Cali­
fornia.\textsuperscript{17}

Waugh, who would take up his duties in January, 1932, was strong in precisely the
area where his most recent predecessors had been weak: scholarship. He had taken
his graduate degrees in psychology, working at Harvard under William James, and
had taught at the University of Chicago, Beloit, and Berea Colleges before taking up
his duties in California. This academic background had been Waugh's greatest asset
in the selection process, and it stood to reason that academic innovation would be a
major concern during the Waugh presidency.\textsuperscript{18}

For his part Morgan, outwardly pleased to be relieved of his administrative
responsibilities and free to write a history of the college in time for its sesquicenten­
nial in 1933, expressed pleasure with the appointment. In a series of letters to Waugh
and as host during the Waugh's first visits to Carlisle, Morgan did his utmost to
make the new first family feel at home. Waugh was himself pleased by the hospitality
and offers of aid and delighted with the opportunities he thought would be afforded
him as president of Dickinson. He intended to make the most of them.\textsuperscript{19}

In truth, there was much to be done. Morgan's long administration and Filler's
brief regime had, to be sure, been constructive. Academic standards had been
strengthened, the financial structure of the college bolstered, alumni relations im­
proved, athletics de-emphasized. An Honors program had been introduced, a
majors system instituted. Faculty quality and salaries had been raised, and so had
admission standards. Hazing and other nonsense prevalent in American colleges in
the prewar years had with administration prodding begun to taper off at
Dickinson.\textsuperscript{20}

Yet the college remained weak in various areas. Its library was antiquated, ill­
staffed, and poorly stocked with books. The curriculum had not been much changed
since the early years of the century. The faculty was probably too "inbred," and ad­
ministration remained haphazard.\textsuperscript{21} In general, the college lacked direction, lacked
a sense under Morgan and Filler that it understood the trends of the day in higher
education.

Versed in administration, keenly attuned to the currents of the liberal arts college
movement, Waugh immediately took charge and offered the kind of aggressive
leadership he believed he had been brought in to provide. As president, he acted on
several fronts to build a new Dickinson. The curriculum was reassessed, a new pro­
gram formulated, and educational objectives of a new order were stated in the col­
lege catalogue. Waugh projected a college course divided into two parts. In the
"lower division," geared for freshmen and sophomores, general survey courses
would be mandated "to give the student some acquaintance with each of the impor­
tant fields of human knowledge." Included as well were "those studies which form
the indispensable tools for the acquisition of later knowledge, language and
mathematics, and, particularly, training in expression in English." In the "upper
division," for juniors and seniors, students would devote their time to "a field of
concentration preparatory to graduate work, or professional studies, or some
special occupation."\textsuperscript{22} The old odes to teacher and preacher preparation were to be
heard no more.
For Waugh, increased student responsibility was essential to a meaningful college education. Thus his efforts to restructure and expand the role of student government at Dickinson; thus his new "cut" policy, which provided a minimum number of cuts for all students, with more excused absences provided to students with higher grade point averages; his attempt to eliminate some of the abuses in the fraternity rush system; his interest in courses in sociology, psychology, and "planning," and his desire to expand the honors program and its independent study options.\textsuperscript{23}

Waugh recognized, too, that new initiatives had to be taken in the realm of college finance. Morgan had always been an economizer, but had had no system, had never prepared a budget. Waugh instituted a new budget system, distributed the college's funds for safekeeping among several local banks to maximize income and minimize the danger to the college in case of a bank failure, and sought to replace the Morgan scholarship system with a new loan policy which would provide funds for more students. Recognizing that Dickinson's floundering athletic program was a major drain on the budget, Waugh proselytized for an end to athletic scholarships and for Dickinson's move to a less rigorous level of competition. The beauty of the de-emphasis on team sports, in his view, was that it seemed essential in terms of the economic picture and was consonant with Waugh's own tendency to stress the life of the mind.\textsuperscript{24}

Students seem to have appreciated the energy as well as the proposals of the new president. Moreover, they were impressed by his evident interest in them, manifest by his appearance at student social functions and the occasional open house he and Mrs. Waugh held to discuss literary and cultural issues.\textsuperscript{25} But if students were satisfied with their president, other constituencies apparently were not. Former President Morgan, who continued to reside in Carlisle and remained active on the College Board of Trustees, was one of those whose initial liking for Waugh soon dissipated. Joining him in dissatisfaction with the course pursued by Waugh were a faculty clique devoted to Morgan and an ever increasing number of trustees, including, most portentously, Boyd Spahr, who had been elected president of the board in June, 1931.\textsuperscript{26}

Reasons for their discontent are difficult to pinpoint precisely. It is likely that they were diverse, both tangible and intangible. Morgan, for example, seems to have adjusted poorly to being out of the spotlight at the college he had headed for nearly twenty years. Many of his policies were being altered or discarded, and he was not being consulted in advance about new policies. Most important, perhaps, for Morgan and for others, Waugh, the outsider, was moving too fast, trying to remake the college—their college—in his own image. The policies Waugh proposed were often difficult to quibble with per se, but something about them collectively and about the way they were being presented irked many of those who had long helped to shape college policy. Waugh's independence seemed alien to the Dickinson way. As Spahr was to write Morgan in June, 1933, regarding Waugh, "it is quite obvious that he was incapable of teamwork and that he wanted to run the college without suggestions or advice from either trustees or faculty."\textsuperscript{27}

In some areas, like Waugh's advocacy of sabbatical leaves for the faculty and his suggestion that the college might withdraw from intercollegiate competition if certain conditions were not met by other schools in its conference, overt alumni and
trustee resistance was evident. In other areas, such as the publication of the college catalogue, Waugh procrastinated overlong to suit the punctilious Spahr. Trustee dissatisfaction, the depth of which Waugh never perceived, led to his dismissal in June, 1933. Waugh was told, in effect, to resign, or life would become very difficult for him. He did so, but did not fade out of the picture without making life rather difficult for those who forced him out.

For one thing, Waugh refused immediately to vacate the presidential house on campus, perhaps out of spite, perhaps in the vain hope that somehow, when the students and uninformed alumni found out what had transpired, he would be reinstated. Waugh was right in believing that the students would back him. “Because of his true interest in the students,” read a statement of support for Waugh signed by a substantial portion of the student body in December, 1933, “they were ‘behind him,’ and they learned to love and respect him as well as to seek his advice.” This was no doubt as satisfying to Waugh, as it was troubling to those who had deposed him, but it did not win back his job.

Waugh resorted to statements to the press, suggesting that a cabal had meant to have him out all along. He denied the trustees’ right to dismiss him, and denounced their inference that there was something in his record which, if made public, would blot his reputation as a man and a scholar. Further, he suggested that the issue between him and his detractors boiled down to “medievalism v. modernism” for Dickinson College, a view endorsed by many students and at least several of the faculty.

Waugh’s scatter-shot technique weakened a strong case on his part. On the matter of the board’s prerogatives in hiring and firing, for example, he had not a leg to stand on. Name-calling won him few supporters among those who were trying fairly to judge the merits of the case. And it is evident that the basis for Waugh’s dismissal was far more complex than the “medievalism v. modernism” dichotomy he stressed. It is clear, for example, that most of the trustees, including President Boyd Spahr, were as intensely committed to academic excellence at Dickinson, to its emulation of elite eastern schools, as was Waugh. There is no record of grumbling about his curricular changes or his efforts to clean up student government and fraternity rush, or to improve the library. They were unhappy with Waugh the man more than anything else and saw the salvation of Dickinson in his removal.

Whether a cabal had long premeditated Waugh’s downfall we cannot know, but that the maneuver was well orchestrated, abrupt, and secretive, there is no doubt. Moreover, the grounds for dismissal and the reasons offered Waugh and the public were dubious, to say the least. In fact, the trustees refused repeatedly to tell Waugh why he was being dismissed, a point hammered home by Waugh’s supporters on campus, among the alumni, and in a national journal like the *New Republic*. As the liberal journal of opinion editorially argued: by dismissing Waugh “without making any definite complaint against him or giving him a chance to defend himself,” the trustees of the college have inexcusably damaged the reputation of an educator with an excellent record, whose policies as president had been popular with the overwhelming majority of the students and faculty.
The controversy was slow to die. Horrified by the publicity given the dismissal of Waugh, put on the defensive by alumni queries and student complaints, the trustees (and Morgan, installed once again as acting president) issued statement after statement in defense of their action, without ever once touching upon any of the actual bases for it. Waugh was charged with maladministration and blamed for the financial deficits under which the college (like so many others during these depression years) labored under; even his ethics were placed in question. Meanwhile, alumni groups had to be pacified, as did the students, and explanations had to be worked up for the AAUP, which was at this time investigating the failure to renew the contract of a young instructor whom Waugh had promised to rehire.

Eventually, some equilibrium was restored. Waugh moved out of the presidential house, the AAUP pronounced itself satisfied with the college's explanations in the Barnes case, and students began to adjust to life under a new regime. But a bad taste had been left in the mouths of many, and the college image certainly suffered, as attested by the decreased enrollment in 1934-35.

Under Morgan and his successor, an in-house choice, the Waugh years were excised from official memory. Morgan gave Waugh's administration exactly a page and a half in his history of the college, and made no mention of any Waugh-initiated policies or the reasons for his leave taking. Under Waugh's permanent successor, Fred Pierce Corson, a number of Waugh reforms were reversed or vitiated, and the new President worked hand in glove with Boyd Spahr and the board of trustees.

The clock could not, of course, be turned back. In the programs of the fifties and sixties, with their emphasis on curricular flexibility and innovation, greater student responsibility for regulating their lives outside the classroom, and student voice in college affairs, Karl Waugh received a measure of vindication.

MICHAEL J. BIRKNER
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1. Leonard Stott Blakey to “Miss P,” n.d., DCA. Blakey was Professor of Economics and Sociology at Dickinson during the 1913-14 academic year.

2. For the 'organization man' motif I am indebted to Charles Coleman Sellers, “James Henry Morgan,” unpublished lecture delivered to the Cumberland County Historical Society, n.d., DCA.
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8. Morgan's report to trustees, 21 May 1921, DCA.


11. Dickinson Alumnus, III (Feb., 1926). Morgan was almost lyrical in his stress on the college as a teaching institution in one of his final reports to the trustees. Viz.: "The teacher is the college, and no amount of equipment or beauty of environment apart from the teacher can make a college. On the other hand, the teacher—that is, the great teacher—even without most of the things today considered necessary to a college, the great teacher almost alone can make a great college, can project himself into the life of a youth and evoke his best. In other words, great teaching alone is the only absolute sine qua non of the great college." Report to Trustees, 3 June 1927.

12. Morgan, Report to Trustees, 17 May 1921; Report to Trustees, 2 June 1924, DCA. "The things of the spirit" quote is from the closing line of Morgan's history of the college (p. 398).
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26. Although logic indicates that dissatisfaction with Waugh began to build shortly after he assumed his duties, the extant correspondence between one of those who turned against him (Board of Trustees Chairman Boyd Lee Spahr) gives little hint of any rift. See, e.g., the businesslike, often cordial exchanges in the Spahr Papers, DCA. In fact, Spahr congratulated Waugh, 22 Sept. 1932, on the increased enrollment. “That is a fine piece of work,” he told the man he would help depose less than a year later. As for Morgan, there is virtually no correspondence (extant) between him and Waugh beginning in Jan. 1932, and lasting to May 1933, when they commenced a most acrimonious correspondence. (Morgan file on Waugh, DCA.)


28. On the sabbatical program, see particularly Lemuel T. Appold to Waugh, 31 May 1932, and Waugh's consiliatory response, 9 June 1932, in Lemuel Towers Appold Correspondence, DCA.


30. The students' statement is in Waugh Presidential Papers, DCA.

31. For Waugh's public statement on his dismissal, see esp. “An Open Letter to Dr. J.H. Morgan,” which appeared in the local and Harrisburg papers and to which Morgan et al. spent much energy seeking to refute.
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35. The Waugh reforms were ripped out in a series of motions passed by the faculty in late June 1933. Others eventually reemerged in different form during Corson's tenure as president, and after. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., to author, 16 April 1979.