"Gettysburg College is fortunate in having preserved its original building, perhaps even more fortunate that this symbol of its early days is a worthy piece of architecture." G. Edwin Brumbaugh, 1965.
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Preface

It is only for the years treated in this volume that there are persons living at the time of its writing who experienced Gettysburg College as students and then later as alumni. I am grateful for all of those men and women who responded to my questions by sharing with me their recollections of Gettysburg half a century and more ago. Most of them are identified in footnotes on the following pages. In addition to the ones mentioned I want to express my appreciation to Dr. Donald R. Heiges, who always listened patiently to my detailed inquiries and then replied with the same forthrightness which I first encountered as an entering student in his freshman orientation course.

Charles H. Glatfelter

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania
February 17, 1987
Greater Gettysburg

As one step toward realizing the goal of a greater Gettysburg, in the spring of 1914 Architect George C. Baum presented the College with what President Granville called "a comprehensive and harmonious scheme for utilizing all the land now owned by the College...for future building sites and campus purposes." In addition to the "harmonious scheme," Baum presented preliminary drawings for the exteriors of a new preparatory department building and for a science hall. Photograph by P. Ross Ramer.
5.
TOWARD A GREATER GETTYSBURG
(1904-1945)

This chapter deals with the history of Gettysburg College between 1904 and 1945, the year in which World War II came to an end. During these forty-one years the United States remained the world's leading industrial power. Among the older established industries, production of raw steel increased from 15,205,000 tons in 1904 to a world-record 89,642,000 tons in 1944, the last full calendar year of the war. By the beginning of the twentieth century, mass production of goods for consumers was fast becoming an important feature of the American economy. Some 8,000 automobiles were already registered in 1900, more than 8,100,000 in 1920, and 26,000,000 in 1945. Especially in the 1920s, urged on by advertising and the easy availability of consumer credit, many families purchased their first electric refrigerator, toaster, iron, washing machine, radio or some other household appliance. Between 1900 and 1929 the actual level of living of most Americans increased markedly. In the 1920s some economists and politicians optimistically asserted that what they called a new era had arrived, one in which Americans had outgrown the propensity to depression which had characterized and bedeviled their past. For a time in the 1920s the most popular folk hero was an automobile manufacturer, Henry Ford. His successor, Charles A. Lindbergh, owed his fame to another device which was all but unknown in 1900: the airplane. Between the censuses of 1900 and 1940 American population increased from almost 76,000,000 to 131,700,000. Thanks to a declining birth rate and a precipitous decrease in the number of immigrants after 1914, the percentage increase during these forty years was significantly lower than that during any earlier period of similar length since the first census of 1790. Urban population, as defined by the census bureau, exceeded 50 percent of the total for the first time only in 1920; it stood at 57 percent in 1940. Even more important than the changes which these data reflected were those occurring in beliefs and behavior as American society with each passing decade became more thoroughly industrial. Especially affected by these changes were the statuses of women and youth, both of which groups figured more

---

prominently in American life in 1940, certainly in 1945, than they
had in 1900.

The years from 1904 to 1945 were also important ones in the his-
tory of American education. Already by 1904 Americans had accept-
ed the idea that every child should have an elementary education,
and in the forty years that followed they came close to making it a
reality. Especially after World War I, they began committing them-
selves to the goal of universal secondary education and made com-
mendable progress toward reaching it. Whereas fewer than 7
percent of the seventeen-year olds in 1904 were high school
graduates, about 49 percent of those in 1940 had earned their
diplomas. There are varying estimates of undergraduate college and
university enrollment in 1904, but certainly there were about 760,000
arts and sciences students in 1941-1942, the academic year during
which the United States entered World War II. There were 165,346
baccalaureate and first-professional degrees conferred in the latter
year, about 44 percent of which were awarded to women.\(^2\)

It was already evident by 1904 that, in spite of the dire predictions
of John W. Burgess and others, the liberal arts college had surprising
vitality and ability in responding to the needs of an increasingly
complex industrial society. College authorities participated in
developing national standards for admission, which assumed a
higher level of secondary school performance than many of them
had accepted in the past. In an effort to improve faculty perform-
ance, colleges began requiring possession of an earned doctorate for
holding the rank of professor. In every field, but especially in the
sciences, social sciences, education, and business administration,
they continued developing their curricula. Both colleges and univer-
sities participated with others in formulating criteria which could be
used in measuring their capacity to perform creditably. The
Association of American Universities, The Carnegie Foundation for
the Advancement of Teaching, the General Education Board, the
Regents of the State of New York, and the United States Bureau of
Education had all begun such efforts before the Association of
Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and
Maryland adopted its initial set of standards for colleges of liberal
arts and sciences in 1919 and published its first list of accredited
institutions in 1921.\(^3\)

By 1904 the United States had become a world power, with over-
seas possessions and a respectable navy. Although it did not ally


\(^3\)The organization is now the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and will hereafter be referred to as the Middle States Association.
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itself with either Triple Alliance or Triple Entente, it entered World War I on the Allied side in 1917. After the war, the United States refused to join the League of Nations, but it was not able to isolate itself from the great depression which hit most of the world at the end of the twenties and which continued far into the next decade. In spite of the strong preponderance of public opinion up to December 7, 1941, America was no more successful in staying out of World War II than she had been in remaining neutral a generation earlier. These three dramatic events - two wars and a major depression - had a marked impact on most American colleges and universities. All three threatened to rob these institutions of their male students, of a major part of their income, and - so it seemed at the time - of their ability to survive. Colleges had been confronted by wars and depressions before, but for many those in the twentieth century appeared to be even more menacing than any in the past.

Between 1904 and 1945 Adams county continued to be a small, rural, agricultural county. Its population grew, but only from 34,496 in 1900 to 39,425 in 1940. The nearest thing to a city within its limits continued to be the borough of Gettysburg, with a 1940 population of 5,916. The battlefield still attracted a host of visitors, many of whom now came by automobiles, eventually over paved and state-maintained roads. The fiftieth anniversary of the battle was celebrated in 1913. The last reunion of the Blue and Gray occurred during the seventy-fifth anniversary in 1938. The College figured prominently in the local arrangements for both of these occasions.

In one way or another, Gettysburg College participated in virtually all of the developments in American life mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. Enrollment increased to such an extent that by the early 1920s, for the first time in her history, those responsible for the College's future concerned themselves with setting upper limits on the size of the student body. Less than a decade later, during the Great Depression, some of these same people were trying hard to find enough students to keep the institution going. In his report to the trustees in December 1930, President Henry W. A. Hanson attributed part of the College's difficulty to the severely depressed conditions in two basic industries, coal and steel, in areas which had contributed a "substantial proportion" of the student body. After

*The three presidents during the years 1904-1945 will be discussed in a later section. Between 1907 and 1923 their annual reports to the board of trustees were published, at first separately but beginning in 1911 as numbers of the Pennsylvania [later Gettysburg] College Bulletin. Hereafter cited as GCB. Beginning with December 1923, presidential reports to each board meeting are available in typescript (and are sometimes incorporated into trustee minutes) in GCA. In the following text, these reports will be identified by date without footnote reference.
A SALUTARY INFLUENCE

1904 men were added to the faculty who possessed the Ph.D. degree and who imparted an increasingly heterogeneous character to that body. Once again, as in the 1880s and 1890s, much needed new facilities were added to the campus: five buildings between 1916 and 1929. Gettysburg was included on the first list of accredited colleges which the Middle States Association published in 1921.

Soon after a new president assumed office in 1904, he and others began to urge that the College take prompt and effective steps to bring it into line with the educational developments of the day. As early as 1907 they began using the term Greater Gettysburg to describe the institution for which they were striving. As some of their original goals were reached, as others were discarded, and as new goals were adopted, the constituencies of two succeeding administrations frequently avowed their own commitment to bringing about a Greater Gettysburg. Not until the Great Depression and then World War II forced them to think in terms which sometimes bordered on survival was the slogan pushed aside. Nevertheless, efforts to realize a Greater Gettysburg constituted a major theme running through the first two-thirds of the period covered by this chapter, and in 1944 the president returned to it in expressing his hopes for the College in the postwar world.

Trustees

In the fall of 1904 ultimate responsibility for the College rested upon thirty-one trustees, of whom thirteen were Lutheran pastors and eighteen were business or professional men. Their average age was fifty-eight years. Five members were in their seventies (the oldest was seventy-nine); six were in their forties (the youngest was forty-one). Seven trustees had been in office for more than a quarter century (the senior member was a veteran of forty-two years), while almost half (fifteen, to be exact) had been elected during the preceding ten years. Twenty had attended Gettysburg College; seventeen had been graduated. Of these thirty-one trustees of 1904, eighteen eventually died in office, the last one in 1938, having reached the age of eighty-three and being in his thirty-seventh year of service. On the other hand, the membership of five of these trustees lapsed

5 For many years before and after 1904 the board chose not to maintain its membership at the level which the charter prescribed (36). For example, there were twenty-nine trustees in 1909-1910 and thirty in 1929-1930. On several occasions while the charter membership was still thirty-six it was reported by the College as being thirty.

6 The youngest trustee of 1904, John B. McPherson, was thirty-three when he was chosen in 1896 to succeed his late father, Edward McPherson. With the exception of the years 1859-1860, three generations of this family served on the board in succession between 1832 and 1932.
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through their failure to attend meetings with the prescribed regularity.

During the forty-one year period covered by this chapter, a total of ninety men (including the thirty-one of 1904) were College trustees. At least four others were elected to the board, but never served; their names do not appear in any catalogue. Although deaths, resignations, and lapses in membership usually led to the election of at least one trustee each year, during nine of the twelve years between 1924 and 1935 no new members were added to the board. Three-fourths of the ninety men were former students of the College; all but a few of these were also graduates. Since 1894 the charter required that at least three-fourths of the board be Lutheran. In recruiting new members the trustees always took this provision seriously. In all probability, both tradition and preference would have assured a large majority of Lutheran members, even in the absence of this charter requirement.

Almost a quarter of these ninety trustees were Lutheran pastors. Among those not already named and deserving special mention were

Charles M. Stock (1855-1913), pastor in Hanover, who served from 1894 to 1913;

William A. Shipman (1852-1934), pastor in Johnstown, who served from 1897 to 1934;

Henry H. Weber (1860-1936), a longtime general secretary of the Lutheran Board of Home Missions and Church Extension and later of the Board of American Missions, who served from 1899 to 1932;

Frederick H. Knubel (1870-1945), pastor in New York City and later first president of the United Lutheran Church in America, who served from 1914 to 1945;

Jeremiah Zimmerman (1848-1937), retired pastor living in Syracuse, New York, who served from 1917 to 1937;

Joseph B. Baker (1877-1946), pastor in Gettysburg, Indiana, and York, who served from 1921 to 1948;

Harry H. Beidleman (1889-1973), pastor in Hanover, who served from 1932 to 1955;

William J. Miller (1879-1961), pastor in Philadelphia, who served from 1939 to 1961; and

Stewart W. Herman (1878-1947), pastor in Harrisburg, who served from 1939 to 1947.

7Someone suggested to the executive committee in 1942 that there should be a woman on the board. Although the committee thought the suggestion a good one, the first woman was not elected until after 1945. A few men elected after 1904 attended no meetings and were soon dropped.
One of the most obvious changes in the composition of the board between 1904 and 1945 was the decline from about 42 to 22 in the percentage of Lutheran pastors. Of the eleven ordained men elected during the entire forty-one years, two were presidents of the College, one was a seminary professor, and one was a benefactor who had retired from the pulpit. Only seven were parish pastors at the time of their election.\(^8\)

Another obvious change in the composition of the board during this period was the decline in the number of Gettysburg residents in its ranks, from six in 1904 to two (including the president of the College) in 1945. R. William Bream (1850-1938), local farmer and banker, served from 1907 to 1938. Jacob A. Clutz (1848-1925), seminary professor, served from 1908 to 1925. From the time of the latter's election, twenty-four years elapsed before another resident trustee was chosen. J. McCrea Dickson (1889-1939), physician and surgeon, served from 1932 to 1939. John S. Rice was elected in the latter year but, since most of his tenure occurred after 1945, he will be discussed in the next chapter. Clearly, the members of the board had come to believe that the several valuable services which resident trustees had performed for the College ever since 1832 now could and should be secured in some other way.

More than half of the recruits to the board of trustees between 1904 and 1945 were nonresident business and professional men, who presumably were willing and especially able to provide the College with sound general direction and also with leadership in attracting the financial resources necessary for its steady improvement as an educational institution. Among these trustees were

- Luther P. Eisenhart (1876-1965), Princeton University professor, who served from 1907 to 1916;
- Martin H. Buehler (1861-1934), telephone company executive, who served from 1907 to 1934;
- Fred H. Bloomhardt (1873-1929), Altoona physician, who served from 1907 to 1922;
- William J. Gies, Columbia University professor, who served from 1908 to 1920;
- William L. Glatfelter (1865-1930), Spring Grove paper manufacturer, who served from 1908 to 1930;

---

\(^8\)Samuel G. Hefelbower, himself an ordained Lutheran pastor and president of the College from 1904 to 1910, told his successor in 1920 that "a board half preacher and half laymen...would be a preacher dominated board." He was obviously proud that, during his presidency, only four of the fourteen new trustees were clergymen. S. G. Hefelbower to William A. Granville, Carthage, Illinois, November 30, 1920, in GCA. In 1923 the Alumni Association presented the board with three possible candidates to fill an alumni vacancy. The trustees chose the one layman on the list. Star and Sentinel, June 16, 1923.
Six long-time trustees. The combined tenure of Dapp, Buehler, McAlister, and Stine as chairmen of the board was forty years. Swope photograph courtesy of Mrs. Donald M. Swope.
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Frank E. Colvin (1862-1945), Bedford attorney, who served from 1908 to 1945;
John F. Dapp (1868-1935), Harrisburg insurance executive, who served from 1908 to 1935;
George B. Kunkle (1868-1942), Harrisburg physician and surgeon, who served from 1908 to 1942;
Charles J. Fite (1876-1938), Pittsburgh grocer, who served from 1910 to 1938;
Burton F. Blough (1873-1928), Harrisburg clothing manufacturer, who served from 1910 to 1928;
Percy D. Hoover (1882-1940), Waynesboro physician, who served from 1914 to 1940;
Harvey C. Miller (1862-1936), Philadelphia shipping executive, who served from 1915 to 1936;
John B. McAlister (1864-1948), Harrisburg physician, who served from 1916 to 1948;
Louis S. Weaver (1877-1939), York physician and surgeon, who served from 1918 to 1939;
Charles T. Lark (1876-1946), New York City attorney, who served from 1922 to 1946;
George H. Hummel (1890-1961), York printing executive, who served from 1923 to 1949;
Paul B. S. Rice (1890-1950), Harrisburg insurance executive, who served from 1929 to 1950;
Charles M. A. Stine (1882-1954), Du Pont Company executive, who served from 1929 to 1953;
Amos E. Taylor (1893-1972), economist with the United States Department of Commerce, who served from 1932 to 1959; and

Several men recruited after 1936 who fall into this category, but most of whose tenure occurred after 1945, will be discussed in the next chapter.

One regular meeting each year, held in Gettysburg at commencement time, was enough to satisfy the trustees until 1910, when they instructed their officers to convene a second such meeting, in December. These midwinter sessions, as they were called, were held in Harrisburg, at first in Zion Lutheran church and later in the Pennsylvania Hotel. During World War II the board held several of its meetings in Philadelphia.

When the trustees met in June 1904, one of their first items of business was to act upon the resignation which their president, Philip H. Glatfelter, had submitted in the previous September, to become
A GREATER GETTYSBURG

effective immediately. While reluctantly accepting his resignation, his colleagues deferred choosing a successor until June 1905, when they elected Samuel D. Schmucker. A year later the trustees learned of his decision not to serve. Finally, after a vacancy of more than three years, in June 1907 they secured a president in the person of Edmund D. Graff (1846-1912), a Worthington woolen blanket manufacturer and brother of Charles D. Graff. After he died in office five years later, the trustees elected William L. Glatfelter, but he declined to serve. In June 1913 they persuaded John F. Dapp to accept the presidency. Poor health prompted him on five occasions to try to give up the office, but only in June 1931 did his colleagues finally accept his resignation. Martin H. Buehler served as president from 1931 until his death in 1934, and John B. McAlister from that date until he resigned in 1941. The trustees then elected Charles

Members of the board of trustees who attended the December 1923 meeting in Harrisburg posed for this picture.
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M.A. Stine, whose tenure continued beyond 1945. Harry C. Picking, who became treasurer of the College in 1893, died in office in 1925. The trustees then selected The Gettysburg National Bank to succeed him.9

Three long-established standing committees of the board were in existence in the fall of 1904: executive, finance, and honorary degrees. In anticipation of a new building program and of a College health service, the trustees in 1913 added two more to the list: a building and an infirmary committee. When the board adopted its first by-laws in 1940, these were the five committees named and whose duties were defined. A religious work committee was authorized in 1941.

Mindful of the charge contained in the charter, the members of the board continued to concern themselves with all phases of college life.10 Sometimes presidents, faculty, or students brought matters to their attention. On other occasions one or more of the trustees themselves placed items on the agenda. The members were closely involved in the two major curriculum changes which were made during this period. Although they delegated to the president more and more responsibility for the actual hiring and dismissal of faculty and staff, as well as for determining their salaries, in 1945 the board still retained all of its former authority in this area, and its members wanted to be informed of what was being done. Between 1904 and

9 In addition to being treasurer of the College, Picking was secretary of the board from 1913 until his death in 1925. His successor kept poor minutes which often failed to record important actions taken. For example, he failed to enter in the January 1927 minutes any notice that the trustees had approved a pension plan and a system of sabbatical leaves for professors. These omissions were dealt with only in December 1931, after former President Hefelbower, who was then writing a history of the College, called attention to them.

10 A work published in 1929 and surveying higher education under Lutheran auspices had this to say about the proper role of trustees, administrators, and faculty in the governance of American colleges: "The theory underlying the operation of higher educational institutions in the United States is that control shall be vested in non-salaried laymen and the operation in a salaried staff. The laymen are selected from the groups who have active interest in the institution under consideration and who form a body designated as the board of trustees or by a similar title. This board in turn employs professionally educated individuals for the actual operation of the institution." R. J. Leonard, E. G. Evenden, and F. B. O'Rear, Survey of Higher Education for The United Lutheran Church in America, 3 vols. (New York, 1929), 1:81. Hereafter cited as U.L.C.A. Survey. The 1924 U.L.C.A. convention authorized "a scientific survey of the educational situation in the United Lutheran Church," to be conducted by "Impartial experts outside of the Lutheran Church." Two years later Teachers College, Columbia University, agreed to do the work. Most of the eighteen institutions included were visited and data were gathered during the 1926-1927 academic year. Three volumes of findings, resulting from an investigation as extensive, intensive, and rigorous as one would expect from that of a regional accrediting agency, were published in 1929.

418
1945 there were many important questions which needed to be answered. What is the best size for the student body? Should women continue to be admitted? To what extent should the College permit hazing? Should students be allowed to live and eat in fraternity houses? How should the College athletic policies be determined and who should be responsible for its athletic program? To what extent should the faculty be directed to supervise or censor student publications? The board of trustees participated actively in fashioning answers to these and other questions. As before, they were not averse to saying no at times or to taking positions which were unpopular with part or all of the campus constituencies. On occasion, their intervention in the operations of the academic program, while not necessarily contrary to the letter or spirit of the charter, was nevertheless unwise.\footnote{In the 1920s the trustees rejected faculty recommendations that the R.O.T.C. program be dropped and that swimming be made a graduation requirement. In the same decade they began closing the College to women students, a decision whose wisdom must certainly be questioned. Since the board met infrequently, sometimes years passed before an issue was finally resolved.}

Some of the items on the agenda of the trustees related to the adequacy of the charter in meeting the needs of the College as it moved into a new century. These items were before the board for more than a decade, during which time it proceeded very slowly in dealing with them. There was much recourse to such devices as deferring action for a year, referring back to committee, and tabling. The major matters at issue were the tenure of board members, the size of the board, alumni and synodical representation, and the name of the College.

In June 1909 the Alumni Association asked the trustees to consider limiting their terms of office to a fixed number of years. When nothing came of this request, the association returned to the topic four years later, at which time five of the six alumni trustees agreed that one of them would resign each year (they hoped that the sixth would do the same thing), so that alumni trustees could then be elected for what would clearly be understood to be six-year terms, with the term of one expiring each year. Again, the Alumni Association commended the idea of specific terms for the entire board.

In response, the trustees in December 1913 authorized a committee to consider the alumni proposal, as well as "any other changes in the Charter of the College that may be found desirable." Reporting in June 1915, this committee recommended that the charter be altered to provide for the gradual introduction of six-year terms as new trustees were elected and that final action on this proposal be taken at the next annual meeting. The committee also dealt with the Alumni
Association proposal, made in 1914, that the name of the College be changed.\(^\text{12}\) It concluded that, since altering the corporate name “might involve some nice legal questions as to titles to property, the taking of legacies, etc.,” the board should not proceed until a committee of lawyer-members had completed the task of determining the long-term implications of a change of name. The board accepted the first recommendation, dealing with the terms of office, and decided, “after due consideration,” that it was “inadvisable to change the name of the College.”\(^\text{13}\)

Although the trustees had adopted a sense motion in 1914 favoring terms of office and although they had accepted the charter committee recommendation on the same subject a year later, when the time came to act in June 1916 they lost their resolve. The minutes explain what happened in these words: “A prolonged discussion followed and finally a motion prevailed that it be laid on the table.” They then named a new committee “to secure additional information, giving the experience of the Institutions of the Country on this question, and also to secure as far as possible the sentiment of the whole alumni body.”

Undaunted by the enormity of this task, the three members of this new committee gathered what information they could and presented their findings in June 1917. The majority members reported that neither the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, nor the United States Bureau of Education was able to provide them with adequate information on which to make a sound judgment. Nevertheless, it was evident to them from what help they did get from these agencies and from their own inquiries into the practices of many individual institutions that Gettysburg College should pursue to completion the proposed charter change and, further, in the interests of greater effectiveness, that it should include in the change gradual reduction in the number of trustees from thirty-six to eighteen. Accordingly, the majority strongly recommended that the motion of 1916 be removed from the table and adopted. This the board declined to do. “I had very great difficulty in restraining my impulse to ‘take the first train out,’” explained William J. Gies, who had gathered most of the material for the majority report, “and aban-

---

\(^\text{12}\)This committee also considered the faculty request that the 1894 charter amendment be repealed. See pp. 448-449 for a discussion of why the request was made and how it was handled.

\(^\text{13}\)It should be noted that the president and faculty decided in 1916 it was advisable to change the name of the College in the annual catalogue to Pennsylvania College of Gettysburg.
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don all of the possible further opportunities to serve the College.”¹⁴

The June 1917 meeting of the board occurred a few months after the United States entered World War I and at a time when College energies were increasingly being concentrated on the problems which wartime created for the institution. Three years passed before the charter again claimed the attention of the trustees. In June 1920 the Active Service Men’s Club, which at the time was making a number of suggestions designed to improve the College, repeated the request that its name be changed. Also, William J. Gies presented his resignation as alumni trustee to this meeting. After accepting it, the board designated a committee to draw up new procedures for choosing alumni trustees.

In his report to the board in June 1921, President William A. Granville strongly advocated swift action to accomplish the suggestions of the year before. “There are many practical reasons why the corporate name of our college should be changed,” he argued, “the sooner the better.” At a time when the institution was embarked on its largest fund-raising effort to date, he believed that continuing to use the “lengthy, cumbersome, and awkward legal name” would “incur financial risks which we as guardians of the material interests of the College have no right to assume.” What he meant was that at any time the trustees might have to go to court in order to collect a gift or bequest which was contested on the grounds that the donor did not use the correct legal name of the College at Gettysburg. The president repeated all of the reasons advanced a quarter century earlier for changing the name, adding numerous up-to-date examples. “That the name of our institution will sometime be changed to Gettysburg College is to my mind absolutely certain,” he concluded. “That being the case, why wait? In the words of a well-known advertisement ‘Eventually, why not now?’”¹⁵ The trustees responded quickly to this challenge by instructing their officers

¹⁴William J. Gies to William A. Granville, New York, June 19, 1917, in GCA. The three committee members were Frederick H. Knubel, Gies, and John B. McPherson. The latter attended no committee meetings (his wife was seriously ill), but submitted a minority report, which was entered into the trustee minutes. He concluded that the board was of optimum size, well-distributed geographically, and well-apportioned among the constituency. He was, he said, not one “to favor a new departure when it is not shown that the old system has failed to produce results, simply because other Institutions of whose conditions and surroundings we know nothing are making experiments.”

¹⁵The president doubted that “half a dozen people in the whole world,” not excluding board or faculty members, knew the correct corporate name of the College. “Whatever reasons there may have been warranting it at the time the institution was founded, there are now no reasons whatever justifying its use in the future.” For a discussion of the other 1921 amendment to the charter, see p. 709n.
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(June 7, 1921) to petition the Adams county court to amend the charter, changing the corporate name from The Trustees of Pennsylvania College of Gettysburg, in the County of Adams, to Gettysburg College. If any negative votes were cast, no record of them was made. On November 14, 1921 the court handed down its decree.\(^{16}\)

At long last, the battle had been won. When the trustees met a few weeks later, as their first item of business they directed that the College seal be altered, but in one respect only, by substituting Sigillum Collegii Gettysburgensis for the old Sigillum Collegii Pennsylvaniensis. Had they decided to conduct some historical research before taking action, they would presumably have found what every succeeding investigator has found: no evidence that their predecessors had ever formally adopted a seal. The charter of April 7, 1832 directed the first trustees to "cause to be made for their use, one common seal, with such devices and inscriptions thereon, as they shall think proper, and by and with which all deeds, diplomas, certificates and acts of the said trustees, shall pass and be authenticated." The trustees had indeed caused such a seal to be made, but the only evidences of that fact are the impressions made when it was used in the years before 1921.

In his June report, President Granville expressed his conviction that the number of alumni trustees should be increased from six to twelve. "There is practically a unanimous sentiment among our alumni in favor of an increase," he wrote, "and that large benefits to the college would result from it cannot be doubted." He also expressed his hope that the committee named a year earlier to recommend procedures for choosing them would soon present "a plan which will give every alumnus a voice" in selecting these trustees, "and not only those who happen to attend an annual meeting of the Alumni Association." Clearly, his proposals were quite different from those which the committee was then formulating. When the board met in December 1921, the latter asked that still another group be formed to consider, not only the president's recommendations, but also several recent suggestions from the Alumni Association. By this time, requests to change College polity were also coming from another source. Several Lutheran synods were asking for formal representation on the board of trustees.\(^{17}\)

\(^{16}\)Adams County Miscellaneous Book F, p. 347. In the Compiler for June 11, 1921, W. Arch McClean of the class of 1882 wrote that, on becoming editor of the newspaper in 1902, he determined "that no other name should be used in the Compiler but Gettysburg College."

\(^{17}\)For a discussion of the reasons for the synods' request at this particular time, see pp. 710-711.
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In June 1922 the new committee recommended that the number of alumni trustees be increased from six to eight and that each of four synods (Maryland, West Pennsylvania, East Pennsylvania, and Allegheny) be permitted to have two trustees. The Alumni Association and the synods would determine how to nominate their candidates for these positions; in all cases, the board would do the electing. If the alumni and the synods accepted the proposal, it would become effective as vacancies in the board occurred. As in the case of the action which made alumni trustees possible beginning in 1886, these changes would result from agreement with the bodies concerned, and not from charter amendment. After considering this proposal, the trustees moved to table it for one year, during which time they expressed their approval in principle and College officials discussed it with representatives of the synods. Formal adoption came in December 1923, but only after the trustees amended the resolution to require concurrence of the president of the College and the chairman of their executive committee in all synodical nominations. Since some synods declined to accept this latter stipulation, and since the trustees required the concurrence of all concerned bodies before any part of the proposal became effective, nothing came of this effort. In June 1927 the trustees repealed the resolution in its entirety.

One more attempt to alter the College charter was made during the years covered by this chapter. In May 1932 the board, apparently acting now on its own initiative and with no recorded opposition, authorized a committee "to investigate the tenure of office of its members." This committee made the first of its several reports in December 1932. Following its guidance, during the next three years the board gradually increased the scope of its intention to revise the College's organic law. Finally, in June 1935 the trustees approved a new draft of ten of the eleven sections of the 1832 charter. Only the preamble and first section were left intact. While only a few words were changed here and there in many of the other sections, in an effort to clarify their meaning, the net effect of what the trustees

18The U.L.C.A. survey team made a number of recommendations concerning the Gettysburg board. Since in their opinion its size was too large, they urged that its numbers be reduced to no more than fifteen members. Believing that life tenure was "not in accord with best practice," they recommended that service be limited to no more than ten years. Gettysburg was one of only three Lutheran colleges whose trustees had life tenure. Also, the trustees should meet more often than twice a year. They should have by-laws, supplementing the regulations contained in the charter. The president of the college should be an ex officio member of the board, without a vote. Since the College would profit if board actions were more fully explained to the several constituencies, the authors recommended that the board issue regular reports, preferably in printed form. U.L.C.A. Survey, 1:131, 165-166.
were now contemplating was considerable indeed. First, the size of the board would be reduced to a maximum of thirty members. Second, six-year terms were proposed and were to be implemented for all trustees, including incumbents, as soon as the intended charter changes became effective. Third, the board would divide itself into six classes, so that the terms of five members would expire each year. Fourth, the names of the two chief officers of the board were to be changed from president and vice president to chairman and vice chairman. Fifth, unexcused nonattendance at three consecutive regular meetings would forfeit membership.

The Adams county court approved the proposed "Articles of Amendment" on December 9, 1935. The regularly scheduled midwinter meeting of the board of trustees occurred on the next day, at which time the members began putting the new provisions into effect. There was still no limit on the length of time a trustee could serve, but at least once every six years there was the opportunity for an incumbent whose term was about to expire, as well as for his colleagues, to decide whether his continuing in office would serve the best interests of the College.

---

19 Adams County Miscellaneous Book L, p. 33.
20 Included in the amended charter was a first-time reference to College by-laws, the initial set of which the trustees adopted in December 1940. In accord with U.L.C.A. policy, the amended charter reduced the required percentage of Lutheran members from three-fourths to two-thirds. The amended charter decreed that the Franklin professorship be one of German Language and Literature, but this provision was ignored.
Finances

From the perspective of a later time, College finance at the beginning of the twentieth century was still very much a matter of small change. Total income for the 1904-1905 fiscal year amounted to $25,552, while expenditures were $26,919. As it had been for more than thirty years, annual tuition was $50. Rent for use of half a dormitory room ranged from $12.50 to $62.50. Payments by students from these and other sources were now yielding about 65 percent of each year's general fund income. The College endowment of slightly less than $200,000 was producing almost all of the remaining 35 percent. On the expense side of the ledger, the treasurer was paying each professor an annual salary of $1,400; this figure had not been changed for fourteen years. In 1904-1905 almost seventy-five cents of every dollar which the College spent went for salaries and wages. The next largest item of expenditures was coal. Finally, in the fall of 1904, as in 1868, the College had a troublesome debt. Although it amounted to only slightly in excess of $40,000, it had stood for more than a decade. Not only was the College unable to reduce it, but also for some years it had resorted to further borrowing in order to meet the annual interest charges.

In the years between 1904 and 1945, every part of the College's educational program demanded increasing financial support. As national agencies were created which began to pass judgment on colleges and then widely publicize their findings, and as foundations began to make sizable grants to those which they deemed worthy of encouragement, many institutions responded by strengthening old programs and introducing new ones. They engaged more and university-trained faculty, strengthened libraries, increased equipment, added to physical plant, and raised additional endowment. Thus it took more money each year for colleges such as Gettysburg to maintain their relative positions in the world of higher education; it took even more money for those which wanted to move up on the collegiate ladder. There were many friends of Gettysburg during these years who wanted her to be in the latter category. In 1941 one of her seasoned professors told an alumni gathering what it would take for their alma mater to climb. Do not try to "finance an A-Grade College on a C-Grade budget," he warned. "Don't expect the President of the College or the Board of

---

21 As indicated in the previous chapter, a complete financial statement for the 1904-1905 year is not known to exist. The information in this paragraph was taken from the incomplete records which are available and was compared with the fuller financial statement for 1906-1907. The 1904 debt was equal to College income for about eighteen months.
Trustees to accomplish what you want without the stuff with which it can be done." The stuff, of course, was money.22

Major national events continued to exert a strong influence on the Gettysburg College budget. Although the years from 1904 to 1917 were generally prosperous ones, during which College enrollment almost doubled and sizable sums of money were raised, these were also years of rising prices. Inflation amounted to almost 40 percent, a fact of which the families of all College employees became increasingly aware. Soon after the United States entered World War I in April 1917, some students and faculty enlisted or left to do other war work. As the draft went into effect and enrollment declined markedly in 1918, the president warned the trustees to expect several deficit years. The government came to the rescue in the fall by establishing a unit of the Students' Army Training Corps on the campus. This promised financial relief for the College, but within less than two months the armistice was signed and the unit disbanded. Although the campus quickly returned to peacetime conditions, some of the war's effects lingered on. For example, the price level in 1920 was almost 60 percent higher than it had been only three years earlier. "The high cost of living has made obsolete all former standards of teaching wages and other school costs," President Granville told the trustees in June of that year. "A complete readjustment to meet these new conditions is now going on in practically all grades of schools and our own college is no exception to this general rule."

Few persons, if any, in 1920 could foresee that the decade just beginning would be one of general prosperity without inflation; in fact, the Consumer Price Index in 1929 was 15 percent lower than it had been in 1920. Nor could many foresee that the 1920s would end with the onset of a massive depression which resembled if it did not exceed in severity those through which the College had passed in the 1840s and 1870s. Enrollment, which began dropping in 1930-1931, did not turn upward again until 1935-1936, and then only because the trustees readmitted women to the College. Male enrollment did not again reach the level of 1929-1930 until after World War II. During the 1930s, for one of the few times in its history, financial stringency was the reason why the College did not renew the annual contract of several members of the faculty. The trustees invited those who remained to take a voluntary cut in their salaries. In addition, several professors went out during the summer as recruiting agents, trying to induce reluctant young men to enroll in the fall. The College experienced seven deficit years in a row, during the

---

22 The professor was Charles F. Sanders. Quoted in the GCB [June 1941], p. 11. This publication, the first alumni issue of which appeared in January 1930, has had several different titles.
A GREATER GETTYSBURG

course of which some students ran out of money and left school, while others were allowed to continue without paying their bills on time, in violation of long-standing rules. Later, some student accounts had to be written off as uncollectable.

Only a few years after it appeared that the worst of the depression was over and that better times were ahead, the entry of the United States into World War II created yet another crisis in higher education. For Gettysburg, the financial effects were minor until early 1943, after the draft age was lowered to eighteen years and when stepped-up offensive operations against the Axis powers greatly increased military manpower requirements. The immediate prospect was for a College enrollment far below the break-even point. Once again, as in 1918, the government acted to use hundreds of college and university campuses to train young people for different branches of the armed forces. Between March 1943 and March 1945 there were military training units in operation on the campus. Compensation for services rendered to them made it possible for the College to balance its budget while assisting in the war effort. In December 1943 President Hanson told the trustees that the government program had "provided the only possible means of anything like normal existence." The 1944-1945 academic year ended three weeks after the surrender of Germany and eleven weeks before the surrender of Japan.

General Fund Income and Expenditures
Selected Years, 1904-1945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904-1905</td>
<td>$25,552</td>
<td>$26,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1911</td>
<td>41,877</td>
<td>41,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1917</td>
<td>65,313</td>
<td>61,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>132,140</td>
<td>131,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1927</td>
<td>198,975</td>
<td>179,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1931</td>
<td>207,943</td>
<td>227,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-1935</td>
<td>164,588</td>
<td>174,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-1939</td>
<td>258,184</td>
<td>249,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-1943</td>
<td>314,866</td>
<td>295,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-1945</td>
<td>443,062</td>
<td>442,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 The figures for 1904-1905 are contained in the president's report for 1906-1907. Beginning with the following year, a treasurer's report was included in the published annual report of the president through 1922-1923. For a decade thereafter, treasurer's and auditor's reports were prepared in typescript and are available in the GCA. Beginning with 1932-1933, the treasurer's report was printed, but distribution was so strictly limited that when the Middle States Association in 1934 asked for a copy of the latest issue, it was told that it "was not the practice of our institution" to comply with such requests. One veteran faculty member, in the economics department, told this writer in the early 1950s that he had never seen a copy of the treasurer's report up to that time.
Since payments by students constituted the largest single item in the general fund budget in 1904, it is understandable that, in attempting to increase overall income, College officials would pay close attention to the charges they set. The catalogue which a student entering in the fall of 1904 might have used as a guide stated that the "necessary expenses of the collegiate year" ranged from a minimum of $150.50 to a maximum of $241.50, "exclusive of books, clothing, furniture and traveling expenses." Included in these totals were estimated amounts for board ($70 to $111) and washing ($12), which did not come to the College, as well as for tuition ($50), room rent ($12.50 to $62.50), and the gymnasium fee ($6), all of which did enter its treasury.

Not included in the catalogue estimates were special fees imposed upon students not rooming in the dormitories ($3), for students taking science courses ($1.50 to $10), and for seniors ($5).24

On eleven occasions between 1904 and 1945 the trustees changed tuition charges. Not surprisingly, in every instance they increased them. Also not surprisingly, in approaching the first change in over thirty years they were more than a little reluctant to act and somewhat fearful of the consequences. According to the minutes, it was only after "prolonged and thorough discussion" in June 1906 that they decided to raise annual tuition from $50 to $75. To soften the blow, they abandoned the $6 gymnasium fee, so that the increase was only $19. What some persons regarded as "an uncertain experiment" in the spring became an unqualified success in the fall when, instead of dropping, enrollment actually climbed. "So far as we know," President Samuel G. Hefelbower boasted a year later (June 1907), "we lost no students because of the increase." He reminded the trustees that Gettysburg fees were now "almost equal to those of the least expensive institutions of our standing in the State."

Tuition levels reached $100 in 1915, $150 in 1921, $200 in 1924, $250 in 1927, and $300 in 1929. There were then no further changes until 1938, when an increase to $325 occurred. The charge of $350 set for 1939 prevailed through the 1944-1945 academic year. From time to time someone spoke up to say that, even with what had come to be fairly regular increases, Gettysburg tuition was still not what it perhaps should be. "A student paying his college dues in full," declared the president in a 1912 brochure, "is only paying about one-half the actual cost of his education. . . . This means that every student of Pennsylvania College has been or is a beneficiary of the

---

24 The 1904-1905 catalogue declared that "tuition and other college dues for each term must, in all cases, be paid in advance." No student could "recite with his class" until he showed his professors either a receipt or a note showing that he had made "some satisfactory arrangement" with the treasurer.
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College to an extent at least equal to the total amount of his college dues." In reporting on a recently approved tuition increase eight years later, the Gettysburgian for December 15, 1920 informed its student readers that it would still cost them more to attend Dickinson, Washington and Jefferson, Bucknell, Ursinus, Allegheny, and Lafayette.\(^{25}\)

The 1942 College catalogue listed separately estimated annual expenses for men and women students. These expenses were between three and four times greater than they had been in 1904-1905. For the men, estimated costs ranged from $681.50 to $759, and for the women, from $700 to $745. In neither case were laboratory fees or personal expenses included, but the charge for women did include board. In 1944, after the College opened its dining hall to male students, the catalogue no longer distinguished between the sexes in this respect. Yearly expenses for both were estimated at between $745 and $800, still accompanied by the observation of earlier days: "The expenses of a student depend largely on his training and habits."\(^{26}\)

The second major source of general fund income in 1904 was the yield of the College's small and obviously inadequate endowment fund. One of the most telling measures of Gettysburg's success (or failure) in maintaining or improving its position as a strong educational institution after that date would certainly be its record of securing major additions to what many early in the century still called its productive funds. Between 1904 and 1945 thousands of people contributed in one way or another to those funds. Many were alumni. As had been true since the 1830s, many others were persons whose only connection with the College was that they were Lutherans. Most of the ninety trustees gave, some of them in small

\(^{25}\)In addition to tuition, students continued to pay a number of fees. In 1942 these included charges for first-year registration ($5), athletics ($20), health ($10), the Student Chest ($10), electricity (believe it or not, $10 for one eighty-watt bulb), as well as for laboratory courses ($8 to $20). The fee for electricity was listed first in the 1912 catalogue, when the charge was ten cents per week for each forty-watt tungsten bulb.

\(^{26}\)Beginning in 1912, the catalogue gave considerable information about ways, both old and new, in which students could meet some of their expenses. They included College scholarships of from $30 to $50, use of several old perpetual scholarships, and working at a variety of tasks either on campus or in town. According to the Gettysburgian, some students about this time earned considerable money during the summer selling aluminumware, which had recently entered the market. Endowed scholarships for which the College actually received the principal, not just the promise, first appeared in the 1918 catalogue. By 1942 eight were listed, with principals ranging from $500 to $19,960, obviously too few and too small to meet the needs. In the 1930s the Alumni Association began offering a few loans to students. In the early 1940s the treasurer reported scholarships from College funds equal to about 10 percent of tuition income. Athletic scholarships will be discussed later.
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amounts regularly contributed over a long period of time. Several pastor-trustees influenced members of their congregations to support the College by means of gifts or bequests. Those members of the board who were not willing to contribute were likely to resign or allow their membership to lapse simply by not attending meetings.\(^{27}\)

Given Gettysburg's extremely poor record in attracting large gifts from a few wealthy persons who might be solicited on an individual basis or who might even come forward on their own initiative, one would expect College officials at this time to rely heavily on fund-raising efforts which would seek gifts from a larger host of donors. Six such undertakings were begun during the forty-one years covered by this chapter.

The first fund-raising effort was launched in June 1906, when the board of trustees named five of its own members to conduct a campaign to coincide with the seventy-fifth anniversary of the College in 1907. The goal set for the Jubilee, or Anniversary, Fund was $150,000. Although the committee sent out many letters and made some personal solicitations, it soon became evident that, unless the unexpected happened, the results were going to be disappointing. While $25,000 had been pledged by June 1907, less than $4,000 of that amount had actually been paid. "Perhaps," lamented President Hefelbower in his report to the board, "our expectations were too high." A year later, it appeared for a brief heady moment that at last the tide was turning. In June 1908 Colonel John F. Firch of Oakland, California, pledged $100,000 for a science building and was promptly elected to the board of trustees. At the same time, there were rumors of several other large gifts impending. Unfortunately, none of these promises ever materialized. Firch disappeared from the records as abruptly as he entered them. The catalogue published early in 1909 did not even list his name among the trustees. The accounting which the College treasurer gave in June 1910 showed that seventy-two persons and three churches had contributed a total of $23,951.66 to the Jubilee Fund. Most of the money ($15,500) came from six donors. Slightly more than $20,000 of the proceeds was used to pay outstanding notes and interest (part of the debt from the

\(^{27}\)A comparison of contributions made by Gettysburg and Dickinson trustees to their respective annual fund campaigns in 1936 showed that the latter gave about four times as much as the former, whose gifts ranged from $5 to $700. GCA.
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building and renovation of the late 1880s-1890s) and to equip the recently established physics department. 28

The second fund-raising effort began in October 1910 when, during a special meeting held in conjunction with the inauguration of President Granville, the trustees named an endowment committee of four members, including the new president. The committee moved rapidly to define its objectives and devise effective ways to accomplish them. First, it set a goal of $300,000, to be added to endowment. Second, it pledged the resulting income to increasing faculty salaries, adding new faculty, supporting the library, purchasing equipment, and making repairs. Third, the committee persuaded the board to engage a financial secretary to assist the president, especially in fund raising. Fourth, on behalf of the College, the committee asked the General Education Board for its help in the campaign. In May 1911 this agency pledged $50,000, payable if the College eliminated its $30,000 debt by July 10, 1913, received $150,000 in cash and subscriptions by July 31, 1913, and met a July 31, 1917 deadline for payment of subscriptions. 29

The challenge of the General Education Board was a powerful boost, but in order to meet it the College had to bring in more money than it had ever been able to gather in the past: $180,000 in cash and pledges within the space of two years. The endowment committee now moved on several fronts. First, early in 1912 it published a brochure which explained the pressing needs of the College and

28 The treasurer's accounting is contained in the published president's report for 1909-1910, pp. 20-23. The Compiler for June 10, 1908 described Firch as a native of Erie who went West and became wealthy as a result of his interests "in western oil fields, in mines, and extensive tracts of irrigated lands in California and Arizona." Although his home was then in Oakland, he was reported to be spending much of his time in New York and Spokane. Firch had never visited Gettysburg, but as "an enthusiastic Lutheran" was supposedly well-disposed to helping the College there. "When the subject of the needs of the college was brought to his attention," wrote the editor, "he made the gift of $100,000 on his own suggestion and without any condition and immediately put it in writing," intimating that "he might be able to add to it in the future." The Gettysburgian for June 10, 1908 carried a similar story. At commencement time a year later (June 9, 1909), the Compiler noted that "the gift of Col. Firch, announced last year was not mentioned or referred to in [the] remotest way."

29 Founded in 1902 by John D. Rockefeller and incorporated in 1903 by an act of Congress, the General Education Board spent $324,800,000 by the time it ceased operations in 1964. During its early years most of the grants were made to support Southern agriculture and education (especially black education), as well as to aid colleges and universities all over the country. By 1911 it had made grants totaling $6,624,000 to eighty-two of the latter. Among the six conditional grants announced in May 1911 was one of $50,000 to Franklin and Marshall College, which agreed to raise $225,000 in matching funds. New York Times, May 26, 1911. See also General Education Board...: Review and Final Report (New York, 1964).
A SALUTARY INFLUENCE

featured two pieces of good news: the conditional pledge of the General Education Board and the fact that $60,000 had already been raised. Second, it persuaded the board of trustees to enlarge the committee to include “members from all the principal centers of Gettysburg influence.” Third, it turned, as the College had done so often in the past, to Lutheran synods (this time to six), asking them to pass resolutions commending the campaign and inviting canvassers into their congregations. Fourth, it secured the services of at least four members of the staff to assist the president in performing the crucial task of visiting hundreds of people and asking them for money.30

By June 1912 half of the $180,000 was given or pledged; by December, $130,000; and by March 1913, $155,000. On March 28, 1913 the College met one of the conditions of the General Education Board when it paid its last remaining debt from the building and renovation program of the 1880s and 1890s: a $30,000 mortgage dated June 27, 1889. A jubilant President Granville announced on June 10, 1913 that, one month ahead of deadline, the College met a second condition by obtaining $256,200 in acceptable cash and pledges. “This means,” he told the trustees, “that there has been accumulated for Pennsylvania College during this movement a total larger than has ever before been collected in the Lutheran Church in America in a single financial campaign for any purpose whatever.” Some eighteen hundred donors had participated. Excluding the General Education Board pledge, the average subscription was about $110. Satisfied that the College had in fact met all of the conditions of its pledge (including the one that subscriptions must be honored by July 31, 1917), the General Education Board paid the College in full on February 9, 1918. “This completes the campaign for payment of the $30,000 debt which rested on the College,” the president told the board a few months later, “and the addition of $200,000 to our Endowment Fund.”

Granville summoned the College to its third fund-raising effort in June 1913, using for that purpose the same report to the trustees in which he announced the successful completion of the second. “Let no one suppose that because the task of raising over $250,000 has been successfully accomplished that we may now rest content on our oars,” he proclaimed. “On the contrary, this is only the beginning; still greater things remain to be done.”

30The brochure, which had no title of its own, was issued as Volume 2, Number 1 of the GCB. Its three parts described the campaign plans, gave facts about the College, and explained the “fundamental importance of the Christian College to the Church and the Nation.” The four staff members who assisted in the campaign were Samuel F. Snyder, Charles H. Huber, Charles F. Sanders, and Abdel Ross Wentz.
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In December 1913 the trustees responded to this call by approving a campaign to raise $130,000 for a new science building ($75,000), renovations to Stevens Hall ($40,000), relocating the engineering shop ($10,000), and an infirmary ($5,000). They agreed to ask the General Education Board to contribute one-fourth of the total amount. Although the president, the financial secretary, and the principal of the preparatory department spent most of their time for nearly a year and a half in soliciting gifts, this third effort never came close to its goal. The General Education Board quickly informed the College that it made no grants to support building programs. A business depression which began in 1913 persuaded the solicitors to avoid the industrial centers and confine their efforts to rural areas, which were believed to be less affected by the economic slump, but which would probably yield smaller returns. Within a period of two years, the president and his coworkers addressed more than 150 congregations, many of which had never previously been visited by College representatives. In June 1917, two months after the United States entered World War I, the president informed the board that the building fund had accumulated $60,000 in gifts and pledges, but also that since January he had "not been able to do much in the way of soliciting for funds because of the unsettled conditions due to the world war." Small amounts continued coming in, but clearly the momentum had been lost. The campaign came to an end with about eighteen hundred subscribers contributing a total amounting to less than one-half of the goal. Much to the disappointment of some of the science professors, the trustees decided in 1915 to use the available funds to construct a new building for the preparatory department and to enlarge, rather than replace, the old chemistry building.31

The fourth fund-raising effort began one year after the 1918 armistice. Meeting jointly, the executive and finance committees of the board of trustees in November 1919 recommended that the College embark on a campaign to raise $500,000, the proceeds to be used for both endowment and buildings. When they assembled a month later, the trustees established a financial campaign committee and vested it with the authority to seek at least the recommended amount. In January 1920 this committee decided to raise the College's sights to $1,000,000, of which $600,000 was earmarked for

31The treasurer reported in June 1917 that what was known as the New Building Fund contained $60,500 in cash and pledges, an amount almost exactly equal to the costs of constructing the new building and enlarging the old one. Since more than half of the $60,500 was in pledges, the College had to borrow to meet these obligations in full. Not all of the pledges were ever paid. As late as June 1922 the College still owed the bank $17,500 on this account.
endowment and $400,000 for repairs and new construction. It engaged a Chicago firm to conduct what was soon being called the Endowment and Expansion Campaign, which began in January and which, it was hoped, would be concluded in about four months. However, in June the treasurer told the board that "the returns have been painfully slow in coming in to us." Thus far, he had received about $250,000 in cash and subscriptions. By this time the College had made its third approach to the General Education Board, which made a preliminary promise in July 1920 of $150,000, if the College would raise an additional $300,000, the total amount to become an endowment whose income was to be used exclusively for faculty salaries.32

News of this challenge reached Gettysburg at a time when it appeared that the current fund-raising effort, as so many in the past, had run its course and stopped far short of the goal. Meeting in August 1920, the board of trustees decided to try to breathe new life into the flagging campaign by replacing the Chicago firm with a local director. The man chosen was Joseph B. Baker (1901), pastor of St. James Lutheran church in Gettysburg. Declining an appointment as vice president of the College, he secured instead a leave of absence from his parish.

 Entirely devoted to his alma mater, energetic, determined, and given to uttering pithy statements, Baker announced that the College was "too old and dear a mother to wear a skirt that is short and she shall not be compelled to do it." His use of the term Second Mile Campaign gave the effort over which he now presided its own identity. In January 1921 he began publishing the Gettysburg Challenger, a paper whose news of the campaign was informative of both its purpose and progress. There were separate editions for several of the geographical areas in which the campaign was concentrated. Finally, Baker and a small group of dedicated lieutenants appealed to Gettysburg's standard constituency for raising money. They visited several hundred Lutheran congregations, asking for cash contributions and subscriptions. In the issue of January 19, 1921, the editor of the Gettysburgian urged students to support the

---

32 Reminded of what wartime and postwar inflation had done to the level of living of faculty members, whose prewar salaries were, in the opinion of many, disgracefully low. John D. Rockefeller in December 1919 gave the General Education Board $50,000,000, to be expended in an effort to alleviate the situation. Within five years 173 colleges had been awarded most of this gift in the form of conditional challenge grants. Ibid., pp. 30-32. The papers necessary to bring Gettysburg's conditional pledge into effect were not signed until the spring of 1921. For each of three years, until the board's grant was actually paid, it gave the College $7,500, which was considered interest on the principal amount of its conditional pledge.
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Second Mile Campaign by exhibiting a positive attitude to the College and by corresponding behavior. Perhaps unwittingly, he paid a high tribute to the new director by urging students, whenever they were in their home communities, to pretend they were Reverend Baker.

Joseph B. Baker (1877-1946)
Director of the Second Mile Campaign, trustee for a quarter century, and strong advocate of retaining women students. Courtesy Mrs. F. Stanley Hoffman.

When the Second Mile drive began, it was agreed to accept that the first phase of the Endowment and Expansion Campaign had raised $475,000, including the conditional pledge of the General Education Board. At commencement 1921 Baker could report a new total of $737,617.79 in cash and subscriptions. "The hearth fires of affection have been re-kindled," he told the trustees, expressing his gratitude for having the opportunity to serve the College at this auspicious moment in its history. "I remain with all the old boys," he concluded, "Yours for the old White Mother." By March 1922 the total had climbed to $915,550.74. At the alumni collation in June 1922 Baker reported the figure of $983,436. One of his associates then raised it to $986,436, after which yet another associate announced that nine trustees and six other men, members of a recently
organized Thousand Dollar Club, had contributed enough to bring the total in cash and subscriptions to $1,001,436.33

Everyone who participated in either the first or the second mile of the financial campaign of 1920-1922 had good reason to be jubilant, since never in its history had the College raised such a large sum of money. Even if they took into consideration the inflation of the time, contemporaries were justified in calling the achievement an unprecedented one. However, the final evaluation of the entire effort would have to wait until it could be determined how many of the subscriptions made in the heat of a campaign eventually turned into cold cash. As was to be expected, not all of them ever did. President Granville estimated in 1922 that the shortfall would be 10 percent, or $100,000. It turned out to be much greater. To begin with, two large pledges remained unfulfilled. First, in April 1921 the Philadelphia Conference of the East Pennsylvania Synod committed itself to raise $101,000, to be used in constructing a dormitory on the campus in honor and memory of Lutherans from the Philadelphia area who served in the late war. The amount actually contributed was less than $20,000 and the dormitory was never built.34 Second, veteran trustee Henry H. Weber announced in the spring of 1922 that his will would provide for a gift of $50,000 for an endowed professorship. His board colleagues quickly decided that this amount could properly be credited to the Second Mile Campaign. Unfortunately, this well-intentioned promise by one of the most energetic trustees never became a reality.35 In addition, not all of the subscriptions made by individuals and congregations were ever paid in full. Nevertheless, by July 1924 the College had met all of the conditions

---

33*Gettysburg Times*, June 14, 1922. The total eventually reached $1,008,735. In his final report to the trustees, Baker thanked two fellow-pastors, Henry Anstadt (1890) and William F. Sunday (1916), for the major assistance which they had given him. In paying tribute to Baker, the trustees told him (July 1922) that “when the College constituency was disappointed and discouraged, you most generously undertook what seemed to many of us a forlorn hope; and in spite of growing business depression and other difficulties carried the canvass through to a successful conclusion. You considered difficulties and discouragements merely difficulties to be overcome. Your enthusiastic consecration to your purpose became contagious. Almost everywhere old friends fell in line and new friends were found for the College. The work that you have done is one of the greatest achievements, if not the greatest achievement in the history of the College.”

34Hopes that the memorial dormitory project might yet be realized persisted well into the 1920s. See the *Gettysburgian* for April 4, 1923 for one explanation of the project and why it failed.

35For information on Weber’s gift, as amended, see pp. 522-523. See also the *Compiler*, June 17, 1922, and *Adams County Independent*, June 23, 1922.
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of its contract with the General Education Board and soon thereafter received the last installment of the latter's $150,000 pledge.36

The fifth fund-raising effort was intended to be part of the College's celebration of its first one hundred years of existence. In May 1928 plans were announced for raising $1,000,000 for the two staple items: endowment and physical plant. At the request of the College, several synods endorsed the proposed campaign. The United Lutheran Church in America gave its encouragement, at least indirectly, by urging all of its related institutions to conduct fund-raising campaigns during 1930, the year in which the Gettysburg effort was to be pressed to completion. The committee in charge engaged a New York firm to conduct the canvass, but the onset of the Great Depression prompted the trustees in December 1930 to order what most at the time believed would be a temporary delay. The fifth fund-raising effort was never resumed. Eventually, College books showed that some $5,560 had been credited to the Centennial Fund.

The sixth and final fund-raising effort of this period began in June 1939 after the trustees committed themselves to raising money for a new chapel. Since here was a goal with strong appeal for many in the College constituency, it did not seem necessary to organize this campaign as thoroughly as some of the previous ones. As of June 30, 1945, the balance in the Chapel Fund was carried on the College books at $140,965.10. Because of the war, construction of the building had to be postponed.37

36In June 1922 President Granville told the trustees that only about $89,525 would remain uncommitted when the campaign was completed. He arrived at this figure by deducting from $1,000,000 amounts for estimated shortfall ($100,000), expenses of the campaign ($55,000), endowed scholarships ($10,000), annuities ($31,000, the principal of which would be available eventually), constructing a Y.M.C.A. building and the memorial dormitory ($176,000), repairs already completed ($25,700), endowment ($450,000), and other purposes ($62,775). A statement of the Endowment and Expansion Fund for the period January 22, 1920-May 25, 1926 listed contributions actually received from all sources at $669,937.05. Financial statement dated June 30, 1926 in GCA.

37What might be regarded as another campaign to raise funds for the College began in June 1934, when the president reported to the board that, after "a careful survey of funds received by Liberal Arts Colleges in America," he was "increasingly of the opinion that the chief source of income has been through bequests payable at the decease of the donor." This observation, whose essential correctness should have been evident for a long time to every experienced student of American higher education, resulted in the formation of a bequest committee in June 1935. Although the latter began formulating long-range plans to encourage testamentary giving within a wide constituency, after 1937 other matters diverted the attention of the trustees from this critical task. The committee did come up with a slogan: Let your will be good will for Gettysburg College.
Harvey McKnight might well have shaken his gray head in disbelief had he lived long enough to observe the success of the College in increasing its endowment during the quarter century after he left the presidency in 1904. The first year after that date for which we have a detailed financial statement is 1906-1907, when the fund stood at $194,000. By 1913-1914, following the first campaign in which the General Education Board participated, it had more than doubled, reaching $398,000. Little further change took place until the next major effort began; the total in 1919-1920 was $415,000. Largely as a result of the Endowment and Expansion Campaign, the figure increased to $781,000 in 1922-1923 and reached $843,000 in 1929-1930, the year of the stock market crash.

As the depression gripped the nation, Gettysburg was faced with a series of major financial problems, some of which it shared with most other colleges, while others resulted from conditions peculiar to it. The first problem actually preceded the depression. The College had to borrow from some source to pay for its new science and gymnasium buildings, both begun in 1925. Second, a new library was completed in 1929, largely on the promise of Trustee Henry H. Weber to change his testamentary gift of $50,000 for an endowed professorship into a $75,000 gift in memory of his wife and for the library. By the time the new building was completed, it had become evident that the promised funds simply were not going to be available, either then or later. Third, major renovations to Glatfelter Hall were begun in 1929, after Trustee William L. Glatfelter and his three sisters pledged $100,000 for the project. While there was no question that this promise eventually would be honored, not all of the funds were available when the work was finished and the bills became payable in the fall of 1929. Fourth, each year from that

38In 1918 a committee of representatives of leading national educational and professional agencies which the United States Bureau of Education appointed suggested a minimum productive endowment of $250,000 for a successful college of arts and sciences, but quickly added that "with advancing standards and prices this amount should be rapidly increased; probably twice as much will be needed in the near future to give an institution the assurance of stability." The goal, committee members believed, was endowment income equal to at least half of the annual expenses. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Resources and Standards of Colleges of Arts and Sciences..., Bulletin 30 (Washington, 1919), pp. 15, 44. Hereafter cited as Resources and Standards (1919). For more information on this committee, see p. 715.

39On September 6, 1928 Weber gave a judgment note for $75,000, payable five days after his death. The College intended to use this note as collateral for a loan until such time as the proceeds became available. Without revealing the details, President Hanson told the trustees in June 1930 about "the very great disappointment which came to the college in the financing of the library," by which he meant that the College had learned the money would never be received. Weber lived until 1936.
time through the spring of 1936 produced a deficit in the general fund.

In order to meet their immediate financial obligations, the trustees began borrowing from the endowment fund, first to pay their building debts and then to close the annual gaps between general fund income and expenditures. At the time, it was assumed that this action was temporary and that the loans would soon be paid back. In his report for the 1929-1930 year, the auditor recommended that "all endowment funds of the College be kept intact, the original endowment preserved, and never disturbed for the purpose of meeting other obligations." He had nothing to say about how those other obligations should be met. By June 1929 borrowing from the endowment had reached $135,000, by June 1935 $290,341, and by June 1941 $365,246.

In actual practice, borrowing from the endowment meant converting some of its assets into cash, which could then be used to pay current bills.\(^40\) Having to do this during the depression was especially troublesome and costly, since the market value of many of these assets had dropped precipitously, while that of others had disappeared entirely. For example, the report of the auditor for 1931-1932 stated that, while the book value of the bonds in the endowment fund at the end of that year was $414,935, their current market value was only $178,362; no interest was being paid on about $50,000 of these securities. The only optimistic thing he could say was that their market value would probably recover as the depression passed.\(^41\) However, to benefit from any appreciation the College would have to retain the bonds, not sell them in an attempt to make current ends meet. Taken together, the sale of some securities to meet building or general fund demands and the failure of others to produce interest or dividends contributed to a significant reduction in endowment income, at the very time when it was most needed. The yield dropped from more than $45,000 in the mid-1920s to an average of $20,000 between 1931 and 1938.

\(^{40}\) In June 1929, exclusive of amounts already borrowed from it, the endowment fund consisted of 73 percent bonds, 14 percent judgments and mortgages, 12 percent deeds of trust, and 1 percent other instruments, including stocks. When the borrowing occurred, no obligations to repay were signed and no arrangement for interest payments to the endowment fund were made.

\(^{41}\) In 1932-1933 one third of the endowment, exclusive of amounts carried as interfund borrowing, was in default. Although the situation did improve, at no time through 1944-1945 did the market value of the bonds in the portfolio come as close to the book value as it had during the 1920s. The book value of bonds held on June 30, 1945 was $159,111, while the market value was $136,911.
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At its meeting in December 1942, the board of trustees finally decided to accept the fact that the large sums of money which had been borrowed from the endowment during the preceding fifteen years were not going to be repaid in the foreseeable future. By writing off at their direction $405,971.94 in what had for several years been called interfund accounts, the treasurer at the end of the fiscal year presented a much more accurate endowment fund figure: $373,045.73. However realistic and necessary this decision was, it must have given pause to any friend of the College who realized that Gettysburg's actual endowment was now lower than it had been at any time since 1912, lower in fact than its 1921 agreement with the General Education Board required. The old professor who had talked about the impossibility of having a Grade A College with a Grade C budget was now retired, but his pronouncement was still wise enough to give further pause to any friend of Gettysburg who happened to remember it. According to the printed report of the treasurer, the endowment fund at the close of the 1944-1945 fiscal year stood at $376,618.31.

It is obvious from the preceding paragraphs that Gettysburg College was no more successful during the period covered by this chapter than she had been during earlier periods in securing the large individual gifts which were necessary to enable her to meet satisfactorily the many and continuing demands of a Grade-A college budget. In addition, too many grand promises, however sincerely made, proved for one reason or another to be nothing more than bitter disappointments. At least as far as Gettysburg was concerned, too many large gifts were dropping into the coffers of sister

---

42. The January 26, 1921 pledge of the board, to which the College formally agreed, stipulated that the sum of $450,000 to be raised in connection with the pledge "shall be invested and preserved inviolate for the permanent endowment of said Pennsylvania College." Statement in GCA.

43. As of June 30, 1945 the use of more than one-third of this amount was subject to restrictions, as follows: $68,461 for scholarships, $28,000 for the library, $6,000 for prizes, $3,100 for lectureships, $29,000 for annuities, and $21,312 for other specified purposes. The first annuity gifts to the College, from which the donors received a lifetime income, were made about 1909. During the 1930s there were sometimes as many as twelve annuitants. The number had dropped to six in 1944-1945.

44. Several of these have already been mentioned. In May 1931 the College learned (and promptly announced) that the will of Sophia E. Zimmerman, whose husband Jeremiah was a trustee and generous benefactor, contained a bequest of $50,000 to the institution, the income from which was to benefit the library, in which she and her husband had been particularly interested. It was soon discovered that there were not nearly enough assets to cover this and other provisions of the will. In 1939 the College accepted property in Syracuse, New York, in full settlement of its claim against the estate. In 1945 this asset was valued on its books at $15,000, a figure which was subsequently reduced to $1.
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Between 1904 and 1945 there were only two persons or families whose actual contributions to Gettysburg College reached or exceeded $50,000. Dr. John L. Rothrock (1863-1943), of the class of 1885, a physician and university teacher whose professional career was spent in St. Paul, Minnesota, contributed $50,000 in 1941 for the proposed chapel. Trustees Philip H. and William L. Glatfelter, father and son, together with several other members of their immediate family, were regular givers whose contributions over the forty-year period exceeded $225,000.

As already noted in the preceding chapter, among those of nine Pennsylvania colleges founded before 1865, Gettysburg's endowment ranked a poor ninth in 1904. The same situation prevailed in 1945, when Dickinson reported $1,718,000; Washington and Jefferson, $1,812,000; Allegheny, $1,658,000; the University of Pittsburgh, $3,433,000; Lafayette, $4,130,243; Haverford, $4,500,000; Bucknell, $1,338,000; and Franklin and Marshall, $1,501,650. Among Pennsylvania institutions founded after the Civil War, Lehigh reported $8,000,000; Swarthmore, $8,364,000; and Ursinus, $700,000. Among the four Lutheran colleges in Pennsylvania, Gettysburg had dropped from first place in 1904 to third place in 1945, ranking below Muhlenberg with $1,006,000 and Susquehanna with $425,400, but ahead of Thiel with $170,700. At the same time, Gettysburg seminary reported an endowment of $999,100, two and two-thirds larger than that of the College.46

46The Gettysburgian for May 2, 1928 carried a story that the recently probated will of the well-known automobile manufacturer, James W. Packard, left a sizable fraction of his large estate to his alma mater, Lehigh University, which he had never visited after his graduation in 1884. Shortly before he died, Packard gave Lehigh $1,000,000 for an engineering laboratory, which was dedicated in 1928. Between 1904 and 1945 Gettysburg had no one as generous as Franklin and Marshall's Benjamin F. Fackenthal, Jr. An industrialist and president of its board of trustees from 1915 to 1941, he gave the college some $630,000 and made possible an endowed professorship (1910), a science building (1929), a library (1938), and a swimming pool.

46The New International Year Book: A Compendium of the World's Progress for the Year 1945, ed. Charles Earle Funk (New York, 1946), pp. 645-646. The Haverford endowment is taken from p. 710 of the 1946 volume. See also the minutes of the 1946 U.L.C.A. convention, pp. 413, 417. The colleges and universities furnished the data which appeared in these publications. Whether any of the endowment totals were inflated has not been determined. The figure reported in the year book for Gettysburg for 1945 ($748,800) does not correspond with the one in the treasurer's report for that year. Some of the New England colleges which in 1904 were among the most heavily endowed in the country continued to enjoy that position in 1945. Dartmouth reported $22,208,000; Amherst, $12,427,000; Wesleyan, $8,766,000; Williams, $11,735,000; and Bowdoin, $8,320,000. In New York, Hamilton had $3,934,000. Elsewhere in the country Colorado College had $2,877,000; Wabash, $2,517,000; and Cornell in Iowa, $2,448,000.
Between 1904 and 1945 there were several important sources of College funds which helped to compensate for the inadequate annual income which the endowment fund yielded. First, in 1907 the General Synod of the Lutheran Church added Gettysburg to the list of colleges to which it made annual appropriations. Between then and 1945 the amount which this body and its successor contributed was $68,300, almost all of which was received by the end of the 1931-1932 year. Second, in 1911 a group of ardent female supporters founded the Woman's League of Gettysburg College, which gave more than $170,000 during the following thirty-four years. Third, in 1933 the Alumni Association initiated a program of annual giving, called the Loyalty Fund, which by the end of the 1944-1945 academic year had added about $100,000 to the College treasury. A fourth and final source of additional funds was the United States government, which used College facilities during both world wars, during the fiftieth (1913) and seventy-fifth (1938) anniversaries of the battle of Gettysburg, and on at least two other occasions. Total income from this source was about $100,000.47

Between 1904 and 1945 four endowed professorships were added to those described in the preceding chapter. The first of these, the Alumni Professorship of Mathematics, has already been discussed. Established in June 1904, it became effective in the following fall. The second, the Burton F. Blough Professorship of Civil Engineering, was founded in December 1910, after the board of trustees introduced an engineering program and after Blough, John F. Dapp, and George B. Kunkle, all of whom were trustees living in Harrisburg, pledged a total of $20,000 to endow the chair. When the engineering program was discontinued in the spring of 1940, this professorship lapsed.

The trustees established the third new chair, the Adeline Sager Professorship of History, in December 1922. Miss Sager, a resident of Philadelphia, a staunch member of St. Matthew’s Lutheran church, and a frequent contributor to charitable and educational causes, including the College, died in 1877. She willed the latter $20,000, “for the purpose of Endowing an old or forming a new Professorship,” but directed that the income from the bequest be paid to

---

47The General Synod, Woman’s League, and Alumni Association will be discussed later in this chapter. The government paid more than $5,000 after the fiftieth anniversary celebration (1913), $3,163 for a marine school conducted on the campus (1913-1917), $1,386 for an army officers’ camp (1917-1919), $15,369 for the Students’ Army Training Corps (1918), $4,230 after the seventy-fifth anniversary celebration (1938), and more than $65,000 during World War II (1943-1945).
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a young ward (a distant relative) during her lifetime. As it turned out, the College had a very long wait. Only after the death of this relative in January 1922 did the College receive $18,480.82, which the trustees decided to use to establish a new named professorship, in history.

The fourth and last new chair came into existence in December 1931, after former President Hefelbower, who was then writing a history of the College, informed President Hanson that the institution had failed to keep a promise which it had made more than a decade before. In 1920 William K.T. Sahm (1850-1924), of the class of 1872, who was for more than thirty years a medical examiner for the Pennsylvania Railroad, based in Pittsburgh, gave the College securities valued at $20,000. An annuity was established, from which he received the income during his lifetime. In return for this gift, made during the Endowment and Expansion Campaign, the College promised to name a professorship in memory of the donor's parents, Rev. Peter (1809-1876) and Susan Sahm. Although not an alumnus of the College, Peter Sahm had been one of the first students in the Gymnasium, beginning in 1827. At President Hanson's request, the board of trustees in December 1931 established the Sahm professorship and assigned it to the department of physics.

Except during the prosperous years of the 1920s (when there was an annual surplus of almost 10 percent) and during the worst depression years of the 1930s (when deficits were taken for granted), the College usually spent almost every cent which came into the general fund, little more and little less. In the mid-1920s, when the trustees adopted a new accounting system, the treasurer began assigning expenditures to one of four major categories, to which a fifth was added after women were readmitted in the fall of 1935. During the seven years between the mid-1930s and the time when World War II began to dominate the College budget, the percentage of general fund expenditures (about $257,000 annually) represented by each of the five categories was as follows: promotion, 1 percent; women's division, 9 percent; maintenance of grounds, buildings, and equip-

48Will 681 (1877), Register of Wills, Philadelphia county, and proceedings, Orphans Court of Philadelphia county, October term 1878, No. 306. See also College Monthly (October 1877), p. 233.

49Although the funds which were actually contributed for the endowed professorships should have been placed in identifiable accounts in the restricted endowment, this appears from the available records never to have been done. After the death of James Strong in 1908, the trustees tried without success to convert into cash the $25,000 note which he had given when the Strong professorship was established. The College carried this worthless paper among its assets in the endowment into the 1920s, when it was at last written off.
ment, 14 percent; general and administrative, 28 percent; and instructional, 48 percent.

The largest single promotional item was the annual catalogue. Expenditures for the women's division were for operating its dining hall. The cost of wages for janitors and fireman, fuel, electricity, water, supplies, and repairs was charged to maintenance of grounds, buildings, and equipment. General and Administrative was a category which included the salaries of the president, dean, and secretaries; costs of student services; the expense of maintaining an alumni office; telephone bills; and any expenditure which did not seem to fit into other categories. No part of the budget had grown as much as this one since 1904 when, for example, there was no alumni office and student services were rendered largely by the president and faculty without cost to the institution beyond the salaries they were paid. Instructional expenses included, in addition to faculty salaries, the costs of operating a number of departments of instruction. For example, between 1936 and 1943 chemistry averaged $2,065 annually; biology, $1,100; physics, $270; and the relatively new education department, $870. At this time, the College was spending about $1,900 each year for books and related materials for the library.

Although faculty salaries during most of this period no longer consumed more than 70 percent of the general fund, as they did in 1904, they were still the largest single item of College expense. Between 1936 and 1943 about forty-three cents of every dollar spent went to pay the teachers. The $1,400 annual salary for all but the newest professors which the trustees set in 1891 was still in effect in the fall of 1904.50 As inflation began eroding their real income in succeeding years, it became increasingly apparent that the professors themselves would have to take the initiative in securing any relief. Accordingly, in June 1909 they petitioned the trustees for an increase of at least $200 to compensate for what they called a 20 percent increase in the cost of living during the "last few years." The trustees were interested, but replied that they did not then have the money to comply. A year later, the faculty repeated their request, asking for an increase of "as much at least as the reported surplus in the treasury will justify." Again the trustees were sympathetic, but this time they decided to wait until a new president was in office and

50According to the 1903-1904 report of the United States Commissioner of Education, "the salaries paid college professors are not very large in any institution and are very meager in a large number of them. These officials, however, by virtue of their positions are required to maintain a certain standard of living; and in order to keep abreast with what is going on in the world, and especially in their lines of work, considerable sums must be expended annually in the purchase of books, magazines, etc." Report of the Commissioner (1904), 2:1417.
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until an attempt could be made to secure new funds.

One of the announced goals of each financial campaign of this period was to secure an endowment which would enable the trustees to improve salaries. "In the first place, we must increase the present pitifully small salaries of our instructors," wrote President Granville in the 1912 campaign brochure. "Just think of paying a high class university trained man $1400 a year after forty-eight years of faithful and efficient service! And this in the face of the continually rising cost of living."

Even before this brochure appeared in print, the trustees raised salaries to $1,500 for the fall of 1911 and to $1,600 for 1913-1914. Four years later, after the United States had gone to war, the professors once again petitioned the board, asking for a $200 raise because of the "greatly increased cost of living and of all necessary expenses." Reminding the trustees of their earlier promise to increase maximum salaries to $1,800 by 1917, they announced their willingness to "make some sacrifice for the good of the College in any time of her imperative need." However, they insisted, "in the last ten years living expenses have increased about 100% while in the same time salaries of professors in this College have increased a little less than 15%." According to their estimate, even with the increases for which they were asking, their compensation for each working day would be about $5.75. At its June 1918 meeting, the board granted the faculty request and then asked the president to appeal to the constituency for contributions in order to sustain it.

The end was not yet in sight. In December 1919 a three-man faculty committee attended the trustee meeting, armed with seven exhibits designed to more than justify their request for a $500 increase for professors in 1919-1920 and a $200 increase the following year. The exhibits cited business and government data, educational leaders, the experiences of former colleagues now in other institutions (three of whom would soon be receiving $3,000 or more), and the practice of other colleges "of our class on our territory" to show that Gettysburg was falling further behind those colleges with which it preferred to compare itself. Salaries at Dickinson, Washington and Jefferson, and Franklin and Marshall, the committee reported, were already beyond what the Gettysburg faculty were requesting for the next year. "It matters not from what angle the approach is made," they argued, "this one fact is evident, namely, that our petition is moderate, and it is in view of its moderation, its fairness, its justice, and of dire necessity that we ask that the increase" be granted, both in full and immediately. "The need is present and urgent." The professors were aware of the burden granting their request would impose on the budget, but they reminded the trustees that "such is the case everywhere, and other institutions are
in the field making provision for meeting this contingency—they are carrying the burden which the situation imposes. In the interest of simple justice and educational efficiency," other institutions "are relieving the professors from the worry imposed by a poverty salary." After closely questioning the faculty committee to determine whether any persons or programs could be eliminated, the trustees voted a $300 increase for the year in progress (1919-1920), promised further increases as soon as possible, and then embarked upon their campaign for a million dollars.

Clearly, the situation at Gettysburg was not merely a local one. As the faculty were pressing the trustees into action, John D. Rockefeller gave the General Education Board $50,000,000 to help improve college and university salaries nationwide. In March 1921 this board released the major findings of its study of salary levels in 259 institutions. Increases during wartime had fallen far behind those in the cost of living. Some 53 percent of the 8540 faculty members included in the study were receiving less than $2,100.\(^\text{51}\)

The challenge grant of the General Education Board, the success of the fund-raising campaign, the tuition increases, and the general prosperity of the 1920s all helped to make it possible for the trustees to raise professorial salaries to $3,000 in 1920, $3,300 in 1925, $3,500 in 1926, and $3,700 in 1928.\(^\text{52}\) During the depression, beginning in February 1932, the faculty voluntarily took a 10 percent cut in salary. At the end of the 1931-1932 fiscal year, the auditor was so pessimistic about the immediate future of the College that he recommended "a further general retrenchment . . . immediately, particularly in the matter of salaries . . . There should be a reduction in individual salaries or in the number of employees." Conditions were slow to improve. A few faculty were dropped, and there was an additional 5 percent reduction in 1935-1936. Not until 1937-1938 were salaries restored to their predepression levels. In 1943, when wartime inflation was again a problem and when faculty members were conducting a military as well as a civilian curriculum, the salaries of professors were increased to $4,500. They remained at

\(^\text{51}\)New York Times, April 1, 1921. Some 39 percent were receiving between $2,100 and $4,199, while the salaries of the remaining 8 percent were above $4,200. The Gettysburgian for November 2, 1921 featured a report from the Institute for Public Service which carried a similar message.

\(^\text{52}\)Coming during a decade of price stability, the salary increases of the 1920s resulted in a substantial boost in the actual level of living for the professors. After 1920, the initiative for increases appears to have originated with the president instead of the faculty.
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that figure in 1944-1945.53

When, upon reaching the age of seventy, Eli Huber retired as
Amanda Rupert Strong professor in 1904, the trustees passed the
customary resolutions expressing appreciation of his service to the
College, but they did nothing more. He neither became a professor
emeritus nor did he receive a pension.54 In the spring of 1904, his
experience was similar to those of retiring faculty members in all
but a very few American colleges or universities. Within a year,
however, the situation began to change dramatically. On April 18,
1905 Andrew Carnegie transferred to what soon became the Car-
negie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching securities
valued at $10,000,000, the income from which was to be used to pro-
vide pensions for retired college and university professors in the
United States, Canada, and Newfoundland. "I have reached the con-
clusion that the least rewarded of all the professions is that of the
teacher in our higher educational institutions," he wrote. "Able men
hesitate to adopt teaching as a career and many old professors
whose places should be occupied by younger men can not be
retired." Carnegie hoped that this gift would "do much for the cause
of higher education and . . . remove a source of deep and constant
anxiety to the poorest paid and yet one of the highest of all
professions."55

Within six weeks of Carnegie's gift, on May 25, 1905, the Gettys-
burg faculty "respectfully and earnestly" asked the trustees "to take
steps to secure for us participation in the benefits of the Carnegie
Pension Fund." Their reason was simple enough: "the smallness of
our salaries and their insufficiency for laying up a competence [sic]

53This discussion has been limited to salaries for professors. Most other faculty
ranks did not exist until some time after 1904 and until the 1920s it was the professors
who time and again took the initiative in seeking increases for themselves as well as
for other College employees. There was no salary range for professors; in 1944-1945
only two were not receiving $4,500. The range for associate professors was from
$3,200 to $3,800, for assistant professors from $2,640 to $3,380, and for instructors
from $1,500 to $2,600. The salary of the president, which was $2,000 in 1904, had
reached $4,000 by 1915, $6,000 by 1924, $8,000 by 1927, and $10,000 by 1943. It
remained at this figure in 1944-1945. The salary of the dean was the same as that of
a professor. Faculty members might increase their income, and many did, by teaching
in a summer session, either at Gettysburg or elsewhere.

54Huber was the first Gettysburg professor to retire at the age of seventy years.
Michael Jacobs was fifty-eight when illness led to his resignation in 1886. Adam Mar-
tin was sixty-three when he retired in 1899. Harvey McKnight was sixty-one when he
left office in 1904. The trustees very generously voted Adam Foutz a lifetime pension
of $5 per month when he retired as janitor in 1908.

55The New York Times for April 28, 1905 announced Carnegie's gift in its lead story,
which reprinted his letter and identified the twenty-five trustees he named to
begin administering the fund.
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for old age." Meeting a few weeks later, the board directed President Hefelbower to make the necessary preliminary inquiries. He soon learned what he must already have suspected, that one sentence in Carnegie's letter meant exactly what it said, and thus effectively eliminated Gettysburg from participating in the new pension program: institutions which "are under control of a sect or require trustees (or a majority thereof), officers, faculty, or students to belong to any specified sect or which impose any theological test are to be excluded." In its second annual report, published in 1907, the Carnegie Foundation stated that 109 colleges and universities had some such disqualifying regulation. In the case of Gettysburg, the report noted, it was only the charter amendment of 1894, requiring that three-fourths of the trustees be members of the Lutheran church, that ran counter to Carnegie's dictum. The report declared that it was clearly the duty of all of the 109 institutions, "in justice to their own teachers, to consider the question whether the substitution of a relation of sympathy and tradition in the place of formal legal relationship does not lie in the direction of true progress." In March 1909 President Hefelbower was a member of a ten-person committee which met with representatives of the Carnegie Foundation in New York to present the claims of the so-called denominational colleges. They were not able to effect any immediate changes in foundation policy.56

In June 1909 the faculty asked the board of trustees to seek removal of the 1894 amendment from the College charter. A committee was appointed to bring in a recommendation, but possibly because a change in administration was then occurring it did not report. Then, in February 1911, the faculty passed six resolutions repeating their earlier request. They told the trustees that "the sympathetic relation of the College with the Lutheran church for more than 60 years before the amendment was fully as strong as it has been since." The only important effect of the amendment was to exclude the College from the benefits of the Carnegie program, something "manifestly unfair to our teachers who have given their faithful services for salaries acknowledged to be wholly inadequate." It was also unfair to the College, they argued, depriving it of the "comparative rank with other colleges to which it is justly

56Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Second Annual Report (New York, 1907), pp. 42-43, 60; Gettysburgian, March 3, 1909. By 1907 the foundation had placed fifty-five institutions on its accepted list, including five in Pennsylvania. One of the latter was Dickinson, whose trustees declared that their college was "never owned or controlled by any church body" and who directed the president "in the future to report the college as non-sectarian." See ibid., pp. 7-11, and Sellers, Dickinson College, p. 313.
entitled" and placing it "at a marked disadvantage in securing well-qualified new Professors." The trustees did not respond formally to this faculty initiative until June 1915, when they adopted the report of the committee charged with considering the wisdom of several proposed alterations in the charter. The trustees agreed that the College had always been "loyal to the Lutheran Church" and "would probably have so remained without the amendment, and would no doubt still so remain even if the amendment were now repealed." They "would all be glad" if the faculty were eligible for Carnegie pensions. Nevertheless, they concluded, "it would be most unwise to run the risk of disturbing the confidence of the Church in the denominational standing or loyalty of the College by now seeking a repeal of said amendment."

The scene now shifted to the New York alumni club (the most active of such organizations at the time), whose members in April 1916 called upon all alumni to join together in shouldering the responsibility for faculty pensions which the trustees were unable or unwilling to assume. They were especially concerned because their "beloved professor," John A. Himes, had been awarded no pension when he retired in 1914, after more than forty years of service, and also because the same fate might await several other senior faculty members (it is evident they were thinking of Bikle, Breidenbaugh, and Stahley). The May 31, 1916 issue of the Gettysburgian was devoted entirely to reprinting the detailed report of the New York club, which proposed pensions for senior professors, funded entirely by alumni contributions over a ten-year period, and annuities for younger faculty members, funded by alumni and faculty contributions.57 Although both the board of trustees and the Alumni Association approved the New Yorkers' plan in June 1916, it produced no results. Representatives of the Carnegie Foundation told its proponents that, while alumni might well help to raise money for faculty pensions, organizing and administering a pension program were clear responsibilities which the College trustees and administration should assume, the sooner the better.58 The costs of a pension program and wartime problems were enough to persuade the trustees to delay any action they might have considered taking at this time.

57The report contained many details, such as the current ages and salaries of faculty members, rules for awarding pensions adapted from those of the Carnegie Foundation, and projected income and outgo of a fund if 1,200 alumni contributed $10 each year for ten years. The New Yorkers assumed that faculty would retire at the age of sixty-five. The report concluded by urging all to consider the principles involved and not "confuse the main issues with any details herein proposed."

58See the article by Grad on pensioning College professors. Gettysburgian, May 16, 1917.
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After 1905 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching rapidly became a general educational agency whose annual reports dealt in detail with many topics of current educational concern, not only with faculty pensions. Its numerous pronouncements and the standards which were applied in approving institutions for participation in its program made it something of a national accrediting agency. There was a continuing need for such an institution in American higher education and, at the same time, a need to find some long-term successor to Andrew Carnegie's effort of 1905, which was most adapted to helping professors nearing retirement or already retired. Clearly, something else was needed for younger faculty. After several years of trying, the foundation succeeded in 1918 in persuading the Carnegie Foundation of New York to join it in chartering (and initially funding) the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America (TIAA), whose purpose was to offer insurance and annuities for all employees of colleges and universities in the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland. Since TIAA was organized to operate as an insurance company, to which premiums were paid on behalf of the insured, denominational or other affiliation of colleges and universities was considered to be no impediment in purchasing policies.

Instead of entering into an arrangement with TIAA, the Gettysburg trustees elected to handle benefits for retired faculty in their own way, case by case, and payable from current funds. When George D. Stahley resigned in 1920, they named him to the newly created post of medical director, with an annual salary of $800, and elected him a professor emeritus, specifically without salary "on this account." A few months later, they belatedly awarded John A. Himes a $500 pension. Compared with this action, they were especially generous in 1924 with Philip M. Bickle and Edward S. Breidenbaugh, granting each of them a lifetime annual pension of $3,000. In January 1927, at the president's urging, the board adopted a plan which provided annual pensions of $1,200 to retiring professors with between fifteen and twenty years of service and $1,500 to those with more than twenty years. Until a special endowment fund could be created, these payments would also be made from current funds. President Hanson praised the plan as one which the College "could very economically carry," whereas one with TIAA or some other insurance company "would involve a real burden for the college." The plan included only professors, five of whom were benefiting from it in 1944-1945. However, when Clyde B. Stover retired in 1943, after forty-seven years as a teacher and administrator, during which time his highest rank was associate professor, the trustees made an exception in his case. They awarded him an annual pension of $1,200.50
The Administration

Harvey W. McKnight's letter of resignation as president of the College was dated February 23, 1903 and was to become effective on the following September 1. Although the trustees would not be acting upon the letter until their commencement meeting in June, the fact of his impending retirement was announced immediately in the Gettysburgian and local newspapers. What happened during the next fifteen months, before a successor was finally chosen, was far different from the board's experience in electing the first four presidents of the College.

On May 5, 1903, members of the New York alumni club unanimously adopted a series of resolutions calling upon the trustees not to elect a new president until "sufficient opportunity has been given for free expression in this connection of the sentiments of the alumni." Further, they recommended appointment of a committee, "with representatives on it of as many Gettysburg Clubs as possible, to consider the qualifications of available men for the position of President and to report their findings to the Board in due time." The New Yorkers urged that this committee "be instructed to solicit and consider the views and wishes of the students and alumni." Finally, they decided to ask the other alumni clubs to take similar action. At the New Yorkers' request, these resolutions were published verbatim in the May 13 issue of the Gettysburgian. At their spring meetings, at least three other alumni clubs adopted similar resolutions.60

Perhaps prompted by what the New Yorkers had done, the students held a mass meeting on May 19. Convinced that "the future advancement and success of Gettysburg College upon broad and liberal lines depends largely upon the selection . . . of the right man

---

60In 1938 the trustees approved a group life insurance plan for College employees. Although nonprofit educational institutions were exempt from the new social security system at this time, President Hanson was shaken by the prospect that they might subsequently be included. "For the first time in human history the Government will proceed to tax churches and institutions of learning to meet the requirements of social service protection for their employees," he warned the trustees in June 1940. "Once the principle of taxation is recognized as a legal right of the Government the limits to which that right may be extended will present a serious handicap to all independent institutions." There is no evidence that the trustees disagreed with his assessment. In 1944-1945 faculty members were eligible to participate if they wished in group life insurance and medical insurance programs.

60John J. Young, vice president of the New York club, at whose home the May 5 meeting was held, was a trustee.
for President" and believing that the trustees would not consider them presumptuous in expressing their sentiments, the students unanimously adopted three resolutions. The first declared that the new president should be "thoroughly acquainted with modern educational methods and experienced in their use; also . . . possessed of executive ability and able to command the hearty support of all the alumni, students and friends of the College." The second endorsed the resolutions of the New York club. The third directed the meeting's leaders to send a copy of the action taken to each trustee and each alumni club, as well as to arrange for it to be published in the Gettysburgian.61

When the board met on June 2, it accepted McKnight's resignation and established a committee of seven members, instructing it to make a careful study of the situation and needs of our College and the organization of other colleges — to consider available men to do the work required — and to call a special meeting . . . when it shall be prepared to make full report, with the suggestion of one or more names for the place.

The declared purpose of the unprecedented procedure was to give the board "an intelligent understanding of the situation." Board President Glatfelter then named five pastors and two laymen to the committee, including the three senior trustees.

On August 10 twenty-six trustees gathered for the special meeting which the search committee (to use a term which came into wide use only much later) had called. Its members reported that they had held one meeting, during which they had explored the several possibilities believed open to them, and at the end of which they could not agree on what to do next. In the words of their report, "the committee has nothing to recommend and no names to present. It asks to be discharged." Probably with considerable dismay, the trustees accepted this report and then, by a vote of fourteen to eleven, decided not to proceed immediately to an election. Five of the seven members of the search committee and the president of the board voted with the minority.

After asking McKnight to remain as president during the 1903-1904 year and establishing a second search committee, of five persons, the trustees adjourned. A few days later (August 12), under the headline "Board Meeting a Fizzle; Trustees of Pennsylvania College Dally with its Business Interests," the Compiler claimed that President Glatfelter "was so disgusted with the tardiness of the board from a business standpoint that he refused to appoint the [new] com-

---

61Gettysburgian, May 20, 1903. Before scheduling the meeting, student leaders asked McKnight for permission to hold it on campus. He replied that, while he did not oppose their purpose, in the interests of strict neutrality he could not grant their request. The meeting was held off campus.
mittee" and that only "after many nominations had been made simply to be refused" were five men found who were willing to serve. The editor reported that "some of the richest men in the board, who have helped the college before this, financially, are understood to be much disgusted and may withdraw their support." He attributed the impasse to two factions in the Lutheran church. "Bitter things are being said on both sides," he noted. "Where the division will end is not known." Although the Gettysburgian for September 16 vehemently denied the accuracy of the Compiler's account, within six weeks of the meeting Glatfelter resigned as president of the board, effective at once. Two of his colleagues handed in their resignations a few months later.

The second search committee consisted of three pastors and two laymen, all of whom had been elected to the board since 1893 and none of whom had served on the first committee. On January 7, 1904 they took the unprecedented step of sending a letter to all alumni, asking them to state what they believed to be "the chief needs of our Alma Mater" and how they could best be met, as well as to identify their first, second, and third choices for president. "The Alumni and patrons of the College are entitled to be heard," the writers argued, "in matters of such vital importance as those now engaging the attention of the committee named." The Gettysburgian reprinted this letter in its issue of January 20 and urged any alumnus who had not received a copy nevertheless to send in his response to the questions which it posed.

On March 1 a second special meeting of the board convened in Gettysburg. The search committee reported that it had met four times and reviewed the alumni suggestions. The members were in full agreement that the College needed a president "who combines with Scholarship and Broad Culture, Executive, Administrative and Business Ability, and ... who has the full confidence of the Church and Alumni." However, since they were not able "to agree, unitedly upon such an one," they were making no recommendations and were asking to be discharged. Once again, their colleagues had little alternative to accepting their report as final, but this time they decided to attempt without further delay to elect a president. On six ballots the two leading candidates received either nine or ten votes, but never the required majority. One of them, Charles M. Stock, 49, a member of the class of 1874, was the longtime pastor of St. Mark's Lutheran church in Hanover, a member of the board since 1894 and its secretary since 1897, and the early choice of many persons (including a majority of the first search committee). The second candidate, William J. Gies, 32, a member of the class of 1893, possessed an earned doctorate from Yale, was an adjunct professor of physiological chemistry at Columbia University, and had a solid record as one
of the most ardent supporters of the College. Both men received votes from senior and junior members of the board as well as from pastors and laymen. Three of the four members of the second search committee who were present voted for Gies. After six ballots the trustees, concluding that neither of these candidates could then be elected, proceeded unanimously to choose Milton H. Valentine, 40, of the class of 1882, son of the former president of the College. The younger Valentine, who had received from one to three votes on the first six ballots, was a pastor who served parishes in Bedford and Philadelphia before becoming editor of the Lutheran Observer in 1899. Both the Gettysburgian and local newspapers had the highest praise for the board's choice, concluding that the newly elected president was indeed the man "to do the work required." However, three weeks after the election Valentine informed the board that, as he had earlier told the search committee, he could not see his way "clear to assume the position." The tone was decisive and convincing.

Probably for a variety of reasons, only thirteen trustees attended the regular commencement meeting of the board on June 14, 1904. By comparison, there were about twice that many at the two special meetings. It was obvious that the delay in choosing a president was reflecting unfavorably upon the College and preventing much-needed forward movement. After dealing with the several kinds of business arising during annual meetings, the trustees discussed the presidency once again and then voted, in what must have been something of an act of desperation, six to five in favor of Samuel G. Hefelbower, Professor of German. After the presiding officer declared him legally elected, those present agreed to make the count a unanimous one. "The election of Samuel Gring Hefelbower to the Presidency of Pennsylvania College came yesterday afternoon with a complete surprise," declared the Compiler (June 15), "and probably as much so to the gentleman himself as to all others." Hefelbower later wrote that "I was elected, not having been consulted, directly or indirectly," in regard to the matter. Only after at least five influential trustees, as well as others, urged him to accept

---

Both Stock and Gies took their candidacies quite seriously. The former entered in the board minute book, "for the information of any curious reader in after years," but "not part of the official record," the names and positions of the ten trustees who had supported him. He also recorded that two friends, who presumably would also have voted for him and given him the majority he needed, were kept away from the meeting, one by business and the other by sickness. Gies included in his biographical sketch which appeared for many years in Who's Who in America that he was the alumni choice for president of Gettysburg College in 1904. Failure to be elected did not lead either man to lessen his support of the College.
did he agree to assume the presidency in September. In the issue of June 24, the editor of the Lutheran Observer praised the man finally chosen for the position which he himself had so resolutely refused to accept. "He will be able to give the expanding work of the College a wise direction and supervision," Valentine wrote, "and to organize it for the best educational efficiency."

Samuel G. Hefelbower (1904-1910)

A few months short of thirty-three years of age when he assumed the College presidency, Samuel G. Hefelbower (1871-1950) was the youngest man the trustees had yet elected to that position. A native of Newville, Pennsylvania, he was graduated by the College in 1891, completed his work at the seminary and was ordained in 1894, and then spent more than a year in graduate study at the University of Leipzig (1895-1896). After serving two Pennsylvania and Maryland parishes (1896-1901), he returned to Europe, where he resumed his work in theology, philosophy, and history at Leipzig and also studied at the University of Halle (1901-1902). While he was back in the United States for what was intended to be a brief interruption of his graduate work, he was prevailed upon in 1902 to join the College faculty as Professor of German. One of his students, Joseph E. Rowe, of the class of 1904, who later became a college professor and president, praised Hefelbower as "an excellent teacher" who held "the attention of the class by his knowledge of the language" and impressed it by "his fluent use of idiomatic German." Hefelbower's first wife was Edna M. Loomis (1870-1899), of the class of 1896. Their daughter was one of the first children born to a union of Gettysburg College graduates.

When he moved into the White House in the fall of 1904, the new president must have realized the magnitude of the problems confronting him. Although his predecessor had accomplished much for the College during his long term in office, there were few advances made in his last decade, at the very time when the pace of change in American higher education was increasing. As a result, Gettysburg

---

63Samuel G. Hefelbower to the Committee on Investigation, Gettysburg, October 8, 1909, in GCA.
64Some contemporary sources, including synod minutes, refer to him as S. Gring Hefelbower.
651932 history, p. 281. Rowe recognized a fact when he wrote that "the traditional conduct" of students in the German department "was one of the sore spots in the discipline of the college." Under Hefelbower, he claimed, "all this immediately changed."
in 1904 was behind the times, both academically and financially.\textsuperscript{66} Having been elected by an almost evenly divided board with little more than a quorum present, after two previous efforts to find a widely acceptable candidate had utterly failed, Hefelbower must have wondered whether it would ever be possible for him to unite the constituencies in a way almost certainly required to bring the College up to date.

Rejecting a formal inauguration and the immediate opportunity which it would provide publicly to chart a course for the future, the new president spent his first year in office performing his campus duties (which still included teaching responsibilities), attending synod meetings, and visiting New England colleges in search of

---

\textsuperscript{66}While admitting the problems, Rowe insisted that "it must not be assumed,... that the College was in a deplorable state, so far as the work that was done was concerned. In spite of limitations, good work was done at Gettysburg, as many of us who attended universities can attest." He insisted that, during Hefelbower's tenure, Gettysburg had "a faculty of good teachers." \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 282-283.
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ideas. One of his first important pronouncements came in an address delivered when the Pen and Sword Society inducted him into membership early in 1905. According to the Gettysburgian for February 22, Hefelbower "warned the Society against the danger of giving to other things a higher place than scholarship, which should be supreme." The same issue of the paper reported his asserting on another recent occasion that "we aim to make Gettysburg the Williams, the Dartmouth of this section."

The catalogue published in 1904, as had its predecessors for more than a decade, listed the "most pressing needs" of the College as "additional teaching force and apparatus." At the end of his first year, Hefelbower persuaded the trustees to begin meeting those "pressing needs." By June 1908 they had created departments in French, physics, and philosophy. They approved hiring a second teacher in mathematics, English, and physics, and a third in chemistry. Even then, the president insisted that more teachers were needed. Meanwhile, the faculty either established or increased course offerings in such subjects as French, German, philosophy, history, psychology, and aesthetics. In his 1908 report, the president characterized the library as "perhaps the weakest point in the equipment of our college," and urged greatly increased appropriations to add personnel and books. Fully convinced that new professors should be persons who had completed substantial graduate work and preferably earned their doctorate, between 1905 and 1907 Hefelbower attracted three Ph.D.'s to the faculty. None was an alumnus, a fact which did not in the least trouble him; he considered "harmful" the old policy followed by many institutions of recruiting only their own graduates.

At Hefelbower's urging, the board in 1907 established a committee composed of trustees, faculty, and alumni to propose higher requirements for admission as well as the more rigorous curriculum which such changes would call for. In the same year, the trustees were at last persuaded to abandon formally the course of study lead-

---

67In June 1905 the trustees urged the faculty to visit other institutions at least once each three years "for the purpose of observing their methods of work" and asked the president to "put himself in touch with the great educational movements of the day." It is evident that Hefelbower needed no such advice. In his last annual report, in 1910, he recalled that during his first year in office he had studied the College, "recent educational progress and the demands of the age."

68"The present policy of securing only thoroughly university trained men has vindicated itself." Hefelbower told the board in June 1907. "It is the policy of all progressive institutions and must be maintained by our College." Although he was not always able to recruit men with doctorates, he never retreated one inch from his position. Later administrations sometimes claimed that they had instituted this policy at Gettysburg, but the facts show otherwise.
ing to the Ph.D. degree. Also in 1907, in a further effort to keep the constituencies informed of what was happening in the College, the board authorized publication of the president’s annual report. The young president brought recognition to himself and the institution when, in the same year, he became one of the five Pennsylvania college and university presidents chosen to administer the recently established Rhodes Scholarship program in Pennsylvania. Further recognition occurred when in June 1909 the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York placed Gettysburg on its list of approved colleges and universities.

On the campus itself, Hefelbower encouraged students to plan extending their formal education beyond the College and proudly reported to the board in 1909 that “the number of our young graduates doing post-graduate work (not counting those in our Seminary in Gettysburg) has almost doubled within five years.” The gradual relaxation or abandonment of some of the old rules and regulations continued. For example, in 1906 the faculty dropped the compulsory early Sunday morning chapel service and in 1908 adopted a somewhat more liberal attendance policy. Students revived an earlier interest in self-government and began discussing an honor system. For some years, the tone of the Gettysburgian suggests pronounced campus enthusiasm for the president and optimism about the future of the College. An editorial in the June 5, 1907 issue, for example, praised “the plans and ideas of our worthy President” and maintained that “it is to his ideal and his persisting zeal in striving for its realization that we owe our present status and inspiring prospect.” Reporting on the opening exercises the following September, the paper noted several “encouraging signs of a Greater Gettysburg.”

Although Hefelbower continued to insist that the College’s highest priority had to be its educational program, the success of his plans for a Greater Gettysburg depended upon his bringing more

---

69 By 1911 this publication also included annual reports of the librarian, treasurer, and athletic council.

70 Reorganized in 1904, the Board of Regents, in exercising its authority to register institutions of learning whose diplomas would be recognized in New York state, was soon widely accepted as an unofficial national accrediting agency. Allegheny, Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, Lafayette, Lehigh, and Wilson were among the institutions approved in October 1909. Journal of a Meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York (n. p., n.d.), June 17, 1909, p. 128; October 26, 1909, p. 172.
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money into its treasury.\(^71\) Increasing tuition, securing an annual grant from the Board of Education of the General Synod, and encouraging the women who within a few years were to organize the Woman's League, were all steps in the right direction, but Gettysburg desperately needed gifts larger in size than any it had ever received. It may have netted the young president to read in April 1905, upon returning from his New England trip, about Andrew Carnegie's gifts of $64,000 to Dickinson College and $37,500 to Franklin and Marshall, while Gettysburg remained empty-handed.\(^72\)

After the Jubilee Fund fell far short of its $150,000 goal, Hefelbower complained to the trustees in June 1907 that "the conduct of the whole matter has been left in the hands of the President," who simply could not carry on "an aggressive, persistent canvass and cultivation of the field," while "acting at the same time as chief administrator of the College." He told the board that "other institutions are beginning to recognize the fact that a college president can do only one man's work, and are providing financial agents." Dickinson had one, while Franklin and Marshall had two. He warned that Gettysburg could not expect to attract the required large sums of outside money until its traditional constituencies contributed enough to pay its existing debts and underwrite the improvements already made.\(^73\) Unfortunately, although he tried, undoubtedly to the best of his ability, Hefelbower was never successful in persuading either old or new friends to come forward in sufficient numbers with the needed sums of money.\(^74\)

---

\(^71\) "Buildings and endowment and income are important," he told the trustees in 1909, "but only as means to an end. The all-important thing is the use that we make of these means. If we as a Board of Trustees are not spending the income of our endowment and the hard-earned fees of our students for the best teachers that we can procure, we are not true to our trust."

\(^72\) New York Times, April 11 and 29, 1905.

\(^73\) Hefelbower told the board in June 1909 that "those men who are doing so much for college work in general are careful to select those institutions that have demonstrated their worthiness of aid by their achievements. Concentrated and persistent effort on our part are the surest guarantees of help from friends that are yet to be made."

\(^74\) On September 1, 1928 former President Granville informed I. L. Taylor, president of the Gettysburg National Bank, of his recollection that Hefelbower had twice formally asked Andrew Carnegie for $100,000 for a physics building. In spite of two suggestions from Carnegie's secretary that a general science building would be more appropriate for a college the size of Gettysburg, Hefelbower persisted in his initial request. According to Granville, there was no reply to Hefelbower's third letter. It should be noted that this testimony was based, not on documents in his possession, but on what he remembered of events which had occurred fifteen or more years earlier. Granville told Taylor that he had tried on two occasions to obtain grants from Andrew Carnegie, but without success. Granville's letter is in GCA.
By the time of the Firch fiasco and the failure to receive several other expected large gifts, there is evidence that the administration was either in or rapidly approaching serious trouble. In the 1908 commencement issue, the editor of the Compiler claimed (June 17) that “the administration at one point in the meeting of the Board of Trustees was outvoted by a majority of one, it was lambasted at the class day exercises and was openly criticised at the meeting of the Alumni Association.” The situation did not improve. Writing in veiled fashion in the issue of April 21, 1909, the editor of the Gettysburgian insisted that “the institution has advanced markedly along certain lines . . . in spite of very unfavorable as well as unfortunate and unnecessary obstacles. The College has labored along well under buffeting from one side and another.” While arguing that the student newspaper “must refuse to take any stand in the controversy that seems now to be nearing a climax,” the editor called upon “every man whose opinion bears weight, whose action may mean even the slightest difference in the position his Alma Mater will occupy in a few years, to assert himself for the best.”

It was Hefelbower himself who precipitated the climactic action in June 1909, when he told the trustees that

inasmuch as the administration of Pennsylvania College has been criticised and condemned in certain statements purporting to have been issued in the interests of the College and circulated generally among the alumni, students and friends of the College, and feeling that this criticism is unfair to those to whom you have entrusted the educational affairs of the College and cannot result otherwise than in great harm to the Institution and its future growth, I deem it my duty to request your Board to appoint a proper committee to fully investigate existing conditions, and, . . . to report . . . any recommendations . . . tending to the betterment or correction of those conditions.

The five-man committee which the board appointed met in Gettysburg over a three-day period in October. It listened to the president, as well as to several faculty and board members. The testimony which Hefelbower gave was contained in a strongly worded and unequivocal statement whose categories were followed in the committee’s final report.75 Under the heading of educational administration, the president charged that, when he took office in 1904, admission requirements were “forty years behind the times” and the curriculum was “not up to date.” He took it to be his “first duty” to correct these defects, and explained in detail both the substantial accomplishments of his administration and what still remained to be done. Under the heading of financial administration, Hefelbower

---

75Samuel G. Hefelbower to the Committee on Investigation, Gettysburg, October 8, 1909, in GCA.
noted the burden of debt and interest which he had inherited. His first duty here, he believed, was to make a few necessary improvements while reducing the debt as much as possible. Of equal importance was finding the money necessary to pay for the many changes being made in the educational program. Although he was able to point to an increase of about 50 percent in annual income and some debt reduction since 1904, he had to conclude that the debt remained "a great incumbrance" and that it was "a difficult task to collect money to cancel obligations that have been long standing." He charged that what he called "our low educational standards," the "denominational character of the Institution," and "a divided constituency, which made itself felt even in the Board of Trustees," all combined to make it extremely difficult to obtain sorely needed support from "persons outside our own constituency." Finally, under the heading of disciplinary administration, Hefelbower accused unnamed members of the faculty of failing to support "the proper administration of discipline" and of reporting confidential faculty discussions to students. In addition, he charged that "outside parties" had interfered, not only with discipline, but also with the operations of the Gettysburgian. "There have been times," he insisted, when the task of functioning in such a situation has been "all but unbearable."

In summary, Hefelbower pointed to the divisions which had hampered the College's "growth and progress for many years." The "disturbed condition" which he found "was not auspicious for the beginning of a new administration," and he was therefore not surprised "that it has been found impossible thus far to harmonize the existing factions." He was especially critical of those faculty members and others who undertook "to resist and to discredit" his efforts to raise admission requirements, change the curriculum, and attract university-trained men. He attributed this difficulty in part to the wide age gap between the older and younger members of the faculty and to the different "pedagogical methods and principles" to which each group was accustomed. Furthermore, he charged, neither board nor faculty appeared to realize that, in spite of changing times, the administration of the College had developed but little since 1832. He took the faculty to task for failing "to respond to certain requests looking to such divisions of labor as are in force at other institutions, and which are suggested by the increased demands on the President."

It was now the turn of the investigating committee, which made its report to the trustees at their regular midwinter meeting in December 1909.76 The members praised the educational administra-

76The text of the report was included in the minutes of the meeting.
tion of the College as "a decided success" deserving "the approval and commendation of all persons having the good of the College at heart." The words used to characterize the financial administration were much more restrained: it "has been fairly successful in certain lines." Although there were definite gains to be noted, the fact remained that "very much of the alleged dissatisfaction with the present administration seems to have arisen because of the failure to get money in large quantities, for all purposes." However, the investigating committee was not convinced that "the administration should be censured and pronounced a failure for that reason." Its members advanced some of Hefelbower's own reasons for the limited success in raising money. They singled out "over-zealous and not always judicious and discreet criticism of the administration" and the lack of "entire harmony among the friends of the College."77 At this point the report contained a startling statement for any responsible college trustee committee to make: "Whether it is the duty of the President of a College alone to provide for its finances is an open question."

Finally, as for the disciplinary administration, the committee concluded that it "is not all that we should desire it to be." Although "the general discipline of the College has been fairly administered, and the order in the Institution is fairly good," the members were unhappy because of the workings of the absence system, as they understood them; of lax use of the penalties for allegedly increasing drunkenness among the students; and of the lack of "harmony, unity of purpose, and cordial feeling" among the faculty, which they believed students sometimes exploited to their own advantage.78

After the trustees considered the committee's report and adopted it, with only minor changes, Hefelbower presented his resignation as president, effective at the end of the academic year. "Being convinced that those policies for which the present administration has stood are thoroughly established," he told his colleagues, "and having the same preference for work of a different character that I had when, under pressure from members of the Board and friends of the College, I accepted the Presidency in June, 1904," he was now prepared to leave. "Whether or not the resignation of our President was the best solution of the difficulty we cannot say," wrote the editor of

77 The committee believed that this state of affairs was so serious that it had limited the growth in student enrollment.
78 The Gettysburgian for January 12, 1910 stated that the trustees simply did not understand the absence system as it functioned. Although neither Hefelbower nor the committee referred to hazing as a problem, it is probable that it contributed to the unpopularity of the administration among the constituencies beyond the campus. For details of a hazing case see p. 672.
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the Gettysburgian on January 12, 1910, "but as a solution it com-
mends itself to all lovers of Gettysburg . . . . That Dr. Hefelbower, 
believing that he saw in a personal sacrifice a bigger and better Get-
tysburg is a beautiful compliment to him as a son of old Gettys-
burg."79 In his last report to the trustees in June 1910, the departing 
president reminded them that they had approved all of his recom-
mandations, elected every professor he nominated, and "unreserv-
edly approved of the general educational policy." It was his parting 
hope and prayer, he concluded, "that a better and a greater Gettys-
burg will soon appear."

After leaving the presidency of the College, Hefelbower studied 
at Princeton and then at Harvard, which awarded him a Ph.D. degree 
in 1914. He was a professor of philosophy at Washburn College, 
Topeka, Kansas (1914-1920), Carthage College (1920-1936), and 
Wagner College (1936-1947). He was the author of The Relation of 
John Locke to English Deism (1918). Elected a trustee of Gettysburg 
College in 1906, he remained a member of the board until resigning 
in 1923. After leaving the presidency, he continued to play an active 
role in the board, to the more-than-occasional dismay of his suc-
cessor. After 1923 he continued to return to Gettysburg from time 
to time to visit and confer with friends. It was he to whom the board 
turned to write the centennial history of the College which was 
published in 1932. When he died in Chautauqua, New York, in 1950, 
his body was returned to Gettysburg for burial.

William A. Granville (1910-1923)

When the board of trustees accepted President Hefelbower’s 
resignation in December 1909, it chose a committee of five of its 
junior members, all of whom had been elected since 1905, to recom-
mand one or more candidates to succeed him. A few months later, 
the newly organized Federation of Gettysburg Clubs asked the 
several alumni clubs to provide the search committee with a state-
ment of the desirable qualifications in a new president and a list of 
persons who, in their opinion, best met them.80 The first to respond 
to this appeal was the Yale club, which at its annual meeting in April 
1910 declared that the next president should be a person who was 
"well versed and trained in American educational methods," 
possessed of "that executive ability which will make the best practi-
cal use of the means at his command," and capable of "sufficient

79After a new president had been elected, the editor of the Gettysburgian lamented 
[June 15, 1910] the lack of unity under Hefelbower and the "harsh and unjust criticism 
when earnest endeavor fell short of accomplishment."

80For more information on the Federation of Gettysburg Clubs, see pp. 688-891.
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influence among men to win and hold the interest and co-operation of public spirited men and women of means." In addition, "by his publications or educational work" he should have "made his name widely and favorably known and his ability felt as an educator." Finally, he should be "a Lutheran - clerical or lay." The club offered, as its first choice, William A. Granville (1864-1943), Professor of Mathematics, Yale University; as its second choice, Luther A. Weigle (1880-1976), of the class of 1900, Professor of Philosophy, Carleton College; and as its third choice, Luther P. Eisenhart (1876-1965), of the class of 1896, Professor of Mathematics, Princeton University. One week later, the New York club met and, after its presiding officer (William J. Gies) stated firmly that he was not again a candidate, adopted its own set of qualifications for the new College president: he need not be an alumnus; since "a large increase of funds was obviously necessary to carry forward" the work of the College, he should be a "professional educator with executive capacity" and the ability, "proved or probable," to secure the support of people with "influence and means:" and he should be a person who could be required to give "much of his time to the financial administration of the college." The New York club then seconded the three nominations already made.

When the trustees met on June 14, 1910, the search committee reported that it had held four meetings and considered all of the information presented to it. The members then offered as their candidate for the presidency William A. Granville, who was elected unanimously on the first ballot. According to a later account (October 26, 1910), in the Gettysburgian, the choice was made within seven minutes after the board convened. The next order of business was to send Granville a telegram inviting him to the campus. When he arrived the next morning, which was commencement day, he was given the nearest thing to a royal welcome which the College had ever extended to anyone. The secretary of the board described it in his minutes:

On Wednesday morning, June 15th, 1910, at 10:50 of the clock, Dr. Granville arrived at the Reading depot. When his distinguished form appeared there was no doubt as to his welcome – the immense crowd of people there gathered sent up such a cheer as was heard to the utmost bounds of the College grounds. Every person wore a conspicuous badge bearing the words "Welcome, President Granville," the bands played "Hail to the Chief." Our Board committee cordially and gracefully bade him welcome and conducted him to the head of the automobile line there in waiting. The procession quickly formed, brass bands in front, automobiles bearing the new

81 See the Gettysburgian for April 13 and 20, 1910 for accounts of the Yale and New York meetings.
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President, the Board Committee, a number of our older Alumni, and bringing up the rear the whole cheering student body in two divisions marshalled by our younger Alumni. By a route a little circuitous [it included the main streets of town] the column moved to the dear old College grounds . . . . Never was a man more cordially welcomed to historic Gettysburg.

The new president, a man then in his forty-seventh year, was born to Swedish immigrant parents in White Rock, Goodhue county, Minnesota. After attending Gustavus Adolphus College for two years, he went to Lindsborg, Kansas, where, at the young Bethany College, he taught mathematics and served as treasurer from 1886 to 1891. One of his students there later remembered him as a teacher "whose powers to clarify the air of a recitation room might be likened unto the fresh northerly winds of Minnesota, whence he hailed." Leaving Kansas, Granville then went to Yale University, which awarded him the degree of bachelor of philosophy in 1893 and of doctor of philosophy in 1897. He began a fifteen-year career on the Yale mathematics faculty in 1895, at the end of which the secretary of the university declared that "year after year the graduating class of the Sheffield Scientific School has voted Dr. Granville to be its best as well as its most popular teacher." While at Yale he published Elements of the Differential and Integral Calculus (1904), Plane and Spherical Trigonometry (1908), Four-Place Tables of Logarithms (1908), and (with Percy F. Smith) Elementary Analysis (1910). All of these works went through several editions and remained in print for many years. The calculus text was the most successful of his publications. An active Lutheran, Granville was the first layman and the first nonalumnus since 1850 elected to the presidency. When he moved to Gettysburg in August 1910, his annual salary dropped from $5,000 to $2,000, plus use of a house.

The inauguration of the new president on October 20, 1910 was unlike any ceremony the College had ever witnessed. It was held in a large tent designed to seat two thousand persons and erected south of Brua Chapel. The entire campus was elaborately decorated and illuminated for the occasion. For the first time ever there was a formal academic procession, in which more than six hundred persons

---

83 The first degree was awarded by the Sheffield Scientific School, which at the time was one of the main divisions of Yale University.
85 Charles M. Stock to George D. Stahley, Hanover, June 17, 1910, in GCA. 
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Members of the faculty, assembled for the academic procession during the 1910 inaugural ceremonies.

participated, including representatives of more than forty colleges, universities, and academies, as well as many students and alumni. Almost one hundred of these participants were dressed in academic costume. Among those awarded honorary degrees on this occasion were Martin G. Brumbaugh, superintendent of the Philadelphia Public Schools; John Page Nicholson, chairman of the Gettysburg National Park Commission; Ira Remsen, president of The Johns Hopkins University; Allen J. Smith, of the class of 1883, Professor of Comparative Pathology and Dean of the Medical School, University of Pennsylvania; and Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., secretary of Yale University.\footnote{The inaugural committee consisted of eleven trustees, faculty, alumni, and students. Its plans for what the Gettysburgian (October 19) called "a celebration which will by far surpass anything of its kind in the history of the institution" were well under way before Granville arrived on campus and joined it in August. Trustees, College and seminary faculty, members of the senior class, and representatives of other institutions all appeared in academic costume. Writing in the 1912 Spectrum, Abdel Ross Wentz called the inauguration "without doubt the most august ceremony and the most distinguished assemblage of visitors that academic Gettysburg has ever witnessed."}

In his inaugural address, the new president began by calling attention to the phenomenon of change in American society and to the many problems which recent changes had created. Prescribing learning as his remedy, he asked whether the nation's educational development was "along lines that will help us to satisfactorily solve our present social and industrial problems and at the same time..."
blaze out a clear and unmistakable trail for the future." Turning to the institution whose chief executive he had just become, Granville inquired whether Gettysburg was "doing her part of this educational work in the most efficient manner" and whether the time had not come "when she should branch out in new fields of endeavor." Any such extension of its current efforts, he acknowledged, must take into account the fact that "the efficiency of a college, like the efficiency of a man, depends, not on the number of things it tries to do, but on the number of things it does well." After reviewing the record of the College in preparing men for the ministry, law, medicine, education, and business, he felt "justified in making the statement that whatever work Pennsylvania College has undertaken to do, she has done well." In words similar to those of Presidents Valentine in 1868 and McKnight in 1885, Granville opted for an "evolution rather than a revolution" in facing the future. "Let us hold fast to all the old that has served us so well and with open minds examine and test that which is new." After all, he argued, "the foundations here have been laid broad and deep, and it is for us to build on them wisely and well." Noting such recent developments as the change in entrance requirements, the beginnings of student government, and the financial support offered by several groups of women, he was obviously convinced that the College was advancing along sound lines.

Granville devoted most of his inaugural address to two topics which he believed were of immediate and "fundamental importance" to the College: engineering education and church relationship. Turning first to the former, he argued that while most people recognize the need for the proper training of ministers, lawyers, and doctors, most are confused when it comes to preparing someone for engineering. This was especially unfortunate because, while "years have passed in which you never needed the services of a doctor and perhaps tens of years when you never needed to call on a lawyer, ... there is scarcely one of us who is not daily exposed to dangers that might arise from the ignorance or deficient training of some engineer." Every day, he thought, "the number of men accidentally killed and disabled is as large as the number of casualties in some of the important battles of the Revolutionary War." Most of the disasters which had occurred, he was certain, were the result of "some bad engineering blunder." Granville outlined four possible plans for sound engineering education, declared that "the question of engineering courses is before Pennsylvania College now and ... requires a definite answer in the near future," and urged alumni and other friends to contribute their ideas before the faculty and board attempted "a satisfactory solution."
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Turning to his second topic, Granville insisted that without the Christian leaven “working in the mass of our population only a short time would elapse before moral decay would undermine our social foundations and there would be no effective defense against those forces ever present which tend to destroy character and turn a people back to savagery.” America, he proclaimed, was a Christian nation; it could not survive as such without Christian leaders, virtually all of whom come from what he called “denominational colleges.” Close them, he warned, and “we could see no ray of hope for the future, by a single stroke our ambition would be crushed out, all enemies of law and order would rejoice, and we would be rushing on to our destruction.” In view of this truth, Granville found it “very difficult to explain” why the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was excluding so-called denominational colleges from the benefits of its pension plan, especially since all of the colleges which it was then aiding were in fact exerting upon their students “a certain Christian influence.” Declining to question Andrew Carnegie’s good intentions, he expressed the hope that the retired industrialist would soon change the provisions under which the foundation was operating.

Granville ended his address with an appeal for unity among the College constituencies. “Gettysburg needs your interest, your sympathy, your prayers, and your money,” he told its alumni and friends, “and I am certain you will not fail her.” All in all, it was an auspicious beginning for the new administration. “The co-operation which has so long been urged as the theoretical remedy,” wrote the editor of the Gettysburgian, in the October 26 issue, “has come to be a reality.”

If we can believe the testimony of the Gettysburgian, the unity for which Granville called was already evident by the time of his inauguration. “Our whole college atmosphere seems to be pervaded with a new life and vigor,” wrote the editor in the September 28 issue. “The Renaissance has surely come for Gettysburg, and no student can help but feel that this life is making his heart beat faster and his hand more ready to give his best to this forward movement.”

87The inaugural address was published in the Gettysburgian for October 19, 1910. See also Granville Inaugural, pp. 39-50. Granville defined a denominational college in his day as one “more or less closely affiliated with some general church body to whose constituency it looks for its main financial support and from which it draws a large proportion of its students.” Almost all such colleges, he said, are “non-sectarian, that is, the students entering or graduating, are not subject to any theological test, nor does the college curriculum include sectarian doctrine as part of the required work.” Gettysburg, he affirmed, “represents the highest type of a denominational college” and glories in its “close relationship to the greatest Protestant Church in the world, the Church of Luther and the Reformation.”
the same time, it is evident that no one saw the rebirth as an abrupt break with the College's past. Enlarged and personalized, the motto of the previous administration was put to the service of its successor. In September the physical director and athletic coach declared that the College war cry was now Granville and Greater Gettysburg. The October issue of the Mercury ran this slogan on every page. "From the 'White House' comes the call to arms," it declaimed,

and in the north and south, and east and west is heard the tramp of marching men - men zealous to fight the battles of a Greater Gettysburg. Before and above them floats "the Orange and the Blue," and at every fresh assault still higher ascends the shout - "Granville and Greater Gettysburg!" 88

The White House was only one of many places from which the call to arms was sounded. The new president followed the lead of his predecessors in addressing supporting synods whenever they were in session. He spoke to an increasing number of congregations and nonchurch gatherings, usually in an effort to raise money for

88Mercury (October 1910), p. 26. See also the Gettysburgian for October 26, 1910 and January 11, 1911, for expressions of the great optimism which pervaded the campus at the time. In the latter issue, the editor wrote that "the signs of the times already indicate the advent of that period of millenial happiness and prosperity which has been the dream of all loyal Gettysburgians."
the College. Frequently invited to deliver high school and academy commencement addresses, he accepted, in part at least, because his effort might help in recruiting students. In addition, he spent considerable time off campus attending meetings of church, educational, and state agencies. In the fall of 1913 his not being on the road was campus news. "Dr. Granville is again at home for a little while," commented the Gettysburgian for October 22. "He spoke in Y.M.C.A. on Sunday." In that year the board of trustees finally and formally recognized the changed responsibilities of the presidency by removing from the office the professorship attached to it since 1832 and assigning it to the chair of philosophy.

Some of the early changes in the Granville administration resulted from initiatives started but not completed during the Hefelbower years. Beginning in the fall of 1911, the entrance requirements were brought into line with the recommendations of the College Entrance Examination Board and the curriculum underwent a major reorganization as the classical and scientific courses gave way to what was called the group system. The latter was in turn replaced by a system of majors, minors, and distribution requirements in the fall of 1922. Student government became a reality in the fall of 1910 and some of the students began operating under an honor system two years later. In response to Granville's request, the board of trustees authorized new programs in civil and municipal engineering for the fall of 1911 and in mechanical and electrical engineering for the fall of 1913. Four other new departments were instituted during his presidency: economics and political science (1914), military science and tactics (1917), education (1921), and history (1923). The first summer session was conducted in 1912. In December 1910 Granville informed the trustees that he would continue the policy of his predecessor by recommending to them for appointment to professorships only university-trained persons and, further, that those without previous teaching experience would be given a period of time to prove themselves before qualifying for more permanent appointment. Although he tried to secure for these positions persons with the Ph.D. degree, he was not always successful. While the

---

89 Although undoubtedly the wives of the earlier presidents played important roles as campus first ladies, Ida Irvin Granville (1869-1947) made the first recorded efforts to substitute on occasion for her husband when he was away on College business. President Hefelbower gave up teaching responsibilities after his first year in office. According to the 1911 catalogue, Granville offered a course of lectures on the history of mathematics. It was not listed in 1912, but he did some teaching during the illness and after the death of Professor Henry B. Nixon.

90 There were classes during the summer under some earlier calendars. This summer session was separate from the regular academic year.
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three fund-raising drives of the Granville years did not yield everything that was hoped for, they did eliminate the troublesome debt and greatly increase the financial strength of the College. When Granville left Gettysburg early in 1923, the endowment was almost four times as great as it had been when he arrived in 1910.

Thanks in part to the efforts of its president, these years also brought added regional and national recognition to Gettysburg College. On two occasions the General Education Board examined its credentials and determined that it qualified for challenge grants. In a report published in 1918 by a committee established by the United States Bureau of Education, Gettysburg was listed as one of the institutions meeting the suggested requirements for a successful college of arts and sciences. Three years later, it was one of twenty-two Pennsylvania schools to appear on the first list of accredited colleges and universities which the Middle States Association issued. In 1922 the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa authorized the establishment of a chapter on the Gettysburg campus. Further recognition resulted from the ways in which Granville was called upon to assist the cause of higher education and the church: serving on the committee which administered the Rhodes scholarships in the United States (1913); representing the General Synod in the recently organized Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (1913-1918); serving on the committee to organize the Pennsylvania Industrial Welfare and Efficiency Conference (1913); serving on the Pennsylvania Rhodes scholarship committee (1916); representing the state at the National Conference on Immigration and Americanization (1916); presiding over the National Lutheran Educational Conference (1919); and becoming president of the Insurance Economic Society of America (1921).

William A. Granville was a tall, handsome man with a large frame and a head of flowing white hair. He had a high-pitched, rather weak voice which did not seem to fit the man and which definitely limited his effectiveness as a public speaker. Years after he left Get-

---

91In his June 1912 annual report. Granville noted that April 7, 1832, the date of its charter, had always been given as the College's founding date, despite the "universal practice of all higher institutions of learning" to use for that purpose "their very first beginnings even if they consisted of only a single teacher with but a single preparatory student." He noted that "Pennsylvania College grew out of Gettysburg Academy, which in turn was the successor of an earlier private school," all of which could carry its beginnings back to Alexander Dobbin and the 1770s. Granville wrote that he was simply calling this matter to the board's attention and was making no recommendation. The trustees listened and, most wisely, took no action.

92Granville "has accomplished within three years the seemingly impossible," John B. McPherson told the editor of the Gettysburgian. See the issue for January 28, 1914.
tysburg, one alumnus recalled that his distinctive laugh always betrayed his presence at the motion picture show uptown. Granny was remembered as a kindly man, whose consideration for others sometimes led him to care for ill students in the White House. Another alumnus echoed the student from Bethany College when he testified that on a few occasions when Granville entered the classroom, to replace a mathematics professor who was ill or absent from the campus, he was a marvelous teacher who made calculus come alive. His fondness for Hershey bars was well-known; one of them often constituted his noon meal when he was traveling on College business. Granny commanded the respect of most students, who saw in him an experienced scholar and good administrator, albeit a man of considerable reserve and somewhat austere.39

Granville experienced two times of troubles at Gettysburg, after the second of which he sought and found another position. The first of these occasions reached its peak during the war year of 1917-1918. The main source of discontent appears to have been hazing, especially of freshmen. It is evident that many alumni and others off campus opposed the practice; some threatened to cut off their financial support if it were not stopped. Both the board and the faculty having taken a strong stand against hazing, it became the president's duty to enforce their stated policy among a student body the majority of whose members firmly believed that some disciplining of freshmen was necessary and were determined to have it in one form or another. The worst of the trouble occurred in the late spring of 1918, when several hazing incidents proved too much for student government to handle and provoked the faculty to intervene by suspending more than a dozen students.

Caught in the middle of all this, Granville attributed the unrest to understandable student uncertainty about whether to remain in College or enter the armed forces, observing that similar situations prevailed on every other Pennsylvania campus. He accepted with at least outward equanimity the opprobrium visited upon him, which is evident in the sharp edge of the fun which the Spectrum poked at him and in an unfriendly nighttime serenade in front of the White House. One alumnus remembered that for a time Granville stopped attending chapel to avoid being booed. When the students returned

39I am indebted to the following for sharing their recollections of Granville with me: Spurgeon M. Keeny (1914); F. William Sunderman (1919); Dwight F. Putman (1920); Owen D. Coble (1921); Fred G. Pfeffer (1921); C. Allen Sloat (1923); Henry T. Bream (1924); Ethel Grace Allison (1925), Kenneth S. Ehrhart (1925); Millard E. Gladfelter (1925); and Millard L. Kroh (1925). Almost every one of these persons, without prompting from me, remembered the voice and the laugh. The nickname Granny appeared early in the administration and remained in use until its end.
to College in the fall of 1918, most of them were under military discipline and hazing, for the moment at least, was under strict control. After the war ended, the unrest did not reappear, as some expected it would, but students and faculty were not able to agree on a mutually satisfactory method of freshman discipline until after Granville left the presidency.94

The second of Granville's times of troubles came to a climax in the spring of 1922, by which time the effects of the honeymoon of a decade earlier had completely worn off. Early in that year, he called in two professors whose work he regarded as unsatisfactory and, following the board rule adopted in 1884, gave them the required six-months' notice that their services were no longer desired. Before acting, he consulted with the executive committee of the board of trustees and secured its approval of what he intended to do. After receiving their notices, both professors protested that they were being treated unfairly. They quickly succeeded in attracting to their side a number of faculty colleagues as well as some students, all of whom appealed to the board to overrule the president's action. Upon receiving their petitions in June 1922, the trustees appointed a committee to investigate the matter and make its report at an adjourned meeting. The abundant testimony which Granville's opponents presented to this committee included a long catalogue of alleged failings and mistakes on his part, some of them going back to the early years of his presidency. One faculty member insisted that, as a result of a series of blunders, the president had lost the confidence of the faculty and should either resign or be dismissed. To each of the chargesGranville made a vigorous response.

By the time the trustees met in July, one of the two professors had removed himself from the picture by resigning. The committee recommended that the other one be continued, but that the candidate whom Granville had secured to replace him be appointed, actually to do the work which the president claimed was not then being done. The trustees accepted this recommendation, but referred back to the committee another proposal which would have involved "the Faculty or a properly constituted Committee thereof" in all future hirings and dismissals, but in a way which would not

---

94The alumni in College in 1917-1918 who shared their recollections with me did not make the connection between hazing and the student-faculty trouble which is developed in this paragraph. The author made it, using faculty minutes, the Gettysburgian, and Granville's own testimony as contained in a July 5, 1922 letter to the president of the board, in GCA. At least two of the alumni interviewed believed in retrospect that Granville deserved better treatment than he received from some students at this time.
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diminish the final authority of the board in this respect. 95

Granville accepted the results of the board's investigation, which occurred just as the College was savoring the announced success of the Endowment and Expansion Campaign. In the fall he visited a meeting of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa and argued successfully for a chapter of that society for Gettysburg College. At the same time, he could not have forgotten that the board of trustees, with the active support of a sizable part of the faculty, had failed to sustain him on an important personnel matter. Certainly, he became receptive to a change of position. Whether or not he took the initiative in securing a new post is unknown, but on November 25, 1922 Granville submitted his resignation to the president of the board of trustees, effective March 1, 1923, so that he could begin to organize and then conduct a bureau of insurance education in Chicago. 96 His letter explained the necessity of his beginning this new work before the end of the academic year and also his belief that a change in College administration could be made "with less confusion during the month of March than at any other time during the calendar year." The accounts of the resignation which then appeared in the Gettysburgian and other local newspapers praised Granville for his many accomplishments and contained no hint of his recent time of troubles. The editor of the Gettysburgian stated in the issue of November 29 that during the preceding twelve years the College had "greatly improved in every department" and that it would "lose an able executive in the departure of Pres. Granville." On the evening of his last day in office, faculty and students gathered to honor him. His last words were very similar to some of the first he had directed to students more than twelve years earlier: the key to success is hard work and optimism. "It was the best speech we ever heard 'Granny' give us," declared a Gettysburgian reporter (March 7, 1923). "It was a man's talk to men."

In March 1923 the Granvilles moved to Chicago, where he spent the remainder of his life as an insurance company executive. At the time of his death in 1943 he was vice president of the Washington National Insurance Company. He continued to be an active

---

95 For the charges and responses made during this controversy, see the letters of Granville, Dapp, and Parsons preserved in GCA.

96 According to the Gettysburg Times for November 27, 1922, the leading life, casualty and accident insurance companies were organizing a bureau of insurance education "to study all forms of social insurance and to conduct research work along such insurance lines." During the controversy, Granville informed Dapp in writing (June 29, 1922) that "during the war I arrived at the firm conviction that in all fairness to myself and family and for the best interests of the college I should resign the presidency when I arrived at the age of 60. This means that in June 1923 I will resign, same to take effect July 1, 1924." GCA.
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Lutheran, serving as president of the American Federation of Lutheran Brotherhoods from 1925 to 1929. Upon leaving Gettysburg, Granville did not resign his position as trustee of the College (to which he was elected in 1910) and protested when his name was dropped from the catalogue list in 1924. It was restored the following year, but last appeared in 1928. The Granville interest in Gettysburg College continued and was evidenced in several ways. He honored the personal pledge which he made during the Endowment and Expansion Campaign and which was still unpaid in the spring of 1923. On several occasions the Granvilles opened their Chicago home to entertain groups of Gettysburg alumni living in the area.

Administrative Committee (1923)

When it accepted the resignation of President Granville, the board of trustees named five of its members to search for his successor and authorized the executive committee to make proper arrangements for carrying on the work of the presidency from March 1, 1923 until that successor was chosen and able to assume his duties. In January 1923 the executive committee established an administrative committee and named two trustees and one faculty member to serve on it: Jacob A. Clutz, Harry C. Picking, and Philip M. Bikle. Upon assuming its duties, the new committee announced a division of labor among its members. Dean Bikle would handle "all matters relating to the internal administration of the institution not disposed of by the Faculty." Its nonmember secretary, Samuel F. Snyder, would be in charge of the president's office and refer matters which he could not deal with to the committee or to one of its members. In the late winter and spring of 1923, as the search committee began its work, there was no campaign similar to those in 1904 and 1910, when alumni clubs formally offered their statements of qualifications for presidential candidates and presented lists of persons who, in their opinion, met them. As early as January 10, without identifying its source, the Gettysburgian reported that at least six names were being mentioned in various quarters. In May, the Gettysburg Times asked several interested persons to state the qualities which a good college president should have. On May 21 it published the response of John F. Dapp, president of the board of trustees. After listing numerous desirable qualities, Dapp observed that "the ideal college president is a superman."

---

97 The trustee minutes record no action formally dropping him from membership, which he forfeited by nonattendance at meetings.

98 Undated announcement. in GCA.
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Although as the time for the commencement board meeting approached, the administrative committee gave the distinct impression that the search for a new president was far from over, it was evident by mid-May that the field had already been narrowed to one candidate. On June 13, the search committee presented to the board the name of Henry W. A. Hanson (1882-1962). Following a brief discussion, twenty-two trustees voted in favor of the candidate, one was against, and two abstained. The vote was then made unanimous. Within a week the president-elect announced that he would accept the board's offer.

Henry W. A. Hanson (1923-1952)

At the time of his election, Henry William Andrew Hanson was forty-one years of age, having been born in Wilmington, North Carolina, to parents of Danish origin. Roanoke College awarded him the degree of bachelor of arts in 1901, when he was nineteen years old. After being graduated by the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg in 1904, he spent two years traveling and studying in Europe before being ordained and becoming pastor of St. Luke's Lutheran church in Pittsburgh. In 1913 he was called to Messiah Lutheran church in Harrisburg where, during his ten-year pastorate, the membership almost doubled and a new church was built. In 1918 Gettysburg College awarded him the degree of doctor of divinity. Early in 1920 he appeared on campus as main speaker during the annual week of prayer. When he was elected president of the College, Hanson was also president of the East Pennsylvania Synod and of the West Indies Mission Board of the United Lutheran Church in America. In addition, he had a record of active involvement in many community affairs in Harrisburg. The new president took up his duties in late August and moved his family into the White House a short time thereafter.

The inauguration on October 19, 1923 was obviously patterned on the one during which Hanson's predecessor was formally inducted into office. It too was held in a large tent designed to seat more than fifteen hundred persons and erected south of Brua Chapel. Once again the campus was elaborately decorated for the occasion. Representatives of almost sixty educational institutions marched in the academic procession. "We are assembled at the beginning of a new epoch in the administration of the College," declared William J. Gies, the presiding officer, "when changes for better or for worse may be impending, and when consequences of good or evil may follow." This well-known alumnus was concerned "lest the College fail to meet its highest opportunities for educational service - lest it be turned from the field of its greatest public usefulness into
avenues of superficiality." He was "equally concerned lest mistaken views of the duties, and obligations, and opportunities, of this College may give it a character we would not wish it to acquire – lest unwise policies affecting the development of the College may pervert its influence or impair its quality." Gies hastened to add that everyone could be "happily reassured by the record of the public career, and by the general knowledge of the private character, of our new leader."\footnote{Quoted in The Induction into Office of Henry W. A. Hanson D. D. as President of Gettysburg College (Gettysburg, 1924), pp. 9-10. Hereafter cited as Hanson Inaugural. The twelve-member inaugural committee included trustees, faculty, alumni, and students. This was the first inaugural captured by motion pictures.}

The new president’s inaugural address differed sharply from the matter-of-fact speech of his predecessor and from the close analysis of the contemporary educational scene delivered by Presidents Valentine and McKnight. Calling to his service the oracle of Delphi, Aristotle, Thomas Carlyle, Rudyard Kipling, H. G. Wells, and Henri Bergson, Hanson sought more than anything else to inspire his audience by delivering a sermon, albeit one without a Biblical text. Material advancements in the world, he declared, have not been
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matched by advancement in the soul. A changing world calls for changed men and women. Quoting a paragraph from Carlyle's Heroes and Hero Worship, he concluded that "the one great task, beside which all others fade into minor importance, is the development of leadership" to meet the needs of the age. The special role of Gettysburg College in the 1920s was to build "a virile, rugged, red-blooded manhood, which is passionately loyal to worthwhile ideals" and which "transforms the vicious statement – 'The world owes me a living,' into the nobler sentiment – 'I owe the world a life.'" Echoing all of his predecessors, Hanson insisted that "an education for leadership which is not Christian is for the needs of our day no education at all . . . Religion is the root; ideals are the blossoms; service is the fruit." There were for the world "industrially, socially, nationally and internationally . . . only two possible alternatives – Christianity or Chaos."

Although Hanson offered no detailed program for the future of the College, he hoped to see it send even more "virile, red-blooded, prophetic souls" into the ministry than it had in the past. Since it could not expect to compete with the extensive programs of many large public institutions, he urged that Gettysburg "be developed along the cultural rather than the technical lines," in harmony "with the purpose of its founders, its traditions, and its largest present day opportunities." He believed it "essential that we have the strongest faculty which can be secured," consisting of "Christian gentlemen who possess in their own personality the traits which we seek to impress upon those entrusted to their care" and who are "thoroughly at home in their own departments." Their salaries should not only enable the College to secure the best men, but also to retain them "when they arrive at the period of widest influence in their respective fields." In committing himself to his task, Hanson concluded,

I want to say that when I have completed my share in this developing of our beloved Gettysburg I shall measure the success of my own efforts by the degree to which I have assisted in sending from this institution men through whose leadership the ideals of our college shall be translated into the great avenues of world success.100

Thus began the longest administration thus far in the history of Gettysburg College. Its twenty-nine years opened in the prosperity of the 1920s, continued during the depression of the 1930s and the war times of 1941-1945, and concluded seven years beyond the end of the period covered by this chapter.

Henry W. A. Hanson brought to his new responsibilities a tremendous amount of energy and such an intense devotion to the College that it soon became difficult to accept the fact that he was not an

100Ibid., pp. 38-49.
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alumnus of long standing. He also brought to his new task a conviction that people were more important than measures and that education should focus upon the individual. His highly inspirational style of speaking, ease in associating with people, and genial manner favorably impressed hundreds of constituents of the College. Even his ever-present cigar and penchant for golf served to convince people that here was someone fully as warm and human as they took themselves to be. The relations which Hanson established and long maintained with the several constituencies testify to his skill in exercising the kind of leadership which he thought was so important for college men to display. They also testify to his skill in establishing a climate of optimism which made people feel good about Gettysburg College.

"The ten years of Dr. Hanson's administration have been marked by a singular harmony of all the elements that make up the college constituency," wrote Professor Milton H. Valentine in the 1933 G-Book. "The board of trustees, the faculty, and the student body have worked with unanimity of purpose and feeling and this first ten years of his administration constitute a shining epoch in the history of the institution." Time and again the trustees passed resolutions commending Hanson for the way in which he was handling College affairs; this action was unprecedented. With few exceptions, faculty members (especially professors) accepted the degree of paternalism which characterized the administration and applauded the numerous improvements which were being introduced, some of

---

101 Hanson's reputation preceded him to the campus. In a story announcing his impending visit to preach during the annual week of prayer, the Gettysburgian reported (December 10, 1919) that he was known as the "Orator of Harrisburg" and that at least one railway engineer to whom a trustee had spoken considered him "the biggest man in Harrisburg."

102 The G-Book was a handbook published annually as a guide for freshmen between 1895 and the early 1960s. It appeared under several titles, the first of which was Students' Handbook. Hereafter cited as G-Book.

103 Continuing a practice which began with the very first administration, the board elected Hanson to membership in December 1923. Mindful of the fact that former President Hefelbower remained on the board during all of the Granville administration, and that now former President Granville was likely to continue for many years into the Hanson administration, the board in June 1923 considered making future presidents ex officio members only, before deciding tentatively that they should be invited to attend meetings, as advisers but not as members. Six months later, they determined finally upon ex officio membership. However, by the time Hanson retired in 1952 all trustees were serving for six-year terms, and he was still an elected trustee when he died in 1962.
which changed markedly for the better their conditions of employment.104

Year after year students used part of the daily chapel exercises to honor President Hanson on March 12, his birthday. This too was unprecedented; who ever remembered when Harvey McKnight was born? In 1929 students took the leadership in commissioning an oil portrait of their president; it hung for many years in the library. Most editors of the Gettysburgian were generous in their praise: President Hanson was "a miracle worker" (October 13, 1926); his was a "leadership that has metamorphosed" the College (October 3, 1928); and he was "the greatest of . . . [campus] teachers" whose door was "ever open to a Gettysburg man" (September 19, 1930). At a time when probably most students were unwilling to accept the merit of compulsory chapel on any terms, the newspaper (February 11, 1932) praised Hanson's Wednesday morning chapel talks as "full of illustrated inspiration; they revive a man's faith in himself and his fellows; they certainly call for introspective thought." Early in 1943, when many male students were called into service after president Hanson had declared repeatedly and without qualification that they would be able to complete the school year, the Gettysburgian (February 25, 1943) defended him by explaining that he had acted throughout in good faith and could not be held responsible for a change in national manpower needs over which he had no control: "You can be sure that Doc did his best to give us the straight dope right along." Not to be outdone by its sister publication, the Spectrum early echoed the newspaper in its praise. "Gettysburg can boast a president who is loved by every man on the campus," declared the editors of the 1929 volume. "A scholar, a courteous gentleman, and a sincere leader, his influence has created a harmony, a spirit of co-operation that is invaluable." To add force to this compliment they insisted that "these remarks are not superficially made as a stranger might suspect from the accustomed commendations of a year book." Rather, they are "the whole-hearted expression of an appreciative student body."

Most alumni responded favorably to the Hanson style of leading the College. The second issue of an alumni bulletin, published in March 1930, predicted that the administration would be known "to the future as a 'Golden' era." In 1939, at the end of his first year as president of the Alumni Association, Clarence L. S. Raby wrote that

104 When the head of the physics department resigned in June 1926 in order to pursue a career "along lines of advanced scientific research," he went out of his way to praise both President and Mrs. Hanson "for the innumerable courtesies which you have shown us on all occasions." Horace S. Uhler to Henry W. A. Hanson, Gettysburg, June 5, 1926, in GCA.
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"with each succeeding conference it has been my privilege to have had with President Hanson, I am more and more impressed with his desire to listen sympathetically to any suggestion offered for the purpose of improving college conditions... we as alumni may feel fortunate in having Doctor Hanson as our leader."105 In 1944 the Alumni Association took the unusual step of giving the Meritorious Service Award to its "honorary alumnus" for his many contributions to the College.

Possibly because as a successful city pastor he had been involved in many community activities, from the very beginning of his administration Hanson assigned a high priority to maintaining and improving good relations with the town of Gettysburg. His attitude "has always been one of broad, sympathetic understanding," declared the president of the Gettysburg National Bank in 1928. "As a result he numbers his friends here and elsewhere by legions."106 Many less influential people then and later fully agreed with this assessment.

President Hanson had an able and gracious colaborer in his wife, Elizabeth Painter Hanson (1882-1956), whom he married in 1904 and who was the mother of his three sons, aged seven through fifteen when they came to Gettysburg in 1923. Elizabeth Hanson was no stranger to the College at that time. Long active in the Woman's League, she was elected its president in November 1920 and served in that capacity for three years. Her picture appeared with that of her husband on the front page of the inauguration issue of the Gettysburgian and in the first Spectrum (that of 1924) published after they moved into the White House. The editors of the latter publication dedicated the 1927 issue to her. "In Mrs. Hanson," they stated, "we have found a Christian example, a kindly friend, a loyal classmate and a true Gettysburgian." This amount of attention to a president's wife was without precedent in the history of the College. For many years "the campus mother," often wearing orchids, played an active role in student life and sometimes substituted for her husband when his duties took him out of town.

Even though there was much that was distinctive in the spirit of the Hanson administration, the watchword of the College continued to be the one adopted as early as 1907. The author of a brief historical note included in the published proceedings of the inauguration was certain that the principles which the several speakers on that occasion had enunciated were those "emphasized as necessary to the Greater Gettysburg."107 The staff of the 1927 yearbook chris-

105GCB (June-July 1939), p. 13
106Quoted in the Gettysburg Times, September 28, 1928.
107Hanson Inaugural, p. 70.
tended their publication the Greater Gettysburg Spectrum. Although depression and then war forced the president and his associates to concentrate their energies on survival rather than advance, the vision of an ever-enlarging future was never entirely lost. As the war was drawing to a close, the watchword surfaced again in 1944.

Under this president, at least until after the war, Greater Gettysburg did not mean much of an increase in the size of the student body. The fall 1942 enrollment was less than 10 percent larger than it had been during the first Hanson year; almost all of the growth between 1904 and 1943, which resulted in more than tripling the size of the student body, occurred during the Hefelbower and Granville administrations. His aim, Hanson told a Gettysburg Times reporter in 1928, was "a good college rather than a big college." Nor was there an increase in the size of the faculty; the numbers in the four

---

108 Gettysburg Times, September 28, 1928. "As we face the second century of the life of our beloved Institution," he told the board in May 1932, "I am anxious above all else that we concentrate rather than expand: that we endeavor to make Gettysburg College a great college rather than a big college." In that depression year not becoming big was much easier than becoming great.
A GREATER GETTYSBURG

ranks in 1923-1924 and 1942-1943 were almost the same. The president continued the practice of requiring professors to have earned doctorates, and he all but required senior faculty to make regular visits to other institutions in search of new ideas. At his urging, the trustees instituted sabbatical leaves, introduced a pension plan for professors, and began discussing a similar benefit for other College personnel. The number of departments of instruction remained the same; a physical education department was created in 1927, but engineering disappeared from the curriculum at the end of the 1939-1940 year. The trustees did establish departments of music and psychology in May 1945, but neither began to function until after the period covered by this chapter. If the numbers of students, faculty, and departments remained stable during the first twenty years of the Hanson administration, the number of campus buildings did not. By the time of the stock-market crash in October 1929, the College had a new gymnasium, science building, and library, as well as a completely remodeled classroom and office building. Obviously, these facilities were needed and contributed much to the effectiveness of the educational program.

Arguing that for many students the freshman year was the crucial period in their college career, President Hanson urged the faculty to increase and improve the ways in which it tried to help entering students adjust to their undergraduate course. As a result, during his first four years in office a more extensive advising system (1924), an orientation course (1925), and a freshman orientation week (1927) were inaugurated. In addition, beginning in 1924 the faculty made a concerted attempt to require a higher level of performance of all students and to drop those who did not attain it.

In its early years the Hanson administration expanded the annual homecoming activities. In the fall of 1924 it held the first in a long series of father’s days on campus and in the spring of 1925 the first mother’s day. Trying to attract students during the depression, in the spring of 1936 it conducted the first subfreshman day, in the course of which prospective entrants were invited to the campus at a time when they could experience a college actually in session.

President Hanson was as energetic as his immediate predecessors in representing the College before synod meetings, congregations, and other assemblies. He was also more visible on the campus, where he often addressed student gatherings. Whether on or off campus, to a greater extent than either Hefelbower or Granville, he used his speaking talents in an effort to set the tone he thought best for the College. Sometimes his announced goal was to make Gettysburg one of the finest of small colleges; on occasion, he aimed it for the top position. The best way to judge the performance of a college, he believed, was to evaluate the lives of its alumni. In making this
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judgment, the most important single criterion to be used was character.\textsuperscript{109} He was fond of telling students that it was not the prize which they obtained in life which counts, but rather the race which they run. Time and again he argued that the main objective of Gettysburg College was to help produce Christian gentlemen. "When you scratch the skin of a Gettysburg man" he said, "you find underneath a gentleman."\textsuperscript{110} His method of accomplishing his end, he often said, was to lead students rather than to drive them. He much preferred to give those of his "boys" who needed it a good "talking to" rather than resort to established disciplinary procedures. "It has always been my contention that a good talking," he told a Gettysburg Times reporter in 1928, "far surpasses a lambasting in the handling of students." Many a young man experienced this aspect of the Hanson style by being summoned into the presidential office or by being stopped somewhere on the campus, only to be partially enfolded by a strong presidential arm and to be reassured about his basic worth as a person. "There is not one of us who has not known at some time the aid of his helping hand," wrote a Gettysburgian reporter in the issue of September 19, 1930. "His warm smile, the heavy clasp of his hand, the understanding of his eyes are unforgettable."

In at least one famous respect, the Hanson style was apparently much firmer. In 1931 he told the board of trustees that his careful review of student life had convinced him that most of its evils stemmed from three sources. "Two years ago I placed before the freshman class," he continued, "what I termed the 'three noes' of a Gettysburg College student;" he might have said, of a Gettysburg gentleman. Every entering student was now required to pledge himself while in College to avoid cheating, drinking, and immorality. The uniform penalty for disobedience, he told the trustees, was expulsion. On this subject the College had adopted an "uncompromising attitude." The student pledge, he was happy to report,

\textsuperscript{109}One of his four major objectives, he told the trustees in June 1925, was to blend "culture and character on our campus....Every possible means is being used for the development of the character of the boys." In an address before the national convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution in April 1936, he asked whether we are "living in an age when ships of steel are commanded by men of wood." Departing somewhat at least from Adam Smith, he insisted that "the wealth of a nation is not measured by fertile fields, the roar of machinery, or the crowded highways, but by the character of its citizens." Gettysburg Times, April 24, 1936.

\textsuperscript{110}See, for example, the Gettysburgian for September 26, 1923.
A GREATER GETTYSBURG

had already "become a part of the tradition of the College." 111

During the Hanson administration, additional recognition came to Gettysburg from a number of outside agencies. In 1926 for example, the Association of American Universities added the College to its prestigious list of approved institutions of higher learning. During most of the years of his presidency, Hanson held influential positions in the Lutheran church. He continued serving as president of the West Indies Mission Board until that agency became part of the Board of American Missions in 1926. For the next ten years he was a member of that board, during which time he was chosen its president. Between 1936 and 1944 he served on the executive board of the United Lutheran Church in America. During the depression he was a member of several state and local agencies charged with administering relief. In 1935 Governor George H. Earle named him to the commission established to plan for and carry out the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg. During World War II he was chairman of the Selective Service appeal board for one of the areas into which Pennsylvania was divided.

While the Hanson leadership was obviously successful in fostering and maintaining a strong feeling of unity and support within the College constituencies, there was another side to this administration, one which cannot be ignored. Many remembered the president as the builder of much needed new buildings; few knew to what extent the endowment fund was decimated in order to pay for them. The U.L.C.A. survey published in 1929, while it ranked Gettysburg among the three strongest Lutheran colleges, was nevertheless critical of its management style. "The functions of administrative officers are very inadequately defined," the survey concluded. "The president, personally, assumes direction of practically all aspects of administration. There is not sufficient delegation of responsibility

111Since Hanson made many speeches, and since they were often reported in some detail, we can find good examples of his style in the Gettysburgian, Gettysburg Times, alumni bulletin, and publications of the Woman's League. For many years he and other College spokesmen informed incoming students about the three noes, but they were not usually discussed in the G-Book. The 1941 issue of this annual declared that the College "expects of every student honesty, temperance, and clean personal living," which drew a quick response from the Gettysburgian. In the October 16 issue, the editor praised the expression "of these moral principles" in positive rather than negative terms. By the 1920s enough students had access to automobiles to make campus parking a problem. There were efforts to regulate and minimize it. Distressed at the student ignoring of signs, the Gettysburgian of September 22, 1932 suggested a fourth abstention for a Gettysburg gentleman: no parking.
or authority." To a considerable degree this situation persisted long after 1929. For example, the U.L.C.A. report recommended the appointment of a dean of the College with major responsibility for the curriculum, as well as of a business manager and two assistants. More than twenty years elapsed before such officers were named.

Although the president himself on more than one occasion paid tribute to those who preceded him in office, College spokesmen sometimes gave the impression that progress at Gettysburg began in the fall of 1923. For example, an article in the Gettysburgian for April 28, 1926, discussing the achievements of the year then coming to a close, referred to the "timid conservatism" which had retarded forward action in the past. No mention was made of the fact that this "timid conservatism," if such it was, had yielded recognition of the College by the New York State Board of Regents, the Middle States Association, and Phi Beta Kappa, or that it had succeeded in tripling the endowment. On at least one occasion, a close personal friend of the president, Professor Frank H. Kramer, told one of his classes, in which this writer was enrolled, that it was Hanson who abolished the practice of placing on the faculty aging and presumably unqualified Lutheran pastors and hiring instead university-trained men. The evidence clearly establishes that few faculty members ever fell into the former category and that it was Hefelbower, not Hanson, who initiated the latter policy.

There were those who found fault with President Hanson on other grounds. His tendency to make no written record of conferences and then to forget to carry out promises which he made during them irked some faculty members and, in fact, led one of the best of them to resign and leave Gettysburg. His frequent use of superlatives could not help but remind a careful listener that there can be only one greatest person, problem, opportunity, or event. Whatever his intentions, the clear impression which he gave of the extent to which his boys observed the three noes of a Gettysburg gentleman cast doubt upon his grasp of the realities of the College scene.

---

113 Ibid. Using a perfect score of one hundred for administrative organization, the survey directors gave Gettysburg a thirty. Several other colleges also failed this test. Ibid., 2:13. The survey directors, it should be noted, did not identify the possible sources of funds necessary to pay for the additional administrative personnel.
114 Greek Professor Albert Billheimer, who left Gettysburg in 1930 to join the faculty of New York University, told John B. Zinn that Hanson's failure to carry out promises made to him during their meetings was the main reason for his resignation. Zinn's reply that not making notes and then forgetting was simply part of the Hanson style did not prevent Billheimer from leaving. Interview with Basil L. Crapster, July 1972, GCA.
In 1904 the College administration consisted of a president, dean, treasurer, librarian, and chaplain. The president was also a part-time teacher; the dean, librarian, and chaplain were full-time teachers; and the treasurer was a businessman-trustee who spent only part of his time performing College duties. Although President Heffelbower complained to the board in 1907 that he was being asked to do the impossible – both managing the store and raising funds – the trustees did nothing to ease the burden during the remainder of his administration.

Change had to await the arrival of President Granville. During his first year in office (1910-1911) two new positions were created: financial secretary and registrar. The primary duty of the former, who was soon given the title of assistant to the president, was to help in fund raising, but he was also responsible for performing any other duties which the president might assign to him. For most of the time between 1912 and 1928, when the position was eliminated, Samuel F. Snyder (1881-1963), of the class of 1909, was the president's assistant. The first College registrar, Herbert A. Rinard (1878-1957), of the class of 1903, gave way in 1912 to Clyde B. Stover, who served as custodian of student records and continued to teach chemistry until 1943, when he retired. Charles R. Wolfe (1899-1963), of the class of 1923, who succeeded him, was named registrar and dean of admissions. In 1920, when George D. Stahley resigned his Graff professorship, the board named him the College's first medical director, a position which he held until his death in 1939.115

Having reached the age of eighty years, Philip M. Bikle announced his retirement as dean and professor at the end of the 1923-1924 year, but since his successor as Latin professor was not immediately available, he agreed to continue performing both of his old duties for an additional year. Although the new Latin professor took over in the fall of 1925, no person was named to replace Bikle as dean. It is

115The 1928 catalogue was the first to list the administration separately from the faculty; only the president, dean, and registrar were included. However, early catalogues listed, either as "faculty and instructors" or as "additional officers and employees," persons on the payroll who were not teachers, such as proctors, athletic directors, superintendents of buildings and grounds, and watchmen. The library, athletic, and nursing staffs will be discussed later. The first secretary to be listed in the catalogue was Rachel Granville (1891-1980), who served during her father's tenure as president. In 1914 the board named Professor Abdel Ross Wentz (1883-1976) historian of the College, but this position lapsed when he left the faculty two years later. In 1915 the law firm of Swope and Swope succeeded Donald P. McPherson (1870-1937) of the class of 1889 as College attorney, an unpaid position which he had resigned, after many years of service, upon being elected president judge of the county courts. In the fall of 1916 Treasurer Picking began devoting his full time to the College, adding to his previous duties those of purchasing agent and superintendent of buildings and grounds.
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Clyde B. Stover (1873-1948)
Member of the chemistry department (1896-1943) and College registrar (1912-1943). After his retirement, the faculty recommended that he be granted an honorary degree in recognition of his long and faithful service.

Wilbur E. Tilberg (1884-1977)
Dean from 1927 to 1955. Active in many community and church affairs. The College awarded him an honorary degree in 1966.

evident that he could have continued serving in that capacity, perhaps indefinitely, had he not suffered a stroke in August 1925. When it became apparent that he would not be able to resume his administrative duties, which appear to have consisted mainly of conducting chapel services, the board approved Jerome C. Jackson (1896-1927), Assistant Professor of Education and Philosophy, to succeed him, with the title dean of men. His tenure in office was short; he served from September 1926 until he died during the following March. In the fall of 1927 Wilbur E. Tilberg (1884-1977) began his duties as dean of men. His title was soon shortened to dean; beginning with the 1953 catalogue, it became dean of the College. A native of Iowa, Tilberg was a graduate of Bethany College and the University of Kansas. After serving for twelve years (1913-1925) as professor of history and dean at Midland College, Fremont, Nebraska, he pursued graduate studies at the University of Wisconsin, which awarded him a Ph.D. degree in 1927. After twenty-eight years at Gettysburg, he retired at the end of the 1954-1955 year.

As Wilbur Tilberg began his work at Gettysburg, the directors of the U.L.C.A. survey were concluding that the dean of a college
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faculty "is an officer of such importance to the institution, and has so great influence in determining the institutional policies that a certain quality of 'bigness' is necessary to his success." Among the areas of responsibility which they believed should be assigned to the office of dean were studying and recommending improvements in the curriculum and in instruction, administering the student guidance program, studying the postcollegiate records of graduates, recommending to the president appointments and dismissals of faculty, adjusting faculty conflicts, promoting faculty research, and assisting the president in publicizing the College.\textsuperscript{116} This was certainly not an accurate job description for the position which Dean Biko had occupied for more than a third of a century. It is evident that in the mid-1920s neither the Gettysburg president nor its board was disposed to grant his successors the large responsibilities which the survey outlined. After the team visited Gettysburg during the 1926-1927 year, they concluded that "no officer is definitely charged with the duty of administering the instructional program as a whole" and that "little is being done in an organized way to examine, evaluate, and improve the instructional work in the various classes of the college." They recommended that someone be chosen "to be held responsible for the administration of instruction."\textsuperscript{117} Although during his long period of service Dean Tilberg came to play an important role in the College's instructional program, it is evident that his major responsibility dealt with the curricular and extracurricular concerns of students, and that a more accurate title for the position which he held for so long would have been dean of men or dean of students.\textsuperscript{118}

When the old preparatory department, later the Gettysburg Academy, ceased operations in 1935, its campus was turned over to women students. Charles H. Huber, the last principal of the academy, became director of what was called the women's division and served until he retired in 1941. His successor was Elizabeth A. Connelly, the first person to hold the title dean of women. Dorothy G. Lee followed her in that position in 1942.

The 1945 catalogue, which listed twelve administrators, demonstrated how limited the growth of this part of the College had been during the previous forty-one years. The five chief administrative officers identified were President Hanson; Dean Tilberg; Registrar and Dean of Admissions Wolfe; Dean Lee; and the treasurer, the Gettysburg National Bank. The seven additional administrative

\textsuperscript{117}Ibid., 1:414.  
\textsuperscript{118}The dean himself made this clear in an interview with Basil L. Crapster and the author, June 1971, in GCA.
officers were the medical director, librarian, alumni secretary, chaplain, assistant to the president, consulting engineer, and superintendent of buildings and grounds. The last two named were also full-time faculty members.\footnote{The title of chaplain, attached to the Amanda Rupert Strong professorship in 1892, was allowed to lapse in the 1920s; it last appeared in the 1923 catalogue. The board revived this title in 1943. At the same meeting it also revived the title of assistant to the president and assigned it to the latter's secretary, Robert B. Rau (1909-1979) of the class of 1937. See p. 619 for a discussion of the reasons why the chaplaincy was revived.}

The Faculty

The catalogue published early in 1905 listed a faculty of nine professors (including the president and dean) and one assistant. Even apart from the fact that enrollment was on the increase (it stood at 199 the previous fall), many then recognized the pressing need for more teachers, if the College hoped to realize its own expectations for itself in the twentieth century. The growth in size of the faculty which occurred during the next forty years took place almost entirely in the Hefelbower and Granville administrations. When President Hanson took office in the fall of 1923 (enrollment was then 628), there were forty persons who held faculty rank: eighteen professors (still including the dean but no longer the president), four assistant professors, and eighteen instructors. In the fall of 1942, when the enrollment was 680, there were forty-one faculty members: sixteen professors (now including neither president nor dean), five associate professors, fifteen assistant professors, and five instructors.\footnote{The rank of instructor was first used in 1906-1907, that of assistant professor in 1914-1915, and that of associate professor in 1926-1927. Obviously, the rank of instructor replaced that of assistant. Equally obvious, faculty growth between 1904 and 1943 occurred largely by adding persons to the two lower ranks. The average faculty size during 1927-1931 was forty-five; it dropped by about 10 percent during the depression years. In 1942-1943 the rank of professor was limited to heads of departments.}

In 1922 President Granville described in some detail the procedure for recruiting faculty developed by his predecessor and continued by him. "When a vacancy occurs or a new teaching position is to be filled," he explained to the president of the board, "I canvass the educational field at once for candidates using all available means at my command." These included the placement bureaus "of all our leading eastern universities;" heads of graduate departments in these universities; and, if necessary, teachers' agencies. He then used the information submitted by interested candidates, in con-
sultation with the department head concerned, to select the most promising prospect, who was invited to the campus for an interview. If the meeting resulted in an unfavorable assessment, then additional candidates would be invited until one was found to whom an appointment— one which would be accepted—could be offered. Obviously, if a department head was being recruited, the full responsibility for carrying out this procedure rested with the president himself. Granville noted that, although the board of trustees still retained its traditional power to elect all faculty, a power which it exercised at its June meeting, the president of the College had to be able to assure a successful candidate months earlier that he would indeed be elected. Otherwise, “by the time the Board meets all the other possible teaching positions that he has been considering will probably be filled and he will be out of a place altogether.”

When Samuel G. Hefelbower took office in 1904, only one of the ten faculty members—Henry B. Nixon—had an earned Ph.D. degree. Of the remaining nine, most had completed little work beyond that required for their baccalaureate degrees. Because of his own personal commitment to graduate study as a requirement for college teaching, and, as he himself put it in his 1908 board report, “in conformity with the practice of the best educational institutions of the land,” the new president began recruiting as replacements for retiring or departing faculty men who had earned their doctorates. Within three years he had secured three such persons. John O. Evjen became Amanda Rupert Strong professor in 1905, Karl J. Grimm German professor in 1906, and Louis A. Parsons physics professor in 1907. When Evjen left to join the faculty of Augsburg Seminary in Minneapolis, Hefelbower secured Abdel Ross Wentz as his successor, but his title was acting professor until he secured his doctorate in 1914.

The pattern thus established was reinforced when the committee which the United States Bureau of Education organized in 1914-

121 William A. Granville to John F. Dapp, Gettysburg, June 17, 1922, in GCA. Hereafter cited as Granville to Dapp, 1922. Granville stated that, for most colleges, the recruiting season ran from February 1 to May 1. He reminded Dapp that the board finance committee had long been authorized to make emergency decisions necessitated by unexpected faculty resignations, or the like.

122 For information on contemporary developments in other institutions, see Rudolph, American College, pp. 394-396, and W. Bruce Leslie, "Between Piety and Expertise: Professionalization of College Faculty in the "Age of University," Pennsylvania History 46 (July 1979):245-265. Leslie concentrates on developments at Bucknell, Franklin and Marshall, Princeton, and Swarthmore. One should not conclude without careful review of the evidence that the transition from what Leslie called piety to expertise was all gain and no loss.

123 Hefelbower told the board in June 1908 that “the selection of professors made by our Board during the last three years establishes the policy of this institution.”
1915 adopted the following statement expressing one of its thirteen requirements for a successful college of arts and sciences:

Members of the faculty ... should have pursued graduate study in addition to the bachelor's degree. At least one-fourth of the faculty should hold the degree of doctor of philosophy or degrees representing equivalent scholarly attainments bestowed by reputable graduate schools. At least three-fourths of the faculty should have secured the master's degree in course at a reputable graduate school.¹²⁴

Both Presidents Granville and Hanson continued the policy which Hefelbower began. Except for professorships in engineering and physical education, the earned doctorate was now a requirement for appointment or promotion to that rank. With only a few exceptions, persons without the degree appointed as department heads were titled acting professors and received smaller salaries than their colleagues in that rank. W. Frederick Shaffer, for example, was acting professor of Greek from 1931 until Princeton University awarded him a Ph.D. degree in 1946.¹²⁵ There were nine Ph.D.'s among the forty faculty members in the fall of 1923 and sixteen among the forty-one in the fall of 1942. During the Hanson administration persons with earned doctorates began appearing in ranks below that of professor.

Although President Hanson was consistent in his support of significant graduate training as a requirement for faculty members, especially for professors and associate professors, he believed strongly that such work needed to prepare these persons to be good teachers. "A confession which I want to make," he told the board in December 1927,

is that there is no one phase of college life which requires more patient and constant effort than that of securing and holding able teachers. In an Institution of the type of Gettysburg College, a man

¹²⁴ Resources and Standards (1918), pp. 16, 59. The standard dealing with this topic adopted by the Middle States Association in 1920 read as follows: "Members of the teaching staff in regular charge of classes should have had not less than one year of graduate study and a majority of them should have had training equivalent to that presupposed by the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; in all cases efficiency in teaching as well as the amount of research should be taken into account." From form in GCA.

¹²⁵ The first persons holding earned doctorates appeared in the several departments as follows: mathematics, 1888; German, 1900 (if we except William Notz in 1868-1869); English Bible, 1905; physics, 1907; English, 1914; economics and political science, 1914; Romance languages, 1916; Greek, 1917; engineering, 1918; education, 1920; biology, 1924; chemistry, 1924 (if we except Samuel P. Sadler in 1871-1874); philosophy, 1926; history, 1926; and Latin, 1932. Milton H. Valentine, Strong professor from 1916 to 1930, was one of several exceptions to the rule that persons appointed to a professorship without an earned doctorate be given the title acting professor. This title was first used in 1896 for Adam Martin's successor in the German department.
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who is given primarily to research cannot render the greatest service. This is the type which our large universities, in the past decade, have been producing in large numbers. The teacher rather than the research expert is needed by a cultural college.126

Almost all of the faculty members appointed between 1832 and 1904 were Lutherans who subsequently became members of Christ Lutheran church. There was such wide agreement this was the way things should be that it was not necessary to enunciate it anywhere in writing as a policy. Once the College began to adopt new methods to recruit a larger and larger faculty, non-Lutheran candidates applied for positions and some were elected, especially after Granville became president. In May 1916 an admissions brochure, carefully designed to help recruit more students, included the following statement of College policy regarding the religious concerns of its faculty: "for a man to be eligible for election on the teaching staff of Gettysburg College an absolute requirement is that he shall be a Christian gentleman of the highest type, the sort of man with whom parents would like to have their sons come in the closest personal and confidential relations."127 During his early years in office, President Hanson frequently used reports to the trustees to state his policy in this matter. For example, in December 1929 he assured them that "one requirement in which the College has not swerved in the smallest respect has been the insistence that every man who occupies a position on the faculty must be a believer in the divinity and the program of Jesus Christ." This he considered necessary if the College was to "supply a young man with an attitude to life and a religious faith which becomes the finest mark of real culture." A year later, he reiterated these convictions and reported that "every member of the Faculty is a member of a Protestant Church." By 1942-1943 a majority of the forty-one faculty were still Lutheran and members of Christ Lutheran church. There were also a few Presbyterians and Methodists, as well as several who, in spite of what the president said about them, were not members of any church.

Eight of the ten faculty members of 1904 were alumni of the College. That being a graduate was still an asset in being considered for a teaching position was evident in what Granville told the president of the board as late as 1922: "First I make every effort to find a Gettysburg graduate who is qualified and willing to accept; all other

126Hanson reiterated this position in 1929 and again in 1936.
127Note that the word Christian, not Lutheran, is used. Hefelbower told the board in June 1908 that the Christian college needed faculty "with a most thorough university training, who are at the same time religious men."
things being equal such men have always been given the preference." 128 Nevertheless, it is clear that, by the time Granville departed in the following year, the preponderance of the Gettysburg contingent among the faculty was no longer what it had been twenty years earlier; there were now twenty-three alumni and seventeen non-alumni. Among the professors, eleven of the eighteen were non-graduates. The heaviest concentration of alumni (fourteen of eighteen) was among the instructors, most of whom held temporary appointments. In 1942-1943 thirteen, or fewer than one-third, of the forty-one faculty members were Gettysburg graduates. 129

The standing rule governing faculty tenure which the board of trustees adopted in 1884 remained in effect (with one amendment) through the entire period covered by this chapter. No faculty member could resign his position without giving the trustees at least six months' notice of his intention; the trustees could not dismiss a faculty member without giving him at least six months' notice of their intention. Following this procedure, the trustees were free to dismiss for any reason and made no promise to grant a hearing either before or after making their decision. In June 1922 President Granville explained to the president of the board how this policy was being carried out in practice. Each new faculty member was given a one-year, probationary appointment, but with the understanding that "as long as his services are needed and his work satisfactory he will probably be reappointed from year to year at the June meeting of . . . [the] Board by the formal action . . . in adopting the salary budget containing his name for the next academic year." 130

Many of the faculty members recruited between 1904 and 1945 remained at Gettysburg for only a short time. Some of them soon found more promising and lucrative positions, but a larger number were recent College graduates, in some cases seminary students, who welcomed the experience and income which a year or two of service on the faculty provided. Some twenty-five of these persons earned Gettysburg masters' degrees while they were members of its

128Granville to Dapp, 1922. In his 1908 report, Hefelbower considered "harmful" the policy of selecting only alumni as professors and described with obvious approval the extent to which sister institutions had departed from it, as well as the fact that Evjen, Grimm, and Parsons were not Gettysburg alumni.

129The U.L.C.A. survey directors called attention "to the dangers incident to the process of inbreeding, due to the tendency to appoint to the faculty too large a proportion of Lutherans and graduates of Lutheran colleges." U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:25, 26, 35. They recommended that at least ten new faculty be added, that qualified women be considered, and that more scholarly activity be encouraged. They found that Gettysburg had the highest percentage of Ph.D.'s and the highest median salaries of any Lutheran college. Ibid., 1:293.

130Granville to Dapp, 1922.
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faculty. In June 1928 President Hanson told the trustees that while "we should secure the best possible men to serve as heads of departments and encourage in every possible way long tenure of office," it was College policy to hire as assistant professors and instructors "promising young men who will serve the College from two to five years and then move on in the normal round of promotion to other fields." It is clear that, within a few years after stating this policy, Hanson began to depart from it, as an increasing number of faculty in the two lower ranks were retained on a permanent basis.

Not all persons who joined the faculty between 1904 and 1945 were permitted to become permanent members. In more than a dozen instances the president of the College, acting in the name of and usually in consultation with the board of trustees, gave the required six months' notice of nonreappointment. President Granville had considerable difficulty in attracting professors of economics and political science, as well as of Romance languages, who performed to his satisfaction. According to his own testimony, he did not renew the contracts of five such persons. On one occasion President Hanson relieved a professor of biology whose administration of the department's program lacked the rigor which he was convinced the times required.

Most faculty dismissals were not contested, but in 1922 and 1925 three men to whom the president had given the required notice sought to have his decisions reversed. Early in the former year President Granville notified two professors that he was not pleased with their work and that they would not be continued beyond the current year. The sequel to this action has already been discussed. In all probability, the incident influenced his decision to resign the presidency a few months later. In December 1923 the trustees quietly gave the required notice to the professor Granville had tried unsuccessfully to dismiss the year before, as well as to two other professors who were not making sufficient progress toward completing their terminal degrees, as they had promised they would at the time of their appointment.

A potentially serious incident began in December 1924 when, at the request of the new president, the board of trustees notified the professor of physics that his services would be terminated at the close of the 1924-1925 year. The reason given in the board minutes was that his lack of cooperation and discourteous conduct in dealing with administrators and fellow-faculty were preventing "that harmony of spirit which is essential in the obtaining of the best results in the Institution." In June 1925 the trustees turned down the professor's request for a hearing and proceeded to elect his successor.
Even before this occurred, members of the American Association of University Professors (A.A.U.P.) and other national educational agencies learned of what was happening at Gettysburg and began to consider whether the case warranted an investigation. Professor William J. Gies of Columbia University, whose concern for the welfare of his alma mater had already been demonstrated on many occasions, now undertook to mediate between the College and those who believed that its policy of dismissal without "judicial inquiry" was out of step with the times. In a letter to President Hanson on June 1, 1925, Gies explained that he had worked out a way to avoid "public exposure" of the College if the latter would promptly effect "a drastic reform . . . on the matter of appointments, dismissals and tenureship." In this way, he argued, it would be possible to turn the misfortune of one professor "to the good account of the College and all the teachers at Gettysburg, now and hereafter." Gies sent along a copy of recently approved statements of academic freedom and tenure, urging the board to use them as documents "now coming to be widely acceptable as satisfactory bases for dignified and suitable
relationships between boards of trustees and members of faculties."

It is obvious that neither President Hanson nor the trustees were willing to move as far or as fast as Gies believed they should, if they were to avoid an outside investigation. In his later letters Gies lamented the fact that the board had not acted at its first regular opportunity, in December 1925, and that it did not appear willing to adopt any document which contained a statement of up-to-date tenure principles and procedures. "If my intervention was a failure," he wrote on March 23, 1926, "I would wish to express regret for the fact and ask to be relieved of any further relation to the situation." Finally, on June 8, 1926 the trustees designated their executive committee "a special committee on hearing" to deal with "any such matters of promotion and demotion as may from time to time develop." Further, they accorded to any professor whose dismissal was being considered "the privilege of appearing before this committee on hearing before final action on the part of the Board." Assured in advance that this resolution was likely to be adopted, Gies concluded (April 24, 1926) that, while it fell short of what he had recommended, it "would eliminate all remaining doubt on the matter." He told the president that "I have eliminated, I believe, all possibility of misunderstanding regarding the situation." This action, which was surely no "drastic reform," was the only change which the board of trustees made in its 1884 tenure rule until 1952.

The personnel problems of 1922-1925 probably help to explain why an A.A.U.P. chapter was organized at Gettysburg College during those years. The national organization was founded in 1915 for the purposes of enunciating and defending both principles and practices of academic freedom and tenure, at a time when some college and university administrators and trustees were dismissing faculty members whose political, economic, religious, or social views and statements were different from their own. The first A.A.U.P. faculty member at Gettysburg was the philosophy professor, Charles F. Sanders (1920). Louis A. Parsons (1923), in physics, was the second, and Frank H. Clutz (1924), in engineering, was the third. The A.A.U.P. constitution provided that seven members in an institution could organize a local chapter. With twelve members, the Gettysburg chapter came into existence in the spring of 1924. President Hanson consulted with its president when repercussions from

---

131 The statements were approved at a meeting in January 1925 called by the American Council on Education and attended by representatives of nine national educational agencies. The text was reprinted in the A.A.U.P. Bulletin (February 1925), pp. 100-101.

132 The correspondence between Gies and Hanson is in GCA.
Six faculty recruited between 1906 and 1919. Their average tenure was twenty-seven years. From the 1922 Spectrum.
the dismissal case were being dealt with. Between 1930 and 1945 more than half of the faculty, including almost all of the professors, were members of A.A.U.P. and of the local chapter.\textsuperscript{133}

Between 1904 and 1945 some 221 persons (including those in service in the fall of 1904) held faculty rank at Gettysburg College. All but five of these were men. At least eleven were engaged at one time or another in more than one department. The size of departments in 1942-1943 ranged from one person (Greek and Latin) to four (English, philosophy, and physical education). In all, or almost all, departments a distinctly hierarchical order prevailed. Even though by the 1930s a second or third member might possess a Ph.D. degree and hold what amounted to a permanent appointment (chemistry, economics and business administration, English, and Romance languages are examples), the head of the department was still its dominant figure. If he wished, he could exercise all of its authority without consulting his colleagues.\textsuperscript{134}

Thirty-three faculty members who began their service after 1904 continued in office for fifteen years or more and contributed in a major way to the manner in which the College functioned during the forty-one years covered by this chapter:

1906-1940 Karl J. Grimm (1871-1954), German
1906-1941 Charles F. Sanders (1869-1959), philosophy
1907-1925 Louis A. Parsons (1875-1957), physics
1912-1930 Albert Billheimer (1886-1971), Greek
1917-1937 C. Paul Cessna (1891-1958), physics, mathematics
1918-1940 Frank H. Clutz (1873-1945), engineering
1919-1953 George R. Miller (1895-1953), physics
1920-1956 Frank H. Kramer (1886-1963), education
1920-1963 Richard A. Arms (1893-1964), mathematics
1921-1942 C. Gilbert Reen (1898-1988), engineering, physics
1922-1947 Thomas L. Cline (1891-1954), English
1922-1964 Herbert G. Hamme (1897-1964), Romance languages

\textsuperscript{133}For information about Gettysburg members and the growth of its chapter, see the January issues of the bulletin of the A.A.U.P. The original minute book of the Gettysburg chapter has disappeared. The author used this book when he was its secretary in the late 1950s and, relying entirely upon his memory, believes that the chapter was organized in May 1924.

\textsuperscript{134}The first two women were appointed to the faculty in 1941. Dean Connelly was also an assistant professor of education, while Margaret K. McGurk was director of physical education for women and instructor in hygiene. Dean Lee succeeded Connelly in 1942, in which year Bertha Paulsens (1891-1973) became assistant professor of philosophy. A Ph.D. from the University of Leipzig who fled Nazi Germany in 1935, Paulsens held a joint appointment with the seminary and taught courses in sociology. Margaret B. Zarfos succeeded McGurk in 1944. The only department with more than one person in 1904 was chemistry. The fourth person included in philosophy in 1942-1943 was Donald R. Helges, whose title after his first year was changed from instructor in philosophy to instructor in orientation. There was no orientation department.
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1923-1959 Robert Fortenbaugh (1892-1959), history
1923-1940 Bertram H. Saltzer (1901-1956), engineering
1924-1950 Rasmus S. Saby (1881-1950), economics, political science
1924-1959 John B. Zinn (1888-1979), chemistry
1924-1954 G. Saylor Warthen (1900-1954), English
1925-1966 John G. Glenn (1896-1985), Latin
1925-1965 Francis C. Mason (1900-1971), English
1926-1969 Rasmus S. Saby (1881-1950), economics, political science
1927-1968 C. Allen Sloat, chemistry
1928-1953 Clayton E. Bilheimer (1887-1971), physical education
1928-1956 George R. Larkin (1890-1956), economics
1929-1960 William C. Waltemyer (1889-1970), philosophy, Bible
1930-1971 Lester O. Johnson (1902-1973), education
1931-1963 Albert Bachman, Romance languages
1931-1962 W. Frederick Shaffer (1903-1962), Greek
1931-1949 Dunning Idle (1904-1980), history
1935-1968 Earl E. Ziegler (1898-1972), mathematics, physics
1937-1976 Parker B. Wagnild, Bible, music
1939-1965 Earl Bowen (1899-1965), biology
1939-1964 William K. Sundermeyer (1894-1975), German

Although as early as 1905 the board of trustees recommended that the professors visit colleagues in other institutions at least every three years to study "their methods of work," almost twenty years passed before a serious attempt was made to implement such a policy. At the very beginning of the Hanson administration, in December 1923, the board asked all professors either "to spend a week at some Institution conspicuously strong" in their fields or "to attend the annual convention of their respective general bodies." An annual grant of $50 for these purposes encouraged compliance with this request. The new president gave the program his wholehearted support. The accounts of faculty visits to other schools and attendance at professional meetings which appeared in the Gettysburgian during the next ten years are testimony of the extent to which the professors responded, as well as of the extent to which their response was considered to be important campus news.

In January 1927, upon the recommendation of President Hanson, the board of trustees approved a sabbatical leave program for professors, leaving to the president and faculty the task of working out

The 1904 faculty continued in office through the years indicated: Coover (1905), Dryden (1906), Hefelbower (1910), Klinger (1912), Himes (1914), Nixon (1916), Stahley (1920), Breidenbaugh (1924), Bickle (1925), and Stover (1943). In a few instances, the tenure of the post-1904 faculty was interrupted for a year or two of graduate study. The dates given are the years of first appointment with faculty rank, and not necessarily the years of first College service, perhaps as a laboratory assistant. Twenty-four of the thirty-three persons listed eventually held the rank of professor.
Six faculty recruited between 1920 and 1924. Their average tenure was thirty-four years. From the 1943 Spectrum.
Six faculty recruited between 1925 and 1939. Their average tenure was thirty-one years. From the 1943 Spectrum.
some necessary details. By June the faculty had completed this task; and in February 1928 Professor Grimm began enjoying the first Gettysburg sabbatical leave by sailing for Europe. In his report to the board in December 1930, President Hanson explained that, since "a student body must be led by a Faculty whose contacts with life and the world have been sufficiently broad to enable them to see beyond the technique of the class-room," Gettysburg sabbaticals had to be spent abroad. After eleven professors took their leaves, the program fell victim to the depression in 1934.\footnote{The Hanson sabbatical proposal of 1927 applied to professors only; they became eligible by seniority; leaves were for one term at full salary; and they were to be spent "in advance study or foreign travel." After the sabbatical program went into effect, several faculty members were granted leaves without pay to pursue graduate study.}

For many years the College had no stated retirement age for faculty members. Professor Himes was sixty-six years old when he resigned. Stahley was seventy, but he then held the title of medical director until he died at the age of eighty-nine. Professor Breidenbaugh retired at the age of seventy-five and Bikle at the age of eighty-one. Beloved though the last-two named were, it is evident from the recollections of some of the students and associates of their later years that they no longer possessed the vigor which they had once displayed and which the College still sorely needed. The pension plan adopted in 1927 was based upon years of service rather than age. Only in December 1939 did the board executive committee decide that, for a three-year trial period beginning in June 1941, retirement would be optional at sixty-five and compulsory at seventy. Their stated goal at this time was optional retirement at sixty and compulsory at sixty-five.\footnote{The minutes of this meeting are bound with the trustee minutes. Professor Grimm was sixty-nine when he retired in ill health in 1940 and Sanders was seventy-two when he retired in 1941.}

In the fall of 1904 the ten faculty members were still meeting at least once a week during the school year. The president, or in his absence the dean, presided over the body, which still spent much of its time admitting individual students, granting or withholding permission for class and campus absences, imposing sentences upon or excusing the many students who exceeded the accepted number of absences from church or chapel (or both), deciding whether certain intercollegiate athletic contests could be held off campus and how many students could participate in them, granting or withholding permission for students asking to attend some church other than Christ Lutheran, dealing with hazing, and dropping students because of poor academic performance.
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As the faculty grew in size and as curricular matters demanded more attention than in the past, its members began to entrust some of their business to regular standing committees, seven of which were included in the first catalogue list, published in 1911. In the following year, the tasks of admitting and dropping students were assigned to committees.

Much to the relief of its members, President Hanson proposed in September 1923 that the faculty abandon the practice, begun in 1832, of meeting weekly, in favor of meeting on the first Thursday of every month during the academic year. Although there were many special meetings as the need arose, monthly sessions now became the rule. The transition from weekly to monthly meetings meant that the faculty would have to rely increasingly upon committees in conducting its business. The most important of these were curriculum (1922), which among other duties passed upon courses departments wished to add or drop; discipline (1915), which in conjunction with the student government relieved the full faculty of a task in which it had long spent far too much of its time; student organizations (1916), to which was assigned the responsibility of determining which campus groups should receive College recognition; and scholastic standing (1923), charged with evaluating the academic records of students, some of whom received counsel while others were dropped from College.

Between 1904 and 1945 the faculty decided upon two major curricular changes and many minor ones. It defined and redefined both entrance and graduation requirements. It adopted many other academic rules, some of which remained in effect half a century later. It demonstrated a persistent concern for devising ways of preventing extracurricular activities from interfering with students' academic work. Needless to say, the ways it hit upon proved largely fruitless, which explains the persistence of the concern. Although as time passed it dealt with the cases of fewer and fewer individual students in its monthly meetings, the faculty still used these sessions to act upon the continuing flow of cheating cases, the petitions of

---

138 Beginning with the establishment of the office of registrar in 1911 and for many years thereafter, the College registrar acted as secretary of the faculty. Anyone needing to use the original minutes or xerox copies thereof will be grateful for the fact that Clyde Stover, unlike some of his predecessors, had a very legible hand.

139 The 1945 catalogue listed nineteen faculty committees, not all of which were of equal importance. The president appointed committee members for what amounted to indefinite terms. For example, between 1926 and 1945 the curriculum committee had but two chairmen. In April 1940 the faculty declared that the principle of rotation should apply here and urged the president to review committee membership at least every five years.
Six men who joined the faculty between 1922 and 1931 as second or third members of their departments. Their average tenure was thirty-seven years. From the 1943 Spectrum.
dismissed students to be readmitted to the College, and an occasional charge of theft.

In 1904, when the permanent faculty consisted of nine professors, including the president and dean, it was clear to all who had the power to vote in faculty meetings. Later, as numbers increased and new ranks were added, the professors were reluctant to share the franchise with anyone else. In June 1934 President Hanson ruled that, on academic matters affecting the departments, each department had one vote, while on all other matters each professor, associate professor, and assistant professor had one vote. In January 1942 the faculty gave the franchise to instructors after they had served for three years, except in those instances in which the one department-one vote rule still applied.

The Campus

In 1904 the College campus consisted of forty-three acres of land, on which were erected seventeen major structures: Old Dorm, Linnaean Hall, the president's house, the janitor's house, Stevens Hall, a double frame house occupied by the families of two professors, the chemistry or chemical laboratory, the observatory, the New Recitation Building, Brua Chapel, a steam plant, a frame house at the southwest corner of North Washington street and West Lincoln avenue, South College, and four fraternity chapter houses. Although the catalogues after 1904 continued to call the president's house by that name, more and more people knew it best as the White House. At special ceremonies during commencement week in June 1912, the New Recitation Building was renamed Glatfelter Hall. Four years later, in December 1916, the trustees formally renamed South College McKnight Hall.

Between 1904 and 1945 the College made six land purchases which more than doubled the size of the campus. In 1911 it bought a small lot at the northwest corner of North Washington street and Constitution avenue; the house on this property was rented until it was removed in 1943. In 1926, when it wished to relocate the building in which its infirmary was then housed, the College acquired a lot on the north side of the 200-block of West Lincoln avenue. In 1933 and 1938 it purchased two lots which included a small triangle of land on the northeast corner and a larger parcel on the southeast corner of North Washington and Stevens streets.

By far the largest acquisition of land thus far in its history occurred in the depression year of 1935, when the College purchased from the Martin Winter estate some forty-eight acres of land, located north of Broadway, west of Route 34, and east of the railroad. As early as December 1930 President Hanson reminded the
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trustees that the College had long “been forced to realize the unfortunate limitation to physical expansion caused by the city property surrounding the campus” and that the Winter land offered “the only available ground for expansion.” Upon his recommendation, the board authorized the purchase of about six acres owned by the estate. There followed a long delay, and in December 1933 Hanson repeated his request to the board, this time suggesting the purchase of about fifteen acres. Admitting that the College did not then have money for buying land, he nevertheless urged the trustees to act before it was too late and the property was sold for residential purposes. Again the trustees gave their approval, and once serious negotiations began, the College quickly determined to purchase everything the estate still owned north of the campus; it completed the transaction in 1935. Each passing year confirmed that this was altogether a wise and forward-looking decision. In 1939 the College completed its land acquisitions during this period by purchasing two small lots on the north and south sides of West Lincoln avenue,
A SALUTARY INFLUENCE

adjoining the railroad. At a total cost of $27,400 it had increased the size of the campus from forty-three to about ninety-three acres.\(^\text{140}\)

A major part of the physical plant of 1904 had been constructed or renovated during the previous fifteen years and was still in a reasonably good state of repair. Maintaining a college plant in such a state requires constant attention to changing needs and to the degree of wear and tear associated with the activities of college youth. A sign of the times was the disappearance in 1906 of a venerable institution – the outdoor privy – when indoor toilet facilities were installed in Old Dorm and Stevens Hall. (McKnight was built in 1897 with indoor toilets.) In 1912 electricity replaced gas and kerosene over much of the campus, and before long students were being warned to stop stealing light bulbs and switches, smashing light globes, and on their own initiative adding to the wiring in their rooms. In an effort to provide at least a minimum of fire protection, the College placed a hydrant in the middle of the campus (1914), purchased a small fire engine (1915), and provided ropes and ladders as fire escapes. As new buildings were built and as traffic patterns changed, many new walks and roads were constructed. Several thousand dollars were spent draining and leveling swampy areas of the campus north of Old Dorm. Major remodeling of this building occurred in 1925 (at which time the partitions dividing the building into three sections were removed) and again in 1936. Similar improvements in McKnight Hall were made in 1926 and 1936.

Sometime during the period covered by this chapter, and evidently near its midpoint, the College began flying the American flag over Old Dorm both night and day, in all kinds of weather. Soon thereafter, as a complement to this practice, and possibly with the assistance of some College authorities, students developed and dutifully passed along to their successors the story that Congress had authorized what was being done in recognition of the building's having been used as a hospital in July 1863. Neither the fact that there was no record of such legislation to be found nor the likelihood that Congress would single out for special recognition one of numerous buildings used for the wounded and dying in July 1863 impeded the development of a very durable tradition, one cherished both on the campus and in the community.

\(^{140}\)For further information on the campus land, see Gregory J. Landrey, "A History of the Gettysburg Campus," (Gettysburg College paper, 1977), pp. 34-40. The cost of the Winter purchase was $21,000, which was met by a mortgage paid in full and on schedule on October 1, 1941. Adams County Mortgage Book RR, p. 63 and Miscellaneous Book P, p. 84. Upon the death of Lillie K. Aughinbaugh in 1942 the College received the property at 143 Springs avenue which she bequeathed and which in 1959 was sold to one of the fraternities.
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As noted in the previous chapter, student interest in having the flag flown over Old Dorm predated 1904. An editorial in the Gettysburgian for May 27, 1908 served to indicate the persistence of that interest and define its character. Given the "thousands of visitors" who "annually come to Gettysburg to honor the brave dead and to view the battlefield which witnessed the deciding point of a great struggle," and given the fact that each year many of these visitors are shown "the beautiful campus that is ours to display," the editor wrote, "the cupola of Pennsylvania Hall could have no more crowning glory than to have the Stars and Stripes floating from its flagstaff." What, he asked, "do you suppose is the impression that a stranger receives as he views our campus and its buildings to see no vestige of that which means so much to the true American – his flag?" Unfortunately, he reported, "our College possesses no flag which is in condition to be displayed." While a week later it was possible for the paper to report that a new banner had been secured and was flying, it is clear from the testimony of the Gettysburgian over the next ten or fifteen years, corroborated by the recollections of a number of graduates of the same period, that the practice of regular, let alone continuous, display of the flag, as well as the tradition to explain it, had not yet developed.

Although Janitor Joe Carver, when interviewed in 1970, seemed to recall one of his predecessors telling him, soon after he was employed in 1914, that he was supposed to fly the flag at all times, the testimony of the Gettysburgian for September 29, 1915 that "heretofore, only on special occasions was 'Old Glory' seen floating above Old Dorm," offers a credible corrective of his memory. For a number of years, beginning in 1915, the newspaper reported that a local merchant was regularly donating flags for use on the cupola, but most photographs of the building which appeared in the Spectrums well into the 1920s, some of which were repeated from year to year, show a bare flagpole.

During his 1970 interview, Joe Carver also recalled that it was President Hanson, sometime after coming to Gettysburg in 1923, who responded to his complaint that it was burdensome to have to climb to the roof of the cupola twice a day, to raise and lower the flag, by instructing him to keep it flying and to maintain a supply on hand from which to replace worn-out flags. From that point, all that remained was for one or more persons to transform this very practical instruction to the janitor into a formal act of the United States Congress and in so doing, to narrow the justification for such action from stressing the importance of the entire field of battle, as did the

---

141 Interviews with Joe L. Carver, August 3, 4, and 24, 1970.
students of 1908, to focusing upon Old Dorm alone. Also interviewed in 1970, Dean Tilberg stated that both the practice of continuous flying of the flag and the well-known explanation for it were in existence when he arrived in Gettysburg in the fall of 1927.\footnote{Interview with Dean Emeritus Wilbur E. Tilberg, August 29, 1970. None of the G-Books issued between 1925 and 1942, all of which included much information about the College and its customs, said anything about the continuous flying of a flag over Old Dorm. For many years this flag was a current one, with forty-eight or more stars. In 1961, after the thirty-four star flag was raised over the building during a Civil War centennial celebration, the business manager, quietly and on his own initiative, continued flying the flag which was current when the battle of Gettysburg occurred. See the Gettysburgian for May 7, 1942 and September 1, 1943 for discussions of the deviations from the established practice during World War II.}

The United States Congress passed no legislation defining what is to be considered proper and acceptable civilian display of the American flag until 1942. On December 22 of that year President Franklin D. Roosevelt approved a joint resolution containing a statement of recommended flag use. Its provisions were based almost entirely upon those of a code adopted by the National Flag Conference which met in Washington in June 1923. Called by President Warren G. Harding and organized by a committee of the American Legion, this conference was attended by representatives of almost seventy organizations.

As adopted in 1923 and enacted into law in 1942, the flag code states that "it is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open" and, further, that "the flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement." At the same time, according to the code, it is permissible to display the flag at night "upon special occasions where it is desired to produce a patriotic effect."\footnote{For the text of the law, see Milo M. Quaife, Melvin J. Weig, and Roy E. Appleman, The History of the United States Flag From the Revolution to the Present, Including a Guide to Its Use and Display (New York, 1961), pp. 180-166.} The interpretation of what constitutes "special occasions" or a "patriotic effect" is left entirely to the judgment of those wishing to display the flag. An increasing number of persons have construed these words very liberally, in order to justify continuous display, a practice which the framers of the code surely did not intend to sanction.

For some years the General Reference and Bibliography Division of the Library of Congress maintained a list of places at which reportedly the flag flew twenty-four hours a day, either by an act of Congress, by presidential proclamation, or by custom. Old Dorm at Gettysburg College was first included on this list as a result of cor-
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As of 1985, the flag was still there, day and night.

respondence with the president of the College which the Library of Congress initiated in 1966. The College gave custom as the reason for engaging in the practice.144

During his brief tenure in office, from 1904 to 1910, President Hefelbower devoted most of his energies to raising the standards for admission, improving the curriculum and library, and increasing the size of the faculty. Not surprisingly, and especially since he was unable to eliminate the long-standing College debt, his reports to the board contain no recommendations for alterations or additions to the physical plant.145

Things changed markedly with the advent of his successor. In reporting to the board on the success of the fund-raising campaign of 1910-1913, President Granville summoned the College to a new financial effort to raise money for a science and engineering building. During the next few months he extended his list of needs. In

144 A 1977 work listed eight places at which the flag flies continuously by virtue of an act of Congress or presidential proclamation and eighteen at which the sanction is custom. The author of this work sought explanatory statements from persons at each of these places. In the course of his investigation he learned that the flag had never flown continuously at a number of places included in previous lists. In a few instances the custom had been discontinued. Bedford O. Kaddy, Jr., Where and Why The American Flag Flies Twenty-four Hours a Day (New York, 1977). As continuous display of the flag becomes increasingly common, the Library of Congress has not kept its list up to date.

145 For a statement of what became of Hefelbower's appeal to Andrew Carnegie for a physics building, see p. 459n.
October 1913, he told the students assembled in chapel that, in addition to a science hall, there should be a machine shop, a new building for the preparatory department, a library building, a Y.M.C.A. building, a gymnasium, and an additional dormitory.

In December 1913 the trustees authorized a campaign to raise $130,000 for a science hall, a preparatory department building, a machine shop, and an infirmary. At the same time, they established a standing building committee and instructed it to choose an architect, direct all constructions and alterations, and insure "that the style of architecture of Pennsylvania Hall be copied as far as is practicable in any new college buildings, all to form part of a harmonious and comprehensive plan for future expansion."

The building committee chose as its architect George C. Baum (1872-1926), of the class of 1893. A resident of Philadelphia, Baum was the son of one long-time trustee and brother of another. Holder of a degree in architecture from the University of Pennsylvania, he continued to serve the College until his unexpected death in 1926. President Granville used the columns of the Gettysburgian for May 6, 1914 to announce that Baum had prepared preliminary plans for a science hall and a preparatory building, as well as "a comprehensive and harmonious scheme for utilizing all the land now owned by the College . . . for future building sites and campus purposes." The Baum plan called for the science hall to be constructed on the site of the existing chemistry laboratory and the preparatory building on the northeast corner of that department's campus. Dormitories, fraternity houses, and other buildings, all to be constructed of "red brick with white pillars, pilasters and trimming," were projected for the area north of Old Dorm. Since that building "faces the new campus as well as the present one," wrote Granville, "a portico fronting north similar to the one now facing south" will eventually be added. Old Dorm "will be the central feature of the completed plans," he told his readers, "a prominence which it richly deserves both because of its classic beauty and because of its historic importance." 146

Unfortunately, since the campaign to raise $130,000 never came close to its goal, the trustees had to decide which, if any, of the four projected improvements could be completed. In June 1915 they instructed the building committee to erect a new hall for the use of the preparatory department. Ground was broken in the following fall and the structure was ready for use in September 1916. Called simply the Main Building, it contained facilities for all of the operations of the preparatory department, including a dining room. For the first time in more than forty years the College could now pro-

146 Granville also discussed these plans in the Spectrum for 1915.
Main Building on the Academy Campus
Completed in 1916 and renamed Huber Hall in 1941.

vide meals for at least some of its students. Granville reported that the cost of the building, furnished and equipped, was about $50,000. When Charles H. Huber retired in the spring of 1941, the Main Building was named after him in recognition of his more than forty years of service to the College. Hereafter in this work it will be called Huber Hall.

Although unable to raise most of the money which it sought in the campaign begun in December 1913, the College was forced over the next several years to make a number of changes in its plant, due largely to the pressing needs of an increasing enrollment. First, in December 1913 the board ordered Dean Bikle and Professor Nixon to vacate the campus houses which they had occupied for many years, so that these facilities could be converted to dormitory use. The dean's appeal to the board to reverse itself was unsuccessful, and by the fall of 1914 Cottage Hall had been transformed into a thirty-room dormitory. Second, by September 1915 the College had converted its house on the southwest corner of Washington street and Lincoln avenue into a fourteen-room dormitory. Called the Athletic Field House, it was described in the catalogue as a facility "designed especially for the use of the members of the College

147 This figure did not include the cost of a central heating plant placed in the basement of Stevens Hall to serve the buildings on the preparatory campus or for the necessary connections to those buildings. In June 1917 Granville told the board that the total costs incurred were $54,400. A. R. Warner, Waynesboro, was the contractor for this and many future College building and renovation projects.
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athletic teams." Third, in December 1915, when it became evident that, without an unexpected windfall, funds would not soon be available for a science building, the board authorized a major addition to the chemistry laboratory. Completed by the following fall, at a cost of about $4,600, it increased significantly the size of both lecture room and laboratories. Fourth, once the new preparatory department building was occupied in the fall of 1916, Stevens Hall became a College office, classroom, and dormitory building. In 1920 the second and third floors were completely remodeled and once again housed students of the preparatory department. Fifth, since the room reserved in Glatfelter Hall for an infirmary had never been used for that purpose, and since the promised money for such a facility did not become available, when it became necessary in the fall of 1917 to segregate a number of students with contagious diseases, the College began using its observatory as a temporary infirmary. In 1923, following another outbreak of contagious diseases, it converted the former Athletic Field House (rented to a family for several years) into an infirmary for all ill students and placed it in charge of what the catalogue described as "an experienced resident graduate nurse," under the general supervision of the medical director.

In December 1914 Professor and Mrs. George D. Stahley, who were childless, proposed to the board that they be permitted to erect on the campus a house which would be the property of the College and "a permanent residence for us to the end of our days." The board formally accepted their proposal at its next meeting. A site at the northwest corner of Carlisle and Stevens streets was chosen and the house was built in 1915-1916, at a cost of $8,000. The Stahleys lived at 300 Carlisle street until his death in 1939; his widow continued residing there until about six months before she died in 1951.

The next new structure on the campus was the Y.M.C.A. hall, which was completed in 1922. In the case of few, if any, other College buildings had there been so long a period of time between conception and fruition or so many frustrations between the time of the actual decision to build and the day of dedication. As early as 1891, urged on by the College Monthly, the Y.M.C.A. had

---

148 The College had purchased the house in 1894, when it acquired all of the properties south of West Lincoln avenue. It was last used as a dormitory in 1920-1921.

149 When the use of this building was changed in 1916, the catalogue began referring to it as Thaddeus Stevens Hall, a name which persisted until the academy closed in 1935.

150 In the spring of 1926, after construction of Breidenbaugh had begun, the infirmary building was moved to a lot in the 200-block of West Lincoln avenue. The medical director and nurse continued to operate it. Mrs. Margaret E. Miller was nurse from 1926 to 1940.
inaugurated a building fund, which from time to time thereafter its members tried to reactivate. The 1904 and 1905 Spectrums reproduced proposed floor plans for the building. During the Hefelbower administration both faculty and trustees gave their blessing to the proposal, but the amount available in cash and pledges remained far from what was required to complete it.

In the fall of 1913 President Granville included a "Christian Social Hall" on the list of needed buildings which he announced to the students in chapel. However, it was not one of the four proposed structures which the trustees decided upon when they authorized a new fund-raising campaign two months later. Granville found an opportunity to advance the priority of a Y.M.C.A. building when the Woman's League asked him to recommend to them one major College project on which they might work. "This seems to be the psychological moment for choosing some one large object on which to concentrate your efforts," he told them in a letter dated September 1, 1915. Urging the women to raise the money needed for a Y.M.C.A. hall (his estimate of what it would take was about $15,000), he predicted that "just your beginning a campaign for the securing of such a building will have a stimulating effect on our College Y.M.C.A. and produce an uplift in the moral tone of the institution." 151

At its annual convention in November, the Woman's League accepted Granville's proposal and called upon students and alumni to come to its aid. A month later the board of trustees approved the project. The 1916 catalogue announced that the league had begun a campaign to secure $30,000 (not $15,000) for a "College Y.M.C.A. Hall to serve as a religious and social center for the student body." During their convention in November 1916, the women dedicated the site chosen for the future building -- just north of the chemistry laboratory along Washington street -- and placed a sign on the spot as a reminder to all passersby of their intentions.

Few at this time realized that within a matter of months the country would become an active participant in World War I and that the government would quickly discourage most building. The women soon found that the war was making it difficult for them to carry on their usual ways of raising money. 152 Between 1916 and 1918 prices increased about 40 percent. The war in general and an influenza epidemic in particular led to cancellation of the 1918 league convention. However, these difficulties only delayed the women. It did not weaken their resolve. In June 1919 they held a groundbreaking

151 The letter appeared in the Gettysburgian for September 29, 1915.
152 Were it not for the war, Granville told the board in June 1918, the building "would now be nearing completion."
ceremony and the following November, during their annual convention, they laid the cornerstone for the new building. They could not proceed beyond this point, however, since the trustees had not yet authorized actual construction. As late as June 1920, citing continued inflation and shortages of materials, the board urged further delay. Finally, in December of that year, after the necessary details had been completed, the trustees at last approved construction. Work began in the early spring of 1921, with students helping to dig the foundations. Even then, there were delays in securing some materials and it took a year to finish the outside work. The building was dedicated on June 13, 1922, with Edgar F. Smith, of the class of 1874, retired provost of the University of Pennsylvania, as the main speaker. Five years earlier, in June 1917, the trustees had decided that the name of the building when completed should be the

---

153 "At last the new Y.M.C.A. building is to be erected," declared the Gettysburgian for March 18, 1921. "Of course, many will say that they are tired of hearing the same old story of the fact that the building is to be erected."
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Robert Weidensall Y.M.C.A. The final report of the building committee gave the cost of the new structure, including furniture and furnishings, as $80,293, a far cry from the $15,000 which Granville had first suggested and the $30,000 which the Woman’s League believed would be its obligation when it adopted the project in 1915.

Weidensall Hall (to use the name by which it has been known since the early 1960s) had a twenty-by-sixty-foot swimming pool, with locker and shower rooms, on the ground floor; a large lobby and various other rooms on the floor above; and a large meeting room, several smaller rooms, and living quarters for the Y.M.C.A. secretary on the top floor. The College never had a facility quite like this; the U.L.C.A. survey team found nothing comparable on the campus of any other Lutheran college. Once it was completed, it took little time for the Y.M.C.A., other student groups, and the administration to find ways to make constant use of the building. For more than two decades it was the favorite place for College receptions.

Meeting the day on which Weidensall Hall was dedicated (June 13, 1922), the board of trustees decided that the next new structure on campus would be a chemistry hall and directed its building committee to secure the necessary plans. On the following day it was

154 Robert Weidensall (1836-1922), of the class of 1860, began a lifelong career with the Y.M.C.A. in 1868, after several years as a teacher, construction worker, and superintendent of the Union Pacific car shops in Omaha, Nebraska. Widely regarded as the father of the student Y.M.C.A. movement in the United States, he also worked in several foreign countries. For half a century he was secretary of the Y.M.C.A.’s international committee. From time to time he returned to campus, to give a talk (1909, 1915, 1912, 1915), receive an honorary degree (1912), or be present at the groundbreaking of the building named in his honor (1919). Too ill to attend its dedication, he died in Omaha in September 1922. See C. Howard Hopkins, History of the Y.M.C.A. in North America (New York, 1951).

155 A detailed report of the cost of the building is included in the Woman’s League number of the CCB for December 1925, pp. 28-30. Construction costs amounted to $75,653.24 and furniture and fixtures to $4,839.80. In November 1917 a secretary of the Y.M.C.A. international committee told the Woman’s League convention that the committee would contribute $25,000 to the cost of the building in recognition of Weidensall’s fifty years of service to the organization. Unfortunately, only about 20 percent of this pledge was ever paid. Weidensall’s bequest of $1,949 was added to the building fund.

156 U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:292,335. To recognize donors the Woman’s League placed hundreds of names in the cornerstone and erected plaques throughout the building. The east portico honored the board president and the west portico the College president. Some of the rooms were also named. The Altoona subleague presented a painting, “The Vigil,” in 1930; it was hung above the fireplace in the main lobby, where a marble drinking fountain was placed two years later in memory of a deceased league president. Once Weidensall was available, some functions previously held in the sweat box were transferred to it and in 1923 the latter was converted into a classroom.
announced that the Endowment and Expansion Campaign had exceeded its goal of $1,000,000, giving reason for many to hope that when all of the pledges were paid there would be sizable amounts available for further construction. There was general agreement at the time, not only that the old chemistry laboratory was woefully inadequate, but also that the College badly needed a new and much larger gymnasium as well as a library building. The Gettysburgian for March 21, 1923 called the existing gymnasium a shame and claimed that it ranked "among the poorest in the country." Three months later the librarian told the board that "our Library rooms are altogether too small. We are indeed in urgent need of a library building."

Urgent as all of them were for the welfare of the College, these three needs were not to be met immediately. The departure of President Granville early in 1923 suggested that planning for further building should be halted until his successor could be chosen and had gained some experience in his new office. The gradual realization that the Endowment and Expansion Campaign was going to yield much less than $1,000,000 prompted a search for new sources of money. In addition, it was soon evident, at least to some, that the College should entrust major decisions in designing a chemistry building to the successor of Professor Breidenbaugh, who was about to retire after a half century of service.

Within a year after becoming president in the fall of 1923, Henry W.A. Hanson selected as the new head of the chemistry department John B. Zinn, a 1909 alumnus, a Johns Hopkins Ph.D., and a veteran of ten years of teaching at Amherst College and Worcester Polytechnic Institute. While recruiting Zinn, Hanson informed him that the next building on the campus would be a hall for two departments - chemistry and physics - rather than for one, and also that, if he returned to Gettysburg, he would have a free hand in designing its interior as an up-to-date facility.157

By June 1925 the trustees were ready to act. After the president reported the availability of $70,000 in cash and $80,000 in what he called gilt-edged pledges, they directed the building committee to secure plans for and proceed to erect a science hall and a "general assembly building which is also to serve as a Gymnasium." The committee approved the proposals which architect Baum submitted for two structures similar in exterior design to Huber and Weiden-

157 Interview with John B. Zinn, July 1972, in GCA. Zinn had high praise for the assistance in designing the building given him by Horace S. Uhler, professor of physics in 1925-1926. At the same time, he was critical of the president for not having a professor of physical education available when the gymnasium was being planned and a trained librarian when the library was being designed.
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sall Halls. Groundbreaking ceremonies for both new buildings occurred on October 3, 1925. Actual construction of both began a few months later.158

The new gymnasium was first used in late April 1927 for an interfraternity ball, an Owl and Nightingale production, and a military ball. The first basketball game did not occur there until January 1928. The cost of the building was $152,995.68.159

Soon after work on the gymnasium began, the Gettysburg community was saddened by the unexpected death of Edward S. Plank (1875-1926). Born near Gettysburg, he began demonstrating his skill in baseball in a country school and on several town teams. Between 1899 and 1901, when he was already in his middle twenties, he enrolled in the preparatory department and sometimes played on the College baseball team. In 1901 Connie Mack engaged him to play with the Philadelphia Athletics. During thirteen years as a member of that team, his southpaw pitching helped it win six American League pennants and three world series. He left the Athletics in 1914 and played for three years with the St. Louis team, first in the Federal and then in the American League. Returning to Gettysburg in 1917, Plank operated a garage and sold automobiles until his death in February 1926. Within a month of that event, a local committee headed by President Hanson was arranging for a benefit game to be played in his memory by the Athletics and Phillies in Philadelphia, with the proceeds to go to the College for the new gymnasium. According to the Gettysburgian for March 24, 1926, the president was hopeful that the yield might be sufficient to enable prompt construction of a library building. Unfortunately, wet grounds forced postponement of the game on the first scheduled date, in September 1926. It was finally played in the rain in October 1927. Attendance and proceeds were both disappointingly small. Long before this, in

158Architect George C. Baum died while these buildings were being constructed. In June 1928 a plaque in his memory was placed in the main entrance to the gymnasium. There is a similar plaque in Weidensall Hall.

159Figures given for the construction of the gymnasium, science building, and library, and for the remodeling of Glatfelter Hall, are taken from the treasurer's report submitted to the board on December 5, 1933.
June 1926, the board of trustees had decided upon a name for its new building. The Eddie Plank Memorial Gymnasium was dedicated on June 7, 1927, during commencement week.

As intended, Plank was a multipurpose building which, according to the 1927 catalogue, fulfilled "the combined functions of a gymnasium, social center, armory, and auditorium." It housed the offices of the medical director and the new physical education staff, living quarters for the caretaker, and a rifle range. In return for a $1,000 contribution, the Owl and Nightingale Club had a stage, office space, dressing rooms, and other facilities at the north end of the building. The main gymnasium floor could be used for dances and other social activities. Last but not least, Plank was a gymnasium with what the catalogue described as "splendid facilities for all indoor sports."

---

150See the obituary in the Compiler for February 27, 1926, and Joseph L. Reichler, ed., The Baseball Encyclopedia, 4th ed. rev. (New York, 1979), p. 1959. Although there is no record that Plank was ever enrolled in the College, he was often assigned a place among its nongraduating alumni, usually in the class of 1904 or 1905. Until World War II, the catalogue, in describing the gymnasium, referred to him as "one of the best known and best loved men who ever enrolled at Gettysburg College." Plank was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1946.

151Obviously, Plank now competed with Weidensall as a place for campus social activities.
Work on the new science building, begun during the winter of 1925-1926, did not quite keep pace with that on the gymnasium. The classrooms and some of the laboratories were first used in the fall of 1927; the remaining laboratories were completed and occupied during the 1927-1928 academic year. Breidenbaugh Science Hall was dedicated during commencement weekend, on June 12, 1929. Charles M.A. Stine, of the class of 1901, gave the address. The cost of the building was $160,458.16. Reflecting upon his more than thirty years of teaching in Breidenbaugh, John B. Zinn in 1972 declared that the building had well served the purposes which he had in mind when he helped design it.162

The chemistry laboratory immediately south of Weidensall Hall was removed during the summer of 1927. During the College centennial exercises, on May 28, 1932, members of the class of 1917 dedicated a sundial on the site where the old building had stood for some fifty-five years.163

Few persons disagreed with the statement made by the librarian in June 1923 that "we are indeed in urgent need of a library building." Soon after becoming president, Henry W. A. Hanson began searching for the funds required for such a facility. After an unsuccessful

162Interview with John B. Zinn, July 1972, in GCA. In June 1923, in adding its voice to many others calling for a new science building, the Alumni Association recommended that it be named for Professor Breidenbaugh.

163Some person or persons who may have thought that they were engaging in good clean fun soon stole parts of the sundial, not all of which were ever recovered.
approach to the Carnegie Foundation, he announced to the trustees in January 1927 that one of their colleagues, Henry H. Weber, was changing his bequest of $50,000 for an endowed professorship, announced in 1922, to one of $75,000 for a library to be named in memory of his recently deceased wife, M. Emma Weber. How long it might take for this gift to become available no one then knew, but about eighteen months later Weber sought to move things along by offering the College a judgment note, payable upon his death, which it could then use in securing a bank loan.

By the time the members of the board, polled individually in September 1928, approved this arrangement, some of them with understandably serious misgivings, building plans were already well-advanced. The site on which Cottage Hall then stood had already been chosen for the new facility; the old structure was sold at public auction and removed in the fall. A new College architect, J. Alfred Hamme (1897-1965), of the class of 1918, drew up plans for a building whose exterior harmonized with the Georgian design of all four buildings erected during the previous decade. In October Paul
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Philippe Cret (1876-1945), a nationally known architect and professor of design at the University of Pennsylvania, visited the campus and approved the Hamme plans. 164

Construction of the library began early in 1929 and the new building was officially opened for use on November 17 of that year. The cost was $108,976.77. The 1930 catalogue referred to the M. Emma Weber Memorial Library Building. Since by that time it was becoming evident that the Weber bequest was not going to be realized, this designation disappeared from later catalogues. Until it was named after the chief founder of the College in 1957, the building was known simply as the library.

Members of the U.L.C.A. survey team who visited Gettysburg during the 1926-1927 year were not favorably impressed by what they saw in Glatfelter Hall. They called the center stairway and the steam engine in the basement fire hazards and thought it odd that only two of the twenty-six rooms in the building had the same dimensions. This latter was described as the "most extreme case" of poor utilization of space in any college visited. As a result, they recommended that the building be razed as soon as possible and be replaced by a more nearly fireproof structure in which more effective use would be made of the available space. 165 While recognizing the inadequacy of the existing building, President Hanson rejected this recommendation and opted instead for a less drastic solution. In June 1928 he proposed to the board that, as soon as the library could be moved into its new building, the administration be relocated in the former gymnasium and the interior of Glatfelter Hall be extensively remodeled. Shortly thereafter, Trustee William L. Glatfelter pledged $25,000 for the remodeling, an amount which he and his three sisters later increased to $100,000.

164J. Alfred Hamme was employed in the York firm of his father, John B. Hamme (1862-1954), who after being graduated in architecture by Cornell University was associated for some years with an earlier College architect, John A. Dempwolf. The younger Hamme, whose degree in architecture was granted by the University of Pennsylvania in 1925, designed buildings for the College for more than thirty years. For a sketch of Cret's career, see the Dictionary of American Biography, Supplement 3 (1973): 199-200. He designed the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Federal Reserve Board Building, both in Washington.

165U.L.C.A. Survey, 1:202,229, 250. Only minor changes had been made in Glatfelter Hall since its completion in 1889. The number of classrooms and amount of space devoted to the library were increased. See the Gettysburgian for April 29, 1925 and September 10, 1929.
The plans submitted by J. Alfred Hamme and approved by the board called for the removal of the entire interior of the building and its replacement by newly designed classrooms, offices, and laboratories. Work began soon after commencement 1929. When it became evident that it was not going to be completed by the beginning of the next school year, President Hanson in a letter to all students appealed for patience upon their return to the campus. During the early fall the contractor worked three shifts around the clock in an effort to ready the building for occupancy. Meanwhile, classes were held in the gymnasium, chapel, science building, Weidensall, and fraternity houses. Classes were first conducted in the renovated hall on December 2, 1929, after the Thanksgiving recess. The new administrative offices were occupied during the Christmas recess.

"Improvements have been made in every detail of the structure," declared the 1930 catalogue. "The building is fire resisting throughout and marble, wrought iron, and terrazzo have been skillfully used in the construction of the corridors." For the first time in the history of the College, each department head had an office separate and apart from what was regarded as his classroom. However, it was an office which he had to share with any assistants he might have. The departments of German, mathematics, and philosophy shared the first floor with the administration. Bible, English, Greek, history, Latin, and Romance languages occupied the second floor. The departments of economics and political science, education, and engineering used the third floor. The basement space was assigned to engineering and military science. The biology department, which moved into Breidenbaugh Hall when the renovation began, remained there until the engineering program was discontinued in 1940, when it returned to Glatfelter Hall. The total reported cost of the renovations was $125,578.86.
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Only a few weeks before the new library was first occupied, the stock market crash of October 1929 occurred. Within a matter of months it became evident that the country was entering a period of severe economic depression. Most plans for further building and renovating activity had to be set aside. Normal maintenance was reduced to a minimum. Between the fall of 1929 and 1945 one old College building got a second portico, a bookstore was built, and the old gymnasium disappeared from the campus.

Adding a north portico to Old Dorm was a project which architect Baum had envisaged in his 1914 campus plan, long before either Weidensall, Breidenbaugh, or Plank was built. As the area north of the old building was developed, interest in a major entrance to what had long been considered its back side increased. "This building is the key of the campus," the president told the trustees in June 1928, "and it is my thought that from whatever entrance one may enter the campus, the most conspicuous feature will be the beautiful old building around which the affections of the thousands of our alumni will always be centered." He hoped that a north portico could be built in time for the College centennial celebration in 1932. However, it was not until 1937 – the centennial of the first occupancy of the old building – that his hope was finally realized. Work was begun in the spring and the new portico was dedicated on June 5, 1937, with Professor Emeritus Milton H. Valentine giving the address. The portico was named in memory of Charles W. Beachem, the first alumni secretary, who died after a brief illness in the preceding January. The cost of the improvement, including necessary changes to the interior of the building, was about $12,300; it was met by contributions of the Alumni Association.

During the summer of 1939 the College built a bookstore on the recently acquired southeastern corner of Washington and Stevens streets. The contract price was $5,300. When the new facility opened for business in the fall, the College converted the space in Old Dorm which had long been used for selling books into dormitory rooms. For many years students had operated the bookstore, providing a service for their colleagues while earning part of their College expenses. Arguing that the responsibility had become too great for students to handle, the College took over the facility in July 1938.166

The desire to convert the abandoned gymnasium into an administrative center, which persisted long after Glatfelter Hall was reoccupied in the fall of 1929, was never realized. Even as town children used it for various purposes, the condition of the building continued to deteriorate. After a spirited student campaign to secure its

166 The student-run bookstore appeared shortly after 1900. At times Old Dorm also housed a lunch room and barber shop.
removal was waged in the columns of the Gettysburgian, the trustees in June 1942 directed the administration to tear down the building. The second oldest College structure, built with much student labor, Linnaean Hall disappeared from the campus during the summer of 1942.

In December 1936 President Hanson told the trustees that the College "has now reached the point where, I think we are ready for a forward step." It was, in his opinion, "decidedly important to the College constituency to inaugurate a project, big enough and sufficiently worthwhile, to challenge the united support of our entire student body" and of the Woman's League. The forward step he had in mind was the construction of "an adequate and attractive" chapel to replace Brua, which admittedly had long "served the College and served it well." He proposed that the new building be designed as "the most attractive structure on the entire campus" and be placed across Washington street from Weidensall, where it would be "in the center of our campus activities" and would "afford a splendid perspective to passers-by." In response to this appeal, the board approved a financial campaign for the new chapel and called for the support of all friends of the College. Although more than $100,000 in cash was soon received for this project and although fond hopes were expressed that construction would begin as early as the spring of 1940, wartime and postwar conditions delayed its completion until the early 1950s.

To recapitulate, between 1904 and 1945 there were many improvements and additions to the College's physical plant. From 1914 on there was a comprehensive campus plan which the trustees had approved, but they were of course always free to determine the extent to which they wished to use it at any particular time. Seven of the seventeen major buildings of 1904 had disappeared by 1945: the observatory (1925), chemistry laboratory (1927), janitor's house (1928), Cottage Hall (1928), Linnaean Hall (1942), and two fraternity houses.¹⁸⁷ One 1904 building, the dwelling house at the southwestern corner of Washington street and Lincoln avenue, had been moved into the 200-block of West Lincoln and was still being used as the College infirmary. Nine of the seventeen buildings of 1904 were still in use forty-one years later.

Between 1916 and 1939 ten new buildings were constructed on the campus: Huber Hall (1916); the Stahley Home (1916); Weidensall Hall (1922); Plank Gymnasium (1927); Breidenbaugh Hall (1927); a

¹⁸⁷The observatory was removed during the summer of 1925 after some years of neglect and brief use as an infirmary. The old janitor's house was the one located north of Old Dorm. In 1943 the College tore down the dwelling house at the corner of Washington street and Constitution avenue which it had purchased in 1911.
new house for the janitor, located west of Glatfelter Hall (1928); the library (1929); the bookstore (1939); and two fraternity houses. The total cost to the College of this construction, plus the renovation of Glatfelter Hall and the addition of the Old Dorm portico, was about $700,000. The treasurer's report for the year ending June 30, 1945 valued the College's land at $171,500, its buildings at $1,296,747, and fixtures and equipment at $244,819. The total was $1,713,066.168

Some of the campus improvements during these years were funded by gifts made by classes either at the time of graduation or later, possibly on some anniversary occasion. Beginning with the 1914 catalogue the College recognized these gifts in a special section entitled Class Memorials. Many classes provided for concrete walks from building to building on the College or preparatory department

168Although Christ Lutheran church was still known as the College church in 1945, and although the College still made an annual contribution to its treasury, its relationship with the institution had undergone major change since 1904. Students were no longer required to attend Sunday services and baccalaureate exercises were no longer held in its sanctuary. Annual contributions ended in 1953.
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campus. Carrying on an old tradition, students themselves sometimes did much of the work in laying these walks. In 1912 the class of 1907 paid for wiring Old Dorm and McKnight Hall for electricity, and the graduating class presented the lamp post between Old Dorm and Brua Chapel. In 1913 the class of 1893 provided for the gateway to the campus entrance across from Water street and the graduating class for the lamp posts in front of Glatfelter Hall. In 1928, after the old chemistry laboratory had been removed, the class of 1892 presented the gateway to the campus entrance across from Stevens street.169

The interest in improving the appearance of the campus which faculty and students had displayed from the earliest days continued well into the twentieth century, especially during the Hanson years. On three or four occasions landscape architects who visited the campus proposed extensive plantings, as well as removing some buildings and relocating walks and roadways. As a result, literally thousands of trees, shrubs, and flowering plants, some of them presented as gifts, were planted, most of which unfortunately soon fell victim to drought and vandalism. The prediction of the Gettysburgian (April 27, 1927) that the recently purchased hundred Japanese crabapple trees would live for three centuries and make the College an effective competitor of the city of Washington in the springtime was never realized. In the late 1920s an effort was made to convert the area along the Tiber into a flower garden. Phi Gamma Delta carried this project to completion in 1931 and called it the Stahler Memorial Gardens.170 For about five or six years, beginning in the fall of 1927, a Campus Beautiful Club under the sponsorship of Frank H. Kramer attracted student energies to supporting these and similar projects.

Adam Foutz retired as a College janitor in 1906. During his thirty-year tenure he was not the only College janitor, but he was clearly the one most students knew and respected. The man who eventually took his place in the life of the institution did not appear on the scene until the spring of 1914, when Joseph L. Carver (1888-1971) moved with his family into the old janitor's house. Joe's association with the College lasted until his death more than half a century later. Even after he formally retired in 1959, he continued to be responsible for maintaining the campus locks and keys. Joe was completely

169The class memorials section of the catalogue was a casualty of World War II, appearing last in 1942. It included class gifts for items other than campus improvements, such as prizes, class reunion trophies, and display cases. The class of 1892 never reimbursed the College for the northern gateway and the obligation was eventually written off as a bad debt.

170Harry L. Stahler (1860-1929) of the class of 1882 was a devoted alumnus and an ardent supporter of his fraternity.
Joseph L. Carver (1888-1971)

Janitor in the tradition of Hopkins and Foutz from 1914 to 1959. However, while the first enjoyed the title of vice president and the second of governor, Joe had to be content with that of professor. The editors of the 1935 Spectrum declared that "'Professor Carver' is an influential factor in the campus life of Gettysburg College," who because of his manifold duties "is certainly entitled to a chair in this institution."

devoted to Gettysburg College. He cared for the buildings with which he was charged and mowed the lawns (for years with a push mower) in the spirit of a true workman. Joe was so punctual in unlocking classrooms in the morning and in ringing the Glatfelter bell to announce the first class that when he overslept one April morning in 1930 the fact was news to the Gettysburgian.

Though his formal education was about as limited as that of John Hopkins or Adam Foutz, Carver was wise enough rarely to reveal to students the degree to which their antics might have provoked him, and consequently he was able to minimize the number of tricks they played upon him. "Although not possessing an official degree," declared a writer for the 1935 Spectrum, "'Professor' Carver is certainly entitled to a chair in this institution." President Hanson offered his own tribute some years later. "I couldn't imagine attempting to operate Gettysburg College without the devoted services of Joe," the Gettysburgian for December 10, 1942 reported him
as saying. "Joe is one of the most indefatigable and loyal men I know. His love for college boys has been a constant inspiration."\textsuperscript{171}

**Preparatory Department 1904-1916**

**Gettysburg Academy 1916-1935**

The announced purpose of the preparatory department in 1904 was one which any alumnus in that year could understand perfectly. "The object of its foundation, which the school has steadily kept in view," declared the catalogue, "was to present to the public an Academy under the control of College authorities." This arrangement was held to be doubly advantageous, because students preparing for college were instructed "under the eyes of their future Professors and in the line of the college requirements," while students wanting "only an English education, preparatory to business, teaching, etc." were taught "under the supervision of college Professors, in a college atmosphere, and with free access to the college libraries." The catalogue advised prospective preparatory students that they could be admitted without examination "at any time to the grade for which they have been qualified by previous study." In the fall of 1904 Charles H. Huber was beginning his ninth year as principal of the department. He had two assistants, both of them recent College graduates and one of whom lived in Stevens Hall. There were fifty-nine students in the two-year course. Thirty-five were from Adams county; twenty were women. Tuition, room rent, and other annual expenses were estimated at $82.85, excluding board, which was available in private homes or clubs at from $69 to $111.\textsuperscript{172}

Changes occurring in American education early in the twentieth century began to challenge the status, even the continued existence, of many college preparatory departments. For example, the rapid increase in the number of public high schools made it possible for college-bound students to prepare themselves while living at home, without the payment of tuition, room, and board. Between 1904 and 1914 the number of high school graduates nationwide all but

\textsuperscript{171}Believing that Carver's service began on April 1, 1913, President Hanson brought faculty and students into his office on April 1, 1943 and in their presence gave the janitor thirty new five-dollar bills. Payroll records, the Gettysburgian, and catalogues establish beyond any doubt that Carver's service began in April 1914.

\textsuperscript{172}In June 1906 Huber informed the trustees that the teachers' course begun in 1898 had been discontinued because it was not profitable and because it interfered with the other work of the department.
doubled, an increase repeated between the latter year and 1923. Another challenge came from those responsible for developing nationally accepted standards by which to measure the quality of higher educational institutions. Most of them insisted that, unless preparatory departments were separate and distinct from the colleges which owned them, instruction in the latter was in constant danger of falling below an acceptable level. For example, the committee on college resources and standards, already referred to, concluded in 1918 that one of the requirements of a successful college of arts and sciences which had an academy or preparatory department was an organization of the latter which was "distinct in students, faculty, and discipline."\(^173\)

These developments in American education were soon felt on the Gettysburg campus. Enrollment in the preparatory department, which had averaged eighty-three during the five years before the fall of 1904, dropped to sixty-three during the next five years. As early as June 1906 Huber explained to the trustees what was happening. Fewer town students were enrolling in prep because the Gettysburg High School was now offering "a full preparatory course for college."\(^174\) In his report to the board a year later, President Hefelbower was more sweeping in attributing the decrease in enrollment to "the general development of high schools that is taking place almost everywhere." Nothing which the College did in an attempt to reverse this situation had any appreciable effect for more than a decade. Although the course of study was increased to four years in 1910 (qualified students could complete it in less time), enrollment reached eighty only once until after World War I. The annual average for the years 1904-1918 was sixty-five. Adams county continued to contribute about forty percent of the student body, which after 1905 was almost entirely male. The number of females in prep dropped from twenty in the fall of 1904 to four a year later. Once it became possible for young women to complete their college-preparatory work at the Gettysburg High School, almost all of those planning to attend the College took advantage of the opportunity. From 1905 to 1918 the average enrollment of women in prep was between five and six.

The trustees remained firmly committed to continuing the preparatory department, if for no other reason simply because each fall it still yielded a good number of male freshmen who otherwise might attend some other college. As early as June 1906 they authorized a second prep dormitory as soon as funds became available. Seven years later, the trustees committed themselves to raising money for

\(^{173}\)Resources and Standards (1918), pp. 16, 57.

\(^{174}\)In 1906 this was less than a four-year course.
four new structures, one of which was intended to replace Stevens Hall, long considered to be unappealing as a dormitory and unlikely to attract students to Gettysburg. It is a tribute to the hold of the preparatory department on the minds of the trustees as well as to the influence which Huber had gained among them that, when only about half of the needed funds were raised, the one building which they chose to construct was Huber Hall.

The impending completion of a new building in the fall of 1916 prompted the College to revise the image of its preparatory department which it had long presented to the public. Although as early as 1911 the catalogue had begun referring to "Stevens Hall, Gettysburg Academy, Preparatory Department of Pennsylvania College," five years later only one of those terms - Gettysburg Academy - remained in the College catalogue and now appeared in the first issue of a separate annual academy catalogue. While both documents stressed the many advantages Gettysburg Academy students enjoyed because they were in "near association with a college," both also argued forcefully that the Academy "is separate and distinct from the College in that it has its own faculty, buildings and grounds and the student body has its own distinctive school life and interests." Principal Huber of the preparatory department was now transformed into Headmaster Huber of the Gettysburg Academy. The other faculty were no longer assistants; they were now masters. Since the new Huber Hall had its own kitchen and dining room, the academy could now be described as a boarding school.
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Since it had its own chapel, study hall, and living rooms, all maintained under the watchful eyes of the masters, the academy could also be described as a "training school for boys" which tried "to give every student a happy, healthful home life," one which attached "the greatest importance to the culture of the heart and to the development of those manly virtues that make the truly Christian gentleman."\footnote{175}

Once Huber Hall was completed and occupied, President Granville could tell the trustees, in June 1917, that "for the first time in our history we have a thoroughly up-to-date Academy that is equipped to compete successfully with the popular preparatory schools in our territory which have been drawing boys, who naturally should enter our College, away from Gettysburg." How competitive the new building and revised organization would make the academy could be determined accurately only after the world war had run its course. Actually, enrollment began increasing in the fall of 1918, even before the armistice. It exceeded 100 in the fall of 1921 and peaked at 158 in 1927. The addition in 1922 of a fifth year to the program, designed for younger students, contributed to the growth. The average enrollment for the years 1918-1930 was 125, almost double that of the early years of the century. About half of the graduating classes of the mid-1920s entered the College.

After World War I the academy began drawing upon a constituency significantly different from its traditional one. The number of students from Adams county and the number of women students continued to decline. In the fall of 1929 there were only eight of the former and one of the latter (she happened to be the daughter of a College faculty member). Only slightly more than half of the students in that year were from Pennsylvania (79). Six other states were represented by 55 persons, while 13 young men came from Mexico, Cuba, Colombia, Brazil, Venezuela, and the Canal Zone.\footnote{176} Enrollment growth prompted the trustees to renovate Stevens Hall in 1920 and use it again as a dormitory for precollege students. Two years later, they leased a house at 339 Carlisle street for the same purpose. Used for the youngest students, it was called the junior dormitory. The charges for tuition, room, and board, set at from $260 to $300 in 1916, depending upon the room chosen, had risen to from $500 to $600 by 1929, and remained at that level until the school closed.

\footnote{175}{The literature which the academy published traced its beginnings to the classical school begun in 1827, thus making it older than the College itself, which in one sense it was, while in another, and more proper, sense, it certainly was not.}

\footnote{176}{There were some students from south of the border during each year of the twenties.}
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The academy opened in the fall of 1916 with a faculty of five, including the headmaster. During the 1929-1931 years there were ten instructors. Most of the masters were recent College graduates who served for one or two years and then went into the ministry, teaching, or medicine. There were several important exceptions. Doyle R. Leathers (1891-1979), of the class of 1913, was senior master from 1916 to 1928, as well as athletic director for both the academy and College. Earl E. Ziegler was master from 1922 until the academy closed in 1935; he was senior master after 1928. Charles R. Wolfe joined the academy faculty in 1923 and Leon C. Saunders in 1924; both served until it closed.

There were a number of ways in which, true to the catalogue promise, the academy provided its students with their own "distinctive school life and interests," apart from those of the College. For example, there were three literary societies (Red, White, and Blue), a Y.M.C.A., a ministerial association, a glee club, dances, an academy senate, and a yearbook (the Osoga, which appeared with several omissions between 1918 and 1935). The academy had a thoroughly developed athletic program, with football, basketball, baseball, and other sports. In the early 1920s the trustees made a major effort to improve the academy playing fields, which were located west of Huber and Stevens Halls. Games were played with a variety of other schools. In the mid-1920s the academy leased a cabin at Laurel Lake and in 1931 built its own structure, known as Osoga Lodge, on state forest land leased from the Department of Forests and Waters. Both of these facilities were used for weekend trips by the football team and other academy groups.\footnote{Other evidences of the distinctness of the academy include the separate financial statement which the trustees decreed, beginning with 1922-1923, and the fact that the academy section of the College catalogue appeared last in 1925. In the early days of College R.O.T.C., the academy was included in the unit. Early in the century, there was an academy social fraternity (Upsilon Gamma Sigma). When the students wished to install a similar organization in 1917, the College faculty vetoed the proposal as improper.}

The Gettysburg Academy had no more ardent defender and advocate than Charles H. Huber. He jealously guarded the privilege which the preparatory department and later the academy enjoyed of recommending graduates who would then automatically be admitted to the College. Whenever he believed that this privilege was in danger of not being honored, he protested. Huber responded vigorously and sharply when, in May 1922, the editor of the Gettysburgian, claiming to echo the sentiments of many faculty, students, and alumni, suggested that the academy be discontinued and Huber Hall be turned into a science building, which everyone admitted the
Four academy faculty members. Leathers left in 1928. When the academy closed seven years later, the other three were given College positions.
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College badly needed. After pointing out the impracticality of the suggestion, Huber observed, in the issue of May 31, that "for cool effrontery this is the limit."

With several years of record enrollment behind him, the headmaster argued in 1928 for construction of a third academy dormitory on campus and offered to do what he could to raise at least part of the money for it. In addressing the trustees at any time during the 1920s, he could point to a profitable operation in which the annual income was usually 10 percent over the expenditures. In addressing the public, he could observe that the Middle States Association had accredited the academy in 1927. No one could question his own commitment to the enterprise. He personally borrowed the money needed to complete Osoga Lodge, hoping to be repaid when contributions and other sources of money became available. Undoubtedly remembering what the College students had done for President Hanson, in the fall of 1929 the academy students commissioned the same artist to paint a portrait of their headmaster, which was then placed in the building which subsequently bore his name.

Academy enrollment reached its peak in the fall of 1927, and then dropped to 146 in each of the next two years and to 133 in 1930. The tumble then began: 100 in 1931, 88 in 1932, 70 in 1933, and 64 in 1934. The largest drop was in the four lower classes and the smallest in the senior, or subfreshman, class, which always had the most students. Red ink appeared in 1931-1932; thereafter the deficits were considerably greater than the surpluses of the 1920s had been.

After the depression hit the College, Huber was consistent in arguing that the basic mission of the academy was as important to the church and society as it had ever been. The depression was a storm to be weathered, in the manner of dealing with previous storms. "With the return of prosperity," he told the trustees in June 1933, "I have every reason to believe that schools, which have maintained their standard and have honest values to offer, will have a quick return to the prosperity which they have enjoyed so many years." In an effort to insure that the academy survived the storm, he cut salaries, reduced staff, and effected savings wherever else he could. As members of the College faculty were then doing, the masters visited prospective students to entice them to enroll in the fall. Convinced that the Gettysburg Academy was in a sounder condition than many other similar schools, Huber told the trustees in June 1934 that "we ... only wish a reasonable time to demonstrate that, with the easing of the depression, we shall again come back to our normal enrollment."

With the only campus dining facilities under his control, Huber could do his cause no harm by providing meals for the trustees whenever they met on campus.
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President Hanson and the other trustees were willing to give the academy some time in which to recover, but their patience had its limits. When the board met in December 1934, the president told it that "we are . . . confronted with a very serious question as to whether the property now being used for the Academy could not be better used by the college proper." At his suggestion, the board asked a small committee (the president of the College, the president of the board, and the chairman of the executive committee) to study the matter and make a prompt report. In summoning the trustees to a special meeting in Harrisburg on April 4, 1935, Hanson cautioned them that "it is of the utmost importance that the Members of the Board regard as confidential both the time and the nature of the meeting in order that there may be no pressure from any source." 179

The argument which the committee presented to the special board meeting was simple enough and countered that which the headmaster had been making for several years. For some time there had been operating in almost every community a public high school which could adequately prepare a young man for college. That being the case, the committee concluded, there was no longer a need for the traditional academies. The depression was merely forcing their proprietors to deal with a situation which had been developing over a period of many years. Some of these schools had a reputation which would undoubtedly enable them to "weather the storm," but many, especially those which were college-owned, would not.

After "a careful study" of the Gettysburg situation, the committee concluded that it "would be a very serious mistake" for the College to continue operating its academy. One possible and desirable use of its facilities which the committee considered was to turn Huber and Stevens Halls into dormitories for first-year men. However, there was at the moment "one insuperable difficulty" with this proposal. There were simply not enough available freshmen to fill these two halls without also requiring that many sophomores and upperclassmen live in existing College dormitories. Such a move, the board was told, would result in "completely crippling" the fraternities which depended upon regular rental income to maintain their houses. There was a second possible use for the academy campus. At a time when there were no women in the College student body (the last were graduated in 1933) and after a majority of the trustees had long and vigorously insisted that Gettysburg had been and should continue to be a men's college, the committee recommended that the academy become a facility for women college students. Putting the best possible face on the proposal, President Hanson argued

179 President Hanson to the members of the board of trustees, March 22, 1935, GCA.
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that it would
take care of the demand of the Church and our constituency—it would provide an asset instead of a liability in our annual budget; it would enable Gettysburg College to present to the United Lutheran Church the most attractive equipment to be found in any Lutheran College on the eastern seaboard.\textsuperscript{100}

When the time came to vote, the trustees decided to discontinue the academy at the close of the current year (in about two months), to convert its plant into a women's division of the College, and to resume admitting women students for the fall term. In his last commencement address to the academy graduates in June 1935, Huber blamed what had happened on the "relentless pressure of the past four years," and not on "an unsympathetic attitude" on the part of the trustees, six of whom he identified as academy alumni. In the fall of 1935 he took up his new duties as director of the women's division of the College. Most of the academy faculty found other positions, but the two whom Huber had called his "main props," Earl E. Ziegler and Charles R. Wolfe, joined the College faculty.\textsuperscript{101}

Curriculum

In spite of many changes which had taken place in the intervening thirty-seven years, a student in the sesquicentennial year of 1982 could recognize the way in which the Gettysburg curriculum of 1945 was organized. Most of the departments of the later year were already in existence at the time of World War II. The titles of some of the courses remained virtually the same, although the content of many was quite different. In both years there were distribution requirements to be met, major and minor fields of study to be selected (minors were optional in 1982), and schedules to be prepared in conjunction with advisers. The same could not be said in comparing the curriculum of 1982 with that of 1904. The course of study which

\textsuperscript{100}The report which President Hanson presented on behalf of the committee is in the GCA. No attempt has been made here to determine the accuracy of the arguments which the committee made, but one has to recognize that the academy was successful during the 1920s in drawing students away from high schools located much closer to their homes than it was. At the same time, it should be noted that the number of academy graduates entering Gettysburg College dropped significantly after 1927-1928. During the last three years the percentage was twenty or less. President Hanson explained the closing of the academy to the alumni in the May 1935 issue of the GCB.

\textsuperscript{101}The term "main props" appears in Huber's report to President Hanson, dated October 3, 1928, in GCA. The academy had so differentiated itself from the College that, years later, some alumni believed that it had sold its property to the College in 1935. The Franklin and Marshall academy survived until 1943. For the demise of Dickinson's academy, Conway Hall, in 1917, see Sellers, Dickinson College, p. 329.
most Gettysburg students of the twentieth century experienced was a product of that century, and it came into existence in response to developments which were nationwide in scope and which affected secondary, college, and university education.

In an earlier day, when secondary education was almost entirely in private hands, when virtually every college in the country was local or possibly regional in character, and when most had their own preparatory departments, each college established its own standards for admission, which determined to a large extent the level of instruction which it offered and the standards which it set for awarding degrees. Members of its faculty examined individually each candidate for admission, asking questions in fields of their own choosing and exercising wide latitude in determining the adequacy of the answers. Whether he happened to be from an academy in the neighborhood or the college's own preparatory department, its teachers knew from experience how to rate the candidate before them. There was no agency to encourage, let alone enforce, a reasonable degree of uniformity. In an effort to attract and retain students, many colleges offered courses which more resembled those of preparatory schools than of the better collegiate institutions in the country. There was general agreement that these schools were, in fact, colleges in name only.

Toward the close of the nineteenth century, as already indicated, the rapid growth of the public high school and the development of the university forced institutions calling themselves colleges to determine how they were going to fit themselves into the emerging scheme of things. Many high schools soon began offering for their college-bound students an academic program which compared favorably with those of the better or best preparatory schools and academies. At the same time, the universities established admission requirements which could be met only by students whose undergraduate programs were sound and demanding. In most cases, the pressure which colleges felt first came from the high schools, many of which now had the difficult task of preparing students for consideration by several colleges, each with its own set of entrance requirements and its own way of administering them. Leaders in both levels of institutions saw the need to establish closer relations with each other, so that at least a minimum of uniformity could be introduced into the procedures of college admissions. This was the major reason why, beginning in 1885, colleges and secondary schools in New England, the Middle Atlantic states, and other parts of the country joined in founding the organizations which eventually became the regional accrediting agencies. It explains why the National Education Association and the Middle States Association joined in 1900 to establish the College Entrance Examination Board.
The need for some uniformity also became one of the major concerns of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, almost immediately upon its creation in the spring of 1905.

One year later, the foundation undertook to define, in terms which could be widely understood and easily applied, what it considered to be reasonable and proper secondary-school preparation for admission to a bona-fide undergraduate institution. Accepting that the four-year curriculum of the better high schools required participation each year in four courses meeting five times a week, the foundation described successful work in each such course as completion of one unit of preparation for possible further study. Thus, most high school students accumulated sixteen units of credit in earning their diplomas. The foundation announced that it would recognize as a college (and, consequently, make eligible for its main program: providing retirement benefits) only those institutions which would require for admission fourteen Carnegie units, as they came to be known. Obviously, it had no objection to those prestigious institutions which were already requiring the equivalent of fifteen or even sixteen units, nor could it criticize those schools, also including some of the most prestigious, which continued to require their own examinations of all candidates for admission.\(^{162}\)

While this step by the Carnegie Foundation did bring a greater degree of order and uniformity into the necessary relations between secondary schools and colleges, it also imposed upon the latter the pressing task of determining whether their own curricula were of truly college level, not repeating work that their students had already completed, and sufficient to prepare those students who wished later to engage in graduate study. Writing in 1907, the president of the foundation was convinced that the main factor in determining "the final efficiency or the dynamic force of a college" was the "quality of requirements for admission." He reported that, after a study of the catalogues of some 950 institutions of higher education, the officers of the foundation had been "astonished at the lack of any approach to uniformity" in such requirements. Some colleges which granted degrees appeared to have no entrance requirements, while others demanded no more than the equivalent of one, three, seven, or eight Carnegie units. In the opinion of the foundation, the worst offenders were those colleges announcing requirements which they did not then enforce. The "real institutions of higher

---

\(^{162}\)The first annual report of the foundation, containing its definition of a unit and of a college, was published in October 1906. The foundation made clear that it had borrowed the concept of the unit from several existing agencies.
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education" were declared to be those which "set forth high standards of entrance requirements, and enforce these standards with care and judgment."183

As early as 1884, after some eight years of study and consultation with the board, the Gettysburg faculty adopted the policy of accepting some students on the strength of certification by those secondary schools whose curricula they approved. By 1904 this privilege had been extended to a number of such schools, beginning with the Gettysburg preparatory department. Most students, however, still appeared in person and gained admission by passing an entrance examination. On three occasions between 1884 and 1898 the faculty raised the requirements in Latin, Greek, mathematics, and English. In so doing, they were following the recommendations of the Middle States Association.

However far Gettysburg might have gone in responding to the changing times, President Hefelbower was convinced it had not gone nearly far enough. In his estimation, the work required in the College's own preparatory department, whose graduates were admitted without examination, amounted to no more than eight Carnegie units. "In this respect," he declared, "we are behind every other first-class college in the state."184 In June 1906, less than two years after assuming office and a few months before the first annual report of the Carnegie Foundation, he persuaded the board of trustees to instruct one of its own committees and the faculty to "plan for the raising of our conditions of entrance at the earliest possible date." Both parties were slow to act. In reporting to the board a year later, the president noted that Gettysburg's requirements still fell short of those being recommended by the Middle States Association and were at least two-thirds of a year short of those recently laid down by the Carnegie Foundation. Fully aware of the interrelatedness of the several parts of the situation facing the College, he declared that "we must raise the conditions of entrance. We must enlarge the Faculty. We must improve the curriculum."

In June 1907 the board took its next step by directing a committee of three of its members, three faculty already chosen by their colleagues, and two "prominent educators" from among the alumni to draft a set of entrance requirements "equal to that of the best Colleges in the State" and to undertake such curricular revision "as is necessary in their judgment, to make this a first-class College." The board members of the committee included Hefelbower; Dr.

---

183 The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Second Annual Report of the President and Treasurer [New York, 1907], pp. 66-75.
184 These views were expressed in his June 1909 board report, but there is every reason to believe that he had held them for some years.
Charles Baum, a Philadelphia physician; and Luther P. Eisenhart, 
then a Princeton mathematics professor. The faculty members were 
the veteran triumvirate of Bikle, Breidenbaugh, and Himes. The two 
prominent educators were Edgar Fahs Smith of the class of 1874, 
then a University of Pennsylvania chemistry professor, and John 
Marshall, a nongraduate of the class of 1879 and professor in the 
University of Pennsylvania medical department.

There were those who hoped for prompt results from this bold 
initiative, indeed that some would be evident in a matter of months, 
but this did not happen. The committee met within a few weeks of 
its appointment, deliberated, prepared a report for the next board 
meeting, and expressed its hope for immediate action so that the 
changes proposed could take effect in the fall of 1909. According to 
the rules then in force, the next board meeting would not be held 
until June 1908, at which time the trustees decided to send every 
member of the board a printed copy of the committee report 
(together with the plea of the preparatory department principal that 
no changes be made) and delay action for another year. President 
Hefelbower must have been more than a little disappointed. "The 
responsibility of the hour is tremendous," he had just told the trus-
tees in his annual report. "On our meeting . . . depends the future of 
Pennsylvania College. There is a tide in the affairs of colleges, as 
well as in the affairs of men, that, taken at the flood leads on to for-
tune." As far as entrance requirements were concerned, he wrote, 
Gettysburg ranks lower than "forty years ago, before this great 
upward movement began in the educational world of America." 
However, having added six persons to the faculty within the pre-
vious three years, he believed that "we are now ready to raise our 
entrance requirements, and are ready for almost all of the advanced 
courses of instruction that are planned."

At last, in June 1909, the board adopted the committee report, 
including a proposed set of entrance requirements in Latin, Greek, 
mathematics, English, and history which Hefelbower believed was 
almost equal to fourteen Carnegie units. It also adopted the pro-
posed guidelines for curricular revision, which left the details to be 
worked out by the faculty. The effective date for both changes was 
the fall of 1911.

During the five years between Hefelbower's first recommendation 
to the trustees and the time when the board action finally took 
effect, there was ample opportunity for questioning its wisdom, 
especially the effect which it might have on College enrollment and 
finances. For example, in June 1906 Principal Huber argued against 
change "in view of the financial condition of the College." The 
minutes of the June 1909 board meeting record that Professor Himes 
objected to the increase in the Latin and Greek entrance
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requirements "on the grounds that the change is likely to occasion financial embarrassment and is too sudden." The year following the board action coincided with the unpleasantness that led to the president's resignation, which prompted the suggestion that the trustees should permit their hard-won decision to be reviewed by his successor. That is precisely what happened but, at the board meeting which coincided with his inauguration in October 1910, President Granville presented and recommended adoption of the final version of the entrance requirements and course of study which the majority of the faculty had approved. The board quickly concurred, thus removing the last roadblock to the changes' taking effect on schedule. The faculty minutes make it abundantly clear that never before in the history of the College had that body spent so much time and effort in deliberating upon the College curriculum. Dean Bikle and Professor Himes came as close as anyone to opposing the final version; both were recorded as not voting on the proposal.

"The raising of the entrance requirements is not going to have as much effect as was feared in reducing the number entering," Granville told the board in June 1911, since in his opinion the revised curriculum would actually attract students to Gettysburg. A year later, he reported that the new policy was already justifying itself, since the freshman class which entered in the fall of 1911 was 25 percent larger than its predecessor, and since the year just closing had been one of record enrollment. "All this goes to prove," he wrote, "that high scholarship standards attract the best class of students." Enrollment records continued to be broken until the war year of 1917-1918. Without a doubt, the best interests of the College were served at this time by all of those who followed the forward-looking leadership of two presidents and who rejected the timid counsels of several of its veteran faculty and others, which if heeded would have severely damaged the College's reputation and soon reduced its enrollment.186

The special committee on entrance requirements and curriculum had proposed in 1907 that the two existing classical and scientific courses of study be retained, each with a heavy set of requirements, and that what it called majors be established in twelve subjects.187 When the faculty began seriously considering the details of a revised

---

185 In his June 1910 board report, Hefelbower attributed the decision not to take action two years before to "the business depression then prevailing" and the belief that raising "entrance requirements would result in decreased attendance, and consequently a smaller income."

186 Contrary to what one might have expected, several synods strongly supported the efforts to raise standards, including imposing higher admission requirements.

187 Greek, Latin, English, French, German, philosophy, history, politics, mathematics, biology, chemistry, and physics.
curriculum, some of its members proposed abandoning the classical and scientific options in favor of a group system, similar to that then in use in some other colleges. This is what the faculty decided upon and what the board approved in October 1910.

"The courses of study in the college are arranged in groups," declared the 1911 catalogue, which listed seven: Greek and Latin; Latin and Modern Languages; Latin and Chemistry or Physics; Modern Languages and Chemistry or Physics; Biology, Chemistry, and Physics; Mathematics and Modern Languages; and Commerce and Finance. In each case, the required and elective courses for the four years were listed in detail. Work in all but the first two groups led to the degree of bachelor of science. After declaring that all seven groups were "of equal value in the mental training of the student," the catalogue averred that the purpose of the new curriculum was to permit students not wishing to pursue "the older college courses of study" to choose subjects "of special value in preparation for subsequent professional study or business," while avoiding "the more diffused and often aimless selection of studies in a too largely elective system." In claiming that the new arrangement would promote "a general training and broad culture" while at the same time permitting the student "to concentrate a fair portion of his time and energy on one or two related subjects," the faculty acknowledged that it had tried to encompass what it thought was best in the old and the new.

During the eleven years this system was in effect, the faculty made a number of changes in it, dropping three groups and adding six others. The ten groups in 1921-1922 were Greek and Latin; Latin and Modern Languages; History and Political Science; Chemistry and Physics; Biology, Chemistry, and Physics; Commerce and Finance; Civil Engineering; Sanitary Engineering; Mechanical Engineering; and Electrical Engineering. From time to time the faculty altered requirements for individual students or for particular groups, in the latter case sometimes after seeking approval by the trustees. In 1916 the faculty introduced the semester hour as a measurement of course value.

Under the group system some 56 percent of about 600 graduates earned bachelor of arts degrees. Most of these students completed the requirements of Group 1 (Latin and Greek); many of them then

---

188 Among the requirements were English Bible of all freshmen, Evidences of Christianity of all juniors, writing and speaking of all four classes, and two specified foreign languages for two or three years. Greek was required specifically only in Group 1, which in College publicity was sometimes called the Classical course.

189 It replaced the unit, sixty-four of which had been required for graduation.
entered the seminary. Of the 44 percent who earned bachelor of science degrees, most chose one of the four groups which stressed training in the sciences. About 8 percent were engineers. Between 1911 and 1922 there were several definite trends in student choices. Fewer and fewer were electing Group 1. More were electing Group 4 (Chemistry and Physics) and, especially after World War I, Group 6 (Commerce and Finance).

In the spring of 1920 the faculty began considering major revisions of the curriculum which would provide more opportunities for students to concentrate than were possible under the existing group system. In December the trustees responded to their request for permission to proceed by asking for details of the proposed new plan, as well as of additions to the faculty and "material equipment" which it would require. A committee of eight professors and President Granville spent much of the year 1921 preparing a detailed report which the faculty adopted in time to be able to present it to the trustees at their December meeting. Possibly in part because they were assured that, as presented, it would require no additions to staff or equipment, the trustees promptly adopted the report. The new curriculum went into effect in the fall of 1922.

With a number of important modifications, the curricular arrangement adopted in 1921 was still in effect more than sixty years later. A total of 136 semester hours of satisfactorily completed work was required for graduation, except for some honor students, who needed only 132 hours. The College now offered seven undergraduate degrees: bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of science in business administration, and bachelor of science in four phases of engineering: civil, electrical, industrial, and mechanical. For the arts degree, which the catalogue described as given to those who chose the Classical course, the candidate needed to complete "prescribed work" or distribution requirements amounting to about one-half of the 136 hours and including two years of Latin as well as a second foreign language. The candidate for one of the six science degrees also had to take work in two such languages, but neither had to be Latin. The distribution requirements for the arts degree were outlined as follows in the 1922 catalogue:

---

190 Synod committees and others were highly pleased that Gettysburg continued to offer the traditional Classical course and attract so many students, while at the same time making newer courses available for those who wanted them. Without offering any convincing proof, the Gettysburgian for March 1, 1916 claimed that Gettysburg had "the largest percentage of students of any college in the United States taking the classical courses."

191 Each issue of the catalogue listed the graduates of the previous year and the names and group choices of current students.
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English, 10 semester hours
Foreign Language, including Latin, 24 semester hours
History, 4 semester hours
English Bible, 2 semester hours
Philosophy, 6 semester hours
Economics or Political Science, 6 semester hours
Mathematics, 6 semester hours
Biology, Chemistry, or Physics, 6-8 semester hours

Both 1922 and 1942 catalogues observed that most of a student's electives were taken in the junior and senior years. No later than the spring of the sophomore year, each student was required to choose from the following list a major field of study: biology, chemistry, economics, education, English, French, German, Greek, history, Latin, mathematics, philosophy, physics, and political science. He also chose a minor field. A major consisted of at least eighteen and a minor of at least twelve hours of what was termed advanced work. There was a limit of thirty-six hours of courses at all levels which a student could take in the major field.

Although one can readily see the similarity in the catalogue statements on the curriculum in 1922 and 1942, it is evident from other sources that the faculty made many changes in the system during those twenty years. The existence of a new College agency helps to explain why. In February 1922, some months before the new system went into effect, the faculty established a standing curriculum committee which, while it had no defined duties, at least none in writing, assumed the responsibility for making periodic reviews of the curriculum, learning about the current and proposed practices of other institutions, and making recommendations to the faculty. At no time since 1832 had either a committee or a dean performed these tasks on a continuing basis. To the extent that they had been carried out at all, the entire faculty had acted from time to time. The curriculum committee met regularly and made many reports and

---

192 For a discussion of the requirement in military science and physical education, see pp. 555-556. The U.L.C.A. survey team found that the median amount of work taken in Bible and religion courses by Gettysburg students (1.6 semester hours) was far less than that for all Lutheran colleges (7.6). U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:287.

193 In 1887 the College began admitting as special students persons who were not candidates for a degree. For about a decade after 1915 the number of special and partial course students, most of whom were premedical candidates, usually exceeded thirty. Thereafter it declined.
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recommendations to the parent body.¹⁹⁴ Some of its proposals were minor in character, such as recommending changing the number of semester hours assigned to certain distribution requirements, the number of hours required for a major field of study, or the maximum number of semester hours of work a student could take in a term. In 1926 and 1930 the proposals were more substantive; in the latter year the board of trustees was asked to register its approval before the proposed changes went into effect.¹⁹⁵ Beginning with the class entering in the fall of 1926, the graduation requirement was reduced from 136 to the more standard 120 semester hours, the number which appeared in the 1942 catalogue.¹⁹⁶

By the end of the 1920s fewer and fewer students were qualifying for the bachelor of arts degree. Each year more and more were electing to complete their course without taking the two years of Latin which it required. In June 1930 more than 70 percent of the graduates were awarded the B.S. degree.¹⁹⁷ Faculty members and others were dismayed at the prospect for the future. "The Bachelor of Science degree was in no sense a substitute to supplant the arts degree," President Hanson told the board in December 1930, "but rather a degree to supplement the arts degree." After hearing reports that Penn, Princeton, and Yale were dropping Latin as a requirement for the latter degree, the faculty in December 1930 voted to do likewise, and to limit the B.S. degree to programs in business administration and engineering. After committees from the faculty

¹⁹⁴The membership of the committee increased from three in 1922 to nine in 1945. There was little turnover. John B. Zinn was chairman from 1926 to 1939 and Thomas L. Cline from 1939 to 1947. Reminiscing years later, Zinn stated that during these years he and Cline were the two leading figures in the faculty, championing different ideas about the curriculum and teaching, but without ever losing respect for each other. He praised President Hanson for minimally involving himself in faculty debates and decisions on curricular matters. Interview with John B. Zinn, July 1972, GCA. The curriculum committee gained the power to determine what courses should be added to or removed from the list of offerings.

¹⁹⁵The report which the board approved in December 1921 recognized the right of the faculty to add new majors "whenever they are warranted by the facilities at the disposal of the college" and to make such other changes as would "not affect the fundamental principles involved." The faculty chose to interpret this warrant conservatively, if indeed they even remembered that it existed.

¹⁹⁶Sometimes this requirement was expressed as 128 hours, in which case it included eight hours credit for the required courses in military science or physical education. In 1929 the faculty adopted the quality point system and employed it to compute grade point averages, which were used in determining whether a student should be allowed to continue in College and whether he could be graduated. In 1940 it refined these averages by assigning numerical values to pluses and minuses for the top three grades.

¹⁹⁷Those who conducted the U.L.C.A. survey found that Gettysburg was the only Lutheran college conferring "a considerable number" of B.S. degrees. U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:154.
and board met together to discuss the proposal, the trustees in June 1931 gave their approval, reminding the faculty of its responsibility "for bringing all the courses to Bachelor of Arts Standard." Beginning with the class entering in the fall of 1931, the College offered the arts degree to all candidates except those in engineering.\footnote{Following board approval, the 1933 catalogue announced that instead of four engineering degrees, there would now be one: bachelor of science in engineering. The proposal to continue the science degree in business administration was dropped.}

In 1942, as in 1922, the distribution requirements consumed about half of a student's College work. Gone were the compulsory Latin and mathematics. In their places the students now had to take two languages and two sciences, although one could substitute what was called "pure mathematics" for either one language or one science.\footnote{One of the professors who crafted this particular distribution requirement in 1936 told this writer years later that it resulted from the logrolling without which certain desired changes could not have been accomplished. From 1927 through 1931 mathematics was listed as an option in the category which included biology, chemistry, and physics. From 1932 to 1936 it was listed as an option in the category which included the languages.}

In 1925 a yearlong freshman orientation course was added to the distribution requirements. Six years later the faculty approved a problems-of-life course for seniors, but it was never offered and was finally dropped in 1939.\footnote{Professor Sanders was largely responsible for the introduction of both of these courses and until his impending retirement in 1940 also for teaching the orientation course, which dealt with such topics as how to study, self-development, scientific-mindedness, the heritage of social institutions, and public opinion. When Donald R. Heiges took over the course in the fall of 1940 he changed it considerably.}

Seniors who were graduated between 1935 and 1942 were also required to take comprehensive examinations. During that time questions about these examinations and how they could be administered fairly demanded considerable attention in faculty meetings. One sore point was how to deal with students who failed part or all of an examination a few short weeks before they expected to be graduated. Plans to institute sophomore comprehensives never came to fruition. The senior examinations became a casualty of war.

The 1942 distribution requirements were as follows:

- Orientation, 4 semester hours
- English Composition, 6 semester hours
- English Bible, 4 semester hours
- Foreign Language, 12 semester hours in two
- Philosophy, Political Science, Economics, and History, 12 semester hours in 2
- Literature, 12 semester hours in two, at least half in a foreign language
- Biology, Chemistry, and Physics, 16 semester hours in two
- Pure Mathematics, 6 semester hours may be substituted for one language or one science.
By 1942 several changes had occurred in the system of majors and minors introduced twenty years earlier. Spanish first appeared as a major field in the 1928 catalogue; education was last listed in 1939; and the faculty approved Bible as a major field in 1941. In 1932, following faculty and board approval, the catalogue began listing the major and minor fields in three groups (roughly language and literature, the social sciences, and the physical sciences), requiring that each student choose what was called a related minor from the group in which the major was placed and another, so-called unrelated, minor in one of the other two groups. The faculty had difficulty deciding how much work should be required in a major and minor field of study, whether beginning courses should be included in the count, and whether a limit should continue to be placed on the amount of work a student was permitted to take in the major field. By 1942 it had taken the following positions: a major field required at least twenty-four hours of work; a minor required at least twelve hours (in languages, in addition to elementary courses); and there was no stated limit on the number of courses a student could take in the major field.201

Between 1922 and 1945 the most widely chosen major fields (in descending order) were economics and business administration, chemistry, English, history, and biology. In the 1930s these five accounted for about two-thirds of the student choices.

When Samuel G. Hefelbower became president in the fall of 1904 there were eighty-two courses in the Gettysburg curriculum, forty-seven of which were required for a bachelor of arts degree. Close to two-thirds of the courses offered were in Greek, Latin, mathematics and astronomy, philosophy, and English. These were the backbone of the curriculum of 1868 and, with the exception of English, of that of 1832. In 1904 there was one course in physics, one in French, and two each in economics, history, and political science. Aware of the

201In October 1933 the faculty appointed Professors Sanders, Kramer, Cline, Zinn, and Saby to “formulate the objectives and purposes of Gettysburg College.” If their colleagues were expecting from this group profound statements or proposals for some bold new ventures, they must have been dumfounded by the report which was submitted four months later: “The committee appointed to formulate Gettysburg College’s philosophy of education has had several meetings in which the proposition submitted to it has been discussed from every angle the committee could think of, and the committee has not found any way to express this better or more accurately for the present than is done by the curriculum together with the regulations provided for conducting it.” Having received this report, the faculty discharged the committee, after which perhaps everyone breathed a sigh of relief.
shortcomings which existed in the curriculum, and which annually were reflecting more unfavorably upon the College, the new president moved as quickly as a nearly empty till would permit to secure additional faculty who could offer new courses. By June 1908 he could inform the trustees that, thanks to the addition of six men, the College had "gone far toward closing the great gaps" of the recent past. The College now offered four years of French and German, advanced work in physics, and courses in philosophy taught by a professor who had some German university training in that field, although he had not completed all the requirements for a doctorate. Although the English Bible professor had "thorough German training in history," he was unable to devote very much of his time to that "all-important" subject which, with economics, required additional staff as quickly as possible. "The faculty is still too small," Hefelbower wrote. "Certain new departments are greatly needed, and others are overworked." Unfortunately, during the two remaining years of his administration the president was unable to continue the progress already made, but when he left office in 1910 the number of courses in the curriculum was 50 percent greater than when he had entered it six years earlier.

During the thirteen years of the Granville administration curricular growth continued. The number of courses increased by about two-thirds, reaching 209 in 1923. In some departments there was little or no change, reflecting either the continuation of personnel or the existence of curricula in well-established fields where the need for innovation appeared to be minimal. Five professors Granville inherited from Hefelbower (in chemistry, Latin, German, philosophy, and physics) he bequeathed to his successor in 1923. With the arrival of new faculty, course offerings in Bible, mathematics, and Romance languages increased. There are six curricular programs of the Granville administration which merit special mention: engineering, commerce and finance, military science, education, the summer session, and a new kind of graduate work.

The first new program was in engineering, and the person responsible for it was the president himself. Given the amount of attention which Granville devoted to the subject of engineering education in his inaugural address and the speed with which the trustees responded to his assertion that the question of an engineering program "is before Pennsylvania College now, and it requires a definite answer in the near future," one must assume that in his discussions with the search committee it was agreed that, if he accepted the presidency, the trustees would support such a program. There was some opposition to the proposal, but it was smothered during the honeymoon
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which the new president enjoyed. There is no evidence from their minutes that the faculty ever specifically discussed whether or not to add engineering to the course of study, but in adopting revised entrance requirements and a new curriculum in October 1910 one of the seven groups which they sanctioned was described as "preparatory to engineering." The trustees approved the report two months later.

The new program was first described in the 1911 catalogue, which announced four-, five-, and six-year courses in civil and municipal (later called sanitary and still later industrial) engineering. Mechanical and electrical curricula followed two years later. After 1911 all references are to four-year programs. In 1932 the trustees approved dropping the industrial course, which had always attracted the smallest number of students. From the beginning, the faculty emphasized that the several programs were intended to stress both mastery of scientific principles and experience gained from actual practice. In later years, they acknowledged that no one branch of the subject could be mastered in four years. That being the case, they proposed to give "a good training" in the fundamentals. After 1922 engineering students had to fulfill virtually all of the distribution requirements imposed upon the arts students. After meeting these and their departmental requirements, they had little time left for electives.

Space in the basement and on the third floor of Glatfelter Hall was reserved for the use of the engineering faculty and students. Granville's hopes for a separate building to be used as a machine shop perished when the fund-raising campaign begun in 1913 produced only about half of its goal. Successive issues of the catalogue assured prospective students that the engineering equipment was "modern and adequate and is being augmented as necessity demands." Annual treasurer's reports suggest that the demands of necessity were relatively light; in only one year (1915-1916) did expenditures charged to engineering exceed $1,000. One of the major strengths of the several programs was the quality and performance of their faculty, most of whom (apart from the assistants) were experienced engineers and several of whom contributed much to the life of the College in ways quite removed from their specialty.

See the Gettysburgian for December 10, 1913. An editorial on January 25, 1905 recommended against an engineering program as too costly and out of keeping with Gettysburg's character as a "literary institution."

An editorial in ibid, for November 14, 1923, noting that the question of whether to continue the engineering program at Gettysburg "consistently reasserts itself," gave as reasons for keeping it "close personal contact with the teaching staff" and "the moral atmosphere" of a campus such as Gettysburg.
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In 1932 seven engineering bodies formed the Engineers' Council for Professional Development and assigned to it the task of visiting those schools which invited them to examine their engineering programs and of placing on its approved list those which were deemed worthy of accreditation. Four years later, in December 1936, President Hanson told the trustees that "the time has now come when we must apply for recognition" of the only unaccredited Gettysburg program. In that same month he asked the Engineers' Council to send a team to the College. The visit took place in April 1937.

No one should have been surprised by the tone of the visiting team's report. Even before it was formally submitted, President Hanson told the trustees in June 1937 that he believed its conclusions would "bring us face to face with most serious questions concerning our entire work in the field of engineering." The board responded by naming a committee to join with the president in studying the report and making a recommendation at the next meeting. The conclusion of the visiting team was that none of the three engineering programs could be accredited, largely because the equipment to support them was plainly inadequate. Consequently, the trustee committee recommended that no new students be admitted to the engineering programs and that when all of the students already enrolled had completed their work the programs be discontinued. The resolution which they presented stated that "we have arrived at the stage where modern demands make it impossible to maintain an Engineering Department of the same level as that of the other departments of our institution." Furthermore, the constant aim of the College has been "not to attempt a task for which we are not properly equipped and prepared." After what the minutes describe as full discussion, the trustees voted, in December 1937, to discontinue the three remaining programs. The College graduated the last five engineering students in June 1940.

Between 1914 and 1940 there were about 215 students who received engineering degrees, most of them in civil and electrical engineering. The peak enrollment of between twenty-five and fifty

---

204 President Hanson admitted as much when he told the board in December 1937 that all the College ever sought to accomplish in this field was "to give the student an idea of the fundamentals" in the various engineering fields. "Any such laboratory equipment we possessed was of the simplest nature."

205 Ibid. for December 9, 1937 explained the decision in this fashion: "since Gettysburg is preeminently a liberal arts school and since the number of engineering students does not justify the purchase of necessary and very expensive equipment, it is better that all instruction in the field of engineering be discontinued."
students occurred in the 1920s and early 1930s. Attrition was high; only about one-third of those who entered the programs as freshmen remained and were graduated four years later.208

The second new program of the Granville administration developed from one of the seven groups of studies which became effective in the fall of 1911. Called Commerce and Finance, according to the catalogue it was designed "to meet the needs of those who do not wish to pursue general scientific or literary studies but desire to prepare themselves for commercial or financial pursuits." At first, most preparation for these pursuits had to take the form of general studies. There were only five courses (History of Commerce, Commercial Law, Statistics, Finance, and Investments) listed under the heading of Commerce and Finance until 1915, when the newly arrived M. Stewart Macdonald, whose title was Professor of Economics and Political Science, changed the heading to Economics and added several courses, including Principles of Economics, Money and Banking, Public Finance, Economic History of the United States, Accounting, and Transportation.207 Nevertheless, until the class of 1920 fewer than 10 percent of the graduating class in any one year were attracted to this group.

When the major-and-minor system was introduced in 1922, the faculty designated economics as a major field of study, leading to the arts degree, and adopted a program leading to the degree of bachelor of science in business administration. The catalogue described the latter as intended for students interested in business, law, or public service, and "generally to form the basis, and provide the outlook, for a life of activity and leadership in community affairs." By this time there were more new courses in the curriculum, including Corporation Finance and Business Management. After a decade of considerable turnover in the department — four heads in ten years — stability came with the appointment of Rasmus S. Saby as professor in 1924 and George R. Larkin as associate professor in 1928. Both remained in the department until their deaths in the 1950s. The bachelor of science program in business administration was dropped beginning in 1931; the economics major continued beyond 1945. Between 1922 and 1945 there were

208For a fuller treatment see William C. Darrah, Engineering at Gettysburg College (Gettysburg, 1974). The list of engineering graduates in the appendix is substantially, but not entirely, accurate. A brief story in the GCB for March 1936 gave the occupations of 170 of the 191 graduates up to that time.

207It was Professor Sanders who actually inaugurated this group in the fall of 1913.
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more majors in economics and business than in any other field of study; they accounted for about 17 percent of the total number of graduates.208

The third new program resulted from a highly controversial piece of federal legislation and the Gettysburg students' response to it. In his annual message to Congress in December 1915, President Woodrow Wilson called for legislation which would make possible what he termed reasonable national preparedness in a world in which war was spreading. Insisting that the United States should continue to avoid direct involvement in the struggle, he nevertheless argued that it should be prepared to defend its interests and its honor. Six months later, on June 3, 1916, Wilson signed what has come to be known as the National Defense Act of 1916, the provisions of which represented a compromise between the opposing preparedness and anti-preparedness forces. The measure increased the size of the Regular Army and the National Guard, brought the latter under greater federal control, and authorized programs to increase the number of trained and available army officers. One of these programs created the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (R.O.T.C.), detachments of which could be established on college and university campuses.209

Even before Congress had passed the preparedness legislation, an editorial in the Gettysburgian for April 12, 1916 urged the College to secure a military training program as an alternative to its physical training requirement, which at the time existed in scarcely more than name only. Returning to the same theme six weeks later, on May 24, the editor argued that "mental and physical development must go hand in hand and each must be given its due attention." Military training will strengthen national virility, which will benefit students and at the same time "keep our nation from war." The ink was scarcely dry on the act before the vast majority of the students signed a petition to the board of trustees asking for the opportunity of military training at Gettysburg College. The faculty having given its approval, the board in June 1916 authorized the president and the finance committee to act on the petition. "Immediately on being given the authority," the president reported a year later, "I applied to the War Department for the establishment here of an infantry unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. As a result Pennsylvania College was one of the first four institutions in the United States

208After the curricular revision of 1931, the catalogue described the economics and business courses as "of a liberal, as distinguished from a vocational or professional, type," which "aim to give a broad, general training in the field of business and economics."

209The federal government had assigned military officers to campuses for many years before 1916. See pp. 294-295 for an account of Gettysburg's unsuccessful attempts to get one before 1904.
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granted this privilege by the Adjutant General, and the very first one in the State of Pennsylvania." The first professor of military science and tactics, Major Frank W. Graham, arrived in Gettysburg early in January 1917 and immediately went to work. According to Granville, when the course was organized 318 college, academy, and seminary students enrolled. Weapons arrived in May and uniforms in January 1918. The faculty began granting credit for the course in September 1917.

Except for the fall 1918 term, when most students on the campus were enrolled in the Students' Army Training Corps, R.O.T.C. continued to operate during the time the United States was actively involved in the European conflict. Once "the war to end all wars" was over, the question facing about 250 colleges and universities with R.O.T.C. units was whether, having been established as part of reasonable preparedness for a conflict that had now been resolved, they had outlived their usefulness and should be abandoned.210 In November 1920 the Gettysburg faculty gave its response to this question by asking the board of trustees (the vote was eleven to eight) to end the program at the close of the 1920-1921 year. The response of the board, registered at its December meeting, took the following form and decided the question, at least as far as Gettysburg was concerned:

Whereas we believe that it is the duty of our institution to do its full share in the preparing of young men for military as well as civil leadership, men who shall be able to render the most efficient service to our country in any future national emergency, and whereas, we believe that the maintenance of an optional course in military training in Pennsylvania College is in a very special sense her patriotic duty situated as she is on the great Battlefield of Gettysburg and because of the glorious records her sons have made in the armed conflicts in which our country has been engaged. Be it therefore resolved, that the R.O.T.C. be continued and that we heartily commend this course to the students of our college asking them as well as the members of our college faculty to give it their full and wholehearted support.

The 1919 catalogue was the first to announce that students taking military science were excused from the required work in physical training. When the major-and-minor system was introduced in 1922, one of the graduation requirements for all male students, except those the medical director might excuse, was either military science

210The National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, widely regarded as one of the key pieces of military legislation in American history, was an attempt to provide for the long-term security of the United States in light of experience gained in World War I and of the country's changed position in the world power structure. It assigned a much larger role to the R.O.T.C. than did the act of 1916.
or physical training during the freshman and sophomore years.\textsuperscript{211} During the 1920s and 1930s R.O.T.C. enrollment ranged between 125 and something over 200 students; it included between one-third and one-half of the males in the two lower classes. In its catalogue the College argued that participation in R.O.T.C. was a service both to the nation, which has "in its wise policy selected this means of preparing and securing its officers for a future emergency," as well as to the students, for whom "the mental as well as the physical benefits . . . are obvious." It called attention to the financial benefits accruing to those who were admitted to the advanced course, successful completion of which made one eligible for a reserve officer's commission in one of several branches of the United States Army.\textsuperscript{212} During the 1930s, a decade of strong antiwar sentiment on many college campuses, there appears to be no evidence of a desire or movement to eliminate the R.O.T.C. from the curriculum. There is ample evidence of the continuing strong support which President Hanson gave it. As World War II approached, interest in the program increased. Some 300 of the 483 male students in the fall of 1941, including 80 percent of the freshmen and sophomores, were registered for R.O.T.C. The wartime catalogues contained the statement that 2,000 or more students had been enrolled in the basic course since 1917 and that more than 400 of these had completed the advanced course and received commissions.\textsuperscript{213}

The fourth new program of the Granville administration was the College's response to state legislation intended to improve the training of future teachers in its elementary and secondary schools. Gettysburg's interest in public education was nothing new. As is evident from preceding chapters, both its charter in 1832 and the act of 1834 appropriating money to build Pennsylvania Hall had committed Gettysburg College to a role in training public school teachers, and from time to time both faculty and trustees tried to determine precisely what that role should be. The overriding reason why they had never developed and maintained a teacher education program was that there was little demand for one. Until after 1900 a high school diploma, much less a college degree, was simply not required for teaching in the common or elementary schools of Pennsylvania. As late as the fall of 1905, only 6 of the 199 public school teachers in Adams county were college graduates and only 49

\textsuperscript{211}There was compulsory R.O.T.C. for academy students through the spring of 1920.

\textsuperscript{212}Between 1921 and 1931 the financial benefits available to R.O.T.C. students were the first listed under the catalogue heading of scholarships and aid.

\textsuperscript{213}The R.O.T.C. offices and rifle range were in Stevens Hall until 1921, in Linnaean Hall until 1927, and thereafter in Plank Gymnasium. The low point in enrollment occurred in the mid-1920s, while there was no College requirement in military science or physical education, rather than during the 1930s.
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were normal school graduates. For many years most teachers in the state qualified by passing an examination which the county superintendent administered, by attending a normal school (the first of which was opened in 1859), or in some cases simply by satisfying a school board that one could impart some knowledge while maintaining a satisfactory level of discipline. Many county superintendents or experienced teachers conducted regular summer institutes, in which some additional training was possible.

The development of the high or secondary school and the determination of its proper place in the American educational system required, among other things, more and better teacher training for all levels in the public schools. The Pennsylvania response to this changed situation was initiated by two major pieces of educational legislation: the School Code of 1911 and the Edmonds Act of 1921. The former, which replaced all existing laws on the subject, authorized state purchase of thirteen normal schools (this was accomplished between 1913 and 1920), increased their entrance requirements, and upgraded their curricula. It also raised the standards for teacher certification. The Edmonds Act provided that after September 1, 1927 beginning elementary teachers would need to have completed an approved normal school program or its equivalent and beginning secondary teachers an approved college program or its equivalent; that permanent teaching certificates would require three years of experience as well as additional college-level work; and that all certification of teachers would be transferred from county and city superintendents to the state Department of Public Instruction.

Although Gettysburg College did not develop a formal teacher education program until after World War I, it did begin to respond to the changing situation a decade earlier. Professor Sanders announced in the 1911 catalogue, which was the first to describe the new entrance requirements and group system, the introduction of two new courses: History of Education and Pedagogy. For many years the catalogue had reminded "School-boards and others desiring teachers" that it was often "in the power of the Faculty to recommend suitable persons." Sanders now added the statement that "the college course is arranged to meet the requirements of the School Code of Pennsylvania, thus securing the State Certificate." Beginning in 1912, he listed his education courses under their own catalogue heading. By the fall of 1920 there were seven such courses and Sanders had a newly hired assistant: Frank H. Kramer, of the

214 Adams County School Bulletin (October 1905), p. 15. In the fall of 1920, 13 of the 218 teachers were college and 40 were normal school graduates. Ibid. (October 1920), pp. 18-25.
class of 1914, who had six years of experience as a teacher in the West Chester High School and a Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania.

In December 1920 the trustees established a separate department of education and named Kramer as its head, effective in September 1921. Thoroughly committed to developing a creditable program for secondary teachers, he made many changes in its curriculum as the Department of Public Instruction revised and then revised again its requirements for certification. In 1932 he announced that the College had "made a considerable break with tradition" by reducing the number of education courses it was offering and reorganizing their content in an effort to deal with the topics which the department required while avoiding duplication of work. Both Pennsylvania and New York gave their approval to his innovation; New Jersey fell in line in 1939. One could major in education and earn either an arts or science degree, but Kramer made it clear that these avenues were intended only for prospective educational administrators. All others were urged to choose majors and minors in fields in which they intended to teach. Fewer than thirty students ever chose education as their major field and it was dropped from the list in 1940.

Mindful of the small respect which many college teachers had for education courses and those who offered them, Kramer tried to arouse and maintain the interest and support of his faculty colleagues. At his urging, in 1936 the faculty created a standing committee on student teachers and authorized it to pass upon candidates who wished to complete the teacher education program by engaging in student teaching (or, as it was then called, practice teaching) in one of the county high schools. Thanks in part to the close personal relations he enjoyed with President Hanson, Kramer was long one of the most influential members of the faculty.

Between 1921 and 1945 hundreds of Gettysburg students entered and completed the teacher education program. The 1936 report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction showed that between 1921 and 1935 his department had issued provisional college certificates to 697 Gettysburg graduates. During the same period 651 certificates had been awarded to Dickinson, 530 to Franklin and Marshall, and 1374 to Bucknell graduates.215

215Report of the Superintendent (1936), p. 83. The total number of provisional college certificates issued during these fifteen years was 42,935. On several occasions during the late 1920s and early 1930s, President Hanson served on statewide committees concerned with improving teacher training and recommending a practical division of labor between the liberal arts colleges and the former normal schools, which beginning in 1927 were called state teachers' colleges.
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When the education department began in 1921, Kramer set up a teachers' agency, called the Bureau of Appointments, which provided a free service available to all students and alumni who were seeking teaching positions. In 1930 its name was changed to the Teachers' Placement Bureau. For many years Professor C. Gilbert Reen and, after him, Professor Lester O. Johnson served as directors.

The fifth new program of the Granville administration, a summer session, was closely related to the fourth. Neither can be understood apart from the increasing requirements for teacher certification. Although the summer session, as teacher education, did not become a regular feature of the instructional program until after World War I, the first efforts to establish it were made a decade earlier. The prime mover was Professor Sanders, who at the time was the closest thing to a universal man on the Gettysburg faculty. He organized and conducted six-week summer sessions in 1912 and 1913. The imposing prospectus which he issued on both occasions made clear that he intended them to be repeated. His main purpose was obviously to offer courses for public school teachers who were seeking one of a number of kinds of available certificates, although he did try to entice younger students who needed to take summer work in order to qualify for college entrance or to remain in College. Unfortunately, enrollments of thirty-one in 1912 and twenty in 1913 led to the quick demise of this effort.

In September 1921, only a few months after the Edmonds Act was passed, President Granville asked the faculty to consider conducting a summer session designed primarily to meet the needs of public school teachers, whose demands for summer courses had heavily taxed the facilities of the normal schools and colleges which had offered them during the preceding summer. Anticipating continued demand, the Department of Public Instruction was asking other colleges to help in meeting it. Professor Kramer, whose new department had just begun to function, was named chairman of a committee to bring in a recommendation, which the faculty approved and

---

218 Under the rubric of philosophy, Sanders also taught the College courses in psychology and sociology, as well as those in education.
217 Summer sessions for 1917 and 1919 were announced in the Gettysburgian, but their stated purpose was to assist students already in College.
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submitted to the board in December 1921. After making two minor changes, the trustees approved the proposal and the first regular summer session was conducted in June and July 1922. 218

During the 1920s summer enrollments averaged about 175 students, many of whom were teachers. Sessions lasted for six weeks, during which a student could earn six credit hours. Enrollment dropped during the depression, in part because many teachers had already met the provisions of the Edmonds Act. During World War II the College operated a twelve-to-fourteen week summer session. The deferment of some students required that they continue their education without interruption. 219

Because it was not part of the baccalaureate curriculum, the sixth new program of the Granville administration, graduate work, is discussed out of chronological order. Before it was adopted and went into effect, an earlier graduate program, having fallen into disuse, was formally abandoned. The 1905 catalogue still announced that the College offered a "graduate course of study leading to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy," but the faculty had long since made this provision a dead letter. It had ceased registering candidates for the Ph.D. degree in 1897 and had recommended none to the trustees for the degree since 1900. In June 1905, at the end of President Hefelbower's first year in office, the trustees entertained a motion to "suspend" conferring the Ph.D. degree. Two years later, in June 1907, the motion was finally passed. The faculty then recommended abandoning one of the oldest practices of the institution: awarding the master's degree -- held to be one in course, not honorary -- to graduates of three years' standing who formally applied for it and who furnished evidence of their post-baccalaureate "professional or literary pursuits." In December 1910 the trustees voted to discontinue this long practice after the 1911 commencement. 220

Not content to stop with what they had eliminated from the College program, and in spite of the fact that most or all of them would have agreed that there was still much needed for proper sup-

218 According to ibid. for October 5, 1921, there were eighty-five Adams county teachers taking courses somewhere during the preceding summer. Surely the faculty hoped that some of them would attend Gettysburg in 1922. Kramer, who knew his College history and who provided the information for this story, recalled the charter injunction that the College help train teachers.

219 Control of the summer session was vested in the faculty who taught in it and who into the 1930s annually asked board permission to continue for another year. The directors were Sanders (1922-1928), Billheimer (1928-1930), and Zinn (1930-1941). From time to time during the 1920s and 1930s the faculty offered extension and evening courses, neither of which proved to be lasting.

220 Actually, the faculty recommended and the board awarded a number of these degrees after 1911, but only to those who paid a $25 fee, not previously required.
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port of the undergraduate curriculum, in February 1911 the faculty approved, with no recorded negative votes, awarding an earned master's degree. They acted in time to include the regulations in the new catalogue and to begin the program in the fall. Requirements for the new degree included possession of a bachelor's degree awarded by a college "of good standing," approval by a newly created committee on advanced degrees of a plan of study, including the equivalent of twenty-four semester hours of work; a satisfactory paper on an approved topic; and satisfactory completion of final examinations. Candidates did not need to be resident in Gettysburg while doing their work. Holders of an undergraduate arts degree were eligible for an M.A. and those holding a science degree, for an M.S.

Three persons, all of them graduates of the College, received the first earned masters' degrees in June 1912. Until after World War I, the number of registered graduate candidates in any one year averaged nine. There was a dramatic increase beginning in 1920 and continuing into the depression years, during which time the candidates averaged thirty-six in number.

It is evident that by the 1920s faculty members were becoming ambivalent about their graduate program. While they recognized its value to the participants and to the College, they now questioned whether, given the limited funds available to support the undergraduate curriculum, graduate instruction was an activity in which they should be engaged. In 1922 they decided that no more nonresidents would be admitted to candidacy for the master's degree, which meant in practice that the required academic work would have to be taken at Gettysburg. Two years later Professor Kramer announced that, because of his heavy work load, he would henceforth give graduate instruction only in the summer session. In 1926 the faculty considered (and then tabled) a motion which would have required full faculty approval of any further masters' candidates and which contained the following pronouncement:

In view of the fact that a separate graduate school cannot be efficiently maintained, it is necessary for the reputation of the college, that no course in which graduate credit is offered be given if the instructor is carrying the standard teaching load in addition to this.
In June 1929 President Hanson asked the advanced degrees committee to consider the advisability of discontinuing the graduate program.\textsuperscript{221} The end of this program was not long in coming. Beginning in 1926 the faculty spent a considerable amount of time debating whether to improve it or drop it. In 1929 it recognized the right of every department head not to offer graduate instruction. In June 1931, after "lengthy discussion," it decided to limit all master's work to the summer school and to what were called graduate courses, as well as to place a limit of four years on the time permitted to finish the program. The 1931 catalogue used a page and a half to describe graduate work and listed each candidate; the 1932 catalogue devoted two sentences to graduate work and named no candidates. Although as late as the fall of 1935 a majority of the faculty voted to continue the program, the catalogue issued only a few months later contained no mention of master's work and no mention of the advanced degrees committee. Only six degrees were awarded after the 1935 commencement, the last in June 1940.\textsuperscript{222}

Between 1913 and 1940 the College awarded about two hundred earned masters' degrees, all but thirty of them between 1920 and 1935. Among the recipients were many public school teachers and administrators, seminary graduates, and academy and College teachers (and wives). In January 1945, as World War II was drawing to its close, President Hanson told the faculty that it might wish to consider reintroducing master's work for the benefit of returning veterans. Discussion of this suggestion revealed that the faculty was divided on the subject. The matter was tabled and evidently forgotten.

During the first twenty-two years of the Hanson administration curricular growth continued, but at a slower rate than was true

\textsuperscript{221}The U.L.C.A. survey team found that Gettysburg was one of five Lutheran colleges conferring the master's degree. Registrars in all of them stated that the programs were being discontinued. "Most of these colleges are not equipped to confer the M.A. degree," the team concluded, "since they are severely handicapped in many ways in offering a comprehensive program for the A. B. Degree." U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:158. "In the last two years," Hanson told the trustees in June 1928, "we have...discouraged the enrollment of students for post graduate work. This has been done because of the fact that we do not have the equipment nor do we have a sufficiently large staff to permit the type of work which must be required if the degree is to have any academic value." In spite of what the Gettysburg registrar told the survey team and the president told the board, the graduate program was not immediately abandoned.

\textsuperscript{222}The trustees involved themselves in determining some of the fine details of the group and major-and-minor systems. They established and later discontinued an engineering program. Their hand is conspicuously absent during the birth, life, and death of the earned master's degree program.
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under Hefelbower and Granville. The number of courses increased from 209 in 1923 to 236 in 1942-1943, but it should be noted that about 40 courses were removed from the curriculum when engineering was dropped in June 1940. As new faculty arrived, in several instances to be the first in their departments to have completed graduate training and earned (or were about to earn) a Ph.D. degree, major changes occurred, whether in the way old courses were now being taught or as new courses were introduced. The recruitment of G. Saylor Warthen and Francis C. Mason in 1924 and 1925 made it possible to enrich the offerings of the English department. When John B. Zinn replaced Professor Breidenbaugh in 1924, the title of chemistry courses changed less than did the content now being offered by one of the latter's former students who had the advantage of twentieth-century graduate training and a decade of subsequent teaching experience. Arriving in the same year, and gaining an assistant in 1925, Rasmus S. Saby soon increased the number of course offerings in economics and political science from fifteen to twenty-six. In 1925 Latin Professor John G. Glenn, succeeding a man who was more than fifty years his senior, kept the titles of most of Dean Bikle's courses, but taught them from a quite different perspective. There were three new curricular developments between 1923 and 1945 which deserve special mention: in history, physical education, and the arts.

The first development began with the Hanson administration itself, in the fall of 1923. When the College received the Adeline Sager bequest, the trustees in December 1922 established the professorship named in her memory as well as a department of history. In June they named Robert Fortenbaugh acting professor, and then in the fall the four existing history courses were transferred from English Bible to the new department. Twenty years later the history faculty had three members, who offered fifteen courses. In December 1928 Fortenbaugh told President Hanson that there were 62 majors in the department and that 252 students – about four of every ten in the College – were taking its courses. By the 1940s history was firmly established as one of the four major fields of study which students selected.

The second development of the Hanson administration began in the fall of 1927, some months after Plank Gymnasium was first occupied. It was in physical education and came after almost forty years of increasingly unsuccessful efforts to require work in health and physical training as a prerequisite for graduation. The man who

223 History became a major field of study when the major-and-minor system went into effect in 1922. All four courses were required. Fortenbaugh became a professor when he received his Ph.D. in 1928.

563
promoted and almost single-handedly carried out these efforts, beginning in 1890, was George D. Stahley. His purpose was stated simply and directly in the description of his Physical Culture course: “to encourage the promotion of health and physical vigor as necessary for successful mental application.” He stressed that “this end is sought under medical guidance in the Gymnasium.” The requirement as stated in the catalogue diminished as College enrollment increased, but not the staff to conduct it. A physical examination was still administered to all entering students, but the “gymnastic work” which was once required of all male students for four years was by 1916 limited to freshmen, and then only from December through mid-March. In 1920, one year after R.O.T.C. students were exempted from gymnasium work, the physical training requirement was extended to include sophomores, so that now both options available to students – military science or physical education – took two years to complete.

When Stahley retired in 1920, he took up his new position as College medical director and continued to be in charge of physical training, including giving the series of health lectures which, at faculty request, he had reintroduced in 1917 as part of the requirement. It is evident from comments in the Gettysburgian and from Stahley’s own catalogue statements that there was a considerable difference between the printed description of this College requirement and the way it was working in practice.\textsuperscript{224} By the end of the Granville administration, given Stahley’s age and the size of the task, some changes were obviously necessary. In June 1923 the board accepted the faculty recommendation that “Physical Training be discontinued in the College Curriculum until proper arrangements shall have been made for the work.” As a result, the

\textsuperscript{224}Beginning in 1916 Stahley cautioned that “credits are given for attendance and attention,” a good hint that both were often lacking. The Gettysburgian for May 24, 1916, in arguing for military training, observed that physical exercises were being “woefully neglected.” If the aging of Stahley or the shortage of available assistants was one reason for the woeful neglect, certainly another was the unsatisfactory character of the available facilities, other than the great outdoors.
military science or physical training requirement disappeared from
the catalogue and from the educational program.225

The new president of the College was not prepared to offer the
trustees a substitute for what had been abandoned until June 1927.
"During the past four years," he then told the board, "it has been an
inflexible purpose of your President to make the privileges of
physical development the possession of every student of Gettysburg
College," instead of the few who were "monopolizing all athletic
appropriations and equipment." The time had come, he continued,
for beginning a "fully-developed physical program." As a matter of
fact, the Gettysburgian for April 6, 1927 had already announced that
several of the College staff, after visiting Dartmouth and observing
its program in operation, had devised a plan for Gettysburg which
would go into operation in the fall. "A systematized plan of
regulated exercise for every student will be in effect," the paper
claimed, "in such a manner that each student will have the
necessary physical training suited to his own particular need and
desire." Acting on Hanson's recommendation, the trustees in June
1927 established a department of physical education and elected
Clayton E. Bilheimer its acting professor.226

Anticipating favorable board action, the catalogue which was
published early in 1927 announced that the two-year requirement in
either military science or physical training had been reinstated.
Three courses were listed under the heading of physical education:
one used to meet the general requirement and two designed for pros-
pective teachers of the subject in the public schools. Although most
of the attention of the staff in this department was to be devoted to
intercollegiate athletics, efforts were made from time to time to
develop an intramural program which would directly involve a large
number of students. One such effort, begun in the fall of 1939 and

225 When it recommended that physical training be dropped, the faculty defeated a
motion that military science be required of all male students. Concluding that there
was one physical requirement for graduation which could be enforced with the exist-
ing staff, the faculty proposed in 1925 that "the diploma be withheld" from a male stu-
dent until he demonstrated the ability to swim at least twice the length of the
Weidensall pool. The trustees professed their desire to make full use of existing
College facilities, but replied that they did not "deem it wise to make swimming a
requirement for graduation." A year later the request was renewed, this time for a
more ambitious standard, including demonstrated ability to rescue and resuscitate.
Although the trustees agreed that "these are manly accomplishments that every
departing graduate should desire to possess," they deferred action on the request.
Within a year there was once again a physical education requirement, but it was not
in swimming or rescue work.

226 The June 1927 board minutes do not state explicitly that a new department was
established, but in his report a year later Hanson stated, correctly, that it had been.
Bilheimer became a professor in 1928.
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directed by Professor Lester Johnson, had about 275 participants during its first year. When women students returned to the campus in 1935 Professor Earl Ziegler was placed in charge of their physical education program, but in September 1941 Margaret K. McGurk became director of physical education for women with a separate catalogue listing and course descriptions. Physical education was not a major field of study at this time. Eight of the twelve courses which the department offered in 1942-1943 were used to meet the general distribution requirement.

The third curricular development of the Hanson administration was the appearance between 1928 and 1935 of courses in the fine, musical, and dramatic arts, all of which resulted from the interests and talents of three faculty members. Students played music and performed plays on the campus long before 1904, and the arts were studied, if only incidentally, in courses offered in the language and literature departments. What was missing were courses dealing directly and specifically with such subjects as painting, sculpture, or music. When Professor Grimm joined the faculty in 1906, he immediately introduced a course in aesthetics, described as an "outline study of the leading periods and the general features of the various fine arts, with discussion of the principal aesthetic problems" and "illustrated by photographs and other reproductions." Although this proved to be a popular course, it disappeared when the group system was introduced in 1911. For the next seventeen years, none of the many new courses introduced quite took the place of Grimm's offering. From time to time the Gettysburgian, some faculty member, or a president could be expected to lament the lack of such opportunities in the curriculum. For example, an editorial in the Gettysburgian for November 17, 1920 presented the argument for a music department and urged the students to agitate until one was created. President Hanson told the trustees in December 1928 that "a graduate of the liberal arts college should be given the opportunity somewhere within his four years to receive a general introduction to the history of art."

The first of the three initiatives in the arts was undertaken by Engineering Professor Frank H. Clutz, in the fall of 1928, when he began offering a course in architecture and sculpture and another in painting. At one time or other he offered six such courses, two of which (Architecture and Painting) survived into the 1944-1945 curriculum. The second initiative came in the fall of 1935, when Greek Professor W. Frederick Shaffer first offered two music courses, one in appreciation and the other in drama. The 1944-1945 curriculum included three of his music courses: Music Appreciation, Music Drama, and Symphony. The third initiative also began in 1935, when Mathematics Professor Richard A. Arms taught a
noncredit course in the theory of play production. A year later he introduced three credit courses: Appreciation of the Theater, Coaching of Amateur Plays, and Production of Amateur Plays, the two former of which remained as part of the 1944-1945 curriculum. The Gettysburgian for October 22, 1942 reported an enrollment of ninety students in the theater appreciation course.

It is clear from the evidence presented in this chapter that one of the differences between the academic program in 1904 and that in 1945 was the presence in the latter year of clearly defined and well-established departments of instruction. Although a few courses such as those in painting, music, and orientation existed outside these structures, virtually all of the others were securely housed within their limits. Aided by his junior colleagues, the professor in charge carefully guarded his bailiwick.

Both trustees and faculty were in agreement that the quality of the academic program should be enhanced by a regular schedule of lectures, some delivered by faculty members themselves, but most by outsiders invited to the campus either by the faculty or by some student organization, such as the Y.M.C.A. Under the heading of Students' Interests, the 1911 catalogue announced that "a series of public lectures will be delivered each year by members of the Faculty and others prominent in some field of general interest." The next year's catalogue began listing the lecturers and their topics. The 1923 call by a newly inaugurated President Hanson for many more guest lectures was not something novel, but merely a summons to strengthen a well-established tradition. Hanson considered the contributions of these visitors so important to the academic program that he often included a list of those delivered during the preceding year in his annual report to the board of trustees.

Among the speakers who appeared on campus during this period were John Wanamaker (1906), Charles Evans Hughes (1907), Jacob Riis (1909), Gifford Pinchot (1919), Hamlin Garland (1923), Edwin Markham (1925), Kenneth S. Latourette (1928), Lowell Thomas (1928, 1930), Lawrence M. Gould (1931), Daniel A. Poling (1934), Richard Niebuhr (1939), A. J. Muste (1940), and Hu Shih (1941).

By the early 1920s Gettysburg had two endowed lectureships. Mary Gingrich Stuckenberg instituted the first in 1912 in memory of her late husband. J. H. Wilburn Stuckenberg (1835-1903) had been a Lutheran pastor, professor at Wittenberg College, developer of sociology as a separate field of study, and prolific author of books and articles on that subject and philosophy. On several occasions in the 1890s he lectured at Gettysburg and learned to know some of its faculty and trustees. In his will, made in 1898, Stuckenberg left his sizable library, map collection, paintings and other works of art, and additional valuable items (including a Goethe album) to the
College. He also bequeathed sums to endow a scholarship and a professorship in sociology, or a lectureship if the funds proved inadequate for the latter purpose. "I favor a progressive Christianity based on the living teachings of Christ and his Apostles," Stuckenberg declared in his will. "I am opposed to the stagnation created by religious dogmatism and traditionalism, and wish none of my possessions to be used in the interest of this stagnation." Therefore, he authorized his wife to transfer his bequests to Marietta College in Ohio, if, in her opinion, Gettysburg was "made to subserve dogmatism and traditionalism instead of a progressive, living Christianity." Concluding that Gettysburg was meeting her husband's expressed standard, soon after he died his widow began carrying out the terms of the will by sending the books and other items to Gettysburg. Since there was not nearly enough money available to endow a professorship, she provided instead for the lectureship. The 1912 catalogue announced the general theme as "some phase of Sociology from the viewpoint of Christian Ethics." The Gettysburgian for October 30, 1912 phrased it slightly differently: the bearing of ethical and religious principles on the solution of human problems. The first lecture was given in October 1912. Through 1925 the lecturers were listed in the catalogue as members of the regular faculty. This was misleading, to say the least, but it added some nationally known names to the list, including Henry C. King, Walter Rauschenbusch, Edward A. Ross, Shailer Matthews, and Harry Elmer Barnes.227

The second endowed lectureship was made possible by the gift of Peter G. Bell (1835-1917), who attended the preparatory department and College, but who completed his studies at Wittenberg. Bell served as a parish pastor in Indiana, Illinois, and western Pennsylvania. Although the trustees approved his detailed offer in 1913, the supporting funds did not become available until after his death and the first Bell lecture was not delivered until April 1923. Through 1925 these lecturers were also listed in the faculty section of the catalogue, the first one being J. Ross Stevenson, president of Princeton Theological Seminary.228

Of what value is a lecture, however well-prepared and delivered by however able a person, if nobody comes? Early in the century the

227 For more information on Stuckenberg, see John O. Evjen, The Life of J. H. W. Stuckenberg: Theologian, Philosopher, Sociologist (Minneapolis, 1938). Evjen was professor and chaplain at Gettysburg from 1905 to 1909. Stuckenberg, who used Wilburn as his first name, spent much of his time in Europe. He established residence in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1895, but died in London. His remains were buried in the Gettysburg National Cemetery; he was a Civil War chaplain whose unit fought in the battle of Gettysburg.

228 Several persons who delivered occasional lectures on constitutional law were also included in the catalogue during these years.
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faculty sometimes announced that attendance at a particular lecture was required. Time and again the Gettysburgian lamented the poor attendance at lectures which were not required and tried to shame students into doing what the editors believed was their academic duty. "If Gene Tunney and Jack Dempsey were to stage an exhibition in Brua Chapel, standing room would be at a premium," they argued on December 7, 1927, "and if Colonel Lindbergh were to appear some morning at chapel exercises, someone might get killed in the rush for seats." Why then do "we turn our backs and hide some place" when we have an opportunity to learn something from a prominent lecturer? Why?

One of the most obvious changes which a reader of the College catalogue for the years between 1904 and 1945 would notice is the increasing attention given to the career interests of students. One may argue that this attention always existed, but did not need to be expressed in words during those years when half or more of those enrolled were headed for seminary or law school. Be that as it may, the catalogue took on a quite different emphasis when it announced the group system in 1911, declaring that the arrangement enabled "the student to select those subjects of study which are of special value in preparation for subsequent professional study or business." In the paragraph describing each of the seven groups there was a sentence identifying the probable careers of those who might choose it. For example, the first group, "largely based on the long established classical curriculum," was recommended "for those intending to enter the ministerial or legal professions." Another group was designed for premedical students. Several were recommended to prospective teachers and businessmen. Beginning in 1912 there were two or more groups for budding engineers.

One of the reasons given for changing to the major-and-minor system a decade later was that it offered students even more choices, including career choices, than did the existing curriculum. Beginning in 1922 the faculty devoted eight or more pages to recommending, in greatly varying detail, courses of study for everyone from ministerial students to those preparing for "technical positions" requiring work in chemistry or physics. It is evident that the curriculum committee and other faculty took these statements seriously and wanted them to be framed so that they would encourage students to make the wisest possible choice of a course of study, as well as of a subsequent career. In the later 1930s the faculty used aptitude tests and formal instruction, especially in the orientation course, to assist in the choice. Even the trustees became concerned, naming a special committee on vocational guidance, which reported in 1940. While it recommended that the time had not
yet come to establish a vocational guidance department, it commended the efforts already being made and urged that they be expanded.226

The premedical program is a good example of long and continuing College concern about student career interests. With the blessing of both his teaching colleagues and the trustees, in 1896 Professor Stahley had devised a program in biology, chemistry, and physics which qualified its graduates to enter the second year of those medical schools which were then adopting four-year curricula. For the next quarter century, or virtually all, Gettysburg premedical students worked closely with Bones Stahley. In the March 21, 1929 issue of the Gettysburgian he recalled the names of about twenty former students who were now successful physicians, most of whom had completed their work at The Johns Hopkins University or University of Pennsylvania Medical School. In the 1920s, after Stahley’s retirement, the faculty spent much time discussing the kind of premedical program which would be best for Gettysburg students. Together with the trustees, they eventually decided that they would no longer recommend anyone to a medical school after only two years of undergraduate work. In 1927 the catalogue stated for the first time that premedical students might major in chemistry as well as biology.

A major nationwide change in medical school admissions occurred in the fall of 1930 when, after two years of study, the Association of American Medical Colleges adopted an aptitude test and most medical schools began requiring it of all candidates for admission. The purpose was to reduce the troublesome dropout rate of more than 20 percent by introducing what the association hoped would become a generally reliable indicator of probable success in medical school. This test, later widely known as the Medical College Admission Test, was first administered on the campus in February 1931.

Near the end of the 1930s a crisis in premedical education developed at Gettysburg. In December 1938 President Hanson, who much preferred to present the positive and bright side of things to

226 The June 8, 1935 Gettysburgian reported that in the fall Robert B. Rau, a junior, would teach typewriting and shorthand, in part because of the return of women students. The 1941 catalogue announced for the first time two courses in each subject, both noncredit, which Rau, now the president’s secretary, was offering. President Hanson told the board in May 1941 that representatives of such firms as Burroughs Adding Machine; Procter and Gamble; Sears, Roebuck, and Company; and Goodyear had visited the campus in search of employees, and predicted that the next decade would “bring a demand for at least some courses having a definite relation to the earning of a livelihood.” In the meantime, he believed that a secretarial course and social science work would be appropriate for women students.
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the trustees, bluntly told them that "for some time I have been greatly concerned with the fact that in the field of medicine our students have not measured up to our standards in other fields." He reported that "almost half of our students who enter medical colleges fail to graduate" and that, as a result, "the College must exert great care or the reputation we enjoy in other fields will be over-shadowed in our medical colleges." Not surprisingly, the minutes recorded that "this question was very fully discussed."230

Over the next three years the president and faculty, supported by the board, with its generous complement of physicians, took decisive action to reverse the situation. In June 1939 Hanson told the trustees that he was dismissing the head of the biology department and seeking a replacement who was "more intimately acquainted with both the atmosphere and the requirements of our best Medical Schools," and also that he intended to invite "three men of national standing in the field of graduate training in Chemistry" to review that department's program and make whatever recommendations might be necessary to bring its work "in line with the best traditions existing in this field of study." The 1940 catalogue contained a greatly lengthened section addressed to the premedical students, requiring those who wished a recommendation to register as such, follow a detailed course of study (which was in effect a premedical major), obtain a B average in science courses, and pass a special premedical senior comprehensive examination with distinction. A newly formed premedical committee, consisting of the dean and the three science professors, was charged with examining the record of candidates at the end of their sophomore year and deciding whether they should be advised to continue in the course. Those given a negative signal were told to change their major field or pursue their premedical studies somewhere else. Late in 1941, after consulting the deans of many medical schools, the curriculum committee recommended a considerably revised premedical curriculum, which the faculty passed only three days before the attack on Pearl Harbor.231

---

230 The faculty curriculum committee believed that the situation had already scared away some potentially good students. Minutes of October 10, 1939, Office of the Dean of the College.

231 The 1942 catalogue contained two recommended courses of studies for premedical students, one for those majoring in biology and another for those majoring in chemistry. Some of the requirements of two years earlier were either softened or dropped entirely. This change reflects in part the rivalry which existed between the biology and chemistry heads. In considering the 1941 revisions, the curriculum committee invited each man to present his views in person, but at separate meetings.
In the period covered by this chapter, how well did faculty members carry out the curriculum which they offered? Certainly, most of them had considerably more postbaccalaureate training than all but a very few of their predecessors, although this alone did not insure that they were therefore better teachers. By the end of the Granville administration few faculty were offering courses in as many different fields as was fairly common before 1904. During these forty years, as will be seen, available library resources and equipment were much enlarged. Throughout the period, presidents and faculty shared an urge to undertake changes which would make Gettysburg, to use their own phrase, one of the best colleges in its class. Presidents Hefelbower and Hanson in particular regularly and in different ways urged the faculty to keep abreast of what other good colleges were doing and to act constructively on what they learned. Especially in the 1920s, during the early years of the Hanson administration, several innovations resulted from a concerted attempt to insure that a greater percentage of students who were willing to put forth the effort could and would complete their course of study. In one form or another, many graduates of these years testified to the value of the curriculum as the faculty administered it in promoting their own development as persons and professionals. As is to be expected, the evidence does not all point in the same direction. To balance the positive statement of such a distinguished alumnus as Joseph E. Rowe of the class of 1904 or Spurgeon M. Keeny of the class of 1914 is the accusation of an unidentified member of the curriculum committee a quarter century later. Some of his colleagues, he charged, based their teaching "on notes prepared twenty-five years ago."232

Library

In the fall of 1904 the College library occupied space on part of the first floor of Glatfelter Hall. Professor John A. Himes held the title of librarian, but he had more than a full teaching load and could not give much time to his other duties. Sallie Krauth, his assistant, kept the library open twenty-two hours each week. She closed the collection at 3 P.M. Monday through Friday and at noon on Saturdays. There were no Sunday hours. The materials in the Philo and Phrena

232 1932 History, p. 281; Columbia University Oral History Interview, typed transcript in GCA; minutes of the curriculum committee, October 10, 1939, Office of the Dean of the College. The assumption is that the curriculum committee member believed that, ipso facto, all teaching making use of twenty-five-year-old notes is poor teaching.
libraries, which were still independently operated, were available to society members only. The 1904 catalogue stated that there were 14,105 volumes in the College library, plus "several thousand partly classified but unbound pamphlets." What the statement meant was that 14,105 volumes had been recorded in the accession register. What it did not convey was that the overall collection was largely disorganized and housed in a most inadequate space. Fortunately, or unfortunately, the prevailing pattern of instruction at Gettysburg did not place heavy demands upon it.

Only after four years in office did President Hefelbower call the trustees' attention to the condition of the library, which he described in June 1908 as "perhaps the weakest point . . . in the equipment of our college." He must have startled them when he stated that his recent reading of an American Library Association report had convinced him that the College should spend at least $15,000 on new books as soon as possible and then appropriate at least $1,000 a year in order to keep the collection up to date. Since the total College budget for the year just closing was but $36,000, the trustees were scarcely in a position to give him what he claimed was needed, but they did respond in two ways. First, they directed the librarian to submit a detailed report of accessions and use of the collection by students, faculty, and others. Second, apparently with Hefelbower's approval, they vested complete control of the operation of the library in a committee consisting of Professors Himes and Evjen, together with the president.

Construing the trustee action as a vote of no-confidence, which it certainly was, in October 1908 Himes presented his resignation as librarian to the faculty, which had elected him twenty years earlier, having already announced that he would not serve on the new committee. Acting alone during the summer of 1908, Evjen and Hefelbower had summoned the veteran chief of the catalogue division of the Library of Congress, James C. M. Hanson, who after a careful study recommended that the three College libraries be combined and that "an entirely new and up-to-date" cataloguing system be introduced. An annual expenditure of about $10,000, half for salaries, including one for a trained librarian, would in his opinion "in the course of four years' time place your library on a sound working basis. In his June 1909 report to the board, made at a time when it was considering stiffer entrance requirements and a more advanced curriculum, Hefelbower described the College's library problem as one growing out of the progress of the age. During recent years a great change has taken place in the colleges of the country in the manner

---

233The quotations are from p. 10 of Hefelbower's 1909 report to the board.
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in which the library is used. In the larger institutions, and also in the smaller colleges, wherever it is possible, the library has become more and more a great center of work, around which the various departments are grouped.

The board now appropriated $3,000 for the library, but only if the funds could “be raised by special contributions for this purpose,” and it attempted to quiet the expressed fear of some faculty members that it was trying to take away their privilege of recommending books to be purchased for the library. It is evident that the board’s previous action had split the faculty almost evenly, with the older members opposing and the younger members, joined by Hefelbower, supporting what it had done.

The library committee which the trustees had established continued to function and was soon treated as a regular faculty committee. In June 1909 the board named Professor Grimm to succeed Himes as one of its three members, but no replacement was named after Evjen left the College in that year. Until 1928 the committee consisted of Grimm and the president of the College. Although Grimm began to function as librarian in 1909, he was never formally named to that position and did not begin using the title until 1911.234

As is evident from the annual reports which he made to the board until he resigned in 1929, Grimm was energetic in executing his new commission. Already in 1909 he persuaded the College to join the American Library Association. Like his predecessor, he was head of a department and could devote full time to the collection only in the summer. Sallie Krauth continued as assistant librarian until 1922. Mary Hay Himes (1890-1977), daughter of the previous librarian, also held the title of assistant librarian from 1916 to 1945. She had taken a summer library course in preparation for her new duties and worked with Grimm in accessioning and cataloguing. Carrie Musselman (1870-1959), who also had one summer library course, succeeded Sallie Krauth in 1922. Student help completed the staff.

Grimm told the trustees in June 1911 that he had spent the preceding summer trying “to become thoroughly acquainted with the library and to bring some sort of order into a large mass of unclassified and disarranged material.” Each succeeding report sought to convey some idea of the magnitude of the task, which in 1916 he lamented was “practically endless and beyond the power of one man.” During his tenure as librarian the number of volumes accessioned almost doubled. Only part of this growth could be attributed to support from the College budget, which never came

234Perhaps the trustees thought they were making him librarian in June 1910, when they named him chairman of the committee, put him in charge of “rearrangement and cataloguing of the library,” and authorized additional compensation.
close to what Hefelbower had called for, averaging only about $250 annually through 1915 and about $1,100 from then through 1929. Usually many more books and related materials came in the form of gifts than by purchase: some 700 books, most of them dealing with economics, from Benjamin K. Miller, of the class of 1877, a Milwaukee attorney; more than 2,000 volumes from the library of J. H. Wilburn Stuckenberg; more than 2,000 from the library of Professor Eli Huber; and more than 6,000 from Reverend Jeremiah Zimmerman, a trustee. In 1919 the daughter of James Macfarlane, of the class of 1837, gave the College $2,000, income from which was to be used to buy books on geology and related subjects. Unfortunately, most of these volumes, while perhaps rare and valuable, did little or nothing to support the College's instructional program. More useful for that purpose were the Philo and Phrena libraries, which were turned over when the societies disbanded in 1924. Into the 1920s the College continued to be a repository for United States and Pennsylvania government documents. Librarian Grimm thought it important to remind the trustees each year that the College still received the publications of the nation's leading educational organizations, including the Carnegie Foundation, the General Education Board, and the Middle States Association.

During the Grimm years, the library became increasingly available for student and faculty use. He soon extended the number of weekly service hours to thirty-eight and by the mid-1920s to fifty-nine, with fifteen of these in the evening. He was able to secure use of an additional room here and there, including one on the second floor for women students. In 1924 the former Philo hall was converted into a large reading room. In 1918 Grimm first mentioned the availability of interlibrary loans and listed the Library of Congress, the Pennsylvania State Library, and The Johns Hopkins University Library among those cooperating.235

As early as 1915 Grimm listed the lack of space as a major problem for the library. At the time, he coveted the rooms which the literary societies occupied, but even as he was securing one of those rooms in 1924, he began calling for a separate library building. Not surprisingly, the U.L.C.A. survey team which visited the campus in 1926-1927 found that "the library is very inadequate for the needs of the College." It referred to existing plans to construct a building

---

235 In April 1914 the Y.M.C.A.'s prohibition committee asked the faculty to remove from the library four books dealing with use of alcohol which it considered objectionable. Professor Sanders was asked to investigate and return with a recommendation. Acting on his report, the faculty decided that the books should remain in the collection and that the librarian should purchase "several books of recent date presenting the other side of the question." Wisely, the faculty thus reaffirmed a position which it had first taken three quarters of a century before. See p. 139.
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John H. Knickerbocker
(1895-1964)
The first professionally trained and full-time College librarian. Served from 1929 to 1959.

"devoted exclusively to library purposes."\textsuperscript{236} Such a facility was indeed one of President Hanson's highest priorities, but not until the fall of 1929 did it become a reality. Although the president told the trustees in December of that year that Gettysburg now had "the most beautiful library building I have seen on any campus of a college of our size," and although a nationally known architect had reviewed its plans in advance of construction, as an efficient library building it was flawed from the start. In at least one Philadelphia-area library school, this structure was later used as an example of how things should not be done. A 1939 American Library Association publication dealing with college and university library buildings commented on poorly used and unused space in the Gettysburg facility and concluded that "the general arrangement of this plan has been used in very few colleges and is not generally approved by librarians."\textsuperscript{237}

Perhaps the Gettysburg library would have been better designed had the College hired a professional librarian before the building plans were finally approved. That did not happen, however, and the first trained librarian, John H. Knickerbocker (1895-1964), did not assume his duties until October 1, 1929, several weeks before the new facility was opened. A graduate of Columbia University with a diploma from the New York Library School, he had held positions in the New York Public Library and New York University Library before coming to Gettysburg. In 1945, as in 1929, Misses Himes and Musselman were his assistants. Their efforts were supplemented by the services of a succession of students.

\textsuperscript{236}U.L.C.A. Survey, \textit{1}:415, 605. The section of the report on Lutheran college libraries (\textit{1}:603-623) demonstrates clearly that all of them were below what the survey team considered a minimum level. They did have a number of good things to say about the Gettysburg collection and found it as close to the minimum as any Lutheran library for which they had data.

\textsuperscript{237}Edna Ruth Hanley, \textit{College and University Library Buildings} (Chicago, 1939), pp. 105-106. Gettysburg's was not the only library building to be criticized in this work. On the other hand, the report commended the design of the Fackenthal Library at Franklin and Marshall College, completed in the late 1930s.
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However poorly the interior of the library might have been designed, it did provide the College for the first time in its existence with a spacious repository for books and related materials. One of the new librarian's first projects, in 1930, was to convert from the Dewey decimal to the Library of Congress system of classification. According to his annual reports during the 1930s, circulation of books and the number of persons using the facility increased by 50 percent. The number of books accessioned went from 33,650 in 1930 to 55,650 in 1945. The amount of money annually budgeted and spent for the library (exclusive of salaries), like that committed to almost every other purpose, plummeted in the early 1930s, from about $2,600 in 1929-1931 to about $950 in 1933-1936. In 1933-1934 only sixty-four books were bought with College funds.

A student organization founded in 1928, the Modern Book Club, was devoted to encouraging general student reading, as well as wider use of the library. This club spent its available funds for the purchase of books of general interest which might otherwise not have been added to the collection. To judge from editorials which appeared in the Gettysburgian from time to time, the College could have used several such clubs whose members were persuading their fellow students to make more use of the library. "It would be conservative to estimate," complained the editor on October 25, 1934, "that more than one half of the members of the student body do not regularly use the library even for required reading." Reportedly, a

235 Librarian Knickerbocker's annual reports to the president are in the GCA. They contain much useful information on library use and growth. The accession register, also in GCA, shows that the number 55,650 was reached on June 30, 1945. According to the survey of American education for 1939-1940, Allegheny then had 90,730 volumes in its library; Franklin and Marshall, 83,800; Bucknell, 78,281; Dickinson, 66,289; Washington and Jefferson, 58,475; and Muhlenberg, 57,290. College and University Library Statistics, 1939-1940, pp. 52-55. This work is Volume 2, Chapter 6 of Federal Security Agency, U.S. Office of Education, Biennial Surveys of Education in the United States, 1938-1940 and 1940-1942 (Washington, 1947). In his December 1937 report to the president, Knickerbocker stated "In comparison with other Pennsylvania colleges of similar faculty, student enrollment, and courses, Gettysburg College Library does the least new-book purchasing, the least amount of bookbinding, and makes the least purchases of periodicals and serial publications." He noted that Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, and Wilson spent annually about 40 percent more than Gettysburg for library purposes. Their spending was close to what the American Library Association recommended for colleges of their size.

236 In October 1931 the Carnegie Corporation of New York awarded the College a grant of $10,000, payable over five years, for the purchase of books. According to the accession register, this generous gift, coming at a time when the depression was most severe, enabled the College to purchase 3,958 volumes, at an average cost of about $2.50 per volume.
member of the class of 1934 "was able to boast an entirely clean record of library attendance," never even getting once into the vestibule.240

Despite reluctant collegians who succeeded in avoiding the place, John Knickerbocker made the library a much more visible and integral feature of the academic program than it had ever been. Freshmen were given instruction in its use. Faculty cooperated by ordering books and making assignments in materials placed on reserve. Knickerbocker arranged for displays and exhibits; he also tried to publicize the library by frequent news releases to the Gettysburgian. He was active in his profession, attending and participating in both national and state library association meetings. On the other hand, he never solved one of the problems which Grimm left unsolved. In the later 1930s he was reporting to the president that, while there were about 45,000 or 50,000 books accessioned, about 50,000 more stored in the basement still awaited processing. Some progress was made, but the task was as overwhelming for him as it

240Professor Zinn recalled being told that, when about 1960 the trustees were deciding whether to build an addition to the library or spend the money on some other facility, one alumnus trustee stated that he did not remember where the library was located when he was a student or that he had ever used it. Interview of July 1972, GCA.
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had been for his predecessor. Both men must have had serious doubts that most of the volumes would ever justify the effort which it would take to process and put them on the shelves.

At times a serious problem for the College authorities was the personality of the librarian, which sometimes led to unproductive clashes with both students and faculty, and which did effectively counterbalance many of the positive things which he had accomplished since 1929. In the spring of 1944 President Hanson informed the board that he intended to dismiss Knickerbocker and place the library in charge of a faculty member until he could "secure a well-trained librarian who will be able to mix with the students and create more genuine interest in the use of the library." He was persuaded to give up this intention, and John H. Knickerbocker remained as librarian until 1959.

Equipment

In the fall of 1904 the College had a long tradition of sound instruction in science and had helped train a number of men who were making their mark in that field. In practice, the instruction was limited almost completely to chemistry, largely because of the interests and abilities of the faculty. Professor Breidenbaugh had supervised the conversion of the old gymnasium into the chemistry laboratory in 1890 and, for a time, according to his testimony, this building was reasonably adequate for serving its purpose. Meanwhile, Professor Stahley had supervised the conversion of Linnaean Hall into a gymnasium, but when that occurred there were no courses in biology. As these were developed, first to serve pre-medical students, laboratory facilities outside the gymnasium were needed. After 1904, the College found two rooms on the second floor of Glatfelter Hall for that purpose.

The first major expansion in equipment after 1904 began occurring when the trustees established a physics department. In June 1909 President Hefelbower reported that more than one-third of the Glatfelter Hall basement was in use as a physics laboratory. At a cost of more than $6,000, most of which had been spent for equipment, Gettysburg now had what he considered to be "the nucleus of a good physical laboratory for a small college." Within a few years, a new president convinced the trustees to authorize several engineering programs, for which additional equipment was required. By 1914, the entire basement of Glatfelter Hall was being used for physics and engineering.

The 1911 catalogue, which announced inauguration of the group system, was the first to describe the "material equipment" of the College in any detail. The authors gave the distinct impression that
the institution was well-equipped for science instruction. The two biology laboratories had "all the appliances necessary" for the department's work. The chemistry laboratories were "ample equipped with all the conveniences and apparatus and supplies that are desirable" for introductory and advanced courses. The four main physics rooms were "equipped with modern and carefully selected apparatus for both elementary and advanced work." A year later, as the engineering programs began operating, the catalogue reader was informed that their equipment was "modern and adequate and is being augmented as necessity demands." What remained unwritten at this time was an account of the inability of both presidents Hefelbower and Granville to secure funds for a science building and of the latter to obtain needed additional space for engineering. The addition made to the chemistry building in 1916 was nothing more than a measure for the short run. The average annual amount which the College spent on equipment and supplies for these four departments between 1910 and 1917 is yet another indicator of the limits which the available financial resources continued to place upon it: $130 for biology, $1,890 for chemistry, $600 for engineering, and $795 for physics.

In a letter which appeared in the Gettysburgian for June 14, 1922, Professor Parsons complained about "the very inadequate, cramped, and unhealthful quarters the physics department has been compelled to occupy." Whenever there was no steam heat the basement of Glatfelter Hall was damp, and sometimes green mold formed on the walls. Parsons attributed the rheumatism from which most of his staff suffered to these conditions. He thought that the chemistry department had "ridiculously inadequate" quarters and even greater need for better ones than physics. The U.L.C.A. survey team which visited the campus in 1926-1927 used the words crowded and inadequate to describe the conditions of the science laboratories.241 The completion and equipping of Breidenbaugh Hall in 1927-1928, like the construction of the library soon thereafter, was an important achievement in the history of the College. Chemistry and physics professors were largely responsible for the interior design of the first truly up-to-date science building which the College ever had. From 1929 until 1940 Breidenbaugh also housed the biology department. When engineering instruction ceased, the biologists moved to new quarters on the third floor and in the basement of Glatfelter Hall. Annual expenditures for supplies and equipment for the three science departments from 1936 to 1943 averaged $1,100 for biology (they tripled after 1939), $2,065 for chemistry, and $270 for physics.
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By relying on the College catalogue for information, one could get a completely erroneous understanding of the condition of the museum which had once been a valuable and valued part of the material equipment of the institution. Every catalogue, including the one published early in 1926, featured a descriptive paragraph identical with the one which appeared in 1904 and which claimed that the collection was "freely used in instruction." Every catalogue identified Professor Breidenbaugh as its curator. Presumably the only reason this misinformation disappeared from the 1927 catalogue was because Breidenbaugh died in 1926.

As early as 1911, the faculty attempted to deal with the increasing neglect of the museum, which even then continued receiving a few gifts, by entrusting its care to the recently inaugurated Student Council. Three years later a student was named assistant curator and instructed to maintain a schedule of hours. In the same year the faculty converted part of the museum space into a classroom and office for the philosophy department. When the assistant curator was graduated in 1917 no successor was appointed. Untended, the collection went from bad to worse. The U.L.C.A. survey team thought that the "discarded, moth-eaten wrecks of animals and birds . . . cannot possibly be of any value and certainly should be burned."242 In an editorial on October 10, 1928, the Gettysburgian called the attention of the students to "several dirty rooms" on the third floor of Glatfelter Hall which had an accumulation of six years of dust hiding "the collections of a good museum," one about to "become wholly worthless." It was "an opportunity for some honorary organization seeking to do the college some good." Unfortunately, no such organization stepped forward and, when Glatfelter Hall was renovated in 1929, most of what still remained of the museum collection was placed in the attic of Breidenbaugh Hall, where it gathered even more dust. In the 1930s some of the pieces were placed in the hobby room in Weidensall Hall while others were auctioned off in 1942 to raise money for the Student Christian Association.243

From Admission to Commencement

The 1904-1905 academic year at Gettysburg began on Thursday, September 15, 1904. It consisted of three terms, the first of which ended before Christmas, the second at the end of March, and the third early in June. Commencement was held on the morning of

---

242Ibid., 1:204.
243Gettysburgian, October 18, 1934; March 11, 1937; and March 18, 1937.
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Wednesday, June 14, 1905. Having an academic year of about thirty-five or thirty-six weeks was already standard practice for American colleges, and the Gettysburg faculty accepted it as a given. The 1939 catalogue announced that “the college year of thirty-five weeks... begins... on a Thursday near the middle of September and continues,... to Commencement Day, the first Monday in June.” The later years of World War II forced the College to alter this routine temporarily and adopt virtual year-round operations. When it began functioning under the group system in the fall of 1911, the faculty abandoned the three-term calendar and divided the academic year into two semesters, with the break between them occurring in early February (by 1925 it was late January).

As was the case in earlier years, there were times when the normal routine was broken by either planned or unexpected occasions which might yield a day or half-day holiday. George Washington’s birthday, first observed in 1839, continued to cancel classes through 1934. Classroom activities were curtailed or suspended on Memorial day. Early in the century the tradition was established that the president should declare a holiday “in the interests of athletics” sometime in the fall. There were still battlefield and town activities deemed important enough to call off some or all classes for a day: dedication of a monument on Culp’s hill (1907), dedication of the Pennsylvania monument (1910), dedication of the west portico of the old seminary building (1914), dedication of the Virginia monument (1917), Armistice day (1919-1921), and farmer’s day in Gettysburg (1920-1922). Sometimes the College formally observed April 7, the date of its charter, as founders’ day. In the 1930s the occasion was used as an academic honors day on which scholarship was given special recognition.

Classroom work was suspended after the first period on February 12, 1909, so that the College could commemorate properly the exact day of the centennial of the birth of two famous persons who, according to the Gettysburgian, had committed themselves to achieving “the freedom of man from the shackles which so long had held him down.” In the morning a botany professor from the University of Pennsylvania spoke about the great work of Charles Darwin “in setting free human thought from its bonds and as the moulder of intellectualism for all coming ages.” In the afternoon, with members of the Grand Army of the Republic sharing the stage in Brua, a former

244 One of the suggested requirements for a successful college of arts and sciences announced by the Bureau of Education committee in 1918 was stated as follows: “Fifteen or sixteen credit hours a week for each student for 36 weeks a year for four years should be regarded as the normal program of work for students.” Resources and Standards (1918), p. 16.
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Minnesota congressman paid tribute to Abraham Lincoln, also born on February 12, 1809, as a man moved to action by his sustained thinking about "the wrongfulness of human slavery and the benefit of the union of the States." 245

Some events which became part of the calendar during this period did not result in holidays for the students, but they were without a doubt of great importance for the College in its relationships with one of its valued constituencies: the parents of students. Following a suggestion made by President Hanson, the first father's day was held during a weekend in November 1924 and the first mother's day during one in May 1925. The response was so great that it removed any doubt about the wisdom of continuing these special days. Hundreds of parents had an opportunity to inspect the campus, many for the first time. They attended classes, listened to concerts, watched plays, cheered Gettysburg teams, and were well fed. Before leaving for home they went to Brua Chapel to hear the president preach one of his highly inspirational sermons. Only such catastrophes as the depression (1932) and world war (1943) could cancel these days, and then only temporarily. In the spring of 1944 the two were combined into one observance.

Although as late as 1942 the catalogue still declared that a student could be admitted to College by passing an examination a few days before the academic year began in September (similar examinations in the spring were abandoned in 1922), long before this date virtually every applicant exercised the other option by "presenting a certificate from an approved secondary or high school." When the new entrance requirements went into effect in the fall of 1911, these certificates had to offer evidence that a student had earned fourteen Carnegie units, six of which (three in English, two in mathematics, and one in geography) were specifically required and the remaining

245Gettysburgian, February 17, 1909. One is struck by the absence in the many available sources for studying the history of this Lutheran-church-related college of evidence that there was a confrontation, either before or after 1909, between advocates and opponents of the theory of evolution. One possible explanation is that the theory was ignored, but this is probably not the correct one. There is no hint whatsoever in the Gettysburgian account of this observance that Charles Darwin was not a great man who, along with Lincoln, deserved to be remembered and honored at Gettysburg College. Writing in the 1917 Spectrum about the history of education, Professor Sanders claimed that Gettysburg had "incorporated the field of science" into its curriculum, but had "not repudiated the Church." F. William Sunderman of the class of 1891 recalls that in his undergraduate days science was presented to him by men who recognized no restrictions on their right and duty to teach what their investigations convinced them should be taught. An article by Schmucker Duncan of the class of 1891 in the College Monthly for November 1890, entitled "Evolution's Bearing Upon the Christian Religion," argued that existing understandings of both evolution and theology were "merely man's statements of his own conception" and capable of further refinement as new knowledge appears.
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eight of which could be in language, history, or science. The faculty went to considerable lengths to describe in the catalogue the level of mastery which it expected in both required and elective fields. By 1914 geography was no longer on the required list and the number of units had been increased to fifteen. In 1942 one still needed fifteen units, including three in English and two in mathematics, for admission. In 1911 the faculty began entrusting individual admissions decisions to its entrance committee, but not until 1943 was there a dean or director of admissions to handle this work on its behalf.

Requiring fourteen or fifteen units was simply one step toward a sound admissions program. The entrance (later admissions) committee had to take into consideration the quality of work which the candidate had done in earning those units and whether there were cases where exceptions should be made. Following a long practice, for some years it did admit students whose records were lacking in one way or other, imposing conditions which had to be removed by a certain time if they wished to continue with their class. Once the requirement of fifteen units was firmly established, the trend was toward flexibility in administering them. In accepting a report from the entrance committee in 1926, the faculty advised that there should be "more freedom . . . exercised in counting units and more stress . . . put on the quality of work offered."246

The U. L. C. A. survey team found that in the mid-1920s Gettysburg had the most consistently good record among nine Lutheran colleges in retaining an entering freshman class and graduating its members four years later. Of the seventy-eight freshmen in the class of 1908, 60 percent were graduated four years later.247 An additional 13 percent received degrees from Gettysburg at some other time or from some other institution. Comparable figures for the class of 1916 are 64 and 72 percent; for the class of 1925, 56 and 63 percent; for the class of 1931, 55 and 61 percent; and for the class of 1940, 55 and 59 percent. The record of B. A. candidates was much better than that of students registered for the B. S. degree. For example, 81 percent of the freshmen B. A. candidates in the class of 1908 and 85 percent of those in the class of 1925 earned degrees four years later.

During the forty-one years covered by this chapter College enrollment tripled. Most of this growth occurred during the first two administrations. The number in the four College classes, which stood at a record 197 in the fall of 1904, reached 545 during the first

246In 1920 the Middle States Association declared that "in administering entrance requirements, exceptions should be few and made only for reasons of great weight." The questionnaire which Granville completed early in 1921 admitted that Gettysburg did admit students on trial, but stated that they were candidates "conditioned in one or two units if other grades are high." GCA.
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STUDENTS IN COLLEGE AND DEGREES GRANTED, 1904-1945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Students</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of the Registrar. Candidates for the earned master's degree are listed with the special students. During this period, some 202 masters' degrees were awarded: in 1911-1920, 35; in 1921-1930, 107, and in 1931-1940, 80.
year of the Hanson presidency. A new record enrollment of 622 in 1928-1929 immediately preceded the depression, during which the number dropped to a low of 480 in 1934-1935. Thanks to the return of women students in the fall of 1935, an upswing began which by the fall of 1942 had produced another record enrollment (668). As demands for military manpower increased, enrollment fell back to almost precisely the levels of World War I: 289 in 1943-1944 and 356 the following year.

During the first three quarters of a century of its existence, the College annually faced the need to attract more students to make financial ends meet. On the assumption that satisfied customers were the best advertisement, it regularly urged current students to encourage their friends to enroll. It prepared attractive illustrated booklets in an effort to entice. In addition, into the early 1920s it annually designated younger staff members to make the rounds canvassing for new students. Soon after the end of World War I, President Granville came to the conclusion that the board of trustees needed to begin dealing with the new question of how much further growth in enrollment, if any, was desirable. "One of our problems in the past has been to secure enough students to enable us to make the most efficient and economical use of our teaching force and material plant," he told them in June 1920. "It seems clear now that in the future our chief problem will be to adequately serve those who shall come to us asking for admission."

Returning to the same theme two years later, Granville advised that "educational authorities are pretty well agreed that from every standpoint the efficient liberal arts and science college should have only from 500 to 600 students." Even if "substantial additions to our financial resources" became available, he stated, he was "personally of the opinion that the time has arrived when we should limit our regular undergraduate college enrollment to 500." Any additional funds should be used for improving plant and equipment, and, "what is the most important of all, to increase our teaching staff and raise it to still higher standards of scholarship and teaching efficiency." After discussing this proposal, the board deferred any action on it until its winter meeting, by which time Granville had announced his resignation. Wisely the members decided to postpone further consideration for a year, when a new president could be expected to be in office. Finally, in December 1923, the trustees adopted a sense motion that, "due to inadequate resources, the crowded condition of the college buildings, and a purpose to excel in
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the character of our college work rather than to strive for numerical strength," further freshmen classes should be limited to two hundred students.248 It is understandable that there were those in the College's constituency who had contributed, perhaps very generously, to the recent Endowment and Expansion Campaign in the belief that they were helping to make possible a bigger as well as a better Gettysburg and who were now both perplexed and disappointed by this action.

While before 1945 President Hanson never abandoned or advocated abandoning the concept of a limited enrollment, he chose to interpret the limit as circumstances appeared to warrant. In June 1928 he told the trustees that total enrollment should be kept close to six hundred, "as this number renders possible the best type of academic work." During the depression the chief problem was once again recruiting enough students. The canvassing reappeared as faculty agreed to visit potential freshmen during the summer, trying to persuade them to enroll in the fall. In May 1936 the College held its first subfreshman day. There were several good reasons for inviting prospective students to visit the campus on a spring day while College was in session, but at the moment the chief one was to help fill the freshman class for the fall. As the depression eased, Hanson began identifying a new target. "It is our desire to secure 500 young men and 150 young ladies as a maximum enrollment," he told the board in December 1939. "All of our buildings and equipment have been provided with this thought in mind." Two years later he reminded it that 650 students were needed in order to balance the budget.

In the absence of records showing the number and preparation of applicants for admission, it is impossible to be very precise about how selective the College was at this time in recruiting its student body. At the time of the depression, the administration was stating that there were about 300 applications each year for the 200 available places, but we do not know how many of these applicants were qualified to do the work the faculty expected. In 1934 there were fewer than 150 applicants, of whom only 25 were rejected.

The question of whether to continue to admit women students, which was before the College for more than a decade in the 1920s and 1930s, cannot be understood satisfactorily apart from the

248 In June and again in December 1923 the faculty strongly urged the trustees to limit the number of freshmen and new special students to 150 each year. It is clear that in acting the trustees rejected Granville's overall limit of 500 students and chose instead to deal with the issue which he raised by using the faculty method, but increasing the number of new students to be admitted each year to 200. The U.L.C.A. survey team a few years later concluded that a student body of 600 was required for an efficient and effective college. Ibid., 2:119.
growth in total enrollment and the eventual desire to limit it, or apart from the unsuccessful efforts by a number of synods to establish a new Lutheran college for women. Although Gettysburg had opened its doors to women as early as 1888, it always considered itself a men's college. There were no dormitory or dining facilities for women and the faculty usually responded negatively to their requests for access to gymnasium, study, or other facilities. The writer in the Gettysburgian for December 5, 1923 was substantially correct in saying that "at the present time Gettysburg is not a coeducational institution. Girls are permitted to attend classes out of mere courtesy. They have no special privileges as to tradition, student government or campus activities. The faculty carries no responsibilities for them further than that relative to their class room work." 249

Between 1904 and 1917 there were usually about twenty women enrolled as degree candidates in any one year, most of them from Gettysburg and vicinity. In the early 1920s, as more and more high school graduates, both men and women, began seeking a college education, the number tripled: the average for the years 1921-1924 was sixty-three women students. Clearly the potential was much greater. The College had just completed its most successful fund-raising campaign among Lutheran families, some of whom contributed in the expectation that their daughters would have access to an education at Gettysburg.

The concern which President Granville first voiced in 1920 over the need to limit the size of the student body led perhaps inevitably to the question of the future of women students. Then in the fall of 1921 three synods closely related to the College (East Pennsylvania, West Pennsylvania, and Maryland) passed almost identical resolutions, which were introduced by pastors who were Gettysburg alumni, calling for the establishment of a new women's college, one which would be under synodical control. Soon ten synods east of Ohio and north of Virginia, in cooperation with the Board of Education of the United Lutheran Church in America, began making plans for such an institution.

Although at their December 1921 meeting the trustees decided that, if asked, they would participate in planning for a new women's college, they were not willing to postpone making their own enrollment plans until it became a reality. In June 1922, following another Granville appeal for action, the trustees began considering two

249 The 1914 through 1921 catalogues did state that "no distinctions are made as to sex except that only male students are admitted to the college dormitories." In September 1923 the faculty declined to act on a sorority request for permission to room and board under its supervision, "inasmuch as the College has never assumed any obligation in reference to the rooming and boarding of women students."
resolutions, which it is clear they were determined to act on together. One, already discussed, would limit total enrollment to five hundred students. The other, prefaced by the statement that "our educational equipment and financial resources are inadequate to care for all who apply for admittance," would refuse admission to women as undergraduate degree candidates (but not as graduate or summer school students) beginning in the fall of 1923. After discussing these resolutions, the trustees postponed action until their December 1922 meeting, at which they tabled both for one year. When the motion concerning women students was removed from the table in December 1923, its effective date having already passed, the fall of 1926 was substituted and an annual limit of seventy-five was placed on the number of women students to be permitted in the College until that time. After what was described as "warm debate," the trustees decided on the very unusual procedure – for them – of including in the minutes how every member had voted. Seventeen votes were cast for the resolution and seven against. The eight pastors who voted divided evenly. Frederick H. Knobel, the president of the United Lutheran Church in America, voted affirmatively, but asked that his reason be included in the minutes: "Because Gettysburg College is not in a position to provide fully for women students." The four resident trustees who voted also divided evenly. R. William Bream and Jacob A. Clutz, who voted against the resolution, were two of its most vigorous opponents.

As early as the summer of 1922, when it became generally known that the College was considering closing its doors to women, there was an immediate and strong reaction from several quarters. By the time the trustees met in December, several synods had passed resolutions asking that no action be taken until a Lutheran college for women was in existence and receiving students. A petition with signatures of local businessmen, College and seminary faculty, and College and seminary trustees also asked for a delay. Another petition, said to have been signed by "all the co-eds," called for no action at all. The faculty was not very helpful at this juncture. Within the space of three weeks it considered a motion recommending that women students be limited to "young ladies of Gettysburg and vicinity residing at home" who would "attend as day pupils"; took up a substitute motion calling on the board "to provide as soon and as far as possible facilities for the women students equal to those of the men"; and then, "after considerable discussion," tabled the entire matter indefinitely.250

250 The position of the Gettysburgian during this long episode changed as editorial staffs came and went. More often than not, its staff favored keeping women. In 1915 the faculty discussed and then defeated a motion to admit no more women students.
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As was to be expected, the board action in December 1923 did not end the discussion. On March 12, 1924 the Gettysburgian speculated that "sufficient pressure from outside sources" may "force the Board to reconsider their action." On April 30 the paper printed a letter from Joseph B. Baker, then a Lutheran pastor in Indiana, Pennsylvania, and one of the seven board members who had been the minority several months earlier. Disappointment and sorrow were words he used to describe his own feelings. "When we select athletes we judge muscle, when we select singers we judge voices, when we select students we ought to judge brains," he wrote. "To use any other basis of selection is to display a pathetic misunderstanding of the very purpose of an educational institution."

There was some progress in creating a Lutheran college for women. With the help of the Board of Education nine cooperating synods in 1924 chose a board of directors, which decided to found a new institution in a metropolitan area rather than attempt to gain control of an existing college. In 1926 they determined to locate near Washington, D.C., whereupon the Maryland Synod agreed to purchase and donate 179 acres of land in Silver Spring, Montgomery county, near the district line. Meanwhile, on the Gettysburg campus, there were few signs that the days of women students were numbered. Their enrollment increased from 79 in 1923-1924 to 84 in 1924-1925 and 80 in 1925-1926. Their Y.W.C.A. had existed since 1920. The faculty recognized a second sorority in 1923, the year in which a glee club and a society for women education students were formed. The women organized and elected their own officers in 1924. Beginning in 1925 they had their own rifle team. In some previous years, either the valedictorian or salutatorian had been a woman. In 1926, for the first time in the history of the College, both of these honors went to women. If we can believe the Gettysburgian, they achieved the ultimate triumph in January 1927, when their petition was granted and they won the right to attend chapel, although they had to be content with seats in the gallery.

The resolution which the trustees passed in 1923 was scheduled to go into effect at the close of the 1925-1926 year. In its issue for November 18, 1925, the Gettysburgian reported finding little support for the board's position and declared that "those who visualize a 'Greater Gettysburg' expect that the board will overrule its action and place co-education upon an improved basis." Believing that the board might reconsider its stand, the opponents once again began presenting their case. Petitions from some fifty past women students, both graduates and nongraduates, as well as from about one hundred current students of both sexes urged the board not only to reverse itself, but also to secure adequate facilities for women. The trustees chose to ignore the matter in December, but clearly
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they could not do so again in the following June. Meanwhile, the pressure continued. In the April 15, 1926 issue of the Lutheran, which reached Lutheran homes nationwide, Elsie Singmaster Lewars, a noted local author and the first woman to receive an honorary degree from the College (in 1916), argued forcefully that the College needed women as much as they needed it. Women were, after all, "the most diligent and desirable part of the student body." Virtually all agreed that coeducation was a success wherever it was tried. "Why in this age of equality and progress," she asked, "take the awkward step of abolishing it at Gettysburg?" A month later, the Maryland Synod pointedly reminded the trustees that President Hanson had "repeatedly assured this Synod and the Church that every action" it had taken in "excluding women was conditioned upon the opening of the Lutheran Women's College and that the women of the church would not be excluded . . . before such date." Since the new college was still far from becoming a reality, the synod asked the trustees to "continue for the present to admit women" and, further, to be allowed to have a representative present its case in person at the June meeting.251

The trustees listened to the synodical representatives; then heard their executive committee recommend that they vote to reaffirm the 1923 resolution; and finally, by a vote of twelve to eleven, accepted Joseph B. Baker's motion to continue to admit women through the 1929-1930 year, "in view of the delay in the opening of the Women's College." Possibly because of the evident determination of the trustees not to reverse themselves (they stated emphatically that further petitions were useless), the number of women students began dropping, from 80 in 1925-1926 to 59 in 1928-1929 and 61 in 1929-1930. The directors planning for the projected new institution secured a charter for the Lutheran College for Women in 1927 and soon thereafter announced that they had secured $150,000 in cash and pledges. Nevertheless, as the next deadline, that of 1930, approached, it was obvious that this new college was still not nearly ready to open. Not surprisingly, another round of petitions from the usual sources reached the Gettysburg trustees, in spite of their warning four years earlier. "I am heartily sick of this whole business," Board President Dapp told President Hanson in February 1930, as he sent along several fresh petitions, "and do not intend to pay any attention to letters of this character in the future."252 In June, the board refused to

251Minutes of the Maryland Synod (1926), pp. 77-78. The East Pennsylvania and Allegheny Synods also sent petitions. The West Pennsylvania Synod did not meet until October.

252John F. Dapp to Henry W. A. Hanson, Harrisburg, February 25, 1930, GCA.
reopen the question and, by a vote of sixteen to six, instructed College officials to respond to all future inquiries by stating that the board had exercised "the greatest possible care" in reaching its initial decision in 1923 and deemed it unwise to change that decision now. The last remaining women students were graduated in June 1933 and the College began the 1933-1934 year with an all-male student body.  

As the depression made it more and more unlikely that a college for women could begin functioning anytime soon, synodical petitioners demonstrated that they too could be determined and persistent. In May 1933 the West Pennsylvania synod adopted a resolution offered by the pastor of the College church, expressing the synod's "increasing concern upon the refusal of Gettysburg College to allow the girls of our congregations the privilege of attendance" and noting "a growing disaffection among the constituency of the Synod." The resolution asked the trustees to reconsider their action "in the light of present conditions, which in our opinion warrant a reversal of the existing policy." We gave the matter "prolonged and careful consideration," the trustees replied after their June meeting; we believe "very keenly that Gettysburg College should not enter the field of Co-Education."  

It was the depression which at last, quickly and effortlessly, accomplished what synods, students, alumni, and townspeople could not. During a special board meeting in April 1935, summoned in great secrecy to avoid "pressure from any source," the trustees decided, for reasons explained earlier in this chapter, to close the academy. Then they went on to abandon the position which the majority had so long and tenaciously held against all comers, and which they had restated less than two years earlier, by transforming Gettysburg from being a college for men into being a truly coeducational school. Although they did vote to limit the number of women in the student body to 150, they declared that "equal privileges shall, as nearly as possible, be given to young ladies and gentlemen attending our institution" and directed the administration to convert the academy buildings for use by women beginning in September 1935. Former synodical petitioners who happened to see

---

253According to one explanation, forcefully offered from time to time, the trustees excluded women because one of their number had in some way wronged a male student whose father was an influential trustee. While such an incident may have happened, and while it may have had some effect, it should be clear from the evidence here presented that it is at best a totally inadequate explanation of trustee action on the subject of women students.  

254Minutes of the West Pennsylvania Synod (1933), p. 73 and (1934), p. 40. Joseph B. Baker told the Compiler after this meeting that the opinion of the board was so strong against coeducation that it was useless to fight it. Compiler, June 17, 1933.
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the account of this special meeting – it appeared in several synodical minutes – may have been more than a little amused, or maybe even embittered, by its last sentence: “In making this important change, Gettysburg College has sought to enlarge its field of service to our beloved church.” In explaining to the alumni what had happened, in the alumni bulletin, President Hanson noted that, in order to survive and thrive over the years, an institution must adhere to “ideals and worthy traditions” while “constantly adjusting its policy to changing conditions.”

The College did deliver on its conditional promise to convert Gettysburg into a coeducational institution. By September 1935 there were two dormitories for women, a dining hall (which is more than the men had), a director for what was called the women's division, and access to student organizations and activities. For example, the Young Men's Christian Association quickly became the Student Christian Association. Some 64 women were recruited on short notice for the fall of 1935. There were 131 for 1936 and 142 for 1937. As their numbers increased, the board authorized a total of 175 women, first for 1941-1942 and then again for the following year. In May 1944 it authorized 250 women, but only for 1944-1945. Women outnumbered men in the student body in the two war years of 1943-1945. The class of 1944 was the first in the history of the College in which there were more women graduated than men.

In common with most colleges which were similar in size and general orientation, Gettysburg during the period covered by this chapter continued to draw most of her students from within about one hundred miles of the town in which she was located, an area

---

255 This account, which the board secretary initialed and which serves as the minutes of the meeting, makes no reference to any votes cast against closing the academy and readmitting women. See GCB (May 1935), p. 5.

256 The board had only promised women equal privileges “as nearly as possible.” As G-Books beginning in 1935 make clear, women were subject to much more stringent regulation than men.

257 An editorial in the Gettysburgian for September 19, 1935, noting the past arguments that there were no facilities for women, observed that “matters have been so revolutionized that one would think that the powers of Aladdin’s Lamp had been invoked.”

258 The Lutheran College for Women, legally renamed Grace College in 1932, never came into existence. A campaign to raise $1,600,000 foundered during the depression after having reached only about 10 percent of its goal. Once the real estate was sold in 1945, the remaining assets were turned over to the Board of Education with instructions that the income was to be used to support the education of young Lutheran women. One can follow the vicissitudes of this unsuccessful effort in the published annual minutes of any of the supporting synods. For an account of Irving College, operated for women and with a Lutheran connection, see Sack, Higher Education, 2:574-575. Located at Mechanicsburg, it was recognized by the state as a college from 1912 until it closed in 1929.

593
The editors dedicated the 1937 Spectrum to the women "who have this year returned to us as an active part of the campus life, not as a separate entity but as an associated group intent upon establishing cooperation and comradeship in accordance with all of Gettysburg's traditions, ideals, and aspirations."

within which, by no coincidence, many Lutheran families lived. In the fall of 1904, 84 percent of the students were Pennsylvanians, while about 9 percent were from Maryland. Both Presidents Hefelbower and Hanson expressed their desire to see these percentages lowered. Some progress in this direction occurred, almost all of it during the latter's administration, but as late as the fall of 1942 Pennsylvania still furnished about 68 percent of the student body. New Jersey contributed about 10 percent, Maryland 9, and New York 7.

About 75 percent of the more than six hundred students who signed their names in the matriculation book between 1904 and 1911 gave their religious affiliation as Lutheran. By the 1930s the number of Lutherans whom the registrar counted each year had dropped to about 55 percent of the enrollment; between 1940 and 1945 it stood at about 52 percent. Each year the figure was higher for women

---

250 Reasons most often given for choosing Gettysburg to the U.L.C.A. survey team in the mid-1920s were academic standards, nearness, Lutheran connection, and cost. President Hanson told the board in May 1941 that a recent poll of freshmen revealed that the two most important reasons why they chose Gettysburg were the influence of an alumnus and its academic standards. In a paper read at an Association of American Colleges conference in 1933, Dean Tilberg stated that the percentage of Gettysburg students coming from less than one hundred miles (62) was slightly lower than that for one hundred other small colleges (65.5). U.L.C.A. Survey, 1:324-325; Gettysburgian, January 18, 1934.
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students than it was for men. It was also higher than the average for all colleges affiliated with the United Lutheran Church in America, sometimes higher than any of the others.²⁶⁰ During the 1930s and early 1940s, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Evangelicals and Reformed, usually in that order, accounted for about one quarter of the Gettysburg student body. About 5 percent were Catholic and about 1 percent Jewish. Very few students stated that they had no religious affiliation.

Although the faculty had always been concerned about the academic progress and general welfare of students (undoubtedly, in the view of many who wished to hide, too much concerned), one of the most important developments within the College during the years 1904-1945 was the institutionalization of that concern in a formal advising system. When the group system went into effect in the fall of 1911, the catalogue announced that the heads of departments had “oversight in the selection of electives and in the general character of the work” of students in the group for which they were responsible. Eleven years later, when the major-and-minor system began, each entering freshman was assigned an adviser, who continued to serve in that capacity until the student selected a major field, at which time the head of that department took over. Advisers were empowered to approve, or disapprove, course schedules and were available for consultation on other matters as well.

Soon after taking office, President Hanson began arguing that the most important year for most college students was their first, when they were making an often difficult transition from the expectations of secondary school to those of college. And, he insisted, having accepted a student, a college thereby assumed the responsibility of helping to make the transition from high school a successful one. In endeavoring to meet that responsibility, the College initiated a senior sponsor system (1924); began a required yearlong freshman orientation course (1925); began a freshman orientation week program (1927); and turned Pennsylvania Hall into a freshman dormitory, with juniors and seniors as resident counselors (1940).²⁶¹

²⁶⁰See the information in the minutes of the biennial U.L.C.A. conventions.
²⁶¹The task of a senior sponsor was not strictly academic. The Gettysburgian for September 24, 1924 described it as teaching “the new students in three days as much as possible of what it took the Senior three years to learn for himself.” The first orientation week schedule, which ran for seven days before classes began, set the pattern which lasted for many years: lectures, tests, meetings, receptions, and tours, all presided over by faculty and about a dozen seniors. Apparently acting on the assumption that too much of a good thing was impossible, the dean announced in 1939 that freshman orientation was going to last an entire year. The administration viewed the freshman dormitory system as a major innovation with great potential for the successful introduction of freshmen to College life.
Accompanying the special concern for freshmen especially evident in the early Hanson administration was a determination to raise the level of academic performance required of all students. Certainly this was not a new resolve; ever since 1832 the faculty had spent much of its meeting time in warning some students, at any time during a term, that their unsatisfactory classroom performance could lead to dire consequences and in advising, or requiring, the fathers of others to come and take their sons away. During the Granville administration there was what the minutes call a dropping committee, whose function was obvious. In 1921 the faculty authorized an instructor to place on probation any student who, "because of indifference or disorderly conduct, is endangering his scholastic standing." Being in this category could lead to ineligibility to represent the College "in any way" and a warning to parents. Two years later the faculty established what soon became the scholastic standing committee and charged it with the responsibility of handling "the cases of all students whose scholarship is deficient," including counseling them frequently during a term and dropping them at the end, if necessary. No student required to withdraw could return until the opening of the next school year and then only by vote of the full faculty. Although the Gettysburgian for September 24, 1924 described the purpose of the new committee as "firing up" rather than "firing out," about 125 students were required to withdraw during 1925-1926 and there was considerable concern about the enrollment for the following year. The casualty lists were substantially smaller in subsequent years, but even during the worst of the depression about twenty students were dropped annually. It is evident that the major assignment of the first dean of men, hired in 1926, was to assume much of the work with individual students previously performed by members of the scholastic standing committee, and this continued to be the case with his successor, even after his title was changed to dean.²⁸² Through the latter, the faculty began honoring students who were doing the best academic work by establishing the Dean's Scholastic Honor List (later the Dean's Honor List), the first of which, for the fall 1929 term, was announced in March 1930.

²⁸²That President Hanson did not retreat from his initial ideas about student counseling is clear from his June 1938 report to the board. "The College has sought in every possible way to promote what might be called an Educational Clinic for its students," he wrote, "In supplying all of our students with supervision, counsel, and incentive, we are rendering real service." He believed that some students "who will reflect honor on this Alma Mater, and will make a real contribution to their day and generation," do not have "any outstanding classroom ability, but should be nurtured along with the others."
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In line with standards being recommended by national educational agencies, the normal load for Gettysburg students was fifteen or sixteen credit hours each week. The faculty usually required degree candidates to take a minimum amount of work each term (about eleven or twelve hours) and imposed a ceiling on the number of hours (about twenty) which a student was permitted to take. Throughout the period covered by this chapter there were detailed class attendance regulations, administered after 1928 by a standing faculty committee. Although these regulations became more liberal over time, as late as 1942 a student with excessive unexcused absences could have hours added to his graduation requirements or be dropped from the course with a failing grade. Soon after 1904, examinations during and at the end of the term had taken on the form familiar to so many later students. In 1928 the faculty formally recognized being snowbound as a legitimate excuse for missing an examination, a status never awarded to oversleeping. Twelve years later, it adopted the bluebook for use in midterm, final, and comprehensive examinations. For reporting student progress, the College had begun using letter grades in 1890. The 1912 catalogue was the first to use an adjective to characterize each grade: A (excellent), B (good), C (fair), D (poor, barely pass), E (failed, but entitled to another examination), F (failed utterly and must repeat with the next class), and Inc. (incomplete). The E grade was abandoned at the end of the 1938-1939 year. Until after 1945, according to the catalogue, students were required to remove F grades from their record in order to quality for graduation.

Cheating, involving one or more students, was an annoying and persistent phenomenon at Gettysburg during the years from 1904 to 1945. Although student government and the discipline committee were of some help in dealing with it, most of the burden of the problem rested on the faculty body, whose rules, though often altered,

---

263 The U.L.C.A. survey team was critical of the College for not using modern tests and measurements. However, both before and especially after the visit, the faculty did participate in the testing programs of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and other similar agencies.

264 The Gettysburgian for March 28, 1923 gave the following grade distribution for the fall 1921 term: 11 percent A, 32 percent B, 36 percent C, 15 percent D, and 6 percent E and F. See also U.L.C.A. Survey, 1:505 for a similar report a few years later. The average percentage of A grades for thirteen Lutheran colleges was 25. One college gave 67 percent A's, another gave 58, and a third 44. Grade distribution reports for Gettysburg during the 1930s were not available, but each term the dean compiled a report of averages for all students, men and women, fraternity and non-fraternity. The fall grade point average for all students for 1930-1939 was equivalent to a C plus; the spring average was about midway between a C plus and a B minus. Women always had higher averages than men (between 1935 and 1939 they were usually close to half a grade higher), and fraternity men slightly higher than non-fraternity men.
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usually required suspension for at least one term of those found guilty of the offense. Administering the rules was never easy and faculty members agonized in trying to find proper answers to recurring questions. Were there ever extenuating circumstances which should be taken into consideration? Was the seriousness of cheating in a brief quiz equal to that in a final examination? Is giving unauthorized aid as great an offense as receiving it? Should the names of the guilty be published in the Gettysburgian, announced in chapel, posted on a College bulletin board, or not be publicized at all? Three, four, and sometimes more faculty meetings each year dealt with cheating cases. Eight students found guilty of the offense were dropped in 1925-1926 and six in 1929-1930.

As early as the spring of 1906, the Gettysburgian began running a series of articles informing students of a movement under way in many other colleges to set up an academic honor system. "It proposes to do away with the system of espionage now necessary and in vogue in most colleges," declared the issue of April 18, "which makes the professor a detective and assumes that the student is a criminal in embryo." Now and later the advocates of an honor system maintained that most students, when challenged to be honest, would be and that the experiences of honesty in college would help students enhance the ideals which they should carry with them beyond their course. "If the students of Gettysburg want this system, we feel sure that the trustees and the faculty, in their desire to better the college, will gladly consent to it," declared the editor in the issue of March 10, 1909. "We believe that the adoption of this system will materially improve both the college and the students, and that it is one of the steps, which should be taken in the very near future if our College is to keep pace with the times and if our dream of a greater Gettysburg is to come true."

It proved to be much easier to identify and extol the values of an honor system than to put one into effect. The initial steps in that direction were not taken until the spring of 1912, when the faculty gave its permission for the sophomore (1914) and freshman (1915) classes to operate under the system. In the following fall, it extended the privilege to the class of 1916.

265 In February 1912 the faculty suspended a senior for cheating. About forty seniors immediately asked the faculty to reconsider its decision, not because the senior was innocent, but because the faculty had elected "to hold one man to a standard of conduct that is unobserved by others." A week later, more than fifty seniors signed a promise not to cheat, on pain of not being graduated, if the faculty would relent, which it did. There may well have been a connection between this incident and the initiative of the class of 1914.
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Since it soon became evident that, even with this commendable experiment in progress, there continued to be more cheating than either students or faculty could tolerate, the Student Council drew up a general plan for an honor system for the entire College.266 The faculty cooperated with its efforts by suspending classes for a mass meeting at which the matter could be discussed. In March 1915 the students approved the general plan, but two months later, at another mass meeting, turned down the constitution which the Student Council presented. In the fall the Pen and Sword Society, believing that the existing class systems were inadequate, began the task of gathering information about honor systems elsewhere and preparing its own version of a constitution which, by a six-to-one vote, the students approved in February 1916. After the faculty gave its blessing, the system went into immediate effect.

The honor system adopted in 1916 applied to all undergraduate students and to all "examinations and tests written in class." Each such piece of work had to include the statement: "I hereby pledge my word of honor that I have neither given nor received illegal aid during this examination." The constitution imposed on each student the responsibility for reporting immediately anyone observed either giving or receiving aid during an examination. Administration of the system was vested in the Student Council, which had the power to try persons accused of cheating and then reporting those found guilty to the faculty, which reserved the right to suspend the latter for whatever length of time it deemed appropriate. Beginning in 1918, the catalogue declared that each entering student's remaining in College was dependent upon his signing a statement "expressly accepting this Honor System."267

The unsettling campus conditions which preceded and accompanied World War I were not conducive to developing the spirit needed to sustain an honor system at Gettysburg. How poor that spirit was became evident soon after the armistice. As early as December 3, 1919, the Gettysburgian reported that many students looked upon the system (which they had formally promised to obey) as a joke. The president of the Student Council, in a letter which appeared in the April 27, 1921 issue of the newspaper, declared that "the honor system in Gettysburg College is certainly headed for the

266 For a discussion of the Student Council, see pp. 615-618. In the minds of many students, student government and an honor system went together.

267 The constitution was included in the faculty minutes of March 16, 1916. Clearly, from the very beginning the most unpopular feature of the honor system was the obligation which it imposed on every student to report others observed cheating. See the Gettysburgian for March 1, 1916; December 3, 1919; and February 3, 1926.
rocks unless everyone, . . . backs it up to their utmost ability."

News that honor systems elsewhere were in trouble and being abandoned did not help the cause, nor did the appearance on campus of two alumni to argue that Gettysburg should not follow suit. In desperation, the Gettysburgian on February 8, 1922 urged the use of "a little blood and iron" to weed out or intimidate "the violators who have almost wrecked" the system. It was too late. In April 1922, after the students had voted, six to one, to abandon it, the Student Council recommended that the honor system be suspended at once and the faculty concurred.

"After several years, when the student body has become tired of the old way," the Gettysburgian predicted on March 8, 1922, "the Honor System will come back," and probably in better form than the one being abandoned. It took thirty-five years, by any count more than several, for the return, but from time to time after 1922 the columns of the College paper were used to urge that a revival be attempted. An effort which proved abortive was made in 1926. In 1940 and 1941 the faculty approved use of an honor system in several sections of chemistry and English. A feature article which appeared in the Gettysburgian for May 3, 1945 returned to one of the arguments of almost forty years previously: "If we intend to continue under our pronounced ideals, we must establish an active honor system." Students should not be permitted to listen to "inspiring and lofty" chapel speeches at 8:45 in the morning and then cheat in an examination less than an hour later. One or the other should yield. Obviously, it should be the cheating.

Although there were many changes between 1904 and 1945 in commencement week activities and the way in which they were conducted, none lessened the character of the occasion as a gala affair, both for the graduates, alumni who returned to the campus, and townspeople who were often interested spectators. For one thing, since the number of graduates increased from 35 in 1905 to 120 in 1925 and 114 in 1943, with each passing year there were more students and more alumni who were eligible to participate in the week's events. In 1905 commencement week began with baccalaureate on Sunday morning and ended with graduation exercises on Wednesday morning. At the request of the Alumni Association, the trustees revised this schedule so that in 1930 and thereafter activities began on Friday afternoon or evening and ended following

---

268 Asked by the Student Council to express itself on the subject, the faculty in May 1920 replied: "it is the judgment of the Faculty that the Honor System ought to be retained, and that every effort be made to invigorate it, and to quicken among the students a sense of personal responsibility for the workings of the system."
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commencement on Monday. As already noted, over the years the actual graduation exercises were moved closer and closer to the beginning of June.

By long-established tradition, commencement week belonged in large part to the seniors. Although they had to share the spotlight with others, it was they, after all, who were being graduated. From 1905 to 1945, with few exceptions, one of the week's highlights was the class day exercises which the seniors conducted, somewhere on the campus. A blend of the serious and jocose which varied considerably from year to year, depending upon the participants and the times, these exercises usually included most or all of the following: calling the class roll; reading the class history, poem, prophecy, and will; the class president's mantle oration and formal turning over of the rights, privileges, and immunities of seniors to the junior class president; and making humorous presentations to several members of the class. Occasionally, when the committee in charge was a bit more playful than usual, its members included such features as a mock valedictory in 1905 or a burlesque in 1922. If the class had decided to present a gift to the College, such as a new walk or a lamp post, this was the time formally to do it. Almost always, class day exercises included music by the College orchestra or some other group. According to contemporary accounts, many were well-attended.

The seniors had first planted ivy on the campus as part of their class day exercises in 1893, but the practice thereafter was sporadic. The class of 1926 appears to have been the one to revive it, following years of disuse, by including an ivy oration in its class day program. "This will be the first year," declared the Gettysburgian for May 26, 1926, with something short of accuracy, "that the seniors will plant ivy." The vine used by the class of 1931 came from Washington Irving's home at Tarrytown, New York. Two years later, the class of 1933 held an ivy week, in mid-May, during the course of which its ivy was planted, with considerable ceremony, along the west wall of the library. Later classes through 1945 continued the practice, usually before commencement week and usually with limited interest on the part of the class members or anyone else.

Commencement week also belonged to the alumni, who had become a part of it as early as the 1830s. It provided a convenient occasion for class reunions and for conducting the ongoing business of the Alumni Association. The traditional Sunday evening Y.M.C.A. address in the College church (it lasted through 1921); the musical programs; the fraternity parties, dances, and banquets; and the baseball games were all sponsored or carried out by student organizations, but most people undoubtedly saw them as primarily
benefiting the alumni who attended. For a number of reasons, alumni involvement in the week's activities was heavier in 1945 than it had been forty years earlier.\textsuperscript{269}

Finally, commencement also belonged to the College, to that continuing corporate entity which was duly authorized to offer instruction and award degrees, and which could not be intelligently viewed apart from the trustees, administrators, and faculty who did its work. As they had done from the beginning, the trustees held their annual meeting during commencement week. In addition to the other business transacted, they approved every candidate for a bachelor's or master's degree; in 1945, as in 1905, the minutes include each graduate's name. At some convenient time near the end of commencement week, the president of the College held a reception to which alumni, students, and all others were invited. In 1905 the White House was used for this purpose, but as the attendance increased it was moved to Weidensall Hall (1923) and later (1930) to Plank Gymnasium. In later years, the reception was followed by what was called an informal get-together. Sensing the possibilities for improving College relations, President Hefelbower brought the alumni banquet from one of the town hotels onto the campus in 1905, at the very beginning of his administration.

Through 1929, baccalaureate services were held in the College church. Since its sanctuary was becoming too small to hold all of those who wanted to attend, they were moved to the Majestic Theater in the following year. This was still the place being used in 1945.\textsuperscript{270} In the early years the president of the College had always delivered the baccalaureate sermon, but Samuel G. Hefelbower, although a pastor, chose to break the custom by inviting someone else to preach. President Hanson chose not to return to the old ways. Between 1924 and 1945 he invited some of the better-known Protestant pastors in the East to deliver the sermon, occasionally the father of a member of the graduating class. Until 1917 the seniors, attired in caps and gowns and led by the president and dean, marched from the campus to the church. In that year, apparently on their own initiative and without an invitation from anyone, the faculty voted to join the procession, also in academic costume. It was only in 1917 that reference to a College marshal appears in the available sources. None was needed before this.\textsuperscript{271}

\textsuperscript{269}For a further discussion of the alumni during these years, see pp. 687-697.
\textsuperscript{270}On several occasions (1932, 1935, 1936, 1939) the services were scheduled for Memorial Field, but were moved to the theater because of the weather.
\textsuperscript{271}The marshal in 1917 was Professor Wing, in 1918-1920 Billheimer, and in 1921 Baxter. In 1922 the president named Professor Kramer marshal, a position which he held until he retired in 1956.
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Nowhere were the changes in commencement week more striking than in those which occurred in the graduation exercises themselves. In 1905 they were held in Brua Chapel on a Wednesday morning and only the graduates wore caps and gowns. The speeches of the day were given by ten seniors, supplemented by whatever brief remarks the president chose to make. All, or almost all, seniors were present, since then (as indeed also in 1945) one of the graduation requirements was participation in these exercises, unless specifically excused by the faculty. Significant changes began taking place during the first Granville commencement in June 1911, when, all for the first time, the faculty appeared in academic costume, only two seniors spoke (the valedictorian and salutatorian), and the main address was given by an outside person (the faculty specified that he should be "a distinguished speaker from abroad"). Twenty years later, in 1931, the valedictorian and salutatorian gave their speeches for the last time. 272 The first commencement speaker was Frederick H. Knubel, of the class of 1893, who was then pastor of a Lutheran church in New York City. Although a number of subsequent speakers were also alumni, most were not. Numbered among the "distinguished speakers from abroad" were Superintendent of Public Instruction Nathan C. Schaeffer (1914), former President William Howard Taft (1918), Governor William C. Sproul (1919), Secretary of the Navy Curtis D. Wilbur (1927), Senator James J. Davis (1931), Writer Lloyd C. Douglas (1935), radio commentator Hans V. Kaltenborn (1938), and then Congressman James W. Fulbright (1943). 273

Although music had been an important part of the graduation exercises for many years, until after 1900 there is no evidence of an opportunity for the audience to participate in singing a hymn or other song. During the Hefelbower administration, the words of Martin Luther's "A Mighty Fortress is Our God" appeared on the program. The first hymn sung at the Granville inaugural in 1910 was "Blessing and honor, and glory and power," which was either his favorite when he came to Gettysburg or which shortly thereafter became his favorite. As early as 1911 he began including it on the commencement program. It soon became known as the College hymn and was used each year, along with "A Mighty Fortress." Beginning in 1922, the newly written "Alma Mater" replaced the lat-

272 The first College occasion on which there was an academic procession in which the faculty was robed was the 1910 Granville inaugural. Later that year the faculty suggested (and the trustees ruled) that in the future the professors should participate in commencement exercises in academic costume. In 1913 this rule was extended to include opening exercises in the fall.

273 There were two special wartime commencements, one on January 25, and the other on September 2, 1943. Neither was assigned a number in the series.
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ter. Through 1945 the College hymn and the alma mater were used at every commencement. The College hymn was often sung during opening exercises in the fall. For much of the time between 1905 and 1945, the College orchestra furnished music for the graduation exercises.

Through 1926 graduation exercises were held in Brua Chapel. Since its auditorium was now too small to accommodate all of the graduates, parents, friends, and others, the ceremonies were moved in the following year to the recently completed Majestic Theater in the first block of Carlisle street. Unless the weather prohibited, the academic procession began at Glatfelter Hall, moved across campus, through the streets, and into the theater. The centennial year graduation and several later ones were held on Memorial Field (1932, 1935, 1938, 1939), while three were held immediately north of the Beachem portico of Pennsylvania Hall (1940, 1942, 1944). The theater was always held in readiness for use in the event of bad weather.

In 1945, as in 1905, recipients of certain College honors were announced in the commencement program. Included in the general curricular revision which went into effect in the fall of 1911 were three new honors (final, departmental final, and class) to replace the old first and second honors. Although the faculty did from time to time make some changes in the rules governing these honors, they remained in effect in 1945. In what was claimed to be an effort to encourage scholarship, the faculty decided in 1935 to begin awarding degrees cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude to students who met the requirements.

Of the six prizes being awarded in 1904, the four which were endowed (Muhlenberg Freshman, Hassler Latin, Graeff English, and Baum Mathematical) remained in 1945. To these the following had been added: Garver Greek (1918), Garver Latin (1918), Military Memorial (1924), Zimmerman Senior (1927), Stine Chemistry (1928), Nicholas Bible (1937), Chi Omega Alumnae (1938), Sceptical Chymists (1942), and Class of 1916 (1944).274

In deciding to whom to award its bachelor's degrees on commencement day, the College had since 1832 a standard of good practice derived from what were widely regarded as the better, even best, colleges in the land. Indeed, long before 1905 the trustees and faculty believed that, by its performance in this regard, Gettysburg had demonstrated that it deserved to be ranked with those

274The dates given refer to the year in which the prize was first listed in the catalogue. The winners of these prizes were named in the commencement program. Between 1904 and 1945 there were a number of unendowed prizes which were discontinued after a time; they are not included above.
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In awarding master's degrees to graduates of three years' standing, the College was following a well-established practice among sister institutions; as already noted, for good and sufficient reasons it was abandoned after 1911. In awarding master's degrees for actual graduate work done and evaluated, it was engaging in a practice in which the standards were also well-known; because of its awareness of these standards and its own difficulties in meeting them, by the 1930s the faculty had decided that Gettysburg should abandon this field to institutions better equipped to occupy it. In awarding honorary degrees, the College was also engaging in a well-established practice in American higher education, but here the available guidelines were less helpful. Here, even for the best colleges in the land, it was most nearly every one for itself. There was some guidance, though not much, in the standards for colleges recommended by the American Council on Education in 1921 for adoption by the regional accrediting agencies. One of the characteristics determining the standing of a college was declared to be its "conservatism in granting honorary degrees." 275

Ever since the early days of the College, the trustees and faculty had wrestled, sometimes with each other, over how to choose honorary degree recipients. The trustees insisted that theirs was the major responsibility, sanctified by long usage, but they were willing to listen to faculty suggestions and on occasion to ask for its advice. They did try to make their procedure more deliberative by requiring that a name be introduced at a meeting prior to the one at which it was to be voted upon. In June 1923 the trustees passed a resolution calling for a major change in the procedure by vesting the power to nominate candidates for honorary degrees in a committee of three trustees and three faculty. John B. McPherson, of Boston, who presented the resolution, later explained that he was trying to "protect the reputation" of Gettysburg by eliminating the "almost disgraceful" practice of granting as many as six to eight honorary degrees each year, especially to persons who "have done nothing in a scholarly way to warrant so distinguished a title as D.D." Several New England college presidents to whom he had spoken welcomed the protection from "constant pressure" which similarly constituted

275From time to time, the faculty continued its earlier practice of recommending that a bachelor's degree be granted as of the date when the recipient would have been graduated if he had completed his work with his original class. This practice, while it sometimes confuses, is nevertheless defensible. Much less warranted was the continuation of the practice of allowing a few persons to participate in commencement exercises who had not met all of the requirements but who, it was hoped, would complete them during the summer. A faculty resolve in 1913 to halt this practice was not always honored.

276Quoted in Educational Record, 3 (January 1922):63.
committees in their institutions had afforded them. Several years later, the findings and recommendations of the U.L.C.A. survey team clearly echoed both the intent and provisions of the McPherson resolution, even to the point of stating that the faculty should vote on all candidates for honorary degrees. "The conferring of honorary degrees is a privilege," they wrote, "which should be adequately safeguarded."277

The committee which the McPherson resolution established was never appointed and in December 1925 the resolution was repealed.278 The already existing degree committee, all of whose members were trustees, continued to function without interruption. To give its members a minimum of protection, their names disappear from the 1928 and subsequent catalogues. Correspondence still in the College archives testifies to the pressures which persisted as individuals and congregations exercised their right to recommend candidates they deemed worthy, especially of divinity degrees.

Between 1905 and 1945 the College awarded 338 honorary degrees, an average of about eight annually.279 Of these, 173 were doctorates in divinity, 67 in laws, 38 in science, and 23 in literature; 17 were masters in arts; and 20 were other degrees. Before 1910 recipients did not participate in the commencement exercises; few were even present. The president simply announced that their degrees had been awarded. Beginning with the Granville inaugural in 1910, a citation was prepared and read as the degree was presented in person. About two-thirds of the recipients, and almost all of the D.D.'s, were alumni. Most of the M.A.'s were public school officials. Between 1904 and 1945 several persons received honorary degrees from the College on two separate occasions.

Gettysburg used the honorary degree to recognize the achievements in higher education (arts and sciences, theology, medicine) of some of its most distinguished alumni: John Aberly (1905, 1936), Edgar Fahs Smith (1906), Rufus B. Weaver (1907), Allen J. Smith (1910, 1921), William J. Gies (1914, 1924), Luther A.

277John B. McPherson to Percy D. Hoover, Boston, April 2, 1926, GCA: U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:22-24. The team found that, among twelve Lutheran colleges, only Wittenberg had granted more honorary degrees than Gettysburg in 1922-1926. Its report is especially helpful in understanding how a group of colleges handled honorary degrees and what the team believed were the proper criteria for granting them.

278One possible reason for the failure of the McPherson resolution was that its author was rarely present at board meetings to defend it. He attended only one of the five meetings between its passage and repeal.

279It should be noted that the U.L.C.A survey team was more critical of the number of honorary degrees than of the character of those receiving them. "While the total number of honorary degrees awarded by the Lutheran colleges is excessive," they concluded, "there appears to have been no actual abuse in other respects of this privilege among the colleges." Ibid., 2:24.
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Weigle (1917, 1934), J. A. Singmaster (1920), Luther P. Eisenhart (1921, 1926), Abdel Ross Wentz (1921, 1940), Samuel G. Hefelbower (1925), Joseph E. Rowe (1930), Levering Tyson (1930), Jacob Diehl (1931), Harold S. Diehl (1935), and Millard E. Gladfelter (1942).280

The trustees were reluctant to use the honorary degree to recognize regionally or nationally known persons who were not alumni. When they did so, it was often as part of some special event. During the Granville inaugural in 1910, Ira Remsen, famous chemist and president of The Johns Hopkins University, received an LL.D. Seven years later, on the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation, Arthur C. McGiffert, church historian and president of Union Theological Seminary, received the same degree. During its centennial exercises in 1932 the College awarded President Herbert C. Hoover a doctorate of laws, in absentia. Finally, in 1944, when the annual national governors' conference was held in Hershey, and the governor of Virginia was the commencement speaker, the College awarded honorary degrees to three state executives. On three occasions it granted degrees to women. The first was Elsie Singmaster Lewars, local author, in 1916. The second was Margaret Himes Seebach, one of the first two women graduates of the College in 1894, editor of Lutheran Woman's Work for many years, who received a doctor of literature degree in 1943. The third was Sophia Jepson, a pioneer Lutheran deaconess affiliated with the Baltimore Motherhouse for some thirty years, who received a doctor of human laws degree in 1945. There is little evidence that the board during this period used the honorary degree as a device to raise money for the College, although it may have awarded some D.D.'s in the hope of encouraging congregations or some of their wealthy members to respond with contributions. A few years after the College awarded a doctor of science degree to John L. Rothrock, of the class of 1885, he gave $50,000 toward the new chapel.281

By long tradition, commencement week at Gettysburg College was a favorite time to make presentations, memorialize friends, and dedicate new buildings. For example, the New Recitation Building was renamed Glatfelter Hall in 1912, and walks and the south gateway were presented in 1913. Weidensall Hall was dedicated in 1922, Plank Gymnasium in 1927, Breidenbaugh Hall in 1929, and the north or Beachem Portico of Pennsylvania Hall in 1937.

280 On three occasions the College awarded honorary degrees to members of its staff. In 1914 Dean Bikle and Principal Huber received D. D.'s and in 1944, one year after his retirement, the board granted an Sc.D. to Clyde B. Stover, longtime chemistry professor and registrar. The faculty recommended the latter.

281 Between 1923 and 1942 commissions were awarded during the commencement exercises to students who had completed the advanced R.O.T.C. course and qualified for them.
Students

Although by 1904 College spokesmen no longer talked about operating the institution in the manner of a well-regulated family, they had retreated scarcely an inch, if at all, from a conviction which they shared with the founders of 1832. Gettysburg College was a place for one to engage in sound learning, but it was at the same time, and of equal or even greater importance, a place to develop sound character. \(^{282}\) Whatever retreat from that conviction had occurred by 1945, at least as far as those who spoke with authority on behalf of the College were concerned, also had to be measured in inches. \(^{283}\) Perhaps many who used the word character were no clearer in their understanding of what it meant than were the national educational agencies which were insisting that "good moral character" should be the first requirement for admission to any college. Lack of clarity on this point seems to have deterred no one from affirming and reaffirming it.

However limited might have been the comprehension of what the word character means, there are available examples from all sides to illustrate the importance which, formally at least, was attached to the twofold mission of the College. The 1905 catalogue summoned students to attain "a high standard of scholarship and manly conduct." The revised statement in the 1911 catalogue persisted with no major changes through 1942. The purpose of the College as there described was to "develop the greatest possible individuality and highest manhood of the student." Prevailing campus influences were said to tend "to lead young men to an active Christian life and to a full realization of their personal responsibilities." With the return of women in 1935, the statement was altered to read "manhood and womanhood" and "young men and young women."

Alumni, faculty, and successive Gettysburgian editors formulated the ideal in their own words, but it was the president of the College who was repeatedly called upon to speak for the institution. "It is the proudest boast of Gettysburg College that she is a Christian college," President Granville told the entering freshmen in 1920, "and you will certainly fail to receive the full benefits of your

\(^{282}\) For a fuller treatment of student life in this period, see Anna Jane Moyer, The Way We Were: A History of Student Life at Gettysburg College, 1832-1982 (Gettysburg, 1982).

\(^{283}\) An advertisement which the College was using about 1930 (for example, in the November 1929 Mercury) described her spirit as liberal and progressive, her work as thorough and sound, and her aim the promotion of - note the order - character and scholarship.
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college course unless you strive for the ideals of a truly Christian manhood." Further, he explained, "an education in which character building is not the most important element . . . . cannot be a true education at all, but only a very crudely executed counterfeit of the real thing, an imitation which should deceive no one." 284 One of the seemingly endless expressions of the ideal by President Hanson during his long tenure simply echoed his predecessor. "An education which does not regard as fundamental the development of character," he told the trustees in December 1925, "is no education at all."

The 1905 catalogue summoned students, not only to attain "a high standard of scholarship and manly conduct," but also to assist "in the preservation of good order," without which, in the firm opinion of trustees and faculty alike, neither sound learning nor the building of character could occur. In that year the current edition of College rules and regulations, deemed necessary for good order in the institution, was that adopted in 1899. It still specified hours for study, recreation, and sleep; regulated when students were expected to be in their rooms, or on campus; defined five types of what were called misdemeanors; and described the demerit system. The next edition of the rules did not appear until 1914, when the trustees finally put their stamp of approval on a revision which the faculty had initiated in 1907, but which a change in administration and other important business had long delayed. The general tone of the new document was quite different from that of its many predecessors. Gone were the "detailed references to any delinquencies" which had remained as late as 1899, but the reader was now warned that the faculty intended to "protect the moral integrity of the student body by punishing any infringement of good morals." Students no longer actually signed the matriculation oath, now called a pledge, but the text of the latter was unchanged from that of 1899 and each person was told that by enrolling in College he agreed to "conform his conduct with its requirements." Compulsory chapel and church attendance, as well as detailed regulations governing absence from class, still remained, as did the demerit system. In addition, during most of the time between 1904 and 1942 the College still required students from outside Gettysburg to room in dor-

2841920 G-Book, p. 5.
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mitories. Exceptions to this rule, many of which were later granted, were considered privileges rather than rights, for which students could be charged $7.50 each semester.285

True to its promise, the faculty did try to protect the students' "moral integrity" by continuing to punish what it took to be "any infringement of good morals." Its efforts to deal with cheating have already been discussed; those involving hazing will be treated later in this section. Among the other infringements were intoxication; disorderly conduct in classroom, chapel, or dormitory; damaging or destroying property; gambling; and theft. Early in this period, it was the faculty as a body which dealt with these offenses, and the minutes were filled, as they had been since 1832, with the details. Once the Student Council began functioning in 1910, it assumed some of the burdens, but the faculty retained the right to review and the power to overrule its decisions. A regular standing discipline committee established in 1914 further relieved the full faculty. After 1920 about the only items relating to discipline which came before it were policy matters and cheating cases.

As before, the faculty could penalize offenders by handing out demerits, taking away remaining cuts, suspending students for the period of time thought to be commensurate with the offense (it was a further and serious offense for a nonresident suspended student not to leave the community), and dropping or expelling a student. As before, the trustees supported the faculty in matters of discipline. Forgetting that in 1871 they had delegated the power to expel to the faculty, the trustees delegated it again in 1915. By arguing that the evidence on which they were found guilty was faulty, that the procedures used in their case were irregular, or that they were truly repentant, many students secured almost immediate repeal of their sentences. "About a dozen fellows were suspended last week," according to the Gettysburgian for December 11, 1907. "They easily got matters arranged so that they were permitted to remain in college."

Although both faculty and trustees often concerned themselves with standards of student conduct after 1914, the rules and regulations adopted in that year were the last in the long series of general legislation on the subject which had begun eighty years earlier. From this point on, the action taken was peacemeal and, although not all would agree, in the direction of fewer and simpler regulations. For example, in 1920 the faculty abandoned the demerit

285Until 1938, except briefly in a few cases, the College did not furnish dormitory rooms. The catalogue informed new students that no-longer-needed furniture was usually sold to the next occupant of a room and that the College engaged an independent appraiser to assist, if desired, in making the sale. A used furniture dealer near the campus sold to many students.
system which it had used for half a century, undoubtedly with more pain to the professors than to the students, who early learned how to get around the numbers and who were thus often able to do almost as they pleased. Under the new rules, suspension followed exceeding the number of permitted absences from chapel, church, or class.286

In the fall of 1904 each student, unless a resident of Gettysburg living at home, had three obligations similar to those in effect since the beginnings of the College and closely associated with its character as a church-related institution. Early each Sunday morning he had to attend what was called a Biblical recitation, an hour-long service which the chaplain conducted on campus. Later that morning he was required to be at worship services in the College church, unless he had written parental permission to attend some other church. An increasing number of students obtained such permission, but until 1920 they had to report every Monday morning to the proctor, assuring him that they had been in church the day before. Finally, six mornings a week each student had to attend exercises in Brua Chapel. Long before 1945 the first two of these obligations had been eliminated. The third continued in force well beyond that date.

Quite possibly prodded by President Hefelbower, who believed that Gettysburg was requiring too many religious exercises of its students and should encourage more voluntary effort on their part, in the fall of 1905 the faculty halved the time allotted to the Biblical exercise. With board authorization, a year later the faculty voted (Professor Himes wanted his negative vote recorded) to eliminate the requirement altogether. Students who still wished to attend an early service could go to the one which the Y.M.C.A. now conducted in Pennsylvania Hall. The editor of the Gettysburgian, in the September 26, 1906 issue, saw this move as a step "to that order of affairs when men shall know no compelling force save their personal responsibility to a Higher Power."

The next step in that worthwhile direction was long in coming. Since some students knew how they might avoid the penalties for excessive absences from church while others were willing to attend without being attentive, there was no major, sustained student campaign to eliminate the requirement. However, in the middle 1920s the long sermons and seemingly longer prayers of an aging pastor reopened the periodic campus discussion of the subject and convinced

286 The faculty adopted the new rules in October 1919 and they became effective in February 1920. The Gettysburgian for February 4, 1920 believed the new system more stringent than the one which had demerits as a buffer between offense and punishment. However, it did not take into consideration students' capacity to modify almost any system to their advantage.
College officials that something needed to be done. In 1927 they persuaded the congregation to adopt what was called the university system, under which the pastor would continue performing his other duties, but relinquish his pulpit during the academic year to outside preachers who presumably would give sermons more attuned to the needs of current College students. If this arrangement was intended to preserve the old requirement, neither it nor the coming of a new and much younger pastor early in 1930 was able to overcome the growing student resistance to the status quo.

At some point, about 1929, the administration simply stopped enforcing the church rule. In December 1931 President Hanson told the trustees what had been done and asked them to make it official. Placing the best possible interpretation on the matter, he stated that many students were going home over the weekends and that, in his opinion, the time spent with their families was "on the whole sufficiently beneficial to outweigh other items which are lost by this arrangement." More accurately, he told the trustees bluntly that "for the last two years it has been found impossible to enforce the rule." The trustees accepted what they took to be inevitable and the 1932 catalogue enunciated the College belief that "regular church attendance is an essential part of the life of any young man," especially when he is "away from the incentives and restraints of the home." Consequently, the College was now urging students to attend Sunday services and assured them that all of the churches of Gettysburg would welcome them into their sanctuaries. One looks in vain to the pages of the Gettysburgian for evidence that the church rule was not being enforced in 1929-1931 and that the trustees repealed it in the latter year. This obligation, which was on the books for almost exactly a century, ended in an inaudible whimper rather than even a modest bang. Soon after College opened in September 1931, the first in a long series of annual communion services for students and faculty was held in the College church. These were completely voluntary events, and in the early years several hundred persons attended them. For some time the College also conducted an Ash Wednesday communion service in the church.

The third obligation of a religious character resting upon the student in 1904 was the daily service in Brua Chapel. Penalties for excessive absences changed over time. At first there were demerits, followed by suspension. Beginning in 1920, there was suspension

---

287See the Gettysburgian for October 6, 1926 and April 27, 1927. Alumni disposed to criticize what happens on the campus long after they have been graduated and prone to argue that in the good old days rules were enforced and tolerably well obeyed should ponder carefully how the administration yielded to the students and abandoned this ancient requirement.
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without any intermediate penalty. Beginning in 1929, there was an addition to the graduation requirement. In 1942, a student was warned after incurring ten absences in a semester, had one hour added to the graduation requirement after fifteen, and was referred to the discipline committee after twenty. Early in the century the entire faculty was constantly dealing with "religious delinquents," students whose demerits exceeded the point beyond which sanctions were in order. After about 1920, chapel cuts became increasingly an administrative concern.

Some students used up all of their chapel credit at the beginning of the semester, while others saved theirs to be expended gloriously at the end. Some students engaged others to occupy their chapel seats, in the hope that those who took attendance would not notice or would not care. Others went to Brua dutifully enough, but used the time for their own purposes, such as reading newspapers, carrying on conversations, studying for a test, or sleeping. Some tried to prevent or disrupt the service, by spreading molasses on the seats, removing name tags from the seats, throwing hymnals, or coming late. There is some evidence that at least a few accepted the chapel requirement, went out of conviction or ignorance, and could testify to certain benefits from the experience.

While the church requirement produced only occasional complaint in the pages of the Gettysburgian, the fact that students had to attend chapel five or six times a week was the subject of perennial comment. Should we have to go to chapel? That was the question which the editor posed in the issue of December 15, 1909. "The Gettysburgian dare not print the popular student answer to this question," he replied, "but surely it may present the question and suggest answers on both sides." On the one hand, he concluded, "compulsion and true worship are poor partners." On the other, chapel was the only way for the student body to know "itself as a community, as a family." In the issue of April 11, 1923, after Granville had left and before Hanson came, another editor called for abolition of compulsory chapel and replacing it with a voluntary morning gathering directed by students. "The present chapel service does not include any of the essentials of true religion," he maintained. "It is hypocritical and lacking in reverence to the Almighty Spirit, who demands and is entitled to the true worship of the true soul, and not the artificial worship prevalent at our chapel services." Still another editor on January 10, 1935 insisted that compulsory chapel had "evolved into a humdrum affair" which no longer served the intended purpose of religious inspiration. While most students wanted it eliminated, he believed they realized that the College's church connection made any change unlikely in the near future. He warned
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that faculty and students needed to cooperate in yet another attempt to improve the services, since “an unwholesome feeling of scorn and ridicule is being engendered among students by chapel as it is.”

While many saw the abolition of compulsory chapel as the only satisfactory solution to the problem, others, concluding that this was not about to happen, suggested alterations designed to make the requirement more palatable. In an effort to please, the faculty was not averse to experimenting with different times for holding the services, which occurred as early as 7:40 A.M. and as late as noon. The time in 1942 was 8:35 A.M. In 1930 Saturday chapel was eliminated and the services went to five days a week. Few faculty ever attended chapel. Their rare presence elicited comment. “What will happen next?” asked the Gettysburgian of December 8, 1909. “‘Pop’ Nixon was seen in chapel last week.” Both trustees and students suggested occasionally that the obligation would be more acceptable if the faculty shared it. The latter demurred. Many persons urged that there should be separate and distinct worship services and assemblies.

Early in his tenure, President Hanson responded to criticism of chapel by using more outside speakers. He took the Wednesday morning service which his predecessor had selected and used it for the inspirational talk he was thoroughly accomplished at delivering. By the later 1930s the S.C.A. was responsible for two of the weekly programs and a third day was set aside for class meetings. On the subject of eliminating required chapel Hanson remained adamant. “If the students will not attend chapel, they cannot stay in college,” he told the U.L.C.A. survey team shortly after coming to Gettysburg. “About certain things the bars go down and the students know they are down to stay.” The requirement remained in 1945 and, bars or no bars, so did the problem. “Chapel is not entirely worthless,” wrote the Gettysburgian editor on February 10, 1944, “although the attitude and actions of many in the student body would make it seem so.” In the face of “inattendance, inattention, and a definite lack of enthusiasm,” the most imaginative suggestion the editor had was still another change in time and more religion.

Near the end of the Hefelbower administration, and after previous efforts to establish student government – except for the occasional mass meeting – had failed, students and faculty began again to discuss the possibilities. The lead story in the Gettysburgian

---

288 While an undergraduate, this author was firmly convinced that the faculty should come to chapel regularly and be seated in the balcony, where all could see them. Soon after joining the faculty, strangely enough, he changed his opinion.

A GREATER GETTYSBURG

Student Council
Sitting solemnly for the 1922 Spectrum.

for February 23, 1910 declared that "the college of to-day must cope with the problems of citizenship, if it is to hold its place in our country" and that the experience of other colleges with student government "has been of such a nature, as to make imperative a trial of this system, if we are to keep up with our rivals." With three faculty members as advisers, an elected student committee drew up the inevitable constitution which, with the sanction of students, faculty, and trustees, went into effect in September 1910. This document provided for a Student Council of four seniors, three juniors, two sophomores, and one freshman, chosen by their classes for one-year terms. Several new constitutions were adopted in following years, but there was no change in the size of this body until 1942. In that year it was replaced by a Campus Senate of nineteen persons: one representative chosen by each of eleven fraternities, two sororities, the nonfraternity men, and the nonsorority women; and four faculty members. When women students returned in the fall of 1935, they formed their own student government association, with its own council.290

As stated in the 1910 constitution, the purpose of student government was "to strive for the betterment of student conditions at Gettysburg and to provide in every possible way for the maintenance of student morale." To achieve that end, the council was empowered to "maintain a general surveillance over all student life" and was accorded "the privilege of consultation with the Faculty in all mat-

290 At the suggestion of the Student Council, the first president of the student body was elected in 1922. His duties included presiding at mass meetings and other general student affairs.
ters of student discipline." It was authorized to try suspected offenders and to impose penalties not subject to review or appeal, except where they were suspensions or expulsions.

Student government at Gettysburg got off to a most auspicious start. The faculty included the names of the ten members of the Student Council in the 1911 catalogue, a practice continued through 1942. Presidents and faculty praised the energy and good judgment of the councilors, who began making suggestions for improving all phases of dormitory, campus, and academic life. They urged the faculty to take steps to insure lighter halls and cleaner lavatories in the dormitories, as well as greater fire protection on the campus. They offered to revive the museum and began an annual award to the fraternity with the highest academic average. In its issue for July 26, 1915 the Independent, a well-known national magazine, praised the council for having "invented" Take-It-Back-Day, on which all borrowed items were to be returned to their owners.

Writing in the 1911 G-Book, the first president of the Student Council stressed the honor and responsibility of each member of the community as major reasons for the existence of student government. Not surprisingly, therefore, the council was the body responsible for administering the honor system introduced in 1916. The faculty's somewhat different priorities at this time are indicated by the paragraph describing student government which they included in the 1911 and subsequent catalogues. According to them, the Student Council was "a trial of self-government" designed to act as "a medium of communication between the students and the Faculty." That it "acts in certain matters of discipline" was the only specific thing said about it. Reporting to the trustees in June 1911, President Granville stated that, during its first year in operation, the Student Council was so successful in handling these matters that "not a single case of order or discipline in the college has been even considered by the faculty." Unfortunately, he could not continue making such glowing reports. During the next few years the Student Council faced the most serious crisis of its existence, one which threatened to destroy the experiment begun so optimistically in the fall of 1910. The causes of this crisis were rooted in the early twentieth-century manifestations of old phenomena: class spirit and rivalry.

291 That many of these suggestions had little or no effect is not here the point.
292 See p. 674.
In the fall of 1904 the College had two literary societies, a Y.M.C.A., six social fraternities, several musical and debating clubs, a fledgling dramatics society, and a few additional organizations, most of which proved to be ephemeral. Over the next forty years the literary societies and the Pen and Sword Society disappeared; the Y.M.C.A. was transformed into a body which gave equal place to women students; the social fraternities increased their standing within the College; music, debating, and dramatics were expanded considerably; and a host of new organizations made their appearance.

The Philomathaean and Phrenakosmian literary societies were the two oldest student organizations in 1904, in which year every member of the graduating class belonged to one or the other. For years faculty and alumni had proclaimed that their meetings, with the debates, orations, and essays, contributed to a student's fund of information, facility for oral and written expression, and readiness to furnish leadership both in and after College. Well before 1904, however, it was evident that the literary societies no longer occupied the almost unchallenged position which was theirs during the first half century of the College's existence. "At present class spirit, fraternity spirit, love for music and for athletics, are the chief centers" of student interest, President Hefelbower told the board in June 1907, "and, unfortunately, the literary society life is at a low ebb, when compared with that of twenty years ago." Then and later, the pages of the Gettysburgian abound with information about the current pulse of the societies (it went up and down), what was wrong with them, and how they might be cured of their malady. President Granville joined many others in recommending that membership in the societies be made compulsory, a certain sign that their condition was indeed serious. A writer in the May 29, 1912 issue of the Gettysburgian criticized the societies themselves for their decline. Although conditions have changed greatly, he argued, "our societies have kept on using the same methods as were used in the older days with the result that they are dead, the inevitable end of any organization which will not change its methods to suit the conditions." Alumni serve no useful purpose, he said, when they tell us what the societies did for them years ago. Whether the societies could have evolved sufficiently to survive and still remain literary societies is uncertain. What is certain is that they did go from bad to worse. For some time, the members complained of the competition from basketball on their Friday meeting night. A new specter was reported in the Gettysburgian for February 5, 1919, when only "a handful of men" chose to attend meetings of the literary societies; all the rest
went uptown to see Douglas Fairbanks and Cleopatra on the screen. Then and later, there were long periods of time when the societies scarcely functioned.

The percentage of graduates belonging to either Philo or Phrena dropped from 100 percent in 1904 to 61 in 1915 and 42 in 1920. The end finally came in the spring of 1924, when in a joint meeting members of both societies formally dissolved their organizations. Their little-used space in Glatfelter Hall, which the College had coveted for years, but which was long considered sacrosanct, was converted into three classrooms (Phrena) and a library reading room (Philo). The two sizable book collections, which the College library had been trying for more than a decade to incorporate into its own collection, now became part of it. It remained only for the trustees in June 1924 to express their regret “that the old Literary Societies had passed away,” and to “record with appreciation the splendid spirit of both societies in bequeathing their assets and possessions to the college.”

Unlike the literary societies, the Y.M.C.A. in 1904 was one of the most successful, if not the most successful, of the student organizations. Its programs were completely voluntary, a feature which undoubtedly made them more attractive. In the years immediately following 1904, between one-half and three-fourths of the students were members, many of them young men headed for the seminary. The Y.M.C.A. sponsored numerous programs, some of which took students off campus. Its activities included regular meetings, worship services, Bible studies, lectures, concerts, support of missions, preparation of the G-Book, receptions for new students, and an address which was part of the commencement program (through 1921). One of the longest lasting of its activities was the week of prayer, which had begun before 1904 and which became religion-in-life week in 1940. These two events brought many well-known preachers to the campus. The Gettysburg Y.M.C.A. was affiliated with several state and national organizations, whose annual meetings students regularly attended, either as delegates or officers. They also participated in the famous conferences at Northfield, Massachusetts, and in the Student Volunteer Movement.

During much of the period covered by this chapter, the Y.M.C.A. had two distinct advantages over every other student organization: after 1908 the services of a staff member and after 1922 a building as a base of operations. These two advantages were closely related. As President Hefelbower explained to the trustees in June 1910, he

---

293 Literary societies continued to exist after 1924 at Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, and some Lutheran colleges. Ibid., 2:379-383.

618
early became convinced of "the need of a practical religious worker among the students," someone who could play "the part of the older brother to the young men." It was his experience, he wrote, that "frequently the young man who is in greatest need of counsel and guidance cannot well be approached by a member of the Faculty." He reminded the trustees that "progressive institutions are providing, so far as possible, for a wholesome and normal exercise of the social instincts of students," something which can best occur "in a separate building under the auspices of the Christian organizations of the College, equipped with rooms provided for free and easy social converse, games, reading, public addresses, etc." He had found that many friends of the College believed "no field of opportunity for helping to mould the characters of young men who are entrusted to us is more important than this." He was in full agreement: "the College needs a well equipped V.M.C.A. building."

In June 1908 the trustees approved for one year the president's request that they establish the position of Y.M.C.A. secretary, but with the understanding that the incumbent's salary would not come from College funds. A year later, the board decided to continue the position, but made no commitment to alter the financial arrangements. Heffelbower secured the needed funds in the first instance from a group of women headed by Mrs. Mary Gingrich Stuckenberg. In 1911 these women joined others to organize the Woman's League, which into the 1930s paid part or all of the secretary's salary. Between September 1908 and June 1943 a total of sixteen men served in this position. Nine were graduates of the College who did the work while they were seminary students. Several also held other College posts, such as canvasser for students, registrar, football coach, or faculty member. About half served for one year only. Nevertheless, their leadership and continuity contributed in a major way to the success of the Y.M.C.A. In 1943 the office was dropped and its duties were incorporated into those of the newly named chaplain of the College.294

The building which President Heffelbower believed the College needed did not become a reality until 1922. When it finally did, there were rooms for meetings of all kinds, study, and recreation; space for receptions; as well as the College's first swimming pool. The Woman's League not only raised the money to pay for the building;

they also contributed funds to support the programs which it housed. After five years of effort, and with the financial help of the Woman's League, the Y.M.C.A. in 1933 completed work on a cabin in the mountains near Cashtown, where small meetings and retreats could be held.295

Soon after the Y.M.C.A. moved into Weidensall Hall, it dropped membership dues and for a time regarded every student as a member of the organization. In 1937 it abandoned this policy in favor of categories of active and associate membership. When women returned to the campus in the fall of 1935, the Y.M.C.A. promptly became the Student Christian Association. This change coincided with the return to campus of Donald R. Heiges of the class of 1931. His tenure as secretary, extending from 1935 until the office was superseded in 1943, was far longer than that of any other person to hold the position.

Under the guidance of the new secretary, the S.C.A. program was expanded to include Sunday evening vespers, Thursday evening candlelight services, a fireside hour during which many contemporary issues were presented and discussed, forum talks on topics of current concern, the Beachem Athletic Award, and responsibility for two chapel services each week.296 Members of the S.C.A. had opportunities to contribute both time and money to numerous causes in which they were interested, both in Adams county and elsewhere.

In his annual reports to the Woman's League, Heiges stressed that it was his intention to strengthen as much as he could the Christian emphasis of the organization and to offer sound guidance to individual students who sought it. He praised the members for their willingness to carry the program with a minimum of prodding on his part. When the S.C.A. observed the seventy-fifth anniversary of its founding in 1942, there were 236 active members. The first woman president, Dorothy J. Keeney, was elected in 1944.297

In the fall of 1904 there were six national social fraternities at Gettysburg College: Phi Kappa Psi, Phi Gamma Delta, Sigma Chi, Phi Delta Theta, Alpha Tau Omega, and Sigma Alpha Epsilon. The Druids was a local fraternity. Close to 40 percent of the student body were members of these seven organizations. With College permi-

295Osoga Lodge, which became available to College students in the fall of 1935, was so much more serviceable than the Y.M.C.A. cabin that the latter was soon sold.
296These were of course not the first discussions of contemporary issues by the Y.M.C.A. Beginning in 1937, the Beachem Athletic Award was given to a male senior in memory of the College's first alumni secretary and in recognition of Christian character, scholarship, and athletic achievement.
297See W. Kent Gilbert III, ed., 75 Years of Christian Growth; The Student Christian Association of Gettysburg College, 1867-1942.
sion, the first four named had already built chapter houses on the campus, and Alpha Tau Omega was completing its house on North Washington street, near the main entrance. Although the faculty made only a passing reference to these fraternities in the annual catalogues (strange as it may seem, it did not list them by name until 1945), by 1904 they had won their battle for recognition and were already establishing themselves as formidable centers of student power and alumni loyalty.

Between 1904 and 1945 the number of national fraternities increased from six to ten. Unlike the first six, all of the new ones began as local clubs. The Druids, organized in 1897, became Phi Sigma Kappa in 1925. Theta Phi, dating from 1909, became Kappa Delta Rho in 1928. Phi Sigma, formed in 1916, joined Theta Kappa Nu in 1924 (becoming the first new national fraternity at Gettysburg in forty-one years) and then Lambda Chi Alpha in 1939. Delta Sigma Kappa, organized in 1916 and then reorganized in 1920, after being disrupted during World War I, became Tau Kappa Epsilon in 1926. The Criterion and Star Clubs, both of which gained faculty recognition as social organizations in 1923, merged nine years later to form Phi Kappa Rho, a local fraternity. In the issue of January 18, 1928, the Gettysburgian editor argued that ten national fraternities had brought the College to "the saturation point" and that no more were needed. Two years later the secretary used the same term in describing the sentiments of the faculty.\(^{298}\)

There were three national sororities in 1945, all of which began as local organizations. Beta Lambda was formed in 1916 and Gamma Phi in 1923. Both became inactive when the last women students were graduated in 1933; both were promptly reactivated when women students returned two years later. Gamma Phi joined Chi Omega in 1937 and Beta Lambda became a chapter of Delta Gamma in 1939. A third local sorority, Phi Phi Phi, organized in 1942, affiliated with Phi Mu in 1945. Chi Alpha Sigma, described as a nonsorority organization, also began in 1942.\(^{299}\) By the late 1930s, about two-thirds of the students were members of fraternities and sororities.

Between 1904 and 1945 two related developments greatly increased the influence of fraternities in College life. The first of these was their acquisition of houses – in the parlance of the time, they were called fraternity dormitories – in which, with faculty and

\(^{298}\) The Gettysburgian for May 24, 1934 reported that Jewish students had organized their own fraternity, Delta Sigma Chi.

\(^{299}\) A sorority, Iota Lambda Delta, formed in November 1903, had a short life, disappearing from the Spectrum after 1905.
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trustee permission, members ate, slept, and otherwise lived together. The second development was the larger and larger role which fraternities played in College social life.

In the fall of 1904, when students were still required to obtain permission to room anywhere other than in College dormitories, the quarters which fraternities rented or owned were used for chapter meetings and small social events, but for little else. The campaign to change this situation, which required almost twenty years to complete, began in December 1904, when the oldest fraternity, Phi Kappa Psi, asked the faculty for permission to buy a house in which its members could room and board. Claiming that it had no authority to act in the matter, the faculty in June 1905 presented the request to the trustees, who by deferring action "for the present" indicated clearly where they stood.

The second and more ambitious phase of the campaign began in November 1911, when once again Phi Kappa Psi asked the trustees for permission to build a house "to be used by the active chapter of our fraternity for dormitory, and all other living purposes, the said chapter to remain under the full control of the College authorities." Three alumni joined four undergraduates in signing the petition, which was presented first to the faculty for its review. Unlike six years earlier, when it declined to express itself on the question one way or the other, the faculty now recommended that the trustees grant the request, but only after the fund-raising campaign then in progress was completed and after satisfactory understandings were reached concerning fraternity house rules, as well as the financial need to keep College dormitories fully occupied. In justifying its positive recommendation, the faculty cited the strong demand from both students and alumni; the attractiveness of fraternity dormitories "in several colleges which are our strongest competitors," a fact which student canvassers reported was already working to the disadvantage of Gettysburg; the increasing number of students from "well-to-do-homes" wanting "the modern conveniences which neither College dormitory could offer unless prohibitively expensive renovations were made"; and the belief that increasing enrollment would soon make it possible to fill both College dormitories and fraternity houses, presumably to everyone's satisfaction.\footnote{\textit{The Gettysburgian} gave equal time to both sides of the question. In the issue of December 7, 1913 it reprinted the letter which the fraternity sent to every board member, with supporting documents, including the faculty recommendation. In the issue of January 14, 1914, it reprinted the letter of John B. McPherson, opposing fraternity dormitories. The registrar reported in December 1913 that, with only two rooms unoccupied, 203 students lived in the dormitories and 89 in town.}
Although the trustees received the Phi Kappa Psi request in December 1911, they managed to delay acting on it until June 1914, when a five-man committee unanimously recommended that it be denied. Most of the more than fifty college and university presidents whom the members had consulted were opposed to fraternity dormitories. This testimony only confirmed the belief of the committee members that fraternity dormitories for Gettysburg College were unwise. Among other objections, they considered these houses undemocratic and likely to advance the social at the expense of the academic. The committee report was so convincing that the trustees unanimously adopted its recommendations.

The third and final phase of the campaign to institute fraternity dormitories did not occur until after World War I. In the meantime, both trustees and faculty approved the construction of several new chapter houses on the campus (none was actually built) and permitted two, and no more, students to live in a chapter house on or off campus, but only if they were acting as caretakers. Then, in June 1922, the other Greek letter societies joined Phi Kappa Psi in yet another petition for fraternity dormitories. This was precisely when the trustees were beginning to consider resolutions to limit College enrollment to five hundred students and to exclude women. Before acting on this latest petition, according to custom, the trustees sought the opinion of the faculty, which turned out to be much more lukewarm to the proposal than had been the case eleven years earlier. After considerable delay, in November the faculty took the position that fraternity dormitories were really "not good policy," but that, until such time as the College dormitory situation was clarified (there was still some hope that the proposed Philadelphia Conference dormitory would be built), the trustees might permit existing fraternity facilities to be used to capacity, beginning in September 1923. At their December meeting, the trustees accepted this recommendation, but specified that only juniors and seniors could live in fraternity houses. A year later, in December 1923, they moved beyond this interim policy by declaring that, so long as College dormitory rooms were occupied, all fraternity members could live in their respective houses. After trying to limit the cost of new fraternity houses to $15,000 and then to $20,000, in June 1924 the trustees increased the limit to $25,000 and, at the same time, excluded freshmen from rooming in them.

When College policy began to change in 1922, there were seven fraternities owning chapter houses, four of which were located on campus. Between 1922 and 1925 eight fraternities either built dormitory houses on campus (Phi Kappa Psi), took over and adapted for dormitory use existing chapter houses on campus (Phi Sigma, Theta Phi), or acquired properties by purchase or gift near the campus.
(Sigma Chi, Phi Delta Theta, Sigma Alpha Epsilon, Delta Sigma Kappa, Druids). Phi Gamma Delta replaced its chapter house on the campus with a larger structure in 1926-1927.

By offering sophomore, junior, and senior members the opportunity to secure room and board in their houses, these fraternities relieved the College of the need to press for new dormitories, none of which, in fact, was built between the completion of McKnight Hall in 1898 and those which came half a century later, after World War II. Instead, available funds were used to construct three urgently needed academic buildings and to complete major renovation of a fourth. Fraternity dining facilities offered severe competition for the boarding houses, clubs, and restaurants which had flourished near the campus since the College closed its dining hall in 1860. At the same time they relieved the College of the need to consider whether, in the twentieth century, it had any responsibility to its students to resume operating such a facility.301

Finally, the operation of the quasi-hotels of the fraternities required for its success the managerial (as well as the diplomatic) skills of many students and for its continuity the increasing involvement of alumni in fraternity affairs. Not only were the latter called upon to participate in making chapter policy decisions, but also they were expected to help in paying for the house and its furnishings, as well as keeping it in repair. In the 1890s President McKnight explained that the College could not then approach the church for money to help pay its building debts because it was the seminary’s turn. Thirty years later, President Hanson explained that the College could not then approach the alumni with a general financial campaign because so many of them were committed to helping their fraternities pay building debts.

Early in this century the social life of students was centered in the several campus organizations to which they belonged and in the more informal personal relationships which they may have established either on campus or in the community. In spite of what one might believe to the contrary, there was no dearth of opportunities for students to associate with others in ways to their liking, although the rules and regulations in force sometimes brought the freer spirits before the faculty to answer for what they had just thoroughly enjoyed doing. In June 1899 that august body met in special session to consider, in this case, something which was about to happen, the propriety of which its members questioned. The pro-

301 The dining room included in Huber Hall when it was completed in 1916 was used for academy students and, beginning in 1935, by women. Major additions to its equipment made to accommodate World War II servicemen enabled the College to offer board to summer session students in 1943 and to male students as well as female, beginning in the fall of 1944.
fessors had learned that the fraternities, without asking for permission, were about to hold a reception, with dancing, in Xavier Hall.™ They decided to forbid the event, at least until the matter of its propriety could be determined by the trustees. In their annual meeting a week later, the latter decreed that "public entertainments that include dancing shall not be given by students."™ As in so many other instances when faculty, trustees, or both attempted to regulate student conduct, firm pronouncements were not enough to settle the issue. It is evident that a major effort would have been required to stop dancing. It is equally evident that no one ever put forth such an effort.

In the fall of 1904 the Gettysburgian announced the start of a dancing class and reported that a Halloween dance had taken place in Xavier Hall. The 1906-1907 social calendar which was included in the 1908 Spectrum listed six major College dances during that school year. Not until 1910, however, was this form of entertainment brought within the pale. In the fall of that year the newly formed Student Council asked the faculty for its permission to hold all social functions (understood by all to include dancing) on campus, specifically in the Glatfelter Hall sweat box. Remembering the existing, although unenforced, rule, the professors again turned to the trustees, who were meeting during the Granville inauguration, with the recommendation that they grant the student request, if for no other reason simply because dancing could then be more easily regulated. Agreeing, the trustees granted the student petition. Five years later, on February 10, 1915, the Gettysburgian observed that "dancing is now becoming one of the most popular pastimes on the campus."

What remained to be done, then, was to regulate what had now become acceptable and popular. In January 1914 the faculty created the committee on supervision of social functions and charged it with the task of approving in advance all such functions, including dances. This entailed devising rules and sharing with the Student Council responsibility for seeing that they were observed. In the case of dances, either the committee or the entire faculty attempted to limit the number held in a term, to require that they be held on campus or in town, and to urge students to exercise financial restraint in carrying out their plans. Dance committees often hired well-known bands, only to find themselves with a deficit of several hundred dollars on the morning after. Inevitably, perhaps, there was occasional trouble.

---

302 St. Francis Xavier Roman Catholic church had recently completed Xavier Hall, on West High street.
303 Presumably the trustees said what they intended to say, which did not include prohibiting a student from dancing.
The Fall 1933 Pan-Hellenic Dance and Military Ball

According to the 1935 Spectrum, "these dances [in November 1933] furnished the nucleus for one of the most successful and enjoyable week-ends that Gettysburg students have ever enjoyed."

when some infraction was detected. In 1914 six members of an inter-fraternity dance committee were suspended for two weeks for permitting "some of the modern dances." In 1931 several students were disciplined for conduct "unbecoming Gettysburg men." During most of the period between 1904 and 1945 the major dances for which fraternities were not directly responsible were the junior prom, first given by the juniors in 1907 in honor of departing seniors, and for many years the major social event of the season; the military ball, first held in 1921; the soph-frosh hop, initiated to replace the two class banquets in 1927; and the ivy ball, beginning in 1933. Faculty members served as chaperones for these dances. Given the imbalance between men and women students, female partners were invited from home, the Gettysburg community, or neighboring educational institutions.

The 1906-1907 social calendar listed five "inter-fraternity" dances held in Xavier Hall, beginning with one on Halloween and climaxing with a "Pan-Hellenic" dance during the week before commencement. Some years later, fraternity receptions and dances gained a place on the published commencement program. In 1923 the first in a series of what were called migratory dances were held: participants went from one fraternity house to another, either until the night was over or until their energy was exhausted. Ten years later, in an effort to preserve if not extend the time available for academic pursuits, Dean Tilberg proposed that there be two big dance
A GREATER GETTYSBURG

weekends each year instead of many smaller ones: the military ball and interfraternity dances in the fall, and the ivy ball and more interfraternity dances in the spring. To make the proposal attractive, he promised that Saturday classes would be cancelled for each affair. Fall and spring houseparty weekends soon became institutions.

Another social event of this era in which fraternities participated, along with other organizations, was the smoker. The Gettysburgian for April 29, 1914 described one which the fraternities had recently conducted in the sweat box. Students and faculty listened to music of all kinds; patiently heard talks extolling the College; participated in toasts; devoured chicken salad, pickles, and coffee; and smoked cigars, cigarettes, and corn-cob pipes. Few respectable College organizations failed to take advantage of this means of bringing people together and, if we are to believe one article in the Gettysburgian, success was measured by the difficulty guests had in seeing each other through the haze. Probably not many ever read an article which appeared in School and Society for November 4, 1916. Asking whether the college smoker was a "worthy social institution," the author concluded: "let us have more of the good fellowship - but without the smoke." Into the 1930s the smoker continued to be a widely used device to bring together students and faculty. The Y.M.C.A. smoker became the S.C.A. fireside hour in 1935.

There were many reasons for rivalries among fraternities. There were advantages for the chapter having the most members, having the kinds of members the majority at any particular time wanted, having the highest grade point average among chapters, or having a commanding position in campus politics by virtue of holding certain key offices.304 At the same time, there were also reasons for interfraternity cooperation, if only because rivalries could, and occasionally did, reach the point of bitterness which would invite faculty or board action. In an effort to create an agency through which cooperation might be achieved, nine fraternities established the Interfraternity Council (I.F.C.) in the fall of 1916. It became inactive during the war, and was not reorganized until 1920. Possessed of only limited powers, the council concerned itself with a number of things, but the major problem facing it for many years was agreeing upon and then enforcing rules for each chapter to follow in securing new members.

Once fraternities assumed the responsibility for maintaining houses in which room and board were available, it was more important than ever before for each of them to recruit at least as many new members.

304Beginning in 1924, the grade point averages for members of fraternities and clubs were compiled and published each term.
members each fall as had been graduated in the preceding spring. As early as the fall of 1923, when fraternity dormitories were first occupied, the Gettysburgian began denouncing the prevailing method of fraternity rushing, called the lead-pipe system, the effect of which was to pledge a freshman very soon after College opened and before he and his prospective brothers had much of an opportunity to learn to know each other. The I.F.C. then began discussing the advantages of deferring rushing for a month or two, but a mass meeting of fraternity men rejected this idea in the spring of 1924. Sorority members adopted the plan that fall. The I.F.C. did approve a deferred rushing plan for the fall of 1925, but there was almost constant tinkering with the details and, given the pressure to recruit, it was difficult if not impossible to enforce.

The lead-pipe system returned in 1931. Innocently enough, the Gettysburgian for February 5 of that year declared that the strength of this system, in which there were in effect no rules, "lies in its simplicity." Although rules were reintroduced the next year and the faculty urged the fraternities to adopt some system of rushing and initiation which would interfere less with College work than the existing one, it is evident that little progress was being made in developing and adhering to a method of recruitment and initiation which was satisfactory to both students and faculty.305 Sometimes the G-Book advised the incoming freshmen to be cautious in their response to rushing. For example, the editors of the 1941 issue warned of "the fraternity assault" that would be made upon them and urged them to remember that rushing "applies strictly to the fraternities' side of the proposition." Freshmen should "watchfully wait" until they were sure their decision to join or not to join was the correct one for them. They were reminded that the fraternity which their father or some alumnus friend remembered might be very different in composition from the one which now bore its name.

In the fall of 1935 alumni representatives of the ten national fraternities, including several leading faculty members, organized the Interfraternity Alumni Conference. They began by telling the undergraduates that "certain evils and weaknesses" existed in the fraternity system at Gettysburg and that these were working against the welfare of the fraternities and the best interests of the College. An organization of alumni, they thought, might be useful in dealing with existing problems, including not only rushing, but also chapter

305In February 1934 President Hanson addressed a letter to his "dear Boys" in five fraternities, instructing them to halt immediately all "hell week" activities which constituted hazing, and appealing to them to be as loyal in complying as he had been in his dealings with every campus group. GCA.
finances and fraternity politics. Six years later, in May 1941, in an attempt to increase "recognition of the fraternities and endeavor to create a closer tie-up between them and the college," the trustees created a fraternity contact committee to work with the Interfraternity Alumni Conference, the Interfraternity Council, and the several fraternities.

The 1941 G-Book accurately advised incoming freshmen of both sexes that the "Gettysburg campus is definitely fraternity conscious." Even if made in 1904, this would have been a factual statement. It was certainly more accurate forty years later. Almost without exception, the written College material produced during the intervening years emphasized the advantages of the fraternity system and echoed the sentiments of an editorial (entitled "Why Fraternities?") which appeared in the Gettysburgian for October 5, 1933: fraternities, which were founded at Gettysburg "to satisfy the gregarious instinct in man," now serve many purposes of "vital importance" to individuals and the College itself. Each person who has joined a fraternity should take advantage of all the opportunities it offers "to become a full, well-rounded personality."

Although it was not included in the curriculum, music was a well-established tradition at Gettysburg in 1904. It was a valued part of formal College occasions; visiting artists gave campus recitals from time to time; and students had opportunities to perform in one or more of the organized musical groups, which began making annual spring tours in 1893. In the fall of 1904, there were three of these groups in existence: a glee club, an orchestra, and a guitar and mandolin club. A fourth was formed in October 1910, when the newly organized Student Council called a meeting to organize a College band. Officers were quickly elected, music and instruments hastily secured, and the band made its first public appearance less than a month later, when it helped welcome the returning football team after a victory over Bucknell. According to the Gettysburgian for February 8, 1911, "the band stands for but one thing – Greater Gettysburg." In the fall of 1911 these four musical organizations had about sixty members.

The responsibility for organizing these musical groups each fall and sustaining them through an academic year rested almost entirely with persistent and able students. In some years there was a student manager for all four organizations and a separate director for each. Funds to support them came from such sources as stu-

306 GCB (December 1935) p. 11.
307 Among the students who contributed greatly to the musical program before 1920 were Joseph Dale Diehl of the class of 1913 and F. William Sunderman of the class of 1919, both of whom continued to be active musicians after graduation.
dent and alumni contributions, benefit performances, and borrowing. The band played at home (and some away) football and basketball games; if its members had time and inclination, which was not always the case, they might give one or more spring concerts on campus. Soon after 1904, the orchestra and band took the place of the outside groups which had traditionally provided music for commencement exercises. Later, the combined musical groups were given a place on the commencement week program. For a few years before World War I it appeared that a new College tradition was developing: spring concerts on the portico of Pennsylvania Hall, then called the forum.

Undoubtedly for many of the student musicians the high point of their year was the annual spring tour of from one to two weeks, which took them to places in Pennsylvania and adjacent states. Time and again the Gettysburgian insisted that these organizations on tour were some of the most effective advertising the College could get. "Many a boy has decided," wrote the editor on October 7, 1914, "that the school they represent is the school for him."306

World War I disrupted the musical organizations. The guitar and mandolin club was never revived. The other three were reorganized in 1919, after the armistice. The glee club and orchestra were able to go on tour in the spring of 1919.

---

306The faculty did not always agree. The 1909 tour was cancelled because of "bad conduct" the year before. Four years later, the clubs could not venture forth before promising not to repeat a play given as part of their performance the previous year. The Gettysburgian thought the play was a decided success, but some off campus who saw it found it objectionable.
A Greater Gettysburg

Bertram H. Saltzer (1901-1956)

In addition to his work in the engineering department, Saltzer directed the band and orchestra from 1925 to 1940.

A new period in the history of music at Gettysburg began in 1925. In March of that year the faculty vested "jurisdiction in all matters connected with music of college organizations" in a committee of three young, recently appointed faculty members: Robert Fortenbaugh, history; Jerome C. Jackson, education and philosophy; and Bertram H. Saltzer, engineering.309 In the issue of April 1, 1925, the Gettysburgian explained that their task was to establish "an all-embracing and unified organization... created and run by students, but also enthusiastically and firmly supported by the faculty." In the fall, Jackson began directing the glee club, while Saltzer took the band and orchestra. Fortenbaugh was in charge of the finances. By that time the "all-embracing and unified organization" had come into existence: the Gettysburg College Musical Association, complete with its own constitution.310 The trustees assigned it a small budget, and for a number of years appropriated additional sums when deficits were incurred.

Bertram Saltzer directed the band and orchestra from 1925 until the engineering program ended in 1940 and he left to pursue other employment. Having been associated with the Pennsylvania State University band and being blessed with energy and patience, he was able to offer a degree and quality of sustained guidance which College musical organizations had never previously enjoyed. In 1925 he composed the music for a song written by Professor Forten-

309Beginning in 1916 or 1917 there was a faculty committee of one person placed in supervision of musical clubs, but not with the mandate this one received.

310The faculty committee established in 1925 continued in existence beyond World War II. Following the death of Jackson, Kenneth L. Smoke (1927-1929) and E. E. Schroeder (1929-1931) directed the glee club, which was disbanded in 1935. A girls' glee club, dating from 1923, came within the jurisdiction of the musical association.
baugh. "The Spirit of Gettysburg," and also that for the "Gettysburg Battle Song." Early in 1926 he composed a march which he dedicated to the Gettysburg College Musical Association.311

Another faculty member who contributed in a major way to further appreciation of music during this period was W. Frederick Shaffer, an accomplished pianist and careful student of the history of music. In December 1932, little more than a year after becoming acting Greek professor, he conducted the first in a long series of weekly Sunday evening musicals. Held in Weidensall Hall, at first beginning at 9 P.M., these programs featured musical performances of various kinds by students, faculty and spouses, and persons from the community. Sometimes Professor Mason of the English department would read poetry. Shaffer insisted that these programs should be informal affairs and resisted the temptation to organize them. Largely because of their popularity, a Sunday evening musical and alumni sing became part of the commencement program in 1934. Professor Shaffer also participated in the activities of a music appreciation group which the V.M.C. A. organized in 1934, and was instrumental in developing a concert series by visiting and local artists. As noted earlier, he began offering credit courses in music appreciation and symphony in 1935.

When the trustees voted in April 1935 to readmit women and accord them equal status as students with men, the faculty music committee (which then consisted of Professors Shaffer, Saltzer, and George R. Larkin) recommended that the College engage a director to organize a choir which would be open to both men and women. The person selected was Parker B. Wagnild, a 1930 graduate of St. Olaf College and four-year veteran of its choir, directed by the well-known F. Melius Christiansen; a 1934 recipient of the degree of Master of Sacred Music from Union Theological Seminary; and then a student at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg. The first choir members were chosen in October 1935. In accepting the offer to join, they committed themselves to three one-hour rehearsals each week, to sing a capella, and to limit their repertoire to sacred music. The choir made its first public appearance during a special Christmas program in December 1935.312

The 1936 G-Book called the College band "the most popular of the musical organizations on the Gettysburg campus." By 1940 the same source gave it second billing, behind the choir. In November 1936

311Saltzer wrote music for several other College songs. The orchestra did not have a continuous existence, being moribund during 1932-1933. Charles Rogers of the class of 1929 directed the band for several years after 1940.

312Professor Waltemyer, faculty manager of the choir, gave a useful contemporary account of its origin in the December 1937 issue of the GCB, pp. 11-18.
the Woman's League voted a sum of money to buy the first gowns and in the following March the group took the first in its long series of tours. When the seminary graduated Wagnild in 1937 the College offered him a position in the department of English Bible, thus assuring his continuing as choir director. Both on and off campus the quality of the choir's performance brought enjoyment to those who heard it and much goodwill to the College. An article in the Gettysburg College Bulletin for April 1939 praised the organization for the "opportunity for musical expression, training and inspiration" which it offered its members, for the "atmosphere of musical interest and appreciation" which it provided for the campus, and for the "genuine publicity of the best kind" which it generated for the College. During the war it continued to exist as an organization, although there was no spring tour in 1943 or 1944.113

Faculty interest in debating and oratory was as old as the College itself. Experience and facility in one or both ranked high on the list of objectives which they hoped students would achieve outside the classroom. One of the major reasons for their promoting the literary societies was to provide forums in which these activities could flourish. As the literary societies began to lose their strong position in the scheme of things, both of them organized clubs which sponsored intersociety debates and both supported financially intercollegiate debating and oratory. During the first decade of the twentieth century, William J. Gies annually gave the Pen and Sword

Society a sum of money to be used as prizes in an effort to promote interclass debates. Gettysburg was an early member of the long-lasting Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Oratorical Union, which was founded in 1893 and included six or seven colleges in the eastern part of the state. The College took its turn hosting the spring meetings and gained a fair share of the prizes that were offered. In the decade or so before World War I, Gettysburg participated in at least three intercollegiate debating leagues, all of which involved fewer than six colleges and universities and none of which lasted very long.

In 1914 students organized a debating club, of which Professor Sanders became adviser. Over the next several years both he and the students began informing the College constituency that competitive intercollegiate debating required regular and thorough training, as well as greater financial support than the literary societies, assisted by a few individuals, could hope to provide. Immediately after the war, the students urged the trustees to enact an activity fee and to hire either a part-time or full-time faculty member for proper support of debating, oratory, dramatics, and public speaking. The board declined to honor these requests; College performance in intercollegiate debating and oratory suffered. 314

An editorial in the January 15, 1919 Gettysburgian argued that "voluntary, willing encouragement and assistance of our debates by several of our able faculty members might revolutionize and completely reinstate Gettysburg in this important college activity." It was in an attempt to secure such encouragement that President Granville recruited Thomas L. Cline, who became Professor of English and Argumentation in the fall of 1922. 315 Moving slowly, Cline waited until the spring of 1924 to persuade the existing club to give way to the Debating Council, whose purpose was, in short, to supervise the forensic arts at Gettysburg. The council was composed of representatives of the different debating and oratorical interests. As they did for the musical association, the trustees included the council in the College budget and accepted the deficits which sometimes developed.

The commitment and talent of Professor Cline and several of his colleagues in the English department ushered in what might be described as the golden age of debating and oratory for Gettysburg

---

314 In May 1917 a chapter of Tau Kappa Alpha, the national debating and oratorical fraternity founded in 1908, was installed at Gettysburg. This was the College's first national honorary fraternity. Members were chosen from among those who distinguished themselves in debate and public speaking and, once elected, they tried to promote these activities on the campus.

315 The latter part of the title was dropped after 1926.
In encounters with teams from nine other colleges in the spring of 1930, Gettysburg debaters dealt with whether the United States should withdraw from the Kellogg peace pact and also with whether the nations should disarm completely, except for "such forces as are needed for police purposes."

College. Active participation in the Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Oratorical Union continued to the end of the 1920s. Interclass debates also continued. The varsity debating team performed on campus; was affiliated with the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges; and went on annual spring tours of from one to two weeks which took it as far west as Kansas and Nebraska, north into New England, and south into Virginia. On three occasions between 1925 and 1928 it debated a team from Oxford University. The varsity team's understudy, called the junior varsity and later the freshman team, debated counterparts from other colleges and varsity high-school teams. Soon after women returned to the campus in 1935, varsity and freshman teams were organized for them. During 1938-1939 the men's varsity team engaged in 35 debates, the freshman men's team in 16, and the women's teams in 25.\textsuperscript{316} Debating, though on a reduced scale, continued during World War II.

Unlike music, debating, and oratory, dramatics was a very small part of the Gettysburg tradition in 1904. Whatever hostility their predecessors might have had to this form of expression was gone by the time the faculty declared in February 1898 that it was "proper to give dramatic entertainment in Brue Chapel." Given the practice of the day regarding student activity beyond the classroom, now it

\textsuperscript{316}The news of debating during this time illustrates the limited sense of history of many of the reporters, who ignored everything which had happened before 1922 and attributed the beginning of debating at Gettysburg to Cline's arrival.
remained for the students themselves either to bring drama to the campus or to produce it for themselves. Between 1895 and 1904 several dramatic clubs came and went. In the fall of the latter year there were two in existence, both recently formed. The Cap and Kittle, whose members were women students, disappeared after about a year. The Mask and Wig lasted a short time longer, but by about 1910 campus drama consisted of occasional Shakespearean plays by a troupe from New York and productions during the junior prom weekend by members of successive sophomore classes, who called themselves the Sophomore Players. Proceeds from most of the early productions went to support some specific cause, such as the football team or the Y.M.C.A. building fund.

In the fall of 1910 Franklin W. Moser (1886-1930), of the class of 1907, joined the faculty as an assistant in the English department. It was he who directed the Sophomore Players in their production of Richard Sheridan's "The Rivals" in the following spring. Until he left the faculty in 1915 he directed most or all of the campus productions, either those by the Sophomore Players or by Y.M.C.A. volunteers. The editors of the Gettysburgian, convinced of the character-building potential of dramatics, believed that these efforts were not enough. "We once boasted of a dramatic club but that organization has ignominiously passed out of existence and is merely a phantom of the past," they declared on November 19, 1913. "It is necessary to organize an active energetic club at once." Pointing their fingers at the literary societies, which had promoted drama in the past, they urged Philo and Phrena to take the initiative again.

There was a response to the call of the Gettysburgian, but it was neither immediate nor from the suggested sources. In April 1914 Moser and eleven members of the 1914 and 1915 Sophomore Players organized a new dramatic club. The name they adopted, the Owls and Nightingales, was promptly shortened from the plural to singular. They presented their first play, Edmond Rostand's "The Romancers," in the open air west of Brua Chapel during the 1914 commencement week. All of the cast members were veterans of the Sophomore Players. From these developments, it appeared that a pattern might be developing. The Sophomore Players continued to exist and presented their annual play in early 1915. Meanwhile, Owl and Nightingale announced its commencement week plans.

---

317 The first sophomore play, "The Magistrate," written by the English dramatist Sir Arthur Wing Pinero, was given in February 1910. Harold S. Lewars, assistant in English, directed it.
Appearances, however, were deceiving. There was no play at commencement time, which coincided with Moser's completion of his duties as a faculty member.

The sophomores managed to continue with their tradition through and beyond the war years, but Owl and Nightingale was not so fortunate. Its members came back to life long enough to pose for 1917 and 1918 Spectrum pictures, but they presented no plays. In March 1919, after the war had ended, the faculty placed control—this was their word—of all dramatic performances in the hands of the head of the English department, but this was a task not to his liking and he did little with it. About a year later, in February 1920, a few remaining members of Owl and Nightingale, urged to do so by the last secretary-treasurer, reorganized the club and began making plans for its future. Under its auspices there was a commencement week play in 1920 and 1921. At that point the future of Owl and Nightingale depended to a large extent upon whether it could secure the services of an able and energetic director, preferably one with a long-term faculty appointment.

In the fall of 1920 Richard A. Arms began a career as head of the mathematics department which ended only with his retirement forty-three years later. Then twenty-seven years of age, Arms had begun writing and directing plays when he was seven, an activity which he pursued while in college and during his brief tenure on the Juniata College faculty. In the fall of 1921, by invitation rather than by appointment of faculty or president, he began his long and successful career as the able and energetic director which dramatics at Gettysburg so greatly needed. By the time he had directed the sophomore and commencement plays in 1922 (they were both farce comedies), the Gettysburgian was much impressed. "Dr. Arms has established a reputation for turning out plays which are characterized more by professional acting than the usual run of amateur productions." This was its verdict in the issue of June 14, 1922.

---

318 The sophomore play directors succeeding Moser were Henry R. Shipherd, Professor of English (1916); Donald F. Ikeler, Instructor in Public Speaking and Debating (1917); Chester S. Simonton, class of 1916, seminary student (1918, 1919), and Grant C. Knight, Instructor in English and Public Speaking (1920, 1921).

319 At least this was the testimony of President Granville in his letter to John F. Dapp, June 17, 1922. GCA.

320 The 1920 director was Instructor Grant C. Knight and the 1921 was Percy S. Eichelberger, a senior.

321 The U.L.C.A. survey team believed that the strength of a dramatic club was "almost wholly dependent upon the strength of the dramatic coach or the sponsoring professor." They made a similar comment about the debating club. U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:377-378.

322 Professor Cline took over debating one year later. Jackson, Fortenbaugh, and Saltzer assumed responsibility for music in 1925.
In addition to performing a multitude of other College duties, Professor Arms moved on many fronts to advance the cause of dramatics at Gettysburg. He reorganized Owl and Nightingale in 1924, transforming it into an organization whose members had experience in some aspects of play production; encouraged students to enter into competition for prizes their own one-act plays, some of which he then produced; continued writing his own plays and producing them (by the late 1930s he had written at least eight and was able to watch one of them being produced on Broadway); administered a series of dramatic contests in county high schools; participated actively in the Pennsylvania Association of College Dramatic Clubs (the Owl and Nightingale won its first intercollegiate contest in 1925); proposed exchange plays with Dickinson and Franklin and Marshall; secured larger and better facilities for dramatics in Plank Gymnasium (President Hanson credited Owl and Nightingale with contributing more than $3,500 for those facilities); taught credit courses in dramatic arts; and gained the praise of President Hanson in December 1933 for having "developed the rare ability" among student activities by making dramatics self-supporting.

The major activity, however, was always the production of plays. Literally hundreds of students had the opportunity to design scenery, handle lighting, act, or support the productions in other ways. The number of performances each year increased from the two staged in 1921-1922 to the customary six twenty years later. "Wings Over Europe," the one-hundredth performance, was given
in November 1933 and featured the director's first appearance as an actor. In June 1935 President Hanson proposed to the trustees that Arms be made director of dramatics and he was so listed in succeeding catalogues. During World War II, although on a reduced scale, the dramatics program continued.

Not only were there major changes in the way in which music, debating, oratory, and dramatics were organized and conducted in the period after World War I, but also during the same time a host of new organizations came into existence. Many reflected the increasing strength and identity of the departments of instruction, while others can be attributed to cultural developments which were national in scope. All were called student organizations, and in a few instances the initiative for their founding came from students. More frequently, at least in the case of those which were departmental in nature, it was the head of the department, wishing to extend its program and influence among his students, who proposed the organization in the first place and whose direction kept it going from year to year. An excess of faculty zeal could easily stifle student interest and initiative; a dearth could easily deprive the organization of its needed continuity and reduce it to inactivity. The wise adviser tried to avoid both extremes, either of which would defeat his purpose. Usually the club began as a local one, but within a few years its members and adviser at least considered, and often established, affiliation with a national body, one which in most cases had come into existence recently, in response to similar developments on other campuses. Local clubs might open their doors to all who wanted to join; in the case of chapters of national societies, membership was usually by invitation to those whose academic record met certain minimum grade requirements.

As early as February 1916 the faculty had established a regular standing committee on student organizations and assigned to it the task of approving most new groups (athletic, literary, and religious were excepted) as well as of exercising general oversight of all of them. It was this committee which represented the interest of the general faculty in the activities of the organizations discussed below.

**Departmental Organizations**

**Biology**

Although biology students were sufficiently cohesive to have their pictures appear in most Spectrums into the mid-1920s, it was only in November 1926 that they established the Biological Society, ostensibly to promote greater interest in premedical study. In 1928 this society joined Beta Beta Beta, a national honorary [1922].

The date in parenthesis here and later gives the year in which the national honorary was formed.
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Chemistry
Although chemistry students managed to have their pictures appear in most Spectrums into the early 1920s, and although they did organize the Chemistry Club in 1917 and the Chemical Society in 1920, it was only in February 1930 that they achieved a society which lasted. They named it the Sceptical Chymists.

Classics
Although the classics were among the oldest fields of study in the curriculum, it was not until February 1927 that they had their own departmental organization. While the Philhellenic Society was founded by a Greek professor and his students, it also promoted interest in Latin. In 1931 it joined Eta Sigma Phi, a national honorary (1924).

Economics and Political Science
Within two weeks' time in February and March 1928, Professor Saby invited students into his home and helped found two societies within his large department. For eight years thereafter they went their separate ways. The first, the Pre-Legal Union, obviously designed for prelaw students, became a chapter of Pi Lambda Sigma, a national society, in 1929. The second, Alpha Psi Epsilon, for economics students, failed in several efforts either to found or to join a national society. The two societies merged and took the name Pi Lambda Sigma in 1936. The Pre-Legal Union is a good example of student initiative in founding a departmental organization. In February 1928 Professor Saby was giving further direction to efforts already begun by Paul H. Rhoads, Albert M. Krug, and John E. Baublitz.

Education
Professor Kramer undertook an ambitious program of organizing his students almost as soon as he joined the faculty in the fall of 1920. The first fruit of his effort, in November of that year, was the Educational Society which in 1922 became a chapter of Kappa Phi Kappa, a national honorary (1922). The Schoolmans' Club for prospective male teachers dated from 1921 and the Girls' Educational Society from 1923. A college chapter of the Pennsylvania State Education Association was organized in 1927. In 1939 Kramer helped found a local chapter of Kappa Delta Epsilon, a national education society (1933). Kappa Phi Kappa was assigned the primary student responsibility for carrying out both father's and mother's day programs.

Engineering
During much of the time the College had an engineering program, there was a departmental organization of some kind. The Engineering Society was begun in January 1916. A local chapter of the American Association of Engineers replaced it in 1923. After it

3241932 History, p. 354. A local chapter of a social science honorary, Phi Gamma Mu (1924), was authorized by the faculty in 1926 but had a short life.
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had become inactive, the faculty and students in 1936 organized Pi Kappa Eta, which continued until the engineering program ended in 1940.

German

The Deutsche Gesellschaft which existed in 1904 to promote the spoken Pennsylvania German dialect, as well as a good time for all its members, did not long survive the coming of Professor Grimm in the fall of 1906. He used the following year's catalogue to announce that "opportunity for more extended German conversation and discussion referring to German life, literature and culture is given to Juniors and Seniors in a voluntary Deutsche Verein." After thriving for some years, this organization disappeared for more than a decade. Revived in 1927, it became a chapter of the national honorary, Delta Phi Alpha (1929), in 1942. Efforts to link these organizations with a German society formed in the 1830s are unconvincing; there are simply too many gaps for there to have been the required continuity.

History

About three months after becoming head of the new department of history, Professor Fortenbaugh in December 1923 organized the Historical Association of Gettysburg College. Within about three years its members had raised enough money to purchase some 350 books for the College library. The association was transformed into Kappa Epsilon Alpha in 1938, a year before it became a chapter of the national honorary, Phi Alpha Theta (1921).

Military Science

The Cadet Officers' Club which was organized in October 1921 became a chapter of Scabbard and Blade, a national military organization (1904), in the following year. For many years there were also separate rifle clubs for men and women students.

Philosophy

In December 1907, soon after he joined the faculty, Professor Sanders organized some College and seminary students into the Gettysburg Philosophical Society. In the following year he published the first number of what was intended to be a periodical; it included four student papers. Both society and publication had very short lives. Another effort to organize, in December 1929, resulted in the formation of the Sages which, after an affiliation beginning in 1931 with a national society, Alpha Kappa Alpha, became moribund about 1937. It was reorganized as the Sages in 1938.

Romance Languages

The French Club which the faculty in this department organized in October 1926 became a chapter of the national Phi Sigma Iota (1922) in 1931. The first mention of a Spanish club comes in 1944. A French club is mentioned about the same time.
General Honor Societies

Gettysburg Honor Society

Responding to a suggestion by students, in June 1934 the faculty approved the idea of a new honor society. During the next academic year the Gettysburg Honor Society came into existence; the first name suggested for it, Blue and Gray, was soon discarded. As the 1936 G-Book explained it, the new organization "was formed out of recognition of the need for an impartial honorary... that would consider both scholarship and extra-curricular achievement." Any senior who met the substantial curricular and extracurricular requirements automatically became a member, as did faculty upon completing ten years of service. Each spring the dean published the names of those elected. In recognition of the part which he played in forming the society, Charles W. Wolf of the class of 1934 was named a charter member.

Pen and Sword

Founded in 1897, Pen and Sword was the oldest campus honor society. It elected both undergraduates and graduates who qualified by virtue of their service to the College and promise of further usefulness. The method of election changed from time to time, but always involved members of the society and the student body in some way. At times, Pen and Sword was more than an honorary: it encouraged alumni giving to the College, drew up a constitution for the honor system, and established a trophy room. By the middle 1920s, there were increasing signs of general dissatisfaction with the society, on the grounds that election had become a popularity contest, with overtones of fraternity politics. While this criticism might have been met by changing the method of election or, as was suggested in the late 1920s, by its becoming a chapter of Omicron Delta Kappa, a national student leadership and scholarship society, neither occurred. A poll conducted in chapel in 1935 indicated that students then held election to Pen and Sword in low regard as a College honor. In January 1943 the students elected five seniors and five juniors to membership. A month later the president of the society announced that the incumbent officers would continue for the duration and that, after the war, the society would attempt to affiliate with a national honorary society. That was the swan song of Pen and Sword.325

Phi Beta Kappa

Eight faculty and alumni presented the College's first application for a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa to the United Chapters of that body in 1907. Fifteen years passed before the request was granted, during which time representatives of the United Chapters raised pointed questions about the College's standards and the adequacy of its

325Another form of recognition for students was inclusion in Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities, an annual published first in Alabama in 1935. Beginning in the fall of 1937, the president, dean, or both announced their choices of about ten outstanding Gettysburg seniors. The announced criteria were character, leadership, extracurricular activities, and potential. The names of those selected were then published in the Gettysburgian and Spectrum.
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endowment. Finally, after responding satisfactorily to the criticisms, the petitioners succeeded in 1922. Iota chapter of Pennsylvania was organized in January 1923, taking its place with those other Pennsylvania chapters already established at Dickinson (1887), Lehigh (1887), Lafayette (1890), University of Pennsylvania (1892), Swarthmore (1896), Haverford (1899), Allegheny (1902), and Franklin and Marshall (1908). In addition to electing undergraduate members in course each year, according to the general guidelines of the United Chapters, and largely on the basis of academic attainment, the faculty members of the chapter followed the common practice among new chapters in electing certain qualified alumni to membership. Through 1945 228 members in course and 107 alumni members were chosen. For many years alumni elected were initiated during a program which was a recognized part of commencement week activities. The chapter elected only two honorary members: President and Mrs. Hanson (1923).

Other Organizations

Many other student organizations were formed between 1904 and 1945. A few generated enough interest to be lasting. More disappeared after a few years. Several were revived at least once, perhaps under a different name. The following is a representative sample:

Press Club (1909), to gain greater publicity for the College, especially in athletics;

College Prohibition Association (1914);

G-Club (1915), open to holders of the coveted G;

Ministerial Association (1915), later the Preministerial Association, one of the longest lasting organizations on the list;

Chess Club (1916), revived several times;

Active Servicemen’s Club (1919), during its short existence promoted maturity on the campus in a number of ways;

Craft (1923), a student Masonic organization, later revived as De Molay;

Radio Club (1925), to encourage further strong student interest in broadcasting and receiving;

Progressive Club (1927), to promote cosmopolitanism on the campus;

Modern Book Club (1928), developed its own collection of recent literature for the use of its members and then gave the books to the library;

International Relations Club (1933);

Sacajawean Club (1936), a social organization open to women students; and

Sketch Club (1944), to foster expression and appreciation in art.
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The increasing number and growing cost of student extracurricular activities after 1904 gave rise to two problems with which the College tried to deal. First, were some students engaging in so many different activities that they were jeopardizing their own academic standing? Were a few students, because of their talents and competitive spirit, coming close to monopolizing the most desirable and influential campus positions? If so, should anything be done to restrain them? Not everyone agreed there was a problem. Not all of those who believed that one did exist were in favor of doing anything about it. The faculty spent much time debating the matter and even the Student Council eventually decided that something should be done. In the mid-1920s it began considering a point system, which would assign a value to every important campus activity and place a limit on the number of points any student could have during a term. With the blessing of the faculty and students, such a system went into effect in 1927, but it soon became clear that it was not working as intended. Later, it was used primarily to determine eligibility for awards in which activities were a criterion.

A second problem arising from the growth of extracurricular activities was financial in nature. It was presaged by the experiences of the Spectrum, Mercury, and Gettysburgian, all of which demonstrated even before 1904 how difficult it was to balance income and expenditures year after year. Lacking subsidies from the College budget, student activities had to rely on subscriptions, admission fees, fund-raising affairs, and even sometimes assessments to raise the funds which they needed to publish the Spectrum, take a spring trip, or produce a play. The inflation which accompanied and followed World War I created a crisis for several most popular activities and prompted students to appeal to the board of trustees to establish a fee, similar to that already charged for athletics, for the particular activity in which they were interested. The trustees declined, but in the 1920s they did make the annual appropriations for musical and debating groups which were probably necessary for the success of the programs which they carried on.

Convinced that there should be a better way than the one being used to finance the major extracurricular activities, the Student Council and a faculty committee employed the favorite device of finding out what other colleges were doing. After about two years of study, they presented a proposal to the board of trustees. Adopted in December 1930, it went into effect in the fall of 1931. Proceeds from a $10 fee charged each student went into what was called the Student Chest, from which a committee including both faculty and students made allocations to qualified activities. At first there were nine of these: Gettysburgian, Mercury, G-Book, the four classes
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(counted here as one activity), Student Council, Y.M.C.A., the musical association, debating, and Owl and Nightingale. Although the total amount available for distribution in 1931 was only about $5,000, the Student Chest was a decided improvement over previous methods of financing these nine important activities.

College Publications

In the fall of 1904 College publications included the annual catalogue, which the faculty issued during the early part of each year; the weekly Gettysburgian, a newspaper which since its inception in 1897 had been entirely controlled by the students who edited it and managed its business affairs; the monthly Mercury, a literary journal begun in 1893 and continued under the auspices of the literary societies; the annual Spectrum, published each spring beginning in 1891 by the junior class in honor of the departing seniors; and the annual Students' Handbook (called in this chapter the G-Book, its later name), issued each fall since 1895 by the Y.M.C.A. for the benefit of the incoming freshmen. The 1911 catalogue, which was the first to list and describe College publications, explained simply that all of them "aim at enlarging the means of communication between the College and its graduates, former students, and friends." 326

The Gettysburgian, Mercury, and Spectrum were expensive publications whose bills their staffs were often unable to pay. The recurring and serious financial problems of the latter prompted the trustees in 1898 to establish a committee of three faculty members to supervise the finances of all of these publications. Although somewhat reluctantly, this committee tried to do its thankless duty and make the required annual reports, detailing for the trustees the efforts of the students to pay past debts and avoid creating new ones. Then in 1908, responding to what they considered to be inappropriate Gettysburgian comments about the developing College difficulties, the trustees moved far beyond their earlier resolution when they created a second committee, manned by faculty members whom the board president appointed, and directed it to take "charge of all student publications, with a view to securing better literary

326By the first decade of the century the College was also issuing occasional calendars and viewbooks for use as promotional pieces. In 1911 it took advantage of certain provisions in the postal regulations to inaugurate the Pennsylvania (later Gettysburg) College Bulletin, which began as a quarterly publication. Volume 1, Number 2, was the 1911 catalogue. Volume 1, Number 3, included the annual report of the president and three other College officers.
style and freedom from objectionable matter." Nothing was to be published without the approval of this committee.

Neither students nor faculty were pleased with this board action, which went into effect in the fall of 1908. The Gettysburgian "has always been an exclusive student paper and we believe that it has been a decided success throughout its existence," the editor wrote in the issue of February 17, 1909. Probably in all seriousness he added that "no one with any love for his Alma Mater would publish anything which would be detrimental to her welfare." As the time for the annual board meeting approached, the newspaper on May 26, 1909 acknowledged that the faculty committee had treated the staff of all three publications fairly and courteously, but it reported that all three editors were "one in strong condemnation of the existence of any such committee." In addition to being very inconvenient, "it takes the gilt edge off the work." The faculty had an opportunity to express itself when the board met about two weeks later. "Any muzzling of the public press," it told the trustees, is "antiquated and un-American." It was better, the professors thought, "for our administration of the College occasionally to suffer unjust criticism than autocratically to repress free utterance," especially since there were existing ways to deal with abuses. With few exceptions, they argued, both Gettysburgian and Mercury had been conducted "with great dignity and laborious devotion to the welfare of the College." It was "ungracious to add unnecessarily to the burden of their management." As for grammar and style, the staffs should be left to answer to their readers, not be protected from error by the faculty. For these and other reasons, the professors asked the trustees to abandon "the official censorship" of student publications.

In its separate report to the trustees, the committee chosen to carry out their 1908 resolution explained that they had "assumed the liberty to interpret the order of the Board according to its spirit rather than the letter." In consulting with the three staffs concerned, they had stressed their desire to function as advisers rather than as censors and, in fact, they had given the editors considerable latitude in deciding what to submit, and what not to submit, for approval in advance of publication. They recommended that the committee be continued, but that its supervision be exercised "by way of suggestion and counsel without requiring the materials of the respective publications to pass through their hands" and, further, that student editors should be required to refer to the committee only those "matters concerning which they feel in doubt." Rejecting the recommendation of the full faculty, that the committee be abolished, the
trustees instead voted to continue it, sanctioning its transformation into an agency quite different from what they had definitely intended it to be.\textsuperscript{327}

Beginning in 1910, then, the two committees of faculty members which the trustees had authorized reported to them each June on the state of the three major student publications. However, all immediately concerned appear to have reached the conclusion after several years that this arrangement was unnecessarily burdensome and that there were more important things for everybody to be doing. The last recorded report of either committee appeared in the 1915 board minutes. By that time, there had been some major developments affecting two of the three publications.

The first of these developments concerned the Mercury, which because of the small number of subscriptions had been in financial trouble almost from the time the Gettysburgian superseded it as the campus news journal. As early as 1905, the older publications committee questioned whether it should be continued. Later, when the same committee urged that the Mercury merge with the Gettysburgian, the editors of the latter properly rejected the idea, arguing that the purposes of the two journals were quite different and could not easily be accommodated in one good student publication. In February 1912 the Mercury ceased publication.

The second development concerned the Gettysburgian. About the time the Mercury disappeared, the campus newspaper passed from what the catalogue called "the private control of students." Since 1897 its staff had been, self-perpetuating, without any regularized College voice in the selection. In 1912 the retiring staff, claiming that "the standard of the paper can be elevated if the students are given a freer voice in the proceedings," asked the student body to elect its successors. A year later, after consultations among the staff, the Student Council, and the faculty, a constitution was adopted which formally vested control of the newspaper in its student subscribers.\textsuperscript{328} A nominating committee which included two faculty members presented two candidates for each staff position; the student subscribers then made their choice. This arrangement con-

\textsuperscript{327}All of the six senior professors voted for the faculty report. The five junior professors, later joined by Heffelbower, voted against it. The negative votes were probably cast in the belief that the committee could be a useful, perhaps necessary, advisory body without becoming a board of censorship. In 1915 the faculty voted to bring the G-Book within the jurisdiction of the committee.

\textsuperscript{328}The purpose of the Gettysburgian, as stated in its 1913 constitution, was as follows: "to uphold every institution of our college; to keep the Alumni ever in touch with their Alma Mater; to arouse a more active interest among our friends; to keep burning brightly the fires of patriotism and to place Gettysburg second to no other."
tinued until 1920, when the staff decided that selections were being made too often on the basis of popularity rather than merit. A new constitution vested the power to choose the staff in a board of four students and three faculty.329

The liberal position which the faculty took in 1909 and the withdrawal of the direct hand of the board from the affairs of student publications some years later did not mean that the censor had disappeared from the scene. After all, the faculty had said there were existing ways of dealing with what might be considered abuses of free speech. In 1915 they began using these ways when they summoned the editor of the 1916 Spectrum to explain why he had not submitted his copy for review before publication. Apparently, the professors were annoyed by what a later generation might regard as good-natured kidding of the faculty, well within the bounds of propriety. They were so incensed by what they termed the editor's "wilful and repeated deception" that they placed him on probation for the rest of his undergraduate career and decreed that he could not represent the College in any way. A year later the faculty suspended the editor of the Gettysburgian for a similar offense, but they soon restored him after being assured that procedures satisfactory to them would be followed in the future.

In the middle 1920s the U.L.C.A. survey team concluded that "no student activity in the Lutheran colleges is so directly the mouthpiece of the student body as the student publications," including the newspaper. "Whatever the nature of the publication it is generally representative of the thinking and activities of the undergraduates." This is an accurate characterization of the Gettysburgian. The two supervisory committees which the board of trustees had established continued in revised form into the 1940s, but after about 1915 they existed as purely faculty agencies, which reported to no other body. The newspaper and its sister publications had faculty advisers. It was understood that they should review all copy before it went to the printer. The Gettysburgian staff told the U.L.C.A. survey team that their adviser did exactly that, but rarely rejected anything. Once, they said, the staff refused to accept the criticism which he offered.330 Occasionally, the newspaper complained about alumni criticism of what it was publishing. "Gettysburg has made no big place for itself in the sun," wrote the editor on May 4, 1927, "but it will never find a bigger place so long as its sons

329In a sense, the constitution of 1920 marked a return to a self-perpetuating staff, but now there was a faculty voice in the selection. In announcing a new constitution in the issue of December 4, 1930, the editor stated that previously "the paper had no constitution or by-laws whatsoever" and had to rely "on the unwritten tradition of the past." Obviously he was unaware of constitutions adopted in 1913, 1920, and 1923, as well as of amendments approved on many other occasions.
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do nothing but chant its praises and condemn any one as disloyal who happens to mention its very numerous faults."

Although an alumnus of the class of 1905 would scarcely recognize the format of the Gettysburgian twenty years later – it had ceased looking like a little magazine and beginning in the fall of 1919 resembled a newspaper – he would certainly recognize the content of the journal. It still carried notices and accounts of meetings of all kinds, concerts, plays, lectures, debates, and games. When the president or dean released statements, the newspaper carried them.331 Even after the Alumni Association began issuing its own publication in 1930, the Gettysburgian continued to include news of the alumni in its coverage.332 Intercollegiate athletics no longer provided lead stories on the front page, but there was now a separate sports section which was a major part of almost every issue. Beginning in the later 1920s, student columnists, some of whom identified themselves only when they retired, commented with varying degrees of sophistication on the passing scene.333 There are frequent references to developments in the nation and the world. Especially interesting are the differing reported reactions to the rise of Adolf Hitler in 1933. Students who read the newspaper carefully also found comments on such phenomena as Progressivism, the treaty of Versailles, the jazz rage, communism, prohibition, and the New Deal.334

Continuing the tradition begun by the College Monthly in 1877, successive editors of the paper attempted to be the conscience of the campus, exhorting students to stop gazing visitors, not to start fires in dormitory halls, to be sure to vote, to avoid being grumblers, to cheer the home team, to stay awake in class, to use the library more regularly, to quit loafing, to keep off the grass, and to elect able rather than popular persons to campus offices. Editors urged freshmen to remember that right and wrong at home were also right and wrong in College, to be careful in selecting a fraternity, and to

---

331The newspaper was consistent in its sympathetic treatment of presidents and deans. Even when it criticized the administration during the last several Hefelbower years, it did not blame him personally for what was going wrong. No president could have wanted a more understanding and supporting press than Hanson enjoyed.

332In the May 21, 1919 issue, the editor claimed that “the greatest means of communication between the student body and Alumni is the Gettysburgian.” About 40 percent of the 900 to 1,000 subscribers in 1924 were alumni. Five years later, with about 1,400 subscribers, the paper claimed that two-thirds were alumni.

333These columns bore such titles as Sweepings, Ricochet, Marks and Remarks, and Silently Flows the Tiber.

334The Gettysburgian often published the results of student polls prior to presidential elections. In 1912 Wilson gained 111 votes, Roosevelt 80, and Taft 5. In 1924 Coolidge polled 265, Davis 93, and La Follette 28. During his four runs for the presidency, Franklin D. Roosevelt garnered a total of 409 votes and was overwhelmed by his Republican opponents, who had 1,120.
begin their College careers by working hard. They sometimes had advice for the faculty: not to give unannounced quizzes after social functions, to be prompt in returning student work, to think again about locking buildings at night when it was so easy to enter through the windows, and to add certain new courses (for example, geography) and departments (for example, music) to the curriculum. Perhaps no advice was repeated so often and so fervently in every decade, beginning with the first of the century, as that urging all students to say hello to other students, as well as to campus visitors. In praising this custom, the editors on March 7, 1928 attributed it to neither the faculty nor the Student Council, but rather to “the gentle art of good breeding that seems to be part and parcel of collegiate life at Gettysburg.”

In 1919 Gettysburg was one of thirteen colleges in the Middle Atlantic states which gathered at Swarthmore College to organize the Intercollegiate Newspaper Association (I.N.A.). Meeting twice a year, members of this organization shared information about publishing college newspapers and recognized the work which the best among them were doing. In the 1930s and early 1940s the Gettysburgian regularly won prizes, both fall and spring, in one of the several existing categories. For example, in the fall 1939 competition it was awarded the first-place cup in news and sports, and second place in advertising. In addition, competing with several hundred college newspapers, the Gettysburgian won the All-American honor rating of the Associated Collegiate Press for newspapers in its class (500-999 student enrollment) four out of eight possible times during the 1939-1943 academic years. These prizes were tributes to the efforts of many students who understood the role which a weekly newspaper could and should play on a college campus. Undoubtedly, in most instances the experience which they gained working on the Gettysburgian was a significant part of their education. More than a few of the editorial and business staffs became leaders in business and education. Some of them eventually became College trustees. The first woman editor, Angeline E. Feeser, chosen in 1944, became a trustee in 1973.

The Spectrum, which through and beyond World War II continued to be published by the junior class and carry its date (the class of 1946, for example, published the 1946 Spectrum in 1945), remained an invaluable pictorial record of a year in the life of the College. Because of wartime conditions, there were no Spectrums for 1919 and 1945 (which would have been published in the spring of

---

335 With what one might hope was some exaggeration, an editor of the Spectrum told the U.L.C.A. survey team that his experience in that office was worth more than ten of his courses. U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:383.
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1918 and 1944). Indicative of the link which long persisted between the College and seminary, as late as 1922 the Spectrum still included pictures of the latter's faculty and student body; the seminary faculty continued to be pictured through 1926. Following the return of women students, the 1938 Spectrum was the first to feature photographs of campus queens, chosen to officiate at the May festival which was part of mother's weekend.

The Y.M.C.A. and later the S.C.A. published the Students' Handbook or G-Book through 1940, after which for several years it became an independent publication under the auspices of the Student Council. One of the issues referred to the book as the freshman's Bible. Successive editors did include in it more and more information immediately useful to a newcomer. Some material, such as lists of faculty and histories of buildings, could be found in the catalogue, but much could not. Only in the G-Book was there practical advice on what to do, and what not to do, during the first few days and weeks on campus: how to deal with customs and fraternities, and how important it was to begin immediately working hard and intelligently.

A new campus publication, called the Blister, began to appear on a bulletin board in Glatfelter Hall in November 1921. Although one may view this every-morning (actually, almost every morning) effort as a successor of the nineteenth century burlesques, in its critical, occasionally caustic, commentary on campus affairs it was certainly not the libelous sheet which its predecessors usually were. Its fare, compressed onto one letter-size page, included an editorial, a cartoon, a poem, a bit of humor, and brief news items. Its producers promised to reveal their identities at the close of the year, by means of a picture in the Spectrum. By that time a new anonymous staff had taken over. Early in 1922 the faculty met to consider the case of this new "bulletin-board publication." Their decision was refreshingly sound. They would recognize the Blister "as a legitimate student enterprise and offer the cooperation indicated as necessary for its successful operation." Given the heavy schedule of publication which it adopted, the Blister had a surprisingly long life, until early 1929. The same cannot be said for its competitors, most

336 In 1934 a paper company chose the 1935 Spectrum from among five hundred yearbooks as the model which it planned to use in its solicitations during the next year.

337 The U.L.C.A. survey team called the Blister a "scandal sheet." Gettysburg was the only Lutheran college with such a publication. "Little resentment is expressed toward this publication by students or faculty," they noted. "It gives a chance to bring irritating questions before the college. These are commented upon and soon forgotten. Unless the satire becomes too personal and ironical, such a publication is refreshing to a campus and conducive to original thinking." Ibid., 2:398.
of which lasted only a very short time: Hot Towel, Brass Tax, Jabberwocky, Migraine, and several others.

In the mid-1920s a group of students decided that Gettysburg should have a humor and art magazine, similar to those published in many other colleges and universities. With the blessing of President Hanson and the faculty, the first number of the Cannon Bawl was issued in November 1924. Intended as a quarterly, it drew heavily (with proper credit) upon its sister journals for brief poems, cartoons, and examples of College humor, for the latter of which there were often double meanings. The fifth issue, which came out early in 1926, aroused the displeasure of the faculty, which warned the staff in May that, unless it eliminated "the profanity and the suggestive which has brought the paper under severe criticism, it would be discontinued." In the June issue, which was entitled the Old Ladies' Home Journal, the editors thanked the faculty for its good counsel and then continued on their way until publication ceased, after fewer than a dozen issues, in 1928. A story in the March 7 issue of the Gettysburgian cited a continuing deficit, lack of student support, and alumni criticism as the reasons for the demise of the Cannon Bawl.338 Several attempts in the 1930s to initiate similar journals were unsuccessful.

338The U.L.C.A. survey team pronounced the tone of the Cannon Bawl "higher than that found in other publications of the other colleges." It declared the cartoons "superior for amateurs" and the humor, although sometimes coarse, "above the average college wit." On the other hand, it called the faculty action censorship without "constructive criticism." Ibid., 2:397
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In the fall of 1925 faculty and students in the English department began planning to publish a literary journal which they hoped would offer valuable experience for student writers and good publicity for the College. Volume 1, Number 1, of a revived Mercury appeared in February 1926. Unfortunately, its career during the next nineteen years resembled that of its predecessor in a number of ways. Although there was usually enough material to go to press, general student interest in the publication was often minimal and financial resources were usually very limited. During the depression years between 1931 and 1934 only one or two issues were published annually. The one which came out in May 1934 was the last until November 1938. The revival which began in the latter year was a vigorous one, but this time it was war which brought the Mercury to a halt. There were no issues during the 1943-1945 academic years.

In October 1923 four students formed an organization to recognize quality service on the staffs of the Gettysburgian and Spectrum. The founders chose a name which would not confuse them with any existing campus organization: Blue Crocodiles. Later, students having engaged in any College journalistic or literary endeavor became eligible for membership. In 1939 the Blue Crocodiles became a chapter of Pi Delta Epsilon, a national journalism fraternity founded in 1909.

Athletic Activity

What appeared in the 1904 catalogue, brief as it was, can be taken as a fair statement of the College sports policy at that time. "Athletic sports are encouraged," it declared, "but under such regulations, as it is believed, prevent them from becoming a source of demoralization to the students, or interfering with the legitimate work of the institution." However, no student could "engage in any public contest" without first securing parental permission. By 1904 College football, basketball, and baseball teams annually engaged in intercollegiate competition; track teams also competed, but only irregularly. On campus, intramural activity varied in extent from year to year. The Sons of Hercules put on their customary exhibition in the late winter of 1905 and there was the annual tennis tournament during most of the month of May. The gymnasium had been renovated within the last fifteen years under the supervision of Professor Stahley, who declared that he was proud of the result. Nixon Field had been in use for less than a decade and was clearly superior to any playing ground the College ever had.

As athletics at Gettysburg were becoming more organized and
developed, the faculty had followed its customary practice of turning over the management of such activity to the students, though not without limiting their freedom of action by many rules and regulations. Thus, during most of the 1890s it was the Athletic Association, clearly a student organization, which directed intercollegiate athletics. One of the key tasks of the association was to select coaches for the various teams. Always short of funds, unable to offer anyone a secure College position, the students watched as men they engaged came and went with great regularity, some of them departing even before the season was completed. By the end of the decade both faculty and trustees had decided that intercollegiate sports had progressed to a point at which a more-encompassing organization was needed to administer them. In 1899 the trustees created the Athletic Council, consisting of twelve persons (three faculty, three alumni, and six students) and authorized it to operate the sports program in cooperation with the Athletic Association.

By the fall of 1904 the faculty had accepted the fact that intercollegiate athletics at Gettysburg had come to stay, at least for a very long time. With little or no prospect of placing them in charge of a College staff person who would do their bidding, the professors had no intention of bringing these sports under their immediate, direct control. However, they could not abdicate their responsibility for maintaining the quality of the academic program, and consequently they continued to insist upon obedience to certain rules which they believed it their duty to impose and enforce, as best they could. For example, they had granted musical organizations and athletic teams fifteen absences each year for off-campus ventures and believed that exceptions to this rule should be few and only for good cause. Further, they held that only those persons demonstrably necessary for playing away games should leave the campus. Also, they believed that only regularly enrolled students taking a normal course load should be allowed to play in intercollegiate teams. Finally, they reserved the right to review and alter schedules whenever they saw fit to do so. Even by 1904 the faculty was making exceptions to these rules and one could ask how long some of them were going to remain on the books.

Judging from the prominence given to intercollegiate athletics in the Gettysburgian and Spectrum, it would appear that many, if not most, students were its strong supporters. They had composed yells, written songs and adopted colors primarily, though not exclusively,

339 Many other colleges created similar organizations about this time, with representatives from trustees, faculty, students, and alumni.
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to support the team. No matter what the faculty thought, many students held that the team needed them as much off campus as it did on Nixon Field; they were willing to push their point until they had won it. When the boys returned from a game, in victory or defeat, students waited for them, and their welcome could take one of a number of unpredictable forms. Finally, there was wide agreement among students that good teams, not necessarily teams that almost always won, were necessary for the strong reputation of the College and to insure its attractiveness to prospective students of the kind Gettysburg wanted and needed. This belief was not meant to detract from the effectiveness of the glee club or of any proud Gettysburg students in recruiting, but, as the Gettysburgian for October 18, 1905 explained, "the youth of today demand an alma mater which is a factor in the world of physical contest as well as the intellectual realm."  

The thoroughly altered catalogue which accompanied the curricular revision of 1911 gave the faculty an opportunity to review and revise the interpretation of College athletic policy which had appeared in this official publication for more than a decade. Not surprisingly, they chose to make no fundamental changes in the statement, only to strengthen it slightly. They now said that the various sports were "recognized as an important part of college life" and that every student was encouraged "to regularly take part in some outdoor exercise." However, there was one unmistakable switch in emphasis: all students were now permitted to engage "in any or all branches of athletics" unless parents or guardians had notified the faculty to the contrary. While the catalogue statement of 1942 was quite different in wording, the underlying ideas – that athletics were "an integral part of college life" and that Gettysburg tried to minimize their interference with "the primary work of the institution" – remained the same. Apparently without doing violence to these ideas, it was possible for the College in the years between 1904 and 1945 to remove one after another of the earlier restraints upon intercollegiate athletics and to expand the program in numerous ways. While all three presidents participated in this development, none was more deeply committed than Hanson to the

340 By the team one meant football, which, the December 5, 1906 Gettysburgian maintained, "enlists the energy and attention of the best men in American colleges." It is "the greatest of college games," one which "meets a real need of the college man." The editor admitted that there were "men of the highest courage who never saw a football" and thought that "they deserve credit for overcoming the obstacles strung in their pathway."

341 This same issue also complained that Gettysburg was not getting proper publicity for its athletic accomplishments and declared that "it is the fault of the student body that such is the case." For more than twenty years thereafter there were intermittent student efforts to man a publicity bureau for the College.
idea that intercollegiate and intramural athletics were a necessary part of the program of a college in which character-building and scholarship were the main purposes.

Between 1900 and 1942 football, basketball, and baseball were the three main intercollegiate activities in which College men engaged. Teams in these sports played more than fifteen hundred games and won about 58 percent of them. Their most frequent competitors were Bucknell, Dickinson, and Franklin and Marshall, but there were times when they met teams from Cornell, Penn, Penn State, and Pitt. Track, an intercollegiate sport in 1904, could never muster the sustained interest of the three listed above, but it did survive. Intercollegiate activity in tennis began in 1906; in cross-country, soccer, and swimming in 1929; in wrestling in 1930; and in golf in 1937. Beginning in the 1920s Gettysburg helped inaugurate or joined bodies such as the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference (E.C.A.C.) in football, the Middle Atlantic Conference in basketball, and the Central Pennsylvania Conference in track.

In his history of intercollegiate athletics at Gettysburg, Professor Robert L. Bloom described the period after 1919 as the golden age for these sports at the College. Although there were many outstanding athletes before 1919 who distinguished themselves and brought credit to the institution, and who then as alumni added greatly to their previous accomplishments, it was the teams of the 1920s, 1930s, and early 1940s which piled up the victories. Gettysburg football teams won championship honors in the E.C.A.C. five times between 1926 and 1941 and shared the title on three other occasions. The basketball teams won almost two of every three games which they played between 1919 and 1942. The evidence is convincing that this record was compiled with what most, though certainly not all, observers would agree was minimal interference with "the primary work of the institution." A careful scrutiny of the lists of students who ran, kicked, jumped, or threw for the College during these years will yield the names of many of its most distinguished alumni and firm supporters.

Four additions to the College's physical plant between 1904 and

---

342 The only two Gettysburg students to win Rhodes Scholarships were graduated before 1920. Both Spurgeon M. Keeny of the class of 1914 and Ordean Rockey of the class of 1916 received their awards, based on academic attainments, success in outdoor sports, and "moral force of character," in 1916. President Hefelbower was a member of the awarding committee for Pennsylvania for 1907-1908, soon after the scholarships were established. President Granville was a member of the committee in 1913-1914.

343 Robert L. Bloom, Intercollegiate Athletics at Gettysburg College..., 2 vols. (Gettysburg, 1976-1977), vividly recounts fortunes and misfortunes in the several sports and names many participants. This account draws heavily upon Bloom's work. Hereafter cited as Bloom, Intercollegiate Athletics.
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1945 enhanced the facilities for intercollegiate and other athletic activity. The first was the running track on Nixon Field which was begun and completed in the spring of 1909. The funds for its construction were contributed by Burton F. Blough, later a trustee, and it was named in his honor. Unfortunately, the track was one-fifth instead of the more common one-fourth mile in length. This could, and sometimes did, act as a hindrance to track teams using it. The second addition was Memorial Athletic Field, which was begun in April 1924 and completed more than a year later, at a cost of $23,616.29. Located west of Nixon Field, which it was intended to replace for football games, it was dedicated on October 3, 1925, alumni homecoming day, and named in memory of those Gettysburgians who died in World War I. The souvenir program for the dedication ceremonies described the field as "another step forward in the plans for greater Gettysburg." Nixon Field continued to be used for baseball and other sports.

The third addition to the plant during this period, Plank Gymnasium, replaced a facility which became inadequate as soon as basketball became an intercollegiate sport and the student body began its rapid increase after about 1900. The basketball court in the old gymnasium was one of the smallest used by any college in Gettysburg's league; there was little locker-room space; and the building itself could not come close to accommodating all of those who wanted to attend the games. As noted earlier in this chapter, there was wide agreement even before the arrival of President Hanson that the old gymnasium needed to be replaced. The only question was when. Ground was broken for Plank Gymnasium, to be located between Nixon and Memorial Fields, on the same day the latter was dedicated. The basketball team played the games of the 1925-1927 seasons in the newly completed Hotel Gettysburg annex; its first game in Plank was in January 1928. The U.L.C.A. survey team was enthusiastic about Plank Gymnasium, with its separate rooms for handball, wrestling, squash, and the like. "This is a long step forward for Gettysburg," they wrote, "for its program heretofore has been top-heavy with intercollegiate athletics." The fourth addition to the College plant which aided the athletic program consisted

---

344 Plans for the field began at a meeting of thirteen persons summoned by President Hanson in early December 1923, only a few months after taking office. Once the trustees approved and work began, students lent their hands to the project. According to the Gettysburgian for April 30, 1924, blisters formed and eloquent French was spoken. Rough grading was completed by fall and there was a good sod by the fall of 1925. The construction was in charge of a special athletic field committee. The cost figure was taken from the audited report of its treasurer, dated December 1, 1925. GCA.
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of numerous tennis courts and other small fields which were laid out in the northern part of the campus at various times before 1945.346

The Athletic Council of twelve persons continued to function until 1910, when it was brought to an abrupt end. The trustee minutes for the annual meeting of that year (at which William A. Granville was elected president) call the report which the council made one "which for inaneness and wearisomeness it would be difficult to match." Since the trustees excused the secretary from including the text of the report in the minutes, and since no copy is known to have survived, we do not know why it was so annoying. The minutes further record that, instead of dealing with "any recommendations which may have been made throughout the dreary stretches of the document," the trustees referred the future of the council to their executive committee, with power to act.

At a special meeting in August, the executive committee dismissed the incumbent council members and replaced them with a much smaller number. The new Athletic Council had three active members (one faculty, one student, and one alumnus) and two advisory members (the athletic coach and the graduate athletic manager). Since some agency was needed to function almost immediately, the executive committee then named persons to these positions and endowed them with the powers necessary to conduct an athletic program "on a fair, clean, and sportsmanlike basis, insuring the greatest good to the greatest number." In practice, this meant performing duties similar to those delegated to the former Athletic Council, including selecting or approving coaches and captains, confirming schedules, purchasing and maintaining equipment, and paying bills. The executive committee also carefully defined the duties of the two new offices which it had created (athletic coach and graduate athletic manager) and gave the president of the College veto power over any action "that in his judgment does not harmonize with the interests of the institution."347

346 As early as 1915, there were thirteen tennis courts. A decade later the U.L.C.A. survey team concluded that Gettysburg was the only Lutheran college with the number of tennis courts meeting the generally accepted standards. Ibid., 2:474. One should perhaps argue that the athletic field house which flourished about the time of World War I and the Weidensall swimming pool were fifth and sixth additions to the plant. In 1924, thanks to the joint efforts of Pen and Sword, the class of 1922, the Y.M.C.A., and the Woman's League, trophy cases were placed in Weidensall Hall. They were used to display balls, pictures, trophies, and other sports memorabilia. The trophy room was relocated in Plank Gymnasium soon after the latter was completed.

347 The executive committee was careful to state that its action was for one year only, but in a brief resolution at the close of its June 1911 meeting the board extended it indefinitely.
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It did not take long to learn that an athletic council of three voting members was too small. In 1913 the numbers were increased to six and three years later to nine, five of whom were now ex officio: the president of the board, the president of the College, the athletic director, the graduate athletic manager, and the president of the student athletic association. From time to time further changes were made. In 1942 the Athletic Council consisted of ten persons: two faculty, two students, two alumni, one trustee, the president of the board, the president of the College, and the athletic director. In addition, the Gettysburg National Bank was treasurer of the council.\(^{348}\)

One of the perennial complaints about the early athletic program was that its managers never had access to sufficient funds to engage dependable coaches, buy proper equipment, and meet other necessary expenses. In response to long student urging that an athletic fee be added to the College bill, the board of trustees in June 1906 named a committee of two trustees, two faculty, and two students to study the matter and then take appropriate action. A year later President Hefelbower reported to the board that this committee had established a $6 annual fee for all students, the proceeds to be given to the Athletic Council. Payment of this fee gained students admission to all home games for which a charge was made. By the 1940s the annual athletic fee had risen to $20.

During the Granville administration an abstract of the audited annual report of the treasurer of the Athletic Council was published in the issue of the Gettysburg College Bulletin which contained the reports of the president and other College officers. Annual receipts and expenditures for the years 1910-1922 averaged about $6,700. Without exception, the largest single items of income were football receipts and student athletic fees. As revenue producers, basketball and baseball were far behind. Most of the expenditures went for coaches' salaries, athletic equipment, transportation of teams, training tables, and guarantees. The administrative committee which operated the College between the Granville and Hanson administrations chose not to publish a treasurer's report for 1922-1923, and the new president discontinued the practice of publishing any

---

\(^{348}\)The Athletic Council was deemed important enough for its members to be included in the catalogue, after the faculty listing, beginning in 1914 and running through 1942. The ex officio members provided much continuity. Several alumni members also had long service: Arthur E. Rice (1913-1927), George W. Nicely (1917-1926), and George H. Hummel (1926-1948). Beginning in 1919, three faculty members served for extended periods: Milton H. Valentine (1919-1930), Richard A. Arms (1926-1943), and Thomas L. Cline (1930-1947). On the other hand, almost no students served for more than one year. Valentine was president from 1919 to 1927 and Hummel from 1928 to 1948. For many years the latter was one of the two or three most influential figures in the entire College athletic program.
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annual reports. A few years later, when the U.L.C.A. survey team asked for a financial statement from the Athletic Council, they were told that accurate information was not available and that its accounts were never audited. 349 A financial statement for the year 1926-1927 which has survived in the College archives shows increased income ($18,600) as well as increased expenditures ($20,100); one could not conclude from this report that the activities which the Athletic Council supervised were even remotely big business. 350

One of the key goals of students, alumni, and others who urged greater direction and continuity for the athletic program was to secure full-time coaches who, if their services proved satisfactory, would remain with the College for an extended period of time, supplementing their income by holding some other position in the College. In its 1910 reorganization of the Athletic Council, the trustee executive committee took a step toward making this possible by establishing the College positions of coach and graduate athletic manager. Although Fred C. Vail, the man it designated as coach (of all sports), did not remain in that position for very long, nor did his immediate successor, in 1913 the Athletic Council did recruit Ira D. Plank (1882-1951) as the first regular baseball coach. Except for a brief period during World War I, he continued to hold that position, as well as operate a business in town, until he died in 1951. In 1916 the Council created the position of athletic director and named Doyle R. Leathers to fill it. Having participated as a member of the class of 1913 in varsity football, basketball, and track, as well as in gymnastics, he was considered well-qualified to take charge of all College athletic activities. During a tenure of eleven years Leathers coached the basketball team for ten and the track team for nine; he recruited William W. Wood, who was football coach from 1919 to 1927; and he was senior master in the academy (and in charge of its athletic activities) from 1916 to 1928.

The year 1927 is one of the most important in the history of athletic activity at Gettysburg College. Plank Gymnasium was first used; both Leathers and Wood presented their resignations; and at their June meeting the trustees created the department of physical education, naming Clayton E. Bilheimer to head it as well as to serve as athletic director. Henry T. Bream, of the class of 1924, succeeded Wood as football coach, a position which he occupied until 1951. He also served as basketball coach from 1927 until 1955, and as track

349 Ibid., 2:493-495.
350 Beginning about 1916 the Athletic Council regularly borrowed money to meet its bills. Its indebtedness in June 1927 amounted to $23,500, most of which resulted from construction of Memorial Field. Although several hundred contributed to its construction, their gifts amounted to less than one-fourth of the total cost.
Beginning with Plank in 1913, these six men contributed in various ways to the athletic program of the College.
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coach from 1932 until 1936. In the fall of 1927 Romeo Capozzi (1901-1973) began a forty-four year association with the College as athletic trainer.

Beginning in the 1920s the Athletic Council began accepting the services of a number of faculty members as coaches: John G. Glenn, Latin department, tennis; William D. Hartshorne, Romance languages, soccer; William R. McReynolds, military science, and Ernest O. Von Scherdtner, German, wrestling; and George S. Warthen, English, golf.

The character of the Gettysburg athletic program during this period was to a significant degree determined by its coaches, who were in sympathy with the main purposes of the College and whose actions reflected this fact. For example, while an undergraduate Leathers was an active member of the Y.M.C.A., an editor of the Spectrum, and one of the Sophomore Players. Wood was an instructor in mathematics for three years. His deep religious convictions and concern for the welfare of students led President Hanson to prevail upon him to add to his coaching duties those of Y.M.C.A. secretary; he served in that office from 1924 to 1927.351

Few schools such as Gettysburg could hope to schedule games with teams they wanted to play, and then win what was for them a satisfactory percentage of the contests, without an additional inducement to some of the young men necessary to field the teams. There were always a few students who were ready to play football – the one sport where inducements were most frequently sought and offered – simply because they liked the sport and wanted to contribute to the school's reputation. However, as early as June 1905 (at the end of Hefelbower's first year in office), it is evident that the College had already begun to rely on something more tangible than school spirit for its teams. The executive committee of the trustees recommended that the practice "that has obtained of granting certain scholarships, known as athletic scholarships, be continued and that the number be limited to twelve." The trustees accepted this recommendation and decreed "that the same be exclusively in the hands of the Athletic Council." However, none of the annual reports of the treasurer of that body published between 1910 and 1922 includes an item of expenditure called scholarships. Although the College was obviously reluctant to release information on the subject, it did tell the U.L.C.A. survey team that in 1925-1926 it granted

351In October 1922 sportswriter Cullen Cain visited Gettysburg, inspected the athletic program, and then wrote a highly laudatory article which appeared in the Philadelphia Public Ledger for October 22. The Gettysburgian reprinted it in full three days later. "To my mind," Cullen wrote, "athletics approach very close to an ideal state at Gettysburg College." He attributed this condition to Leathers and Wood, but especially to the character and ability of the latter.
A GREATER GETTYSBURG

forty scholarships "for which only men out for athletics" were eligible.352

Most of its competitors were as committed as was Gettysburg to an athletic program which would bring good will and support to their schools while not detracting more than tolerably from their ability to achieve their primary mission. Aggressive recruiting of athletic talent was expensive. Accepting a transfer student simply because he was a star player and then putting him immediately on the team was regarded as unfair competition. Treating a star player as a special student or no student at all was demoralizing internally. Giving alumni or other local businessmen, however well-meaning they might be, a major voice in athletic policy or in financing teams, would jeopardize an institution's control over a program for which it was ultimately responsible. It was to deal with such situations that President Granville joined many other Pennsylvania college presidents in January 1916 as they embarked upon a campaign to "purify" college athletics. A committee, of which he was a member, proposed that athletic scholarships be discontinued and that transfer students be required to wait one year before becoming eligible to play on an intercollegiate team. These proposals were approved unanimously and the presidents returned home to persuade their colleagues to accept them. Within less than two weeks, the Gettysburg faculty adopted the recommended waiting periods for transfer students.353 However, the professors did not have the power to determine the fate of athletic scholarships. Before the trustees or the Athletic Council had time to consider what to do about them, the energy appears to have gone out of this particular crusade and the attention of all was diverted to wartime concerns.

Another attempt to "purify" intercollegiate athletics within the schools with which Gettysburg competed was initiated in February 1926, when it joined Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, Muhlenberg, and Ursinus in organizing what was ambitiously called the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference. The detailed rules which the E.C.A.C. recommended to its members for adoption placed strict limits on the amounts and sources of financial aid permitted athletes, as well as upon their eligibility to participate in intercollegiate competition.

While the other colleges were deciding how they would respond to these proposals, Gettysburg began what it was soon calling a "complete reorganization" of its athletic program. By the time it was com-

352U.L.C.A. Survey. 2:507. The College did state that neither the alumni nor any "organizations, philanthropic in nature, which are non-academic" granted such scholarships or their equivalent to Gettysburg students.

353This was neither the first nor the last time the faculty considered this proposal. Resolutions on matters such as this had a way of being forgotten.
pleted in the fall of 1927, the College had a department of physical education whose head had faculty rank as a full professor and who also held the title of athletic director; it had a two-year requirement in physical education for all male students who did not elect military science; and it had committed itself to eliminating athletic scholarships. What this latter apparently meant was that the College would offer no new scholarships open to athletes only, but that henceforth financial aid would be awarded to all students on the basis of scholarship, character, and financial need; athletes would have to meet these qualifications before their special abilities would enter into consideration. There was no mention of a specific number of scholarships reserved for students with special athletic ability. In all of this, the College claimed that it was following the rules which the E.C.A.C. had recommended.354

Early in 1926, about the time the E.C.A.C. was being organized, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching undertook a major study of college athletics in the United States, during the course of which its representatives visited 112 colleges and universities, including Gettysburg. The report which was published in the fall of 1929 ran to more than three hundred pages and dealt with virtually all facets of college athletics. The director of the study declared that its purpose was "to offer an unbiased treatment as full and as accurate as circumstances permit" and to make whatever suggestions for improving athletics "as may grow out of the materials in hand." The tone of the report reflected the authors' clear awareness that there was often a major difference between what an institution said and what it did, as well as their conviction that it was better for an institution to face probing questions about its athletic practice than to ignore them.355

The Carnegie report had little specifically to say about Gettysburg College. It was not included in a list of 28 of the 112 colleges visited

354See p. 565 for a discussion of these changes from a somewhat different perspective. About this time the College told the U.L.C.A. survey team that "the custom of awarding athletic scholarships was being discontinued, that there would be less emphasis on the need for winning, and that the general athletic situation was to be improved." It is evident that the College tried to carry out at least some of the survey team's recommendations concerning its athletic program. However, on April 22, 1931 the College treasurer gave President Hanson a report on what he frankly called athletic scholarships for the five years from 1928 to 1931. According to this report, their annual value had increased from $7,126 in 1926 to $12,300 in 1931. In the spring 1931 term more than 60 percent of all scholarship aid was going to athletes, none of whom received more than full tuition. Ibid., 2:543-544. The treasurer's report is in GCA.

355Howard J. Savage and others, American College Athletics (New York, 1929), p. 5. This publication was Bulletin 23 of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Among the nineteen Pennsylvania schools visited were Bucknell, Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, Lafayette, Muhlenberg, and Ursinus.
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at which "no evidence was found that athletics were subsidized by any group or individual." For that matter, none of the nineteen Pennsylvania institutions visited was included on that list. The report did state that, at the time of the visit, Gettysburg was awarding thirty of what it called "frankly and unequivocally . . . athletic scholarships" and, in addition, was one of a number of schools which somewhat informally "cared for" an unspecified number of athletes simply in order to remain competitive with the teams it customarily played. Finally, almost in passing, the authors mentioned several ways in which Gettysburg staff members corresponded with promising young men with athletic ability whom it was interested in attracting as students.356

College reaction to the findings of the Carnegie report was immediate. President Hanson issued a statement which appeared in the Gettysburg Times (October 24) and the Gettysburgian (October 31) and which stated flatly that "the facts quoted relative to Gettysburg College no longer exist." He denied that the College had "slush funds" or engaged in "cut-throat competition" in recruiting students, insisting that it did not "cheapen educational standards to accommodate athletic prospects." All scholarships, he stated, are awarded on the strength of "character, need, scholastic attainments and athletic or other accomplishments." In a statement to the local newspaper, Professor Arms, a member of the Athletic Council, confirmed the accuracy of the president's statements. The Gettysburgian editor complained about the "ill-timed explosive" which the foundation had set off by releasing a report based upon evidence which, he claimed, was some four years old and, "in newspaper parlance, slightly stale." Fearlessly he issued a formal invitation to investigate the current situation at Gettysburg, for "we are ninety-nine and forty-four one hundredths per cent pure."

Perspective, usually a decided advantage to have, suggests that Gettysburgians overreacted to the matter-of-fact Carnegie report, responding to accusations which its authors had not really made. While establishing that some schools had satisfactory athletic programs without apparent recruiting or subsidization of students, the authors did not insist that, in order to escape their critical comment, all schools need emulate them. They did not say, even imply, that Gettysburg had slush funds or engaged in cutthroat competition. The report did remind its readers that many of the details of intercollegiate athletics were sensitive matters which few wanted to explain at length and in public. The Gettysburg reaction reflects this sensitivity. Surely few persons in the College constituency at this time expected that Gettysburg would not make an effort to attract students with more-than-average athletic ability or that it would not

encourage them to remain by means of grants of one kind or another. Whether its athletic program was administered in ways consistent with the College's published statements depended largely upon the good sense and integrity of presidents, faculty, and coaches. It depended upon something else. This writer has found no evidence to refute Professor Bloom's conclusion that, if nothing else, perennially limited funds prevented the College from engaging in abuses which a more bulging purse from inside or outside the institution would have made possible.\textsuperscript{357}

The approach of the Carnegie Foundation to intercollegiate athletics was somewhat different from that of Gettysburg students, whose newspaper almost always continued to argue that the College's intercollegiate program enhanced its image while helping its students. The Gettysburgian also insisted that, relatively speaking at least, the program was what, over and over again, they called clean. We want a winning team, according to the November 10, 1909 issue, but "a clean team, a team of legitimate students, free from any taint or unfair tactics." In announcing the appointment of the first athletic director, the issue of May 24, 1916 declared that "we want a man who will throughout stand firm for clean athletics and discourage any tendency which demands pay for college loyalty and service in her honor." Accordingly, when the staff learned that a good player who was not a regularly registered student had been allowed to participate in a Bucknell game, they used the issue of November 25, 1914 to declare that "such an affair should not have arisen and we feel sure that it will never come up again."\textsuperscript{358}

Early in the century students were already refining their established ritual for supporting the football team. In the advance of a game, the customary mass meeting took the form of a pep rally, at which presidents, faculty, team members, student leaders, and others might talk, and at which there would be songs, yells, and excitement galore. Cheerleaders made their appearance as early as 1912, a response to poor Gettysburg spirit at a Penn game. Faculty resistance to having students attend away games gradually dissipated. If we can believe the Gettysburgian for November 10, 1915, almost the entire student body went with the team to Baltimore for


\textsuperscript{358}See the issue of April 6, 1927 for an editorial entitled "Too Much Football," which criticized the current student mores accommodating sports, dances, fraternities, automobiles, and parties, leaving room for only "an occasional class thrown in between."
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the game with The Johns Hopkins. If the team won, or even if it lost gallantly trying (and it always tried gallantly), students welcomed it home in style. This meant more speeches, parades, bonfires, and sometimes trouble. A parade through the streets of town could easily get out of hand, and the wood for the bonfire had to come from somewhere. As early as 1909 the faculty suspended classes after 9 A.M. to allow students to attend a game with Dickinson. Later, the faculty sometimes declared a holiday on a playing day, but more frequently after the game when the taste of victory was still fresh. In 1923 a new president assumed the prerogative of calling off classes "in the interests of athletics." In the years that followed, hundreds of students participated in the ritual of gathering before the White House after a victory (announced to the world within hearing by ringing the Glatfelter Hall bell), imploring the president to grant a football holiday. They usually got their wish.359

Undoubtedly, students were pleased when early in the century College officials began responding to their frequent appeals to put the athletic program on a sounder financial footing. Yet as they watched the changes that were being made, clearly in the interests of providing more experienced direction and greater continuity to the program, a few of them registered a valid complaint. Little by little, the student initiative which had long characterized athletics, as well as other campus activities, was being superseded by direction and continuity in which faculty, trustees, and alumni had the dominant voice.360 There were once student managers with genuinely independent and responsible powers and duties, and a coach whom the Athletic Association hired. Now there was a graduate athletic manager and a coach to whom the students were answerable.361 Some of them complained that they had been reduced to the status of errand boys. However, the die had been cast and the course was not about to be reversed. One unmistakable sign of the times was the quiet disappearance of the old student-run Athletic Association. Its president last sat as an ex-officio member of the Athletic Council during the 1921-1922 year.

The 1941-1942 season was still part of the golden age for intercollegiate athletics at Gettysburg. Among nine varsity teams, the

359 The practice of ringing the bell began as early as 1892, soon after it was installed in the tower. In an interview on September 10, 1964, Henry T. Bream said he remembered its being rung after victories at home and away, occasionally if the team had played well but lost, and occasionally off and on all night.

360 The Carnegie report lamented that "from the point of view of education, the most regrettable aspect of the control of college athletics in the United States to-day is the meagreness of the responsibility that is entrusted to the undergraduates." It concluded that "much of the genuine educational benefit that responsibility in the administrative control of college athletics might bring is reaped to-day by men whose formal education has ended." Savage, American College Athletics, pp. 102, 103.
football, basketball, and baseball squads won twenty-one of their thirty-four contests. Support from students, alumni, townspeople, and others continued strong. During the course of the next year, wartime demands began seriously to disrupt all intercollegiate schedules. In part to maintain morale, the Athletic Council decided to continue with as many sports as possible, but on a greatly reduced scale. There was no 1943, 1944, or 1945 football season and none in 1943 or 1944 for baseball. Basketball was the only varsity sport which was not interrupted, but it did not have its normal number of games. Several of the other varsity teams managed to play a few times. The Athletic Council encouraged intramural teams, but without much success.

The financial report of the Athletic Council for the 1941-1942 year showed an income of about $24,500 and expenses of $29,000. This body still received the proceeds from the athletic fee which the College assessed and it still paid the coaches, whose only salary received from the College came for their work in the physical education department. In May 1941 Harry H. Beidelman, a newly chosen trustee member of the Athletic Council, told his colleagues that, since the reorganization of 1926-1927, the Athletic Council had incurred a deficit of about $25,000. He was quick to express "only the greatest praise" for those who had administered and participated in the athletic program, as well as to say that he knew "of no college where so much is accomplished with such a limited amount of money." Nevertheless, Beidelman believed that some changes in the athletic program were now in order. He suggested that the College should carry a larger part of its financial burden and that the trustees should review once again athletic scholarships (which presumably had long since disappeared from the scene). In December 1941 the trustees incorporated the Athletic Council, and its indebtedness, into the College budget. A special board committee named in the previous May to study scholarships for athletes had yet to report four years later.

**College Spirit and Discipline**

College spirit was a phenomenon which could be found on almost every campus. Its existence helps explain such things as alumni interest; songs, colors, and yells; and intercollegiate athletics. There was also class spirit, which manifested itself in hats and colors, as well as in rivalries, especially between sophomores and freshmen.

---

361 In August 1910, when the trustees established these two positions, they assigned extensive powers and duties to each. The post of graduate athletic manager disappeared in 1927.
Students in all parts of the country insisted that it was necessary for the continued vitality of a college that freshmen be initiated into campus life by being placed, and for a time held, on the bottom rung of the ladder. Full equality was too much for freshmen to handle, it was argued, until their proud and defiant spirit had been broken, and until they recognized the superior status, with all its perquisites, to which the members of the other classes were entitled. In most cases it was the sophomores, with the most recent experience of being broken, who took the major responsibility for the proper care of the freshmen. This often involved what came to be called hazing, physical manhandling of neophytes in a fashion which often was brutal and sometimes resulted in serious injury, occasionally in death, for persons on both sides of the contest.

Although there was class rivalry at Gettysburg long before 1904, it was scarcely a serious problem for the faculty. The few references to hazing in early College journals describe and then condemn it as it existed on other campuses. The faculty had its hands full with a host of student irregularities, but hazing was not one of them. The absence of reference to it in successive editions of the rules and regulations is good evidence of that fact. Orienting the new Gettysburgians each year appears to have taken the form of constant teasing. The campus section of the College Monthly and its successors was full of two-or-three line examples, most or all apochryphal, of how naive and "verdant" "freshies" were in their dealings with professors, fellow-students, townspeople, and women.

At the turn of the century, rivalry between freshmen and sophomores could be seen in at least two annual events: the class rush and the class banquets. As early as 1890, if not before, one class would challenge the other to meet on the prep campus some night early in the fall to fight it out. In describing one such battle, the College Monthly for October 1891 stated that the students formed themselves "into two triangular shaped bodies" and then "came together like two well-trained armies." After eight rushes the freshmen claimed the field. Mindful of the casualties which these battles sometimes produced, and hoping to set a useful precedent, class leaders in 1897 substituted a game of baseball. However, they were unable to prevent an unofficial rush in that year, and this form of rivalry, with occasional injuries, occurred sporadically for many years thereafter, even while interclass games were being played. A second annual event was the effort of freshmen and sophomores to prevent the other class from conducting its banquet at a local hotel without interruption. Members of one class might gather outside the hotel determined to prevent the would-be banqueteers from entering. Occasionally, the latter would enter the hotel through an unguarded entrance or disguised as women (1904). Occasionally,
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they would be kidnapped and left some miles away to return to town on foot (1920, 1921). From time to time, there was what one College spokesman called "unnecessary roughness," which brought borough police or the faculty into the act. Despite attempts to end it, this form of rivalry continued until the banquets passed out of fashion in the later 1920s.

Although there were scattered references before 1904 to specific written rules which freshmen were expected to follow, it is only in the Gettysburgian for February 28, 1906 that one finds firm evidence such directions did exist and were to be taken seriously. The writer claimed that these rules had been in force for one year, but it is not clear whether he meant that they had begun in the fall of 1904 or of 1905. "It suffices to say," he concluded, "that the rules, in some measure, have restrained those likely to be carried away by the first liberty of college life until a more sober view of the surroundings could form a basis for proper conduct." It is evident that these rules were adopted and announced to the freshmen with the least possible notice to the faculty. When that body met on October 18, 1906, its minutes record that the members had learned "that a joint meeting of the Senior and Junior classes, a motion prevailed that the Freshmen should be ordered to wear a special kind of cap." The faculty directed that the presidents of these two classes were to be informed "that such assumption of authority will not be tolerated."

In spite of this strong faculty decree, freshmen customs at Gettysburg College had begun, and they continued in force long after 1945. Sometime in the spring, some appointed or self-appointed committee would draw up a list of rules for the freshmen of the next year to follow. The list was then published in the G-Book and sometimes the Gettysburgian. The first item was always the earliest custom: that the freshmen wear the regulation cap or dink for that year. There was much variation in the length of the lists, some

---

362 See the Mercury (October 1898), pp. 139-140. The Gettysburgian for October 24, 1906 printed the freshman rules then imposed at Bucknell and Dickinson.

363 With a fine disregard for the facts in the case, later students defending customs often claimed that they had existed at Gettysburg for many years, even since 1832, and that one reason for upholding them was to please the alumni. In a letter published in ibid. for April 26, 1922, Trustee Charles Baum of the class of 1874 told President Granville that existing customs were unchristian, un-American, and tyrannical practices which were discouraging some prospective donors. "When I was a student," he correctly observed, "no such 'traditions' were to be found."

364 Dinks came in different designs, sizes, and colors. The first ones were black, with a green button. From 1909 through 1912 they were green with a yellow button. From 1913 through 1923 the cap was blue and the button orange. From 1924 through 1937 the colors were red and green. The orange dink with its blue button appeared in the fall of 1938 and became standard thereafter. For a brief period in the 1920s a woolen cap served as a winter dink.
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containing fewer than ten items and others more than twenty. The length of time freshmen were required to endure customs changed considerably over the years. In the beginning, some or all of them ended on February 22, a holiday and the day of the fantastical parade. Later, they often lasted into May. 365

An editorial in the Gettysburgian for September 25, 1907 expanded upon the developing customs with a student perspective that helps explain both the fervor with which they were defended and their remarkable staying power:

Every college of note has its established traditions. They give it a distinction that is enjoyed by the graduate in after life. The Alumni of Gettysburg have long felt the need of some traditions that may create a greater spirit of loyalty and bind closer the ties of friendship with their Alma Mater. In Harmony with the Greater Gettysburg spirit, and at a time most opportune, the first of a series of rules were proposed and universally adopted whereby each freshman shall wear throughout his first year in college, except Sunday, a black cap with a green button. As a mark of honor for victories in inter-class athletic contests or debates the cap, or button, or both, may be discarded. The spirit in which the new men entered the plan and the hearty cooperation of the other students should be commended. This innovation, although seemingly small at first, is bound to foster that true and progressive class spirit upon which college spirit is founded.

It is clear that, while the upperclassmen had prescribed a set of rules which they fully expected freshmen to follow, they had not set up a means of enforcing them. One should never have expected that, in the absence of effective sanctions, the freshmen would oblige the other classes by obeying. It did not take long for these sanctions to appear; not surprisingly, they came from outside the authority of any College law. Late on the night of March 4-5, 1908, three masked men entered the rooms of three freshmen who were not following the rules, including wearing the dink. They blindfolded and tied the hands of the freshmen and took them out of town, where they painted their faces with iodine, shaved the top of their heads, and threatened to push them in front of a passing train.

An account of this incident was featured in a York newspaper a few days later. The mother of one of the students wrote a long letter, which the Star and Sentinel published on March 25, in which she explained that she had instructed her son to wear different headgear during the winter months because of his recurring physical ailment. The father of the same student, Adam Stump, of the class of 1878, a well-known Lutheran pastor in York county, conferred with College

365 Note the junior and senior initiative in establishing customs at Gettysburg. Ostensibly because sophomores had overstepped what were supposedly their bounds in the community, the upperclassmen in 1909 imposed the first customs on them. Sophomore customs continued into 1931.
officials and then wrote an article for the Lutheran Observer of April 3, entitled "The Growth of Anarchy in America," in which he condemned the "barbarous indignity, perpetrated by a pack of bullies upon those who had shown a superior manhood." The faculty met, summoned three seniors (who stoutly maintained that they had done nothing), decided they were guilty, and suspended them. Upon further investigation, and after many other students came to their defense, it withdrew the sentences. Now, as later, the faculty was faced with the very formidable difficulty of identifying and disciplining students who had thoroughly disguised themselves and who operated late at night. The attitude of the Gettysburgian toward the case was expressed in the issue of March 18: the three neophytes were surely aware of the warning of what might happen to those freshmen who were not obeying customs; after the incident, with shaved heads and all, they "appeared to be in as good condition as ever"; and the attempt to set an example before all freshmen by hazing several of their number "seemed to have had the desired effect." Two of the three freshmen continued their course and were graduated; young Stump withdrew at the end of the year.

Disturbed by this incident and not knowing what possible effects it might have beyond the campus, in the fall of 1908 the faculty directed the president to warn students not to engage in class rushes or hazing. In an effort to channel energies away from the former, in the spring of 1909 student leaders devised two substitutes: an annual tug-of-war on Nixon Field between ten freshmen and ten sophomores, and a tie-up at the same place, in which all members of the two classes could participate and in which the object was to bind with short ropes the hands and feet of as many members of the other class as possible. There were detailed rules for staging both events.

Meanwhile, hazing continued, and the faculty attempted to discipline all those whose masks slipped or were pulled off. Early in 1910 three sophomores were saved from suspension when their classmates signed an agreement to halt hazing for the rest of the term.

A new element was injected into this developing situation in the

366See p. 462 for a discussion of the discipline problem as one of the dissatisfactions with the Hefelbower administration.

367It was hoped that these two events would replace all interclass contests except debating, athletics, and poster nights. In the latter, each of the two classes put up many posters with sentiments scarcely flattering to the other. The object was then to remove the opponents' posters as quickly as possible. In 1924 the tie-up gave way to the pushball contest (students on each side trying to roll a pushball seven to eight feet in diameter over their opponents' goal line) and the shoe scramble (each man finds his shoes on the pile in the center of the field, puts them on, and lines up on his end of the field). In 1931 the flag rush began, in which freshmen tried to subdue the sophomores and secure the flag at the top of a greased pole.
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fall of 1910, when the Student Council began operating and was assigned the unpleasant task of dealing with fellow-students accused of hazing. One way in which it did so was to commission a number of sophomores to haze freshmen in ways which would not likely incur the wrath of the faculty. The names of the members of the Sophomore Band, who functioned with masks, were known only to the Student Council. Although not all freshmen or impartial observers would agree with the assessment, the Gettysburgian on March 18, 1914 concluded that this body had done its work responsibly and well.

The faculty was always less interested in finding mutually acceptable ways of enforcing freshmen customs than it was in stamping out hazing in all of its forms. In October 1913 President Granville, returning to a theme which he had developed before the students on previous occasions, told a mass meeting that as many as twenty-five prospective freshmen were refusing to come to Gettysburg and that several men were refusing to pay their pledges to the endowment fund until hazing was abandoned. By an almost unanimous vote the students agreed to renounce the practice and abolish the Sophomore Band. A week later, pronouncing this action "one of the greatest steps forward ever taken at this institution," the faculty passed a resolution "forbidding all forms of hazing in Pennsylvania College." Responding to a request for an explanation of what it meant by hazing, in December the faculty informed the members of the Student Council that it adhered to a standard dictionary definition: "severe practical joking involving physical personal injury and bodily harm, or the performance of any humiliating action entailing surrender of dignity and self respect under fear or threat of force." Later, it clarified one point by declaring that requiring freshmen to wear a prescribed cap was not hazing. Finally, the faculty included a new sentence in the 1914 catalogue: "hazing in any form is forbidden."

In the spring of 1914 the Student Council proposed, and the faculty approved, a Board of Surveillance to replace the Sophomore Band. Its members were to be juniors; they were forbidden to use corporal punishment; and they were to be masked, with identities known only to the Student Council. In its issue of May 20, the Gettysburgian professed to believe that, at long last, the problem had been solved. What it called discipline would replace hazing. "Under the old system," the reader was told, "the merciless Soph did the work; under the new plan the brotherly Junior will guide the erring Freshmen into the straight and narrow path."

As the events of 1914-1915 were to demonstrate, the problem was

---

368 Members of the Sophomore Band were pictured in the Spectrum from 1912 through 1918.
far from being solved. It soon became evident that the Board of Surveillance was not working as intended. The inability of faculty and Student Council to agree on penalties in numerous cases involving hazing, cheating, and other offenses reached its climax after the former suspended eight sophomores suspected of hazing and then, when appealed to, refused to reverse its decision. The Student Council ceased to function after a majority of its members either resigned or were recalled by their classes. A student mass meeting considered, and then rejected, abolishing student government. In April and May, after several meetings of student representatives and faculty members, both sides agreed on a revised constitution for the Student Council. Elections did not occur and the new body did not begin to function until October 1915. The Board of Surveillance was abandoned, and once again the students denounced hazing. In return for this action, the faculty agreed to consult with the Student Council before making or changing rules governing student life. All in all, as President Granville later wrote, it had been "a somewhat tense situation."\(^{369}\)

While nighttime hazing by masked men continued, the next crisis did not occur until the 1917-1918 academic year, and then in spite of the war and its effects on the campus.\(^{370}\) In April 1918, at the request of the Student Council, the faculty reissued its definition of hazing, "pursuant to the imperative order of the Board of Trustees" and convinced that "the principle of democracy and equal rights" for which the nation was then fighting demanded that the practice be eliminated. In its next issue, the Gettysburgian claimed that the board and faculty position was "directly opposed to the will of the Student Council, and, as opinion shows, to the will of a large majority of the students."\(^{371}\) If what followed was to be a test of opposing wills, the students were about to learn that the faculty members were now more determined than ever before to defend the position which they had so often taken. During two weeks in early May the faculty met eight times and suspended thirteen students,

\(^{369}\)In a letter to William J. Gies, June 29, 1917, GCA.

\(^{370}\)In June 1916 President Granville informed the Student Council that among the dormitory rules to be posted in the following September would be one obligating a person about to be hazed and anyone in his company to protect themselves by calling out and by trying to remove the mask of at least one of the attackers. Failure to perform this obligation was subject to punishment. "It is obvious," Granville wrote, "that except under most unusual circumstances, no one who does not consent to be hazed, will be hazed." With the Board of Surveillance out of business, and with the Student Council unable to convince the faculty to cooperate in a system of daylight discipline without masks, a vacuum now existed which an independent group called the Woozies filled. They appeared in the Spectrum for 1918, 1920, and 1921.

\(^{371}\)Gettysburgian, April 17 and 24, 1918.
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whose petitions for reinstatement were denied. The professors took time out for a petition of their own, asking the trustees in June 1918 to discontinue student government, "as neither the student body nor the Student Council seem to realize the purpose of student participation in college government." Everyone must have breathed a sigh of relief when the term ended and the students went either home or into the service. The trustees expressed the hope that student government could continue, but referred the decision to a joint committee which, when it met, decided that it should go on, at least for the next year. When College opened in September 1918, most male students were under the command of army officers, who were most effective in preventing hazing.372

At the beginning of the first postwar academic year yet another attempt was made to deal with this annoying issue. In September 1919 some 150 upperclassmen presented the faculty with a petition which was also unanimously endorsed at a meeting of the freshman class. The time having come, the petitioners stated, for a closer relationship between students and faculty, they were pledging their "support and influence to eliminate hazing in any form whatever, a practice which has resulted only in harm to the institution." In return, they hoped that the faculty would consider readmitting those suspended students who had by now been "sufficiently punished" for what they had done. The faculty lost no time in accepting the petition and beginning the reinstatements. If the Gettysburgian for October 8, 1919 accurately reflected student sentiment, things had indeed changed since the hectic days of the previous year. Crediting returning servicemen for their help in promoting a different attitude, the editor wrote that Gettysburg students had "been bound by the shackles of an institution which the greater majority of colleges and universities have abolished five to ten years ago. Hazing has had its day and can now be only cast aside as useless since we have come to a better understanding of student relationship."

Nevertheless, in spite of petitions and near-unanimous resolutions, hazing persisted. Both Student Council and faculty continued to deal with it as best they could. At long last, its reduced level permitted the introduction of a tolerable method of enforcing freshman customs, the sentiment for which among most students

372The 1919 College catalogue added to the earlier sentence on hazing one which defined the practice in words very similar to the faculty's dictionary definition. In the spring of 1919, upon the recommendation of the Student Council, the president hired a local police officer as a night watchman, with instructions to patrol the dormitories at regular intervals between midnight and daylight. For a somewhat different treatment of the events of 1917-1918, see p. 472. For an account of hazing at Dickinson, which also had its sophomore band, see Sellers, Dickinson College, p. 298.
remained undiminished. In the spring of 1923 the Student Council asked faculty approval of the Tribunal, which would be an agency of the council in trying those students charged with violating customs and in carrying out sentences imposed upon those found guilty, during daylight hours and by persons without masks. The faculty reacted gingerly to this request. It accepted the recommendation of its discipline committee that the plan "be not forbidden" and that it be initiated "on trial." The professors reserved the right "to discontinue their acquiescence" upon due notice to the Student Council.

The Tribunal, consisting of two seniors, three juniors, and four sophomores, began functioning in September 1923. Its trials usually occurred on Thursday evenings and the sentences were carried out about noon on Friday on the south steps of Pennsylvania Hall. Penalties ranged from having to wear a sign calling attention to one's particular transgression to enduring a thoroughly unprofessional haircut. Few students protested this arrangement, in part because few who opposed it and kept to themselves became involved in it. Two letters appearing in the Gettysburgian in November 1932 illustrate the degree to which ideas of a quarter century earlier were still firmly held by the opponents and supporters of freshman discipline. The first characterized most customs, and the
The Tribunal, as childish, unchristian, and dishonest; obviously they should be abolished. The second predicted that their demise "would prove fatal to the true spirit of loyalty which our Alma Mater has a right to demand of us." Such loyalty, its author claimed, could come only "after we have learned to humble ourselves." 373

The vigor of the Tribunal depended, in large part, on the interest of its members, and there were times when that interest was at a low ebb. However, there was always enough zeal to propel the institution into the next year. Customs continued to exist, and to be defended, although considerably curtailed, during most of the war years. The Tribunal established in 1923 excluded women students, who had their own Tribunal both before 1933 and after 1935. In the later

373Two signs of the times were the disappearance from the 1927 catalogue of the definition of hazing and from the 1928 catalogue of all reference to it. In December 1931, following adjournment of their meeting, many trustees engaged in an informal discussion, observing that fraternities still practiced hazing of their initiates. The board president then asked President Hanson to notify the fraternities that they had no special privileges in the College and that the rule against hazing applied "with equal force to every group on the campus." Hanson agreed to cooperate "in every possible way," but the effect on fraternity behavior was minimal.
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Customs for Freshmen Men, 1941-1942

(1) The regulation dink shall be worn at all times, except when out of town, when in uniform, on Sundays, and when engaged in College athletic activities.

(2) No dates shall be allowed freshmen during the first semester.

(3) Walking on the grass by freshmen is prohibited.

(4) Smoking will be permitted the freshman only in his room.

(5) Black socks and ties will have to be worn. Black shoe strings used for ties will not be recognized.

(6) Entrance to the campus must be made through the driveway, not through the pavement on either side of the gates.

(7) Hands must be kept out of the pockets.

(8) The center walk leading from Old Dorm to Brua Chapel may not be used until after the Christmas vacation.

(9) It will be compulsory for all freshmen to attend all pep meetings and athletic contests and to sit as a group. At home football games they shall form a double line at the gymnasium door to greet the team when it comes on the field.

(10) At all times a good supply of matches for the accommodation of upperclassmen must be carried.

(11) All freshmen must greet everyone on the campus with the traditional Gettysburg "hello." The freshman will then repeat his name to the person to whom he has spoken. For example: "Hello, my name is Jim Jones."

(12) All reasonable requests of upperclassmen must be obeyed.

(13) Freshmen may not enter or leave Glatfelter Hall by the main, east entrance, but will use the doors at the north and south ends of the building.

(14) Upon entering any of the college buildings, the dink must be removed.

(15) A coat or sweater with sleeves must be worn at all times.

(16) All school songs and cheers must be learned.

(17) There will be no conversation by freshmen with co-eds.

(18) Cars may not be parked on the campus.

(19) A frosh must at all times carry his books slung over his shoulder with a bookstrap.

(20) After the conclusion of the chapel exercises, freshmen will remain seated until all others have passed out.

(21) Absolute quiet must be maintained while in chapel.

(22) Customs are suspended after every football game won from the time of the victory until the following Tuesday morning at 7:45 o'clock.

Adopted by the Student Council and announced in the fall 1941 G-Book. The freshmen men were reminded that the Tribunal held its trials every Thursday evening and that the "slaughter of the innocents" occurred on the front steps of Old Dorm every Friday at 12:30 P.M.
1930s and 1940s, women’s customs were briefer in duration than men’s and intended to be more direct in orienting freshmen to life at Gettysburg College.  

A review of the Gettysburg experience during the years from 1904 to 1945 will yield sufficient evidence to warrant the conclusion that, overall, student discipline was not a major problem. There were, to be sure, some positions both students and faculty took which the other would not accept. The crisis resulting from the occasional confrontations over important issues produced few casualties and left a minimum of ill-feeling. In his commentary for the 1911 Spectrum, Professor Stahley wrote that measures taken to maintain discipline during 1909-1910 had been “severe enough to impress, but not to crush.” He could have written the same thing about most, if not all, other years. Few students were ever expelled with no hope of being reinstated at some future time. Even when they were strongly resisting each other, students and faculty usually demonstrated an understanding of the other’s position. In the matter of compulsory church attendance, faculty and trustees finally and quietly yielded to the students. In the matter of hazing, the faculty eventually and reluctantly accepted a method of daylight freshman discipline which did not fall within its definition of the forbidden practice, but fraternity hazing continued. In the matter of cheating, which was usually an individual’s offense, both students and faculty cooperated in what turned out to be inconclusive efforts to minimize the practice. In the matter of compulsory chapel, the faculty and trustees held their ground; the issue was far from resolved in 1945.

During his long presidency, Henry W. A. Hanson formulated old convictions about student behavior in terms which differed from those of his predecessors and which reflected his own personality as well as nearly two decades of experience as a parish pastor. There was really nothing new in his statement that cheating, drinking, and immorality were three forbidden acts at Gettysburg. President Krauth could have said the same thing, and probably did. What was new was the high degree to which Hanson appealed to whatever gentlemanly instincts students had and the extent to which he relied upon moral suasion rather than sanctions in persuading students to conform to the traditional standards of behavior. In its issue of October 2, 1930, the Gettysburgian reported that someone had removed the names pasted on the chapel seats and used for verifying

---

374The U.L.C.A. survey team included in their report a list of freshman customs as published in the student handbook of one Lutheran college and noted without comment the following statement later on in the same publication: “Let them say what they please, men are above kindergarten actions.” Perhaps no comment was needed to establish their point, but it should be noted that they were using the Gettysburg G-Book as their example. U.L.C.A. Survey, 2:366-367.
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attendance. The editor commended the president's "gentlemanly treatment of the incident." He was "right in not wanting to know the name of the man who did it." If found, the culprit, "no doubt, would be laughed off the campus." The editor may have been much too sanguine about the reaction of his fellow-students, but no one should doubt either the president's sincerity during this and similar incidents or the merits of such a strategy in a liberal arts college, especially one with a church relationship. What one might doubt is whether there were not serious limitations at times to a policy of not wanting to know the identity of those responsible for what was happening on campus. If he had been more fully informed, for example, would the president still have assured the trustees in June 1926 that "drink has ceased to be a problem at Gettysburg College"?

College Spirit: Songs and Colors

College spirit could and did manifest itself in many ways, several of which have already been discussed in this chapter. It was also evident in the numerous efforts by both students and faculty to produce songs and colors which would accurately reflect College sentiment and demonstrate to sister institutions that Gettysburg was not behind the times in cultivating loyalty.

In the fall of 1904 the students did have a song which they could regard as officially their own: "The Orange and the Blue."

A second song, "Our Alma Mater," served as an unofficial alma mater for more than a decade; the Pen and Sword Society regularly used it to close its annual meetings at least through 1911. Meanwhile, "The Orange and the Blue" was soon cast aside and forgotten.

In the fall of 1905 several members of the class of 1904 offered a prize to the person who composed the best entry for adoption as the "permanent college song" and set it to some well-known tune. The offerings were sparse (they usually were on such occasions) and the contest had to be extended. However, by the spring of 1906 the judges were able to submit two entries to the decision of a student mass meeting, which chose Bertram A. Strohmeier's "Sons of Gettysburg," sung to the tune "Men of Harlech," over "Gettysburg," sung to "Die Wacht am Rhein." While the contest was in progress, George R. Pretz wrote the words and Will D. Moyer the music for the "Gettysburg March Song," which was published as sheet music.

375 There were at least two other entirely different College songs with this same title which appeared in print during the first decade of the century. The College colors figured prominently in the lyrics or titles of most of its songs.
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in the spring of 1906. It was the first College song to appear in this form. Both the march song and the Strohmeier composition proved to be popular and appeared in College publications for more than thirty years.

Although the Gettysburgian for May 9, 1906 urged that "Sons of Gettysburg" should "receive formal adoption by the student body as the Gettysburg Song," no such action on its behalf was ever taken. Six years later, in the issue of May 1, 1912, the newspaper complained that, of the two College songs then in use, one ("Sons of Gettysburg") suffered because it was "set to a borrowed air," while the other ("Gettysburg March Song") was faulted because it contained "the most prosaic poetry." In the interests of school spirit, the editor argued that the College needed a new tune for one, new lyrics for the other, more songs, and (to keep up with other schools) a College song book. For a time, it appeared that the latter might become a reality. In the fall of 1913 the Press Club sent out a call to alumni and students to submit new compositions for a proposed publication. Then, in the spring of 1914, the faculty entered the picture for the first time when it named a committee to prepare a College songbook. When the project's editor died unexpectedly, the committee in June 1915 published in its stead Songs and Hymns for Commencement. Among the nineteen selections which it included were the College hymn ("Blessing and Honor") and five other College songs, including "Our Alma Mater," "Sons of Gettysburg," and "Gettysburg March Song." In the foreword, the committee stated its purpose: to "inspire to good fellowship and to enthusiasm for the Greater Gettysburg." It also announced ambitious plans (which never materialized) to produce another songbook, one with about two hundred selections.

At the customary Y.M.C.A. reception in the fall of 1915, students sang a new one-verse song whose opening lines were "We are here to cheer for Gettysburg." About a month later, President Granville wrote a second stanza and Trustee Jacob A. Clutz a third. Known best as the "Student Song" or the "Gettysburg Student Song," it was immediately popular and appeared in G-Books into the 1950s.

The prevailing campus mood during the first two decades of the century explains why, especially on warm spring evenings, as their year's College work was drawing to an end, students gathered on the steps, or forum, of Pennsylvania Hall to sing College and other

---

376 The Gettysburgian for October 24, 1917 gave the lyrics of three songs which "every Gettysburg Man" should know: "Sons of Gettysburg," "Gettysburg March Song," and "Gettysburg Student Song." Both then and later there were other College compositions which are not discussed here. In the spring of 1919 the annual concert of the glee club and orchestra included F. William Sunderman's "On Gettysburg," dedicated to her students who were casualties of the recent war.
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Alma Mater

As softly the evening shadows
Are veiling the campus towers,
We come, a band of good fellows,
To sing in the twilight hours;
The silvery moonlight mantles
The worn walls of chapel anew;
The wind in the trees sweetly echoes
Our praises of orange and blue.

Whenever thy loyal sons gather,
To waken fond memory,
Our thoughts shall be turned, Alma Mater,
Old Gettysburg, back to thee;
Forever am I thy debtor,
And whatever else I may do,
I'll love, I'll defend, and I'll honor
The glorious orange and blue.

Gettysburg March Song

Yale may sing about her spirit,
Harvard laud her noble men,
And you hear the songs of Princeton,
University of Penn;
And the yells of all the others
That upon the breezes surge,
But the one that thrills our hearts the most
Is the one of Gettysburg.

Chorus.
So then we'll cheer and yell and sing,
For Gettysburg, old Gettysburg,
We are the kind to dare and do;
We'll raise our glorious flag
Up to the sky, and there defy
An equal to our noble Orange and the Blue.

We're as jolly a set of students
As you'll find in any place,
No matter where the search goes,
Or upon what map you trace;
We do not go off in raptures,
Nor do we sport around or splurge,
But when you want the right kind,
Just come around to Gettysburg.

Now we'll raise our voices higher,
Louder give our yells and cheers,
Rally round our glorious banner
That has stood the test for years;
Till the echoes, never ceasing,
As the songs from us emerge,
Tell the honor and the glory
Of our dear old Gettysburg.
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Gettysburg Student Song

We are here to cheer for Gettysburg
Whose sons we're proud to be
We are here to fight for Gettysburg
To win a victory
On track, or field or rostrum
Our boys will fight it through
So again we cheer for Gettysburg
For the Orange and the Blue.

We are here to cheer for Gettysburg
Our Alma Mater fair
We are here to sing for Gettysburg
Our praises to her bear
Wherever we may wander
To her we will be true
So again we cheer for Gettysburg
For the Orange and the Blue.

We are here to cheer for Gettysburg,
To fling her banners wide;
We are here to work for Gettysburg,
To swell the rising tide
Of men, and wealth, and power,
Of fame and learning too;
So again we cheer for Gettysburg
For the Orange and the Blue.

Sons of Gettysburg

Bertram A. Strohmeier

Sons of Gettysburg! Outspoken
Myriad voices rise unbroken,
Swelling strong in mighty token,
'Tis for Gettysburg!
'Tis the chorus of our sires,
Earthly and celestial choirs,
Lighting love's undying fires
For old Gettysburg.

Chorus
Loyal sons assemble
Days of old resemble;
Let colors fly 'midst shout and cry,
Till ev'ry voice shall tremble!
Hurrah! Hurrah! Swell the chorus.
See our banner streaming o'er us,
O, forever wave the glorious Orange and the Blue.

Sunlight flashing on the tower,
See the grandeur, feel the power!
Thrill with love our latest hour
For old Gettysburg.
Raise the flag we rally under,
Let the craven stand and wonder,
While we shout in voice of thunder,
'Tis for Gettysburg!
songs. In June 1912, as a new feature of commencement week, the Y.M.C.A. sponsored a song service on the forum in which students and the College orchestra, as well as members of town churches and their ministers, all participated. References in the Gettysburgian over a period of more than twenty years make it abundantly clear just how fragile a custom this always was and how difficult it was to sustain it for more than one season at a time.

At the beginning of the 1920s, despite two contests and prizes, as well as numerous impromptu offerings, while the students of Gettysburg College had songs for which they obviously had affection, they had none which everyone would recognize as their official song. That lack was about to be remedied, and in a swift and decisive manner. A student letter published in the Gettysburgian for November 2, 1921, noting the recent agitation for "new songs to be used at football games, other athletic contests, and mass meetings," asked why the College could not have a song, to be called the alma mater, which would be sung only on such occasions. During its singing "everyone would stand with heads bared and no one would move from their places until the last note had been sung." As a clincher, the unidentified student used the standard argument that "this is a custom at one of our rival colleges and is one of the most beautiful and impressive of all the customs there." A few days later, Paul S. Gilbert, of the class of 1922, wrote two verses of a song which he called simply "Alma Mater." He took them to Frederick E. Reinartz, of the class of 1924 and his fraternity brother, who composed the music. In response to a general demand on the part of the student body for an Alma Mater song," reported the Gettysburgian for November 9,

an original production was offered for approval at the mass meeting last Friday evening [before a football game with Villanova]. The glee club sang it first, and the student body joined in after they got an idea of the tune. The melody is rather pretty and the sentiment is not bad either.

Official action and frequent use quickly ratified the new song as the alma mater. In March 1922 the Student Council accorded it that status. During their annual spring tour the musical clubs used it as the final number on their programs. In June it preceded the Doxology during the dedication of Weidensall Hall. The senior class sang it at the close of the commencement ceremonies. This was the first time in the history of the institution that a College song was so honored; it soon dethroned "A Mighty Fortress is Our God" from the position it had long occupied on the commencement program. In

377In an interview on October 3, 1982 with this author, Gilbert remembered writing the second stanza and then the first, both in one sitting, and then making few if any changes in his first draft before presenting it as a finished work.
September it was used during the opening exercises.\textsuperscript{378} Clearly, by the fall of 1922 the Gilbert-Reinartz song had become the College's first widely recognized alma mater, and its use had been extended far beyond athletic contests and mass meetings.\textsuperscript{379}

The immediate success of the new alma mater did not prevent the Gettysburgian from calling periodically for more College songs or erstwhile composers from offering them. Soon after joining the faculty and assuming a major responsibility for the music program, Professor Saltzer composed several marches, set lyrics written by others to music, and wrote the "Loyalty Song" (1929).\textsuperscript{380} In 1933 Charles H. Kauffman, of the class of 1929, wrote "The March of the Bullets," which he dedicated to George H. Hummel, trustee and president of the Athletic Council. Lester Loucks of the Spring Garden Band, York, composed the music. In the same year Robert S. Nagle, of the class of 1935, wrote the "President's Marching Song." In 1934 Trustee Charles T. Lark's "Anima Gettysburgiae," set to the well-known old tune "Integer Vitae," was performed on campus for the first time. The 1941 G-Book contained eleven College songs which freshmen were enjoined to learn (most probably did not).\textsuperscript{381}

\textsuperscript{378}In his last report to the board in May 1952, President Hanson declared that "my first act as President was to make the Alma Mater the official College song to be used at all gatherings of our Alumni throughout the world." No record of this action appears to have been made in 1923.

\textsuperscript{379}Paul S. Gilbert secured a copyright for "Alma Mater" in the spring of 1922. Published as sheet music, it was dedicated to Dean Bikle. In August 1924 Reinartz, whose name was not included in the copyright notice, gave the Woman's League the remaining copies of the song and granted that organization the right to make reprints from the original plates. For many years, sale of copies was a dependable, although small, source of revenue for the women. The text of the assignment is quoted on page 36 of the published minutes of the 1924 Woman's League convention. An undated letter from Mrs. Jean F. Kridle, Supervisory Copyright Bibliographer, Copyright Office, Library of Congress, to this author stated that there is no record of renewal of copyright. Thus the alma mater passed into the public domain after twenty-eight years.

\textsuperscript{380}Saltzer wrote the band music for the alma mater. He set to music "The Spirit of Gettysburg" and the "Gettysburg Battle Song," words written by Robert Fortenbaugh (1925); "Old Dorm in the Moonlight," by Wellington R. Emmert (1928); and "Farewell Song," by John W. Ostrom (1932).

\textsuperscript{381}The eleven were the College hymn, the alma mater, "Sons of Gettysburg," "Student Song," "Rah, Rah, Gettysburgia," which dated from about 1920, "Old Dorm in the Moonlight," "Loyalty Song," "Farewell Song," "March of the Bullets," "President's Marching Song," and "Anima Gettysburgiae." In addition, the 1941 G-Book included thirteen cheers, all of which had been developed since 1904. Whether because of space limitations or the personal preference of the staffs, there was considerable variation from year to year in the number of songs included in the G-Book. The 1941 edition happened to contain a large number.
Between 1904 and 1945 there was only one serious challenge to the colors which the students had adopted in 1889. In May 1932, as the College was preparing to celebrate its centennial, Trustee Charles T. Lark, of the class of 1898, in a letter to the editor of the Gettysburgian (which as a student he had helped found) proposed that the College should enter its second century with a new set of colors. Since the orange and blue "seriously clash and fight each other," there was good reason in his mind for substituting either light blue and dark blue or blue and gray. If the College chose the latter combination, he argued, it would "perhaps be the only institution in America having colors which really mean something." No one gave serious consideration to this proposal during the celebration, but over the next two years it was discussed on the campus and at alumni meetings. In June 1934 a student mass meeting, which drew only some thirty persons, voted decisively against the Lark proposal and, on the same day, those attending the annual meeting of the Alumni Association, after a lengthy discussion, voted to table it indefinitely. In a letter which both the Gettysburgian and the alumni bulletin published in December 1934, Lark was especially pointed in denouncing slavish adherence to "Grandfather Tradition," which he said had frequently stymied "practically every forward movement" at Gettysburg College. He repeated his earlier argument that the College should "select colors which are not only artistically and esthetically harmonious, making a very attractive and pleasing combination, but which also now indicate the happy union between the blue and the gray forces whose deeds made Gettysburg historic." The College had been "out of step with the times and place entirely too long." It was now high time to enter "a new deal and gratefully accept our sacred heritage."

The editor of the alumni bulletin invited verbal and written comments on the Lark proposal, and he got them. Three letters in the March 1935 issue attacked Lark's main point. To "reorganize our emotional attachments to our College around the memory of a battle," argued Spurgeon M. Keeny of the class of 1914, seemed to deny "the most elementary educational principles for which Gettysburg and every other real educational institution stands." Howard F. Sheets of the class of 1925 stated that he wanted to remember the College because of his experiences there "under the orange and blue" and not because of a battle fought long before he was born. Lewis C. Manges of the class of 1928 objected strenuously "to using our Alma Mater as a means of perpetuating probably the most asinine disaster written in the pages of our nation's history." Sheets expressed the "fervent hope that the proposal dies a natural death," which it did. Orange and blue were among the survivors.
In 1904 the Alumni Association was still following its customary routine of convening annually in business session during commencement week. This enabled it to admit the graduating class into formal membership, to note deaths which had occurred during the preceding year, to elect officers (an annual task), and to transact such other business as it chose to consider. In addition, there was an alumni banquet somewhere in town and several classes held reunions.

Closely related to the Alumni Association were the five alumni clubs—Yale, New York, Harrisburg, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh—all of which had been organized during the previous decade. As already noted, in 1903 and 1904 the New York club had taken the leadership in encouraging active alumni participation in the choice of a successor to President McKnight.

For a few years after 1904, nothing occurred to change substantially the old routine. In 1906 Charles S. Duncan returned to the presidency of the Alumni Association and continued to occupy it for more than a decade. In the previous year Clyde B. Stover was elected secretary, a position which he held until 1919. Harry C. Picking, who had been elected treasurer for the first time in 1886, decided that he had had enough of the responsibility only in 1917. When the Alumni Association met during commencement week, its members interrupted their reminiscing and merrymaking long enough to approve recommendations intended to upgrade the College and lay plans to raise money for its use. Long before the trustees were ready to take such steps, the alumni recommended, on several occasions, that the name of the College be changed and that the charter be amended to prescribe trustee terms of a specified number of years.

They also asked the trustees to publish regular summaries of their deliberations. In 1908 the Alumni Association proposed to raise $30,000 to endow a chair of history, but it abandoned the project the next year when it appeared to be not feasible. About the same time the association approved the 1908 plan of the Pen and Sword Society to conduct a systematic annual campaign for funds, the proceeds to be used for the good of the College.382 When the Athletic Council secured a full-time coach, the Alumni Association under-

---

382 The General Alumni Fund, as it was called, was an obvious forerunner of the Loyalty Fund. President Granville praised it as a way for former students of limited means to support the College on a regular basis. Class agents were appointed and eventually several thousand dollars were raised. None of the money was to be used until the total reached $5,000. As late as World War I there were efforts to revive the fund, but they were unsuccessful.
took to raise some of the money needed to pay his salary and meet other expenses of the athletic program.

Recognizing the importance of alumni support in his efforts to move the College into the twentieth century, President Hefelbower brought the annual alumni banquet onto the campus and for many years thereafter the College offered a free meal to all takers. The response was gratifying. Held first in the gymnasium and then in the sweat box, beginning in 1917 the alumni gathered for this event in the dining room of Huber Hall. It was the final event of the program, after the commencement exercises. The College was helped by the increasing number of class reunions, which brought more and more alumni to the campus. Commencement programs published about the time of World War I show that by then the College was inviting classes to meet every five years; many began doing just that. Early in the Granville administration a number of these classes presented the College with valuable gifts, including cement walks, gateways, and classroom furnishings. A few new alumni clubs were formed after 1904, but it was as difficult as ever to keep them alive for more than a few years. The 1912 Spectrum, the first published during the Granville administration, listed, in addition to the five clubs of 1904, ones in York county and at The Johns Hopkins University, as well as one formed by the women graduates.

There were alumni, especially graduates of the previous ten to fifteen years, who actively supported the changes being proposed and effected during the Hefelbower administration, and who in fact wished to see the pace of change quickened. They chafed at the bit as year after year they watched the majority of older men who attended the annual alumni meetings turn the occasion into a largely social affair, during which it was difficult (although obviously not impossible) to transact serious business. Finally, in 1909, these dissatisfied alumni, who were active members of clubs at whose meetings the future of the College was carefully discussed, decided to establish a second organization, which would also meet during commencement

---

383 No class matched the feat of the 1904 graduates, who began publishing an informative annual bulletin in the year of their graduation and continued the practice through 1964.
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week,384 Called the Federation of Gettysburg Clubs, it was to be comprised of delegates chosen and presumably instructed by the various clubs. Possibly because a new College president took office in the fall of 1910 and because of the successful financial campaign which quickly followed, the federation became inactive after its third annual meeting in 1911. Five years later, as new problems confronted the College, it was revived. In the April 4, 1917 issue of the Gettysburgian, an alumnus identified only as Grad, whose understanding of the situation sometimes exceeded his tact in describing it, gave this forthright explanation of why the federation was needed:

You know an army isn't effective unless it is well organized and adequately officered. Nor is a business concern successful unless it is well organized and intelligently managed. The German army is effective and the Standard Oil Company is successful because of their wonderful organization. Organization is the key to effectiveness and success in these ultra modern days.

I think you will agree with me that our alumni are shamefully disorganized. There ought to be some sort of a clearing house for alumni ideas and some well organized central body through which alumni might take effective action. The post-prandial meeting of the alumni which follows the commencement exercises is not the sort of thing that works effectively. Very few people ever know what is going to be “pulled off” there. Some one will get up, make a flowery speech, deliver himself of a proposition that nobody has had opportunity to think over, but it will be carried by an unanimous vote in the spirit of “Sure Mike, we’re all good fellows.” But there is another consideration, too. The gathering of alumni at that meeting is not a representative gathering — and it is not a serious gathering. There is too large an audience for such a small show. We go there for fun and not for business. There is nothing of German army effectiveness nor of Standard Oil success in the so-called business deliberations of this meeting. And that is no reflection on “Charlie” Duncan either, because he runs the show in the time-honored manner established by precedent. He is a great dispenser of fun and that’s what we go there for.

But don’t you think the business of the alumni should be done in a strictly exclusive business meeting? The great educational institutions of this country that spell success have come to their

384By far the most active club during this period was the one in New York, which at times reported well over one hundred members. (In 1917 it had 240). Its two most energetic workers at that time were William J. Gies, an alumni trustee from 1908 to 1920, and George W. Kessler, of the class of 1908, after 1911 a New York attorney. Detailed reports of the club meetings which were often published in the Gettysburgian show the wide range of its concerns for the College. Gies was chairman of the committee which persuaded other clubs to join in organizing a second association, called the federation. Kessler, who was secretary from 1908 until he died during the flu epidemic in the fall of 1918, strongly supported the alumni fund, the federation, and pensions for professors. There were, of course, other alumni who were equally committed to improving the College. Among them were Louis S. Weaver of York and W. K. T. Sahm of Pittsburgh.
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present status largely by organized alumni thought and action. Each has an alumni federation composed of delegates who represent alumni clubs the country over. Serious and vital things are discussed in the local club meetings. The local club elects its ablest men to represent it in the alumni federation where they meet with able representatives of other local clubs and of the alumni generally to exchange their views and decide upon some definite course of action when occasion seems to require it. They take back to their local clubs ideas and proposals that have been dignified by the serious deliberations of able representative men of the alumni from all parts. In the local club meetings these proposals are weighed, and the alumni of each locality instruct their representatives what action shall be taken. Then concerted action is taken, and that spells progress and success. That is effective organization. 385

During the 1917 commencement weekend, when some scheduled events had to be cancelled because, due to the war, so many people left the campus early, the unexpected happened. The Alumni Association and the Federation of Gettysburg Clubs merged to form the Alumni Federation of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, whose business meetings were to be conducted by two or three delegates chosen by each of the alumni clubs. It was agreed to complete the reorganization by adopting a new constitution during the 1918 commencement weekend. After many years of service, Charles Duncan and Harry Picking declined to accept office in this new organization. In December 1917 the trustees recognized the federation as the official body of College graduates and former students, authorizing it to nominate candidates for alumni trustees, so long as the right to participate in its deliberations remained "open to the alumni generally." In the absence of minutes of the federation and of anything more than scattered College or town newspaper comment on alumni activities, it is difficult to know what happened during the next several years. 386 Printed commencement programs reserved time for business meetings of the "Alumni Association," but whether they were actually held in 1918 (a war year), 1919, or 1920 is not clear. What is certain is that the federation formed in 1917 soon disappears from the picture. The College catalogue never

---

385 Between April 4 and May 23, 1917 Grad contributed strongly worded articles on alumni federation, limited trustee terms, the general alumni fund, and pensions for professors. The editor apparently thought that Grad's columns would become a regular feature, "a new departure from the old rut," but none appeared after the end of the school year.

386 In addition to recognizing the federation in December 1917, the board refused to consider the question of limited terms for its members or to accept the resignation which Gies presented. Unfortunately, no minutes of the alumni association, whatever its name at the moment, for the years 1903 to 1929 are known to have survived.
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once acknowledged its existence, but continued to refer to the alumni organization by its old name.387

In the May 25, 1921 issue of the Gettysburgian, Louis S. Weaver, who according to the catalogue became secretary of the Alumni Association in 1919, issued a call for its annual meeting during the forthcoming commencement week. He urged a good attendance because there were two vacancies to be filled among the alumni trustees. Recognizing that there might be some question whether any general alumni body still existed, the board had begun as early as June 1920 to review the procedures for choosing alumni members. Most trustees wanted more persons than those attending an annual alumni meeting to be able to participate in the choice. Thus, when it met in response to Weaver's call, the Alumni Association adopted a list of qualifications for voters (for example, they must have been graduated for at least two years) and provided for a mail ballot to those who met them. In December 1921 the board elected the first two alumni trustees nominated in this way.388

The association which was revived in 1921 continued to represent the alumni through the rest of the decade. During the annual banquet which still closed commencement week, its members managed to interrupt their reminiscing long enough to choose officers, no one of whom had served before World War I or remained in office for more than three or four years. The number of alumni clubs increased during the 1920s, but the battle to federate them into a rival organization was over. Now the Alumni Association began urging the College to follow the example of many other schools by appropriating funds for a full-time alumni secretary and a periodical. As early as June 1923 the trustees authorized their finance committee to grant the association's request.389 However desirable, even necessary, this step was for the future of the College, it took almost six

387 A copy of a letter addressed to John B. McPherson and dated November 28, 1921 states that the Alumni Federation never completed its organization in 1916 and that the Alumni Association was therefore never actually dissolved, but that for several years it did not function. GCA.

388 Five of the six alumni trustees of 1904 were a hardy lot, with an average tenure of thirty-six years. Three survived into the 1930s. With the exception of William J. Gies, elected in 1908, the alumni nominated no trustees between 1900 and 1921, and only one between then and 1932. Of about 1800 alumni who were sent ballots in 1923, 584 actually voted to choose a candidate to fill a vacancy in that year.

389 Ever since it began in 1897, and continuing in the tradition of the College Monthly, the Gettysburgian tried to be a publication for the alumni as well as for the students. Its greatest difficulty in accomplishing this purpose was always in securing enough information of interest to alumni: information about themselves. Neither regular appeals for help, appointment of an alumni editor, nor special alumni editions in the mid-1920s yielded the desired results, but even into the 1930s the paper continued trying to include the alumni in its weekly reporting.
years and considerable prodding before President Hanson and the trustees decided that enough money was at last available to support an additional staff member and a regular publication. Finally, in the spring of 1929, a joint committee of the trustees and the Alumni Association announced the appointment of Charles W. Beachem (1902-1937) of the class of 1925 as the College's first alumni secretary.

Things began to happen as soon as Beachem assumed his duties in the summer of 1929. First, he took charge of the alumni homecoming which had been held with considerable success on a big football weekend each fall since 1920. Second, he began assisting classes in organizing their commencement reunions. In 1930 the alumni banquet was moved from the very end of the program to Saturday noon and renamed a collation; five years later a new event, an Alumni Council dinner meeting, was scheduled for Friday evening. Third, Beachem began editing a quarterly, best known as the Alumni Bulletin, the first number of which appeared in January 1930. Sent without charge to every known former student, graduate and non-graduate, this publication combined news of individuals with reports of what was happening on campus. It afforded President Hanson an excellent opportunity to establish a line of communication with the alumni similar to the one used by his two predecessors, but abandoned in 1923. Fourth, Beachem led the way to a major reorganization of the Alumni Association, one which must have pleased those who a generation earlier had tried and failed to achieve a similar end. A revised constitution adopted in 1930 vested in an alumni council the "power to determine the policies and to

---

390 The Alumni Association was the chief prodder. Urged to act by the New York club, in June 1925 it authorized a committee to investigate alumni organization and activity in other colleges and to recommend a plan for Gettysburg. Under the chairmanship of Levering Tyson of the class of 1910, then on the staff of Columbia University and one of the organizers of what became the American Alumni Council, the committee prepared a long, detailed report which was published in the April 28, 1926 issue of the Gettysburgian, together with a ballot for all alumni to indicate their approval or disapproval of its findings. The report showed how far behind its sister institutions Gettysburg was in organizing alumni work. At its next meeting, the board named a committee to find an alumni secretary.

391 The parade of reuniting classes began in 1932.

392 The report of the special 1925-1926 committee stressed the great importance of regular communication (and not only when money was needed) in bridging the gap between alumni who remember the College as they experienced it as undergraduates and the institution of a later day. The alumni are proud of the College as they believe it was in their day, the report argued, and often find it difficult to see why it should be changed. At the same time, those involved as students, faculty, and administrators in a later day sometimes take a dim view of much of what existed in the past. The committee urged "educating the alumni" by regular reports to every former student, including an annual report by the president.
regulate the activities of the Association." This body consisted of representatives of classes and alumni clubs, as well as members-at-large. "The alumni council is the heart of the alumni association," declared a writer in the March 1930 bulletin, "directing its activities and bringing to fruition the potential possibilities of a loyal, concerted constituency." A 1932 amendment to the constitution encouraged new leadership by limiting Alumni Association officers, excepting the secretary, to three successive one-year terms. Fifth, Beachem organized new alumni clubs, five during his first year in office. The 1930 catalogue listed five clubs; the 1935, thirteen; and the 1942, twenty-five.

Although recognizing their close association with the College administration, the leaders of the Alumni Association were determined to retain their own identity. For example, they insisted on keeping their old name when attempts were made to call them the alumni department of the College. Also, when the Alumni Council decided late in the depression year of 1932 to initiate an annual loyalty fund drive, it made clear that the idea was its own and also that it would determine (to be sure, in consultation with administrative officials) how the money was to be used each year. The first loyalty fund drive was conducted in 1933. In part because it was well-organized (each class had an agent who was committed to solicit) and in part because Beachem and his associates had significantly raised alumni spirits, it must be regarded a decided success. A total of 586 contributors gave $3,556. The thirteen drives between 1933 and 1945 yielded some $104,000. A quarter or more of the graduates participated. The money was used for student loans and scholarships, adding a north portico to Pennsylvania Hall, and general operating expenses.

In 1933 the Alumni Council adopted the first in a series of awards to recognize superior service to the College and to society. The class of 1925 agreed to sponsor the Alumni Meritorious Service Award as its gift to the College. The first medal was presented in 1935 to Professor Stahley, then living in retirement on the campus. In that year

---

503 Another amendment in 1932 required future alumni trustees to resign after serving for six years, unless they happened to "be filling a position of vital importance on the Board." Three years later, at long last, the trustees initiated six-year terms for all members. In 1941 the Alumni Council abandoned the practice of nominating alumni trustees by mail ballot and began making the choice itself.

504 The committee of 1925-1926 declared that "from the alumni standpoint the most effective alumni organization in the long run is one that is entirely independent of the institution." It acknowledged that such an organization was "not only well-nigh impossible at the outset but impracticable as well" for Gettysburg, and that therefore "the administration and alumni officials should work hand in glove."
the Alumni Association observed its centennial by dedicating a plaque on the south portico of Pennsylvania Hall. 295

While many persons contributed to the success which followed the hiring of a full-time alumni secretary in 1929, much of the credit must go to Charles Beachem, whose energy, personality, and tact won him many friends. His promising career was cut short by his death in January 1937. The long-desired north portico of Pennsylvania Hall, which was being planned when he died, was named in his memory. C. Paul Cessna of the class of 1915, who was then an assistant professor in the mathematics department, succeeded Beachem.

With the able assistance of Rosea Armor, who began a forty-seven year career with the College some months before her graduation by Gettysburg High School in 1930, Beachem developed the first set of systematic and continuing records of the 3,400 former students whose whereabouts were known. This was obviously a necessary first step in the reorganization of the alumni effort. However, as already noted, the College had a long history of publishing periodic

295 Relying upon the information contained in John Griffith Olmstead, Alumni Achievement: An Evaluation of the Work of the Alumni Associations of American Colleges and Universities (1931), p. 2, for many years Gettysburgians claimed that theirs was the fifth oldest alumni association in the country. However, the information in Olmstead was inaccurate. Forming alumni associations became fashionable in the 1820s and 1830s. By 1835 there were such bodies at Williams, Brown (defunct in 1835), Columbia, Bowdoin, Princeton, Yale, Dickinson, Union, Rutgers, Jefferson, and probably other places. Within two months after the Gettysburg association was formed, Washington College in Pennsylvania and the University of Pennsylvania fell into line. What was distinctive about the Gettysburg association was that it was formed so soon after the first class was graduated and that it continued without a break (except possibly 1918-1920).
lists of graduates, sometimes with addresses and occupations included. Both the 1905 and 1910 catalogues contained lists of all graduates since 1834, with additional information about each. Efforts to publish a more extensive alumni directory in 1907 (the seventy-fifth anniversary of the College) and again a decade later came to naught. However, in 1912 and again in 1918 the College itself did bring out as complete a list as possible of all former students, graduates and nongraduates. Registrar Clyde B. Stover, who was then also secretary of the Alumni Association, edited the latter, which appeared as the Alumni Directory of Pennsylvania College of Gettysburg, 1832-1918 [Gettysburg, 1918]. At the time of the centennial celebration in 1932, Stover and Alumni Secretary Beachem edited the most complete alumni directory which the College has ever published: The Alumni Record of Gettysburg College, 1832-1932: Centennial Edition [Gettysburg, 1932].

Between 1905 and 1945 the College awarded bachelor's degrees to 3,445 persons, two and one-half times as many as had been graduated between the first commencement in 1834 and 1904. No graduating class numbered one hundred or more persons until 1925. A peak of 141 recipients was reached in 1930 and again ten years later. The number of graduates fell below one hundred in the depression years 1936 and 1938, as well as in the war years 1944 and 1945. No twentieth-century class kept in closer touch than did the members of 1904, who were graduated just before the beginning of the period covered by this chapter. Fifteen years after their graduation, their annual bulletin reported that half of the 65 members (41 of whom received degrees) had entered the four professions of ministry
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(12), teaching (9), law (9), and medicine (3). About one-fourth were in business (15). Most of the rest were described as homemakers (9). In June 1931 President Hanson told the trustees that, of 128 graduating seniors that year, 49 intended to enter business, 40 teaching, 19 the ministry, 10 law, and 10 medicine.

Between 1905 and 1945 a stream of graduates continued to flow into the ministry, largely though not exclusively Lutheran.396 About one-half of the ninety students who entered the local seminary in the falls of 1940, 1941, and 1942 were from Gettysburg College. A century earlier, fully 80 percent of its graduates had become ministers. Those who moved to the school on the hill in 1940-1942 constituted fewer than 12 percent of their classes.

As before, some graduates entered the professions of medicine and law. The College now had curricula in biology, economics, political science, and history to help students prepare for these careers, but it did not have the tradition or reputation of training in these fields to compare with its record of preparing men for the theological seminary. While faculty, presidents, and trustees always welcomed students intent on becoming lawyers or doctors and sought to offer them sound programs, there is little or no evidence that they wanted Gettysburg to be widely known as a pre-law or premedical college.

Many of the students who entered Gettysburg after 1904 and whose numbers year after year broke previous enrollment records had no intention of becoming pastors, lawyers, or doctors. Instead, they expected to secure employment somewhere else in a continuously developing and increasingly industrial economy. There were few careers within the broad field described as business which did not have a contingent of Gettysburg graduates. Chemicals, railroads, petroleum, engineering, telephone and telegraph, insurance, banking, and sales far from exhaust the list.

When Pennsylvania began requiring a college degree for teaching in its public schools, Gettysburg responded by creating a department of education. Beginning in the 1920s many students completed the teacher education program and became public school teachers or administrators. Others pursued graduate training and became college and university professors. The 1932 alumni directory, for

396Judging from what its representatives said to synodical conventions and the Woman's League, the College must have continued to impress upon its students the importance of the ministry as a career. "The claims to the ministry," President Hanson told the women in 1925, "are always presented to every last boy some time while he is on the campus." Beginning in 1912 and continuing into the 1940s, the catalogue announced (the policy itself predated 1912) that children of clergymen were entitled to a scholarship amounting to one-half of tuition and general fees. Beginning in 1926, preministerial students were also entitled to a tuition credit.
example, listed teaching as the work in which almost half of the 1926 graduates were then engaged.

By 1945 there were at least twenty names to add to the list of alumni who had been college and seminary presidents and who were named in preceding chapters: Henry Eyster Jacobs (1862), Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; John A. Singmaster (1873), Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg; John B. Focht (1874), Susquehanna; Franklin P. Manhart (1877), Susquehanna; Millard F. Troxell (1880), Midland; Charles T. Aikens (1885), Susquehanna; John Aberly (1888), Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg; Frederick E. Metzger (1888), Maryland College for Women; Samuel G. Hefelbower (1891), Gettysburg; Herman F. Swartz (1891), Pacific School of Religion; Charles W. Leitzell (1893), Hartwick; Moritz G. L. Reitz (1895), Hartwick Seminary; James A. McAllister (1898), Interdenominational Seminary, Puerto Rico; William H. B. Carney (1899), Hartwick Seminary; Harvey D. Hoover (nongraduate, 1899), Carthage; Jacob Diehl (1903), Carthage; Joseph E. Rowe (1904), Clarkson Memorial College of Technology; Abdel Ross Wentz (1904), Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg; Levering Tyson (1910), Muhlenberg; Earl S. Rudisill (1912), Thiel; N. J. Gould Wickey (1912), Carthage; and Samuel Fausold (1912), Indiana State Teachers College. In addition, two men to whom the College had awarded Ph.D. degrees became college presidents: Rufus B. Peery (1895), Midland; and James A. B. Scherer (1897), Newberry and California Institute of Technology.397

At the time of its centennial in 1932, the College reported on the careers of some 5,382 students enrolled during the first century, 3,837 of whom were graduates. Of these, some 1,507 had entered some phase of business, 1,433 the ministry, 1,352 education (as teachers and administrators at all levels), 489 medicine and dentistry, 376 law, 156 a category called science, and 69 the military.398

397 These persons were elected presidents sometime between 1904 and 1945.
398 The compilation was included in the centennial program and reprinted elsewhere. The compilers warned that there were some duplications and that they had included some recent graduates still engaged in professional study. In June 1935 Alumni Secretary Beachem noted that “for many years the great majority of Gettysburg alumni went into vocations wherein monetary rewards were very meager.” He believed that while they “are by no means wealthy now, they do represent capital enough to place our college among the best of the smaller ones.” GCB (October 1935), p. 10. His comments about the limited means of alumni echoed those of others interested in the reorganized alumni effort. How many other colleges similar to Gettysburg could have presented the same argument, with equal justification?
Early in the Granville administration, some forty women met on the campus to form an organization which quickly became a distinctive feature of the College constituency and one of the institution's most stalwart supporters. Its chief founder was Mary Gingrich Stuckenberg (1849-1934), whose interest in Gettysburg paralleled that of her late husband. Several years after his death in 1903, when she visited the College to help arrange the books and other items which he had bequeathed to it, President Hefelbower discussed with her some of the pressing needs of the institution and the inadequate resources then available to meet them. As a result, Mrs. Stucken-berg decided to act on its behalf and chose a specific project with which to begin. With the president's full approval, in the spring of 1908 she met with small groups of women members of Lutheran churches in York and Pittsburgh, proposing that they raise enough money to pay the annual salary of a secretary (or director) for the College Y.M.C.A. The prompt and generous responses to her pleas persuaded the trustees, at their June 1908 meeting, to establish the position and appoint the first incumbent. Within a short time the donors whose contributions enabled the College to begin and continue the office were calling themselves woman's leagues of Gettysburg College.

Quickly recognizing the worth of these efforts, in December 1910 President Granville convinced the trustees to adopt a motion commending the women who were making them and endorsing "the

399See pp. 567-568.
plans for the extension of their work for the benefit of Pennsylvania College, and the organization of similar new Leagues in new locations." Within a month, representatives of the existing leagues, joined by several local women, met in Gettysburg and made plans to effect a general organization later in the year. In the meantime, they vowed to establish as many new leagues as possible.

On November 2 and 3, 1911 some forty women gathered in Brua Chapel to organize what came to be known as the Woman's League of Gettysburg College. The delegates represented the seven then-existing subleagues (as they shall subsequently be called): York (1908, reorganized 1911), Pittsburgh (1909), Gettysburg (1911), Philadelphia (1911), Chambersburg (1911), and Shippensburg (1911). The reported membership of these seven subleagues was 467. Mrs. Stuckenberg was elected president. One of the first two vice presidents was Elizabeth Painter Hanson, of Pittsburgh, whose husband became president of the College in 1923.


During the four years between 1911 and 1915, the number of subleagues increased from seven to nine and the number of members almost doubled, going from 467 to 885. The report of the second convention which appeared in the Gettysburgian for November 13, 1912 contained the first substantial statement of the purpose of the new organization: to develop general interest in educational work in all Lutheran homes, to promote Lutheran parents' support of Gettysburg College by making financial contributions and by sending it their children, to raise such annual sums for Gettysburg "as women are able to give," and to help in keeping "a high moral and cultural spirit" in all Lutheran educational institutions. In trying to carry out these purposes, each subleague undertook its own project. Several continued to provide much of the salary of the Y.M.C.A. secretary. One committed itself to the ambitious task of raising an amount
equal to the annual salary of the English Bible professor, once it became clear that the principal sum which James Strong had promised for that purpose would not be forthcoming. The women also presented small annual gifts to the library and occasional grants to assist certain campus activities, such as debating and oratory. Their total support at this time averaged about $1,200 each year.

From the very beginning of the league's existence, both the president of the College and his wife were actively involved in its affairs, especially during the annual conventions held each November. During these sessions the Y.M.C.A secretary gave detailed reports of his work. Students provided musical and other entertainment for the campus guests and featured the league in each year's Spectrum. Although Mrs. Stuckenberg maintained her interest in the organization, she relinquished the presidency in 1912.403 It is a tribute to the vitality of the organization of which she was chief founder that then and later there were many other qualified women who provided it with inspired leadership. The first three presidents succeeding her were from Philadelphia, Washington, and Altoona.

A new period in the life of the Woman's League began in 1915, when its officers asked President Granville to recommend one pressing College need which all of its subleagues, working together, could attempt to satisfy. He was quick to suggest that they raise money to pay for a Y.M.C.A. building on the campus. At its next annual convention, the league accepted this challenge. A month later the College trustees added their blessing. Before the building was finally ready for dedication and use in the summer of 1922, both the women and the College experienced one disappointment after another: the original building estimate of $30,000 proved to be much too low; the promise of a $25,000 gift from the national Y.M.C.A. (in honor of Robert Weidensall) yielded only 20 percent of that amount; World War I, the shortage of building materials in the immediate postwar era, and major inflation made construction either impossible or unwise until the spring of 1921; and the amount for which the Woman's League ultimately assumed responsibility was about $80,000.

Thanks to the energy and devotion of league members, they had to borrow only about $35,000 in order to pay the last of the construction bills. In an effort to attract contributors, as early as 1916 they had begun projecting a series of ways in which to recognize donors of amounts ranging from $1 to $1,000: placing names in the cornerstone (there were eventually some 2,200), entering them into special books, and preserving them on special plaques to be erected in

403 She spent most of her long widowhood in Wooster, Ohio, returning to Gettysburg from time to time and occasionally attending league conventions.
the completed building. The drive to enlarge their constituency resulted in the increase in the numbers of subleagues from nine in 1915 to thirteen in 1922 and in members from 885 in the former year to 2,323 in the latter. During some of this period the office of Y.M.C.A. secretary was vacant, and thus almost all that the Woman's League raised (it averaged more than $5,000 annually) was placed in the building fund.

A third period in the life of the Woman's League began in the fall of 1922, when Weidensall Hall was at last put into full use, a Y.M.C.A. secretary was again on duty, and almost half of the cost of the new building remained for its members to pay. Undaunted by the discouragements of the preceding seven years, the women actually increased their level of annual giving; it averaged $8,000 between 1922 and 1929. Their continuing success in raising funds during the prosperous twenties enabled them to add to the appointments in Weidensall, contribute annually an amount which paid most of the salary of the Y.M.C.A. secretary and helped support the program which he administered, and retire their debt. On October 3, 1928 they made the final payment on their note. Records of the gifts which league members presented were entered into one of their Golden Books, the first of which was purchased in 1921. By the end of the decade, there were Golden Books of Honor, Memory, Sunday School Honor, and Civil War Veterans and other Heroes. After formally burning their note during the 1928 convention, the women moved quickly to set a new goal for themselves: raising an endowment of $75,000, the income to be used to support the Y.M.C.A. secretary and maintain Weidensall Hall.

Thanks to diligent efforts, membership in the Woman's League broke all previous records during the 1920s, increasing from 2,323 in 1922 to 4,047 in 1929. Meanwhile, the number of subleagues grew from thirteen to seventeen. The depression which began in the latter year had by 1935 reduced league membership more than one-third (to 2,514) and the number of subleagues to fifteen.

---

404 The league used porticos, rooms, doorways, and windows, as well as plaques, to honor or memorialize its supporters. In 1925 the building committee reported that “all places in the building that could be so marked have been taken.” Nevertheless, wall space remained and plaques were still being erected as late as 1939. The minutes of the annual conventions include subleague reports, showing the many and sometimes ingenious devices members used to raise money for the College.

405 The Weidensall appointments contributed through the 1930s included such items as religious pictures, a water fountain, a cross on the eastern portico, a meditation room, hymnals, and chairs.

406 A book of jewels, for children under ten, was begun in 1933 and one of victory, for World War II servicemen, in 1942.

407 In 1931 the league president announced her motto for survival: lay low, go slow, coddle membership. Two years later, in an effort to add to the ranks, the women established several junior subleagues, which lasted about a decade.
difficult years league income averaged $4,000, half of what it had been during most of the 1920s. Nevertheless, in spite of the poor times, by the fall of 1935 the Y.M.C.A. endowment fund had reached $20,290.

A fourth period in the life of the Woman's League began in 1935, when the College, facing serious deficits, decided to close the academy and turn Stevens and Huber Halls into dormitories for women students. President Hanson appealed to the league for a silver anniversary gift to the College of $10,000 to finance the conversion. The fall league convention agreed to make it. For the first time in its history, the activity of the Woman's League was being extended significantly beyond the nurture of one campus organization. In addition to supporting the S.C.A., which succeeded the Y.M.C.A. in the fall of 1935, league members now embarked upon a campaign which they called their Gifts for Girls or Gifts for Girlhood. Eventually the women decided to go the second mile with this project. By the time they made their last payment in 1939, they had given the College more than $20,600 for the women's division. As early as 1936 the league began contributing to the newly formed College choir (by providing funds for purchasing its first robes) and in the following year urged the formation of a music department.
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Once again out of debt, in 1939 it agreed to raise $25,000 for the proposed new chapel, specifically to purchase an organ and a window.408

Between 1935 and 1945 league membership failed to approach the levels of the late 1920s, growing only from 2,514 to 2,854 (the number of subleagues increased from fifteen to seventeen).409 Nor did annual income return to predepression levels, although it did average about $5,800 during the decade and thus enable the women to pay their chapel pledge in full by early 1945, long before ground was broken for the new building.

Despite wars and depression, the financial contribution of the Woman's League from the time of its founding in 1911 to 1945 is most impressive: something in excess of $170,000. In addition, members of this organization had encouraged many college-bound students to come to Gettysburg, contributed in both direct and indirect ways to the success of the several financial campaigns, and created much good will for the College. One might hope that during these years several thousand women within the College constituency derived a generous measure of personal satisfaction from the conviction that they were committing themselves to a cause which merited their time and effort.

Town and Gown

Between 1904 and 1945 there was no substantial change in the generally good relations which had always existed between the College, on the one hand, and the Gettysburg and Adams county communities, on the other. This is not to say that everything remained the same. In sharp contrast to the earlier years, there were now very few resident trustees, although those who still sat on the board, especially Harry C. Picking and R. William Bream, wielded considerable power. As the student body increased from 197 in the fall of 1904 to 668 in the fall of 1942, the percentage represented by the Adams county contingent declined significantly. Even before the College readmitted women students in 1935 and offered them dormitory accommodations for the first time, Adams county had lost the virtual monopoly which it once held providing females for the student ranks.

408In May 1945 President Hanson informed the trustees that the league executive committee had agreed to his proposal that the women raise $50,000 to establish a music department.

409All but four of the twenty-one subleagues formed before 1945 were still in existence in that year, including all but one of the first seven.
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As the College catalogue passed through a series of revisions after 1904, the faculty members responsible for keeping it up to date consistently reminded its readers that Gettysburg was easy to reach by major highways and by rail (the last year in which rail service was mentioned was 1942). It also stressed that Gettysburg was the site of a heavily visited battlefield, of which the campus was an important part. The 1912 catalogue was the first to remind its readers that "here also is the National Cemetery where Lincoln made his ever to be remembered dedication speech." From time to time the Gettysburgian encouraged students to take full advantage of the educational opportunities which the battlefield offered. "With the thousands of tourists and excursionists annually visiting the town," wrote the editor on October 17, 1906, "our students have the best opportunity, during the hours of recreation, to mingle among men and to learn the lessons taught by experience. Gettysburg is truly a cosmopolitan town."

College and community still supported each other in many ways. Although there were times when the College tried to have its own fire-fighting equipment, successive presidents, realizing that the institution was heavily dependent upon the Gettysburg fire department in the event of a major disaster, contributed money to its treasury. Even before World War I there were two motion picture theaters in town, both patronized by many students. In 1926 the Gettysburg Times brought out the first in a long series of fall College editions, each containing much information about the institution and its program.

President Granville was deeply involved in the fiftieth anniversary celebration in 1913 and, several years later, was in charge of the county Liberty Loan drive. His successor always carefully cultivated good community relationships, and most countians with whom he came in contact responded favorably to his friendly gestures. He helped organize the Gettysburg Chamber of Commerce in 1931 and became the new organization's first president. A year later he coordinated county relief efforts. One of the leading local figures arranging for the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle, in November 1938 Hanson helped organize the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania and was chosen its first president. Other College personnel also contributed to community life. For example, Dean Tilberg was one of the leaders in the Boy Scout movement in the county. In the late 1930s and early 1940s Professor Fortenbaugh was one of the organizers of the present Adams County

410 The Lincoln Fellowship was organized to promote interest in the sixteenth president by celebrating his birthday, observing the anniversary of the dedication of Soldiers' National Cemetery, and calling attention to him in other ways.
Historical Society, of which he was in fact if not in name executive director. In the mid-1930s Librarian Knickerbocker and Professor Sanders worked with others in the community in an attempt to organize a county library.

The 1904 G-Book informed readers that "the people in general are very courteous to the students." The wording strongly suggests that there were some exceptions to this statement, and the evidence supports this interpretation. The near-inevitable tensions of earlier days remained. "There seems to be a disposition on the part of some of the citizens of Gettysburg to regard the students as common nuisances," declared the Gettysburgian for February 20, 1907. Three years later, after the freshmen and sophomores used the town streets for what the paper called a "fifteen minute tussle," the borough council created a special riot police, "for the purpose of preventing and suppressing unlawful demonstrations within the Borough on the part of the student body or other persons." In response, the Gettysburgian for March 23, 1910 concluded that "student disturbances always have been comparatively few in Gettysburg" and regretted that local newspapers had goaded the borough council into hasty and ill-adviced action, the reasons for which would soon be forgotten.

The Gettysburgian often reminded its readers, undoubtedly in the hope townspeople would take due notice, just how much money, along with many other benefits, the College brought into the community. The 1910 estimate was $75,000. By 1924 the figure had risen to $300,000 and by 1932 to $330,000. During the Hanson years the Gettysburgian could usually be counted upon to criticize students whose carefree activities incurred the wrath of the townspeople. "There is no excuse for such downright numb-skull tricks of witless fervor as were pulled on Monday night," declared the issue of November 16, 1933, after a football victory celebration had gotten out of hand. "Dr. Hanson has worked long and hard to obtain a harmonious relation between College and town, but in a few hours some nit-wit, big-feeling he-men, who did nothing to win the Dickinson game, did more to wreck that feeling than Dr. Hanson can repair in months."

The College and the Lutheran Church

In the fall of 1904 the College positions on its relationship to the Lutheran church and on religion in general were both long-established and recently reaffirmed. Professor Charles F. Sanders expressed them succinctly in writing the brief article describing the College which appeared in the fourth volume of A Cyclopedia of Education, published in 1913. He called Gettysburg "a nonsectarian
institution, founded and fostered by the General Synod Lutheran Church, chartered by the legislature of Pennsylvania in 1832," adding that "while the primary motive" in its founding "was to furnish a thorough preparation for the men contemplating the seminary course in theology, the general object of the founders was the promotion of academic and scientific education under Christian influences."411

Those responsible for the direction and management of the College in 1904 could be expected to call it a Christian institution, in the sense that the Christian view of the world and man informed the conduct of its entire program. They would also call it a Lutheran institution, in the sense that Lutherans were always predominant among its trustees, faculty, and students. Moreover, the College had consistently and deliberately limited its search for financial support almost entirely to Lutheran circles. At the same time, Gettysburg treasured its traditional independence from church control. The 1894 charter revision had in no way altered its freedom of action in this respect. The board of trustees was still entirely self-perpetuating and could if it chose reject even those candidates for membership nominated by the Alumni Association. It was because of freedom of choice rather than of outside pressure that more than the required 75 percent of the 1904 trustees were Lutheran.

Finally, the directors and managers of 1904 could be expected to call Gettysburg a nonsectarian (or unsectarian) institution, in the sense, first, that its charter forbade religious tests for trustees, faculty, and students, and, second, that the College had always declared that instruction required of students was nonsectarian. The forthright statement of the trustees on this subject when they established the Strong professorship in 1892 merely reaffirmed what the College had been saying during the preceding sixty years. One might question how nonsectarian an institution could be whose trustees, faculty, and students were drawn so heavily from one denomination. Perhaps an answer could be found in an investigation of the sincerity of its statements and of the ease, or difficulty, with which it eventually welcomed increasing numbers of non-Lutherans into its midst.412

When in desperation the trustees in 1904 chose Samuel G. Hefelbower as fifth president of the College, they probably had little idea that this thirty-three year old man, with only a few years of

411See also Harold A. Dunkelberger, Gettysburg College and the Lutheran Connection:... (Gettysburg, 1975).
412"Although a Lutheran institution, the sectarian spirit has no place" at Gettysburg, wrote President Hefelbower in the 1907 Spectrum. "The college is engaged in a general educational work, and offers to all comers courses of study severally adapted to the needs of candidates for the different learned professions, as well as for those who have in mind other vocations."
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experience as a parish pastor, graduate student, and college professor, would move so quickly in attempting to raise admissions standards, upgrade the curriculum, and recruit faculty with graduate training. Hefelbower well knew that these changes involved some risk and that they required significant amounts of new money. Doubting that the Lutheran church could be counted on to furnish this money, he counseled the trustees to begin looking elsewhere for it. Distrusting the ability of his fellow-clergymen to provide the leadership which the College then desperately needed, he urged the trustees to recruit qualified laymen when replenishing their ranks. Hefelbower was much more successful in the latter than in the former. As noted earlier in this chapter, between 1904 and 1945 there were only eleven ordained men among the fifty-nine persons elected to the board, and of these only seven were parish pastors. Unfortunately, the president was unable to develop the alternative sources of income necessary for the College to liquidate its debts and increase its endowment. On the eve of his resignation, he attributed his failure in part to what he called "the inherited divisions" in the College constituency. While he did not describe "the existing factions" which hindered advance, it is quite possible that he was referring to the parties in the church which had supported or opposed President McKnight in the 1890s.413

During the brief Hefelbower administration the College began to receive a small but welcome annual grant from the Lutheran church, the first such subsidy in its history. In 1905 the board of education of the General Synod, which for some years had been aiding four institutions within its territory, decided to investigate the possibility of extending its help to the remaining ones. In 1906 the Gettysburg trustees accepted the board's offer of an annual grant of $3,000, if in return the College would abandon its regular appeal to congregations for contributions to what it called its contingent fund. The payments began arriving during the 1907-1908 year. At a time when annual College income was less than $40,000, they were a most appreciated boon, even though they did not always arrive on time and sometimes the promised amount could not be met in full.414

413 Writing to his successor in 1920, Hefelbower claimed that while he was president "we freed ourselves" of "a preacher dominated board." S. G. Hefelbower to William A. Granville, Carthage, Illinois, November 30, 1920, in GCA. His comments on factionalism in the constituency are contained in his letter to the Committee on Investigation, October 8, 1909, in GCA.

414 Minutes of the board of education and College records show that the College received $38,700 from this source between 1907 and 1918, when the General Synod became part of the United Lutheran Church in America. During the same period, Susquehanna and Wittenberg, but not Muhlenberg and Thiel, also received board grants.
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As already noted, William A. Granville was the first layman to become president of the College. An active Lutheran before coming to Gettysburg in 1910, beginning with his inaugural address he championed the Christian characteristic of the College as vigorously as any clergyman could have done. "One of the proudest boasts of Gettysburg College is that she is a Christian College," he wrote in a 1916 admissions pamphlet, "for religion is the vital force and the most important element in any education." In his opinion, "the future development as well as the very existence of the Christian civilization in which we live depends largely on our Christian colleges." Continuing the practice of his predecessors, he presented the College cause before countless congregations and annual synod meetings. In addition, he represented the General Synod on the executive committee of the recently organized Federal Council of Churches and participated in the work of the National Lutheran Educational Conference, of which he was chosen president in 1919. Granville succeeded where his predecessor had failed in attracting significant sums of money from new sources. However, in order to qualify for the challenge grants of the General Education Board, the College had to raise large additional amounts. Instinctively, its trustees once more turned for help to their traditional Lutheran constituency. For example, in June 1912 they asked six synods to give their blessing to a "systematic canvass" of member congregations in support of the endowment campaign. A similar approach to the synods was made during the campaign which began seven years later. An important development in the relationship between the College and the Lutheran church occurred in November 1918, when after more than half a century of going their separate ways the General Synod, General Council, and United Synod in the South merged to form the United Lutheran Church in America.

415 Organized in June 1910, shortly before Granville came to Gettysburg, the Lutheran Educational Conference (National was added nine years later) was formed to promote higher education in all Lutheran-related institutions. Philip M. Bikle was its first president. Henry W. A. Hanson was also an active member of the conference and was elected its president in 1936. Gould Wickey, Lutheran Cooperation through Lutheran Higher Education: A Documentary History of the National Lutheran Educational Conference, 1910-1967 (Washington, 1967).

416 It was the desire of the trustees at this critical time, as they expressed it, not "to run the risk of disturbing the confidence of the Church in the denominational standing or loyalty of the College" which led them in June 1915 to reject the petitions of the faculty that they seek repeal of the 1894 charter amendment, which was the only thing preventing the College from being placed on the accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and retiring faculty from qualifying for Carnegie pensions. See p. 449.
The first president of the new body was Frederick H. Knubel, an 1893 graduate of the College and a trustee since 1914. He served as president of the U.L.C.A. until 1944 and as trustee of the College until he died a year later.

The constitution of the board of education in the new church authorized it "to prepare general surveys of educational standards" for member institutions and to determine which colleges and seminaries "shall receive aid from its funds." The constitution specified that, in order to qualify for such aid, an institution had to "be organically connected with a Synod or Synods of the United Lutheran Church; or ... be authorized by The United Lutheran Church; or ... by charter provision perpetually have at least two-thirds of its board of directors or trustees members of The United Lutheran Church."

The board of education immediately accepted Gettysburg as a U.L.C.A.-related institution; it more than met the third criterion. The standards which the board announced in 1922 it intended to follow in evaluating U.L.C.A. colleges were the very ones which the American Council on Education and accrediting agencies had recently adopted and were beginning to apply.

---

417 See E. Clifford Nelson, ed., The Lutherans in North America (Philadelphia, 1975), pp. 373-377, for a brief explanation of why and how this reunion occurred when it did. More than one-fourth of the synod presidents in the new church were Gettysburg graduates.

418 Minutes of the U.L.C.A. (1920), p. 257. For additional qualifications which the board wished to require of institutions seeking aid, see p. 280.

419 On May 16, 1921 the College secured an amendment of three words (those italicized below) to its charter, so that now three-fourths of the trustees would have to be members of The United Lutheran Church in America. Adams County Miscellaneous Book D, p. 197. As already noted, when the trustees secured a major revision of the charter in 1935, they reduced the required percentage of Lutheran trustees from the three-fourths set in 1894 to the two-thirds minimum now specified by the national church.
Some trustees, including former President Hefelbower, were fearful (and not without reason) that the mere mention of organic connection between synods and colleges was evidence of a desire to bring the latter under ultimate church control. In a letter to his successor in November 1920, he lamented "the widespread tendency on the part of our present general organization, including its boards, to put more and more authority in synodical and board organization, and less and less in the individual congregations on the one hand, and in the various enterprises of the church, for example, educational institutions, on the other."420

The election of Henry W. A. Hanson in 1923 returned a Lutheran parish pastor to the campus White House. Hanson had just completed his term as a synod president and was serving one of the U.L.C.A boards in the same capacity. Fully in sympathy with the tradition stressing the Christian over the Lutheran character of the College, in his hundreds of appearances before congregations, synods, and other gatherings he interpreted and developed that tradition in ways which favorably impressed thousands of men and women, who responded to his charm and regarded his inspirational messages as true expressions of the Gettysburg character. "The greatest single problem confronting modern education is placing behind culture of head, nobility of soul," he told the East Pennsylvania Synod in 1926. "Gettysburg College seeks as its greatest object, quickening a respect for, and loyalty to, the person and program of Jesus Christ." If it fails in this regard, he said, "I should regard my own connection with it as having failed in that which is nearest my own heart."421

When Hanson became president of the College in 1923, the trustees were already considering renewed requests from several synods

420S. G. Hefelbower to William A. Granville, Carthage, Illinois, November 30, 1920, in GCA. Meeting a few days after Hefelbower wrote this letter, the faculty, with but one dissenting vote (that of Dean Bikle), asked President Granville to express its decided sentiments on the subject in the event the matter of synodical control was raised in the forthcoming board meeting. "The history of educational development in our country has been away from the ecclesiastical administration of general academic education," he declared, "and we should regard the adoption of this suggestion [that trustees be elected by synods] as tending towards a narrowing parochialism out of all harmony with the democratic spirit of our American institutions."

421Probably without realizing all of the implications of what he was saying, Hanson also told the synod that "in its desire to reach the highest levels of academic scholarship," Gettysburg had not "in a single case departed from its announced purpose of having on its staff of teachers only men of Christian convictions." In the admissions brochure of 1916, Granville said substantially the same thing. Was this not imposing the kind of religious test which the 1832 charter forbade?
A GREATER GETTYSBURG

that they be given formal representation on the board. Synodical spokesmen argued that such representation would be consistent with the minimal organic relationship which the U.L.C.A. believed should exist between the church and its colleges. They also observed that representation would serve as a recognition of the major assistance which Lutherans had rendered during the recent financial campaign as well as an assurance of a favorable reception during the inevitable ones which were yet to come. After several years of discussion and delay, in December 1923 the trustees finally agreed to permit the Maryland, West Pennsylvania, East Pennsylvania, and Allegheny Synods each to nominate two trustees, but, since not all of these bodies accepted the conditions which the board included in this proposed arrangement, it did not go into effect for any of them and was formally withdrawn in 1927. During these same years, while the trustees were debating whether to close the College to women students, the synods annually voiced their decided opposition to the proposal. Once the decision was made, they asked either that it be reversed or, at least, not implemented until a Lutheran women's college was in full operation. Female students and prospective students found among the College constituency no stronger champions than these synods.

The failure to secure representation on the board of trustees or to persuade that body to repeal its decision concerning women students neither deterred the synods from repeating their annual petitions nor reduced the civility with which they and the College conducted their relations with each other. Until the board suddenly reversed itself in 1935 and readmitted women, about all the trustees could say to the synods was that they had been careful in reaching the decision in the first place and saw no sufficient reason to change their minds. On the subject of synodical representation, the board usually ventured the opinion that existing practice already assured a strong synodical voice in its deliberations and that changing the rules would, in fact, accomplish little.

422 From 1905 on, the reports which committees submitted to the annual synodical conventions, and which were routinely approved, highly commended the College on the many academic improvements it was making, urging support in its drives for church funds and its search for qualified students. The recurring theme in these documents, many of which were prepared by pastors who were alumni, is that the synods want Gettysburg to become the strongest possible academic institution, obviously one with a Christian orientation. It was only in 1921 that synods again asked for synodical representation on the board. The East Pennsylvania Synod resolution gave as one reason for its request the fact that the U.L.C.A. had "declared a policy that looks toward synodical representation or control of all institutions of higher education looking to the constituency of the United Lutheran Church for support." Henry W. A. Hanson was one of the most prominent members of that synod.
At each annual synodical convention, committees reported on the state of the College, sometimes simply repeating information which President Hanson had provided for them. One learns from these reports about improvements in academic program and physical plant in the 1920s and weathering the depression in the 1930s. One reads about the many-faceted concern for the individual student to which the president was genuinely committed. Like Granville in his earlier reports to church bodies, Hanson usually commented on the large number of men (sometimes he claimed as many as one-sixth of the student body) who were preparing for the ministry.

A major change in Lutheran synodical organization in Pennsylvania occurred in 1938, when the Allegheny, East Pennsylvania, Susquehanna, and West Pennsylvania Synods merged to form the Central Pennsylvania Synod, with 624 congregations and some 179,000 confirmed members. This development prompted President Hanson in June 1939 to observe to the trustees that the College had "maintained the happiest relations with our constituent synods" for many years and to urge them now to consider taking the initiative in inviting the Central Pennsylvania and Maryland Synods each to nominate one clergyman and one layman for election as trustees. He reminded the board that families in these two synods were then sending the College "a very large percentage" of its student body, including "practically their entire list" of preministerial students. "It is most important," he argued, "that there should not develop any line of cleavage or separation between our cooperating synods and Gettysburg College." The board did not act on Hanson's suggestion, but during World War II the synods renewed their petition for representation. For the moment at least, the trustees agreed only to study the matter.

While President Hanson continued to hold influential positions in the national Lutheran church (between 1926 and 1944 he served successively on its board of American missions and executive board), he chose to maintain a good-arm's length between it and the College. This policy was easier to follow as the amount of money which the board of education allocated to Gettysburg gradually declined during the 1920s and after 1932, with but a few minor trickles, ceased altogether. Gettysburg did cooperate in the comprehensive survey...
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of Lutheran colleges which the board authorized in 1924. The study demonstrated clearly that academically it was one of the two or three strongest Lutheran colleges, but also that it was the one having the least tangible ties with either supporting synods or the national church. In subsequent years President Hanson did not always furnish all of the information, especially that concerning income and expenditures, which the board asked for and intended to publish as part of its biennial report to the church.

Between 1904 and 1945 the relations between the College and the seminary continued to be close and cordial. There were a few men who served as trustees of both for long periods of time. The best examples are Harry C. Picking and R. William Bream, both Gettysburg bankers, who together served on the College board for fifty-eight years and on the seminary board for fifty-four. Nine of the twelve faculty whom the seminary recruited during this period were College graduates, as were all three of its presidents. Three of the four professors of English Bible in the College were seminary graduates, as were most of the other teachers in that department. Several of the Y.M.C.A. secretaries were seminary students who found time to pursue both tasks.

In The World of Higher Education

Between 1904 and 1945 those responsible for the management and direction of the College, as well as others interested in its welfare, were, if anything, even more aware than their predecessors had been that Gettysburg College was an inescapable part of a world of American higher education. Beginning in the early days of the Hefelbower administration, those committed to the goal of a Greater Gettysburg were determined to raise its relative position among liberal arts colleges, no matter how difficult the task might be. More often than in earlier periods, College spokesmen declared their intent to make Gettysburg one of the very best such institutions in the state or the best college in its class.424 "Gettysburg College has equal rank with the very best colleges in the country," wrote President Granville in the 1916 admissions brochure, "irrespective of age, number of students, wealth, or apparent reputation."

One of the most important developments in American higher education after 1904 was the initiation of regional and national efforts to formulate and apply criteria for evaluating the quality of

---

424 These spokesmen did not explain what they meant by its class or identify the other institutions which were in it.
colleges and universities.\textsuperscript{425} Virtually nothing like this was attempted before 1900. State departments of education and the United States Bureau of Education did regularly solicit information from these schools and then publish it in their annual reports. However, compliance was voluntary, and little or no attempt was made to pass judgment on what was submitted. Those aware of the difficulty in determining the worth of individual baccalaureate degrees often described the existing situation as one of chaos and confusion. The four regional agencies founded between 1885 and 1895 came into being, not to accredit colleges and universities, but to permit secondary schools and undergraduate institutions to reach agreement in an orderly fashion on proper standards and procedures by means of which students could pass from one to the other.\textsuperscript{426}

Considerable impetus to the development of standards for colleges and universities followed creation of the Association of American Universities (1900), the General Education Board (1902), and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1905). Fourteen leading universities founded the first-named organization, in part as a response to the dilemma which both they and their European counterparts faced when they tried to evaluate the American college degrees held by students applying for admission. Obviously, the dilemma was similar to that which first confronted undergraduate institutions a decade or two earlier, as the increasing number and varying quality of public secondary schools made the long-established methods of admission politically impractical, at least for most colleges. Managers of the General Education Board and the Carnegie Foundation were determined to make their attractive grants only to those colleges and universities which were already strong and which gave promise of long-term improvement in their position. All three of these agencies attempted, as best they could, to pass judgment on those institutions with which they had some dealings, but theirs was less than the needed effort. Following passage of a 1904 law which gave it wide power over the entire educational system of the state, the Board of Regents of the State of New York was more successful than they were in gaining a national reputation as an accrediting agency. After it began approving undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools all over the country, whose diplomas were then accepted at face value in New York, authorities in other states used the board's findings as their guide. "The Board of Regents of the State of New York," President

\textsuperscript{425}The words accredit, classify, and standardize were used to describe these efforts.

\textsuperscript{426}There are now six such agencies. The North West Association dates from 1917 and the Western from 1924.
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Granville told the trustees in June 1922, "was really the first agency which succeeded in a large measure in establishing a rating of colleges which was generally recognized."

In 1915, after the Association of American Universities twice failed in its efforts to get the United States Bureau of Education on its own authority to publish a classified list of colleges, the bureau agreed to appoint a committee, whose eleven members represented the four regional agencies, the Association of American Universities, the American Medical Association, the Bureau of Education, and several other bodies. The bureau instructed the committee to determine whether it was advisable to establish a national classification of colleges and universities and, if so, to suggest ways to proceed in accomplishing that end. In 1918, after reviewing questionnaires returned by some 250 institutions (including Gettysburg College), this committee (known as the Committee on Higher Educational Statistics) published a list of thirteen suggested requirements for what it called a successful college of arts and sciences. Included were a minimum annual income of at least $40,000; a minimum productive endowment of $250,000; at least fifteen full-time faculty, one-fourth or more with the Ph.D. or equivalent degree; a maximum teaching load of fifteen hours per week; and minimum annual expenditures of $1,000 each for books and periodicals, and for laboratory equipment. One could take these suggested requirements, apply them to the data submitted by the colleges, and do one's own accrediting.427

A year following the publication of this report, the Middle States Association began entering the field of accrediting by adopting its own set of eleven requirements for an acceptable institution of higher learning and establishing a commission to apply them to schools within its geographical area.428 Two years later, in November 1921, but only after encountering vigorous opposition from several quarters, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education issued its first list of fifty-nine accredited institutions in the Middle States. Selection was made, not following visits by evalua-

427 Resources and Standards (1918), pp. 15-17.
428 Two of the twelve members of the first commission were Gettysburg alumni. Augustus S. Downing (1856-1936) of the class of 1874 was deputy commissioner of education of New York and Luther P. Eisenhart of the class of 1896 was a Princeton professor.
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tion teams to the schools, but by analyzing information furnished by the Bureau of Education, the New York regents, and in some cases by the institutions themselves.429

Gettysburg College participated in these developments from the very beginning. As noted in the previous chapter, she was a founding member of the Middle States Association in 1887 and later adopted its recommendations for strengthening entrance requirements. Sometime during the later years of the McKnight administration membership was allowed to lapse and was not renewed until 1909. During the Granville years someone from the College usually attended the annual Middle States meetings. President Hefelbower presented the Gettysburg case to the New York regents, who approved its B.A. and B.S. programs in June 1909. Beginning in 1915 and continuing beyond 1945, the annual catalogue usually included the Board of Regents' blessing in its recital of the College's credentials. In 1911 Gettysburg met the requirements of the General Education Board when it applied for a major grant.

Following publication of the report of the Committee on Higher Educational Statistics, President Granville proudly told the trustees in June 1918 that "our College has been rated as of the highest grade by the United States Bureau of Education." In the interests of accuracy, he should have told them simply that the data which he had submitted demonstrated that Gettysburg met or exceeded most of the committee's thirteen criteria for a successful college of arts and sciences. Only in two areas was it lacking. The average salary for professors was about 70 percent of the recommended level, and faculty teaching load was sixteen hours instead of the recommended fifteen.

The next hurdle was Middle States accreditation. Concerned that Gettysburg might not be included in the first list that was being prepared, President Granville wrote to the commission on February 5, 1921, noting that, as a result of the financial campaign then in progress, faculty salaries had been increased, additional faculty were

429Lloyd E. Blauch, ed., Accreditation in Higher Education (Washington, 1959) and William K. Selden, Accreditation: A Struggle over Standards in Higher Education (New York, 1960) are two useful and informative studies. Both deal with the reasons for accreditation, the opposition to it, and the transition from reliance on quantitative and minimal standards to an emphasis on the procedure as a way to strengthen institutions. Both stress that accreditation in the United States developed as a voluntary self-discipline by colleges and universities, as an alternative to governmental supervision. Ewald B. Nyquist, "Life Begins at Forty: A Brief History of the Commission," (Middle States Association, 1961) is a witty yet serious study of Middle States evaluation up to 1961. The North Central was the first regional association to publish a list of accredited schools, in 1913. The Southern Association published its first list in 1920.
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being hired, and the endowment was significantly higher than ever before. He offered to provide any additional information that might be needed. Three days later, the chairman replied that the commission had placed Gettysburg on the "accepted list... at its first meeting," since it had "full and satisfactory information obtained from the records of the New York State Education Department."\footnote{The letters exchanged between Granville and Arthur Leroy Jones are in the GCA. In his letter, Jones enclosed a copy of the commission's questionnaire to institutions, which Granville chose to complete and return.}

Gettysburg was one of the twenty-two Pennsylvania colleges and universities, already approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction to grant degrees, which were included on the first Middle States list announced in November 1921. Twenty-five institutions with similar state approval were not accredited. Of these, six were identified as almost, but not quite, meeting the standards. In June 1922 President Granville told the trustees that accreditation does not mean "that it is safe for Gettysburg College to rest contented with what she is," since the standards which the commission used were "only a minimum, the least that for practical reasons could be used to start with." We should "make every possible effort to strengthen and increase our faculty and to augment our financial resources," he argued, not simply in order to obtain a "first grade" rating by all educational agencies, but "also because we shall never leave a stone unturned to make Gettysburg College one of the very best among the first grade colleges."\footnote{In 1934 the Middle States Association reaffirmed the College's accreditation following receipt of a completed questionnaire. Regular ten-year reaccreditation visits did not become customary until after 1945. The academy was accredited in 1927.}

Within a year of the announcement of the first Middle States list, the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa authorized chartering a chapter of that society on the Gettysburg campus. Since this action followed careful investigation of the College and its practices, acquiring a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa can be regarded as a form of accreditation. The Gettysburg chapter was the ninth in Pennsylvania.

When Henry W. A. Hanson became president in 1923, the only widely recognized accrediting agency whose approval the College had not yet secured was the Association of American Universities, which had issued its first list of approved institutions in 1914. The coveted blessing of that agency came in the fall of 1926, after the required application, with supporting data, was submitted. According to the Gettysburgian for November 24 of that year, President Hanson told his chapel audience that this latest recognition of the College would "not cause as much demonstration as a football vic-
SALUTARY INFLUENCE

Two national educational associations which made no attempt at accrediting colleges and universities were formed about the time of World War I. Many liberal arts colleges banded together to form the Association of American Colleges (A.A.C.) in 1915. Three years later, fourteen organizations founded the American Council on Education (A.C.E.), which rapidly became the major national coordinating agency in higher education. President Granville attended an A.A.C. meeting as early as May 1917, but the College did not join that agency until 1924. Although the faculty in October 1919 recommended that Gettysburg join the A.C.E., this did not happen until many years later. With some regularity beginning in the 1920s, administrators or faculty attended the annual meetings of both organizations.433

As early as the beginning of the Hefelbower administration, the board of trustees urged the faculty to acquaint themselves with the practice of other colleges. This was in fact gratuitous advice, since they had been doing this from time to time ever since 1832. Nevertheless, President Hefelbower had set his colleagues a good current example by beginning his administration with visits to several New England schools. Before 1904 few faculty belonged to the national professional organizations in their field which began appearing in the 1870s. With the coming of a new administration, things began to change. Professor Grimm, for example, who joined the faculty in 1906, was a member of the Modern Language Association, American Oriental Society, and the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. Professor Evjen joined the American Historical Association during his first year on the faculty. Beginning in 1923, President Hanson all but required professors to visit other

432 During the May 1944 board meeting a trustee urged the College to seek approval of the American Association of University Women. President Hanson replied that efforts in that direction were being made, but a decade passed before they were successful.

433 Although the A.C.E. did not accredit educational institutions, it did promote the development of uniform criteria to be used by other agencies for that purpose. In its journal, the Educational Record (1920), pp. 71-80, it published for the convenience of all a list of colleges and universities which had passed the test of one or more of four recognized accrediting agencies. Gettysburg was one of twenty Pennsylvania institutions on the list.
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institutions in search of ideas and attend annual professional meetings, by making money available for those specific purposes.

The College continued to place its claims before the public by means of advertising. Beginning early in the century, it tried to keep an up-to-date viewbook in print. In 1916 President Granville prepared an admissions brochure which presented the claims of Christian colleges in general and of Gettysburg in particular. The first radio station in York started to broadcast in 1932. A year later, some twenty administrators and faculty began traveling to that city each school year in order to present fifteen minute programs on some topic of general interest. Reporting to the Alumni Council in 1937, President Hanson included these faculty radio talks as a form of publicity for the College, along with visits to synods, addresses to high schools, and many events bringing high school students, teachers, and coaches to the campus. College officials continued to proclaim that some of the most effective advertisements on behalf of the College were those provided by the institution’s students and alumni.

Anniversaries, Wars, and Depressions

On at least seven occasions between 1904 and 1945 the normal tenor of College life was altered, and sometimes disrupted, by anniversaries, wars, and depressions. If nothing else, these events were reminders of the world beyond the campus. All of them left their mark upon the institution.

The first occasion was the seventy-fifth anniversary of the College in 1907, which the board of trustees and the Alumni Association decided to celebrate in a major way. Accordingly, in June 1906 the trustees named a committee of five of their leading members and charged it with raising $150,000, a sum which would take the College out of debt for the first time in more than fifteen years and enable it to begin paying for the academic improvements which were being undertaken and planned. The Alumni Association decided to publish an updated version of the 1882 history-alumni directory and engaged its editor, Professor Breidenbaugh, to do the job. Unfortunately, neither of these goals had been accomplished by the time the Alumni Association observed the anniversary during the 1907 commencement week. There was but one event, called the seventy-fifth anniversary exercises. Three of the four addresses delivered on that occasion emphasized the role of Gettysburg since 1832 in different career fields: science and education, medicine, and the church. The financial campaign never came close to its goal.
Professor Breidenbaugh began his editorial work, but no alumni directory was published until 1918 and no history of the College until 1932.

The second special occasion was the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the battle of Gettysburg in 1913. In the fall of 1910 local, state, and national committees or commissions met in Gettysburg to begin preparing for the first major reunion of the Blue and Gray since the end of the Civil War. During the next thirty months subsequent meetings were held in Washington, Philadelphia, and again in Gettysburg. These committees succeeded in securing enough public funds to carry out most of their plans.

Probably because President Hefelbower announced his resignation in December 1909, there was no representative of the College on the original local anniversary committee. However, soon after taking office in the fall of 1910 President Granville became deeply involved in the planning. Two years later he offered all of the College facilities for use during the celebration, a decision which the trustees confirmed at their December 1912 meeting. The Gettysburgian also gave its approval. In the issue for January 15, 1913 the editor declared that "this celebration will be the greatest event of its kind known to history, and will surely reflect great honor on grand old Pennsylvania College."

The anniversary celebration took place between July 1 and 4, 1913. During its course the president of the United States, the vice president, the speaker of the House of Representatives, the secretary of war, and at least eleven governors gave addresses. Many members of Congress were present, as were more than 53,000 veterans, whose average age was seventy-two years. Most of those in attendance were accommodated in what was called the Great Camp, located on the battlefield south of town. The programs took place in the Great Tent, which was large enough to seat 15,000 persons and was located near the Codori House.

The headquarters of the host Pennsylvania Commission were in tents on the College campus, south of Pennsylvania Hall. Here the governor, his staff, and members of the commission welcomed more than five hundred special guests, who were then assigned rooms in the College and seminary dormitories. Many of these guests took their meals in a large tent located between Pennsylvania Hall and Pennsylvania Hall and...
Headquarters of the governor and his staff during the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, 1913. The lampposts are in front of Glatfelter Hall.

the gymnasium. The entire state police force was assigned to Gettysburg during the celebration; its members were quartered on Nixon Field. Between July 1 and 4 many of the College students worked in various capacities assisting the hosts in making the affair a success. Looking back upon the celebration in his June 1914 report to the trustees, President Granville described it as "a most interesting chapter in the history of the College." Not only did it serve to make "our institution more generally known," but also it was "of pecuniary benefit to the College, over $5000 being received in rental."435

The third special occasion during this period of time, and the first which actually disrupted College life, was World War I. Within a month of America’s entry into that conflict, in its issue of May 2, 1917, the student newspaper announced that

Gettysburg is now in the grip of a wave of patriotism. War activities are the subjects of discussion in every room and in every

435 There is a full account of the planning for and execution of the celebration, including the full text of many of the addresses delivered, in the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg: Report of the Pennsylvania Commission, December 31, 1913 (Harrisburg, 1914). A revised edition was published in 1915.
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nook and corner of the campus. Everyone has the spirit and would be glad to get out of the routine of school work and do something that would count in the present need of the country. Mindful of that spirit, President Woodrow Wilson and many others (including the Gettysburgian staff) urged college students everywhere to continue with their studies until they were graduated or until their services were called for. The facts that the Selective Service Act of May 18, 1917 set the minimum draft age at twenty-one years and that many Gettysburgians were preministerial students meant that most of them could complete their studies and be graduated. Nevertheless, the "wave of patriotism" was so strong that students began leaving the campus to enlist even before the spring 1917 term ended. So many departed that several commencement week activities had to be cancelled. Some of these students had enrolled in the R.O.T.C. program when it began early in 1917 and were able to earn commissions after a short period of additional training. In his June report to the board, the president observed that more than fifty students were already in an officer training program, but much more of his statement was devoted to finances. How could the College remain solvent as revenue from student fees dropped while inflation increased the cost of everything it bought? The price of coal for the fall of 1917, he told the trustees, would be double that paid in 1916.

During the 1917-1918 year, with an enrollment reduced about 15 percent, the College tried to operate on a business-as-usual basis, following the course of action which the presidents of Pennsylvania colleges and universities had agreed upon and which President Wilson strongly advocated. Gettysburg tried to maintain the customary standards of academic performance and discipline, as well as to continue with an athletic program. As might be expected, almost all male students enrolled in R.O.T.C. Nevertheless, it was not a normal year. Students conserved food and fuel. They helped to sell Liberty Bonds in the county. The junior class decided not to publish a Spectrum. Several organizations suspended operations. A few faculty left to enter war work. At the urging of the Pennsylvania presidents and also of the students, commencement was held a month early and its activities were reduced to a minimum. Clearly, one of the most troublesome features of the 1917-1918 year was the great restlessness and tension generated by the hazing controversy. President Granville insisted that the root cause of the trouble was actually the uncertainty which college students on almost every campus faced during a war which a large majority of them supported but in which they were not directly participating at the time.

436See pp. 674-675.
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As far as Gettysburg College and virtually all of its sister institutions were concerned, the outlook for the 1918-1919 year darkened ominously as Congress debated lowering the draft age to eighteen years, something which the Selective Service Act of August 31, 1918 made a reality. As President Granville explained in his biennial report to the Board of Education a few months later, all had realized that the war threatened "the very existence of our college educational system in this country." The lowering of the draft age made it "a foregone conclusion that unless some radical measures were speedily adopted the colleges would practically be emptied of male students" and would suffer "the same deplorable fate" as institutions of higher education in the warring European powers. The radical measure which was speedily adopted was the Students' Army Training Corps (S.A.T.C.), under which some five hundred institutions were operating when classes resumed in the fall. The federal government offered to train eligible young men on college and university campuses and, in return, to compensate the institutions for the use of their facilities. These men would be inducted into service and be given training designed to prepare them for leadership and technical positions. In August 1918 the executive committee of the Gettysburg board of trustees unanimously approved the faculty's recommendation that the College accept the government's offer, which entailed replacing R.O.T.C. with S.A.T.C. for the duration.

Most of the students who returned to the Gettysburg campus in late September 1918, together with several hundred newcomers, joined the S.A.T.C. and were mustered into service a few days later. "We're in the army now," proclaimed the October 2 issue of the newspaper. "The doors of military Gettysburg have swung open." Under the command of six army officers, the inductees began their program of military instruction. Meanwhile, a much smaller number of preministerial students, physically unqualified males, and women students – about 15 percent of the entire enrollment – were engaged in the regular College program. This arrangement proved to be of unexpectedly short duration. Less than seven weeks after the term began the war ended, and the S.A.T.C. men were discharged in mid-December. When classes resumed in January, once again there was but one student body, now determined to restore peacetime conditions as quickly as possible.437

437The roll of honor in the 1920 Spectrum included the names of fourteen Gettysburgians who gave their lives during the war, as well as of 336 others who had served their country in some recognized capacity. Additional names could be added to the list, which was compiled early in 1919.
The fourth special occasion, the Great Depression, began more than a decade after the end of World War I, following upon the stock market crash of October 1929. It is evident from the discussion earlier in this chapter that the depression touched many phases of College life, forcing trustees, administrators, faculty, and students to curtail or abandon many of their plans for the immediate future. Enrollment began dropping slightly in the fall of 1930; it had fallen about 25 percent by the time the low point was reached four years later. During the same period the number of students in the academy halved and it was only because the trustees closed that school in the spring of 1935 in order to devote its plant to women students that College enrollment began increasing that fall. With but two exceptions, that enrollment did not exceed the levels of the 1920s until the fall of 1941. The depression forced some students to drop out, while others remained only because they were permitted to delay paying their bills. Beginning in 1934, first under the Civil Works Administration and later the National Youth Administration, sixty or more needy students each term could earn $15 per month assisting janitors, working in the library, or performing some other tasks.

The College incurred a slight deficit in its current account in 1929-1930 and was unable to end the year in the black until seven years later. Since not much could be done to increase income (readmitting women was one way), every effort was made to reduce expenditures. Salaries were cut, a few faculty positions were eliminated, and sabbaticals were set aside. Years later, one faculty widow recalled that those professors whose income continued, even on a reduced scale, were able to weather the storm with a minimum of discomfort, especially since the price level had dropped significantly.

Even after the upturn began and was sustained, the memory of the bleak depression days lingered on and influenced the ways in which both administrators and faculty went about their work. The depression had made it impossible for the College to bring in the money needed to return to the endowment the large sums borrowed, certainly in good faith, in order to pay for the building program of the 1920s. Consequently, after prosperity returned, the College was denied most of the cushion which it had the right to expect from the income yielded by the endowment principal acquired during the Granville administration.

The fifth special occasion to be noted between 1904 and 1945 was the centennial of the chartering and actual opening of the College in April and November 1832. Plans for this celebration were initiated well in advance of these dates. In December 1927 the trustees named committees to arrange for proper observance of the occasion and for publication of a new history of the College. During the next two
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years, the committee decided to incorporate the celebration into the 1932 commencement week and to reschedule the latter for May, a time which would not interfere with similar exercises at other institutions. It also decided to undertake a financial campaign in 1930 for $1,000,000, the proceeds to be used for debt reduction, endowment, and further physical expansion. To conduct the campaign, the College engaged a firm which had recently completed a major fund drive for the U.L.C.A. Final payment on the pledges was scheduled for the spring of 1932, so that the success of the campaign could be announced during the anniversary exercises.

In his June 1930 report to the board, President Hanson remarked that "the committee arranging for the centennial is planning to make it the outstanding experience of the century." Yet, even as he wrote these words, he was aware of the depression that was beginning to settle on the country and had participated in the decision to delay the financial campaign until there could be some better understanding of how serious the economic downturn was likely to be. Later in the year, the board of trustees instructed the committee to proceed with the campaign, which by that time was supposed to be nearly completed, at "such a time as their judgment renders the undertaking most advantageous." Unfortunately, such a time never came. Before long, the College was reduced to asking for donations to help pay for the centennial celebration.

The depression notwithstanding, the commemorative exercises began on May 26, 1932 and closed with commencement on May 30. The ceremonies opened with Professor Kramer's ringing of a small bell believed to have been used by the College in 1832 and closed with students' ringing of the Glatfelter Hall tower bell 101 times, to signal the beginning of the College's second century. The main feature of the observance was a series of five symposiums – for medical men, clergymen, lawyers, scientists and industrialists, and teachers – during which alumni and others discussed the achievements made in these fields during the previous century. In addition to the usual commencement activities, there were special athletic, dramatic, and musical events. Several organizations, including Pen and Sword and Phi Beta Kappa, had their own anniversary meetings. President Hanson led an "alumni walk-around," during the course of which four distinguished graduates, standing on the steps of four College buildings, discussed Gettysburg past (in the fields of science, Christian service, and the humanities) and future. What was called a historical parade moved through the streets of town. The United States government presented, and the College accepted and dedicated, a plaque which was placed on the steps of Pennsylvania Hall,
recognizing the use of the building during the battle.\footnote{The inscription read: "U.S.A. This building served as a Union signal station June 30, July 1 and July 4, 1863, and as a hospital for the care of both Union and Confederate wounded July 1 and for some weeks thereafter."} The centennial convocation, held on Memorial Field on May 27, began with an academic procession that included representatives from many other institutions. It featured an address by Yale University President James R. Angell; awarding of eight honorary degrees, including one, in absentia, to President Herbert C. Hoover; and formal presentation of the new history of the College.\footnote{There is a good account of the exercises in the GCB (October 1932), pp. 4-6. The last event of the year, held on November 7 in Brua, marked the one hundredth anniversary of the beginning of classes. Professor Valentine substituted as main speaker when illness prevented the grandson of Samuel Simon Schmucker from being present.}

Samuel G. Hefelbower, the author of the 1932 history, was well-qualified for his task. An 1891 graduate of the College, between 1902 and 1923 he had served it successively as teacher, president, and trustee. Citing distance and other reasons, he was reluctant to accept his assignment, consenting only in the spring of 1929 when ill health forced his first choice, Professor Valentine, to decline. Hefelbower's first step was to return to Gettysburg and literally find the necessary sources. There were no College archives. In some cases he had to plead with people to turn over records which clearly belonged to the College, not to them. From various places he eventually brought together most of the major original pre-1932 records.
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of the College which are known to exist at the time of this writing. The Hefelbower history contains much pertinent and accurate information, based heavily on these original sources. It deals most thoroughly with the years before 1904. From a later perspective, the text is as remarkable for what it could have included, but did not, as it is for what is there.440

If we can believe the editors of the alumni bulletin for October 1932, the centennial observance exceeded the "fondest of hopes." The only exceptional thing about the weather was that low temperatures chased the baccalaureate service indoors. Some two thousand persons signed the guest book, and it was believed that an equal number attended one or more of the events without observing that formality. The editors estimated that about 40 percent of all living alumni had returned to the campus during the five-day celebration and that there were approximately 175 guests from other institutions. All twenty-eight speakers appeared on schedule. They included the United States Commissioner of Education, the associate editor of the New York Times, the vice president of General Motors, and the president of the U.L.C.A.

A sixth special occasion was the observance in July 1938 of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle of Gettysburg. The three-day program was the result of imaginative, yet practical, planning at local, state, and federal levels, which began in December 1934, when the president of the Gettysburg Chamber of Commerce named a six-man anniversary committee, of which President Hanson was chairman. Quickly recognizing that 1938 was going to be the final opportunity for a Blue and Gray reunion, and that an appropriate celebration would have to be a state and national event, the Chamber of Commerce included as active or honorary members of its committee Pennsylvania's two United States senators, the district's member of the House of Representatives, Adams county's two representatives in the Pennsylvania legislature, and the incoming governor of the Commonwealth.

The active members of the local committee lost no time in seeking the necessary outside support. In April 1935 the legislature provided for a state anniversary commission of nine members. Governor George H. Earle named Senator John S. Rice, Gettysburg, of the class of 1921, its chairman and Henry W. A. Hanson one of its members. Early in 1936 several of these commissioners met with Presi-

440 Professor Robert Fortenbaugh wrote the chapter on the Civil War and edited the one on fraternities. Joseph E. Rowe of the class of 1904 wrote the chapter on the Hefelbower administration. In his preface, Hefelbower explained that his account of events since 1884 "is chiefly narrative" because his generation "is too close to recent administrations to be able to view them in a historical perspective."
Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the
Battle of Gettysburg Commission

Seated, from left to right: President Henry W. A. Hanson, Governor George H. Earle, Chairman John S. Rice, and Congressman Harry L. Haines.

dent Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House and secured his pledge of support, financial and otherwise. A few months later Congress authorized a federal anniversary commission. Meanwhile, the state commission promptly accepted President Hanson's offer of the use of any or all College facilities during the celebration. The local committee, having accomplished its purpose, ceased to function.

As the spring 1938 term closed, state and federal officials took over the College property. On what President Hanson called the new campus - he meant the land purchased a few years earlier from the Winter estate - together with some additional leased acreage, the government constructed a camp designed to accommodate more than 6,800 persons, including the veterans, all of whom were at least ninety years of age, as well as the many others necessary to make their stay in Gettysburg safe and comfortable. Glatfelter Hall became a sort of general headquarters; Pennsylvania Hall and its environs were converted into a hospital and nurses' quarters; McKnight and Weidensall Halls were readied to accommodate newspapermen and broadcasters; and Huber Hall became head-
Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg
A few of the many tents on the campus for the 1938 celebration. These were located west of Glatfelter Hall, part of which is visible in the lower right. The house in the lower left was the residence of Joseph L. Carver, the janitor.

quarters for the Pennsylvania Commission, a temporary office for the governor, and an official reception center. Other buildings and parts of the campus were also pressed into use.

The great celebration was held on July 1, 2, and 3, 1938. Estimates of attendance ran to 500,000 persons, among them about 1,850 Union and Confederate veterans, far fewer than the number present in 1913 but about a quarter of all those who still survived. Thousands, perhaps millions, of others listened to the ceremonies on radio or watched them on movie newsreels. Most of the events were held on Memorial Field: the opening exercises on Friday, the veterans' program on Saturday, a Roman Catholic mass (probably the first such celebration ever held on College property) early Sunday morning, and a Protestant service a few hours later. The reviewing stand for what President Hanson called the grand parade through town on Saturday was also on Memorial Field. The president participated in several of these events. Together with Mrs. Earle and Mrs. Rice, Mrs. Hanson was one of the three official host-
esses for the entire celebration. Several other members of the College staff were also involved.

The climax of this seventy-fifth anniversary occurred in the early evening of Sunday, July 3, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt dedicated the Peace Memorial on Oak Ridge, north of the campus. Lack of funds had prevented the planners in 1913 from constructing such a monument, and their successors a quarter century later made achieving it one of their high priorities. President Hanson was a member of the committee which selected Paul Philippe Cret, the Philadelphia architect who had approved the plans for the College library, to design the structure. When completed, what came to be known as the Eternal Light Peace Memorial contained in its apex a constant flame fueled by natural gas and, on its base, proclaimed peace eternal in a nation united. A crowd estimated at several hundred thousand witnessed the dedication ceremonies, while thousands of others were trapped in the greatest traffic jam Adams county has ever witnessed, at least to the time of this writing.

President Hanson was completely truthful when he told the trustees in June 1938 that "Gettysburg College has entered wholeheartedly into the preparation for the final Reunion of the Blue and Gray" and that it "has been able to occupy the key position of the celebration." Once the ceremonies were over and the visitors had all departed, the state and federal governments made good on their promise to restore College property to the condition in which they found it.

The seventh and last special occasion between 1904 and 1945 to be noted here was World War II, which for the United States began formally with the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. This conflict proved to be even more disruptive to colleges and universities than its predecessor in 1917 and 1918. Not only did it last more than twice as long, but also it required a much greater commitment (and eventual loss) of human and natural resources.

The immediate effect of the war upon the College was slight. The Selective Service Act then in effect set the minimum draft age at twenty-one years, which meant that virtually all students could finish their course, if they so desired. A few did enlist, but not as many as left in the spring of 1917. Responding to their departure, both administrators and students tried in various ways to keep Gettysburgians past and present who were in the service informed of what was happening on the campus and also to remind them that

---

441 There is a full account of the planning for and execution of this celebration in Paul L. Roy, comp., The Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, Report of the Pennsylvania Commission (Gettysburg, 1939). As executive secretary of the commission, Roy worked tirelessly and in many ways to insure the success of the celebration.
the College had not forgotten them. These efforts continued for the
duration. As in 1917, shortly after war began President Hanson
announced that the facilities of the College were at the disposal of
the government; once again, it was potentially a matter of survival
for the institution. At the same time, Presidents Roosevelt and Han-
son joined the Gettysburgian in telling students that it was their pa-
triotic duty to work diligently at their studies until they might be
called into military service. Clearly, most took this advice. There
was a record high enrollment in the fall of 1942.442

The immediate prospects for male college students everywhere
changed dramatically as offensive operations began in the Pacific
and Africa during the second half of 1942 and as military manpower
needs soared. In November the minimum draft age was reduced to
eighteen years, a move which the Gettysburgian on December 3
claimed would “seriously affect if not cause complete collapse of
the collegiate educational system as it stands today in the United
States.” By this time, College officials were urging students to enlist
in one of the several available reserve programs, in which case they
would probably be permitted to complete the current academic year
before being called to active duty. When the government halted
enlistments in early December, about 85 percent of the males in the
student body had enrolled in an army, navy, or marine corps
reserve. Professor Bream, defense coordinator, believed that this
was one of the highest percentages in any liberal arts college in
the country.

Following repeated conversations with government officials, Pres-
ident Hanson assured and reassured the student body that the enlist-
ed reserves were “frozen” on the campus until the end of the spring
term and advised them to ignore all rumors to the contrary. In the
Gettysburgian for January 28, 1943, for example, he is quoted as
saying that the rumors then current that all enlisted reserves would
be called very soon do “not concern men on the campus.” Then, on
February 8 and 11, 109 men in the army enlisted reserves were
ordered to active duty in ten days. This early “thaw” shocked the
campus, but the fact that Hanson had been told less than a week
before that there was no imminent change in the schedule for these
men carried no weight whatsoever against the subsequent War Man-
power Commission decision that their services were needed

442 The Gettysburgian for January 8, 1942 featured an article on Gettysburg’s
developing “war program.” It included air raid defense, blood donations, nurses’ aid
and first aid training, and a three-year emergency course of study. This issue also
contained President Roosevelt’s advice to students that it was “their patriotic duty to
continue the normal course of their education, unless and until they are called.” This
advice was contained in a telegram to the Association of American Colleges, whose
meeting President Hanson had just attended.
immediately. For every, or virtually every, student in college in February 1943, the words “frozen” and “thawed” acquired additional meanings, ones which they would never lose.

As early as December 1942, President Hanson intimated to the students that within a short time the College would be asked to participate more directly than before in the war effort. Early in February he announced that Gettysburg was one of eleven Pennsylvania colleges selected for a special military training program. Since some 550 cadets were expected to arrive by May 1, it was necessary to begin immediately to prepare for them. Baccalaureate was rescheduled for Easter Sunday, April 25, and commencement for the following day. The beginning date for the new program was soon moved up to March 1, and by the time the class of 1943 was graduated, both men and women students had been moved out of three dormitories and the Phi Kappa Psi house had been taken over as a military infirmary. If not before, certainly during the spring 1943 term war hit the Gettysburg campus.

When the civilian students returned to the College in the fall of 1943, they found two colleges in operation, exactly as their predecessors had found twenty-five years before. Only this time the war did not end in less than seven weeks. Instead, it continued on for almost two years. The number of male students had now dropped from about 500 in the previous year to 100, while the number of women had increased slightly, to about 190. Instead of a student body nearly 700 strong, there was now one of slightly less than 300. Since the military students occupied three of the four dormitories, the College took over the fraternity houses, assigned women to room and board in some of them and men to occupy others. Since deferment of the male students, most of whom were headed for the ministry or medicine, required it, the College now operated year round, and permitted new students, some of whom had not completed four years of high school, to enter at several different times during the year. Some finished in January, while others completed their work in the spring or in late summer.

The women and men students on campus during the 1943-1945 years attempted as best they could to keep College institutions going. There was a Gettysburgian, but it published every other week, was reduced in size, and acquired its first woman editor in 1944. The Mercury was discontinued, there was no G-Book for the fall of 1943, and no 1945 Spectrum was published. The S.C.A. continued to function; its first woman president was chosen in 1944. In spite of dire predictions to the contrary, the College choir also survived and was, in fact, able to take a short tour in the spring of 1945. There were abbreviated social and athletic programs. Students gave blood, kept most automobiles at home, engaged in scrap drives, and
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donated money for war relief. Through the columns of the Gettysburgian, students engaged in a spirited debate over whether freshmen customs should be continued in wartime. From this exchange and other evidence, one gets the impression that most students believed they should carry on as many of the usual practices as they possibly could, because that was what the men in service really wanted them to do, and also because, after the war, people returning to old Gettysburg should find it intact.

Between March 1943 and March 1945 there were two military units on campus, in succession, and their personnel constituted the second college. The first of these was the 55th College Training Detachment (Aircrew) of the Army Air Forces, which between March 1943 and May 1944 enrolled 1,659 young men. At any one time there might be as many as 550 of them on campus, engaged in a four-to-five-month program in preparation for preflight school. Their military training was entrusted to R.O.T.C. officers; physical training, to the physical education staff; flight training, to the Gettysburg School of Aeronautics; and academic training, to the College faculty, who taught courses in English, history, geography, mathematics, physics, and medical aid. The task of coordinating all four of these programs was entrusted to Professor Arms. There were regular Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish services on campus. The S.C.A. and persons in the community provided a social life for the trainees. The men were housed in Pennsylvania, McKnight, and Huber Halls; they took their meals in Huber, where a new and greatly expanded kitchen and cafeteria had to be installed; and their infirmary was located in the Phi Kappa Psi House.443

Just as Professor Arms and his colleagues were finally mastering constantly changing army regulations governing aircrew training and had successfully adapted them to the Gettysburg situation, they were informed that the program would be terminated at the end of May 1944. To fill the gap and help balance the College budget, the 3333d Service Command Unit, Army Specialized Training Unit of the Army Air Forces, was activated on the campus in June 1944. Its members were seventeen-year olds, whose six-to-nine months program included most of the subjects which the faculty had taught to the aircrew students. Since there were only about 225 men in this program when it began, the College was able to reclaim McKnight and Huber (but not the latter's dining hall) in the fall of 1944 and use them for its civilian students. With the war reaching its final stages, the government terminated this second program in March 1945.

443John R. Floyd, “History of the 55th College Training Detachment (Aircrew), Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania,” (typescript, 1944), is a terse, factual account prepared as the program was ending. There is a copy in GCA.
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A worried President Hanson, writing in the alumni bulletin for February, ventured the opinion that "1945 will present the severest test which institutions of higher education in the United States have ever been called upon to meet." He appealed to the alumni for contributions to keep the College going. Later, in the August issue of the bulletin, with the war ending, he made a prediction which proved to be far wide of the mark. "With the return of the veterans to civilian life," he wrote, "it is estimated that 1946 will bring college enrollments back to normal."

In May 1946, at a special memorial service, Gettysburg College honored sixty-two graduates and former students who gave their lives during World War II. The number who served in the military was about fifteen hundred, of whom, according to early postwar catalogues, some 75 percent held commissions. 

And Still, A Greater Gettysburg

As Henry W. A. Hanson presided over the commencement exercises in the Majestic Theater on May 28, 1945, he and his audience rejoiced that the war in Europe was now over. No one knew how long the war in the Pacific was going to last, but all were confident that the defeat of Japan was inevitable. If the president allowed his mind to wander during the commencement address of Francis B. Sayre, he might have reflected upon what had happened to Gettysburg College during the more than forty years since the fall of 1901 when, as a nineteen-year-old graduate of Roanoke College, he had arrived in the Gettysburg community in order to enroll in the seminary. Since those last days of the McKnight administration, the College had changed in almost every imaginable way. Even during the low point of the recent war years, the student body was more than half again as large as it had been in the fall of 1901. There were now five new buildings on the campus, three of them constructed during his own presidency. In 1901, only two of the nine professors had anything more than a very brief period of formal graduate training. Now it was taken for granted that full professors would have completed such training and earned a doctorate. The changes in the curriculum since 1901 might be described as revolutionary, as the College strove to take cognizance of new knowledge and to prepare young people for an increasing number of careers. True to form,

The Alumni Association Meritorious Service Award presented in 1946 in memory of the former students who died in service included sixty-two names, but as additional information became available more names could have been added. The bronze plaque placed in Christ Chapel in 1954 contained sixty-four names.
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Gettysburg had moved slowly in abandoning her traditions, but clearly demonstrated that she was not immune to change. Compulsory church was gone, but compulsory chapel remained. Hazing of freshmen was gone, but freshman customs remained. On the other hand, in the 1940s, as many times before, students tried to preserve the tradition of friendliness on campus and asked from time to time why the custom of saying hello to everyone one met was not universally observed.

Possibly most important of all, as far as its long-run health was concerned, was the evidence that Gettysburg College had participated, obviously in its own way, in the nationwide changes which had taken place in American higher education since 1901. She had met the minimum standards on the successive lists which, acting together, colleges and universities had themselves developed. At the same time, her trustees, administrators, and faculty were aware that meeting minimum standards was not enough. One might well ask whether they had done as much as they should and could have done to move beyond those minimums, but perhaps it was best on this ceremonial occasion not to pursue that topic.

If the commencement speaker continued to ramble on, and some further reflection seemed possible, President Hanson might have been pained at recalling the price which Gettysburg had paid, both before and since he became president, because of a succession of failed pledges, and then because of depression and war. Loss of endowment used to pay for needed buildings and even on occasion to meet current expenses had left the College in a potentially precarious financial position. The memory of the many deficit years during the depression, and his determination not to repeat them, may help to explain Hanson's determined efforts to keep the College in the black, as well as his proud reporting of success whenever it was achieved.

Clearly, this president was more comfortable in expressing his hopes for the future than he was in reflecting closely upon the ground which he and the College had already covered. As he addressed the alumni through the "Our President Speaks" column of the bulletin during the last year of the war, he shared with its readers his vision of the days to come. He reminded Gettysburgians that he was urging the faculty to begin preparing for the future by reviewing all course offerings and, repeating a long practice, by then comparing their conclusions about probable needs with faculty in other schools. He was thoroughly convinced that, with the war over, the United States was going to have a greater need than ever before in its history for graduates of liberal arts, church-related colleges such as Gettysburg had always been. The terrible threat which the Germans had visited upon the world came from a people advanced in "techni-
cal education," he believed, but with "an educational system that omitted all spiritual appreciations." Now that the war was ending, he was certain that Gettysburg College stood "face to face with the greatest opportunity which has ever confronted an educational institution." It was the opportunity to train people of "conscience and character" for "responsible living," so that they could participate in "the building of young men and women who shall make the dreams of today the reality of tomorrow."

On one occasion, in the summer of 1944, President Hanson did try to join past, present, and future together. In so doing, he expressed a theme which had been sounded over and over again during the preceding four decades, casting it in words which perhaps only he would craft: "It is my sincere hope and belief that, in the days that lie ahead, we shall together dedicate ourselves to the building of a greater Gettysburg College that will carry within its heart every noble and worthwhile ideal we have learned in the 112 years that are past."
This map, which was included in the 1931 catalogue, shows the campus (minus the former academy segment) as it existed following the completion of the new library in the fall of 1929. College buildings were identified as follows: Breidenbaugh Hall (2), Brua Chapel (3), Plank Gymnasium (5), Glattelter Hall (7), heating plant (8), infirmary (9), janitor's residence (10), library (12), McKnight Hall (14), Old Dorm (15), White House (19), and Weidensall Hall (20). Linnaean Hall, west of Old Dorm and no longer used, was not given a number. The other buildings belonged to fraternities.

There were only three changes on the campus as shown here between 1929 and 1945: removal of the old Phi Delta Theta house (1) in 1938, construction of a bookstore at the southeastern corner of North Washington and Stevens streets in 1939, and removal of Linnaean Hall in 1942.
"The library is the heart of any college." W. S. Paul, 1960
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IN CHANGING TIMES (1945-1985)

American historians who tried during the forty years which followed the end of World War II to furnish some perspective on the times in which they were living often used superlatives to describe the changes which were occurring in almost every aspect of American life. They also pointed to the inaccuracy, at least in the short run, of many of the assumptions solemnly made about the future of this country during the dark days of the depression. For example, instead of leveling off and then declining, as predicted, population continued to increase, growing from 131,700,000 in 1940 to 226,500,000 forty years later. Instead of relapsing into depression once wartime stimuli were withdrawn, the American economy entered upon its longest period of sustained prosperity in American history.

Those who during the 1930s could not see any future investment opportunities similar to those which had spurred economic growth in the past had failed to reckon with the capacity of technology to refine old and devise new goods and services for eager consumers to purchase. After a decade and a half of depression's and then war's privations, Americans were ready for new houses, second automobiles, television, home freezers, power lawnmowers, record players, and much more. Thanks to wartime prosperity and bonuses for overseas service, as soon as the war ended consumers had the purchasing power to match many, if not all, of their desires. This was just the beginning. There appeared to be no end of the new generations of creature comforts which entered the market each year and found willing buyers. Introduced in 1950, the credit card armed consumers with a form of extra purchasing power easier for most of them to use than any previous forms of credit had been.

The hopes which many Americans had in 1945 that the surrender of the Axis powers would usher in a prolonged period of international peace, one in which the major world powers, led by their own country, would cooperate to minimize tensions, were quickly dashed when the United States and the Soviet Union embarked upon radically different courses in world affairs. One may debate
endlessly about the causes for what is known as the cold war, but it is clear that the contention between these two great powers often threatened the peace of the world. We may argue that American production of an atomic bomb in 1945 and Russian production of one four years later resulted in a balance of power which would insure that neither side would ever use these weapons. We may also argue that continuous development and refinement of nuclear arsenals, not only in the United States and the Soviet Union, but also elsewhere in the world, simply magnified an unprecedented threat to all of humanity, one which somehow and sometime would have to be ended. At no time during the forty-year period covered by this chapter was that threat absent from any serious discussion of the world and its future.

The deteriorating relations between the United States and the Soviet Union led this country in 1948 to embark upon programs of economic and later of military aid designed to bolster the rest of the so-called free world (which soon came to include both West Germany and Japan, the recent enemies) as a balance to growing Soviet power. The amounts of money which the United States committed to these programs ran to tens of billions of dollars and dwarfed any previous American undertaking, excepting only World War II itself. Since many of these funds were spent in this country to provide goods and services for those receiving aid, they were long an important factor in insuring continuing American prosperity. One of the results of these programs was to expand greatly American involvement in the affairs of nations in all parts of the world and to create at least the impression that the United States had come closer than any previous state to being a universal imperial power. Growing American dependence on others for certain vital raw materials, no longer in abundant supply here, also had the effect of increasing American involvement in the rest of the world.

One of the significant sequels to World War II was the breaking up of a number of European and other empires, some of which had existed for hundreds of years. No period in history has come close to matching the years between 1945 and 1985 in the formation of new nation-states in almost every part of the world. Areas which long counted but little in the international balance of power became forces to be reckoned with, not only because of their valuable natural resources, but also because of the danger to peace which their frequent political instability could, and did, create.

In a work first published in 1979, William E. Leuchtenburg described the American experience after 1945 as "a troubled feast." As far as goods and services were concerned, Americans had never been so well off. As far as standing in the world was concerned, they had never been so powerful. Nevertheless, especially beginning in
the mid-1950s there was much pain and anguish as some of them began to insist upon fair and equal treatment of blacks, women, and other victims of improper discrimination, and as, beginning in the mid-1960s, the federal government sought to insure that the affluence of goods and services would be more equally distributed by declaring war on poverty. At the same time, many Americans, especially the young, began to question and reject some of the most widely and deeply held assumptions of their culture. Had the unprecedented material wealth led Americans into living shallow and crass lives? Was the conventional religion which had so obviously flourished since 1945 in fact a sham? Had America in its dealings with other countries gone far beyond its proper bounds as a responsible great power? Was the goal of a self-fulfilling life to be achieved, not through reason, knowledge, and hard work, but rather by recourse to intuition and, in many cases, to the use of drugs? The rejection reached such proportions that some observers referred to the existence of a counterculture, created largely by young people who denied that anyone over thirty could be trusted. The tensions which all of these developments created were sufficiently strong that when William L. O'Neill published (1971) what he called his "informal history" of America in the 1960s, he called it Coming Apart. The end of the long and costly military effort to contain communism in Southeast Asia, which came in 1973, removed one of the major rending forces. The fever pitch of the later 1960s and early 1970s could scarcely have been sustained indefinitely, but once it subsided things were substantially different from what they had been in the early postwar years.

American education was no more immune from the rest of American culture after 1945 than it had been at any time in the past. An excellent example of this fact is provided by what happened after the Soviet Union announced in the fall of 1957 that it had sent the world's first man-made satellite, called Sputnik, into orbit around the earth. That the Russians could be the pioneers in this endeavor led to an immediate search for scapegoats and the conclusion that the American educational system was at fault. While school systems throughout the country began to upgrade their instruction in science, mathematics, and foreign languages, Congress in 1958 passed the National Defense Education Act, which provided federal assistance for instruction in these subjects at all levels.

One of the most prominent features of postwar American life was the strong reaffirmation of the long-held belief in the powers of education in making possible useful and happy lives. This belief manifested itself in the sustained public willingness to approve bond issues, pay higher and higher taxes, and contribute time as well
as talents to the fast-growing public and private educational establishment at the elementary and secondary levels. According to one report, expenditure per pupil in these schools, as measured in constant (1970) dollars, increased fivefold between 1945 and 1970. Enrollments in public and private elementary and secondary schools expanded from 25,300,000 in 1946 to 44,000,000 in 1980. The percentage of seventeen-year olds receiving a high school diploma rose from about 49 in 1940 to about 72 in 1980.1

Another prominent feature of postwar American life was the commitment of an increasing number of families to the belief that their sons and daughters were entitled to a college education. In some cases, parents were determined that their children should have more educational opportunities than they themselves had enjoyed during the long years of depression and war. Four years of college was a way for them to prepare their children to function as adults to their own and society’s best advantage. Eventually it became fashionable to predict how many thousands of dollars more a college graduate could expect to earn in a lifetime than someone with only a high school diploma. Understandably, some parents came to believe that they could not maintain their social standing if they did not send their offspring to college.

Among the numerous benefits which the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (the GI Bill of Rights) made available to veterans was the opportunity to continue and complete their formal education. By the time this particular measure expired in 1956, almost 8,000,000 veterans had taken advantage of their opportunity, many of them by entering the nation’s colleges and universities. In some respects the GI Bill and its successors were among the most important pieces of legislation which an American Congress has ever passed, since they made possible advanced learning for millions of young men and women who otherwise would never have experienced it. While one can never hope to measure precisely the advantages which thus accrued to individuals and society, there can be no doubt that they were considerable. Many of the postwar parents who were determined to make a college education available to their children had themselves benefited from the GI Bill.

Degree-credit enrollment in four-year colleges during 1941-1942 was about 1,400,000, about 8 percent of college-age youth. Enrollment in many of these institutions doubled soon after the war ended and continued at a high level even after the veterans had departed.

By the later 1950s many were predicting that a "tidal wave" of students would begin flooding the colleges in the early 1960s, once the first postwar babies began reaching eighteen and as a college degree became as customary as a high school diploma already was. Enrollment in four-year colleges, which stood at 3,130,000 in 1960, did reach 6,290,000 a decade later. Whether this amounted to a tidal wave is debatable, but by 1970 several opposite trends in higher education were discernible. Some young people were deciding that there was little merit for them in the traditional undergraduate curriculum. Either they did not come to college or, once there, they soon dropped out. Older observers, noting the decline in the birth rate which began in 1958, started to warn that at some point in the foreseeable future there would be fewer and fewer college-age youths and, unless a larger and larger percentage than in the past elected higher education, decreasing enrollments were inevitable. Nevertheless, by the fall of 1980 there were about 7,570,000 enrollments in four-year colleges, more than five times as many as there had been in the fall of 1941 and more than 30 percent of all college-age young people. The increase in the number of baccalaureate and first-professional degrees was comparable: from 185,346 in 1942 to 996,357 in 1980, about 47 percent of which were awarded to women.

What was written in the previous chapter to describe Adams county in an earlier period can be repeated here. Between 1945 and 1985 it "continued to be a small, rural, agricultural county." Its seat of government, Gettysburg, whose population increased from 5,916 in 1940 to 7,194 in 1980, remained by far the largest borough within its limits. Never even moderately industrial, Adams did not experience anything to compare with the growth in manufacturing which characterized York and other counties after 1945. Thus it was scarcely affected by the movement of firms and people to the South and West, to the so-called Sunbelt, which eventually crippled many industrial economies in the North and East and which dramatically altered the relative standing of states in the nation. The number of seats allocated to Pennsylvania in the United States House of Representatives dropped from 33 in 1940 to 23 in 1980. During the same period California gained twenty-two seats and Texas, six.

After 1945 Adams usually ranked among the top two counties in the state in the production and processing of apples, cherries, and peaches; these and related activities were a major source of income for its residents. Especially during and after the Civil War centennial in the early 1960s, tourism reached new heights and was another major source of income for countians. Several sizable real estate developments in the eastern and southern parts of the county brought an influx of new people, which helps explain why Adams
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was one of the five fastest growing counties in the state. While the population of Pennsylvania increased by only 20 percent in the forty years after 1940, that of Adams county grew from 39,435 in the latter year to 68,292 in 1960, an increase of about 73 percent.

Contrary to what President Hanson had predicted, Gettysburg College did not return to a normal enrollment once the war ended in August 1945. Instead, during the fall and spring terms that followed, recently discharged veterans all but doubled the normal enrollment. As they finished their courses and found employment, students who had been too young for wartime military service applied to take their places. Trustees, administrators, and faculty gradually came to accept the fact that, barring some national disaster, enrollment would never return to the 600-700 level, at least not in their lifetimes. The task now was to determine whether and, if so, when to repeat the action of the 1920s by setting a new upper limit on enrollment. By the early 1960s there was general agreement that the College should seek to serve a student body about three times as large as it had before the war.

With considerable justification, College spokesmen had argued that the faculty and physical plant of the 1930s were reasonably adequate for about 600 students, given the current generally accepted standards for college performance. Obviously, doubling and finally tripling the enrollment meant that more faculty, classrooms, laboratories, libraries, dormitories, dining facilities, playing fields, and the like were required. In addition, as the prevailing standards for undergraduate learning were raised, the College needed to be as much concerned about improvements in quality as about those in quantity. Since it was not possible to pay for everything that was needed out of current income, College authorities with little experience in successful fund raising either had to learn rapidly or watch the institution deteriorate.

The addition of large numbers of new faculty and new students, drawn increasingly from areas not part of the old constituency, and occurring at a time of, if anything, more than the normal rate of change in American society, effectively superseded the campus community which had functioned as generations of students came and went during the quarter century before the war. When something which might be called normal emerged in the 1950s, Gettysburg was in numerous ways a different place from what it had been in any period since 1832. Many concerned with her welfare were convinced that she would be in serious, if not mortal, danger as a place of effective learning if this were not the case. Others, equally concerned, believed that, in keeping up with the times, and in new hands, Gettysburg had surrendered too much of her soul.
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A proper review of the four periods into which this study is divided must take into consideration what happened to the consumer price level in the forty years after 1945 and how that change related to those which occurred in previous periods. With 1967 used as the base year (100), the consumer price index in 1832, the year in which the College was founded, was 30. The index of 40 in 1868 reflects the continuing influence of Civil War inflation. In 1904 the price level stood at 27, which was 10 percent below that of 1832. The several fluctuations during the first half of the twentieth century, some of which were discussed in the previous chapter, produced an index reading in 1945 of 54, which was double that of 1904 but still less than the 60 recorded in 1920, shortly after World War I ended. What happened after 1945 was without precedent in the history of the College: readings of 90 in 1961, 110 in 1969, and 289 in the sesquicentennial year, 1982. One must read all dollar amounts of income and expenditure, all dollar charges to and by the College, between 1945 and 1985 with the almost constant factor of inflation in mind.

Trustees

The charter in effect in the fall of 1945 vested "the management, direction, government and control" of Gettysburg College in a board of trustees which was not to exceed thirty in number. There were then twenty-eight incumbents, whose average age (sixty-two) exceeded by four years the average of the 1904 board. The senior member, aged eighty-three, had been elected in 1908, during the Hefelbower administration. The fact that there were no limits on the length of time one could serve explains why seven of the eight senior members of 1945 died in office, the last (Henry W. A. Hanson) in 1962. Nevertheless, in terms of service it was a young board. More than half of the members had been elected during the preceding ten years, following a decade and a half of minimal recruiting of new blood. Of the twenty-eight members of 1945, twenty-three were graduates of the College, one had attended for a year, and one was the president, leaving only three who could be regarded as outsiders at the time of their election. Six of the twenty-eight were Lutheran pastors, three of whom had joined the board since 1930.\footnote{The 1935 charter clearly specified that the terms of five trustees should expire each year. Since no one took the responsibility for seeing that this happened, the six classes into which the trustees had divided themselves were soon unbalanced. In 1962-1963, after the size of the board was increased to thirty-six, the classes included 2, 8, 6, 11, 5, and 2 trustees respectively.}
Between 1945 and the spring of 1985 a total of 159 persons (including the twenty-eight of 1945) served on the board of trustees. This number, which was significantly larger than the ninety who served between 1904 and 1945, included the alumni-nominated members and, beginning in 1958, those persons whom several Lutheran synods were authorized to elect to the board. Since 1952 the president of the College has been an ex officio member of the board. In December 1958 the trustees invited the Woman's League to designate a representative to attend board meetings. The women responded by sending their president. About three-fourths of the 159 post-1945 trustees were former students of the College; almost all were also graduates. Of the thirty-seven trustees in office in 1984-1985, thirty (81 percent) were alumni.

Between 1945 and 1985, apart from alumni and synodical trustees, the board elected only one Lutheran parish pastor (Chester S. Simonton) to membership. During the same period there were usually at least two, but sometimes as many as three or four, members who either lived or worked in Gettysburg, and who carried on the old tradition of the resident trustee. Among them were John S. Rice, Clarence A. Wills, C. Harold Johnson, Herman G. Stuempfle, and Charles W. Wolf, all of whom had at least twelve years of service. Elected in 1947, at a time when the College was seeking American Association of Women approval, Minerva Taughinbaugh Baker of the class of 1917 became the first woman trustee. Wife of a Lutheran pastor and active in the affairs of the national Lutheran church, she was a secondary-school teacher and administrator in the Pittsburgh area whose tenure as trustee ended only in 1966. By 1985 nine additional women trustees had qualified, five of whom were chosen by the Alumni Association and one by the Central Pennsylvania Synod.

---

3See pp. 963 and 978-980 for a discussion of alumni and synodical trustees.

4In the spring of 1952 the board asked three qualified outsiders to comment on the wisdom of having a president continue his membership in that body after leaving office, as five previous Gettysburg presidents had done. All three outsiders advised strongly against the practice, not because they doubted the ability of President Hanson, but because they considered it unfair to any president to have his predecessor on the governing board. Since, like every other trustee, Hanson was then serving a six-year term and was not disposed to resign, the trustees dealt with the issue by amending the by-laws in May 1952 to establish that future presidents would be ex officio trustees. Unfortunately, everybody then proceeded to forget about this amendment. It was not included in the by-laws published in 1960. Believing that they were establishing, rather than restating, a policy, the trustees in a 1964 charter amendment decreed ex officio board membership for presidents.

5The percentage dropped from 81 to 71 for the 1985-1986 board.
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The following persons, not already mentioned in the previous chapter, and not including presidents of the College, were trustees for twelve or more years after 1945:

   Shoe manufacturer
1937-1958 Hiram H. Keller (1878-1959)
   Attorney and judge
1939-1951 Roy C. Dougherty (1879-1963)
   Cutlery manufacturer
1939-1951 Frederick B. Dapp (1894-1951)
   Insurance executive
1939-1954 Edward W. Furst (1875-1959)
   Chemical company executive
1939-1968
   Fruit packing supplies manufacturer; state and national public servant
   Merchandising executive
1941-1965 Richard C. Wetzel (1888-1968)
   Textile machine manufacturer
1941-1958 Charles B. McCollough (1890-1970)
   Petroleum refining executive
1946-1953
   Attorney
1946-1964 Clarence A. Wills (1885-1971)
   Banker
   Educator
1948-1964 William H. Sandlas (1894-1965)
   Engineer
1948-1966 Chester S. Simonton (1894-1978)
   Pastor
1949-1964 Paul R. Sieber (1886-1975)
   Physician and surgeon
1952-1964
   Baking executive
1952-1964 Lester Gingerich (1899-1964)
   Railroad engineering executive
1953-1959
   Attorney
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Editor
1954-1966 Bertram Wilde (1898-1985)
Investment banker
1955-1967 Donald K. Weiser
Insurance executive
1958-1960
1966- Howard J. McCarney
Pastor and synod executive
Attorney
1958-1971 Millard E. Gladfelter
Educator
Insurance executive
1962-1974
1976- Lavern H. Brenneman
Manufacturing executive
1962-1978 Bessie H. Kline (1885-1979)
Philanthropist
1963-1975 Howard Trexel
Educator
Physician
Telephone company executive
Investment broker
1965-1977 Alfred L. Mathias
Food service executive
1965-1978 Joseph T. Simpson
Steel company executive
1965-1977 Herman G. Stuempfle
Seminary professor
1966-1979 Raymond A. Taylor
Radiologist
1966-1980 Irvin G. Zimmerman
Telephone company executive
1967-1979 Paul E. Clouser
Attorney
1967-1979 William S. Eisenhart
Attorney
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   Fruit processing executive
1967-1979 F. William Sunderman
   Physician and medical educator
   Attorney
1968-1983 Paul M. Orso
   Synod executive
1969-1981 Harold Brayman
   Public relations executive
1970-1982 Albert R. Burkhardt
   Pastor
1970-1982 Charles W. Wolf
   Attorney
1972-1984 Ralph W. Cox
   Insurance executive
1973-1985 Charles H. Falkler
   Banker
1973-1985 Paul F. Folkemer
   Businessman
1973- Angeline F. Haines
   Homemaker
1973-1985 Carroll W. Royston
   Attorney
   Attorney

These nine men served as chairmen of the board of trustees between 1953 and 1986.
The Gettysburg board of trustees in 1945 was not experienced in dealing successfully with many of the kinds of issues which it would face during the next forty years. One might argue that this statement applied with equal force to the boards of many, if not most, of the institutions with which Gettysburg usually compared itself. The task of private college and university trustees in any age is a difficult one. Those who prepare and enact charters vest these persons with broad powers to manage, direct, govern, and control, but assume that they will not be engaged full-time in exercising these responsibilities. In fact, unless trustees delegate the most important of their powers, they fail in their mission. The heart of a liberal arts college is to be found in the teaching and learning activities of faculty and students, both of whom must have broad freedom in choosing how to do their work, if they are to do it well. Without disrupting a successful educational enterprise, trustees cannot treat either faculty or students as though they were employees in a business firm. Trustees contribute most to the well-being of that enterprise when they provide it with the general guidance and the material resources necessary for its good health, when they resolutely defend from attack the freedom to teach and to learn, and when they do everything in their power to create good will for the institution.

At the same time, since trustees are ultimately responsible to public authority for the entire performance of a college or university, they must from time to time review and evaluate its operations, weighing them against the stated purposes of the institution and the generally accepted standards in the world of higher education. In order to do this properly, they must become familiar enough with the details of how the college functions so that the judgments they make are soundly based. In reaching their conclusions, responsible trustees walk the fine line between uncritical acceptance of what they are told and hasty substitution of their own opinions for those of the administrators and faculty who have been placed in immediate charge of the college.

Not surprisingly, the record of the Gettysburg board before 1945 in reviewing and evaluating College programs was not consistent. At times, they became minutely involved in those programs, while at other times there is no record that they were at all concerned. In general, trustees were undoubtedly more willing than they should have been to defer to what successive presidents told them about what was happening both inside and outside the classrooms. Had they conducted their own investigations and made their own com-

---

6The presidents during this period—Henry W.A. Hanson (to 1952), Walter C. Langsam (1952-1955), Willard S. Paul (1956-1961), C. Arnold Hanson (1961-1977), and Charles E. Glassick (from 1977)—will be discussed in a later section.
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comparisons with what many similar colleges were doing, instead of advising faculty and presidents to do this, they would certainly have been much more vigorous in finding new resources and directing how they should be used to improve the educational program.

The standing board committees in existence before the 1930s reveal the topics to which the trustees were accustomed to devoting most of their time and energies: executive, finance, building, infirmary, and honorary degrees. Evidence of a widening trustee interest even before World War II is furnished by the appearance of two new committees in 1941: one on fraternities and the other on what was called religious work. The 1949 revision of the by-laws made these two and a third, on physical education, regular standing committees. The religious activities committee, as it was now called, was very specifically enjoined to insure that religion courses were "properly given," that required chapel was maintained, and "that there be a Christian atmosphere at the College." The 1959 by-laws were the first to regularize a planning committee; they directed it to "give continuing consideration to the over-all planning and future development of the College." An academic affairs committee, first appointed in the early 1960s, was given regular status in the 1972 by-laws and assigned responsibility for broad oversight in matters affecting "the academic character of the College."7

On four occasions between 1945 and 1985 the trustees secured proper approval to alter the College charter. The first of these, on October 9, 1954, brought law into conformity with practice by assigning the Franklin chair to the professorship of Greek, with which it had been associated since 1882. The second, on July 7, 1958, for the first time in the history of the College, authorized three Lutheran synods to elect a total of six trustees. The third, on February 1, 1964, was made necessary after the United Lutheran Church in America merged (1962) with several other national bodies to form the Lutheran Church in America. The realignment of synods and colleges which followed paired the Central Pennsylvania and Maryland Synods with Gettysburg College, whose charter was now amended accordingly. The maximum number of trustees was increased to thirty-eight, of which number the two synods could elect six. In addition, under the amendment the president of each synod became an ex officio member of the board.8

The fourth change in the charter was more sweeping than any

---

7In 1958 the board established a curriculum committee as a standing committee, but neglected to amend the by-laws accordingly. The 1959 revision of the latter contains no reference to such a committee.

8Adams County Miscellaneous Book AA, p. 18. The 1935 charter revision assigned the Franklin professorship to the German department, but no action was ever taken to transfer it from Greek. The 1958 and 1964 charter revisions were never recorded.
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since the College came into existence; it was in fact a new organic document. After a brief preamble which retained a few phrases from the 1832 version, the new charter followed the form recommended for nonprofit corporations. "The purpose of Gettysburg College," it declared, "is to serve the cause of liberal education in changing times, by providing a community of learning committed to the discovery, exploration, and evaluation of the ideas and actions of man, and to the creative extension of that developing heritage." The College continued "under the management, direction, government and control" of its board of trustees, whose number could not now exceed thirty-nine, including three ex officio members: the presidents of the College, the Central Pennsylvania Synod, and the Maryland Synod. The new charter was less than half as long as the one it replaced. Obviously, it left much to whatever guidance the by-laws might provide. Under new Pennsylvania procedures which

eliminated the courts from having to pass upon charters of nonprofit corporations, this document was submitted to the Secretary of Education, who approved it on April 1, 1974. The last step occurred when he filed a copy with the Department of State a week later.9

The College somehow managed to survive without by-laws for more than a century, until the first set was adopted in December 1940. Thereafter, changes were made from time to time, some of which were then promptly forgotten.10 In 1962, at the urging of Arnold Hanson, and for reasons that were obvious, the trustees passed an amendment which was not forgotten. For the first time in the history of the College, there was now a limit (one of twelve years) on the length of time one could serve in succession on the board. One year would have to pass before a person would again be eligible for election.11

A major by-law revision occurred in 1972, about the time a new charter was being secured. The number of regular board meetings was increased from two to five each year.12 In a calculated effort to involve more members in board deliberations, several new committees were created and given specific duties to perform, while the executive committee which had dominated, at times almost monopolized, the proceedings for many years was stripped of virtually all but emergency powers. It was soon obvious that this by-law revision was accomplishing its intended purpose. It also ushered in more than a decade of very frequent by-law changes, as the trustees adjusted their own operations and as the administrative structure of the College changed.

For many years the trustees deliberated in private and relied upon the president to convey whatever official information of their action

9These proceedings occurred under the provisions of the act of November 15, 1972.
11In the mid-1950s, the trustees began awarding the emeritus title to some of their colleagues when they retired. It was used more widely once the twelve-year rule went into effect a decade later. Under the 1972 charter, the by-laws provided that the board could elect "as an honorary life Trustee any individual who has served Gettysburg College, the community or the nation with distinction." Eight persons have been so recognized: John S. Rice (1973), Paul H. Rhoads (1973), Ralph W. McCreary (1974), William H. B. Stevens (1976), John A. Apple (1977), John A. Hauser (1978), F. William Sunderman (1979), and Ralph W. Cox (1985). In 1982 the board decided to award trustee emeritus status to all living former trustees having served for twelve years or more and having attained the age of sixty years.
12Actually the board had been meeting on the average of four times a year since the early 1960s. A 1980 by-law amendment reduced the number of regular meetings to four. After holding at least one of its meetings each year in the Union League in Philadelphia, starting in the 1940s, the board began in 1964 conducting almost all of its sessions in Gettysburg.
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was released to the constituencies. Periodically faculty, students, or alumni asked for a regular flow of information directly from the board, but it proved difficult to sustain the promised releases for more than a few years at a time. Formal contacts between the board and the constituencies were few, but since most trustees were graduates there were regular occasions for them to meet and converse with other alumni, including faculty, some of whom were former classmates or professors. In 1952, as President Hanson was leaving office, he transmitted to the board a faculty request for an opportunity to discuss some of their pressing concerns, especially salaries, directly with the trustees. The following fall the new president, to whom this request was referred for action, used an interpretation of the College by-laws (one with which few faculty would agree) in informing the faculty that this document made him the sole medium of communication between the two bodies and asking for patience as he tried to deal with their petition. When he left three years later, some faculty asked that two of their number be permitted to attend board meetings and that a joint trustee-faculty committee be created, with duties to be defined.

No joint committee was formed, but gradually some of the barriers separating the board from the rest of the College were lowered. Beginning in the later 1950s joint dinners gave trustees and faculty opportunities to learn to know each other and begin to discuss common concerns. Board committees dealing with such subjects as fraternities and religious activities could not function intelligently without regular contacts with administrators and faculty members. The faculty religious activities committee was established in 1956 in response to a board request. As the College in the 1960s began devoting more attention to institutional planning, it made sense to involve committees consisting of trustees, administrators, and faculty at important stages in the process. During the trying 1960s and early 1970s the trustees wisely made concerted efforts to communicate directly with both students and faculty. A by-laws amendment in 1968 authorized the board to appoint nonmembers to certain of its committees, and to give them both voice and vote. By 1974 several trustees were wondering just how much of their business was so confidential that board meetings needed to be closed at all.

In 1945 there were only a few books and articles dealing with the actual and ideal roles of trustees in the operation of the nation's colleges and universities. The available evidence indicates that for years after 1945, in company with counterparts in many sister institutions, Gettysburg trustees believed that they could perform their duties creditably enough simply by drawing upon their experiences as college-trained and as successful business or pro-
It was only as the College began to experience the complexities of the later sixties and seventies, and as it confronted new situations which demanded the direct involvement of the trustees, that the president and board officers devised programs to orient new members to what the College constituencies had the right to expect of them. As the body of literature on effective trusteeship grew, both president and board chairman from time to time recommended that their colleagues become familiar with some of the best of it. In 1975 Gettysburg joined the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, in order to begin taking advantage of the several services which it offered, not the least of which was the series of more than a dozen brief booklets dealing with the manifold...
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responsibilities which the times had thrust upon trustees.13

In March 1982 the Gettysburg board undertook the first major systematic study of its operations in a century and a half of existence. The committee designated to initiate the study sought "to discover how the Board of Trustees can become most effective in dealing with the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for Gettysburg College." The report which it presented to the board a year later identified and explained eleven major responsibilities of college and university boards and then proposed steps to be taken in an effort to meet them more fully.14

Among the conclusions which the committee reached were the following: (1) fund raising must be a continuous board activity; (2) every trustee must participate directly in initiating and carrying out fund-raising efforts, either contributing personally or securing contributions from others; (3) there should be considerable diversity in the characteristics and experience of trustees (for example, no more than three-fourths should be alumni, while a variety of business and professional persons should be represented); (4) more attention needs to be given to the recruitment of trustees and evaluation of their performance once in office (the committee presented specific criteria to be used in selecting candidates); (5) while deliberate efforts must be made to insure that each trustee becomes as fully acquainted as possible with all matters within the purview of the board, members must concentrate on making and evaluating College policy, leaving administration to others; (6) the important task of coordinating board work should be assigned to the executive committee; and, (7) since sound and sustained leadership is crucial, the limit on the chairman's tenure should be increased from three to five successive years. After discussion and some modifications, the full board adopted the committee report in June 1983 and authorized those changes in the by-laws which were then required.

13Founded in 1921, the organization which developed into the Association of Governing Boards began as an informal body whose members met annually to share experiences. A mission statement adopted in 1974 included among its purposes at that time advancing "higher education by increasing the knowledge and strengthening the performance of its trustees" and facilitating "understanding of the problems and responsibilities of higher education trusteeship." Linda E. Henderson, Director, Trustee Information Center, Association of Governing Boards, to the author, Washington, October 6, 1985. One of the most influential of the association's publications was John William Nason, The Future of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards (Washington, 1975), which was extensively revised and reissued as The Nature of Trusteeship: . . . . (Washington, 1982). See also another association publication: Richard T. Ingram and associates, Handbook of College and University Trusteeship (San Francisco, 1980).

14The eleven major responsibilities were drawn from John W. Nason, The Nature of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards (Washington, 1982), pp. 19-46.
"It is with feelings of deepest gratitude," President Hanson told the trustees in December 1945, that he could report that "we have been able to survive the war years with no financial deficits." Thanks in large measure to heavy enrollments of women and to federal payments for services rendered, the income reported for fiscal 1944-1945 was $443,062; the expenditures amounted to $442,126. The steady upward trend of the postwar price level, relieved only by occasional periods when inflation was under control, insured that such figures would not be repeated in the ensuing forty years. The College budget first exceeded one million dollars in 1953-1954, two million in 1958-1959, five million in 1968-1969, ten million in 1977-1978, and twenty million in 1983-1984.

During most of the forty-year period between 1945 and 1985, tuition and related fees (exclusive of room and board) yielded about two-thirds of annual general fund income. The 1945-1946 tuition was $350 (the athletic, student chest, and health fees came to an additional $30). The trustees were still reluctant to increase charges for College services, but during the remaining Hanson years they did raise tuition to $400 for 1947-1948 and to $450 for 1951-1952. With the coming of a new president, Walter C. Langsam, tuition and related charges were combined into a comprehensive academic fee, which was set at $625 for 1953-1954. After remaining at that level for three years, the fee increased to $725 for 1956-1958, $930 for 1958-1959, and $1,000 for 1959-1961.

For the first year of the Arnold Hanson administration (1961-1962), the comprehensive fee was $1,100. Early in his sixteen-year tenure, he and the other trustees found it necessary to begin making annual upward adjustments, ranging from $100 to $270. For his last year in office (1976-1977), the comprehensive fee was $3,300, triple what it had been in the fall of 1961. During the Hanson years many repeatedly predicted that, if the pattern were not soon broken, the College would price itself out of its market. The customary response from the president was that Gettysburg's charges were still under those of the colleges with which it most often compared itself. For what it might have been worth, he could also have reminded all concerned that, year after year, the comprehensive fee was yielding about the same proportion of general income.

Increases during the next seven years resulted in more than doubling the basic College charge, from $3,620 in 1977-1978 to $7,740 in 1984-1985. The 1945 catalogue still reminded readers that "the expenses of a student depend largely on his training and habits." With this as an introduction, it estimated that tuition, fees, board,
room, and books would cost a "moderate" student $730 for the upcoming year and a "liberal" one $780. The 1984 catalogue ventured an estimate of $10,560 for the same services, and no longer made any distinction between moderate and liberal students. In 1984-1985 comprehensive fees comprised about 62 percent of current fund income.\(^\text{15}\)

The College could not rely on its endowment fund to yield more than a tiny fraction of needed current income. During most of the period covered by this chapter, it yielded about two cents of every dollar received. There was a steady, but painfully slow, growth in the principal from the $376,618 recorded at the end of 1944-1945. It exceeded half a million in 1952-1953, one million dollars in 1958-1959, two million in 1966-1967, and stood at $4,321,786 at the close of the Arnold Hanson administration in 1977, when the yield furnished about 2 1/4 percent of total current income. Actually, these figures were misleading, since during this administration reserves, which actually served as an endowment even though not given that name, were set aside within a category labeled General Restricted Funds. When most of these moneys were actually transferred to it during 1977-1978, reported endowment increased to $11,222,668. At the close of the 1984-1985 year, the total was $17,074,369 and its yield produced about 5 percent of general fund income.

As noted in preceding chapters, among those of nine Pennsylvania colleges and universities founded before 1865, Gettysburg's endowment ranked ninth in both 1904 and 1945. It had climbed only one notch by the sesquicentennial year 1982-1983 (the last for which comparable figures were available at the time of writing), when Dickinson reported $23,799,177; Washington and Jefferson, $13,500,000; Allegheny, $19,916,486; the University of Pittsburgh, $125,251,330; Lafayette, $96,768,393; Gettysburg, $16,760,820; Haverford, $50,337,363; Bucknell, $52,734,000; and Franklin and Marshall, $28,020,000. Among Pennsylvania institutions founded after the Civil War, Lehigh reported $102,502,041; Swarthmore, $158,204,000; and Ursinus, $20,129,374. Among the four Lutheran colleges in Pennsylvania, Gettysburg had moved from third place in 1945 to first place in 1982-1983, when Muhlen-\(^\text{15}\) According to the annual treasurer's reports, scholarships increased from about 5 percent of tuition income in 1946-1947 to 10 percent in 1960-1961 and 13-14 percent in the early 1980s. Until 1952 the president made the awards. In that year a faculty committee took over the task. It in turn was superseded in 1980 by the director of financial aid. Beginning in 1956 the catalogue announced that the College "uses the scholarship services of the College Entrance Examination Board" and informed parents of various private tuition plans available to them. About this time College and government loans became a widely used form of financial aid.
berg reported $15,115,000; Thiel, $4,729,751; and Susquehanna, $4,000,000.16

Between 1945 and 1985 Gettysburg College continued to benefit from old sources of revenue, including gifts and bequests for general and specific purposes, the annual Loyalty Fund, and the Woman’s League.17 At the same time, it developed valuable new income sources, including annual synodical appropriations for operating expenses, grants by businesses and foundations, grants or loans from federal and state governments, and amounts generated by conferences and related activities, especially during the summer months. By the 1960s annual giving from all sources was approaching $950,000. In the early 1980s it averaged $2,600,000.18

A report to the College constituency for the year 1964-1965, halfway through the period covered by this chapter, indicated that 63.2 percent of general fund income came from tuition and fees, 21.6 percent from auxiliary enterprises, 8.4 percent from gifts, 1.9 percent from endowment, and 4.9 percent from all other sources. The four largest expense items in that year were instructional costs (33.2

---

16Council for Financial Aid to Education, Voluntary Support of Education, 1982-1983, (New York, 1984), pp. 13-31. The figures reported are market value of endowment. Some New England colleges which as early as 1904 were among the most heavily endowed in the country continued to enjoy that position: in 1982-1983: Dartmouth, with $354,606,520; Amherst, with $136,781,826; Wesleyan, with $162,774,000; Williams, with $162,876,626; and Bowdoin, with $76,900,000. In New York, Hamilton College had $58,580,605. In other parts of the country, Colorado College had $57,331,349; Wabash, $70,464,000, and Cornell in lowa, $22,703,601.

17Endowed scholarship funds increased from $66,460 in 1945 to $3,274,505 forty years later. Trustees and others, sometimes anonymously, made many generous contributions for such varied purposes as funding an expanded pension plan in 1947 and building a president’s residence some twenty years later. Some of the many bequests after 1945 were added to endowment, while others were used to help meet the goals of capital-funds campaigns. For a discussion of the Loyalty Fund and the Woman’s League, see pp. 966-967 and 970-972.

18For a discussion of synodical support, see pp. 979-982. In 1952 Gettysburg joined thirty-seven other colleges and universities in organizing the Foundation for Independent Colleges, Inc., of Pennsylvania, through which they began one combined annual appeal for funds to business and industry. Since that time Gettysburg presidents and other administrators have devoted several days each year, with figurative tin cup in hand, to making personal solicitations. By 1985 Gettysburg had received more than $575,000 from this source. Also in the 1950s Gettysburg began to benefit from the recently instituted practice by many business firms, often through their education foundations, of making direct grants to educational institutions, sometimes to support specific projects, sometimes for general purposes, and sometimes to match employee contributions to the College. By the early 1980s the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and similar agencies were supporting scientific research or general improvement in science instruction. Beginning in 1963 the College annually devoted one issue of the GCB to a detailed report on College finances, including annual giving.
percent), auxiliary enterprises (19.9 percent), reserves for construction and debt reduction (14.7 percent), and general institutional expense (9.3 percent).

While there may have been many things about the proper role of college trustees which were unclear in 1945, one thing should not have been in doubt: aided by the president and whatever staff he might have, trustees were responsible for funding the institution they served. This was not something which they could delegate to anyone else, although if they were good stewards they were obligated to seek help wherever they could find it. In their first postwar meeting, in December 1945, at a time when they could not be expected to see much beyond a temporary heavy influx of veterans wanting to enter the College, the Gettysburg trustees authorized a fund-raising firm to determine the feasibility of a financial campaign and make a recommendation. Although the firm advised waiting, the trustees authorized it to organize a $500,000 campaign. The money was to be used for a new chapel, a new infirmary, a field house (or remodeling Plank Gymnasium for use by men and a new gymnasium for women), and an additional dormitory for women. In spite of the fact that they called it the Expansion Fund Campaign, it is evident that the trustees viewed this undertaking as a resumption of the building program which the depression and the war had interrupted, one designed to accommodate an enrollment only slightly larger than that before the war.

President Hanson was being truthful in June 1946 when he introduced the alumni to the forthcoming campaign by reminding them that "no institution of learning has been more thoughtful in avoiding any financial burden on its constituency than has our own." The Gettysburg style, he reminded them, has been to avoid "extravagance or luxury" and to seek instead "dignity and simplicity." The College "has always been most conservative in financial expenditures," he wrote, and "has sought to serve its constituency at a cost-level below that of our friendly rivals." In keeping with that well-established tradition, the campaign about to begin would be "a dignified and united approach" instead of a "high pressure effort to secure funds."

The campaign – the alumni bulletin called it one for a Greater Gettysburg – began in February 1947, with simultaneous alumni meetings in all parts of the country, and it continued with appeals in Central Pennsylvania and Maryland Synod congregations on Reformation Sunday, in October. Writing in the January 1948 alumni bulletin, President Hanson proudly announced that pledges amounting to some $700,000 had been secured, about half from the alumni and half from the church. He assured his readers that, "in carrying out the church phase of the campaign, only those churches which
This summons to all alumni for the 1947 financial campaign was inserted in a brochure entitled A Greater Gettysburg.

were willing to cooperate were covered,” since “it was the desire of the college that there be no embarrassment to anyone – the funds subscribed should come from those who really desired to participate in the campaign.” As of October 1949 only about 50 percent of the pledges had been paid, largely because the national church had launched a money-gathering effort which the College agreed should include completion of its own. By the time the College closed out the Expansion Fund account in June 1952, a total of $368,313 had been credited to it.19

In October 1948 the biennial convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, convinced that Lutheran-related institutions “should be superior, with faculties of high standing, facilities adequate for effective work, and curriculum sufficient to advance the whole program of the whole church,” approved 1950 as a Christian Higher Education Year (C.H.E.Y.), during which it hoped to raise $6,000,000 to help meet the building needs of its colleges and seminaries. Prior to the convention, each institution had presented a

19It is worth noting that Hanson also told the alumni in January 1948 that “this was the first campaign for funds which has occurred within my 25 years as president of Gettysburg College.” The money raised for a new chapel before the war was in response to letters he wrote to individual alumni and to his approach to the Woman’s League. In 1947 the fund-raising firm systematically organized both alumni and pastors in order to secure pledges.
list of its needs, which understandably came to double the total amount finally agreed upon as the goal. The quota assigned to each synod was based upon an estimate of its ability to contribute and the allotment to each institution took into consideration fund-raising efforts which it already had under way. The Central Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia Synods were asked to give Gettysburg College a total of $621,750. Amounts actually paid prior to the end of 1949 on pledges to the Expansion Fund Campaign could be counted toward this total. The College accepted this arrangement. "It has been deemed wise," President Hanson told the alumni in January 1949, "that our own church campaign merge with the general campaign of the Church."

The C.H.E.Y. campaign was concentrated in the first several months of 1950. President Hanson joined other members of the faculty and staff in visiting many congregations to explain the effort and solicit support. When the final receipts were tabulated, the national goal was exceeded by more than 10 percent. Several institutions, including Muhlenberg and Wittenberg, eventually received considerably more than their original allotments. In the case of Gettysburg, the two smaller supporting synods, Maryland and West Virginia, over-subscribed, but the large Central Pennsylvania Synod raised only about 85 percent of its quota. According to U.L.C.A. records, the total amount which Gettysburg received through June 30, 1956 from its treasury was $395,978.20

In the fall of 1952, long before the last C.H.E.Y. contribution was recorded, President Langsam arrived on the scene. He found that the costs of a recently completed women's dormitory, a chapel then being constructed, and a new heating plant had already used up all of the available Expansion Fund and C.H.E.Y. moneys, leaving the College with a debt of about $200,000 and a series of needs which might well be described as desperate. At his urging, the board in December 1953 created an office for development and embarked upon a campaign to raise $1,000,000, $200,000 to eliminate the debt and $800,000 to build a three-unit dormitory for male students, almost half of whom were then being housed in temporary and inadequate quarters. Clarence L.S. Raby resigned from the board of trustees to become the first development officer in the history of the College. Under his direction a campaign was organized designed to reach alumni, businesses, and foundations. It began with dinners at many locations in late April 1954. The key word was GIVE, an acronym meaning gifts insure vital education for Gettysburg

20The College certified that it had received an additional $126,402 directly from individuals and congregations, making a C.H.E.Y. total of $522,380. However, the College treasurer's reports gave the total as $348,809. See the minutes of the biennial U.L.C.A. conventions from 1948 through 1960 for C.H.E.Y. items.
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College. Although the progress reports in subsequent issues of the alumni bulletin were glowing and gave the impression that the goal was being approached, when Raby resigned in December 1955 (he never intended to remain any longer), he reported cash and pledges of less than $250,000 and an inability to generate much interest among either churches or foundations. Treasurer's reports through 1956-1957 credit this campaign with eventually securing $355,134.

In the month of Raby's departure, the Ford Foundation announced a record gift of $500,000,000 to aid some 4,150 colleges, universities, medical schools, and hospitals. Grants totaling $210,000,000 and intended to help raise teachers' salaries were awarded to regionally accredited, privately supported colleges and universities of liberal arts and sciences. "In the opinion of the foundation's trustees," Henry Ford II declared, "private and corporate philanthropy can make no better investment of its resources than in helping to strengthen American education at its base - the quality of its teaching" and, he added, "nowhere are the needs of the private colleges more apparent than in the matter of faculty salaries," which had not kept pace with the postwar compensation of other professionals. The amount awarded to each of the 615 institutions was about equal to its 1954-1955 instructional payroll. Gettysburg received $291,000, which when added to its endowment increased the principal by about 50 percent.21

In June 1949 the board of trustees went on record as "wishing to keep Gettysburg College free from subsidies and political entanglements." As time passed, as it became obvious that enrollments would probably be increasing rather than decreasing, as it became equally obvious that the College needed additional money for literally every aspect of its program, and as the best-intentioned fund-raising efforts failed to reach their several goals, the board elected (December 1955) to run the risks of subsidies and political entanglements by taking advantage of a program which the federal government was then offering. In 1956-1958 it secured three loans, totaling $3,280,000, from the Housing and Home Finance Agency. With interest rates of between 2¿ and 3 percent, these obligations were payable over a period of forty years. The last payments were due in 1996-1998. The proceeds from these loans were used to construct five dormitories, a dining hall, and a college union building. It

21New York Times, December 13, 1955. The original announcement stated that the Gettysburg allocation would be $263,900. Dickinson was one of 126 institutions receiving an additional sum for having "led the way in their regions in improving the status and compensation of American college teachers." Institutions accepting Ford grants promised to invest them, using the income for at least ten years for improving teachers' salaries. A questionnaire returned to the foundation in August 1955 was used to determine the initial amount of Gettysburg's grant.
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is difficult to see how these buildings could have been constructed when they were, or even in the following decade, without these federal funds. Understandably, there was little or no incentive to repay the loans ahead of schedule.

Federal money was available only for construction of income-producing facilities, not for other buildings which the College also sorely needed. Consequently, under a new president, Willard S. Paul, the board of trustees decided upon still another campaign, its fourth since the war. Guided once again by a fund-raising firm, the

President Dwight D. Eisenhower addressing the 1959 convocation initiating yet another fund-raising campaign. Note the unfinished Student Union Building in the background.

---

22In authorizing the first application for federal funds, the trustees did observe that "we should look into the matter of 'Federal Pressure' if any." Although the funds received were in the form of loans, the terms were so generous that one might regard the effort as the most successful fund-raising campaign up to that time in the history of the College.

23In May 1956, during the meeting at which they elected a new president and at a time when they were looking for sources of new money, the trustees authorized formation of a wholly College-owned corporation to construct and operate a shopping center on part of their land, north of West Broadway. The corporation was formed, but the Adams County Shopping Center, Inc. did not function as planned.
College inaugurated this new effort in April 1959, at a convocation which President Dwight D. Eisenhower addressed on Memorial Field. The initial campaign goal was ambitious, indeed, far beyond anything the College had ever attempted in the past: $5,175,000 over seven or eight years, for a new library ($1,255,000), a life science building ($1,250,000), a men's physical education building ($1,000,000), reconstruction of Old Dorm ($350,000), a new infirmary ($150,000), remodeling of McKnight Hall into a language building ($150,000), and endowment ($1,000,000). As it quickly became apparent that this sum was far beyond the College's reach, either then or in the near future, the total was drastically scaled down, to $1,625,000, which included the estimated costs of a men's physical education building, renovation of Old Dorm, a new infirmary, and renovation of McKnight Hall. When the books on this campaign were finally closed in June 1965, several years after first intended, the yield was recorded as $1,648,801. Well over half of this amount was paid from the treasuries of two synods: Central Pennsylvania ($700,000) and Maryland ($210,743).

By the beginning of the 1960s, Gettysburg College had demonstrated that it could still count on the loyalty of hundreds of its alumni and of the Lutheran church when it undertook to supplement its current income, but it had not yet succeeded in attracting the major foundation grants or large bequests which were necessary if it hoped to have the resources adequate for the quality of work it clearly wished to do. While there undoubtedly were several reasons for this failure, it was evident that many who could provide the College with such new sources of income would base their decision to a large degree on the example set by the trustees themselves, either by their own giving or by their success in persuading others to give. Increasingly, presidents and trustee leaders reminded their

24Eisenhower used the occasion to discuss the development of understanding as one of the major purposes of education. Freedom in the world, he insisted, was indivisible. Americans needed to understand that Southeast Asia, Japan, and Berlin were all important in preserving that freedom. For the text, see Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1959 (Washington, 1960), pp. 309-317.

25Cone from the schedule was anything for endowment. During most of this period presidents and trustees obviously favored increasing it, but time and time again they assigned endowment a priority one or two notches below renovating an old building or constructing a new one. In 1958 the business manager told the president he believed the College had taken "a wrong turn back some years ago" in not insisting that "a certain definite proportion of every unrestricted gift should go into endowment." In June 1961 the trustees solemnly committed themselves to securing $100,000 annually for endowment, a commitment which was not met.

26Note that this church money came from synodical treasuries and not from congregational solicitations, as in the past. The final campaign report, printed in the GCB for January 1966, credited the trustees with having contributed $32,261 to this effort.
colleagues of this fact and exhorted them to begin doing something about it.

Upon taking office in the fall of 1961, Arnold Hanson was faced with a serious and immediate financial problem. To meet commitments of $2,200,000 already made for various capital improvements, only $700,000 from the fund-raising campaign had become available. Some of the balance could not be expected for up to four years. The College had borrowed large sums in the form of short-term notes, which could be called at almost any time. One of Hanson's first steps was to secure board approval of a $1,500,000 loan, repayable over a ten-year period, from a major insurance company. In 1962 the College responded to an initiative from the Ford Foundation by preparing a detailed proposal for a major grant. The foundation gave no reason for its rejection of the proposal in May 1963, but one trustee told his colleagues a month later that the College had neither been thinking nor acting big enough to merit the confidence of major foundations.27

Obviously, since all of the projects, and more, included in the original development plan of 1959 could be considered necessary, what one trustee called "a challenging intensive campaign" was needed to make them possible. However, the president, many trustees, and the professional fund raisers all doubted that, given its record, the College could hope to succeed in a new campaign so soon after the one begun in 1959 and for which the books were not yet closed. Nevertheless, in 1963 the board committed itself in principle to a ten-year development program, which included constructing a life science building and three dormitories, as well as renovating Old Dorm. Mindful of the prospects for success, the trustees elected to begin by conducting what they called a quiet campaign, one in which, if there were failure, it would be less devastating.

The results obtained during 1964 were gratifying. In January the Emma G. Musselman Foundation offered the College $250,000 for construction of a stadium, to be used for College and community events. Although this facility was not included in the current development program, the trustees promptly accepted the gift.28 In

27The trustee was undoubtedly correct. In June 1963 the Ford Foundation announced grants averaging about $2,000,000 each to thirteen colleges, including Lafayette. To qualify, these schools were required to raise an average $4,800,000 each. Well into 1964, President Hanson was trying to persuade the Ford Foundation to reconsider Gettysburg's request. He did not succeed.

28Christian H. Musselman (1880-1944), a native of Lancaster county, together with his father and brother, purchased a Biglerville cannery at a 1907 sheriff sale. Shortly thereafter acquiring sole interest in the business, he built the C.H. Musselman Company into one of the nation's largest and most successful fruit processing firms. Emma G. Musselman (1880-1966) actively worked alongside her husband in all of his endeavors. During his lifetime Musselman made generous gifts for educational and
November the Longwood Foundation of Wilmington, Delaware, made a $675,000 challenge grant, which the College was required to match in about eighteen months, for the construction of a life science building. The trustees formally resolved to meet the challenge, and in June 1965 Trustee Ralph W. McCreary presented the College with a gift then valued at $700,000 which the foundation accepted as meeting the challenge.29

During the next several years the College conducted a difficult campaign to raise money for Old Dorm, whose renovation was obviously going to cost far more than the first estimate of $350,000. Only the most minor repairs had been made on the old building for some years; it would soon have to be modernized or removed. Efforts to secure the major foundation gift which the 1963 development plan projected to cover the costs of renovation were unavailing, although several large and many small gifts were received. Finally, in September 1968, with less than half the needed amount in hand, the trustees authorized the work to begin and borrowing from reserves to help pay for it.

Thanks to the almost constant campaign efforts, by the early 1970s the College had built most of the new buildings and renovated most of the existing ones which were included in the 1959 campaign statement. In September 1972 the board boldly committed itself to yet another long-range plan, this one to culminate with the College sesquicentennial in 1982. The first draft of this plan called for a goal of $18,500,000, but once again fund raisers and others had immediate and serious doubts about its feasibility. Consequently, the trustees decided in January 1973 to appeal for funds for a new library, a new facility for the creative and performing arts, and renovation of space vacated once these facilities were available. Although their cost estimate for these plans was about $5,000,000, they decided not even to announce that figure immediately. In fact, pleading recession, dissatisfaction within the constituency, and other reasons, on four occasions during the next several years the

—— other charitable purposes, both in Adams county and elsewhere. After his death, chiefly through the Emma G. Musselman Foundation, his widow greatly expanded the family's philanthropic activities, from which Gettysburg College benefited on frequent occasions. Beginning in 1954, gifts from the Musselman Foundation and the Emma G. Musselman Foundation supported scholarships, music, theater arts, visiting scientists and business executives, as well as a new stadium, field house, and library. Apart from synodical contributions, these two foundations contributed more to the College between 1945 and 1985 than any other single source. See "Fruits of Success, The Musselman Legacy," GCB [August 1981], pp. 1-3.

29 As an article in the July 1985 GCB made clear, the gift was in the form of 7,000 shares of McCreary Tire and Rubber Company preferred stock. Since one of its conditions required the College to retain the stock to a date beyond the time of this writing, the ultimate actual value of the gift is not yet known.
trustees turned down the recommendation of their development committee that they make a public announcement and proceed.

The campaign for what was described as the new library and learning resources center was finally launched, with considerable fanfare, at a dinner meeting in January 1976. What happened over the next thirty-three months once again illustrated the financial strengths and weaknesses of Gettysburg College as they had manifested themselves repeatedly in her past. As months came and went, the pattern of giving as measured against the schedule which fund raisers insisted was necessary for a successful campaign showed that hundreds of people had joined to subscribe the smaller amounts expected, but that the large gifts indispensable to success were simply not forthcoming.30

Leaders of the campaign within the board of trustees repeatedly reminded their colleagues, not all of whom had made their pledges, that the College could not expect foundations, with whom at least some of the large gifts would almost certainly have to originate, to come to its assistance unless its governing board was unanimous and wholehearted in supporting the campaign. The Indians are doing well, remarked one trustee, but it is the chiefs we must be worried about. If we do not succeed in this effort, remarked another, we may as well never try another campaign. Mindful of the College’s past record, a third stated that, after talking to trustees in many other colleges, he was convinced that Gettysburg trustees simply had to put forth every possible effort and keep trying until they succeeded. Then they would have an undoubted achievement behind them which could be used as a stepping stone for the future.

When Arnold Hanson retired in the summer of 1977, the achievement was still in the future. The campaign was stalled at about one-third of its goal.31 It was only in 1978, with the announcement of a $200,000 challenge grant from the Dana Foundation, a similar one of $100,000 from the Pew Memorial Trust, and a $1,250,000 gift from the Emma G. Musselman Foundation, that the decision to proceed with the library could finally be made. In September 1981 the College recorded receipts of $4,179,473 from the campaign.

30The schedule called for one $1,000,000 gift, ten between $100,000 and $500,000, and “many” below $1,000. For months the largest pledge was $75,000. The first gift above that amount came from a bequest which the College was able to use for the library instead of endowment.

31The fact that the library campaign was stalled far from its goal must be considered together with an equally incontrovertible fact: in the summer of 1977 the College’s current accounts were in very good condition and were being responsibly and prudently administered. Reflecting upon his understanding of the College after a year in office, President Glassick told the trustees in September 1978 that “the College has a fiscally sound base of operations.”
As early as September 1978, even before the library construction was begun, and under President Charles E. Glassick, the board committed itself to yet another campaign, called One Hundred Fifty Years and Beyond. In 1981 its members set a goal of $12,000,000, divided among current needs, plant, and endowment, and scheduled to be completed by June 1985. Following recommended fund-raising practice, they then undertook to secure much of this amount in a quiet campaign. Late in 1982, after cash and pledges amounting to almost half the goal had been secured, they made a public announcement, in which the goal was increased to $14,000,000, to include $2,000,000 for deferred gifts or what were called gifts of future interest. "We don't seek to make Gettysburg much different," the chairman of the board declared. "We do hope to make it much better and stronger." Significantly, One Hundred Fifty Years and Beyond proposed to accomplish this purpose by giving much more attention to the College's educational program than any of the other post-1945 campaigns, all of which concentrated so heavily on buildings that some faculty accused their authors of being afflicted with an edifice complex. When the campaign closed at the end of June 1985, the recorded total in gifts and commitments was $20,167,000, of which $12,700,147 in cash had actually been received.

Clearly, by the spring of 1985 the College had come a long way over four decades in demonstrating the extent of its capacity to meet pressing financial needs. The style which Henry W.A. Hanson so eloquently expressed as late as 1946 was not suited to sustain, let alone advance, the College in the postwar world. In keeping with its traditions, Gettysburg was slow to move to a different posture. While establishing a development office in 1953, the president and board did not then assign it the priority, and consequently did not give it the resources, which the times demanded. It is evident that the successive presidents and development officers, none of whom had long tenure in the 1950s, were aware of sources that needed to be cultivated, as well as of the time and patient effort required for that purpose. The conventional wisdom on the campus in the 1950s and early 1960s was that it would take years before the pioneer work of the developers would bring results. Whether this was an accurate assessment depended at least in part upon the amount and quality of pioneer work being done. President Paul offered a sobering commentary on College priorities in December 1959 when he praised the retiring director of alumni relations and development for the

32Gifts and commitments by category were as follows: for current operations, $5,821,000; for physical plant, $3,005,000; for endowment, $6,391,000; and for future provisions, $4,950,000. Some of the future provisions were in the form of revocable commitments and some were not expected to be realized for a decade or more. See GCB (October 1984), p. 35.
excellent work he had done. "Unfortunately, he is only one person," the president told the trustees, "and has had to forego Foundations solicitation."

A number of steps toward a more sophisticated development program were taken in the 1960s. For example, in February 1963 the College began devoting either a large part or all of an alumni bulletin to a rather detailed explanation of College income and expenditures, naming many who had made contributions during the preceding year, and identifying past accomplishments as well as present needs. Then, in June 1965 the trustees established a board of associates (nonalumni) and a year later a board of fellows (alumni). The administration undertook regularly to inform these persons of important developments, in the hope that they would then be motivated to supplement trustee programs for raising funds. (The Gettysburg College Associates superseded the board of associates in 1979.) In 1967 the president attempted to integrate a parents' association, which had been formed in 1955 but had met only irregularly thereafter, into the development program. Also in 1967, the College revived an effort briefly begun and then abandoned in the 1930s when it established a committee on deferred giving, concerned with wills, bequests, and life-income arrangements. An assistant director of development for estate planning began his duties in 1971. His many articles in the alumni bulletin and personal visits to potential donors had their desired effect. By the end of the decade the planned giving program was being credited with bringing several million dollars to the College.
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Under a new president, beginning in 1978, the development activities were reorganized and greatly expanded, in both old and new directions. An Orange and Blue Club founded in 1979 (and replacing an earlier club) was designed both to recognize those who had contributed to College athletic programs and to encourage them to continue. A Cupola Society formed in 1979 used a prominent feature of the oldest College building as a symbol for an organization to recognize and encourage major donors, both individual and institutional. In the same year, students participated in the first of a series of phonathons to help raise money for the Loyalty (later Annual) Fund, upon which the College relations (no longer development) office was putting increasing emphasis as a means of inviting sustained gifts from a widening circle of donors. In 1980 the senior class was persuaded to revive a custom long fallen into disuse, so long in fact that all assumed it had never existed. Following a tradition established at the beginning of the century, seniors pledged to the alma mater one or more parting gifts of their own choosing.

Presidents

Henry W.A. Hanson (1945-1952)

In the fall of 1945 Henry W.A. Hanson was in his sixty-fourth year. His health was good and his devotion to Gettysburg College undiminished. Pleased at being able to help provide opportunity for returning veterans and others to get a college education, he presided over a rapid doubling of the student body and faculty. Along with others responsible for the College, he gradually accepted that, barring some new and dreadful crisis, enrollment would not soon, if ever, return to prewar levels. Hanson actively supported curricular studies and changes which resulted in several new departments and required courses. He helped the College secure a pension plan which provided coverage for all employees, not only department heads.

Through the pages of the alumni bulletin and in many other ways, President Hanson continued to preach his doctrine of optimism. The great work of Gettysburg College, he assured his readers and listeners, was in the future and, because it had successfully weathered the trials of depression, war, and postwar confusion, the College was in a stronger position than would otherwise have been the case to face that future. Over and over again he insisted that the education which he had long advocated for Gettysburg was, if possible, even more valid than in the past. "I want to bear witness to one deep conviction," he wrote in the June 1952 bulletin. "There has never been a period in the world's history when the type of education Gettysburg College seeks to produce has been more sorely needed. Character values, integrity, faith in God and in His guidance are
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essential for individual happiness and for the highest type of service to the land that we love."

It was also obvious from his repeated pronouncements that this president was as determined as ever that the College remain in the black. Since one could not really be certain of next year's enrollment, he told the alumni, all faculty appointments were being made on an annual basis. When the Korean War in 1951 threatened to take away many young men, he actually released several junior faculty. Hanson participated vigorously in two fund-raising campaigns but, since the objectives of both were new or renovated buildings, they yielded no funds for direct support of the educational programs. Given the College's deliberate policy of charging less for tuition than did its "friendly rivals," it had to use limits on wages and salaries as the major way of staying in the black. The salaries of professors, which were increased to $4,400 in 1946, and $5,000 in 1948, remained at the latter figure for 1952-1953. During the period from 1946 to 1952, the price level had increased by more than 35 percent.33

As the time for their retirement approached, there was genuine appreciation for what both President and Mrs. Hanson had done for the College over more than a quarter century. Even those faculty members who were growing increasingly restive, for one reason or another, when they reflected carefully upon the entire Hanson administration would have to agree that its accomplishments were many and that to its conclusion it had widespread and warm support in all of the major College constituencies. On the occasion of his twenty-fifth anniversary as president, the board established a major scholarship in Hanson's honor and decided to name the first postwar campus building for him.

In the spring of 1952 there were numerous farewell dinners, gifts (the Alumni Association presented the Hansons with a 1952 Cadillac sedan), and statements of appreciation. One of the most revealing of the latter was the one which the faculty adopted unanimously in May 1952. It commended the retiring president for the consistent style of his leadership of the faculty in academic matters, especially for "his avoidance of expression of opinion during debate on matters of Faculty prerogative." Further, it praised him for his protection of academic freedom in the classroom and, finally,

33Although there was increasing dissatisfaction over salaries, there was no direct faculty approach to the trustees similar to those which followed World War I and which resulted in substantial increases. The approach which was finally made in 1952 was indirect and had no immediate effect. It should be noted that the $4,500 paid to professors in 1943-1945 included compensation for instruction of military and civilian students.
for his "uniform kindness and sympathy" in dealing with individual faculty members.  

After presiding over his last commencement in June 1952, and after having been elected president emeritus, Henry W.A. Hanson, with his wife, left the White House and moved into their new home on Front street in Harrisburg, overlooking the Susquehanna river. He honored the promise made at his last faculty meeting, to continue working for a greater Gettysburg College, by returning to the campus for many special occasions. Until his death in 1962, following an illness of about six months, he was regular in attending board meetings. After funeral services in Harrisburg and Gettysburg, he was buried in Evergreen cemetery, as was his wife, who had died in 1956.

---

34It was at this meeting, in May 1952, that Hanson was asked, "as one of the last services that you can perform for the Faculty before your retirement," to transmit to the board of trustees requests for a salary increase "to meet the increased cost of living" and for a joint committee to consider "matters of general College policy." All or most of those responsible for these requests, which originated in the A.A.U.P. and whose intentions were clear enough, wanted to present them in a way which would be least embarrassing to the retiring president.
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Walter C. Langsam (1952-1955)

As early as June 1949 the board of trustees authorized appointment of a committee to select one or more candidates for it to consider in naming a successor to President Hanson upon his retirement three years later. Eventually consisting of five persons, this committee in the spring of 1951 asked Millard E. Gladfelter, of the class of 1925, who was then vice president and provost of Temple University, to become a candidate. They requested an answer as soon as he had made up his mind, but certainly by the fall. Although Gladfelter had always been active in Gettysburg alumni affairs, in November he told the committee that "the investment I have made in years and in the development of programs of Temple University" had become such "an intimate part" of his "life and spirit" that he was removing his name from further consideration.

After determining that Gladfelter's decision was final, the committee interviewed several other possible candidates during the December board meeting in Philadelphia. Then, on January 14, 1952, at a special board meeting held in the same place, the committee presented the name of one of those persons, Walter C. Langsam (1906-1985). After appearing before the trustees and answering a battery of questions, he was elected unanimously and accepted immediately.

A native of Vienna, Austria, Walter Consuelo Langsam was brought to New York City in the year of his birth. The City College of New York awarded him a bachelor's degree in 1925, when he was nineteen. He earned a master's degree in 1926 and his Ph.D. in 1930, both from Columbia University. Between 1927 and 1938 he was a member of the Columbia history faculty, and from 1938 to 1945 was professor of history at Union College, Schenectady, New York. Elected president of Wagner College in 1945, he was serving in that position when the Gettysburg trustees chose him seven years later. By that time he had published The Napoleonic Wars and German Nationalism in Austria (1930); a major textbook, The World Since 1914 (1933), the sixth edition of which was in print by 1948; a book of readings, Documents and Readings in the History of Europe Since 1918 (1939), available in revised and enlarged form by 1951; and Francis the Good: the Education of an Emperor, 1768-1792 (1949). In addition, from 1934 to 1950 he served as history editor for the J.P. Lippincott Company.

Langsam was an active Lutheran layman (from 1948 to 1960 he was a member of the board of publication of the United Lutheran Church in America), as well as a participant in the affairs of the Middle States Association and national educational organizations. He had appeared on the Gettysburg campus in the spring of 1946 to
address the Phi Beta Kappa banquet, and four years later returned to accept an honorary degree. The Langsam family arrived in town during the late summer and moved into the former Stahley house at 300 Carlisle street. The White House which had served as the president's residence since 1860 was taken over by the new chaplain.35

Walter C. Langsam was inaugurated eighth president of Gettysburg College on Memorial Field on October 25, 1952. There was the now customary academic procession, with delegates of many educational institutions marching. Representatives of the several College constituencies brought greetings. In what was by far the briefest inaugural address yet to be delivered in the history of the College, Langsam drew upon what his predecessors had said on similar occasions, as well as upon other pertinent sources, to prove that he was simply reaffirming the long-established principles of the institution. “The principles of Christian higher education,” he declared, “obviously are timeless and immutable.” All he needed to do was restate them briefly and in his own way:

That higher education is right which emphasizes the dignity of the individual as one who is created in the image of God; which teaches the student that spiritual values are superior to and more lasting than material values; which develops stable men and women who can hold fast to basic values even in times of stress; which makes it clear that giving, based on love, is far more rewarding than any kind of taking; which teaches young people how men and women throughout the ages have lived together, have made a living, and have interpreted the universe about them; which, in short, helps produce effective Christian citizens and leaders for tomorrow.36

One of the three outsiders whom the board asked in the spring of 1952 whether to retain a former president as a trustee advised strongly against it, on the grounds that it would likely be embarrassing to both the new man and his predecessor. If there were no conflicts between the old ways and the new, he argued, then probably the new president should not have been selected in the first place.37 When he conducted his first faculty meeting in September 1952, Walter Langsam, a man young enough to have been his predecessor's son and following an administration that had lasted for twenty-nine years, professed his “high respect for,” but not slavery to, tradition, and then announced that he was proposing “no revolutionary changes” for the College. Having said this, he went to work.

One of the first places to which the new president turned his atten-

35The Langsam family consisted of Walter C. and Julie E. (Stubblefield) Langsam, who had been married in 1931, and two sons.
36The entire inaugural program as given was reprinted in the February 1953 issue of GCB.
37Obviously this statement, which referred to the phenomenon of change over time, was not intended by its author to reflect unfavorably upon either Hanson or Langsam as persons or to predict that they would consistently find themselves on opposing sides of the issues. It was intended to affirm what its author believed was a fact.
tion was the administration. He established a business office, assigning to it financial and maintenance responsibilities which previously had been discharged in a number of places, including the president's office, and which, in some cases, were performed only irregularly. He began instituting a budget system, asking departments and offices for the first time to present requests for funds needed during the next year. Langsam created the position of dean of men (there had been a dean of women since 1941) and changed the title of Wilbur Tilberg to dean of the College. While he probably anticipated no change in the latter's actual duties during the few short years before his retirement, the new title revealed the larger role which he obviously had in mind for the position. The first full-time chaplain, relieved of all teaching responsibilities, took over in the fall of 1952. Shortly after taking office, the new president announced that he was meeting regularly with his chief administrators, one more of which was added to the list when the development office was created in 1953.

36 The following were chaplain-teachers: Parker B. Wagnild (1944-1946), Howard J. McCarney (1948-1950), and Edward K. Stipe (1950-1952). Full-time chaplains have been Edwerth E. Korte (1952-1960), John W. Vannorsdall (1962-1976), and Karl J. Mattson (from 1977). Beginning in 1969, there have also been assistant or associate chaplains.
A veteran college teacher and a productive scholar, Langsam began to play a considerably more active role than had his predecessor in the development of the academic program. He considered himself an active member of the curriculum committee, attended meetings whenever he could, and was not reluctant to express his views. At an informal meeting of the committee in his home in late October 1952, he made fourteen recommendations, including that all 1953 graduates be required to take the Graduate Record Examination (an outside and presumably impartial measure of the effectiveness of instruction); that the introductory Bible course be required of all freshmen, as part of the foundation of their entire program; that a cooperative engineering program be entered into with Pennsylvania State College; that a department of art be established; and that a study of the entire curriculum be undertaken. At his first board meeting after taking office, he persuaded the trustees to adopt the 1940 statement on academic freedom and tenure, as well as to incorporate pertinent portions of the statement into the by-laws. At his suggestion, the trustees approved the College's first formal salary schedule, or scale, although because of the lack of funds only small increases in individual salaries were possible during his administration. In his search for new money, as early as 1952 he began exploring the possibility of adding synodical trustees in exchange for regular church grants. Three years later, he assured the trustees that "much gain, and no disadvantage, would result from the early grant of Board representation to the supporting Synods."

Beginning in September 1952, the president arranged to have the faculty minutes duplicated and distributed to each member. He published the 1951-1952 balance sheet and statement of income and expenditures in the alumni bulletin, and then made a copy of the complete treasurer's report available to every faculty member who wanted one. In September 1952 he promised that there would be a faculty handbook, the first edition of which, prepared by a faculty committee, appeared one year later.

Carrying on an old Gettysburg tradition, Langsam entered into discussion and consultation with students. An ill-fated experiment with voluntary chapel begun in the fall of 1952, much to their delight, was abandoned the following year. A second experiment, in the spring of 1953, was more successful. In an effort to attract superior students, the College offered a small number of competitive

---

39Very brief financial statements began appearing in the bulletin as early as January 1948.
40Succeeding editions of the handbook, each a bit larger than the preceding one, appeared in 1960, 1964, and 1973. Langsam's initiatives followed at least two faculty requests for such a publication to help orient new faculty members as well as inform veteran ones interested in being reminded of existing rules and regulations.
It is evident that he sometimes had second thoughts about the way in which he had acted, but by that time the damage had been done.42

41It was only after World War II that the Commission on Higher Education decided to review the accreditation of all members once every ten years and to accomplish this by sending teams to spend several days on the campuses examining, at least theoretically, all major parts of the institution. Ewald B. Nyquist, "Life Begins at Forty: A Brief History of the Commission," (Middle States Association, 1961), p. 26. Subsequent accrediting visits occurred in March 1964, October 1973, and November 1983. Copies of the materials submitted to the Middle States before, and of the accrediting team's report after, each visit are in the GCA. Subsequent references to these sources are made in the text (for example, 1954 Middle States report) rather than in footnotes.

42As early as December 1952, in his board report, he credited his staff with occasionally applying "effective brakes" on his "tendency sometimes to act too quickly."
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An excellent example of the Langsam style is provided by an exchange which occurred in the columns of the Gettysburgian within a few weeks after College opened in the fall of 1952. A major editorial entitled "The Thorn In The Side" noted with pride the new chapel then being erected and called its completion a truly major achievement, but, having said that, the editor quickly drew the reader's attention to the "pitiful condition of the supposedly temporary dormitories that now exist," in which many men students spend much more time than they ever would in the new chapel. To strengthen his case, the editor pointed to what he considered extravagance in several recently completed buildings, noting that "extravagance is also shown in the $45,000 pipe organ to be installed in the new chapel." His conclusion was that, while the recent building program had yielded many undoubted benefits, its directors erred in not assigning highest priority to constructing satisfactory dormitory facilities. The student could only hope that "in the future a carefully planned program [might] be initiated so that practicality will finally supplant idealistic extravagancies and immediate needs . . . distant dreams.”

Having dutifully read the editorial, the new president had several options. He could ignore it, respond in a brief and noncommittal way, or respond with what must have been foremost in his mind as he learned more and more about the College's slender financial resources. Not surprisingly, Walter Langsam chose the latter course. In a letter to the editor, published a week later (October 2), he agreed completely that improvement of old and construction of new men's dormitory facilities were urgently needed, but observed that past actions could not be undone. He went on to state bluntly that, even "with the best of intentions, I cannot promise an immediate or even very early remedying of the situation." Three things stood in the way. First, at least $150,000 would soon have to be borrowed to pay for the chapel. Payments for interest and principal amounting to several thousand dollars would have to be written into the annual budget for some years to come. Second, an engineering firm had advised the trustees that the College heating system was in immediate need of complete overhauling, at a cost of at least $170,000. "Unless someone is moved to make a donation larger than any we have ever received," Langsam wrote, this obligation must also be met with borrowed funds, and the College would soon be paying out for these two commitments alone "a sum greater than the total return of our endowment." Third, he insisted that "simultaneously

---

43 For the temporary dormitories, see p.
44 Gettysburgian, September 25, 1952. Many faculty members would have agreed with this assessment, at least in assigning a considerably lower priority to a new chapel at this time.
we shall have to do something about our Faculty salary scale, for this is far too low." As a professor at Union College in the early 1940s, he told his many readers, he received more than the Gettysburg professors were being paid in the fall of 1952. Obviously, the money required to pay debts and raise salaries would not be available to build dormitories. All he could do was counsel patience, since the goal of trustees, administrators, and faculty was "to give the students first-rate Christian professors and an adequate physical plant."

Langsam's first two reports to the board of trustees, one consisting of almost fifty pages and the other of about ninety, were filled with detailed information and many specific recommendations. The trustees were sufficiently impressed that they formally praised him on two occasions for the way in which he was educating them about the workings of the institution. The new president's time of troubles began, not with his colleagues on the board, but with those on the faculty, whose complaints eventually focused on the activities of Richard C. Debus, the young man Langsam had brought with him from Wagner College to become Gettysburg's first business manager.45 While most faculty were willing to admit that more money was needed to improve every part of the College, they were increasingly convinced that the business manager and his staff, obviously with the president's support, were diverting excessive portions of very limited funds to buildings, grounds, and business operations. They spoke of extravagance and waste, pointing out that, because of this, the rest of the budget was being seriously shortchanged.46 Several faculty members took their complaints to Trustee Clarence A. Wills, member of the finance committee and president of the Gettysburg National Bank, which had been the College's treasurer since 1925.

Acting on these complaints, in July 1954 Wills asked the accountants who regularly audited the College books (those which the bank kept) to determine whether exception could properly be taken to any transactions which the business manager had recorded during the previous year. In September, the firm replied, in a statement specifically directed to the board of trustees, but sent to Wills. The five-page report claimed that in many instances the business office had not followed good accounting procedures; it also questioned the wisdom of certain of its business and financial procedures. This report became a major topic of discussion when it was presented to the December board meeting. The trustees decided to name a special

45 Born in 1923, Debus was a graduate of Wagner College and had earned an M.B.A. from New York University. He had about two years of experience as Wagner's bursar and purchasing agent when he came to Gettysburg.
46 In June 1954 the board of trustees directed its secretary "to write a letter of appreciation to those responsible for the splendid condition of the College grounds."
committee "to make a complete, exhaustive, and impartial examination of all operations, of the financial report, and of the practices of the Business Manager's administration, including the operations of the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds." The committee was directed to present its report to the chairman, who would then decide whether to call a special board meeting.

The five-man special committee began to function in January 1955. It engaged two outside consultants (one a vice president and professor of economics at Swarthmore and the other controller of George Washington University) to visit Gettysburg and conduct an independent investigation. After receiving their ten-page, carefully prepared, report, dated January 20, members of the special committee met twice in Gettysburg and once in Philadelphia, interviewing as many persons as they could, including eight faculty members. After these meetings, committee members consulted with each other by telephone and letter. They quickly agreed the faculty testimony had convinced them that the problem was much more serious than a matter of business-office waste and extravagance, which presumably the trustees could deal with promptly and easily. Whether justified or not, a sizable number of influential faculty members were bitterly opposed to the president because of what he was trying to do and the way in which he was trying to do it. Committee members divided on whether the differences could be healed. Even those members who believed they could be were not very optimistic. Consequently, they all decided not to report immediately to the board chairman in the hope that the president would make the next move. They did not have long to wait. On March 17, 1955 Langsam consulted with the chairman and secretary of the board, after which he informed the University of Cincinnati that he was accepting an offer to become its president. On April 14, 1955 the board met in special session to accept his resignation and to hear the report of the special committee, which it adopted.

It is clear that the members of the special committee, using all of the information which they could glean, came to the conclusion that almost everyone involved in this unfortunate controversy shared

---

*Its members were W. Emerson Gentzler (chairman), Lester Gingerich, William H. Patrick, Amos E. Taylor, and Bertram Wilde, all of whom were fully qualified by career experience for their task.

*Nowhere in the special committee's papers in the GCA are the eight faculty identified, but their statements are summarized in one of the chairman's letters to his colleagues. Langsam was said to be guilty of trying to destroy Gettysburg's traditional practices, of interfering with faculty responsibility for the academic program, of impetuosity, and of self-aggrandizement. Those preferring some of the charges would have had great difficulty, if called upon, to prove them, by offering the quality of evidence which should be expected in the classroom. One faculty member did say he agreed with Langsam's academic objectives, many of the changes made were desirable, but the president had tried to do too much too quickly.
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some of the responsibility for what had happened. The accountants had not bothered to consult with either the president of the College or the chairman of the board before making their report; if they had, they would have learned that some of the practices they questioned predated 1952, some had already been corrected, and some resulted from board rather than administrative action. Trustee Wills proceeded without consulting other members of the finance committee and did not promptly present his board colleagues with a report clearly addressed to all of them. While neither the consultants nor the special committee found any evidence whatsoever of dishonesty or intent to deceive on the part of the business manager, and while they noted the magnitude of his task and his very limited experience in preparation for it, they did criticize his judgment in handling purchases, maintenance, record keeping, and supervision of staff responsible to him. Members of the special committee continued to cast their vote of confidence in Walter Langsam as a potentially outstanding college president, but they also insisted that he was finally responsible for the workings of the business office and should have conducted his own investigation, making necessary changes as soon as complaints began to reach him. The members of the committee were certain that he should have been more sensitive to the settled ways of the Gettysburg College community as it existed in the early 1950s and definitely more tactful in dealing with it. Finally, they reserved a special indictment for the board of trustees of which they were members, declaring that during the course of their inquiry they were "impressed by the marked degree to which the Board and its committees have kept themselves disassociated from many of the vital functions of the College." Based on its past performance, they concluded, "the Board has not fully lived up to its responsibilities in the field of administration and finance." Had they been doing their duty, trustees would have participated actively in organizing the College's first business office, including carefully defining its powers and duties. They would also have insisted upon monitoring its operations, including counseling the first business manager, at the very least during the formative years of the new office.48

48Members of the special committee pled with their colleagues "to place the operation of the College on a more businesslike basis." The 1954 Middle States team, the two outside consultants, and finally the committee itself agreed that the first step to that end was to elect an individual to the position of College treasurer and to transfer control of financial record keeping from the bank to the business manager. The Middle States team believed that, however well the existing arrangements may have worked in a simpler past, they simply precluded efficient operation in 1954. The two outside consultants pronounced the existing arrangement one "new to our experience" which posed "many questions of policy, procedure and relationship." The trustees did elect Clarence A. Wills treasurer in 1955 but then, for reasons best known to themselves, returned to the old arrangement two years later. In February
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At the end of June 1955 Walter Langsam and his family left for Cincinnati. Earlier that month, in his last report to the board of trustees, he thanked all of those "who so generously supported my efforts further to enhance the standing and achievements of the institution." Instead of resting his case at that point, he then went on to identify twenty-three "urgent items of unfinished business," favorable action on which was needed in order for Gettysburg "to stride forward in the American college field." Among these items were improved faculty salaries; reintroduction of sabbatical leaves; lowering the retirement age to sixty-five years; reducing teaching loads; encouragement of faculty research; more women on the faculty; improved preprofessional programs for medicine, law, and teaching; increased facilities, especially for women students; and efforts to alter student priorities which placed extracurricular activities above scholarship and loyalty to fraternity above loyalty to the College. "As would appear from the foregoing," he said in conclusion, "I am not one who believes that the words, 'as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be,' were intended to apply to academic policies and procedures."50

Walter Langsam served as president of the University of Cincinnati from 1955 until he retired, at the age of sixty-five, in 1971, at which time he was elected president and professor emeritus. After he left Gettysburg, nine institutions awarded him an honorary degree. He was active in the community, in regional and national educational affairs, and in the Lutheran church. Among the posts which he held were chairman of the board of a branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, civilian aide to the secretary of the army, chairman of the history advisory committee of the department of the army, officer of the North Central Association, and officer of the board of theological education of the Lutheran Church in America. He died in Cincinnati in 1985, one year after his wife.

Administrative Committee (1955-1956)

In June 1955, when it became clear that there would be no new president to take over in the fall, the board of trustees named four persons to carry on the executive duties until Langsam's successor had been chosen. The four members of what was called the adminis-

---

50Langsam had already listed many of these needs, in a letter to the secretary of the special committee, dated February 1, 1955. Apparently he was then trying to answer somebody's preposterous charge that he had urged tuition increases in order to build up bank balances. "We are still so far behind the best colleges in salaries, services, and equipment," he wrote, "that I may soon have to propose a further increase in fees." Unless it works to meet its needs, he warned, "Gettysburg will stagnate as it had begun to do, and will fall far behind in the highly competitive college business of the 1950's and 1960's." Original in GCA.
trative committee were John S. Rice, newly elected chairman of the
board, chairman; Robert Fortenbaugh, veteran of more than thirty
years on the faculty, vice chairman; Seymour B. Dunn, who became
dean of the College and a member of the committee at the same time;
and Charles R. Wolfe, dean of admissions and registrar.\textsuperscript{51}

It was agreed that Professor Fortenbaugh would occupy the presi-
dent's office several hours each day and make routine decisions.
When more important matters arose, the entire committee met and
reacted. They recruited a new business manager and a new dean of
men, and they made the normal faculty replacements and additions.
An unexpected increase in fall enrollment of more than 10 percent
enabled the trustees in December to increase faculty salaries for the
year in progress by amounts which in many instances were a boost
of more than 10 percent and in almost every instance a great boon to
faculty morale.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{51}Many later believed that John S. Rice served as acting president of the College at
this time. The evidence shows that he did not.

\textsuperscript{52}John Rice announced the retroactive salary increases at a trustee-faculty dinner in
Huber Hall, held following the December board meeting and, according to newspaper
reports, attended by all but one trustee. \textit{Gettysburg Times}, December 15, 1955. This
was one of the first of numerous such occasions, bringing together many centrally
responsible for the welfare of the College.
The administrative committee functioned smoothly until a new president was elected and assumed his duties on August 1, 1956.53

Willard S. Paul (1956-1961)

When it met in April 1955 to accept the resignation of President Langsam and consider the report of its special committee, the board of trustees authorized appointment of a committee of five members, under the chairmanship of John Rice, to identify and present one or more candidates as his successor. In June and again in December the committee reported that it had met, considered persons whose names were offered, but had no candidates to present.

Early on the morning of September 24, 1955, about ten days after the beginning of fall classes at Gettysburg, President Dwight D. Eisenhower suffered a heart attack in Denver, Colorado. After a seven weeks' stay in the army hospital there, on November 14 he came to his Gettysburg farm to continue his recovery and resume his executive duties on a limited scale. The College offered him access to its president's office, and in the weeks that followed he used it on occasion to address the nation and conduct meetings.54 On December 9 the New York Times reported that in a television news interview on the preceding day John Rice had stated that Eisenhower could be elected president of Gettysburg College simply by expressing his interest in the position. The newspaper report observed that Rice and his search committee had the same problem then facing the Republican party. No one knew whether Eisenhower was interested in running for anything. He removed all doubt only in late February 1956, after his return to the White House, when he told a press conference that he would accept renomination for the presidency of the United States. About the same time, he gave the College search committee the name of one of his World War II generals as a possible candidate for the presidency of the College.55 In a special trustee meeting on May 5, 1956, the committee presented the name of that man, Willard S. Paul (1894-1966). Elected by a vote of twenty-one to five, he promptly accepted and assumed his duties on August 1, 1956.

Born in Worcester, Massachusetts, Willard Stewart Paul studied

53The trustees generously voted $500 to Fortenbaugh, Dunn, and Wolfe as compensation for their services on the administrative committee.

54Gettysburg Times, November 16, 1955. The office which Eisenhower occupied in the post-office building was not suitable for radio or television addresses. On December 18 he delivered his Christmas message and lit the national Christmas tree from the Glatfelter Hall office.

55In a conversation on October 11, 1978, John Rice told this writer that he remembered no serious consideration of Eisenhower by the search committee, although they might well have joked about it, but he did remember asking Eisenhower personally for the names of possible candidates.
at Clark University and Dartmouth College, but enlisted in the army in 1916 before earning a degree. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in 1917. Choosing to make the army his career, he was assigned to the various duties of a peacetime officer which were usual at the time. The Johns Hopkins University awarded him a bachelor of science degree in 1924 and American University a master of arts degree in 1942. During World War II he organized the 75th Infantry Division and later commanded the 26th Infantry Division, under General George S. Patton, in the European Theater of Operations. He retired from the army with the rank of lieutenant general in December 1948. Then still in his mid-fifties, he accepted a number of public-service appointments: consultant to the president of the American Red Cross (1949-1950), membership on the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Commission Report (1951-1952), consultant to the assistant secretary of defense for manpower (1952-1953), and assistant to the director of the office of defense mobilization (1953-1956). At sixty-two years of age, he was the oldest man ever to have been elected president of Gettysburg College. He was reported to have said at the time that he wanted to render one more service to his country.

Willard S. Paul was inaugurated ninth president of Gettysburg College in Christ Chapel on October 19, 1956. "This is truly a great moment in my life," he told his audience. To be chosen to continue his life of service "in a new field of endeavor, the Christian education of our youth is really a crowning glory." Professing his "faith in the future notwithstanding the critical times ahead," he was confident "that only a free society will triumph." Such a society must try "to bring the elements of character, moral values, human relations, and personal adjustments in balance with the advances of science, communications and social complexities." This can be accomplished only by an education that is liberal, one which stresses "a knowledge of the past," "an appreciation of the humanities," and "spiritual values." He advocated a "militant and dynamic Christianity," and concluded by saying that "ethical behavior, moral conduct, and spiritual belief must be the fundamental goal of all education."

A Presbyterian, Willard Paul was the first Gettysburg College president who was not a Lutheran. Anticipating questions about this fact, especially since the College was then actively seeking formal ties with several Lutheran synods, John Rice did his homework and was thus able to remind all who asked that the trustees had offered the first presidency to a non-Lutheran in 1834. This answer did not satisfy everyone, and during the next several years representatives

---

56Excerpts from the address were printed in the January-February 1957 issue of the GCB, p. 14. The full text appeared in the Gettysburg Times for October 20, 1956.
of the College could expect to be presented with complaints from the alumni and church constituencies. Meanwhile, the new president, who had not sought the position in the first place, retained his denominational loyalty while upholding the principles espoused by his Lutheran predecessors.

To those who argued that Paul was neither an educator nor a successful parish pastor, John Rice could not reply that the trustees had once offered the presidency to a general from the War of 1812 or the Civil War. What he could and did say was that the trustees hoped the new president, partly because of his many associations beyond the traditional College constituency, would attract large new sums of money to Gettysburg. Then, with a stronger financial base, in less than a decade, the trustees would choose an educator to move the College forward academically.

To almost all of those who worked with him, W.S. Paul, as he usually wrote his name, was simply the General. That is what he was called in the minutes of the first meeting of the curriculum committee in the fall of 1956. Short of stature, self-confident, almost cocky, and determined, Paul was a highly intelligent person with a
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generous fund of common sense. Although not experienced in the ways of a college faculty, he knew how to make a careful estimate of almost any situation and also how to act, if necessary promptly and decisively. It is evident that he was often frustrated, as was his predecessor, with the slow pace of change, or with the unwillingness to change, at Gettysburg College. On most (although not all) occasions he repressed his feelings and virtually all who disagreed with him still respected him. Even those students who once hanged him in effigy probably shared that respect.

In preparing for his new task, the General read and mastered the 1954 Middle States report, the final recommendations of his predecessor, and other pertinent documents. His estimate of the situation as it applied to the faculty led him to increase salaries, add forty additional faculty members over five years, revive sabbatical leaves, and support major revision of the faculty committee system. At the same time, he urged increased student self-government, an honor system, and steps to promote student loyalty to College first and fraternity second.

When the General came to Gettysburg, the College still had required chapel. He quickly made clear his wholehearted support of the requirement and, even as student opposition increased, announced firmly that it would not be changed while he remained in office. One suspects that at times the General wished it were possible for him to muster his young men and women somewhere on the campus and personally lead them off to the chapel. Only after the recently named faculty religious activities committee and its trustee counterpart came to the conclusion that the requirement could no longer achieve its purpose, except at an unacceptable cost, did he yield, undoubtedly still completely convinced that his view was the proper one.57

About the time the General came to Gettysburg, many educators and others were urging colleges and universities to prepare for an imminent inundation by the tidal wave of students born after World War II and approaching college age. Although public institutions could be expected to create most of the additional facilities these young people would require, the General was convinced that private colleges had a responsibility to participate in meeting the expanding need. Concluding that Gettysburg could set an example for similar institutions and, at the same time, establish a national reputation for itself, he began to advocate that it undertake year-round operations, with a three-term calendar which would enable a student to earn a degree in less than three years. Without a major increase in

57He did admit to the board in December 1960 that "the change in our religious worship program has eliminated a constant source of irritation. The morale is good."
facilities, the College could thus offer educational opportunities to many more students, who would be able to enter the work force more than a year sooner than those who attended institutions requiring four years for a degree. As discussion occurred, the faculty remained unconvinced that year-round operations were educationally sound or that Gettysburg could attract enough students to make them financially successful. In February 1961 it resoundingly defeated the General's proposal. Understandably disappointed, he told the dean of the College the next day that he might proceed with year-round operations in spite of the faculty vote. This was not merely a passing thought. "The calendar is a Board matter, not a faculty one," he advised the trustees the following June. "It is conceivable that the Board will have to declare itself and the faculty can adjust the curriculum and themselves to whatever is determined."

By this time the General was within two months of retirement, and dealing with the tidal wave of students was left to others.

One of Paul's most important contributions to Gettysburg College was shaping its administrative organization, a task to which he brought both ability and experience. He encouraged Dean of the College Seymour B. Dunn to begin to develop his office into the kind of responsible position which the U.L.C.A. survey team had advocated a quarter century before and which President Langsam advocated during his brief tenure. In 1957 the General created the office of dean of students and assigned to it all student personnel work, as well as coordination of on-campus activities. In the fall John W. (Jack) Shainline became the first dean of students and assumed responsibility for the dean of men, dean of women, director of guidance and placement, special counselor, and medical director.

There was no development officer during most of the year the administrative committee was in charge. The General revived the position, but he was unable to secure an incumbent who remained in office for any length of time.

Paul was much more successful with the business manager whom the administrative committee had recruited. F. Stanley Hoffman, of the class of 1929, was experienced in banking and construction. He assumed his duties in June 1956, as the College was embarking upon a period of major building. Paul and Hoffman soon developed a close working relationship. In December 1957 the General told the trustees of the high quality of Hoffman's work and six months later expressed concern that there was no one being prepared in the event that he would have to be replaced. In December 1958 he reminded the trustees that the business manager had many and powerful duties, all of which he still performed "without any express

---

Professor Earl E. Ziegler of the class of 1921 was acting business manager in 1955-1956.
authority from the Board of Trustees or the Charter or By-Laws." If for no other reason than for the business manager's own protection, Paul said, this situation should be changed.

In June 1959, largely because of the General's urging, the board of trustees enacted the first major revision of the College by-laws in a decade. The administrative organization which it prescribed, with four chief officers "and such other administrative officers as may be required for the effective administration of the College," remained essentially unchanged for the next twenty years. It was, in effect, the organization which the General had perfected since his arrival in 1956.

The officer first named in the by-laws, the dean of the College, was given "primary responsibility," in cooperation with the faculty, "for the development of policies relating to the curriculum, academic standards, instruction, and faculty personnel," as well as direct responsibility "for the administration of the academic program of the College." The second-named officer, the dean of students, was assigned responsibility for "student discipline, supervision of all counseling services, student employment and financial aid, student health services, and the coordination of all campus student activities."

The third-named administrative officer, the business manager, was given "general supervision of all financial affairs of the College, including the budget, purchasing, the maintenance of the physical plant and the operation of auxiliary enterprises." The last of the four chief administrative officers, given the by-law title of director of development and alumni relations, was assigned "general supervision of all off-campus activities including the raising of funds, relations with alumni and the public relations program."

59The first by-laws adopted in 1940 did give the dean "general supervision of instruction and discipline," but this statement had little or no effect upon the way the office was administered at the time. Seymour B. Dunn was dean of the College from 1955 to 1960. He was followed by four deans drawn from the faculty and appointed for five-year terms, but eligible for reappointment: Charles H. Glatfelter (1960-1966), Basil L. Crapster (1966-1970), James D. Pickering (1970-1975), and Leonard I. Holder (1975-1979). The first in a series of assistant and associate deans was appointed in 1966. The 1959 by-laws stated that the chief administrative officers, who served "at the pleasure of the President," were also responsible for "such special duties" as he might assign. For a discussion of administrative officers after 1978, see p. 803.

60John W. Shainline was dean of students from 1957 to 1965. His successor, Frank B. Williams, began his duties early in 1966.


62The title of this position became director of development in 1960, although it continued to have responsibility for the alumni office. The incumbents were Robert L. Kunes (1957-1958); Harold A. Dunkelberger (1959-1960); Seymour B. Dunn (1960-1962); Paul G. Peterson (1962-1969); and Robert E. Butler (1969-1978).
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The hopes that President Paul would attract large gifts from new sources were unrealized. The government loans which the College began to secure in 1956 greatly relieved the immediate financial situation, but the trustees applied for the first of these in December 1955, months before the General was elected. The fund-raising campaign begun in 1959 eventually yielded about $1,650,000, but much of this was not received until after he left office. The General spent most of his time on campus, where there were many things which needed his attention and which he enjoyed doing. During the summer of 1959 a heart condition which sent him to Walter Reed Hospital for diagnosis and treatment curtailed greatly the amount of time and energy which he was able to devote to his duties. Because excitement exacerbated his condition, doctors ordered him to spend only brief periods of time in his office. In December 1960 he informed the trustees that his health required him to resign the presidency and yield up its duties as soon as possible, but no later than September 1, 1961. His farewell message to the alumni, which appeared in the July 1961 alumni bulletin, began with an expression of the "great reluctance and regret" with which he was obeying his physician's orders to give up the presidency. He called attention to much which remained to be done, including rebuilding Old Dorm, acquiring a new stadium, constructing adequate facilities for what he called the living sciences, providing for art and drama, and developing a plan to guide the College through the 1960s. Friends honored him on the occasion of his retirement with the endowed scholarship which he indicated would mean more to him than the finest silver plate money could buy.

The General was a widower when he became president. His first wife, Ruth Sieurin, to whom he was married in 1919 and who was the mother of his son, died in 1953. In 1956 he married Luella Musselman Arnold (1910-1978), daughter of C.H. Musselman, a member of the class of 1931, and an alumni trustee. Soon after their marriage, General and Mrs. Paul took up residence in her home, a few miles north of Gettysburg. He was living there when he died in 1966. After funeral services in Christ Chapel, he was buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

63In July 1959, during a press conference, reporters asked President Eisenhower about his plans after leaving office. One repeated the rumor that he had been offered the presidency of Gettysburg College. "Now, this is the first I have ever heard about the presidency of Gettysburg College," replied the chief executive. "As a matter of fact, there is a man there now that I respect and who is younger than I am, so I don't know why I should be thinking of that." Actually, Paul was less than three and one-half years younger than Eisenhower. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1959 (Washington, 1960), p. 553.
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C. Arnold Hanson (1961-1977)

When President Paul announced his resignation in December 1960, the board of trustees authorized appointment of a committee to identify and present one or more candidates to succeed him. Less than a month later, on January 9, 1961, the executive committee of the faculty addressed a letter to the General, requesting him to transmit it to the board. Referring to a growing practice among colleges and universities, the letter expressed “the desire of the faculty that it participate in an appropriate way in the choice of your successor” and suggested use of an elected committee, either existing or special, to accomplish that purpose. “We believe that such a committee could be most useful,” the faculty members observed, “in passing judgment on the academic qualifications of candidates and on their likelihood of offering the academic leadership which the College must have if it is to move forward.”

The search committee responded to this request by asking the executive committee to suggest criteria which might be used in recruiting a new president and by forwarding names of possible candidates. Within a few days the executive committee submitted (February 22, 1961) four main qualifications which in its judgment a new president should have: ability to administer, to represent the College effectively in all situations, to provide “a high degree of academic leadership,” and to speak for the College in its changing relationships with the Lutheran church in a way which would retain its traditional ties as well as its traditional independence. Although a list of names of possible candidates followed, it was the search committee itself which located the person who eventually succeeded the General. In April and again in May this candidate visited the campus to meet with faculty and administrators. After the second visit, six persons who met with him expressed (May 16, 1961) their generally favorable reactions to the search committee, which on June 2, 1961 presented to the board of trustees the name of C. Arnold Hanson (1913-1983), who was unanimously elected tenth president of Gettysburg College.

A native of Akron, Ohio, Carl Arnold Hanson (he wrote his name C.A. Hanson and wanted to be called Arnold) was of Swedish origin and not related to Henry W.A. Hanson, whose forbears were Danish. Because of the depression, it was not until 1939 that he earned a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Akron. While occupying an administrative position there and later at Cornell University, between 1939 and 1942 he was also a graduate student at the University of Chicago. Following service in the United States Navy between 1942 and 1945, he returned to Cornell, which awarded him a Ph.D. degree in 1948. For the next thirteen years he was professor in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cor-
C. Arnold Hanson (1913-1983)  
President of the College from 1961 to 1977. This picture, taken from the 1969 Spectrum, shows him halfway through his presidency.

nell, and from 1957 was also dean of the university's college of arts and sciences. An active Lutheran layman, he was a member of the executive committee of the National Lutheran Council's division of college and university work. In 1946 he and Jean Landefeld (1917-1970) were married. They and their two children moved to Gettysburg in the late summer of 1961 and took up residence in the newly purchased College house in Twin Oaks. Hanson became president of the College on September 1, 1961.

In his inaugural address, delivered in Christ Chapel on April 28, 1962, the tenth president exhibited a certain self-effacement which was to recur frequently during the next decade and a half. "These proceedings," he began, "are institutional and only incidentally personal...a moment in a continuum" which began in 1832 and "now carries forward from this day." They make sense as they permit an "examination of the past in order to arrive at an estimate of the future." Paying tribute to Samuel Simon Schmucker, a man "as remarkable in accomplishments as in name," he noted that few institutions could claim "a purpose as simply phrased or as delicately poised between ambition and honesty" as that of the founder: to exert a salutary influence upon liberal education. That
influence, Hanson believed, could still be exerted by "a liberal arts college, purposely modest in dimensions, in which the development of the individual – both teacher and student – is of deliberate concern." The College must encourage the student to become more responsible for his or her own learning; it must bring all parts of the institution to support this goal; and it must uphold the values associated with scholarship.

Hanson brought with him to Gettysburg a keen interest in the educational possibilities available beyond the classroom in a residential college. Regretting that too little use had been made of these possibilities and that campus environment may actually offer a "resistance to learning," he made an inaugural pledge to work to change "the values, the mores" at Gettysburg. This could be accomplished, he thought, in a way which would preserve most or all campus institutions, but would change their "balance or effect."

A significant portion of the inaugural address was devoted to a discussion of the character of Gettysburg as a college related to the Lutheran church. Speaking as the United Lutheran Church in America was about to enter into a merger with Lutheran bodies having somewhat different pasts than its own, he described the Gettysburg heritage and concluded that, stripped of all secondary adjectives, this is a Christian college in the liberal tradition which seeks to provide an education the distinctive quality of which resides in common pursuit of academic and religious insight.... We commit ourselves to the task.... convinced that in the determination of that which is "salutary" we may draw on the integrity which the tradition of scholarship provides and on the faith which is ever a part of man's search for ultimate understanding.

Having gained some understanding of the Gettysburg tradition and made an estimate of its resources during eight months in office, Hanson closed with the assurance that its assets "give ample promise of a future in which there is opportunity for service for all who associate in this venture."

During his first meeting with the faculty, in September 1961, the new president stated that he expected to remain on campus as much as possible, that he intended to make his administration a decentralized one, and that he considered the heart of the College to be the faculty, which he intended to consult as discussions of the future of the institution were undertaken. Early in the fall he visited every department of instruction, discussing with its members matters affecting them and the College as a whole.

Whereas the General sometimes announced his decisions even
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\[\text{influence, Hanson believed, could still be exerted by "a liberal arts college, purposely modest in dimensions, in which the development of the individual – both teacher and student – is of deliberate concern." The College must encourage the student to become more responsible for his or her own learning; it must bring all parts of the institution to support this goal; and it must uphold the values associated with scholarship.}\]

\[\text{Hanson brought with him to Gettysburg a keen interest in the educational possibilities available beyond the classroom in a residential college. Regretting that too little use had been made of these possibilities and that campus environment may actually offer a "resistance to learning," he made an inaugural pledge to work to change "the values, the mores" at Gettysburg. This could be accomplished, he thought, in a way which would preserve most or all campus institutions, but would change their "balance or effect."}\]

\[\text{A significant portion of the inaugural address was devoted to a discussion of the character of Gettysburg as a college related to the Lutheran church. Speaking as the United Lutheran Church in America was about to enter into a merger with Lutheran bodies having somewhat different pasts than its own, he described the Gettysburg heritage and concluded that, stripped of all secondary adjectives, this is a Christian college in the liberal tradition which seeks to provide an education the distinctive quality of which resides in common pursuit of academic and religious insight.... We commit ourselves to the task.... convinced that in the determination of that which is "salutary" we may draw on the integrity which the tradition of scholarship provides and on the faith which is ever a part of man's search for ultimate understanding.}\]

\[\text{Having gained some understanding of the Gettysburg tradition and made an estimate of its resources during eight months in office, Hanson closed with the assurance that its assets "give ample promise of a future in which there is opportunity for service for all who associate in this venture."}\]

\[\text{During his first meeting with the faculty, in September 1961, the new president stated that he expected to remain on campus as much as possible, that he intended to make his administration a decentralized one, and that he considered the heart of the College to be the faculty, which he intended to consult as discussions of the future of the institution were undertaken. Early in the fall he visited every department of instruction, discussing with its members matters affecting them and the College as a whole.}\]

\[\text{Whereas the General sometimes announced his decisions even}\]
before a colleague had a chance to finish presenting an issue to him, Arnold Hanson was much more deliberative and often delayed his decision until he took all of the time he thought he needed to convince himself that it was indeed the proper one under the circumstances. Needless to say, some of his close associates believed that he often took too much time to reach a decision. Unlike his predecessor, who usually chose to deal with his chief administrative officers individually, Hanson began meeting regularly with all of them together and involving them in the decision-making process.

Arnold Hanson's genuine concern for persons and for the welfare of the College could be hidden by the reserve which was an integral part of his make-up. Undoubtedly, it helps explain the paradox of a man who was committed to proceeding by consensus, but who nevertheless with some frequency insisted on keeping his own counsel. This reserve, which some called dignity, was a characteristic which led some faculty, alumni, and others to conclude that Hanson was uninterested in them and unappreciative of their contribution, or intended contribution, to the College.

Although Arnold Hanson had definite ideas about the educational program and how it should be organized – as already noted, he was especially interested in making students more responsible for their own learning and in helping them develop a system of values consistent with liberal learning – he allowed faculty, at times joined by students, to make the studies, frame the proposals, and bring about change. While the faculty was debating the first major curriculum and calendar change in almost half a century, most members knew only that he was prepared to support any new system they might propose, so long as it did not in his opinion jeopardize the future of the College. Early in his tenure he asked the executive committee to develop Gettysburg's first written set of personnel policies and procedures. He played an active role in bringing about term chairmanships for departments and in setting a limit of twelve successive years on trustee tenure. In his farewell message, President Paul had declared that "planning, in which all constituencies of the College are involved, is an essential first step" in solving the problems of the 1960s. One of his successor's first acts, in the fall of 1961, was to convene a faculty and administrative planning group, and during most of his sixteen years in office trustees, faculty, administrators, and students, either together or separately, were engaged in charting a future course for the College.

Hanson established a five-year term for the dean of the College and deliberately chose three men drawn from the faculty, rather than from the outside, to serve in that position. He recruited two directors of development and one dean of students. The only chief administrative officer who continued throughout his tenure was the
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F. Stanley Hoffman (1907-1982)  
John J. Schlegel  
Jay P. Brown

Hoffman was business manager from 1956 until 1976 and Schlegel from 1976 until 1985. Brown's service to the College began in 1947, in the treasurer's office; he was named bursar in 1958. Maddox was superintendent of buildings and grounds from 1956 through 1978.

Rex Maddox

business manager. Arnold Hanson found in Stanley Hoffman a kindred spirit who shared his belief that the College had to husband and use most prudently its still very limited financial resources. Hanson promised continuing faculty salary increases, but to accomplish this objective he was most reluctant to continue increasing faculty size. He was equally reluctant to accept outside funding to help finance new programs, as was fashionable in the 1960s, when it was understood that after a certain period the money for their continuance would have to come from the College treasury. Both Hanson and Hoffman also believed that, especially since enrollment was now apparently stabilized, any proposal for new building would

65In 1969 Hanson named Paul G. Peterson assistant to the president. This title had been used before, but the duties were now different.
have to fully justify itself.\textsuperscript{66}

Together with many other administrators and faculty on the campus, but especially in company with the chaplain, President Hanson attempted during the trying days of the late 1960s and early 1970s to maintain contact with students, directing their unhappiness and distress into the most constructive channels possible at the time, where those issues vital to them could be discussed and such action as was practical could be taken. Over and over again he reminded the trustees that there was no place for censorship or discipline without adequate cause on the kind of campus Gettysburg wanted to be. Although this course of action was distasteful to many alumni, without question it enabled the College to help meet the immediate needs of those students who happened to be in residence at the time, and to do so in a manner consistent with its goals as a liberal arts, church-related institution.

In December 1970, only a few years after she and her family had moved into the new president’s residence on West Broadway, Jean Hanson died of cancer. Two years later President Hanson married Mrs. Anne Keet McGlynn, of Gettysburg. Twice during 1974 he underwent open-heart surgery. Although he recovered from the operations and resumed his full duties, health was undoubtedly a major factor in his announcement to the trustees in September 1976 that he wished to retire from the presidency as of August 31, 1977. The board granted his request and subsequently named him president emeritus.

On numerous occasions during his long tenure, the board of trustees had commended Arnold Hanson for the quality of his work as president of Gettysburg College. In June 1963 the minutes record “a unanimous rising vote of confidence” for his “devoted and able leadership.” Eight years later the chairman of the board expressed his appreciation of Hanson’s “great service and outstanding accomplishment” during the preceding decade. At its meeting in March 1977, the board of trustees formally commended both Hanson and Stanley Hoffman, who also retired in 1977, “for building the financial strength of the Institution and operating it on a sound fiscal basis through the past troublesome times.”\textsuperscript{67} The four deans of the College who had served with him since 1961 prepared the faculty tribute presented in May 1977. It praised his “fairness and patience”

\textsuperscript{66}After waiting patiently for two years, president and business manager in December 1963 persuaded the trustees to retire the bank as College treasurer and elect the business manager to that position.

\textsuperscript{67}At its June 1977 meeting the board’s finance committee praised Hoffman “for his wise, tireless, and invaluable counsel and dedicated service over twenty-one years to Gettysburg College, the present security of which must be credited in very large measure to his self-less service.” The entire board then concurred in this judgment.
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in presiding over faculty meetings, his style of leadership in deliberating and deciding upon matters involving the future of the College, and his "patient restraint" during the late 1960s and early 1970s. In conclusion, the deans recorded their conviction that Arnold Hanson "had exercised a salutary influence upon this College, laboring diligently to preserve it against the forces which would weaken it and to advance it at a time when the tides appear to be running against higher education." 88

Arnold and Anne Hanson retired to their home on West Lincoln avenue, where he died in 1983 after a debilitating illness of about eight months. He was buried in Evergreen cemetery. 89

Charles E. Glassick (since 1977)

By the fall of 1976 many if not most colleges and universities, while still recognizing that their boards of trustees were legally responsible for electing a president, were delegating important parts of that task to what was widely known as a search committee, consisting of representation from three or four of the institution's constituencies. Unlike 1961, when the faculty asked to be represented in the choice of the General's successor, fifteen years later, upon the announcement of the Hanson retirement, the Gettysburg trustees took the initiative in establishing a search committee and charging it with identifying candidates for the presidency. When this committee reached its full complement, it consisted of ten trustees, four faculty, two nontrustee alumni, and two students, all chosen by agencies of their respective constituencies. Board chairman Cox named a trustee and a faculty member cochairmen.

At its first meeting, in mid-October, Cox described the task of the search committee: "to identify one or more candidates from which the Board may select a President." The committee began its work by preparing statements of College needs and of desirable qualifications for a successful candidate. In an effort to be fair to all concerned, it also adopted a detailed statement of procedures. Notices in national publications and in other places eventually yielded the names of 334 persons, almost half of whom nominated themselves. What the board chairman later described as "unbelievable hours" of

88One of Arnold Hanson's favorite words was modest. His own modesty prompted him to say little or nothing about honors accorded him. He was reluctant to discuss the fact that in 1967 the American Academy of Achievement had recognized him as liberal-arts college president of the year. Those who read the local newspaper in the fall of 1976 were aware that the Gettysburg Chamber of Commerce gave him its Adams County Outstanding Citizen Award and that the Pennsylvania Senate passed a resolution commending him for his long service to higher education in the state.

89Hanson spent his last years in the house once owned by a daughter of Samuel Simon Schmucker, whom he had characterized in his inaugural address as a man "as remarkable in accomplishments as in name."
work were necessary to reduce the number of candidates to seven, all of whom were invited to the campus for a series of interviews in late February and March 1977. The search committee then asked two of the seven to return with their wives for a second interview, and in early April it recommended the name of Charles E. Glassick. At a special board meeting on April 15, 1977, the trustees unanimously elected him eleventh president of Gettysburg College.

Born in Wrightsville, Pennsylvania, in 1931, Charles Etzweiler Glassick was graduated with honors by Franklin and Marshall College in 1953. Four years later Princeton University awarded him a Ph.D. degree. After serving as a research chemist in Philadelphia and instructor at Temple University from 1957 to 1962, he joined the faculty of Adrian College in Michigan as professor of chemistry, a position which he held until 1968. From 1967 to 1968 he was an American Council on Education fellow in academic administration at Fresno State College and in 1968-1969 vice president of the Great
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Lakes College Association. After serving from 1969 to 1972 as associate dean and vice president for academic affairs at Albion College in Michigan, he became provost and vice president for academic affairs of the University of Richmond, the position which he was holding when he came to the attention of the search committee. Glassick was married in 1952 to Mary Williams, the mother of their five children. He was a member of the Methodist church. Arnold Hanson relinquished the presidency to his successor on August 1, 1977.

The formal inauguration of Charles E. Glassick took place in the College Union Building on April 15, 1978. He began his address in a way reminiscent of the opening theme of his predecessor sixteen years before, by calling attention to the long "stream of history of Gettysburg College" and then by affirming his commitment to its "history and heritage." Observing that no two people view the College in exactly the same way, he then proceeded to explain how it appeared to him. It was one of many spots on the globe where faculty and students come together "to shape the minds and values" of the future leaders of society. It shares with many other institutions serious problems, including increasing costs and a declining student population. The solution of these problems "will test our skills, test our commitment, and test our resourcefulness."

Gettysburg College had made "an historic commitment to education in intellectual skills and intellectual processes" necessary to prepare students "regardless of the problems, issues and questions which they confront." As a college with a church connection, it had also made an historic commitment to "a continuing search for meaning in life," to a search for values. The existence of commitments to these two goals at Gettysburg, he concluded, together with the necessary resources to attain them, offered what Glassick saw, in spite of problems, as opportunity.\textsuperscript{70}

Early in its deliberations the search committee had listed many personal qualities which the new president should have. He (or she) should be energetic, tactful, able to make decisions, outgoing, and capable of expressing the needs and aspirations of the College. In addition, he should find agreeable the task of making friends for Gettysburg. It became evident from the fall of 1977 that the new president had these qualities and was able to use them to good effect.

Charles Glassick took charge of a college which was in generally good condition. After a year in office he announced his belief that it was better than it thought it was. Convinced that no college should be permitted to drift, he wanted to improve the performance of Get-

\textsuperscript{70} Typescript of the inaugural in GCA.
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tysburg in the face of growing problems for institutions of higher education everywhere, but especially for those in the Northeast. Glassick believed that the alternative to drift was regular and careful planning, including periodic reexamination of institutional purposes. Accordingly, he intensified the planning efforts of the preceding administrations and urged both faculty and trustees to join in supporting them.

The statement of qualifications which the search committee adopted in 1976 included the assertion that the new president must exercise leadership in advancing the academic program, allowing the faculty to act whenever it was prepared to do so, but prodding where its leadership was either lacking or timid. Glassick's goal for the faculty was to encourage it in as many ways as possible to increase the level of expectation in the academic program. He proposed to do this by the use of stricter standards for granting tenure, as well as by offering faculty more opportunities, including released time and financial assistance, to take steps designed to improve their own level of performance as teachers and productive scholars. Faculty must be learners, he insisted, if students are to be. He urged faculty members and departments to set goals, regularly test their progress in meeting them, and also regularly develop new goals. Significantly, Glassick became the first Gettysburg president to ask the dean of the College to preside at faculty meetings, which permitted him to participate more easily and actively in the discussions.

The search committee declared that "Gettysburg students expect a personal interest in them on the part of the president." In response, Glassick repeated a familiar theme: students must be involved learners and the faculty should employ every reasonable way to motivate them to that end, including seminars and individual study. He also stressed that the administration and faculty needed to do all they could to make the College program outside the classroom a close adjunct to the more formal learning in the classroom. As did most of his predecessors, he tried to learn to know and listen to many students.

The search committee insisted that any successful candidate for the presidency "must be committed unquestionably to the development effort and be willing to devote considerable time and energy to it." In discussions with all seven persons invited to the campus in early 1977, this commitment was one of the most serious and time-consuming topics. Most candidates agreed, at least at the moment, that for an indefinite period, if they became president, they would need to spend between 35 and 50 percent of their time raising money for the College. Once in office, President Glassick considered honoring this commitment one of his first orders of business. The results of his efforts by the end of the 1984-1985 year can be traced in the
preceding section on finances.

In devising an administration which he thought would best meet the current needs of the College and his own style of governing, Glassick made the first major revisions in the organization developed by President Paul twenty years before. First, in 1978 he changed the title of the director of development to vice president for College relations and began to increase significantly the size of the staff in that department. Second, later in 1978 he announced his intention to appoint a dean of the College without a stated term. The reason given was that the increasing demands of off-campus activity on the president's time required continuity in the office of the next ranking administrative officer. Third, in 1979 he began to reorganize the office of dean of students. By 1981 its duties, together with additional ones, were being carried out by two officers. The dean of student life was responsible for discipline, counseling services, health services, and coordination of on-campus student activities. The dean of educational services was made responsible for admissions, financial aid and student employment, institutional research, administrative computing, freshman orientation and advising, and intercollegiate athletics.

During the search in 1976-1977, both the board and the search committee considered, if only briefly, the advisability of instituting some regular evaluation of the performance of the president. Nothing formal was devised at the time, but beginning in 1980 the executive committee of the board began conducting an annual evaluation. At Glassick's request, in 1983 the three former chairmen of the board conducted a more thoroughgoing review, which resulted in what the board minutes called an "extremely favorable" report.

The Administration

One of the most striking evidences of the changes which occurred at Gettysburg in the forty years after 1945 was the growth of the administration which successive presidents deemed necessary to do the work for which they were ultimately responsible. The 1946 catalogue listed twelve such persons, and in the following order:

---

71 The trustees made the necessary by-law changes to accommodate this revision.
72 As late as 1976-1977 there were only two persons in the development office whose primary professional responsibility was development.
73 Richard P. Allen became vice president for College relations in 1978; David B. Potts became dean of the College in 1979; Frank B. Williams became dean of student life and educational services in 1979 and dean of educational services in 1981; Ralph W. Arend, Jr., was acting dean of student life in 1981-1982; and Susan M. Brady became dean of student life in 1982. John J. Schlegel left the post of business manager and treasurer during the summer of 1985. Under his successor, Arnold Hanson's administrative staff became the president's council.
president, dean, registrar and dean of admissions, dean of women, treasurer, medical director, librarian, alumni secretary, chaplain, assistant to the president, consulting engineer, and superintendent of buildings and grounds. Of these twelve persons, three were either full-time or almost full-time faculty members (chaplain, consulting engineer, and superintendent of buildings and grounds). One (assistant to the president) was the president’s secretary.

The last catalogue of the Paul administration, in 1961, named thirty-two administrators, listed according to the general’s reorganization: office of the president, three; of the dean of the College, ten; of the dean of students, nine; of the business manager, five; and of the director of development, five. The admissions staff had grown from one to three persons. Instead of one librarian with a baccalaureate degree, there were now five. In the office of the dean of students, there was a director of guidance and placement, a special counselor, a clinical consultant, and a director of reading services.74

The administration for the 1984-1985 year was almost double in size that of 1960-1961: sixty-three persons. Within the office of the president there were now four persons; of the dean of the College, fourteen; of the dean of educational services, twelve; of the dean of student life, fifteen; of the treasurer and business manager, eight; and of the vice president for College relations, ten.75

The gradual, apparently inexorable, growth in the administration did not escape the close attention of the faculty, many of whom took a very dim view of what was happening. As early as January 1953, President Langsam found it necessary to explain to the curriculum committee that the additions which he had made to the administrative staff during the preceding four months were not excessively costly to the College. In the years that followed, faculty voiced their continuing dismay, more often to each other than to anyone else, each time a new administrative position was announced and an appointment made. Meanwhile, later presidents sometimes echoed the sentiments of General Paul. We must increase the size of the administrative staff, he told the board in June 1958, since “we are trying to do too much with too few.” Occasionally, these presidents were even able to persuade faculty members to agree with them.

74Not included in these totals were emeriti administrators and the College counsel, who was not listed in the 1948 catalogue.

75Not included in these totals are eleven members of the athletics staff, who occupied positions which until early in the Glassick administration had faculty status. Including them would increase the number of administrators to seventy-four.
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Faculty

In the fall of 1945, about five weeks after the Japanese surrender, some 35 faculty members gathered to begin the 114th year of instruction at the College. As the year began, there were about 450 enrolled students, but Gettysburg, along with many other colleges, permitted some returning veterans to enter during the term. By February there were about 650 students on campus and more entered at midterm. The number swelled to an average of 1,100-1,125 by the fall of 1946. A year later it exceeded 1,200 for the first time in the history of the College and only twice afterward (1951-1953) dropped below that level. The College had no alternative but to enter into competition with almost every sister institution in the country to secure additional faculty. Seminary students were pressed into service, as were some recent graduates with little or no postbaccalaureate training. Most of the nine persons who joined the faculty in February 1946 fell into those two categories. Only rarely was it possible to secure a new person with a terminal degree. Before 1945, it was not unusual for several years to pass with virtually no change in the size and composition of the faculty. In the forty years after 1945 this was definitely no longer the case and the adjustment in size was almost always upward.

By 1952-1953, the first year of the Langsam administration, and a year for which the retiring president had made the arrangements, there were a record 62 faculty members. Not surprisingly, almost all of the increase had occurred in the three lower ranks. For example, the number of instructors had increased from six to eighteen. The ranks of associate professors had more than doubled, from five to twelve, due in large part to the promotion of four veteran teachers who did not have their doctorate. Walter Langsam considered the sixteen-to-one student-faculty ratio which he found at Gettysburg one of the College's major problems. In spite of the financial constraints under which he operated, he was able to increase the size of

---

76 In the last chapter the closing point of reference was 1942-1943, the last war year which began under near-normal conditions. In this chapter, the beginning year is 1945-1946. In counting faculty, administrators who taught a course or two, military science personnel with faculty rank, and persons on other-than-sabbatical leave for a year or more are not included.

77 After 1945 the administration began using several new faculty categories for short-term appointments, including assistant (1946), lecturer (1952), private instructor in applied music (1952), visiting professor (1955), and adjunct (1979). By-law changes codified some, but not all, of these categories.

78 The 1954 Middle States team thought the ratio was "among the highest of the liberal arts colleges in the State." Lovejoy's College Guide (1953), which they used for purposes of comparison, gave the Dickinson and Franklin and Marshall ratios as twelve to one and thirteen to one respectively.
Six of the men who served as dean of the College between 1945 and 1986.

the faculty by about 10 percent, as was the administrative committee during its year in office. However, enrollment was also moving upward during these four years.

When General Paul assumed the presidency, there were 77 faculty members and a student body of about 1,400 persons. Quickly determining that the student-faculty ratio had actually been increasing during the preceding four years (he thought it had reached seventeen to one), he persuaded the trustees in December 1956, only three months after taking office, to commit themselves to increasing the size of the faculty by ten members each year for four years, beginning in 1957-1958. Even though the trustees later permitted him to take a year or two longer to add forty new faculty, they declared that in so doing they were not retreating from the goal. Probably the General would have preferred to appoint some of the new persons to
During this period an increasing number of persons offering instruction had ranks other than the four usual ones. Excluding R.O.T.C. personnel, there were 13 such persons in 1952, 15 in 1956, 13 in 1962, 40 in 1977, and 54 in 1984. Each of the four ranks, but finances dictated that virtually all of the recruits would be fresh from graduate school, with masters' degrees, and eligible only for the ranks of instructor and assistant professor. During the General’s tenure, in fact, only one new faculty member was appointed to the rank of associate professor and one (other than several visiting faculty) to the rank of professor. The latter replaced the retiring head of the chemistry department in 1959. However, with the board’s continuing support, the General had markedly reduced the faculty’s teaching load from the heaviest it had ever been in the history of the College.

The faculty over which Arnold Hanson began to preside in the fall of 1961 consisted of 119 persons, 42 more than when the General took over five years earlier. Once the planning which Hanson initiated led to the conclusion that the enrollment should be stabilized indefinitely at an annual average of about 1,850 students, he took the position that the size of the faculty should also be stabilized at a level which would yield a student-faculty ratio of about fourteen to one. Once again, the financial condition of the College, as well as the desire to continue improving faculty compensation, determined this ratio, rather than a lower one which most faculty members would have preferred. Nevertheless, partly because enrollment continued to creep upward and partly because of shifts in departmental loads, the faculty did increase by 20 members during the sixteen Hanson years, reaching 139 in 1977-1978.

One of the chief concerns of the later Hanson administration and of its successor was the prospect that, at least for an extended period of time, the number of college-age persons in the Northeast would decline by as much as 30 or 40 percent. This consideration, added to the ever-increasing costs of recruiting and retaining able faculty, led President Glassick to be as greatly concerned as his predecessor with maintaining a student-faculty ratio of about thirteen to one (down from the earlier fourteen to one). The number of faculty for
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1984-1985 was 134.79

In the fall of 1945 about one-third of the Gettysburg faculty members were alumni. In the years that followed, whether a candidate was a graduate was more often than not a neutral factor in recruitment. Even as early as 1954, by which time the proportion had dropped to one-fourth, the Middle States team could scarcely accuse the College of inbreeding. In the fall of 1984, there were twenty-two alumni faculty, one-sixth of the total, scattered through thirteen departments. The heaviest concentration (five persons) was in religion.

In the fall of 1945 the traditional, but from time to time differently stated, policy that faculty members be Christians remained in effect. Although the policy must be regarded as one of the ancient Gettysburg givens, it was not clear whether it required one to be a church member (some faculty were not) or whether it permitted the hiring of Catholics, Unitarians, or agnostics. As the war ended, a majority of teachers were still Lutherans and members of Christ Lutheran church. Six years later, as President Hanson was about to retire, the board of trustees elected to reaffirm the traditional policy, presumably for the guidance of a new administration, by recommending (but not requiring) "that only professing Christians shall be employed as members of the Faculty and Staff of the College." Although Walter Langsam and his successors did not always follow this recommendation, as late as 1957 President Paul told the trustees that "we bring in only Christian men and women on our faculty."80

In 1959 the faculty religious activities committee, in responding to the General's request that it study the College commitment to the Christian religion and to the Lutheran church, offered him a proposed statement for use in hiring new faculty. It declared that the College (1) expected the faculty to recognize her church relationship as being "as much a part of her tradition and spirit as the goal of academic excellence and the pursuit of truth," (2) assumed that all teachers had a sincere religious affiliation which, it was hoped, went beyond nominal church membership, and (3) obligated faculty to express their convictions, rather than be silent, in appropriate settings. This statement, for which no precedent has been found in the history of the College, was an attempt by faculty members to pro-

---

79 This number is misleading, since the Glassick administration made it possible for members of the department of health and physical education to become part of the administration as coaches and enter an evaluation system different from that applied to those in the four usual faculty ranks. In 1984-1985 eleven persons were listed as coaches (including the director of intercollegiate athletics) under the dean of educational services. Thus the 1984-1985 figure for total faculty comparable with that for 1977-1978 was 145.

80 The College reported to the U.L.C.A. that in 1960-1961 53 of 138 faculty were Lutheran. 1962 minutes, pp. 669-691.
pose a policy which would make the principal criteria in recruitment competence in teaching, "together with a sincere commitment to some religious tradition." It had the advantage of being more honest than past policy with regard to current and future faculty, more in keeping with the 1832 charter of the College, and more in consonance with its liberal-arts character. If only because it contained a recommendation that compulsory chapel be eliminated, neither the General nor the trustees were prepared to accept this report, and the old policy remained in effect.

During the early years of the Hanson administration, the faculty executive committee returned to the subject of religious expectations when it was preparing a document prescribing procedure for teacher recruitment. Hanson presented the 1959 statement to the faculty for its reaction, and the executive committee's report early in 1962 contained a three-paragraph statement in spirit very similar to the one presented three years earlier, but which went on to state that one of the marks of Gettysburg as a church-related institution was "a faculty that is predominantly Protestant, with a significant number of Lutherans." Subsequent revisions of the recruitment document resulted in one which in 1985 described Gettysburg as "a liberal arts college in the Christian tradition and...related to the Lutheran church, but....not church-controlled," but which said nothing about expectations which that character placed upon individual faculty members. In 1985 a small minority of administrators and faculty were members of Christ or St. James Lutheran church in Gettysburg, or of some other Lutheran congregation. A somewhat larger number belonged to one of the other churches, Protestant or Catholic, in Gettysburg.

In the fall of 1945 four faculty members were women. One, not included in the count used in this chapter, was the dean of women who also held the title of assistant professor of education. A second, an assistant professor of philosophy, taught sociology and also held a seminary position. The remaining two were instructors, one in hygiene and the other in English. Walter Langsam found six women faculty members, four of whom were instructors, when he arrived in the fall of 1952. Recruitment of two women Ph.D.'s, one as dean of women and the other as head of the new sociology department, probably tipped the scales in favor of American Association of University Women approval of the College a year later, but in his farewell message he warned that "if Gettysburg is to remain on the approved list of the American Association of University Women, it will be necessary to increase the proportion of women on the Faculty." The board responded to this admonition in December 1955 by urging that "full consideration be given to the desirability of increasing the number of women members of the faculty as the need for
replacements or circumstances make it practical." Most of the forty or more persons the General recruited were men, but by 1961 there were twenty-one women faculty: one professor, two associates, eight assistants, and ten instructors.

As the College moved from a student body with 23 percent women in 1956 to 48 percent in 1977 and 49 percent in 1984, and as civil rights legislation became effective, both justice and law suggested that the recruitment of women be given high priority and that opportunities be created for more women to reach positions of leadership in the College. In 1984-1985 there were thirty-three women faculty members. Five were professors and associates; twenty-eight were assistants and instructors. All five in the top two ranks were department chairpersons (to use a phrase then current). While the number of women faculty members increased, the number of men remained relatively stable.

Long years of faculty service was a well-established tradition at Gettysburg before 1945. One needs only recall the names of Jacobs, Baugher, Bikle, Breidenbaugh, Stahley, as well as many others. Seen in this light, Henry W. A. Hanson's policy of retaining junior faculty for only two to five years was but a brief aberration on a long line; indeed, he himself abandoned it soon after enunciating it. In 1945 most of the thirty-five faculty members were veterans of from ten to twenty-five years of service. Slightly more than half of them lived on Broadway, Lincoln avenue, and Stratton street, only a few minutes walking distance from the campus; only one had a rural free delivery address. As the faculty grew by leaps and bounds after 1945, suitable accommodations were not available for all within the borough limits. More and more began to rent or buy houses which were not within easy walking distance of the campus. By 1984-1985 only about 36 percent lived within the borough limits, and only seven on Broadway, Lincoln avenue, and Stratton street. Although many of the faculty recruited after 1945 remained for only a few years, more sought to become long-term employees and were eventually accepted as such. Consequently, soon after the first rapid growth during the last years of the Henry W.A. Hanson administration, the faculty began to redevelop into a body characterized by a high degree of stability and continuity. Relatively few members whom the College wished to retain moved on to more prestigious positions. From time to time some faculty who were observing the passing scene commented that the fact there were so few raids on the Gettysburg faculty by other institutions probably indicated that the College was not as good as it thought it was.

In the fall of 1945 seventeen of the thirty-five faculty members

---

1 The 1954 Middle States report concluded that "it would seem that the number of women students would justify more women on the faculty."
2 Of the sixty-three administrators listed in the 1984-1985 catalogue, twenty-seven were women.
Nine of the long-term faculty employed between 1945 and 1949. Most photographs of faculty and staff in this chapter from the 1974 Spectrum.
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(fourteen professors, one associate, and two assistants) possessed Ph.D. degrees. In spite of the hectic recruiting which followed during the next few years, the proportion was slightly higher (54 percent) at the time of the 1954 Middle States visit, which led the visiting team to conclude that "the education of the faculty compares favorably with the average college of comparable size, resources, and objectives," although they did regret the scarcity of Ph.D.'s below the rank of professor.

When the General became president in the fall of 1956 and the trustees committed the College to forty additional faculty in four years, as noted earlier, they were able to find only enough money to hire mostly people with a minimum of graduate training and little or no full-time teaching experience. There was then no established College policy (some departments had their own) by which to inform these recruits of what further graduate work was expected of them as they approached the time when the College would decide upon their permanent status. Consequently, when the General resigned, five years and forty-two additional faculty later, he left an institution in which the percentage of Ph.D.'s had fallen to 39.

In the early years of the Arnold Hanson administration there were many young, able, and promising faculty whom the College wished to retain and who had several years of work ahead of them if they were to earn the terminal degree widely regarded in the world of higher education as appropriate to their discipline. By using College funds, Lutheran church grants, and leaves of absence, President Hanson tried to encourage and assist many of them to resume and complete their graduate work. For most, especially those with young families, it was a trying assignment. For a variety of reasons, some did not succeed in finishing it. Several who did not try raised the old, and obviously telling, argument that possession of an appropriate terminal degree did not in and of itself insure good teaching. Nevertheless, the administration persisted, as did many faculty, and by 1977-1978 67 percent of the faculty, a record proportion, possessed a Ph.D. degree.

Beginning in the later years of the Hanson administration, there was a growing assumption that completion of graduate work and possession of the appropriate terminal degree was in most cases one of the conditions of faculty employment. The College was now in a much stronger position than it had been during the Paul years to act upon this assumption in recruiting. In 1984-1985 some 77 percent of the faculty had a Ph.D. and a total of 84 percent were deemed to have

---

63During his brief tenure, Walter Langsam offered small sums to several faculty completing their graduate work, but it can be said that most faculty who earned their terminal degree during the 1950s did so because they wanted to, and not because the College was prodding them.
the terminal degree appropriate to their discipline.

By 1945 Gettysburg had a well-established tradition of encouraging faculty to continue study in their own discipline, to learn what colleagues in other institutions were doing, and to participate in their professional organizations. Early in his administration, the first President Hanson made small travel grants available to professors and in 1927 the board of trustees established sabbatical leaves, which the depression ended seven years later. There were many scholarly persons on the Gettysburg faculty before 1945, but little of their activity resulted in the publication of articles or books.

Himself a productive scholar, Walter Langsam told the board in December 1952 – it was an understatement – that faculty scholarship was "not so voluminous as might be wished." Attributing this state of affairs to heavy teaching loads and low salaries, he tried in a number of ways to improve it. First, he urged that sabbatical leaves be reinstituted and that they be used for further study (reading and research) rather than for travel only, as was presumably the rule in the earlier program. The board restored sabbaticals, under the General, in 1957 and they remained in effect in 1985. Second, Langsam's urging led the trustees to begin approving increasing amounts for faculty to participate in professional meetings. Finally, he secured money for faculty study. Beginning in 1953, it was called the president's fund and amounted to an annual total of $1,000. In 1958 the Danforth Foundation awarded the College $10,000 to be used for the same purpose over a three-year period. When that money was spent, the College resumed its support, first through the aid-to-faculty-study fund (1961) and later through faculty fellowship grants (1962). Also, beginning in the early 1960s, the Lutheran church offered grants and loans which supported faculty development in a number of ways. Especially in the sciences, professors took the initiative in securing research grants, many of which supported projects involving both faculty and students. Later grants from the Ford Foundation (1968), the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (1975), and the Mellon and William and Flora Hewlett Foundations (1980) greatly extended the ability of the College to promote faculty development in the broadest sense of that term.85

84 Under the 1957 action, not more than 5 percent of the faculty could be on leave, for one term at full salary or one year at half salary, at any one time. On several occasions after 1957, faculty committees urged improvements in the program, the most obvious one being increasing the number who may be on leave in a term. Beginning in 1957, faculty applied for a leave to the executive committee, which made its recommendation to the president, who made the decision. Leaves for administrators became available in 1972.

85 The $29,000 Ford grant was used for study projects in the humanities. The $200,000 Mellon grant was to help faculty over four years improve themselves at a
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On every occasion when they made statements on the subject after 1945, both administrators and faculty declared that the first requirement for a Gettysburg teacher was the best possible instruction of which he or she was capable. The appropriate apocalyptic statement, implicit and rarely expressed, was teach or perish. However, while first in importance, that was not the only requirement, and increasingly after 1945, beginning especially with Walter Langsam, College spokesmen argued that sustained scholarly activity was necessary to support sustained good teaching. They argued further that, more often than it had in the past, scholarly activity should result in publication. Walter Langsam and his successors were willing to admit that heavy teaching loads had discouraged scholarly activity, let alone publication. However, as some faculty noted, those determined to publish were usually able to arrange their schedules so that they could do so, while others without that drive were able to find excuses enough not to. Publication in some fields was more difficult than in others, and no College document touching upon the subject ever advocated publication as an end in itself, whatever its merit as a contribution to liberal learning.

Although the alumni bulletin made occasional references to faculty publications in the 1950s, it was in the next decade when that publication began to record in almost every issue an increasing level of accomplishment, both in articles and books. After the 1973 Middle States visiting team concluded that the Gettysburg record was still less than it should be, the dean of the College told the academic affairs committee of the board that about 40 percent of the faculty annually publish, read papers at scholarly meetings, perform, or exhibit. "Certainly," he noted, "the emphasis is on teaching, but not to the neglect of creative scholarship."

It was simple enough to deal with faculty careers at Gettysburg College in a day when most candidates intended to be permanent employees were hired as professors and when the six-months' notice rule of 1884 was still in effect. Even after Henry W.A. Hanson decided to retain some junior faculty, he and the department head concerned could decide between themselves whether and when to promote them. Between 1945 and 1952, concerned that the next year might bring a large drop in enrollment, Hanson made it clear on several occasions that those recently hired had one-year contracts.
SERVING THE CAUSE

Things began to change with the arrival of Walter Langsam. In December 1952 he recommended that the board of trustees adopt the 1940 statement on principles of academic freedom and tenure endorsed by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, and as urged by the Middle States Association. The trustees responded favorably, and in June 1953 they amended the by-laws to stipulate seven years of college teaching before tenure could be granted, four years of which had to be at Gettysburg for persons appointed as instructors or assistant professors and one year for those appointed as associate professors or professors. The amendment stated specifically that any appointment beyond the probationary period described above automatically conferred tenure.86

Since the trustee action of 1952-1953 provided no procedure for awarding tenure in specific cases, it was left to the president, in consultation with the department head if he chose, to decide how it should be accomplished. President Paul chose to alter what his predecessor had done by naming an advisory committee in the fall of 1956 and using its four members when he was considering personnel matters, reserving the right to make the final decision in all cases.87

One of the first acts of Arnold Hanson in the fall of 1961 was to ask the faculty executive committee to prepare a series of documents dealing with what came to be called the faculty career process. With little in the way of written College sources upon which to draw, the committee, after frequent consultation with the president, reported to him early in 1962 on department chairmanships, tenure, promotion, recruitment, and sabbatical leaves. The faculty had an opportunity to react to these documents in 1963 and the president then adopted them as administrative policy. Later they were approved by the academic affairs committee of the board. All of these documents engaged faculty colleagues more intimately in the career process than had previously been the case, without denying the role of the president or board in making final decisions.88

86The amendment also stated that, with the concurrence of the president and the board officers, initial appointments to the two highest ranks could be with tenure. No such appointments were ever made, and in 1965 the board acted to require a probationary period of at least two years for all associate professors and professors. Subsequent by-law revisions left the details of tenure to trustee legislation, but the by-laws in force during 1984-1985 affirmed that the College accepted the 1940 statement on academic freedom and tenure. About 45 percent of the faculty automatically acquired tenure in 1953.

87See p. 831 for what happened following the 1957 faculty committee revision.

88Understandably, from time to time some faculty expressed their reluctance to involve themselves in decisions of this type affecting a colleague’s career. The rejoinder usually asked them to consider the alternative, granted that, somehow, the decision was going to be made.
Eight of the long-term faculty employed between 1950 and 1953.
Although Hanson frequently stated his intention to refer the documents to the full board for adoption as College policy, for some reason he delayed doing so. The only career process document which did gain both faculty and trustee sanction at this time was one dealing with dismissal of tenured faculty for cause, which the faculty approved in 1965 and the board in 1966. Proposed revisions of some of these documents did begin to come before the faculty as early as 1968. In each case they were given the closest scrutiny in a number of faculty meetings before they were approved. In 1984 and 1985 the faculty and board approved four extensively revised tenure and promotion documents, which for the first time separated policies (requiring future approval of faculty, president, and board) and procedures (requiring future approval of faculty and president).

Many of the forty faculty members recruited during the Paul years became eligible for tenure as the College was just beginning to enunciate more rigorous expectations for completion of graduate work and engaging in scholarly activity, and as it was developing more refined and announced procedures for reaching tenure decisions. In the belief that it was in keeping with general College policy, those responsible for making tenure decisions chose to introduce the new policies and procedures gradually. Most of the persons the General hired who sought tenure received it. In the following years, as some sister institutions became concerned about their increasingly highly tenured faculty, and began imposing upper limits, President Hanson stated that there was no tenure quota at Gettysburg and that candidates would be judged on their qualifications as teachers and scholars. He regarded this policy as fair to the candidates and beneficial to the College, and he was not convinced that future developments would actually result in an excessively high percentage of tenured faculty at Gettysburg. As the percentage, which had been 44 in 1960, reached 76 in 1976-1977 and peaked at 82 in 1979-1980, the inevitable debate began between those who argued that there was no necessary relationship between a high percentage of tenured faculty and institutional torpor and those who insisted that steps should be taken before the College ability regularly to recruit new faculty was further decreased.

In a reversal of his previous position, President Hanson in 1975 had begun offering two- and three-year appointments (often called nontenure-track appointments) to some candidates, a move which proved to be unpopular, as did the faculty personnel committee's proposal for a decade-long tenure moratorium, whose effect would last until some of the faculty the General recruited had begun to retire. The faculty resoundingly defeated this proposal in 1979. The
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tenure documents approved in 1984 and 1985 finally eliminated term appointments, but recognized the president's authority to invoke what were called institutional criteria in cases where it was determined that certain nontenured positions should be retained. In 1979 the College began making it financially and otherwise possible for faculty to obtain early retirement, and this helped bring the percentage of tenured faculty down to 69 for 1984-1985.

In the fall of 1945 there were three emeritus faculty members, all of whom had attained that status by procedures based on custom rather than on any formally promulgated rules. During the next ten or twelve years the number of retirees remained small. In 1957-1958 there were still only three, excluding President Hanson and Dean Tilberg. The latter, at the time of his retirement in 1955, explained the meaning of his new title. E, he said, meant that you're out, while meritus meant that you deserved it.

By the middle years of the second Hanson administration most veteran faculty of the prewar years who had survived to the age of seventy (at least eight had not) had retired. In 1968-1969 the catalogue listed fourteen professors emeritus. Only Henry Bream, Lester Johnson, and Parker Wagnild remained as active teachers to tell people firsthand what it was like at Gettysburg College before 1945. By virtue of a career-process document which the trustees adopted in 1968, faculty colleagues now shared formally with the president and trustees in the granting of the customary retirement honor. Beginning in 1968 all faculty, no matter what their rank at retirement, who were given the title of emeritus were also given the rank of professor. In 1984-1985 the catalogue listed a record number of thirty-six emeritus faculty and administrators.

As of the fall of 1945, Gettysburg College had no faculty salary schedule. In fact, it had never had one. All of the professors, except one who had not yet earned his Ph.D., were paid $3,700. With a few exceptions, associates received $3,000 and assistants, $2,800. The salaries paid the instructors, two of whom were part-time employees, varied widely, but this fact did not reflect a schedule for that rank. The trustees approved a 20 percent increase beginning with 1948-1947 and raised salaries beginning in 1949-1950 to $5,000 for professors, $4,000 for associates, $3,500 for assistants, and

---

89 In 1984-1985, in spite of faculty and board efforts as early as the Langsam administration to reduce it, the official retirement age was still seventy years.

90 In October 1966 the executive committee sent to the president a document proposing procedure for determining who should receive the title of emeritus. More than a year later, after the committee approved the president's suggestion that all faculty who qualify should retire as professor emeritus, the faculty was given an opportunity to consider the document and the trustees approved it in 1968.
$3,000 for instructors. In the two lower ranks, actual salaries varied a few hundred dollars from these figures, largely in response to supply and demand, into which in a few cases possession of a Ph.D. degree entered as a factor. Faculty could supplement their regular income, and many did at this time, by summer-school teaching. In addition, the College usually paid a year-end bonus, amounting to 5 to 10 percent of salary.

There were no further general increases during the remaining Hanson years and thus, despite continuing inflation, the base salary for 1952-1953, the first Langsam year, was the same as that for 1949-1950. Instead of announcing immediate increases, as many restive faculty hoped he would, the new president stated that there would be no more bonuses; administrators would no longer be paid extra for the summer session, but their salaries would be increased to reflect their yearlong duties; and the board of trustees had approved the salary schedule which he proposed, but for the following year. Beginning in 1953-1954, for example, professors might expect to receive from $5,000 to $6,000 and assistant professors from $3,500 to $3,900. The maximum professorial salary for 1953-1954 was, in fact, $5,500. None received as much as $6,000 until 1955-1956, after Langsam had left for Cincinnati.

For many years after 1945, concern with faculty salaries was so great and continuing that it becomes a significant item in the history of the College. Walter Langsam first expressed himself publicly on the subject within six weeks of becoming president; he told the special committee in February 1955 that "we must provide for still higher (or at least less low) salaries"; and improvement in the "salary scale" was the first item in the list of unfinished business in his farewell report to the board four months later. The 1954 Middle States team warned that "there should be a deepseated belief in salary increases and dissatisfaction with the current scales." Its members disputed Langsam’s belief that Gettysburg salaries would permit him to recruit persons at least as able as the ones who would be retiring within the next five to ten years.

In discussing 1956-1957 salaries, the General told the trustees at his first board meeting that "you as business men know that you can’t keep in that situation long and retain the people you want." Six months later he proposed a five-year schedule of increases which, he said, would raise salaries, but only to the "point of respectability." Early in his administration Arnold Hanson, who quickly learned the truth of what the 1954 Middle States team had concluded, began regularly informing the board of the "keen competition for competent persons," which could only be met, in fairness to all concerned, by continuing salary increases. In 1967 he told the board that it was becoming difficult to retain some faculty because
of better salaries, lighter teaching loads, and greater opportunities for research at other places. Early in his administration he pledged himself to work for an annual 5 percent increase. In some years he was able to accomplish considerably more than that, but between 1966 and 1977 inflation averaging between 9 and 10 percent annually wiped out gains made nationwide by college faculty and many in other occupations as well.

For most of the years between 1945 and 1985 the annual report of college and university salaries compiled by the American Association of University Professors offered a comparison between compensation paid to Gettysburg faculty and that received by colleagues in most sister institutions in all parts of the country. The first report of the A.A.U.P. committee on the economic status of the profession covered the year 1958-1959. Seven grades were assigned for an institution's performance in each rank: AA and A through F. Amounts needed to earn a particular grade in any one year depended on the price level and other factors. For the first year the Gettysburg chapter submitted salary information which the administration had supplied but, along with that from such other Pennsylvania colleges as Allegheny and Dickinson, its publication was not authorized. For 1959-1960, when the restriction was lifted, with an average salary of $5,951 for all ranks, Gettysburg earned scores of D, D, C, and B, the latter for instructors. Salaries paid in 1961-1962, the last year for which the General had responsibility, earned Gettysburg grades of C, C, C, and B. The average salary for a full-time faculty member in that year was $6,862.

Deciding eventually that its existing grading system no longer served a useful purpose, in part because most institutions were raising salaries and consequently getting high grades, especially for the lower ranks, the A.A.U.P last used it in 1969-1970, by which time Gettysburg was earning scores of B, B, A, and A, and the average salary was $11,694. Beginning in 1970-1971, the A.A.U.P. divided institutions into three categories and established ten ratings for schools in each. As a four-year institution offering the baccalaureate degree, Gettysburg fell into the second category. During the rest of the Hanson administration, with only two exceptions, the College earned the highest ratings of one in each rank. The average salary for a full-time faculty member in 1977-1978 was $18,651.91

Surveying the state of the College and the apparently trying times ahead for higher education in the Northeast, upon assuming office in 1977 President Glassick began reminding faculty and trustees of

---

91Annual reports of the committee on the economic status of the profession were published in the A.A.U.P. Bulletin, usually in a summer issue. Determining whether compensation paid by one school was fair and how it compared with that in other institutions was a complicated task. The brief information given here offers only the beginning of a careful, comprehensive study of the subject.
the salary gains which had been made under his two predecessors and expressing doubts that further increases much beyond the inflation rate would be possible, unless the student-faculty ratio could be increased or carefully determined priorities were reordered. Nevertheless, the A.A.U.P. report for 1984-1985 not only placed Gettysburg's average salaries for all four ranks in the first rating, but also identified those for three of the ranks in the 95th percentile or above for institutions in its category. The average salary was $31,000, which was slightly above that of Dickinson and below that of Franklin and Marshall.

In 1984-1985 fringe benefits amounted to about one-fourth of the average faculty salary, which placed Gettysburg on a par with such Pennsylvania schools as Allegheny, Lafayette, and Muhlenberg. Forty years earlier the situation was quite different. All faculty were eligible in 1945-1946 for a small amount of group-life and hospitalization insurance. Although there had been discussions before the war of extending the pension plan, only professors were covered. During the next five years there were extensive improvements. In 1947 the board of trustees approved a pension system for all faculty; by vote the latter chose the Equitable Life Insurance Company of Iowa plan over TIAA. Early in 1950 the faculty agreed to participate in Blue Shield and later in that year, by a vote of 58 to 1, it elected to come under social security, with the understanding that the pension plan would be amended to yield a total retirement benefit based on both pension and social security. During the Langsam administration the College entered a cooperative exchange plan which permitted faculty children to attend other member schools without having to pay tuition.

The General told his first faculty meeting in September 1956 that he regarded the existing pension system "a confused mess" and that something should be done about it immediately. Given the option, most younger faculty elected to join TIAA in 1957; future faculty were required to join as they became eligible. Also in 1959 the College replaced Blue Cross and Blue Shield with a comprehensive medical plan for all employees. Finally, in 1960 the trustees offered children of all regular College employees liberalized tuition benefits.

Both before and after 1961 faculty, administrators, and trustees, sometimes working separately and sometimes together, sought with considerable regularity to improve fringe benefits as inflation ren-

---

92The chairman of the faculty committee on pensions told the trustees that those attending a special meeting in August 1947 had voted unanimously for the Iowa plan as "more adaptable and favorable to the Faculty" and as less expensive in purchasing benefits for older employees. His letter was made a part of the December 1947 board minutes.
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Theodore C. Daniels

Richard B. Geyer (1919-1984)

C. Robert Held

John D. (Jack) Shand

Robert D. Barnes

Carey A. Moore

M. Scott Moorhead

Seven of the long-term faculty employed in 1954 and 1955.
dered existing ones inadequate. In one case, that of employee-
children tuition grants, escalating costs made it advisable to place an
upper limit on the benefit for those hired after 1978.

In the fall of 1945 the primacy, even virtual supremacy, of the one
professor in each department was still unchallenged.\textsuperscript{63} Professors
held fourteen of the seventeen faculty Ph.D.'s; two of the remaining
three belonged to persons not considered permanent members of the
body. The professors were considered to be the scholars in the
College, and it was taken for granted that they would overshadow
their junior colleagues by the example they set in the classroom and
the manner in which they handled departmental business. One
might say that when decisions were to be made they could, if they
wished, in and of themselves constitute both a quorum and a
majority. Department heads, as they were called, were appointed for
indefinite terms. While presidents could, and sometimes did, dismiss
a head, the vast majority appointed to that position remained in it
until they died or retired. There is evidence that this arrangement
worked to almost everyone's satisfaction well into the twentieth
century. Many alumni of the 1930s or 1940s, for example, could
have testified, if called upon, to strengths of both departments and
the entire College which were attributable to the contributions of
such men as Richard Arms, Robert Fortenbaugh, Frank Kramer,
William Waltemyer, and John Zinn (to name five whose names were
drawn from different parts of the alphabet).

Walter Langsam was the first president to urge that some changes
be made in this traditional hierarchical organization. At his first
board meeting he asked the trustees to adopt tenure and announced
his belief that it would improve faculty morale if there were more
than one professor in a department. At his request, a year later the
board approved the promotion to professor of Francis Mason and
Allen Sloat, the first persons who were not department heads to hold
that rank. In his 1955 farewell message Langsam noted the "need for
democratization in a number of the academic departments." He
would not have been in error had he said in most of them. The 1954
Middle States report made no comment on the departmental power
structure, but it did question the soundness of a curriculum commit-
tee consisting of all of the department heads, one for which no other
faculty were ever eligible.

Within about a month of becoming president, the General pro-

\textsuperscript{63}No new endowed professorships (it might be better to call them named pro-
fessorships because of the small amount of actual endowment they produced) were
established until 1985. See p. 995. The General and Dean Dunn allowed a number of
the existing ones to lapse. In fact, the College's record of keeping them up to date in
this period was not a good one. At the end of 1984-1985 all ten existing endowed or
named professorships were assigned.
posed a revision of the faculty committee system which, when achieved, did change markedly the ex officio standing of department heads in the College. He added only one person who was not in charge of a department to the list of professors, but did assign the rank of visiting professor to some half dozen men and women given annual appointments to fill short-term needs. In the spring of 1960 he chuckled and then supported an incoming dean who in preparing the catalogue for that year changed the title of head, which he found distasteful, to chairman, but who did not learn until later that many, with good reason, believed these were not synonymous terms. The change persisted, except that beginning with the 1982 catalogue the word used was chairperson.

In the fall of 1961 Arnold Hanson asked the faculty executive committee to study and report on department chairmanships as part of the investigation of the faculty career process. There were now 119 faculty members and the chairmen no longer had a majority of the Ph.D.'s. In some departments there was now at least one person with or about to have tenure who was qualified to exercise leadership equal to or even better than that of the incumbent. At the same time, there were still many departments in which there were no regular staff meetings, in which issues could be discussed and decisions reached in which all participated.

The executive committee, only one of whose members then headed a department, began by assuming that chairmen should have term appointments (an assumption with which the president was in full agreement) and that they should be enjoined to share the government of the department with their colleagues. At one point committee members considered recommending that the terms be three years, with no immediate reappointment possible, but the report which they sent to the president in February 1962 proposed four-year terms, eligibility for reappointment, and the presumption that rotation would be followed wherever practical. Given the opportunity to react, some chairmen, fearful that the vital position of leadership within the departments was about to be reduced to that of a caretaker, almost a janitor, took issue with the committee proposal. Others, fearful that the change was going to be applied in the cases of current chairmen and enjoying whatever prestige the remnants of headship still conferred, spoke of a breach of faith. After all, they had been hired for indefinite terms.

The 1949 by-laws were the first to describe the duties of what were then called department heads: to "have charge of the instruction and discipline of his own department" and "give advice on any subject connected with his department, when requested to do so by the President of the College."

At least two chairmen explained to this writer in the early 1960s that they did not hold department meetings because of the inevitable bickering among the members. Each said that, when necessary, he conferred individually with his colleagues.
Deciding not to tamper with existing appointments, in December 1962 President Hanson recommended to the board of trustees the appointment of the first chairman for a specific term: five years, rather than four. All subsequent appointments to the position were for specific terms of from one to the normal five years. The last chairman enjoying an indefinite term retired in 1982. The turnover in leadership was not as great as might have been expected. Many chairmen were reappointed for one or more additional terms, but always there was the opportunity, indeed the necessity, for a review of performance every five years.

It is difficult to imagine the postwar Gettysburg faculty continuing under the traditional departmental arrangements without increasing tensions which would have seriously impaired the effectiveness of the educational program. The need for a strong and intelligent leadership continued unabated in every department. Given the changes in size and composition of the faculty, as well as in the willingness of college teachers in general to defer to senior colleagues, that leadership could best be exercised by a person able and willing to draw freely upon the strengths of both tenured and untenured colleagues. The 1964 faculty handbook contained the text of a proposed amendment to the by-laws (actually adopted in June 1966) which described the manner in which President Hanson hoped, indeed expected, chairmen would operate:

> It is the responsibility of the chairman to provide the leadership and direction necessary to maintain a high level of instruction in the department, to represent the interests of the department before the administration and the faculty, and to insure that the department contributes to the academic program of the College. It is his further duty to enlist the counsel and energies of the other members of the department in the discharge of these responsibilities.

One of the most durable Gettysburg customs in the fall of 1984 was holding the regular monthly faculty meeting on the first Thursday of the month, the day agreed upon in 1923, when the new President Henry W.A. Hanson proposed monthly instead of weekly meetings. Although increasingly after 1945 special meetings were necessary to transact all of the business which came before the faculty, the old regular meeting date remained intact.

A recurring concern of the faculty as a body was who could attend meetings and who could vote. In October 1952 the faculty decided to extend the franchise to all full-time members, at which time some younger instructors were angered to learn that for three years they

---
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FACULTY MEMBERS WITH SERVICE BEGINNING IN OR AFTER 1945 AND CONTINUING FOR FIFTEEN OR MORE YEARS

1945-1979  Norman E. Richardson, philosophy
1946-1963  Frederick C. Ahrens, German
1946-1970  *Kenneth L. Smoke (1803-1970), psychology
1946-1974  *Glenn S. Welland (1906-1986), chemistry
1946-1987  Joseph K. Wolfinger (1905-1987), English
1947-1980  Harry F. Bolich, English, speech
1947-1963  Harold M. Messer (1893-1972), biology
1947-1966  Katherine K. Taylor, English
1944-1966  *Edwin D. Freed, Greek, Latin, religion
1947-  Grace C. Kenney, physical education
1949-1981  Robert L. Bloom, history
1949-  Basil L. Crapster, history
1949-  Charles H. Glatfelter, economics, history
1949-1980  Conway S. Williams, economics
1950-1983  Harold A. Dunkelberger, religion
1950-1980  Chester E. Jarvis, political science
1950-1981  W. Richard Schubart, philosophy
1951-1985  Paul R. Baird, economics
1951-1981  Guillermo Barriga, Spanish
1952-1984  Ralph D. Lindeman (1925-1984), English
1953-1976  R. Henry Ackley, music
1953-1968  M. Esther Bloss (1903-1984), sociology
1953-  Richard T. Mars, physics
1954-  Theodore C. Daniels, physics
1954-1979  Eugene M. Haas (1921-1984), physical education
1954-1986  *C. Robert Held, English, classics
1954-  James D. Pickering, English
1954-1984  John D. (Jack) Shand, psychology
1955-  Robert D. Barnes, biology
1955-1971  Marie McLennand, English
1955-  *Carey A. Moore, religion
1955-1981  M. Scott Moorhead, mathematics
1956-  Edward J. Baskerville, English
1956-  Louis J. Hammann, religion
1956-1982  Ingolf Qually, art
1956-1981  Russell S. Rosenberger, education
1956-  Robert H. Trone, religion
1956-1974  Waldemar Zagars, economics
1957-  A. Bruce Boenau, political science
1957-1983  Glendon F. Collier, Russian
1957-1974  William C. Darrah, biology
1957-1986  Lewis B. Frank, psychology
1957-1979  Robert T. Hulton, physical education
1957-1979  R. Eugene Hummel, physical education
1957-  Jack Locher, English
1957-1983  Charles E. Platt, psychology
1957-1985  Howard G. Shoemaker, physical education
1957-1985  Janis Hathorn Weaver, Spanish
1958-  Bruce W. Bugbee, history
1958-  Chan L. Coulter, philosophy
1958-  Robert M. Gemmill, economics
1958-  Rowland E. Logan, biology
1958-  *Samuel A. Mudd, psychology
1958-  Alex T. Rowland, chemistry
1959-  Gareth V. Blaer, physical education
1959-  J. Richard Haskins, physics
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1959-1984  Caroline Cameron Hendrickson, Spanish
1959-1979  Calvin E. Schildknecht, chemistry
1959-1984  Walter J. Scott, physics
1959-  Mary Margaret Stewart, English
1960-1978  Norman L. Annis, art
1960-      Neil W. Beach, biology
1960-      John T. Held, education
1960-      Thomas J. Hendrickson, physics
1961-1977  Helen H. Darrah, biology
1961-      Edmund R. Hill, economics
1961-      John T. Held, education
1961-      Thomas J. Hendrickson, physics
1962-1983  Arthur L. Kurth, Romance languages
1962-      Ray R. Reider, physical education
1962-      Helen H. Darrah, biology
1963-      Edmund R. Hill, economics
1963-      John Roger Stemen, history
1963-      Emile O. Schmidt, English, theatre arts
1963-      Dexter N. Weikel, music
1963-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1964-      Henry Schnelder III, German
1964-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1964-      Leonard I. Holder, mathematics
1964-      Sherman S. Hendrickson, physics
1964-      Donald O. Forness, history
1964-      Michael L. Ritterson, German
1964-      Gertrude G. Gobbel, psychology
1964-      John M. Kellett, mathematics
1964-      James P. Myer, Jr., English
1964-      James L. Ritterman, German
1964-      David L. Crowner, German
1964-      Shields H. Fortnum, chemistry
1964-      F. Eugene Belt, music
1964-      W. Eugene Belt, music
1964-      John F. Clarke, English
1964-      Robert S. Frederickson, English
1964-      Arthur McCardle, German
1964-      Amie Godman Tannenbaum, French
1964-      Kermit H. Finstad, music
1965-      Richard T. Wescott (1921-1985), physical education
1965-      George H. Fick, history
1965-      Wade F. Hook, sociology
1965-      L. Carl Leinbach, mathematics
1965-      Gertrude G. Gobbel, psychology
1965-      Robert F. Zellner, music
1965-      Donald W. Hinrichs, sociology
1965-      Donald G. Tannenbaum, political science
1965-      Kenneth F. Mott, political science
1965-      James P. Myer, Jr., English
1965-      James L. Ritterman, German
1965-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1965-      David L. Crowner, German
1965-      Richard T. Wescott, physical education
1965-      George H. Fick, history
1966-      Wade F. Hook, sociology
1966-      William E. Parker, chemistry
1966-      Michael L. Ritterman, German
1966-      Donald H. Fortnum, chemistry
1966-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1966-      James L. Ritterman, German
1966-      Donald G. Tannenbaum, political science
1966-      Gertrude G. Gobbel, psychology
1966-      Robert F. Zellner, music
1966-      Donald W. Hinrichs, sociology
1966-      Kenneth F. Mott, political science
1966-      James P. Myer, Jr., English
1966-      James L. Ritterman, German
1966-      Donald H. Fortnum, chemistry
1966-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1966-      James L. Ritterman, German
1966-      Donald G. Tannenbaum, political science
1966-      Gertrude G. Gobbel, psychology
1966-      Robert F. Zellner, music
1967-      Richard T. Wescott, physical education
1967-      George H. Fick, history
1967-      Wade F. Hook, sociology
1967-      William E. Parker, chemistry
1967-      Michael L. Ritterman, German
1967-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1967-      James L. Ritterman, German
1967-      Donald H. Fortnum, chemistry
1967-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1967-      James L. Ritterman, German
1967-      Donald G. Tannenbaum, political science
1967-      Gertrude G. Gobbel, psychology
1967-      Robert F. Zellner, music
1967-      Donald W. Hinrichs, sociology
1967-      Kenneth F. Mott, political science
1967-      James P. Myer, Jr., English
1967-      James L. Ritterman, German
1967-      Donald H. Fortnum, chemistry
1967-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1967-      James L. Ritterman, German
1967-      Donald G. Tannenbaum, political science
1967-      Gertrude G. Gobbel, psychology
1967-      Robert F. Zellner, music
1968-      Richard T. Wescott (1921-1985), physical education
1968-      George H. Fick, history
1968-      Wade F. Hook, sociology
1968-      William E. Parker, chemistry
1968-      Michael L. Ritterman, German
1968-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1968-      James L. Ritterman, German
1968-      Donald H. Fortnum, chemistry
1968-      James F. Slaybaugh, education
1968-      James L. Ritterman, German
1968-      Donald G. Tannenbaum, political science
1968-      Gertrude G. Gobbel, psychology
1968-      Robert F. Zellner, music
1969-      *Lois J. Bowers, physical education
1969-      Paul R. D'Agostino, psychology
1969-      Robert S. Frederickson, English
1969-      Arthur McCardle, German
1969-      Carol DeBorns Small, art
1970-      Kermit H. Finstad, music
1970-      Branko A. Lenski, French

This list continues the one on pages 499 and 500. It is limited to persons holding the rank of instructor or above. The asterisk indicates that service to the College was not continuous. Haas, Hulton, Hummel, and Bowers (who was an instructor from 1952 to 1955) entered the administrative department of intercollegiate athletics and, except for Haas, were still employed at the end of the 1984-1985 year. This list clearly shows the long-term effects of President Paul's program to add forty additional persons to the faculty in four years.
had dutifully attended faculty meetings, completely unaware that, officially at least, under 1942 legislation their votes were not counted. The 1934 rule that on academic matters each department had one vote seems to have been forgotten. As the administration grew in the 1950s, and without an enunciated policy to guide him, the General awarded full faculty status to a number of its members. At the urging of President Hanson, the faculty in late 1961 adopted a statement of policy, presented by the executive committee, which was designed to include in faculty discussion many teachers who did not hold one of the four major ranks as well as many administrators. This legislation extended the right to vote on matters affecting the academic curriculum to persons in the four ranks who had or were eligible for tenure, and on other matters coming before the faculty to a wider group, including some administrators. Amended on a number of subsequent occasions, this statement of policy remained essentially unchanged in 1984-1985. Responding to student requests, in 1971 the faculty granted a stated number of students the privilege of attending faculty meetings, participating in the discussions, but not voting. The number was increased in 1974. After more than a decade of experience, earlier fears that the presence of students would inhibit faculty discussion and alter voting patterns appeared to be groundless.

On several occasions after the faculty exceeded one hundred in number, someone proposed that its members consider transacting their business by means of a faculty senate much smaller in size than the entire body. None of these proposals was adopted, even though at times there was difficulty in enticing a quorum to attend meetings. Except for a brief period in the early 1970s, the quorum was 50 percent plus one of those who could vote on all matters, although there was a gradual refinement in the way the total of the latter was calculated in any one term.  

In the early 1960s, during a relatively quiet period as far as debate and legislation were concerned, one administrator complained that the faculty spent too much time in meetings listening to announcements and not nearly enough discussing and acting upon issues vital to the College's future. He might have made a similar comment about most of the 1950s, when many changes in the College were occurring, but most of them not as a result of faculty debate and decision. Until 1962 the entire faculty still reserved the right to vote on the petition of former students to be readmitted to the College, something which was certainly not an efficient use of professorial

---

87Registrar Charles Wolfe was faculty secretary until 1957 and Registrar Mildred Hartzell from 1957 to 1960. In the latter year the faculty elected one of its number secretary for a three-year term, which was shortened to one year in 1969. Between 1960 and 1985 eighteen persons served as secretary.
time. By the middle 1960s things were different, as the faculty began to debate such matters as calendar and curriculum change, admissions policy, whether to delegate responsibility for residential life and student conduct, and the faculty career process. One of the most significant changes in the part which the faculty as a body played in the life of the College, beginning in the Paul but especially in the later Hanson administration, was its participation in discussions related to planning for Gettysburg's future. There was scarcely any precedent for this activity before the 1960s. A significant change in faculty meetings themselves was the increasing participation of younger members in the debates.

The 1945-1946 College catalogue listed nineteen faculty committees, all of which had appeared in the twentieth century. Once the faculty began meeting monthly, these committees assumed a greater role in conducting its business. In almost no instance were their powers and duties defined or their numbers determined by legislation. Although on several occasions the faculty has asked the president and dean to rotate committee membership, it appears that the lists were usually prepared at the last minute, when the easiest thing to do was to make as little change as possible. Walter Langsam announced his intention of putting every faculty member on at least one committee. During his first month in office, he expanded the curriculum committee (beginning with the 1953 catalogue, the curriculum and policy committee) to include all department heads, thus increasing its size from ten to twenty-one, eventually to twenty-five members.

As already noted, in 1956 the General prepared himself for his new duties by mastering the contents and recommendations of the 1954 Middle States report. The evaluators believed that the curriculum and policy committee was too large, even though it had many functioning subcommittees, and recommended "an elective process in order that all members of the faculty may be eligible for

---

98 Whether all of the hours consumed in these debates represented an efficient use of professorial time was a subject for reflection.

99 With but few exceptions, faculty and administrators during this period worked together with considerable mutual respect, even while expressing their differences of opinion and defending their opposing positions, in a manner characteristic of a healthy college. While there were minor confrontations, there was no major battle. For reasons that are unclear, the A.A.U.P. chapter which flourished for many years on campus, enrolling more than fifty members as late as 1960, had become inactive by 1984. In that year there were but eight faculty members who belonged to A.A.U.P. In the early 1970s President Hanson informed the trustees that faculties everywhere were showing an increasing interest in unionization and declared that the College should behave responsibly in the event the Gettysburg faculty exercised their right to join a union. In June 1973 he reported that it did not appear faculty were interested in organizing.
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membership." At the General's suggestion, made at its first meeting in the fall of 1956, this committee moved to recommend to the faculty the election of a committee on committees "to study the entire committee structure of the College and to make recommendations to the faculty as a whole." Acting in a thoroughly democratic fashion, the faculty approved the idea, nominated by ballot candidates for the committee at its October meeting, and then by ballot elected eight persons, including the dean of the College, the following month.

The seven persons who chose to serve on the committee included three veteran department heads, three young assistant professors, and the dean. Quickly they agreed that the number of committees should be reduced drastically, the formation of new ones should be discouraged, the principle of rotation should be affirmed as faculty policy, the duties and size of each committee should be defined, two elected committees should be established, and specific provision should be made for a formal review of the proposed system. In May 1957 the faculty accepted the report.

The Rule Governing Committees of the Faculty of Gettysburg College went into effect in the fall of 1957. A carefully drawn brief preamble reminded members of their prescribed duty to "bear an active part in the immediate government of the college, share in the general work of the institution, and discharge effectively the particular duties" of their position. Further, it enjoined the faculty to use "a few key committees" to do much of its work, in such a way as to "provide an adequate measure of faculty participation" in operating the College and yet "permit faculty members to find more time for teaching and investigations." The rule established nine standing committees, including two (academic policy and program, and executive) whose six members were elected by the faculty. It committed the faculty "in so far as possible" to use these nine committees to exercise "such responsibilities as the faculty delegates." Elected committee members were chosen for three-year terms and could not be reelected immediately; the president, observing the principle of rotation, appointed all others for one-year terms. The rule carefully defined the duties of the nine committees and prescribed procedures designed to insure their accountability to the entire body. Finally, it mandated the election in three years of

100 These were not mere idle words. They were the expression of men who knew that most Gettysburg faculty members wanted to participate (indeed, had participated) in a major way in making College policy and in carrying out its program, but who were often puzzled by how to do this and still have the time needed for teaching and scholarly activity.

101 As though to stress that the selection of the two elected committees was a concern of the whole faculty, until 1966 elections were conducted in connection with a faculty meeting.
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another committee on committees to review the working of the new system.

With little disagreement within the first committee on committees and with no bloodshed on the floor of the faculty, a minor revolution had been effected in the latter's polity. For the first time since a committee on curriculum was established in 1922, persons who were not department heads were eligible to serve on it, while those who were now had to compete with most of their colleagues for elected positions on its successor and on the newly constituted executive committee. The principle of rotation of membership was observed, in part at least due to an increasing involvement of the executive committee in choosing members of appointed committees. While many special committees were formed, most came into existence to do work which properly belonged to a faculty. On six occasions after 1957, and at five-year intervals after 1960, the faculty elected new committees on committees to review the system and propose changes, many of which were approved. Methods of election were changed. Committees were added, changed to commissions meeting periodically, or eliminated. Nevertheless, the basic provisions of the original rule remained intact in 1985.

One of the most important sections of the 1957 rule accorded faculty sanction to an advisory committee which the General had established on his own initiative in 1956. Consisting now of three persons, it was charged with consulting the president on any College matter on which he wanted advice. When he summoned them to consult on matters of appointments, promotions, and dismissals, the rule obligated him to choose one member from each of the two elected committees to participate. The 1960 rule increased the number from each elected committee to two and entrusted to them the choice of persons to become part of what was then called the augmented advisory committee. Ten years later, in 1970, the members of the fourth committee on committees persuaded a somewhat reluctant President Hanson to agree to a fully elected advisory (now called faculty personnel) committee of six persons, plus the dean of the College, who would elect their own chairman and who could conduct their business without the president in attendance at all times. The other tasks of the old advisory committee now fell to the executive committee.

The Campus

In the fall of 1945 the Gettysburg campus consisted of about ninety-three acres of land, on which were erected twenty major buildings: Old Dorm, the White House, Stevens Hall, Glatfelter Hall, Brua Chapel, the steam plant, McKnight Hall, Huber Hall, the
Aerial view of the campus made after the temporary barracks were placed in early 1947 and before work was begun on Hanson Hall in mid-1949. Courtesy Adams County Historical Society.

Stahley house, the S.C.A. building, the infirmary, Plank Gymnasium, Breidenbaugh Hall, the janitor's house, the library, the book store, and four fraternity houses.

As College enrollment doubled and then tripled in the ensuing years, and as no one was certain at what point the limit might be reached, further enlargement of the campus acreage became highly desirable, if not necessary. Limited expansion to the south was possible, but growth to the east and north would result in the purchase and probable removal of buildings along Washington, Stevens, Carlisle, West Lincoln, and West Broadway. Entirely apart from the cost involved as an undesirable factor in such a course of action was the ill will such a move would almost certainly generate in the community. Clearly the best prospects for extending the existing campus lay to the northwest and west, where there were two businesses, two residences, and considerable unused land.

102 In June 1962 the board found it advisable to record that "the present plans of the College do not contemplate the purchase of any property east of North Washington St."
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Between 1945 and 1965 the College made fourteen purchases of property contiguous to the campus, which all but doubled its size. During the first decade, with attention focused on many other things, there was little activity. In 1948 the College bought a small square of land west of Carlisle street and north of Broadway, which had not been included in the Winter purchase of 1935. Three years later it bought the unimproved lot at the northwest corner of West Lincoln and College avenues. The cost of these two acquisitions was less than $9,000. By 1956, when some of the directions of postwar higher education were becoming clear, it was evident that the trustees, including the General once he arrived on campus, had contracted expansion fever. Embarking upon an ambitious building program, they concluded that the immediate and probable future needs of the College required that they purchase properties whenever what was to them a reasonable opportunity presented itself. In his final report to the trustees in June 1961, the General restated his "personal belief that it is not only wise to purchase all land contiguous to the campus whenever available, but essential to growth."103

Between 1957 and 1960 the purchase of four properties, at a cost of $75,500, completed College ownership of all space on the north side of the 200-block of West Lincoln avenue. The major acquisitions, which had been actively sought since early 1956, even before the General became president, were not completed until the Arnold Hanson administration. Between 1961 and 1964 five purchases, costing $491,500, brought into the College campus more than sixty-seven acres lying to the northwest and west. Viewed as one transaction, this was the largest as well as the most expensive property acquisition up to that time in the history of the College.104 In 1965 the Clutz property at the corner of West Broadway and the Mummasburg road was acquired. This had once been part of the

---

103 Although he may long since have forgotten a phenomenon in American history known as manifest destiny, the General was certainly illustrating it when he advised in this report that the trustees buy the seminary property in the event that institution left Gettysburg. The campus could be used, he thought, to add a junior college, to convert Gettysburg into a university, or for strictly College purposes.

104 Deciding upon the proper position to take on the first two of these purchases, which cost $263,000, was only one of several difficult problems which Arnold Hanson faced in the fall of 1961. Some faculty and others counseled strongly against buying any property at a time when there were so many other pressing and immediate needs. On the other hand, the trustees had been trying to make these purchases for about five years and were determined to act, in what they were certain were the College's long-term interests, as soon as these properties came onto the market. Had they been sold to others and used again for industrial purposes, the traffic in the 200-block of West Lincoln avenue would surely have seriously interfered with daily and heavy College use of this part of the campus. An effort about this time to make a purchase which would have given the College direct access to Route 30 on Buford avenue came to naught.
Martin Winter tract. Two purchases totaling about sixteen acres, along the southern and southwestern edges of the campus, one in 1967 and the other in 1974, completed its growth in the forty years after 1945. At a total cost of $605,925, a far cry from the $27,400 which had brought in some fifty acres between 1904 and 1945, the College had added about eighty-seven acres to its main campus.105

The most immediate College need in the fall of 1945 was not acres of land for campus development, but facilities to handle a record enrollment. Many male students could and did find rooms in town, but the College felt a responsibility to provide for more of them on campus than the fewer than two hundred who could be packed into Old Dorm and McKnight, the only two men's dorms. By early 1947 there were seven barracks located along the south side of the 200-block of West Lincoln avenue, capable of housing more than two hundred students, including some with families. By the same time there was also a second infirmary, attached to the existing facility on West Lincoln avenue. The older building was used for women and the one recently acquired, for men. When fire seriously damaged the S.C.A. building in November 1946, the College secured a recreational building and placed it between Glatfelter Hall and Plank Gymnasium. Finally, late in 1947 a one-story annex with four classrooms was attached to the west side of Glatfelter Hall. All of these structures were government-surplus property, made available to the College at no cost.106 Unlike the men, women students were not permitted to room where they pleased. The catalogue prescribed

---

105 For further information on the campus land, see Gregory J. Landrey, "A History of the Gettysburg Campus," (Gettysburg College paper, 1977), pp. 40-51. During this period the College acquired a number of properties which were not contiguous to the main campus: the Bilheimer house at 109 West Broadway, purchased 1953 and sold 1955; the V.F.W. house at 249 Carlisle street, purchased 1954, sold 1958; and repurchased 1975; the Kramer house at 140 West Broadway, bequeathed in 1968; the Berkey house at 138 West Broadway, purchased in 1969; the properties at 400 and 412 Carlisle street, purchased in 1972; the property at 59 West Lincoln avenue, a gift in 1982 from Anne Keet Hanson and her husband, the president emeritus; and the property at 63 West Lincoln avenue, purchased in 1982 from Hood College. In 1959 the College sold the house at 143 Springs avenue which Lillie K. Aughinbaugh bequeathed to it in 1942. Several of the above purchases were made to provide accommodations, if only temporarily, for women students. Others, such as the ones in 1972 and 1975, were made in an effort to preserve the residential character of the campus perimeter at a time when there was a specific threat of commercial development. Not all of its neighbors were pleased at the prospect of student use of newly acquired off-campus College residences, regarding it as a threat to the residential character of the area.

106 The barracks, which the catalogue cheerfully called "temporary dormitories," were not removed until 1957. The recreational building, later used as the air science headquarters, survived until 1967; the Glatfelter Hall annex until 1969; and the old infirmary, which was last used as a women's dormitory, until 1970.
that, except for Gettysburg residents, women were "required to room under dormitory supervision" and board in Huber Hall. To handle the overflow from Stevens and Huber Halls, the College used the Aughinbaugh house on Springs avenue and a rented house, called Myrtle Terrace, on Carlisle street. Even so, the number of women students dropped from 241 in 1944-1945 to 175 in 1949-1950.

At its meeting in May 1945, several months before the Pacific war had ended, the board of trustees authorized appointment of a planning committee "to consider immediately a proposed new field house," or modernization of the Plank Gymnasium, and "the necessity of an infirmary." Apparently as something of an afterthought, the committee was also asked to "consider further post-war building and curriculum expansion." Until this committee ceased to function several years later, from time to time it presented the board with lists of needed buildings, to each of which a priority was assigned. For example, in December 1947 a new chapel was rated first, a women's dormitory second, and the field house was now third. At the same time, the committee counseled that there be no building until prices dropped and the results of the current financial campaign were known. A year later, in December 1948, the trustees themselves arranged the priorities, placing the women's dormitory first, the chapel second, and the field house third. By the time Henry W.A. Hanson left office in 1952, one of these buildings was already in use and the second was under construction.

107 In documents of the time young men were often called boys and young women girls. It was a girls' dormitory which was rated second. The author is convinced that use of these words was not an attempt to be demeaning.
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Ground was broken on June 4, 1949 for the first new campus building, except for the bookstore, in twenty years. Designed to accommodate about one hundred women and include quarters for a head resident and four sororities, it was ready for use in the fall of 1950 and was dedicated on November 3 of that year. On the occasion of his twenty-fifth anniversary in the White House, in 1948, the trustees had decided to name the first new building, other than the chapel, in the president's honor, but the dormitory was finally named the Elizabeth Painter and Henry W.A. Hanson Hall, in order to recognize the contributions of both members of the campus first family. The cost, according to the finance committee's report in December 1951, was $342,772, not including furnishings.

"It has long been a dream of my own," President Hanson told the board in June 1951, "that I would live to see on our campus a House of Worship which would serve as a challenge to every student." By that date the dream was becoming a reality. A year earlier, the board had selected the location, one intended to be the center of the campus, and had determined that the structure should be large enough to seat twelve hundred persons. Ground was broken on May 13, 1951 and the cornerstone was laid on November 3. Construction extended over a period of two years and the building was first used when College opened in the fall of 1953. Christ Chapel was dedicated on October 17, 1953, with President Emeritus Hanson delivering the dedicatory sermon. The cost was $592,871. In 1963 the bell once used in Old Dorm and then briefly in Glatfelter Hall was brought out of storage and installed in the chapel tower.

The planning for a new chapel forced the trustees to consider what use, if any, should be made of the old one. As early as December 1949 they approved converting Brua into the music and dramatic center of the campus. Professors Wagnild and Arms met with the

---

106] J. Alfred Hamme continued to be the College architect until his death in 1965. Many criticized his designs of postwar College buildings as unimaginative. Actually, as he himself explained, he operated within general architectural and financial guidelines which the trustees determined.

107] The trustees chose the name Christ Chapel in June 1951. President Hanson suggested the theme for the mural placed above and behind the altar: Christ blessing a graduating student shown leaving the chapel, with John 14:6 as the text. In December 1952 the trustees granted President Langsam's request that a curtain be installed which could be drawn over the mural when the chapel was being used for other-than-worship purposes. Later, when some expressed their opposition to what the mural meant to them, the curtain remained drawn. Efforts to reopen the matter in the board of trustees in the early 1970s led nowhere. The January 1954 issue of the GCB included a list of memorials and designated gifts for the chapel. In May 1954 the Alumni Association dedicated a bronze plaque in the narthex in memory of sixty-four Gettysburg graduates killed in World War II. The figures for construction during 1950-1962 are taken from the GCB for February 1963. After that date they are taken from a report prepared by the bursar.
architect to prepare plans, and the Woman's League offered to pay most, if not all, of the cost. The cornerstone of an addition to the south end of the old building, designed to provide facilities for music, was laid during the annual league convention on November 3, 1950, and dedication occurred during the next annual convention, on November 1, 1951. A year later, the finance committee informed the trustees that the cost of the addition was $91,297.

Since Brua had to be used for chapel services until the fall of 1953, it was not feasible to alter any part of the original building until that time. Although drawings were then prepared showing a two-story brick addition to its west side for use by Owl and Nightingale, and although the Woman's League continued to be cooperative, nothing came of this or of several later initiatives to turn Brua into a hall of the arts, not simply one of music. In 1958 the auditorium was partitioned into practice rooms, a band room, class rooms, and a multipurpose room seating 150 persons. Brua Hall, now no longer Brua Chapel, was dedicated on November 6, 1958. The cost of the alterations was $59,863.¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰Owl and Nightingale used the Brua auditorium for its plays until the Student Union Building became available to it in 1960.
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Although the completion of Christ Chapel in 1953 left the College uncomfortably in debt, its building and grounds committee continued to remind the trustees of the need for major repairs and further construction, all within the context of what was being called a developing master plan. As early as June 1952, this committee gave estimated costs for needed alterations in the sixty-year old heating plant, a field house, a dining hall, dormitories, and a classroom and office building. The total was, for that time, a staggering $2,275,000. Scaling this list down to what he believed was a practical size, President Langsam told the trustees in December 1953 that the single most urgent need was for three men's dormitories. As he explained to the alumni in the January 1954 bulletin, almost five hundred male students "live either off-campus or in the crumbling barracks. This is a bad situation." Agreeing, the trustees immediately authorized a campaign to raise the necessary funds. Even before its meager results were known, in December 1954 they approved construction of the first unit, which it was agreed earlier would be named in honor of the recently retired (and now deceased) chairman of the board, Charles M.A. Stine. Groundbreaking ceremonies were held on February 21, 1955 and Stine Hall was ready for use in February 1956. Accommodating about 135 students, it was formally dedicated during commencement week, on June 2, 1956. The cost was $274,886.

Contrary to what one might have expected, the board of trustees did not delay discussion and action on needed campus development during 1955-1956, the year without a president. Instead, it took the steps necessary to secure the College's first federal loans to construct income-producing facilities and authorized construction of two new men's dormitories and a dining hall. Ground was broken for the dormitories in August 1956 and they were ready for use in September 1957. The total cost of what were first called Dorms B and C, each accommodating 135 students, was $599,882. Dorm B was formally named John S. Rice Hall on April 8, 1961, during a dinner in his honor as he was leaving to take up new duties as United States ambassador to the Netherlands. Dorm C was formally dedicated as Willard S. Paul Hall on June 2, 1962.

When the war ended in 1945, President Hanson still regarded the College's feeding men students in the Huber Hall dining room as a temporary measure, one to be discontinued as soon as possible. Postwar developments quickly convinced him and others that this was not to be the case. As early as December 1951, John Rice told his

---

111 This committee replaced the building committee in 1949 and took over at least some of the tasks of the former planning committee. Over the next third of a century it proved to be one of the busiest and hardest-working committees the trustees ever created.
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fellow-trustees that the College should use the recently acquired lot at the corner of West Lincoln and College avenues to build a new dining hall. Four years later, as its chairman, Rice presided when the board authorized the administration to proceed with a facility designed to serve up to 750 persons at a time. Construction began late in 1956 and the dining hall was first used in February 1958, at a cost of $468,877.1

The General's first report to the board of trustees in December 1956 was a clear summons for it to enter upon one of the most concentrated periods of building in the College's history. "We are working now in a space situation built for about one-half of our strength," he declared. Even while waiting for the completion of a master plan, the College should move immediately to construct a women's dormitory, faculty housing, an infirmary, a recreation building, a fourth men's dormitory, and a new classroom building. Now having access to several million dollars in federal funds for income-producing facilities, an unprecedented largess, the trustees responded with alacrity to his call. Within the next two years they authorized construction of five buildings: two women's dormitories, one more men's dormitory, a student union building, and an infirmary.

Construction of two women's dormitories, placed between Huber and Hanson Halls, and each designed to house about 130 persons, was begun in the early fall of 1957. They were ready for occupancy in the fall of 1958, at a total cost of $1,002,516. Ground for the new men's dormitory, located at the southeastern corner of West Lincoln and Constitution avenues, was broken in June 1958. Dorm D, as it was called, was first occupied by students in September 1959. Construction costs amounted to $350,313. One of the women's dormitories was formally named the Emma G. Musselman Hall in April 1960, while the other, first called North Dormitory, was named Patrick Hall, in memory of William H. Patrick, Jr., in June 1969. Dorm D was formally christened Apple Hall, in honor of John A. Apple, in September 1967.

As late as June 1955, College infirmary facilities consisted of two converted buildings on West Lincoln avenue, one of which was a

112The completion of the dining hall made possible conversion of the now unused space in Huber Hall into rooms for women students. The cost was $94,395.

113The federal funds, it should be remembered, were in the form of loans and, to secure them, colleges and universities had to advance some of their own money for each project. In the case of Gettysburg the advance amounted to about 10 percent. Since the interest rate was 3 percent or less, since forty years were scheduled for repayment, and since there were strict rules to be followed to insure that payments were made on schedule, the arrangement was most advantageous for the institutions which secured the loans.
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the other a government-surplus structure in use for about a decade. After the infirmary committee in that month reported on the pressing need for a modern facility, the trustees authorized it to solicit the medical alumni for funds, which were not available for this purpose from the federal government. Since the results were most disappointing, the committee then considered converting Buehler Hall into an infirmary. Its conclusion was that, while a new building was definitely preferable, conversion of Buehler was a practical expedient. Surprisingly, the board elected the former over the latter, decided to locate the new structure on the south side of West Broadway, and authorized construction in June 1959. Work began during the summer and the infirmary was placed in service in the fall of 1960. The cost was $161,300. On June 2, 1962 it was dedicated as the Sieber-Fisher Infirmary, in honor of one trustee (Paul R. Sieber) and in memory of another (Nelson E. Fisher). Their exertions had helped in a major way to make it a reality.

Addressing the alumni in September 1956, less than six weeks after assuming office, the General declared that the College was changing "Hen Bream's Field House," which three years earlier had lost its top-priority position on the list of intended new buildings, into a "recreation center for the very simple reason that what we want is a Recreation Center," with bowling alleys, handball and squash courts, indoor track, gymnasium, swimming pool, and similar facilities. Since federal funds were available for this purpose, the board proceeded in June 1957 to choose a location, on the south side of West Lincoln avenue, and a year later, on June 16, 1958, ground was broken for a building whose design and purpose were quite different from what the General had projected less than two years earlier. The main auditorium of the Student Union Building was sufficiently near completion, but only barely so, that it could be used for commencement in June 1959. The rest of the building was opened for student use unofficially in November and officially on December 1.115 Costing $1,158,322, it was by far the most expensive building which the College had ever built. In 1974, in part at least because of the practice followed in other institutions, the name was changed to the College Union.

The completion of seven new dormitories - from Hanson to Apple - in the 1950s provided accommodations for about nine hundred men and women students. As these buildings were occupied, the

114 The house at 249 Carlisle street purchased in 1954 was promptly named in memory of former Trustee and Board Chairman Martin H. Buehler.

115 An article titled "The Campus Hearthstone" appearing in the January 1960 GCB described and pictured the facilities available in the new structure. "So at last we have our home away from home." It concluded, "our center of communication for all."
College was able to discontinue some of its marginal residential facilities. The barracks were removed; three off-campus houses were sold; and McKnight was withdrawn from use as a dormitory, as was part of Old Dorm. However, all of this did not mean that the problem of student housing was solved, at least as far as the administration was concerned. In 1960 the General urged the board to buy the Huber property at the northeast corner of Carlisle street and Lincoln avenue for use by women students and a year later recommended the construction of still another men's dormitory. Neither proposal brought a favorable response from trustees now convinced that other projects should be given higher priorities. The completion of the Student Union in 1959 brought the bookstore, snack bar (Bullet Hole), and radio station into the new facility and resulted in abandonment of the swimming pool in the S.C.A. building.116

In the fall of 1956 faculty in more than half of the departments were still housed in Glatfelter Hall. Classrooms, especially at the popular hours, were at a premium. Offices meant for one or two persons were now crowded with two or three times that number. Unless they happened to be alone at the time, faculty wishing to confer privately with a student had to find an unused classroom or leave the building. A limited amount of additional office space was created

116The bookstore had been in the small building constructed for it since 1939; the snack bar was opened in what was later Room 108 in the S.C.A. building in 1953; and the radio station operated from the third floor of Breidenbaugh since 1948.
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here and there in the building, but this did little to relieve the problem.

Noticeable relief came only as faculty were able to locate elsewhere. Already in 1953 instructors in art, German, and sociology occupied offices and conducted their classes in the new chapel basement. In 1956 the General asked ( ordered would be a better word) the chaplain to vacate the White House by the end of the year; Romance languages and political science moved in. In 1960 all of the language faculty were relocated in McKnight Hall and history, philosophy, and sociology in the S.C.A. building, which now became known by its formal name: Weidensall Hall. 117 In 1961 the departments of education and mathematics occupied the recently purchased Phi Kappa Psi house, which was formally named the George Diehl Stahley Hall on March 10, 1962. Although the removal of the German and sociology departments in 1960 left the art faculty with most of the chapel basement, trustees did begin to discuss the need for a separate art building, but took no immediate action. They assigned a higher priority to the needs of biology and psychology, two of the fastest growing departments. 118

As their numbers increased, administrators as well as faculty needed more space. In 1952 the College purchased Glatfelter Lodge from Sigma Chi and placed the business office there. Three years later it leased the Alpha Tau Omega house at 157 North Washington street and turned it over to the development and alumni staff. The administration's move into the White House began with the dean of the College in 1957 and was followed by the admissions and guidance offices. The bursar came into the S.C.A. building in 1958. Beginning in 1958, first the ground and later the second floors of Old Dorm were used by administrative personnel.

By the end of the 1950s the trustees had to confront the fact that their supply of readily available money was nearly exhausted. The recently inaugurated fund-raising campaign was going well, but most of its proceeds would not be available for several years, nor could they secure federal loans for the facilities which they most

117 In 1959 the entire interior of McKnight Hall was removed and replaced with rooms designed as offices and classrooms, at a cost of $154,416. The classics department moved from McKnight to the former bookstore building in 1965. Major repairs to convert Weidensall into a classroom and office building were not made until 1965, at a cost of $43,884.

118 A good college faculty is rarely unanimous on almost any subject. Some now lamented the diaspora from Glatfelter Hall and consequent loss of community which existed in that overcrowded building, where with or without benefit of daily coffee stimulating discussion involving faculty from several departments regularly occurred. Obviously, there were gains and losses as the administration began moving toward providing an office for every faculty member, something which could never have occurred in Glatfelter Hall unless every classroom there had been converted into office space. Few advocated that course of action.
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wanted to construct. In their last meeting of the decade (December 1959), recognizing that sizable loans would be necessary to carry out their action, the trustees authorized expenditures of more than $1,000,000 for a new physics building, a major addition to the library, and a new physical education building.

Space and equipment needed to teach chemistry and physics as the faculty wanted them taught were overtaxing the existing facilities of Breidenbaugh Hall. At the board meeting in December 1959, the trustees learned, not only that it would not be feasible to use third-floor space in that building, but also that implementation of new state fire-exit regulations would actually reduce usable space on the second floor. They also learned that some prompt action was necessary. Instead of attempting to enlarge Breidenbaugh by adding wings to the west, as was suggested at one point, the trustees decided to construct a new building for the physics department, keeping the cost as low as they could. A site south of Plank Gymnasium was chosen, bids were opened in May 1960, and the department moved into its new quarters in the spring of 1961. The cost was $236,298. The building was dedicated in an informal ceremony on April 6, 1962. On November 2, 1963 it was formally renamed Fred G. Masters Hall. In 1966, at a cost of $135,269, the College completed an addition to the north side of Masters Hall for a planetarium and related facilities. Three years later, to house a recently purchased telescope, the College built an observatory on the northwest part of the campus.

In December 1956 the trustees accepted the General’s recommendation and authorized identification of the “present nameless library,” as he called it, with the chief founder of the College. During exercises in observance of the 125th anniversary of the College, on April 14, 1957, it became the Samuel Simon Schmucker Library. Giving it a name, however, did not hide the fact that growth in the library collection and in its use made the building more inadequate with each passing year. In 1958 the trustees agreed to give serious attention to this need at an early date. A consultant engaged to assist the architect advised the trustees to build a new library rather than enlarge the old one, but the trustees decided that they could not afford to accept his recommendation. In December 1960 they approved a contract for constructing an addition to the west side of

---

118Fred G. Masters (1880-1963) of the class of 1904 was a high school science teacher and administrator, as well as a bank director and president, in southwestern Pennsylvania. The building was named in recognition of his bequest, which eventually amounted to more than $220,000.

120Hatter Planetarium was named in recognition of the gift of George G. Hatter (1889-1976) of the class of 1911. Hatter was an official of the Pennsylvania Department of Highways and later president of the Pennsylvania Motor List Company.
the building which would practically double the available space. Work began in the spring of 1961 and was completed a year later, in time for formal dedication exercises on June 1, 1962. The cost was $494,685.

While a few of the hopes for the long-delayed field house might have been realized by the completion of the Student Union Building in 1959, clearly this was not the facility most people had in mind when they used the term. Useful as it was, the union building scarcely eased the heavy burden on Plank Gymnasium, built for a student body one-third the present size. Faced with the urgent demands for more library space, a new physics building, and facilities for health and physical education, the trustees decided not to choose among them, but to respond to all three. Fourteen years after the field house was assigned top priority, they decided to build what was now called a physical education building, but one with only those facilities which were thought to be most pressing: gymnasium, locker rooms, training room, and wrestling space. Construction began early in 1961. The new building was first used on January 4, 1962, for a basketball game with Bucknell (Gettysburg won). The cost was $802,011. In June 1969, on the occasion of his retirement after forty-three years of service to the College, it was named the Henry T. Bream Physical Education Building.121

Outstanding financial obligations facing him in the fall of 1961 persuaded Arnold Hanson that he should take a stand against further building unless a proposed project could more than justify itself. He soon learned that there were several such projects and that decisions concerning them could not be indefinitely delayed. All of them were expensive and, as it turned out, none was eligible for a federal loan. During the sixteen years of the Hanson administration six new structures were added to the campus, and at its close a financial campaign was being waged for a seventh. The new buildings are discussed in the order of their completion.

As early as December 1957 the General told the trustees that the stadium should be moved away from the center of the campus to a place on the perimeter where adequate parking space would be available. The vacated space, he thought, could then be used for academic purposes. Since he was unable to effect this relocation during his tenure in office, he used almost the same words to repeat the recommendation in June 1961, shortly before he retired from office. During 1963 the Emma G. Musselman Foundation, of which Mrs. Paul was a director, informed President Hanson that it would give the College $250,000, but only for the specific purpose of constructing a new stadium. The College accepted the offer and the gift

---

121Plank Gymnasium was turned over to women students in 1962.
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was announced on January 30, 1964. The trustees selected a site on recently purchased land west of the railroad, where the General's goal of ample parking could be realized. Work began in July and was completed at a cost of $432,311. Musselman Stadium was dedicated on September 25, 1965. Among the guests on this occasion were former President and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Lieutenant Governor Raymond P. Shafer.

When the Hansons came to Gettysburg in August 1961, they moved into a house which the College purchased for their use and located in Twin Oaks, adjacent to the borough. Convinced that this was only a temporary arrangement (a judgment with which Arnold Hanson thoroughly concurred), the trustees a year later authorized a special committee to present plans for "a proper residence" for the president and his family. Although this was an item of business which regularly came before the board during the next several years, progress was painfully slow, in part because the funds had not been obtained and in part because Arnold Hanson was determined to secure a design for the house which would insure its long-term acceptability both as a College facility and a family residence. Finally, in the summer of 1966, after a site along the north side of the 200-block of West Broadway had been selected, construction began. The Hanson family moved into what was called the President's Residence in May 1967. The College sold the Twin Oaks property a few months later. Generous gifts by two trustees helped make the new building, which cost $163,803, possible.

Late in 1963 the trustees directed the administration to prepare for a capital campaign which would include funds for construction of two additional dormitories for men and one for women. It was assumed that these new facilities would be used, not for an enrollment increase, but to improve accommodations for the current number of students. Upon learning that federal loans for such facilities were no longer available, the trustees decided in June 1967 to build an addition to Dorm D (soon to be named Apple Hall), using other moneys, including increased room rents. Construction began in the fall and, at a cost of $651,505, was completed for the beginning of the 1968-1969 academic year. None of the other dormitories was built.

In his December 1957 report to the board, the General added a new item to his "needed badly" list: what he called a living science build-

---

122 The necessity of dismantling the old stadium and moving the maintenance shops located under one of its stands prompted the College to renovate the large building located west of the railroad and purchased in 1961. Completed in 1967 at a cost of $190,566, what was now known as the West Building housed maintenance, Army R.O.T.C. (moved from Plank Gymnasium), and Air R.O.T.C. (moved from the postwar recreation building).
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ing, designed to provide facilities for biology, psychology, and sociology (later also anthropology). The estimated cost of $1,250,000 which the buildings and grounds committee submitted a year later, along with preliminary sketches, was sobering indeed, but the trustees included the building as part of the goal of the financial campaign they began in 1959. In his final report to the board, the General, noting that the biology and psychology departments in particular were attracting increasing numbers of students, urged that what he still called the living science building be given high priority.

While the departments concerned assisted in planning for the use of space in a new building, the trustees gave their attention to raising the money to build it. Gifts from the Longwood and McCready Foundations assured construction. Groundbreaking ceremonies were held on June 3, 1967 on a site west of Glatfelter Hall. Work in earnest began in the fall. The biology and sociology departments occupied their new quarters in the late spring of 1969 and the psychology department in the early summer. Costing $1,335,766, McCready Hall was dedicated on November 1, 1969. It was named in memory of Harry C. McCready (1899-1964) and in honor of Ralph W. McCready, both of whom had served the College as trustees.123

The major work which eventually transformed the College's oldest building took at least fifteen years to plan, finance, and complete. In his last report to the board in June 1955, Walter Langsam declared that "Old Dorm should be remodeled internally just as soon as possible." In response, the trustees began the obviously necessary study and discussion which would have to precede sound action. The first question to be asked was whether this old building, with its wood interior, soft brick walls, and possible major structural weaknesses, should be allowed to stand or be torn down. Since obviously most of the resident students were soon going to be living on another part of the campus, if preserved should Old Dorm be abandoned as a dormitory and converted to one or more of a number of other possible uses? To what extent should the decision be based upon the fact that this was the original College edifice, used for the wounded during the battle of Gettysburg, and undoubtedly the closest thing to a symbol the College had? Finally, since either rebuilding or restoration was going to be costly, and no federal funds were likely to be available, where could the College secure the money?

123Bowen Auditorium in McCready Hall was named in memory of Earl Bowen, veteran chairman of the biology department who urged the General to put the living science building on his list of badly needed items. After the death of Kenneth Smoke, veteran chairman of the psychology department, a laboratory suite was named in his memory. The construction of McCready made necessary removal of the janitor's house built in 1928 and made advisable removal of the postwar annex to Glatfelter Hall.
General Paul began forming his answers to these questions as soon as he arrived on the campus. "I am most anxious to make Old Dorm into a sort of shrine and museum for this College," he told the trustees in December 1956. "It is historical; our first and oldest building, and structurally sound." He thought that there were "many combinations" for its use, but was not ready at that time to decide which were preferable. Before long few advocated its continued use as a dormitory, and by 1959 the board had preliminary plans for its conversion into a museum and administrative building, at an estimated cost of $350,000. However, the trustees decided that there were more immediate needs and postponed taking any action. "Old Dorm is approaching the point of being unsafe," the General told them in his farewell message. "As I have repeatedly pointed out, both the historic tradition and the beauty of this building requires a complete restoration, for use as an administrative center."

Much as he might have wished to avoid it, Arnold Hanson had to resume the debate on Old Dorm at a point far from its resolution. Since it was obvious that something major would soon have to be done with the building, only the most necessary repairs were being made. An occasional mother who brought her son to his dormitory room in the fall took him along home again when she saw the interior of the room assigned to him in the old building. Although one architect or engineer after another who examined Old Dorm advised the College to level it and start over, the trustees refused to make that decision. At one point in 1963 they agreed that it should
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become an academic building, for history, political science, and related departments, including Civil War studies.

By the early fall of 1965 President Hanson and his colleagues had returned to the earlier belief that Old Dorm should become an administrative center. In October they called in G. Edwin Brumbaugh (1890-1983), a nationally known restoration architect. In his preliminary report he declared that "Gettysburg College is fortunate in having preserved its original building, perhaps even more fortunate that this symbol of its early days is a worthy piece of architecture." He called Old Dorm "an unusually dignified and effective example of the American Greek Revival," which, he wrote, "may properly be described as our earliest national architecture." As it stands, he argued, it "still reflects the essentials of basic Americanism. Even if it were in dilapidated condition, it would be worth restoring, but fortunately, evidences of structural weakness are not alarming or critical." He advised study by a qualified engineer to determine the accuracy of his judgment and estimated the cost of restoration at about $850,000.124

After a consulting engineer reported finding no "insurmountable problem," and after several sizable gifts were received, in September 1966 the board of trustees committed itself to restoring the building for use as an administrative center and authorized the president to enter into a contract with Brumbaugh and his partner, Albert Ruthrauff. When sufficient funds to warrant proceeding were received, work began in early January 1969. The last students to live in the building occupied it during the spring 1968 term.

Once renovation began, the entire interior was removed and replaced by steel columns and girders to which the walls were fastened and on which a new interior was constructed. Brumbaugh designed a building intended to be functional, but added what he called architectural treatment at the north-west ground-floor entrance, the second-floor rotunda, and the Lyceum on the third floor. The administrative offices began moving in during August 1970. The trustees now officially gave the building a name: Pennsylvania Hall. It was dedicated, for the first time in its long history, on October 24, 1970. The cost was neither $350,000 nor $850,000, but $1,317,639.125

Gifts offered by the Musselman Foundation and the Emma G. Musselman Foundation in 1971 made it possible for the College to

---


125For further information, see Charles H. Glatfelter, Yonder Beautiful and Stately College Edifice: A History of Pennsylvania Hall (Old Dorm), Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania (Gettysburg, 1970). Pennsylvania Hall was added to the National Register of Historic Places on March 16, 1972.
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construct a building which, with the adjoining physical education building, would provide the field house to which the trustees had given top priority in May 1945, more than a quarter century earlier. Ground was broken on October 28, 1972 for what the trustees had already named the John A. Hauser Field House. The building was dedicated on November 3, 1973. Costing $408,395, it housed an indoor track; tennis and basketball courts; cage areas for baseball and golf; and practice areas for soccer, football, and lacrosse.

In June 1972 the board of trustees adopted the report of a long-range planning and development committee which had been at work for about three years, preparing the draft of a master plan for the years 1972-1982. In adopting the report, the trustees committed themselves first and foremost to “the maintenance and improvement of the current program.” The only three capital items in the plan were, in the order of their priority, a new library, a new facility for the creative and performing arts, and renovation of space vacated once these facilities were available. In June 1973 the board determined the general site of the library: on the west flank of Pennsylvania Hall complementing Weidensall to its east. Two years later the administration selected Hugh Newell Jacobsen, of Washington, D.C., to design the structure. Awards by the American Institute of Architects and the Architectural Record were among the fifty recognizing his previous creations. Working with an already existing committee of faculty and staff, Jacobsen designed a building whose exterior was intended to have an integrity of its own without offending that of its two imposing neighbors, Pennsylvania Hall and Glatfelter Hall.

The large Emma G. Musselman gift which, together with several others received about the same time, made the new library finally possible contained the stipulation that no existing buildings or trees could be removed in its construction. Since the site chosen in 1973 would have required the demolition of Stahley Hall and removal of several trees, in accepting the Musselman gift the trustees were now faced with the task of relocating the library. In January 1979 they chose a site south of Paul Hall, on part of the old Nixon Field, one which the architect recommended, in part at least because it would not require more than minor changes in the exterior design of the building. When faculty and students learned of the new site, a spirited and sometimes emotional debate ensued. Students who advocated alternate locations on the perimeters of the campus had an opportunity to present their views to the chairman of the board and then to the April board meeting. The trustees listened, carefully considered the arguments pro and con, and then decided to reaffirm their earlier decision in favor of a central campus location. Ground was broken for the new building on June 21, 1979. Twenty-two
Library moving day was April 22, 1981.

months later, on April 22, 1981, more than one thousand students, faculty, and others joined in a well-organized and successful transfer of books and other materials from the old library to the new. Most of the task was completed in half a day. Musselman Library/Learning Resources Center was dedicated on September 19, 1981. Costing $4,567,558, it was by far the most expensive College building up to that time. By the time the College began actual construction of its new library, the trustees had to take into consideration much that had happened since they had adopted the master plan of 1972, which envisaged a new building for the creative and performing arts. In the fall of that year, the property committee had suggested the area south of McCreary Hall as its possible location. Seven years later, for a number of reasons, the trustees were actively considering remodeling the former library building for the use of art and music, and Brua Hall for theatre arts. When the Spillman Farmer Architects of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, advised that this was a feasible course of action, they decided upon it. The renovation of Schmucker Hall began during the summer of 1981; the departments of art and music began using it for their instruction at the beginning of the spring 1982 term. Work on Brua began in October 1983 and was completed during the summer of 1984. The first performance in the new theater

126 The Musselman gift, announced as $1,250,000, actually amounted to $1,371,700. Andrea Oppenheimer Dean, "Sculptural Shapes That Sit Solidly on the Ground: Hugh Newell Jacobsen's Gettysburg, Pa., College Library," AIA Journal (Mid-May 1982): 176-183, is an interpretive description of the library which explains its relationship to Glatfelter Hall, but not to Pennsylvania Hall.
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was in July, while the official opening occurred with a ribbon-cutting ceremony on October 21, 1984. Renovation of Schmucker cost $1,076,323 and of Brua, $1,237,335, with an additional $182,407 for air conditioning of both buildings. In the fall of 1977, soon after the arrival of President Glassick, the trustees committed themselves to a five-year plan of "maintenance and improvement for all college facilities." Using plant reserve funds and gifts, between then and the spring of 1985 they had completed one or more major projects for Huber Hall, Stevens Hall, Glatfelter Hall, the Dining Hall, Christ Chapel, Weidensall Hall, and Plank Gymnasium, at a cost of more than $1,350,000. Renovation of Breidenbaugh Hall costing about $2,650,000 was almost complete. In addition about $2,450,000 was spent in installing new underground steam, electrical, and communications lines; fire alarm systems; and parking lots.

To recapitulate, in the years between 1945 and 1985 the trustees had almost doubled the size of the campus, demonstrating the same level of concern for the future of the College which their predecessors had displayed, as for example when they purchased the Winter tract during the depression days of 1935. The trustees had also provided many of the physical facilities necessary for a student body more than three times the size of the prewar enrollment and for whom an adequate educational experience required more refined facilities than were available in the past. New dormitories accommodated more than one thousand students; the only prewar dorms in use after 1968 were Stevens and Huber. There were either new or greatly remodeled buildings for students taking courses in art, biology, chemistry, military science, music, physics, psychology, sociology and anthropology, and theatre arts. Teachers and students in all other fields worked in surroundings renovated one or more times since 1945.

A specially built dining hall replaced the one in Huber Hall originally designed for fewer than one hundred academy students. A specially built infirmary (by 1985 called a health center) replaced the converted family dwelling moved to West Lincoln avenue in the

127 The following areas within the two buildings were named in recognition of major gifts: Luella Musselman Paul Recital Hall in Schmucker, by the Emma G. Musselman Foundation; Kline Theatre in Brua, by the Josiah W. and Bessie H. Kline Foundation; and Stevens Laboratory Theatre, by William H. B. and Ida H. Stevens, both of the class of 1926. The Green Room was named in memory of the longtime director of dramatics, Richard A. Arms.

128 In June 1984 Stahley Hall was demolished and the area which it had occupied was landscaped. The education department relocated in Weidensall. The mathematics department returned to Glatfelter Hall. The classics department moved into Weidensall in 1982.
Aerial view showing the campus from the south. From the 1978 Spectrum.

1920s. If the College Union Building never became quite the home away from home which some young dreamer in the early 1960s believed it would, that facility nevertheless performed the same kinds of services for the student body after 1960 that the S.C.A. building offered its much smaller predecessor during the forty years before. Although they moved slowly, the trustees did eventually
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honor their promise to create adequate facilities for physical education for men and women students; in so doing they also built a new stadium.

In or near the center of the campus in 1985 there stood a preserved Pennsylvania Hall, testifying to students that Gettysburg College was proud of its long past in the history of American higher education and, as part of its reason for being, had demonstrated its care for things of beauty. Directly to the north and still close to the center there was a recent creation, Musselman Library, the College's very visible testimony of the extent of its commitment to active teaching and active learning, wherever they might occur on the campus.

In making available to the student of the 1980s and beyond a campus which would serve more than 1800 persons and, if possible, serve them better than the 600 prewar students were served, the trustees inured costs which surely would have appeared incredible to almost every one of their predecessors before 1945. How would one explain to Harvey W. McKnight that it cost $1,237,335 to convert into a theatre arts center his Brua Chapel, which cost $19,000 to build? How much easier would it be to convince Henry W.A. Hanson that the Breidenbaugh Hall which cost $180,458 to build would consume $2,650,000 to remodel less than sixty years later?

It is clear that a desire to keep the campus presentable existed from time to time, though not continuously, from 1837 on. As the spirit moved them, students assumed the role of landscapers. Janitors made their contribution. Occasionally, the College summoned landscape architects to recommend trees, shrubs, roads, and paths. In part because the effort was not sustained and not sufficiently professional, trees and shrubs died and in many places grass did not thrive. At the end of an extended period of depression, war, and rapid postwar expansion, Walter Langsam could truthfully say in his final report to the trustees in June 1955 that “in general, the trees and shrubs have suffered long neglect. They need continuing professional attention.” The record in the succeeding thirty years was the best in the history of the institution. Trustees assigned a higher percentage of the budget for landscaping, especially as new buildings were completed. They formally thanked a number of alumni, acting as individuals or through their classes, for relieving them of even larger appropriations by making generous contributions for plantings. Administrators engaged landscape architects to recommend plans which interested faculty members could supplement and the buildings and grounds staff could then

129 For example, Luella Musselman Paul (1960), for the area around the dining hall and union building; Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Wolf (1971), for the area around Pennsylvania Hall; and the class of 1926 (1972), for the area surrounding the lake, west of the railroad tracks.
The 1984-1985 campus
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carry out as part of its regular work. Although a few voices still asked whether all of this activity was not waste and extravagance, the College had established to its own satisfaction that a well-kept campus was eloquent, if silent, testimony to a significant part of its broad mission as a school of the liberal arts.

For many years parking was low on the priority list of needed campus facilities, the assumption apparently being that if students had automobiles they also had the responsibility of finding a place to park them, somewhere else. A campus map included in the 1948 catalogue showed but one small parking lot. Beginning with Walter Langsam, presidents urged the trustees to appropriate money to construct parking lots on the perimeter of the campus. The General was adamant in his opposition to any parking on campus roads, even including brief stops in front of Glatfelter Hall to pick up one's mail. If caught, no one was safe from his reprimands. In 1958, when the trustees approved paving a lot south and west of the Phi Gamma Delta house designed for one hundred automobiles, the General set the need at five hundred spaces and urged that parking be included in long-range planning. By 1985 more than six campus lots far more than met the need which he had expressed.

The 1942 catalogue announced that Nixon Field afforded "room and facilities for all kinds of outdoor sports" and that it was supplemented by "more than a dozen tennis courts . . . laid out for the use of the students" north and east of the field. The College began soon after 1945 to use part of the Winter tract north of West Broadway and eventually some of the land west of the railroad tracks to provide the playing fields needed by a much larger student body for such sports as baseball, football, hockey, and tennis. A baseball diamond completed northwest of the gymnasium in 1952 was named in memory of the veteran coach, Ira Plank, who died the year before. In 1961, after most of Nixon Field had disappeared beneath several men's dormitories, the trustees recommended that "this designation be applied to the land immediately north of Broadway presently used as a baseball diamond and football practice field." By 1985 the General's prediction that the area vacated by the removal of the old stadium would be needed for academic purposes had not come true. Although a parking lot encroached on part of it, much still remained as Memorial Field and was used for women's field hockey and lacrosse.

During more than its first century of existence, Gettysburg was served by a succession of three janitors whose individual activities dominated the care of the campus and whose regular interaction with the students was a noteworthy phenomenon of the College educational program. Even before Joe Carver formally retired in 1959, he fell victim to the times. The need for increased janitorial
services for more students and more faculty, spread over a larger and larger campus, living in a world less and less resembling that before 1945, insured that the janitors who joined and followed him would play a significantly different role in the life of the College. Even those who were most conscientious in the performance of their duties must be described in terms of their own day, and not those of John Hopkins or Adam Foutz.

Planning and Purposes

It is clear that those responsible for the management of Gettysburg College during more than a century before 1945 had engaged in planning for its future, if not continuously, then at least at important junctures in its history. In the 1830s its founders had labored with enough vision and soundness so that the College was able to survive those childhood ailments which brought either interruption or early death to so many similar ventures. Half a century later, aware of new and expanded needs in his day, Milton Valentine, and after him Harvey McKnight, planned successfully for what the former called a larger place. The new and remodeled facilities of the late 1880s and early 1890s—the larger place—were intended to permit the College to do what Valentine called a greater work, something which could not be accomplished without more faculty, more courses, and higher standards for admission and graduation. Unfortunately, this second part of the plan had to await the coming of a new century and a new president, Samuel G. Hefelbower. The planning which he undertook, which contemporaries described as the drive for a Greater Gettysburg, and which continued (though not without interruptions) into the Granville and Hanson administrations, soon came to include, in addition to academic innovations, even more new or improved facilities. Planning at Gettysburg always included, not only the difficult task of raising money to pay for the desired changes, but also constant attention to the place in American higher education which those responsible for the management of the College wanted it to occupy.

Thus, Henry W. A. Hanson was acting in thoroughly traditional Gettysburg fashion when, early in 1945, several months before the conflict in Europe ended, he began moving on several fronts to initiate planning for the future. In February he asked the faculty curriculum committee to undertake a comprehensive study of course offerings, "with the postwar period in mind." In May he urged each department to evaluate its program "in terms of postwar developments and check its findings with at least two good schools." Later in May, at his urging, the trustees created a postwar
planning committee "to chart a course for the college." The additions to the physical plant which resulted from these initiatives have already been discussed; the curricular changes which followed will be treated in the next section. During his three short years as president, Walter Langsam was engaged in a form of planning as he repeatedly made recommendations to the board and faculty. Had he remained longer at Gettysburg, he might well have involved more parts of the constituency in the process. As it was, he was the planner and much of what he proposed remained to be accomplished when he left.

In his first report to the trustees in December 1956, which dealt with much of the unfinished business identified by his predecessor, President Paul declared that "we have reached the point where it would be proper to have a joint committee of Alumni, Faculty and Trustees work up an integrated plan covering the next fifteen to twenty-five years." With trustee approval, in February 1957 he appointed such a committee, consisting of three trustees, three faculty, three alumni, and four ex officio members (the president of the College, the president of the board, the director of development, and the administrative assistant to the president). This joint planning committee, as it was called, had the broadest possible mandate: to study the College of 1957 and recommend plans to propel it as an increasingly strong institution to its sesquicentennial year: 1982.130

Convinced that the need for certain new facilities was already fully evident, the General persuaded the trustees in December 1956 to authorize immediate construction, as he put it, "without waiting for the Master Plan." Since federal loans were available, this could be, and was, easily done. Meanwhile, a subcommittee of the joint committee, studying the educational program, began reviewing the proposal that the College prepare for year-round operations in the near future.

The initiative which the General took within a few months after assuming office was the first major attempt to involve trustees, faculty, administrators, and alumni in a comprehensive planning effort on behalf of the College.131 Unfortunately, it produced no master plan which, with or without updating, could be used to guide the College into the early 1980s. Toward the end of the Paul administration what remained of planning activity was being exercised by several board and faculty committees. There were several reasons for the failure. First, from the very beginning there was wide agree-

130The faculty curriculum and policy committee also named a planning committee. Its work was soon absorbed by the joint group.

131The first such effort, on a somewhat less ambitious scale, occurred in 1907, when a committee of trustees, faculty, and alumni was chosen to recommend revised admissions requirements and curriculum. See pp. 541-542.
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ment that, plan or no plan, the College needed all of the new buildings which, year after year, were being begun and completed. Much of the energy which might have gone into planning for the future was therefore expended in achieving in the present. Second, the General's unpopular proposal for year-round operations prevented him and the faculty from ever agreeing upon an educational plan which both could wholeheartedly support and push to adoption. Third, the General's illness which began in 1959 deprived the entire undertaking of the level of leadership which it needed if its original purposes were to be realized.132

About six weeks after taking office in the fall of 1961, Arnold Hanson began the planning effort all over again by establishing what he called the planning group (sometimes called the planning committee). Consisting of seven faculty members and the five chief administrators, over the next two years its members investigated virtually every aspect of the College as it existed at the time and discussed the directions in which it should be moving during the next decade. Before long, pages upon pages of information were assembled.133 While the planners were still in the midst of their deliberations, the Ford Foundation invited the College to apply for one of the major challenge grants available under its special program in education. The eighty-four page application which the president submitted to the foundation in November 1962 was a detailed review of the College since 1953 and an equally detailed statement of its intentions through 1973. Members of the planning group helped prepare the application and the trustees gave it their blessing. The president accurately described it as a planning document, but it was never used as such. In fact, it had to be constructed before much of the pertinent evidence necessary for a finished piece was presented and carefully weighed. By the time the Ford Foundation informed the College in May 1963 that it would not receive one of the special-program grants, much of the interest in completing the work of the planning group had dissipated. No business meetings were held after that date. Perhaps the most valuable service which its members performed was helping introduce a new president to the opportunities and problems of Gettysburg College in the early 1960s.

132There is something of the poignant in the General's explanation to the trustees in December 1959 that, since the building program was nearing completion, it was now time "to start on an intensive program of improving the academic side of the College."

133The book for planners at this time to read was Sidney G. Tickton, Needed: A Ten Year College Budget (New York, 1961). The president supplied each member of the planning group with a copy.
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In the summer of 1964 Hanson assumed the responsibility for preparing a planning document, using materials which the planning group had assembled as well as other sources. Incorporated into a statement which, with trustee approval, committed the College to a ten-year plan, it was issued under the title "Gettysburg College: The Direction of Its Future" in October 1964. This document gained neither wide circulation nor wide acceptance, except as Hanson and the trustees used it to embark upon a carefully crafted new building program. By the later 1960s none of the three most recent efforts had produced the comprehensive master plan which President Paul called for in December 1956.

In the fall of 1968 Arnold Hanson once again directed the attention of the trustees to the need for reaching some conclusions about the directions which the College should be taking during the 1970s. As he and the trustees began developing their plans, and as some of the faculty began asking pointed questions about their adequacy, it became clear that the success of any new effort depended in large part upon the president's willingness to summon a broadly based group and offer it vigorous personal support until it reached conclusions which could gain wide acceptance.

The president announced in the spring of 1969 that a long-range planning and development committee would be created. He named its members in the fall: four trustees, four faculty, four administrators, and four students, with himself, the chairman of the board, and the assistant to the president as ex officio members. This committee held many meetings. Both board and faculty discussed the progress reports which were issued and made numerous suggestions for changes. After approving its work in principle on several occasions, the trustees adopted the final version during a special meeting in June 1972. It was released to faculty, administrators, trustees, and some others three months later. An abbreviated version, entitled Gettysburg College (1972-1982): A Projection for Growth and Development, was published as an issue of the College bulletin in May 1973. The closest thing to a master plan which the College had yet produced, the document contained authoritative statements on purpose, program, personnel, admissions, and development priorities. The latter included, in order of priority, maintenance and improvement of the current program, a new library, a creative and performing arts center, and increased endowment.

An issue of the College bulletin published in May 1977, as Arnold Hanson was retiring, and entitled Gettysburg: State of the College, described the extent to which the goals of the long-range plan had been met during its first five years in operation. This report introduced a topic entirely absent from previous planning docu-
ments. With the expected nationwide decline in the number of high school graduates, an outgoing tidal wave, it predicted that Gettysburg would face increasingly severe competition in recruiting the kind of students for whose benefit its academic program was designed. "The challenge of the years ahead," its authors proclaimed, "will be to increase the attractiveness of the College through improved facilities, programs, and financial position so that the College can continue to attract an able student body." 134

Charles Glassick came to the presidency with the firm conviction that, along with many similar colleges, Gettysburg faced more than a decade of potentially serious problems rooted in changing demographic patterns over which it had no control. He was equally firmly convinced that Gettysburg could respond most successfully to the situation in which it found itself only by engaging in careful and continuing planning. During his first years in office he convened a fiscal projections planning committee composed of trustees, faculty, administrators, and students. Its charge was to meet periodically and, to the best of its ability, maintain a five-year projection of the College’s financial position. In part as a reaction to the president’s proposal that enrollment be reduced about 10 percent over a period of several years, the faculty in the fall of 1980 authorized the establishment of a faculty institutional planning committee, which during the next two and one-half years of intensive effort attempted to cover much the same ground as the planning group of twenty years earlier. While it produced no comprehensive report, the findings of its fifteen task forces became available to standing committees and others for eventual disposition.

In the spring of 1983 the president established a strategic planning committee, consisting of three elected faculty members and two administrators. Its initial mission was to advise the president on matters relating to "the process of adjusting the College, including its budget, programs and personnel to changed enrollment circumstances," by which was clearly meant enrollment decline. 135 In January 1985 Glassick decided that conditions now warranted stating the task of the committee in more positive terms: to recommend "specific actions to be taken to advance the institution toward

134 Decade of Achievement: Gettysburg College (1960-1970), a bulletin issue published in May 1971, can be used together with the 1977 publication as a convenient summary of many aspects of the Arnold Hanson administration.
135 In June 1981 the president named a committee consisting of two trustees, two faculty, and two administrators to draw upon existing documents "to summarize the present and short-term future goals of the institution" in order to prepare an interim planning guide to be used until such time as a more inclusive replacement for the 1972-1982 document could be devised. The statement of purpose which this committee drafted gained faculty and board approval later in the year. Reflecting upon the earlier document in the mid-1980s. President Glassick concluded that it had been a sound and useful guide to him during the first five years of his presidency.
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becoming one of the most outstanding selective liberal arts colleges in the nation."

Intelligent planning at any time requires some measure of agreement concerning the purposes of the institution on whose behalf it is being undertaken. During more than the first century of the College's existence it did not seem necessary to express those purposes in writing, at least not in one officially approved document to which one could easily refer. In the early announcements of the College it was deemed sufficient to say that it was a college. Certainly the founders assumed every interested person would know what that meant. In their inaugural addresses, successive presidents usually explained their understanding of the liberal arts and how Gettysburg proposed to present them to its students. In occasional major statements addressed to the church, officers of the College discussed how its purposes were closely related to its Lutheran connection. At the same time, year after year one looks in vain to the annual catalogue for something helpful. Even the greatly revised issue of that publication which accompanied the major curricular revision of 1911 offered nothing more illuminating than the quotation from the charter that Gettysburg "promises to exert a salutary influence in advancing the cause of liberal education," and the further reminder that the College has always endeavored "to meet the special educational needs of the time and of the community."

Probably someone who inquired about the specific objectives and purposes of the College at almost any time before 1945 would have received an answer similar to the one given by the committee which the faculty commissioned in 1933 to formulate a statement of objectives and purposes: look at our curriculum and the regulations in force to conduct it; then you will know what we are. Actually, this answer was still very much in evidence forty years later. "We must be aware that one characteristic of the style of Gettysburg College, as manifested by many members of the faculty in recent years," the campus steering committee told the visiting Middle States team in 1973, "is a reluctance to develop detailed statements of purposes and then secure adherence to them. The purposes are to be seen rather from the way in which the institution in practice behaves."

Without fanfare, the committee preparing the 1945 catalogue added a three-paragraph foreword to that publication in which they declared that "mastery of ideas and discipline of the mind have been and are the primary purposes of a college." They stressed the equal importance of "a high standard of intellectual excellence" and "ideals of conduct." As always, they concluded, Gettysburg dedicates "all her resources to the high purposes of clear thinking

---

136See p. 549n.
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and noble living." This brief statement continued in use until it was supplemented and finally supplanted by a two-page explanation of the "educational objectives of Gettysburg College" which first appeared in the 1949 catalogue. In keeping with a long Gettysburg tradition, the statement asserted that "development of character," and it was clear that the authors meant Christian character, "becomes the basic aim of our entire campus program." 137

This document had some sanction, having been adapted from a brief statement of purposes, or philosophy of education, which the curriculum committee approved in January 1949 and presented to President Hanson, but apparently never submitted to the faculty for debate and vote. With the arrival of a new president in the fall of 1952, a briefer but somewhat more detailed statement was entered into the 1953 catalogue. Although Langsam pronounced the latter the College's "official 'educational objectives'" in his 1954 report to the Middle States Association, the new formulation did not survive his administration. The administrative committee which directed the College for a year after his departure did not hesitate to use a still briefer statement in the 1956 catalogue, listing four particular College aims: emphasizing "the importance of the Christian faith as an integrating force in life;" awakening interest in the humanities and sciences in order to enrich student "appreciations" and help develop "a worth-while philosophy of living;" enabling the student "to gain a solid and broad preparation" for a career and for taking "a creative part" in the world; and helping the student to give proper attention to physical well-being, wise use of leisure time, and the responsibility "to live in harmony" with self and others. In considerably altered form, this statement appeared in the next three catalogues. It disappeared from the issue published in 1960. 138

In the fall of 1958, the academic policy and program committee began considering what might eventually have become the first major revision in the calendar and curriculum since 1922. It soon concluded that any of the changes being discussed would touch upon so many aspects of campus life that they could not sensibly be proposed until a careful statement of the College's purposes was formulated and approved. Unable to find such a document at hand, the committee constructed what it called "a general statement to serve

137Six things were listed as essential to an education at Gettysburg: the habit of accurate observation, standards of judgment and self-measurement, comprehensive grasp of modern problems, basic understanding of principles of vocational success, ability to participate understandingly and creatively in community life, and sensitive appreciation of values.

138It is regrettable that there appears to be no good evidence to indicate whether any of these statements of purposes, all of which appeared in official College publications, were ever taken seriously. Apparently those responsible for successive catalogues believed they were free to change the statements as they wished.
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as a basis on which to work." Included in a report dated May 1959 and entitled "Gettysburg College: Its Future," it gained trustee approval a month later.139

While the committee's working paper might easily have been developed into a widely approved statement of College purposes, this did not happen. When the committee finally presented a series of major calendar and curricular proposals to the faculty in December 1960, it stated that "its total educational philosophy gradually emerged from working closely with the specifics of the college curriculum." The members said they had proceeded in this fashion because they early recognized "the difficulty of reaching agreement on all basic objectives."140

The first statement of College purposes which received the approval of representatives of trustees, faculty, administrators, and students was contained in A Projection for Growth and Development, adopted in 1972. Consisting of but three paragraphs, it had the virtue of brevity, but proved in that respect to be too righteous. Consequently, after considerable debate and reworking, in December 1977 the faculty adopted a statement presented by the academic policy and program committee, entitled the "Academic Purposes of Gettysburg College." It appeared in full in the 1979 and subsequent catalogues; concerted efforts were made to use it in making curricular decisions. Although drawn up at different times and by different persons, the statements of 1959 and 1977 are more remarkable for their similarities than for their differences.141

139The calendar and curricular study which a subcommittee of the joint planning committee began in 1957 was continued by the new faculty academic policy and program committee when it began functioning in the fall of that year. Professor Richard T. Mara was chairman of the subcommittee and then, from 1957 to 1959, of the faculty committee.

140The materials which the College submitted to the Middle States Association in February 1964 contained the full text of the 1959 statement. The lengthy section on College objectives in "Gettysburg College: The Direction of Its Future," the development brochure which the trustees approved in the fall of 1964, drew in part upon the 1959 statement and in part upon what the 1961 catalogue committee prepared.

141In submitting its version of the statement to the faculty in October 1977, the academic policy and program committee observed quite correctly that something "finally adopted by the faculty will have an official standing not held by statements written by individuals and editors of College publications acting in the absence of a stated faculty position."
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A Statement of Purpose

Chartered in 1832 for the express purpose of exerting "a salutary influence in advancing the cause of liberal education," Gettysburg College is a community committed to the discovery, exploration and evaluation of the ideas and actions of humanity and to the creative extension of that heritage. Gettysburg College cherishes its place in history as the oldest existing college affiliated with the Lutheran Church in America and intends to continue that church relatedness. By intent also, Gettysburg College is nonsectarian in its instruction and strives to serve students of all faiths.

To meet its commitment, Gettysburg College seeks foremost to establish and maintain an environment of inquiry, integrity, and mutual respect. In this setting, the College creates opportunities for students to learn specific intellectual skills and to strive for breadth of understanding. A rigorous program of undergraduate learning in the arts and sciences is complemented by student and religious life programs designed to challenge and enrich the academic experience.

Gettysburg College considers its purpose fulfilled if its students grow as critically informed, humane, and creative individuals and continue to grow in these qualities after they have left Gettysburg.

The Academic Program At the heart of Gettysburg College is the academic program which stresses logical, critical thinking and clear writing and speaking. Through a curriculum that derives its coherence from the tradition of liberal education, faculty introduce students to the assumptions and methods of a representative variety of academic disciplines in the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. Students are encouraged not only to specialize but also to broaden their understanding of the past and present intellectual, social, and cultural contexts within which knowledge lives. The academic program is designed to provide more than skills and intellectual perspective; it places these in a context of humane values such as openmindedness, personal responsibility, and mutual respect.

The Gettysburg faculty is dedicated to the goals of liberal learning; committed to professional development that serves and exemplifies those goals, responsible for periodic review of the curriculum, and eager to teach and learn with students in an open and trusting exchange.

Gettysburg's academic program can reach its full potential only if our students continue to have the ability and the inclination to profit from an intense liberal arts experience. The academic environment is further enriched when such students come from many socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds.

With a coherent curriculum, an able and dedicated faculty, and students committed to learning, the academic program seeks to free students from narrowness and provincialism and to free them for the joys and benefits of conscious intellectual strength and creativity. Gettysburg wants its students to learn a wise skepticism and a sense of human fallibility, to acquire new interests and orientations through liberating experiences of change and growth, and to learn to use the skills, knowledge, and values of a liberal education in an unending but satisfying search for wisdom and fullness of life.
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The Student Life Program  Students entering college are interested in discovering who they are. Because students often face critical decisions about personal values, occupational choices, and role identities during their college years, the student life program seeks to provide opportunities for resolution of these important matters. To assist students in weighing available options and making decisions, the student life program offers, for example, psychological and career counseling and informal seminars on a variety of topics. Personal contact with Gettysburg's faculty and administration provides the attentive student with a wide range of role models to contemplate. Gettysburg's annual lecture series further expands students' horizons.

The College also reveals its commitment to the total development of its students by encouraging them to play an important role in establishing and enforcing the conditions of campus life. Students supervise the academic Honor Code; students participate on certain trustee, faculty, and College planning and policy-making committees; and students fund and control many student activities.

To supplement what students learn through living on campus and participating in student development programs, the College provides a full and varied extracurricular program. This program encourages students to develop leadership skills by working in student government; to deepen their appreciation for the arts by participating in concerts, dramatic productions, and other performances; to sharpen their writing and speaking skills by contributing to College publications or broadcasts; and to enjoy the mental and physical self-discipline required by competition in intercollegiate, intramural, and recreational athletics.

The Religious Life Program  Gettysburg College has partnership agreements with the Central Pennsylvania and Maryland Synods of the Lutheran Church in America. These relationships and, more specifically, the campus religious life program, nurture intellectual values and give opportunities for the examination of spiritual and moral values and for commitments by those who choose to make them.

The religious life program of the College is designed to meet the needs of this religiously heterogeneous community to worship, to study, and to serve. The Chaplains, although they are employed by the College and report directly to the President, are called to this service by the synods of the Church. They assume primary responsibility for corporate worship; they counsel students and other campus personnel, help students and faculty plan programs to explore theological issues and to reach out to those in need, facilitate the work of local churches and denominational groups on the campus, and speak prophetically to issues of human justice when College values and College practice seem to diverge.

Gettysburg College best serves the Church through its performance as a superior educational institution in which the Church's commitments and practices may be tested.

Summary   Through its academic program, its student life program, and its religious life program, then, Gettysburg College provides for the development of the young adult as a whole person—intellectually, socially, emotionally, physically, and spiritually.

This 1981 statement was approved by faculty and trustees.
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Curriculum

Students entering Gettysburg College in the fall of 1945 found a curriculum consisting of 224 courses of instruction, not all of which ran for the same length of time (some were one- and some were two-term courses) or carried the same amount of academic credit (it ran from none in the case of shorthand to eight in the sciences). The distribution requirements which every degree candidate had to meet amounted to 66 semester hours, slightly more than half of the 120 hours required for graduation. All students took the yearlong courses in English (six hours), orientation (four hours), and Bible (four hours). Beyond these three there were no specific courses which every student had to take. Each person chose one of the fifteen acceptable major fields of study, as well as two minor fields; together these consumed at least 48 semester hours. The remaining 16 hours which most students were permitted to take without special permission were available for electives. The normal load for freshmen and sophomores was fifteen or sixteen semester hours (five courses) each term. For juniors and seniors it was up to eighteen semester hours (outside the sciences, up to six courses) each term. With a number of important exceptions (for example, the addition of a required orientation course and the elimination of engineering), this was the curriculum which went into effect in the fall of 1922.

President Hanson’s request to the curriculum committee in February 1945 that it begin a study of course offerings “with the postwar period in mind” led the members of that body to renew an inquiry as old as the College itself: what are other schools doing? Still pinned to some of the 1945 committee minutes forty years later were clippings of articles which were then appearing in the New York Times and which provided an answer to the question. Convinced that the times called for students to grapple with a common core of learning, some schools were now considering required courses in what was called general education. Acting in what was for Gettysburg unaccustomed haste, by the fall of 1945 the faculty, led by the curriculum committee, was actively discussing existing programs at Amherst, Columbia, and Harvard. The administration cooperated by making available copies of the famous General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge, 1945). Early in 1946 four members of the faculty visited Columbia and one went to Princeton to study firsthand what these

---

142 Excluded from these totals is the required program in physical education or military science. Requirements for a student who began a foreign language totaled 74 hours.

143 See Rudolph, American College, pp. 455-456, for a brief treatment of an earlier general education movement.
schools were doing. In informing the alumni of what was occurring, President Hanson in November 1945 assured them that Gettysburg was acting in thoroughly traditional fashion. While adjusting "ourselves to any improvements or needed developments for effective teaching in the world of tomorrow," he wrote, we are going to retain the best "gleaned from a hundred years' experience."

In the spring of 1946 the curriculum committee established, and the faculty subsequently approved, three experimental two-term courses to be offered during the 1946-1947 year. Two of the three were given for the first time in the fall of 1946: Introduction to Contemporary Civilization and Literary Foundations of Western Culture. The experiment went well enough so that in March 1947 the faculty approved what was called the unified course for freshmen, to begin in the fall: Introduction to Contemporary Civilization, English Composition, the Bible course (Old Testament History and the Life of Christ), and two other offerings (which might include a language, a science, or some other course). A committee was authorized to make exceptions to the first three courses in hardship cases, but it was assumed these would be few.\(^{144}\) When it approved the unified course for freshmen, the faculty decreed that, beginning in the fall of 1948, Literary Foundations of Western Culture would be required of all sophomores.

Although when it acted in 1947 the faculty certainly considered Contemporary Civilization, Literary Foundations, English Composition, and Bible, taken together, as the common core of what it now expected of all students, when most people used the term general education, they were referring only to the first two of these courses. Beginning with the 1948 catalogue, they were placed first in the listing of courses of instruction, set off under the heading of general education from all of the rest, which were labeled departmental courses. From 1948 through 1969 successive catalogues contained the following explanation of why these courses were so integral a part of the Gettysburg curriculum:

> In view of the growing complexity of our civilization and our increasing awareness of individual responsibility, it has become apparent that premature specialization and the departmental isolation of students and teachers are no longer either ethically defensible or socially practicable. An education valid for our world must find its basis in an integrated understanding of man in his essential roles: as living creature in the natural universe, as inheritor of a rich and significant past, as participant in human institutions, and as discoverer (and creator) of patterns and values which give mean-

---

\(^{144}\)Credit for the Bible course was increased from four to six hours at this time, and the orientation course required for some twenty years was dropped. During the next twenty years many exceptions were made for freshmen whose program could not easily accommodate the three required courses.
ing to human existence. Similarly, the wise choice of a vocation and adequate training in its special techniques must be based upon an inclusive knowledge of the chief fields of human endeavor and some appreciation of the special potentialities and obligations of the various callings.

Contemporary Civilization (C.C.) and Literary Foundations (Lit. Found.) were required of all Gettysburg students for a period of twenty-two years, from 1947 through the spring of 1969.\textsuperscript{145} The catalogue described the C.C. course as an introduction "to the back-

\textsuperscript{145}A few transfer students were excused from the requirement. The third general education course established in 1946, one in the fundamentals of the physical sciences, was never offered. From time to time a subcommittee reported some progress in planning such a course, but the fact remains that there was never enough support among those expected to teach it to make it feasible as a requirement for all students. There were eventually other general education courses, including World Literature since 1830 and Development of the Sciences of Man, but they were always electives.
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grounds of contemporary social problems through the major concepts, ideals, hopes, and motivations of western culture since the Middle Ages." The same source presented Lit. Found. as "an introduction to the ideas and forms of Western thought, presented through reading and interpretation of selected classics: Homer through St. Augustine and Dante through Goethe." With the support of Henry W.A. Hanson and his successors, sections of both courses averaged no more than twenty-five students. The 1950 catalogue listed fourteen instructors teaching the freshman course and eleven teaching the sophomore course. In 1965 the numbers listed were seventeen and seventeen. Over the years most of the C.C. instructors were drawn from the history, philosophy, and religion departments, although many others were represented for varying periods of time. Most of the Lit. Found. instructors were members of the language and literature departments. A few persons, beginning with Richard Arms, at one time or another offered both courses. Almost without exception, no one taught more than one section at a time. The staffs met regularly to discuss matters of content and method.

At first the texts in the freshman course were four volumes published in 1946 and 1948 and used in a similar course which had been introduced at Columbia University in 1919. As early as November 1946 Professor Norman E. Richardson, who served as chairman of the C.C. course during the entire period it was required of all students, expressed the hope that the Gettysburg instructors would develop their own text, as the curriculum committee minutes express it, "in line with our own needs and our own point of view." This hope became a reality in the fall of 1955, when students in the course began using two volumes whose contents were written by C.C. instructors, two of whom served as editors, and which were produced on the Gettysburg campus. The texts used in the Lit. Found. course were modern editions of classical writers from Homer through Goethe.

The success of a venture such as this depended largely upon the ability and commitment of those who were called upon to teach in it. It is indicative of the state of mind of the Gettysburg faculty in the early postwar years, when the student-faculty ratio was the highest in the history of the College, that the persons responsible for staffing

146 The instructors listed in the 1955 catalogue represented nine departments: biology, education, German, history, philosophy, physics, political science, psychology, and religion. Those listed in 1965 represented five: English, history, philosophy, political science, and religion.
147 An Introduction to Contemporary Western Civilization and Its Problems was published in 1955 and 1956. A second edition, also of two volumes, Ideas and Institutions of Western Man, was published in 1958 and 1960. These materials were used into the mid-1960s.
these two courses could secure enough able and committed persons to make the experiment a decidedly successful one. The report of the 1954 Middle States team, which praised the general education program, nevertheless declared that "conversations with students indicated that general education I [C.C.] is too difficult," and concluded that a look at the 1952-1953 grade distribution in the course (5.9 percent A and 20.6 percent D and F) "may indicate that the students' criticism has some validity."

According to the team report, "the students did not offer any objections to General Education II," whose grade distribution approached "the curve satisfactorily." However valid the criticism might have been, there is evidence that, for many years after the unified course for freshmen was introduced in 1947, C.C., English Composition, and Bible offered a truly rigorous introduction to the Gettysburg curriculum, one which relatively few freshmen may have looked upon kindly while they were experiencing it, but which in later years they remembered as a genuinely worthwhile learning experience.

Between 1945 and the early 1960s the introduction of general education was not the only curricular development which occurred at Gettysburg. Six deserve mention. First, the faculty approved several amendments to the distribution requirements, the most important of which, in 1948, was the addition of four semester hours in what were first called appreciation courses. Although other work was sometimes accepted in meeting this requirement, for all practical purposes it was one in art and music. The distribution requirements listed in the 1961 catalogue totaled about the same as those of 1945. Second, six new major fields of study were introduced: social science (1946), psychology (1946), physical education (1948), music (1951), sociology (1953), and art (1960).

Third, in 1947 the faculty reintroduced senior comprehensive examinations, beginning with the class entering that fall, and the first postwar examinations occurred on schedule in the spring of 1951. The same gap between the ideal and the reality of these examinations which had bedeviled the College before World War II

\[\text{149}
\]

Strangely enough, the team did not comment upon the fact that the percentages of A's and B's, as well as of D's and F's, in C.C. and in English Composition were almost the same. In 1963-1964 the grade distributions in Bible, C.C., and English Composition were almost exactly the same.

\[\text{148}
\]

According to the 1947 catalogue, social science was an "inter-departmental combination major" for "students preparing for social work." It was "not a terminal vocational course," but one designed "for those intending to continue their preparation in graduate school." The 1949 catalogue extended the purposes to "those students who wish general knowledge of the social sciences." Concluding that this major was not providing a satisfactory degree of concentration, the faculty dropped it in 1953, after more than one hundred students had chosen it. The following became minor fields at the time indicated: psychology (1940), music (1947), sociology (1949), speech (1951), dramatics (1951), art (1954), and Russian (1961).
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A fourth curricular development was the introduction of bachelor of science programs in health and physical education (1954) and in music education (1955). Reporting to the board in June 1953, while these programs were being developed, President Langsam explained that they were limited to fields "in which the special needs of certain professionally minded members of our constituency conflict with the full liberal-arts character of the traditional A.B. degree." The 1954 Middle States report recommended that the faculty "consider the possibility of a B.S. degree" in certain fields. The faculty closed entry into the science program in health and physical education beginning in June 1962. That in music education remained in 1965.150

Fifth, in 1952 the College began entering into cooperative professional and similar programs, in which the student usually spent three years at Gettysburg and one or two years at the other institution, during the course of which a bachelor's and a master's degree could be earned. The number of students participating in these programs was never large, but they offered advantages to those who wished to study in a liberal-arts college and a professional school.151

Sixth, the College began devising ways for its students to engage in approved off-campus study. The first of these, in 1957, with American University, made it possible for Gettysburg students to participate in the Washington Semester. The opportunity to spend an approved junior year abroad was first listed in the 1959 catalogue. By the mid-1960s students were informed that "arrangements can be made with one of the many regularly organized programs of study in Europe, Latin America, or elsewhere." In the early 1980s there were several off-campus programs, in which about twenty-five students participated each year.152

The Middle States team which visited the College in March 1954

150 Another reason for the B.S. in health and physical education was to permit a student to seek both teacher certification and complete the R.O.T.C. program, in the wake of the Korean War.

151 Agreements were made with the School of Forestry of Duke University (1952), the School of Engineering of Pennsylvania State University (1952), the Lutheran Deaconess Motherhouse School in Baltimore (1953), and the School of Engineering of New York University (1962). The cooperative engineering programs were dropped in 1964, but several new ones were authorized in 1973.

152 During the Langsam administration the faculty considered reintroducing master's work during the summer session. In March 1954 it actually approved in principle the graduate program which the curriculum and policy committee proposed. The Middle States team was critical of the plan, pointing to the lack of adequate resources and of clearly defined purposes, and it was soon dropped. Several later studies led to the conclusion that the College should confine its attention to undergraduate work.
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came to the conclusion that its curriculum was "too rigid," by which they clearly meant that, in their opinion, both distribution and concentration requirements were excessive. They described the language and literature requirements as "extraordinarily high," and believed that the postwar addition of required courses in general education and appreciation, however valuable for the student, had only made things worse. "A student may have only one or two free electives," they noted, "after the various requirements are met." Team members were pleased to find in the curriculum and policy committee minutes evidence that "the faculty is aware of many problems and needs of curriculum revision." Probably few of them were naive enough to believe that being aware of problems and needs is the inevitable preliminary to doing something about them. In his farewell message in June 1955 President Langsam also noted that, in spite of some recent changes, the curriculum was still "too rigid and inflexible to meet the needs of our current constituents." A year and a half later, the General could find no better term than "too rigid" to convey his impression of the existing curriculum.

The new president diverted whatever momentum there might have been at this time for prompt response to the Middle States recommendations into a study of how best to handle the Gettysburg contingent of the tidal wave of students. He favored dividing the year from September through August into three terms, each equivalent in length to a traditional semester, with brief vacations between each of the so-called trimesters. In this way the College could accommodate some 2,250 students during a twelve-month period without an increase in facilities. Faculty members on the joint planning committee and later on the new academic policy and program committee soon convinced the General to join with them in turning their investigation from the trimester to the quarter system, in which an entire year would be divided into four eleven-week terms. The proposal which the latter committee presented for the preliminary reaction of the trustees in December 1958 called for fall, winter, and spring terms only, running from September to June. Its members believed that this calendar arrangement had distinct academic advantages entirely apart from the question of year-round operations. They hoped that it could be approved and placed in operation in 1960-1961. The General lent his support to the committee proposal, arguing that, if approved, "the College will be a leader in its group and ready without too much confusion to adopt a fourth quarter if and when demand justifies it."

At this point the academic policy and program committee decided that it should not proceed with further development of the quartersystem proposal until it could devise and secure approval of a statement of College purposes. Although a tentative statement was
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approved in June 1959, not until December 1960 did the committee present to the faculty (and trustees) the series of motions necessary to move the College from a two-semester to what was now being called a three-term system. 133 The General saw this proposal as forward-looking and responsible, in the public interest. Many faculty, unconvinced that year-round operations for Gettysburg College were either necessary or desirable, and conservative (to say the least) when it came to curricular change, were reluctant to vote for this proposal, especially since they believed that it might soon be used to introduce such operations. A secret ballot taken on the calendar and curricular portions of the committee proposal in February 1961 resulted in their decisive defeat, by a vote of 38 to 77. All that was salvaged from this major effort to secure calendar and curricular revision was a significant reduction of about fifteen hours in the distribution requirements. It was approved in October 1961, but only by the narrowest of margins: 50 to 48.134

In his first report to the board of trustees in December 1956, the General stated that, while he did not "subscribe to the idea of adding courses and electives and faculty just to make a showing," he did believe that "as an up to date Liberal Arts College we should have a wider variety of language and area studies, particularly of the Asian-Africa block of nations. In addition, we should have a well defined Department of Geography, courses in Geology, a Department of Political Science, and courses in international relations." Acting upon a suggestion which the Middle States team had made, he established a separate department of political science a few months later.135

One of the curricular steps which the General wanted the faculty to take began near the end of his administration. Under the chairmanship of Professor Norman E. Richardson, in 1960 a committee began exploring ways in which to introduce Non-Western studies into the curriculum. Eventually six area colleges (Dickinson, Gettys-
burg, Hood, Mount St. Mary's, St. Joseph's, and Western Maryland) applied to the Ford Foundation for the necessary financial support. Grants of $180,000 in 1962 and $40,000 in 1965, supplemented by funds from the six colleges themselves, made it possible for faculty members from each school to engage in an intensive eighteen-month period of reading, seminars, and graduate study or travel. Some of the funds were used for the purchase of library materials. Among the many results of this effort were several new courses on India and China (the areas included in the program) which were still in the curriculum a quarter century later.

As the time for the second decennial Middle States evaluation approached, the executive secretary of the association informed the College that, since its continued accreditation was not at stake, it could dispense with the usual comprehensive review and instead use the occasion to secure the help of a group of outsiders in dealing with some of the important issues then before the College. Accepting this proposal, faculty and administrators drew up a list of twelve questions for consideration during the visit, the most important of which dealt with how to increase the level of expectation of students, how to make them more responsible for their own learning, and how best to assist them in developing sound values for their lives. The Middle States team visited the College in March 1964. The concluding paragraph in its report summarized the advice which its members had for the Gettysburg faculty:

We do not believe that the college can successfully attain more independent study in the general student body unless the student's course-load is sharply diminished. This may be the point at which the study of the curriculum should begin. Our report closes with the obvious admonition: Effective independent study begins with the gamble of cutting the student free to accept or not to accept the challenge of self-education.

In the fall of 1964 the academic policy and program committee informed the faculty that it was resuming the curricular review

---

156 Later grants from other sources made possible faculty study in other Non-Western areas. The General's efforts to introduce a Portuguese language program, suggested by the federal government, were not successful.

157 These were not new questions. A prominent feature of the curricular discussions which began in 1957 was the desire to offer special opportunities for superior students, more of whom the faculty hoped to attract in the future. A report which the academic policy and program committee issued in November 1959 stopped short of advocating a formal honors program with a special honors degree, similar to those in some other colleges, but it did urge departments to increase opportunities for honors-type work and faculty to study the feasibility of a formal Collegewide program within a decade. In April 1962 Professor Mara presented to the planning group a lengthy "working paper," entitled "Ways of Challenging Students," which urged the faculty and administration to do many things to challenge all students, not only the best ones.
which had been dropped more than three years earlier. Between then and the end of 1965 the committee visited the departments and engaged in what it hoped would be “frank discussions” with their members, in an effort to determine how much support, if any, there was for change, as well as the direction which any change might be expected to take. Committee members found many colleagues at least willing to consider reducing both the number of courses students could take in any one term and the number of distribution requirements. Beyond that, they were given little helpful guidance.

Although the faculty began discussing alternatives to the existing calendar and curricular system early in 1967, it was not until the fall that the academic policy and program committee, sensing that the faculty might be about ready to act, proposed a timetable by which its sentiments might be tested during the 1967-1968 year. In numerous regular and informal meetings, the faculty responded positively to most of the committee’s initiatives. First, it narrowly rejected the thirty-two course system which the committee first presented; the vote was 54-55. Second, it overwhelmingly approved a thirty-six course system, later deciding that a student must pass thirty-five courses in order to be graduated. Third, it determined that all courses should be of equal credit value, excepting only a few in health and physical education and music education. Fourth, it considered three calendars accommodating a thirty-six course system and, by a wide margin, selected 4-1-4.158 Fifth, it redefined the major field of study (eight to twelve courses) and eliminated the minor field. Sixth, it adopted a set of distribution requirements which accounted for about one-third of the student’s total program, down considerably from the one-half or more which had prevailed for most of the time since 1922. Seventh and finally, as agreed upon at the beginning of the debate, on April 25, 1968 by secret ballot the faculty considered the question of reaffirming its previous actions. The vote was 87 to 7.159

Obviously, for the first time since 1921-1922 the Gettysburg faculty had firmly committed itself to major calendar and curricular change, even to the point of actually voting decisively for it. In reducing from forty-four to thirty-six the number of courses a student could take, without at the same time greatly increasing the rigidity of the curriculum, it was necessary to effect a significant

158 The three calendars, all of which were already in use in other institutions, were 4-1-4 (four courses in the fall, one in January, and four in the spring), 3-3-3 (three courses during each of three ten-week terms), and 5-5-4-4 (five courses during the first two years and four during the last two). The faculty began considering 4-1-4 as early as the January 1967 meeting. During the 1967-1968 debate, the faculty changed its preference from 4-1-4 to 4-4-1, but later reversed itself.

159 Later, in the fall, the faculty voted to make senior comprehensives optional, which was a long step toward making them a thing of the past.
reduction in the distribution requirements. One evident place to begin was with the unified course for freshmen, and with general education. C.C., Lit. Found., and English Composition were eliminated as requirements (they continued as electives), and the Bible requirement was reduced from two courses to one. In the spring of 1968 the faculty created a general education committee and charged it with developing and administering elective courses offered under that rubric.

The faculty spent part of the 1968-1969 year in preparing the courses which would be offered when the new calendar and curriculum went into effect in the fall of 1969. Although much attention was riveted on the proposed January term offerings, the departments were responsible for developing first new fall and spring term courses, each of which would occupy one-fourth of the time of a conscientious full-time student. As far as the committee which proposed it was concerned, the new system was based on four closely related, but often misunderstood, assumptions. First, all of the new courses would be devised in an effort to encourage, even require, students to assume a greater responsibility for their own learning than in the past. Second, what took place during the January term was expected in every case to have the academic content necessary for it to qualify as one of the thirty-six courses a student took. Third, during each January term there would be a variety of academic experiences, some similar to and others different from fall and spring term courses. Fourth, while the faculty classroom teaching load was decreased under 4-1-4, this was intended to effect a rearrangement of the way in which a faculty member used his or her working time and certainly not a decrease in the number of hours which it consumed. Less time spent in class would probably

---

180By 1967-1968 much of the faculty enthusiasm which had long carried the required general education courses was missing. This was especially true of the C.C. course. Some younger faculty who were determined to advance their professional careers, at a time when colleges were increasing their emphasis on scholarly activity, were reluctant to spend their time teaching a nondepartmental, general education course for freshmen. Strangely enough for a liberal arts college, a few faculty argued that virtually no one was prepared to teach the C.C. course. Many faculty who remained convinced that the two general education courses were fully justified as requirements had to weigh that conviction against one which held that the best interests of the College in the late 1960s required a reduction in the number of different courses a student was taking at one time as well as in the number of required courses. By now the pendulum, at Gettysburg and elsewhere, had swung away from the notion that there should be a core curriculum to the notion that no course should be required of all students. Under the new curriculum none, not even the religion course, was. The only possible exception was the course in health and physical education, which was not listed as a distribution requirement.

181Beginning with the 1976 catalogue, courses previously listed under general education were called interdisciplinary courses.
be more than matched by time spent in working with students in other ways and in increased scholarly activity.\textsuperscript{162}

In the fall of 1969 Gettysburg joined some fifty other colleges and universities using the 4-1-4 system. Before long most students taking four courses during the fall and spring terms found it difficult, for one reason or another, to understand how their predecessors could ever have handled five or six. January offered students a variety of educational opportunities, in all of which they devoted their efforts to one course only, presumably with fewer diversions than during the rest of the year. There was concentrated study on campus, either independently or in classes. There was off-campus study of many different kinds, both in this country and abroad.\textsuperscript{163} No one investigated how many managed to turn their January term into a winter holiday of up to four weeks, but during most of the seventies there was general agreement that enough students were making good use of the distinctive educational features of the January term to justify its continuance as an integral feature of the College calendar. The admissions staff reported that it was a positive factor in recruiting.

Calendar and curricular change at the end of the 1960s did not prevent further adjustments in the academic program during the 1970s. Pass-fail grading, first introduced in 1967, continued, but apparently it was not often used by those who wanted to venture forth into areas of the curriculum in which they had little previous experience; this was the strongest reason advanced for adopting it. In 1969 the faculty approved a special major, which the catalogue defined as "interdisciplinary concentrations or sequences of courses to focus on particular problems or possible areas of investigation, which, though not adequately included within a single department or discipline are worthy of the effort." Freshman seminars were begun in the fall of 1971 and for several years close to one hundred entering students chose a one-term experience dealing in a small class with a topic of interest to them. After several years fewer and fewer freshmen registered for the seminars, and in 1979 they were dropped. Possibly the waning interest was related to the declining preparation of entering students, a decline which Gettysburg experienced along with many other schools. This declining preparation of both men and women students prompted the faculty in 1976 to institute an English proficiency requirement.\textsuperscript{164}

\textsuperscript{162}What was probably most distinctive about 4-1-4 at Gettysburg College was the fact that the January term was required of all students and that the January course was treated as the equivalent of every other course.

\textsuperscript{163}In 1979 and 1980, for example, about 350 students were engaged in individualized study, internships, off-campus courses, and exchange programs.

\textsuperscript{164}By the end of the 1960s, after more than a decade of steadily increasing preparation of students to do high-grade College work, at least as measured by the commonly used verbal and mathematical scores, so many students were being exempted from English Composition that few opposed dropping it entirely as a requirement.
year the English department established a writing center to assist students in development of one of their most necessary skills.

A curricular innovation introduced in 1974 was directed to able students nearing the end of their undergraduate careers. The Senior Scholars' Seminar was designed to provide a small group of students, selected from as many different disciplines as possible, with the opportunity to spend a term together in intense study of an important contemporary issue. Guided by two faculty members, and assisted by a number of outside resource persons, up to twenty students each year had an opportunity to evaluate a mass of information on the chosen topic, contribute insights from their own major discipline, and benefit from encounters with those offered
from other disciplines. Topics covered during the first decade of the seminar included genetic engineering, conflict resolution, computers and human communication, aging and the aged, and dissent and nonconformity.

There were important changes in the R.O.T.C. program during the 1970s, to understand which some background is necessary. In 1947 Gettysburg became one of four Pennsylvania schools to be awarded a unit of Air R.O.T.C., to which women students were first admitted in 1952. After a 1964 act of Congress authorized two-year (junior and senior) R.O.T.C. programs, the faculty voted to drop the basic, or freshman and sophomore, course. Gettysburg proved to be one of the few institutions with units to follow this course of action. Nine years later, in 1973, the faculty reinstated both four-year programs (both now open to women), while still retaining the ones covering the junior and senior years only. Because of low enrollment, and after several vigorous efforts to retain it, the Department of Defense disbanded the Gettysburg Air R.O.T.C. unit at the end of the 1976-1977 year.

The steering committee chosen to prepare for the 1973 Middle States visit to the College proposed, as an appropriate topic for consideration at that time, an evaluation of the new calendar and curriculum, after it had been in operation for four years. The team report, based upon discussions with many faculty members and students, stated that Gettysburg had "clearly profited from its new calendar device," but expressed the opinion that "the energizing quality" of the January term had "begun to run down with the passage of time." Team members thought they had detected a "trend toward traditionalizing." After talking with students, they doubted "whether the new system was sufficiently stimulating students to take greater responsibility for their own education or to take learning risks." Their recommendation was, not to abandon the existing system, but rather to reform it. In their opinion, "Gettysburg was again in late 1973 at a fork in the road." Would it revert to "the more conservative, traditional style of the past" or would it act to insure "a continuing attention to change and experimentation?"

Although there was dissatisfaction with the existing system and some agreement that, figuratively at least, the College stood at a fork in the road at the end of 1973, few seemed to be certain of the direction in which to move when the faculty began its post accreditation curricular review in the spring of 1974. Debates on the honor system, the faculty career process documents, and other matters preoccupied the body for months. Curricular discussion, once resumed, focused on several topics, including the possible reintroduction of specific required courses and changes in the distribution requirements. After several years of debating the advantages and
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disadvantages, in 1980 the faculty abandoned the idea of introducing four core courses. Instead, beginning in 1983 it did require all entering students to participate in a course called the Freshman Colloquy, intended, in catalogue terms, to “strengthen reason, writing, and speaking skills” by means of “intensive writing and class discussion.” In 1984, after having added three courses to the distribution requirements since the 4-1-4 system was introduced, the faculty eliminated several others, reducing the total once more to about one-third of the number of courses required for graduation.

On several occasions after 1974, the faculty reaffirmed its commitment to the 4-1-4 calendar. Enough doubts about its wisdom for the future remained, however, to warrant the academic policy and program committee’s introducing a motion in the spring of 1984 to return to the two-semester calendar, while retaining the requirement of thirty-five courses for graduation. The issue at this time was not nearly as clear-cut as the one before the faculty seventeen years earlier, when the sentiment for change, for some promising change, was nearly unanimous. In 1984 the defenders of the 4-1-4 calendar argued that educational opportunities which the January term (or possible May term) offered students were one of the strongest and most useful features of the Gettysburg program. Correct weaknesses and add to strength, they argued, but do not abandon the system. Opponents noted that many schools had already dropped the January term and questioned whether there remained sufficient faculty faith in its educational advantages for it to be the quality program which the College needed. In December, by a 60 to 42 vote, the faculty decided to adopt a two-semester calendar, under which students would normally take four courses during four terms and five courses during the remaining four. The 4-1-4 calendar came to an end at the close of the 1984-1985 year.

After 1945 faculty were, if anything, more convinced than their predecessors had been of the need to supplement formal instruction by inviting many lecturers and performers to the campus. In 1953 President Langsam established a lecture and concert committee, through which College funds could be used more effectively for that purpose. A revised faculty committee rule in 1965 divided the increasingly large task between two committees: one on lectures and the other on performing arts. The lecturers invited to the campus reflected the changing concerns of the times; Arnold J. Toynbee, Ralph Nader, Shirley Chisholm, Bill Bradley, John Dean, and Ben-

165 These courses would have been quite different from the C.C. and Lit. Found. courses.

188 The three added were the English proficiency requirement, the colloquy, and a Non-Western course which became effective in 1981. The faculty introduced an optional minor field of study in 1980.
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jamin Spock are but a few examples. Increasingly, guests were asked to spend more than one day on the campus and students joined in the choice of persons to whom invitations were given. The College chapter of Phi Beta Kappa participated in the national Phi Beta Kappa Visiting Scholar Program from the time of its inception in 1956. A one-month artist-in-residence program, in either theater or music, began in 1967. The John B. Zinn seminars regularly brought outstanding chemists to the campus.

Several gifts increased the number of endowed cultural activities beyond the two funded lectureships (Stuckenber and Bell) in existence in 1945. The gift of Clyde E. Gerberich of the class of 1913, and his wife, in 1966 assured continuance of the Robert Fortenbaugh Memorial Lectures on the Civil War.167 Gerberich and Fortenbaugh were College classmates. A 1976 gift from F. William Sunderbaum was used to establish the Henry M. Scharf Lecture on Current Affairs. Sunderbaum and Scharf were friends who served together as trustees. In 1977 the Musselman Foundation's gift made possible the Musselman Visiting Scientist program. Finally, a 1983 gift from F. William Sunderbaum was used to establish the Sunderbaum Chamber Music Foundation, designed to promote chamber music at the College.

The 1984-1985 Gettysburg curriculum included over five hundred courses, more than twice as many as were listed in the catalogue forty years earlier. With but few exceptions, all of them carried one course credit. The distribution requirements applicable beginning in 1984-1985 (and now called College-course and distribution requirements) were as follows:

- Proficiency in written English, one course;
- Freshman colloquy, one course;
- Foreign language, one to four courses;
- Arts, one course;
- History or philosophy, one course;
- Literature, one course;
- Natural science, two courses;
- Religion, one course;
- Social science, one course; and
- Non-Western culture, one course.188

Acting within guidelines established by the faculty, departments could require between eight and twelve courses for a major field of

167See p. 995 for more information on this lecture.
188Students were also required to take three quarter courses in health and physical education. Those who entered with strong preparation in a foreign language and who could demonstrate English proficiency needed to complete only ten required courses. The maximum number required was fourteen. While these figures represent a lower percentage of the total number of courses required for graduation than at any time since 1922, it should be noted that the Gettysburg faculty never subscribed to the view current in the later 1960s and early 1970s that required work should be eliminated.
study, the number of which had increased from fifteen in 1945 to twenty-three forty years later. The fifteen major fields of 1945 were Bible (called religion beginning in 1969), biology, chemistry, economics, English, French, German, Greek, history, Latin, mathematics, philosophy, physics, political science, and Spanish. All fifteen remained in 1985. In addition, students could now major in psychology, health and physical education, music, sociology (called sociology and anthropology beginning in 1963), business administration (listed first as a separate field in the 1954 catalogue), art, classical studies (approved by the faculty in 1981), and music education (listed first as a separate field in the 1982 catalogue).

Perhaps the most striking difference between the curriculums of 1945 and 1985 was that the faculty had incorporated into the latter much of the vast amounts of new learning which had occurred in almost every field during the intervening forty years. New learning was not a new phenomenon. The faculty had been dealing with it for a century or more. What was distinctive about the period after 1945 was the sheer quantity involved. Most 1985 courses required (or at least expected) significant amounts of reading, written work, and use of the library. Virtually every department offered individualized study and seminars, especially for but not always limited to seniors. In some departments participation in a seminar was required. In science and related fields, students could sometimes engage in research working closely with a faculty member.

Although after 1945 Gettysburg continued to insist that her commitment to the liberal arts was as strong as ever, this did not mean (clearly it had never meant) that her faculty and students were uninterested in how an undergraduate curriculum was, or should be, related to the graduate's subsequent career. To the extent that the College from its earliest days was willing to train public school teachers it was, in a sense, presenting a professional along with an undergraduate liberal-arts program. When it established a department of education in 1921, in response to state legislation regulating teacher certification, and began offering a student after four years both a bachelor of arts degree and eligibility to qualify for a teaching certificate, it accorded first rank to its one program which was clearly a professional one.

Several developments after 1945 illustrated the faculty's willingness to extend its teacher education program, apparently in the belief that the type of undergraduate training which it offered gave

---

198 The faculty approved a major in management to replace business administration in 1985.

170 In an effort to introduce a greater degree of uniformity into one student-one instructor opportunities for learning, the faculty in 1974 approved the designation Individualized Study for tutorial, research, and internship arrangements, each of which was defined.
Six of the long-term faculty employed in 1959.

promise of preparing superior teachers. Examples included the bachelor of science programs in health and physical education and in music education, both introduced in the mid-1950s. After much study and debate, an elementary education program was introduced in 1963. Two years later the faculty approved what was called an educational term, during which all of a student's efforts could be devoted to teacher training. At the same time it established a teacher education committee, its members drawn from many departments, to oversee the program, in cooperation with the department of education. One of its most important duties was to determine admission to the program. Changes in state regulations in the mid-1960s increased the College role in issuing teaching certificates, once the state department of public instruction passed favorably upon each of its subject-area programs, the eighteenth and last of which was approved in late 1967. During the 1960s 825 students completed the
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College's secondary and 164 its elementary education programs. The figures for the 1970s were 478 secondary and 298 elementary. The annual average for the 1960s was about 100 students and for the 1970s about 77. The 1980 catalogue informed readers that the College still maintained a teacher placement bureau and that all of the 1979 graduates of its teacher education programs who sought teaching positions had found them.

Although for many years after 1945 the catalogue referred to "premedical majors" in biology and in chemistry, the fact remains that the College did not have a prescribed major course of study for either premedical or prelaw students. This was a deliberate policy, and not the result of default. The faculty had little desire for Gettysburg to become known as a premedical college, but departments offering courses which medical schools recommended or required for admission maintained standards which, they believed, would satisfy both graduate and professional schools which their students might wish to enter. The premedical committee established in 1939 continued to advise students who sought its help and also to make all College recommendations for medical schools. Students were free to ignore the committee and apply on their own. The few who did were rarely successful. According to a 1974-1975 study, during the quarter century between 1950 and 1974 some 230 graduates entered a total of twenty-nine medical schools. Of these, about 60 percent enrolled at Jefferson, Temple, Hahnemann, and Pennsylvania.171

During much of the period between 1945 and 1985 departments assumed full responsibility for advising and recommending their majors who intended to become lawyers. The dean of the College named a prelaw committee in 1955, but it became inactive after a few years. A second committee, appointed in 1974, developed a comprehensive program of providing students who sought its help with both information and advice, but left to its members and other faculty the task of writing individual letters of recommendation. Accurate data on Gettysburg graduates attending law schools during most or all of the forty years after 1945 were not available, but a survey of graduates in the 1967-1971 classes reported 102 as having entered law school.172

171See pp. 570-571 for a discussion of what amounted to a premedical major introduced about 1940. The information covering the years 1950-1974 comes from an untitled study in the GCA. Its authors were correct in declaring (p. 7) that "our curriculum is in no way tailored or specially administered to any group of students." The 1954 Middle States report commended the biology staff "for maintaining their department as one of comparative biology and not merely a training center for premedical students."

172 Untitled survey in GCA. A study for the three years 1975-1977 reported 58 graduates in law school.
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As graduate schools expanded after World War II to meet the increasing demands of higher education, industry, and government for highly trained persons, the faculty responded by encouraging more promising students to consider graduate study. Especially after the arrival of Seymour Dunn in 1955, the dean's office assiduously informed both departments and students of available opportunities, especially to secure scholarships and fellowships, that might not otherwise come to their attention. In addition to direct financial assistance from graduate schools, beginning with the class of 1950 high-ranking Gettysburg students interested in college teaching could compete for the Henry W.A. Hanson scholarship. Later, national awards such as the Woodrow Wilson and Danforth fellowships prompted students to prepare for college teaching. The first Gettysburg recipient of a Woodrow Wilson was selected in 1960 and of a Danforth fellowship in 1963. Subsequently, other students were awarded Woodrow Wilsons, but the total number of such awards remained small. The information which the College submitted to the Ford Foundation in 1962 estimated that the percentage of graduates entering professional and graduate schools had increased from about 23 to 35 during the preceding decade. Into the 1970s the latter figure, representing about one-third of the graduating classes, continued to apply.\(^\text{173}\)

As the accompanying table demonstrates, during the forty-year period between 1945 and 1985 more students chose economics or business administration as their major field of study than any other. Upon graduation, most of these students intended to enter some field of business. Some were able to secure their first positions entirely on their own initiatives, but many others looked to the College for assistance. Even before World War II, a number of well-known national and regional business firms sent representatives to the campus to recruit seniors, and the trustees were discussing the need for what they called a vocational guidance department.

In March 1946, in cooperation with the Veterans Administration, the College established a campus guidance center, one of whose many functions was to inform veterans of job opportunities. After

\(^{173}\)A study of the baccalaureate origins of persons awarded Ph.D. degrees in all fields between 1920 and 1980 attributed 817 such degrees to Gettysburg graduates and ranked the College 50th in a list of 667 private undergraduate institutions. The rank was determined by taking into consideration their enrollment and the size of their graduating classes. Another study, which did not take into consideration enrollment and graduating class size, placed Gettysburg 40th in the same list of 667 schools. The number of Ph.D. degrees credited to Franklin and Marshall was 896 and to Dickinson, 497. Alfred A. Hall, "Starting at the Beginning: The Baccalaureate Origins of Doctorate Recipients, 1920-1969," Change (April 1984), pp. 40-43; Marcia Stanley Frederick, ed., Baccalaureate Sources of Ph.D.s: Rankings According to Institution of Origin (Lancaster, 1982), p. 3. The Frederick study was conducted by the Office of Institutional Research, Franklin and Marshall College.
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Major Fields of Study of 1946-1985 Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Business Administration</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>3594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>889</strong></td>
<td><strong>2790</strong></td>
<td><strong>3901</strong></td>
<td><strong>4489</strong></td>
<td><strong>2765</strong></td>
<td><strong>14828</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These totals do not include several students whose permanent records either do not indicate a major or list premedical as the major. During the 1970s there were 634 business administration and 208 economics majors. The number of music majors includes those in the B.A. and B.S. curriculums. The department of Biblical literature and religion became the religion department in 1969. The 1963 catalogue began listing what had been a sociology major as a sociology and anthropology major. Some students had double majors and are here counted twice.

According to the 1949 catalogue, “the products of the college can not be evaluated on Commencement Day when happy hands receive

---

174 The officer in charge of this service has been called the student counselor, director of guidance and placement (1956), director of career counseling (1970), and director of career services (1978).
Seven of the long-term faculty employed in 1960-1962.
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a diploma bearing the insignia of the institution." Rather, "the final test of the value of an education is what becomes of its students when they have been called upon to meet the long, hard grind of the dusty highway." If this be true, anyone wishing to monitor the test must decide where on the dusty highway to take up one's position, which persons to draw to the side of the road, what questions to ask, and how to evaluate answers that might be given.
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In 1948 Dean Tilberg asked numerous graduate and professional schools about the performance of Gettysburg graduates who had entered their institutions since the fall of 1946. Reports returned on 74 students rated 4 as superior, 35 excellent, 29 good, and 6 poor. In preparation for the 1954 Middle States visit, President Langsam asked for a much more extended stop along the dusty highway: an evaluation of the graduate and professional work accomplished by Gettysburg alumni between 1942 and 1952. Responses indicated that some 738 of 800 were considered to have been adequately prepared. As for the quality of performance (and here there were returns for more than 900 students), 135 were rated excellent, 368 good, and 243 average. The remaining 163 had done poor work, were dropped, or withdrew.\textsuperscript{175}

Twenty years later, after the chairman of the board of trustees raised a number of questions about what he took to be the deteriorating academic standing of the College, the academic affairs committee asked the dean of the College to conduct a thorough investigation to determine the truth of the matter. The lengthy progress report which was issued in 1975 brought together much pertinent information for the period from 1959 to 1974, both for Gettysburg and for several other Pennsylvania colleges which were willing to share information. Unlike the survey of twenty years earlier, which drew upon graduate school testimony, this report was almost entirely concerned with the performance of Gettysburg students from the time they applied until they were graduated. In presenting this material to the trustees in March 1975, the academic affairs committee declared that a study of the contents convinced it that there had been "no change in the quality of student performance or of educational program, particularly relating to institutions with whom we have been compared."\textsuperscript{179}

\textsuperscript{175}The results of the 1942-1952 study were included in the College report to the Middle States Association. A man of high standards, Walter Langsam believed that this study justified prompt remedial action by the board and faculty. Although only 9 of the 128 graduates who attended medical school were reported to have been inadequately prepared, in his farewell report to the trustees the president stated that the College's premedical program had "fallen to a position of low esteem." There was more and disturbing evidence for criticizing the preparation of candidates for law school: of 132 graduates on whom reports were received, slightly more than half did poor work, withdrew, or were dropped. In the College report to the visiting team, Langsam explained that he hoped soon to create a separate political science department in order to improve the quality of prelaw work.

\textsuperscript{179}The chairman of the board was particularly disturbed by the small percentage of Gettysburg premedical students recently gaining admission to medical schools. By the 1970s Gettysburg had clearly become the victim of its long and firmly held premedical philosophy. In the early 1960s almost every candidate the premedical committee recommended to medical schools gained admission to one or more. After that, as the number of applicants nationwide increased markedly, the competition became
Early in 1976 a group of trustees, faculty, and administrators met on the campus to discuss the academic quality of the College and its prospects. By that time the dean had assembled additional information, included some pertaining to the performance of Gettysburg seniors on certain national tests. The evidence presented convinced the group that during the preceding fifteen or twenty years there had been no important change in the scores these students had earned on the Graduate Record Examination, Medical College Admissions Test, or the National Teachers' Examination. Since there was no way to measure the large majority of Gettysburg alumni, who did not pursue graduate or professional study, against some national norm, the dean observed, “a systematic means of measuring the influence of Gettysburg College is not available.”

Each of the four Middle States teams since 1954 concluded, admitted on the basis of a brief visit to the campus, that the College was a place where sound teaching and learning were occurring. “Gettysburg is a solid place,” declared the 1973 team. “It doesn't take long for a visitor to note many strengths,” There have been many faculty since 1945 who have agreed that most of its instruction was of high quality, but who nevertheless have insisted that it could and should have been better. Faculty meeting minutes and other sources testify to their belief that the College was not sufficiently successful in preserving through a year the enthusiasm which most freshmen brought with them in the fall and in moderating or eliminating what was often called the sophomore slump. They agreed that the administration and faculty were somehow abdicating their responsibility to render the fraternites at least a neutral factor in the educational life of the College, if they could not be made into a positive one. They were certain that the faculty were not doing enough to elicit the very best from the superior students.

Between 1945 and 1985 there were many alumni interested enough in their alma mater to share with faculty members and with

much more severe. Many of the highest-ranking Gettysburg students in departments from which most premedical candidates usually came were now entering other fields. The number of seniors in the 1980-1985 classes seeking premedical committee recommendations averaged seven.

177 Leonard L. Holder, “‘Academic Quality’ Is Theme of College Colloquium,” CCB (July 1976), pp. 5-11. “While records of acceptance of Gettysburg students at law schools are not complete,” the dean stated, “our record in recent years has been excellent.” Of 131 seniors in the 1978-1985 classes applying to law schools, 114 gained acceptance to at least one.

178 As the admission requirements and the academic program became more demanding, some alumni accused the administration and faculty of turning Gettysburg into another Haverford or Swarthmore. One of the questions which several trustees asked Arnold Hanson soon after his arrival was whether this was his intention. While many faculty regarded the College’s being placed in a class with Haverford and Swarthmore as a distinct compliment, they would have been content being charged with turning the College into a better Gettysburg.
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administrators their estimate of the weaknesses as well as of the strengths of the academic program which they had experienced as undergraduates. This awareness on the part of both teachers and learners that there is always need for improvement, coupled with an understanding that effecting improvement is sometimes an extremely intricate undertaking, was surely a sign of strength and vitality.

Material Equipment

The College began the 1945-1946 year with a library of some 55,650 volumes. The chemistry and physics laboratories were located in Breidenbaugh Hall. The biology laboratories were on the third floor and in the basement of Glatfelter Hall. All of these facilities were in relatively new quarters. The library building and Breidenbaugh were less than twenty years old. Biology had moved into renovated sections of Glatfelter Hall only after the engineering program was terminated in 1940.

The statement of educational purposes which first appeared in the 1949 catalogue made no specific mention of the role which libraries and laboratories were expected to play in the life of the College, although it did state that "a student should be introduced to the great characters and the great books which have contributed to the worthwhile things of life" and did stress as essential to an education "the habit of accurate observation." Clearly, however, since becoming librarian in 1929 John Knickerbocker had worked tirelessly to prepare the collection under his control for much greater use than at any previous time in the history of the College. Also, all three science heads tried, with varying degrees of persistence, to secure as much up-to-date equipment as they could persuade the president to purchase for them. By later standards, the amounts being spent for what the catalogue then described as the material equipment of the College were still pitifully small. In the annual report for 1945-1946, the treasurer stated that $3,027 had been disbursed for the library and $2,876 for supplies and equipment for the three science departments.178 Increased enrollments required greater expenditures in subsequent years, but during the remainder of the Hanson administration library expenditures, exclusive of salaries, averaged only $6,967, while those for the three science departments averaged only $9,849.

A brief report which the librarian prepared at the end of 1944 indicated that the library was then open eighty-eight hours each week, including four on Sunday afternoons.180 In addition to the

178Including salaries, library expenses were $8,885. The librarian reported purchasing 875 volumes during the preceding year at an average cost of $2.60 each. Exclusive of salaries, the biology department cost $1,800, chemistry $954, and physics $122.

180After the war, library hours were reduced, to 72 per week during 1952-1953, but by 1964-1965 they had been increased to 98½.
books, there was a periodicals collection. Some three hundred "current magazines," he noted, were being received. The Modern Book Club was still functioning, and Knickerbocker was considering organizing other persons interested in supporting the library. Also, he was contemplating purchase of a microfilm reader, a motion picture projector, and a record collection, none of which the library then had.

A crucial step in the development of the library occurred in the fall of 1950, when the first two professionally trained assistants joined John Knickerbocker on the staff. Then, in preparation for the 1954 Middle States visit, Walter Langsam more than doubled the amount budgeted for books, periodicals, and binding. These two steps help explain why the team was able to conclude that the library was "reasonably adequate in relation to the existing undergraduate program of instruction." This latter comment was intended to establish that the collection was not sufficient to support the graduate work which was then being discussed, but it could also be interpreted to refer to the team's belief that, while the collection was "reasonably effective in support of instructional objectives," it could be made "more useful." What was needed was faculty support for encouraging greater student use of the library. The team concluded that much rested on the librarian's willingness "to exercise initiative in having this building made more attractive and useful, in improving the collection in size, content, and condition, and in improving the quality and extent of service to more adequately meet the needs of the students."

Less than a year after taking office, President Paul turned his attention to the library. In his June 1957 report to the trustees, he listed the work that needed to be done in the building and declared that "as we grow it must be accepted that the library is the center for our educational life." In June 1959, as he and the other trustees were reaching the conclusion that much additional space was needed for the collection, either by a new building or a major addition to the existing one, the General relieved John Knickerbocker of his duties and named Lillian H. Smoke as his successor.181

Under the direction of its new head, the library entered upon a period of unprecedented growth and usefulness to the College. The addition to Schmucker Library which was completed in 1962 doubled the space available for housing and managing the collec-

---

181 Wife of the head of the psychology department, Mrs. Smoke served as acting librarian for one year. After a one-term leave of absence, Knickerbocker became historian and director of the new Civil War Institute, which was housed in the former bookstore building. He was serving in that capacity when he died in 1964, after which the institute was disbanded and its collection was returned to the library.
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Norman K. Nunamaker  Ruth E. Pavlantos  John R. Winkelmann

Norman O. Forness  Sherman S. Hendrix  William F. Raling

Henry Schneider III  James F. Slaybaugh

Eight of the long-term faculty employed in 1963 and 1964.

tion. Steadily increased College funds, federal grants which were available in the 1960s and early 1970s, and several bequests enabled the librarian to increase the size of the staff, allocate funds for preserving books and periodicals, and in cooperation with the departments extend the collection in all directions.
A SALUTARY INFLUENCE

In her first report to the General in the fall of 1959, Mrs. Smoke reminded him that "acquiring books in larger numbers than there is staff to administer them is always disastrous." During her tenure (she retired in 1974) the professionally trained staff increased from three to eight; the amount spent on the library increased sixfold; and the size of the book collection increased from 89,010 volumes to 204,575, or by about 7,000 volumes annually. The number of periodicals being received in 1974 was 1,398. Copying machines made their first appearances in the 1960s. Interlibrary loan service had been available for many years, but was little used. During 1945-1946 there were only thirty-eight transactions. By the end of the 1960s the College participated in several cooperative programs which brought the facilities of major libraries in Pennsylvania and other states within prompt reach of a Gettysburg faculty member or student. All of these developments coincided with greatly enlarged demands upon the library. As students were encouraged to be more responsible for their own learning, and as the College increased its emphasis upon scholarly activity by the faculty, more persons used the many different resources which the library had to offer.

The long-range development plan of 1972 focused on a "library learning center" as the College's "first priority capital project." Since she was approaching her desired time of retirement and believed that someone who would be directing the new library should have a major part in designing it, Lillian Smoke resigned in 1974 and James H. Richards was appointed to succeed her. The dream of 1972 became a reality when on April 22, 1981 many volunteers moved the collection from the old building to the new. Four years later, as of June 30, 1985, the librarian reported that it included 292,434 printed volumes, 7,000 pamphlets, 1,306 periodicals, 22,205 microforms (reels, fiche, and prints), 11,457 recordings, and 11,225 slides. Exclusive of salaries and wages, the College spent more than $344,000 on its library during 1984-1985.

The Musselman Library was designed to include space for the proper care of a number of valuable gifts which the College had received over the years, including some presented after 1945.

---

182 The accession registers from which these latter figures were taken were begun in 1834 and were last used to record entries in September 1974. The totals include books removed from the collection.

183 The April 1975 issue of the alumni bulletin (pp. 4-16) contains a useful description of the library as it existed at that time, presented in the context of current national developments in library management.

184 According to the Yearbook of Higher Education: A Directory of Colleges and Universities, 1984-1985, 16th ed. (Chicago, 1984), pp. 484-523, Allegheny reported 291,188 volumes in its library; Bucknell, 433,214; Dickinson, 385,729; Franklin and Marshall, 203,000 books and periodicals; Gettysburg, 277,000 volumes; Muhlenberg, 175,000; and Washington and Jefferson, 189,390. See p. 577n.
Included among many items in what was called the special collections section were the Arensberg library of books relating to the American Civil War and other wars, donated by the Francis L. Arensberg family (beginning in 1949); books by and about Henry L. Mencken, donated by Wilton C. Dinges (1965); rare books and magazines, including many rare first editions, donated by Thomas Y. Cooper (1965); and organ music, donated by Claire Coci (1979). In addition, several alumni (among them Charles A Willoughby, Amos E. Taylor, Stephen H. Warner, and Nancy Connor Springer) gave the College valuable personal papers. The Gettysburg College Archives (called GCA in footnotes in this work) became part of the special collections as the College began, for the first time in its long history, to bring together in one location original, primary, and secondary sources relating to its past.

One of the College’s major collections can be traced to a hobby of Professor Frank Kramer. His interest in Chinese art led him to begin offering a course in Oriental art in the fall of 1948, after the faculty added what were called appreciation courses to the distribution requirements. An article in the June 1948 alumni bulletin was the first of a series of appeals which Kramer made for gifts of objects which he could use in his course. In 1959 one of his friends, John H. Hampshire of Baltimore, presented the first of several major gifts of Chinese porcelains and other objects. Shortly thereafter, Professor and Mrs. Kramer gave the College their entire art collection of more than five hundred pieces, including jade and other stones, carved ivory, porcelains, embroideries, tapestries, and wood carvings.

In part because one of its members was a chemistry professor, the 1954 Middle States team devoted a considerable part of its final report to the departments of biology, chemistry, and physics. The
team found in each of these fields qualified faculty and basically sound programs, but it called attention to many things the College needed to do, as rapidly as possible, if it intended to measure up to its stated undergraduate goals, let alone begin the master’s work which was then under consideration. Heavy teaching loads and, in the case of biology, lack of space were major factors hindering both the faculty and upper-class student research which the team members believed indispensable for a quality undergraduate program in the sciences. They regretted that the two senior chemistry professors were forced to give up trying to do research. Their report commended the members of the physics staff for recent efforts to repair old and purchase new equipment. These efforts were effecting major improvements in what the report termed that department’s previously “barely adequate instructional program in elementary physics.”

General Paul’s obviously careful study of the Middle States report included close attention to the pages dealing with the science departments. During his five years in office the faculty in these three departments increased from eleven to eighteen, expenditures more than doubled, and the College provided additional space for chemistry and physics, while beginning to plan to relieve biology. During the 1960s construction of McCreary Hall, increased College appropriations, and outside grants further strengthened the science program, both teaching and research.

185The amount which the College spent on the physics department during 1954-1956, exclusive of salaries, was more than five times that spent during the previous two years.
The addition of major fields of study in psychology, music, health and physical education, and art, as well as the introduction of the laboratory into instruction in the modern foreign languages, required the purchase and maintenance of equipment for use of these disciplines.

The most expensive piece of equipment which the College had ever purchased was a refinement of an invention during World War II. As early as March 1967, Arnold Hanson told the board of trustees that the College needed to respond to "changing knowledge, including the need for computer equipment for teaching and research." With the help of a $185,600 grant from the National Science Foundation, the College purchased an IBM 1130 computer, which was installed in the basement of Glatfelter Hall in the fall of 1968. Its purpose was to support the academic program, especially but not exclusively in the sciences. "Gettysburg is among a very small (and elite) group of colleges that has a computer which is used primarily for the academic, as opposed to the administrative, aspect of providing education," wrote Richard K. Wood, director of computing facilities, in the October 1972 alumni bulletin. It is useful "as a high speed calculator, as an aid in teaching, and as the heart of a new discipline worthy of study in and of itself." By 1976 some eight hundred persons were using the computer annually.

No longer adequate to serve College needs, the first computer was replaced in 1977-1978 by a Burroughs 6700.188 This new piece of equipment could accommodate many more faculty and students,

---

188 A $480,734 educational grant from the Burroughs Corporation enabled the College to purchase the 6700, which was priced at $868,342.
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those working in offices and laboratories as well as those in the Glaf- felter Hall basement. It also offered the prospect that many adminis- trators could begin using the facility. By 1984-1985 there was a computer studies curriculum of six courses, a computer studies faculty with the standing of a department, separate administrations for academic and administrative computing, and increased com- puter facilities, both in Glafelter Hall and over the campus.

From Admission to Commencement

The 1945-1946 academic year at Gettysburg College began on Thursday, September 15, 1945, only thirteen days after the formal surrender of Japan, and ended with commencement on Monday, May 27, 1946. Since 1911 the College year was divided into two terms, and for about twenty years the semester break had been com- ing during the second half of January. The catalogue no longer announced an academic year of thirty-five weeks, although this in fact remained the standard. Formal opening exercises, following a freshman orientation program which varied in length from time to time, occurred on a Thursday in mid-September (often, though not always, the third) and commencement took place on the first Mon- day in June. In 1951 the College broke with a tradition as old as the institution itself when it decided to begin holding baccalaureate and commencement on the same day: the first Sunday in June. A major calendar change occurred eighteen years later, when 4-1-4 went into effect. The fall term then began in early September and ended before Christmas, eliminating the brief post-Christmas session which many had long found unrewarding. After a four-week term in January, the spring session began in early February and ended in time for bac- calaureate and commencement to be held on the first Sunday in June.

For all practical purposes, the College operated year round during the war. Most of the veterans who entered after the fighting had ended wanted to complete their education as quickly as possible, and for several years after 1945 summer-session enrollments ranged from four to six hundred students. By the 1950s they had dropped into the two hundreds and remained there for more than fifteen years. Several efforts to attract more students proved to be unavail- ing and in 1971, after enrollments had fallen below two hundred for several years, the summer session was abandoned. The months of June, July, and August were used instead for conferences, as well as for necessary maintenance and improvements.

In the forty years after 1945 local and national events caused fewer interruptions in the announced schedule of classes than they
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had during any previous period in the College's history, although classes were suspended following the assassination of John F. Kennedy in 1963 and during some of the turmoil in the decade that followed. Eventually the traditional football holiday became a thing of the past and, when Saturday classes became optional under 4-1-4, only a few professors chose to continue holding them. The well-established practice of having a father's day in the fall and a mother's day in the spring was continued. Walter Langsam considered observing these two special days one of his predecessor's "greatest contributions" to the life of the College. Equally aware of their value, Arnold Hanson gradually converted these occasions into fall parents' and spring parents' weekends.

The admissions problem facing the College in the fall of 1945 and for several years thereafter was how to make an equitable selection from the several thousand applications which it received annually. If we can believe the surviving data, the College rejected more than 5,000 applicants during 1946-1949. The administration and faculty were equally determined, not only to give preference to veterans, but also to be as fair and reasonable as possible in their treatment of former servicemen and servicewomen. The 1946 catalogue announced that, since Gettysburg was seeking veterans "functionally prepared to do college work," whether or not they had the proper credentials, it had "liberalized" requirements for their admission and graduation. To avoid unnecessary delays, they were permitted to enter at six different times during a year. A pamphlet entitled "Gettysburg College Plans to Meet the Needs of Returning Veterans" went through several editions, as experience suggested that its provisions be updated. Early in 1946 a Veterans Administration Guidance Center, to serve a ten-county area, opened on the campus.

During the 1946-1949 years about 57 percent of the students, who then numbered about twelve hundred, were veterans. Fears that they might find it difficult to adjust to the demands of College life proved to be groundless. This was due in part to the fact that the administration and faculty realized that they were dealing with two student bodies, the larger of which consisted of persons who were adults and deserved, even demanded, to be treated as such.187 The closing of the guidance center and the expiration of the liberalized entrance requirements in 1947 were signs that the bulk of the veterans had

187"Perhaps the greatest surprise of the year," President Hanson told the board in May 1947, "was in relation to our veteran students." Despite fears in all parts of the country, at Gettysburg "the veterans were not only capable of adjusting themselves to the routine life of the campus, but they entered wholeheartedly into all college activities." The ages of students during the year just closed, he wrote, ranged from seventeen to thirty-four.
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already entered the College. A report to the faculty in October 1952 indicated that the contingent of former servicemen in the student body had dropped to 7 percent.

Once the task of admitting veterans had been completed, it became necessary to fashion recruiting policies and procedures appropriate for the changed conditions of higher education in the postwar world. Although this was a task which many trustees, administrators, and faculty performed together, no person was more influential in developing and then carrying out Gettysburg's plans than Charles R. Wolfe, whom President Hanson named registrar and dean of admissions in 1943, and who served in the latter capacity until his death twenty years later. Known to most people as Hips, he won the plaudits of many on and beyond the campus, including the four presidents under whom he served. For example, General Paul, who relieved him of the registrar's duties in 1957, told the trustees in December 1956 that "as I have met and talked with other college Presidents I find that Gettysburg College is considered to have one of the best admissions offices and systems."

The 1949 catalogue, the first to contain a statement of the educational objectives of the College, also included an expanded section on admissions (from two to five pages), one which declared that, while Gettysburg had responded to the "needs of the larger community" by increasing its enrollment "as much as it has considered wise in order to meet the demand," it nevertheless continued to believe that "it will be of most service if it maintains its character as a small church-related school." No one at that point could be certain of what the word "small" meant. The postwar admissions criteria described in the 1949 catalogue, as well as in other places, retained much from the past and, in most instances, persisted into the 1980s. First, the College continued to insist upon what it called good character and acceptable social habits. "The basic requirement of the College for admission," Hips Wolfe told high-school counselors in 1960, "is that a student be a well-adjusted person of sound moral character." Second, the College regarded the evidence provided by a strong secondary school record as the best indicator of ability to do college work. Third, in the language of the 1984 catalogue, it considered "superior facility in the use of the English language and an understanding of fundamental mathematical processes as essential to a successful college experience." Fourth, it continued to give some preference to candidates who were Lutheran or members of alumni families; this was always a policy much easier to enunciate than to carry out. Finally, in June 1949 the trus-

---

188 Catalogues through the 1963 issue listed good character as the first criterion for admission. Its successor listed evidence of high academic attainment first.
Directors of admission.

Charles R. Wolfe (1943-1963)  
Martin H. Cronlund (1963-1968)  
Julius G. Hlubb (1968-1971)  
Delwin K. Gustafson (since 1971)

Committees declared that "it has always been the policy of Gettysburg College and we hereby re-affirm said policy that there shall be no discrimination in the admission of students because of race, creed, or color." The College continued to stress the importance of its current students and its alumni in recruiting qualified candidates for future classes.

As going to college became more and more common among secondary school graduates, the old reliance upon a certain number of Carnegie units, whose quality each institution had to interpret for itself, became increasingly unsatisfactory. To supplement or replace them, the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) offered tests designed to furnish nationwide measures of scholastic aptitude and secondary school achievement. It subsequently made available a program in which students could participate if they wished to seek either college placement or credit for some of their secondary school work.189

189In an effort to ease the transition from secondary to undergraduate education, twelve colleges, the Middle States Association, and the National Education Associa-
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The 1949 Gettysburg catalogue was the first to mention CEEB tests. The College recommended that applicants in the lower 40 percent of their classes take the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) early in their senior year and announced that some marginal candidates might be required to take it. In 1954 the catalogue began recommending that all applicants take the SAT and a year later that all take three achievement tests in subjects of their own choice, one of which should be English. The next steps came when the College required SAT's, beginning with those seeking admission in the fall of 1957, and three achievement tests (including one in English), beginning with the class entering in the fall of 1966. Reference to Carnegie units appeared for the last time in the 1963 catalogue. Its successor proclaimed that "a fixed number of secondary school units" was no longer required for admission.190 The College began participating in the Advanced Placement program in 1959. Each year after that, some entering students were able to offer evidence of attainment which yielded them advanced placement in or credit for one or more College courses.

In an article which appeared in the April 1959 alumni bulletin, Hips Wolfe described admissions procedure at Gettysburg (and at most similar institutions) in the years immediately preceding World War II. "The principal problem then," he wrote, "was to fill a quota of 150 boys and 50 women." Most of the 250 to 300 persons who applied, usually only after high-school graduation and after the principal had submitted a copy of their scholastic record together with his recommendation, were admitted. Almost all of those who were admitted showed up in September. There were no application fees, no entrance examinations, and no admissions staff or office.191 Except for those who might have attended a subfreshman day in the later 1930s, few ever visited the campus before they enrolled as freshmen.

_The CEEB_ had organized the CEEB in 1900. It administered its first tests in 1901. The famous Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) was first given in 1926, but was widely used only after 1945. The Educational Testing Service and College Scholarship Service are related to the CEEB. As a large body of literature attests, the SAT is an imperfect measure of aptitude.

190 For many years and into the mid-1950s the College had used examinations prepared by the American Council on Education to gain information, but these were administered only after freshmen had enrolled. Presidents and deans used the information which these tests yielded to compare Gettysburg freshmen with those in two or three hundred other institutions which also used them. Achievement tests became optional for applicants in 1973. It should be noted that during the years 1943-1948 the catalogue made no reference to Carnegie units.

191 Actually, one could take an entrance examination as an alternative to submitting one's record, but few chose to apply in this fashion.
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These simple and uncomplicated procedures changed markedly during the war and they were not used again once it was over. For several years most colleges were deluged with applications from veterans and recent high school graduates. Then, for a brief time in the late 1940s and early 1950s, when some of the small number of persons born during the worst of the depression were applying for admission, it appeared that, as so often in the past, many colleges would not be able to attract as many new students as they wanted to begin the next academic year. By the mid-1950s educators were predicting a tidal wave of students a decade hence, once youth born after World War II began applying to the nation's institutions of higher learning. Their forecasts created a near-panic as college-bound students subsequently began applying to many schools in the hope of ultimately getting into one. Until colleges realized what was happening, some of them assumed they had more serious candidates for admission than they really did.

The fragmentary information available indicates that during the immediate postwar years Gettysburg annually rejected about 1,500 applications. Then, in what Hips Wolfe called "the lean years," the early 1950s, the total number received averaged only 1,100 each year, of which the College accepted fewer than one-half in order to fill its freshman class. By the middle and later 1950s it was becoming evident that Gettysburg was experiencing a tidal wave of sorts, as the number of applications more than doubled, from about 1,300 in 1955 to 2,930 in 1962. This increase resulted in large part from College efforts to establish regular and close contacts with an increasing number of guidance counselors (who were largely postwar phenomena), from faculty and staff attendance at an endless number of college nights at places where additional candidates might be found, and from continuing recruiting efforts by current students and alumni.

The increasing number of applications did not necessarily mean that Gettysburg could be more selective in its choice of new students. Actually, if anything, the competition was becoming keener. In an article published in the July 1961 alumni bulletin,

192 In October 1949 President Hanson told the alumni that "there has been a marked reduction in the size of student bodies throughout the country." As late as the fall of 1957 Dean Wolfe told the faculty that half of the colleges in Pennsylvania had recently opened with a less-than-capacity student body.

193 During the 1950s, if not before, admissions became a year-round activity. Prospective students were urged to visit the campus and many did. Beginning in 1958 the College recruited about one-third of its freshmen class by offering early acceptance to those who were committed to attending Gettysburg. Beginning in the fall of 1960 the admissions staff published and sent to high-school counselors an annual brochure, called a profile, describing the most recent class recruited as well as current developments in the College's educational program.
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Frank H. Bowles, president of the CEEB, explained that there were then three categories of undergraduate institutions: the preferred, the standard, and the easy. The 100 to 150 on his preferred list had enough prestige so that they could easily recruit the top-ranking high school seniors in the entire country. The 700 to 800 on the standard list were selective and had prestige, but most of the students who chose them ranked close to the middle of their high school classes. The 800 so-called easy institutions accepted almost all applicants with a secondary school diploma. In a commentary accompanying the Bowles article, Hips Wolfe placed Gettysburg "clearly not yet" on the preferred list, but at the very top of the standard colleges. As evidence, he pointed to an average of 2,500 applications and 970 acceptances in order to obtain an entering class of about 550 freshmen during each of the preceding three years.194

In the same article, Hips Wolfe pointed to another and especially sensitive reason why an increasing number of applications did not necessarily mean greater selectivity for Gettysburg College. He and his staff consistently urged counselors and alumni to advise applicants unlikely to succeed at Gettysburg not to apply. If they persist, are accepted, and enter, he wrote, the "real harm" that usually results falls upon the student who tries and fails, and whose records "permanently show his dismissal." This effort met with only limited success and encountered considerable alumni opposition.195

It is not surprising that, beginning in the late 1950s, the administration decided that it was advisable to use the alumni bulletin for regular reports to the constituency, reminding it of the College's

194Wolfe had his own ranking of schools. At the top, he placed between fifty and one hundred Ivy League colleges and universities. Next there were "several hundred" highly selective schools, including Gettysburg, whose students had SAT scores about 100 points lower than those of Ivy League students. In December 1958 the General told the board that the College had recently lost about two-thirds of its best applicants to more prestigious institutions. This "is a situation we must face realistically," he argued, by trying to make Gettysburg more attractive to such candidates. Clarence E. Lovejoy's Complete Guide to American Colleges and Universities, the earliest edition of which appeared in 1948, was one of the first of many books seeking to inform college-bound students and their parents about hundreds of undergraduate institutions. Not all of the information in these works was accurate or fairly presented.

195In June 1959 the trustees adopted a statement of admissions policy which declared that "the success of any college depends on a continuous enrollment of superior students," and that Gettysburg would give preferential treatment to children of alumni, Lutherans, and others "related to the college" only when they "clearly qualify for admission." It called upon all Gettysburgians to cooperate in recommending "known superior students" and in resisting efforts "to secure undeserved acceptance of inferior academic students."
aspirations for a more rigorous academic program, of the justification for such aspirations, of the increasingly intense competition as an institution moved toward or into the Bowles preferred category, and of the continuing need for the support of alumni and others.

In the quarter century following 1960, the number of completed applications for admission averaged slightly more than 2,400 annually and the number of acceptances necessary to fill the freshman class of approximately 560 averaged about 1,350. As time passed, the competition for superior students intensified. During the 1960s, for example, the College needed to accept only about 45 percent of the applicants. By the 1970s the percentage had increased to 58 and in the early 1980s it was necessary to accept 65 percent in order to recruit a class of about the same size as that of a quarter century earlier.\footnote{Evidences of attempts to attract superior students were Get Acquainted Day, begun in 1973; the Mentor program, begun in 1981; and the Key Alumni program, begun in 1983.}

The report submitted to the Middle States Association early in 1954 indicated the degree of selectivity which the College had been able to achieve during the three preceding "lean years." Of 990 entering students, 34 percent were in the top fifth of their high school classes, 23 percent in the second, 22 percent in the third, and about 20 percent in the fourth and fifth. President Langsam had been so distressed by this record that he raised enough money to begin a small competitive scholarship program to attract more highly qualified students. On the other hand, Dean Wolfe explained to the president in early 1954 that, while "some 50 or 60 colleges are much more fortunate than we," as far as selectivity was concerned, Gettysburg came "no lower than the second hundred of the 1800 educational institutions in America."\footnote{In common with all colleges," wrote the dean. "Gettysburg College faces the serious problems of poor high school preparation, social immaturity, and the lack of proper motivation on the part of our entering freshmen. Our freshmen have the ability to do good college work, and most of them are conscientious students. There is, however, a sizeable group of freshmen who come to us with poor study habits and improper scholastic attitudes created by the background of unrestricted use of television and automobiles, the lack of proper supervision in the homes, and the attitude of 'just get by' in the high schools. It is difficult to challenge these students to put forth their best efforts.'" The dean was Wilbur E. Tilberg. The date was April 16, 1955. The occasion was his annual report to the president.} During the next decade, there was steady improvement. By 1960 50 percent of the entering students ranked in the top fifth of their classes. The peak was reached in the fall of 1963, a few months before the death of Hips Wolfe, when 69 percent of the freshmen ranked in the top fifth of their classes and 93 percent in the top two-fifths. A decline followed and by the early 1980s only about 50 percent of new students had
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been in the top fifth of their classes, although about 80 percent had been in the top two-fifths.198

The question of admissions cannot be dealt with apart from consideration of the desired size of the student body, as ultimately determined by the board of trustees. It is clear from the preceding chapter that for some twenty years before World War II the board had set the figure at somewhere between 500 and 650 students. Except for the disagreement over whether this total should include some women, the decision gained wide acceptance. There is no evidence to suggest that as World War II drew to a close either President Hanson or other trustees doubted the continuing soundness of the existing enrollment limits. They were prepared to take care of as many veterans as they possibly could, but this civic duty was considered a temporary exception to the rule. Accordingly, in December 1945, "in view of the emergency occasioned by the returning boys from the service," the board authorized Hanson to accommodate as many students as he could, up to 625 men and 175 women. In May 1946 it increased the number of women to 200, as soon as "proper facilities are provided for their care." By March 1947 the president was telling the alumni that "we are trying, in every possible way, to hold our enrollment down to 1,100." Two months later he explained to the board that he had yielded to pressure from veterans and recent high school graduates and was therefore committed to an enrollment of 1,200 for 1947-1948.

As the influx of veterans peaked and began to recede, President Hanson was obviously trying to determine in his own mind what to recommend to the trustees for the long run.199 By the spring of 1948 he had taken the first major step toward an eventual resolution of

---

198 The median SAT scores of the class of 1961, the first required to take these examinations, were 467 for the men and 509 for the women. By the time the peak was reached in the mid-1960s the median had risen about 100 points. The peak for men was 558, reached in 1965, and for women 624, reached in 1963 and 1964. The median in the early 1980s for all entering students (College profiles no longer ranked men and women separately beginning in 1977) ranged from 502 to 512. This decline reflected a nationwide drop in mean SAT verbal scores from 486 in 1967 to 425 in 1983. In the early 1980s students with 512 verbal scores ranked about the 75th percentile. See Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1985 (Washington, 1984), p. 147.

199 Enrollment in most of the Pennsylvania colleges with which Gettysburg compared itself did begin to drop after the high point was reached sometime between 1948 and 1950. For example, Allegheny peaked in 1947-1948 at about 1,100 students and averaged 980 during 1951-1954. Bucknell peaked in 1949-1950 at about 2,300 and averaged 1,890 during 1951-1954. Dickinson peaked in 1948-1949 at about 1,020 and averaged 985 during 1951-1954. Franklin and Marshall peaked in 1949-1950 at about 1,350 and averaged 1,025 during 1951-1954. The above figures for 1951-1954 represent between 10 and 60 percent above immediate prewar enrollment. Lafayette peaked in 1949-1950 at about 2,020 students and averaged 2,000, double prewar enrollment, in 1951-1954. The data were taken from the Encyclopedia Americana yearbooks for the years in question.
the issue. "Very conservative thinking," he told the trustees in May, "would warrant the conclusion that we will not return to pre-war levels of enrollment." In the following December he informed them that the College’s physical plant was designed for about 650 students, that he was coming to regard 800 as "the level for the greatest good of the college," and that he did not believe Gettysburg could recruit a sufficiently qualified student body of 1,000 for the long run. What might be taken to have been the last, and one might argue the most crucial, step in the development of Hanson’s answer occurred when he told the trustees in June 1951 he now believed that "the qualities which have endeared Gettysburg to generations of graduates" could be maintained and nurtured in a student body of 1,200 persons. There is no record that the trustees acted formally upon the president’s conclusion, but there appears to have been a consensus that an optimum number had been found.

However reached, the decision to set enrollment at about 1,200 students, which the board affirmed during the Langsam administration in December 1954, imposed a heavy burden upon the admissions staff. At a time when many other Pennsylvania colleges had enrollments of 25 to 50 percent above their prewar levels, and when freshman classes still consisted of depression-born young people, Gettysburg had determined, not only to double in size, but also at the same time to increase its selectivity. In the fall of 1955 an unexpectedly large return of continuing students and high yield of accepted freshmen boosted enrollment over 1,400 for the first time and prompted the trustees in December to approve a ceiling of

200 Of a list which includes Allegheny, Bucknell, Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, Gettysburg, Haverford, Lafayette, Lehigh, Muhlenberg, Swarthmore, and Ursinus. Gettysburg was the only one whose 1954-1957 average enrollments were more than double those of 1939-1942. Franklin and Marshall’s were 20 percent larger and Dickinson’s were 65 percent larger. Ibid.
### STUDENTS IN COLLEGE AND DEGREES GRANTED, 1945-1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Special Candidates</th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1946</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1947</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-1948</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-1949</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-1950</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1951</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1952</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-1953</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-1954</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-1955</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-1956</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1957</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-1958</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-1959</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-1960</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1961</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1962</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-1963</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-1964</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-1965</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1966</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1967</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 14,028 | 344 | 14,372 |

Source: Office of the Registrar. The College awarded a total of 19,149 degrees between 1834 and 1985.
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about 1,500 students. With his eye on the expected tidal wave of the 1960s, and convinced that adding a few more students each year brought in more revenue than the added expenditure it created, President Paul gave instructions which resulted in an increase from 1,400 students in the fall of 1956 to 1,766 in the fall of 1961. In December 1959 the board gave its blessing to what was happening by extending the upper limit to about 1,550 students.

One of the tasks of the planning group which Arnold Hanson established in the fall of 1961 was to review the enrollment question and make a recommendation. The consensus which emerged from its extended deliberations was incorporated into “Gettysburg College: The Direction of Its Future.” This 1964 document declared that enrollment should be maintained “for the next several years” at a level of about 1,800 students, a number which the board had approved in December 1963. Then it would be increased in “a controlled and orderly” manner to 2,250 by 1972-1973, but only if additional staff and facilities were first available to support further growth. Although fall enrollment continued to increase after 1961, exceeding 1,800 for the first time in 1962 and 1,900 in 1970 (fall enrollment did not drop below the latter figure through 1984-1985), there was little desire anywhere within the College to advance beyond the upper limit which the board had set in 1963. The 1972 long-range plan declared simply that “there are compelling reasons to maintain the current size (1850) of the College.” By the early 1980s the question was not whether to increase enrollment, but rather whether to act in advance of the anticipated decrease in the number of qualified students Gettysburg could expect to recruit by reducing it by several hundred.201

Once the trustees voted to readmit women students in 1935, there was never any doubt in their minds that Gettysburg had become and would remain a coeducational institution, something which it had never previously been. In the context of the times, however, it is easy to understand why they would limit the number of women to those who could be accommodated in Huber and Stevens Halls and to commuters. The College was grateful to its coeds for helping to keep it in the black during the war and demonstrated its gratitude by adding a third dormitory for their use as the first postwar building. Shortly after Hanson Hall was occupied in 1950, the board reiterated its policy. The maximum number of women students would be equal to the number the three dormitories could accommodate plus commuters.

201Both Hanson and Glassick administrations regarded the 1,850 figure as an annual average, which meant that there had to be more than 1,900 students in the fall to yield an 1,850 average for the year. By the mid-1980s the College was using a Dana Foundation grant to devise ways to make it more competitive.
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In the early 1950s the percentage of women in the student body ranged from 20 to 24. Dean Wolfe was not pleased. In the spring of 1953 he complained to President Langsam about the "double standard" which the existing rule imposed. A year later he asked that "serious thought" be given to securing additional women's dormitories, urging a 900-400 ratio within five years and a 900-500 one within ten. "The College will be a better institution," he wrote, "if the Admissions Committee can administer the same standards of admission to men and women." Given the existing ratio, the latter always had higher academic qualifications than the men. The dean reflected this when he told Langsam that "too many men are cultivating an inferior complex or are simply talking about the superiority of the girls as an excuse for poor work on their own." In her last report to President Langsam in the spring of 1955 the dean of women repeated the recommendation and declared that both the Middle States Association and the American Association of University Women were in favor of a "better balance in numbers."

The construction of two new dormitories for women during the Paul administration, plus the use of several College-owned houses near the campus, made it possible to increase the number of women from 328 in 1956 to 622 in 1961, and the percentage from 23 to 35. In 1963, when it set an enrollment limit of about 1,800, the trustees decreed that about one-third of that number should be women. As a result, the College continued to have two differently selected student bodies.\footnote{Although some faculty believed that the General increased the percentage of women in the student body in spite of board policy on the subject, the trustees obviously authorized all of the additional facilities provided for their residence between 1956 and 1961. About this time some educators believed that the future reputation of colleges such as Gettysburg would depend in large measure on the percentage of their graduates sent to graduate and professional schools. Those faculty who tended to subscribe to this "feeder-college" theory also tended to doubt that Gettysburg should recruit more women, since at the time a smaller percentage of them than of men pursued graduate work. There are many evidences that men and women students were differently selected. In the five classes which entered between 1961 and 1969 the fall-term grade-point averages for all men (on a four-point scale) was 2.38 and for all women was 2.8. Between 1963 and 1973 the local chapter of Phi Beta Kappa elected 117 men and 214 women to membership.}

As it became apparent in the early 1970s that the existing ratio was then forcing the College to accept an increasing number of men who were academic risks in order to maintain a student body of about 1,800 persons, its admissions committee proposed to the faculty in December 1973 that the percentage of women admitted for the following fall be increased to 40 and that this ratio be continued "unless experience dictates that a change in the sex ratio is
Shainline was dean of students from 1957 to 1965. Williams, who began serving in that capacity in 1966, became dean of educational services in 1981. Brady became dean of student life in 1982.

necessary in order to maintain a high academic quality in the student body." In January 1974 the faculty gave its unanimous approval to this recommendation, apparently with the tacit understanding that its less-than-clear wording would permit the realization of the goal which Hips Wolfe had expressed twenty years earlier: a student body in which men and women had been selected by applying the same criteria to all applicants. The trustees promptly adopted a verbatim version of the faculty action, in their January meeting. By the last years of the Hanson administration the percentage of women students had risen to 44.5. During the first eight years of the Glassick administration the male-female ratio was 51-49.

In the years between 1900 and 1940, the College could expect to graduate between 55 and 60 percent of a class on schedule, four years after it entered. An additional 5 to 10 percent would finish their work at some other time or at some other place. After 1945, with a few exceptions during the 1950s, the rate of attrition declined. Between 1960 and 1984 an average of 70 percent of those who had entered four years earlier were graduated.

Although presidents from Hefelbower on sought to widen the geographical area from which Gettysburg drew its students, as late...
as 1941-1942 69 percent still came from Pennsylvania and an additional 24 percent from Maryland (10), New Jersey (8), and New York (6). The proportion of Pennsylvanians changed surprisingly little while veterans constituted the bulk of the student body; it was 67 percent in 1949-1950. Only as the College began more systematic and intense recruitment in the late 1940s, and as some families in Gettysburg's traditional constituency began considering other colleges for their sons and daughters, were there signs of marked change. By the time Hips Wolfe reminded the faculty in 1955 of what he called Gettysburg's changing clientele and extended sphere of influence, the Pennsylvania contingent in the student body had fallen to 55 percent. It dropped below 50 in 1960-1961, below 40 in 1966-1967, and below 30 percent in 1981-1982, when for the first time in the history of the College students from New Jersey outnum-bered Pennsylvanians. In 1984-1985 Pennsylvania and New Jersey both contributed 28.7 percent of the student body, New York 14.2 percent, and Maryland and Connecticut each 9 percent.

If only because it was the accepted thing to do in Pennsylvania colleges, the chief founder of Gettysburg had written into its charter in 1832 that no applicant was to be denied admission because of "his conscientious persuasion in matters of religion." For many years thereafter it was custom rather than any deliberate policy which produced a student body most, but never all, of whose members were Lutherans. As the College expanded early in the twentieth century, more and more non-Lutherans enrolled, and during World War II the Lutheran contingent averaged only slightly more than half: about 52 percent. There is no evidence that trustees, administrators, and faculty were concerned about the trend, beyond wanting to give preference to Lutheran candidates, other things being equal. As the College began looking for students in new and less heavily Lutheran areas, and as more and more Lutheran families sent their sons and daughters to other institutions, the number of Lutherans in the student body fell below 50 percent in 1947-1948, 40 percent in 1958-1959, 30 percent in 1962-1963, and 20 percent in 1970-1971. By 1984-1985 it stood at 16 percent. The number of Roman Catholic students, who comprised 6 percent of the total in 1945-1946, exceeded Lutherans for the first time in 1973-1974 and constituted 36 percent of the student body in 1984-1985. About 25 percent were Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Methodists in the latter year.

---

204 Few were confident that one could ever determine that other things were equal.

205 A 1961 Pennsylvania law was designed to insure equal educational opportunities for all of its citizens. Acting under the terms of the measure, Gettysburg identified itself as an institution related to the Lutheran church; one wishing to give preference, other things being equal, to Lutheran applicants; and one intending to comply with the spirit and letter of the law in every way. Accordingly, it eliminated from its
SERVING THE CAUSE

The available records for the period before 1945 provide no evidence that black youth applied for admission to the College or that they were ever actually encouraged in any way to apply. Indeed, there were few blacks in its traditional constituencies who were likely to seek a college education. The reaffirmation of a non-discrimination policy in December 1949 did not mean that the College now intended to change its customary admissions policies in this respect. The first known blacks to attend Gettysburg were two brothers who were students at another college but who applied for admission to the 1950 summer session. It is apparent that no one knew their race until they began attending classes. Not until the fall of 1952 did the first black enter as a degree candidate; he was graduated four years later.

Along with many similar colleges, Gettysburg did eventually try in a number of ways to recruit black students. It soon found itself in severe competition for candidates whose credentials indicated that they were prepared to do the quality work expected of Gettysburg students at the time. In the 1968 recruiting season, for example, of 33 known blacks who applied (there were 2,099 applicants that year) 15 were accepted, but only 7 entered in the fall to join 5 returning black students. In later years there were often even fewer blacks among the applicants. In 1976 President Hanson told the trustees that it was "not only a legal requirement but a Christian duty" for the College to make increased efforts to secure more black students, administrators, and faculty. Under his successor there continued to be such efforts, carried on under conditions similar to those which produced disappointing results in previous years.²⁰⁶

Although one would look in vain in the 1984-1985 College catalogue for statements describing the College in quite the terms commonly used during its first century of existence, it is clear that in and beyond its sesquicentennial year of existence Gettysburg still bore some of the identifying marks which its founders imposed upon it in 1832. One of the three categories of evidence used in admissions application any information about the candidate’s religious affiliation except to ask: are you a Lutheran? Also, it removed from the student’s permanent record any information about religious affiliation. The Fair Educational Opportunities Act of 1961 prohibited discrimination on grounds of race, color, ancestry, or national origin, as well as religion. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the College experienced a new phenomenon. For the first time in its history many of its students indicated that they had no religious preference or affiliation (it was permissible under the 1961 law to ask for such information once an applicant was admitted and enrolled). Some 14 percent responded in this way in 1970-1971 and 16 percent in 1971-1972.

²⁰⁶From time to time students and faculty urged greatly increased efforts to attract more foreign students to Gettysburg, but since no educational program designed to meet their particular needs was developed, the number who came remained very small.
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W. Ramsay Jones
(1956-1975)

William H. Jones
(since 1964)

Nancy Locher
(since 1968)

Staff members in the office of dean of students and its successor.

(since 1965 listed third in order instead of first, as previously) was testimony to the applicant's "good moral character and social habits." These characteristics, it was believed, would enable the student "to contribute to the success of the College community." The student of the 1980s was told that the Gettysburg residential environment promoted "the formation of a community" (was this perhaps the late twentieth-century version of the much earlier family?) and encouraged "the styles of life which are conducive to the development of respect" for both the individual and society. Although the College no longer issued periodic codifications of rules upon which both faculty and trustees had put their stamp of approval, students in the 1980s were still being reminded that "every community has certain regulations and traditions which each member is expected to abide by and uphold," and that "a college campus
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community, even more than others, depends upon members who are mature and have a sense of responsibility.”

With but few exceptions, administrators and faculty in the years after 1945 assigned a high priority to finding and using ways to insure that students who had passed the test of admissions, enrolled in the College, and subsequently displayed a willingness to work, had ready access to the help which they needed or wanted to finish their course. The administration and faculty continued the freshman orientation program begun in 1927. Rarely satisfied with its length or content, they made frequent, if not annual, changes in both. If there was a trend in the program’s development, it was to reduce its length and stress increasingly the faculty’s academic expectations of entering freshmen. After many years during which the burden of advising students was borne almost entirely by department chairmen, in 1961 the faculty established the principle that every teacher should share in this task and, to stress its importance, decreed that the name of the adviser should be carried on the student’s permanent record. As early as 1947, the College announced that, with the help of members of the newly established psychology department, it had organized a counseling service to supplement the work of faculty advisers. The service was prepared to “assist students with educational, vocational, social, and personal problems.” As the numbers of students and their needs in these areas increased, the College responded by adding additional staff, always recognizing that, in the case of psychological counseling, there were limits beyond which it was not appropriate for it to go.

Although there was always much in Willard Paul’s demeanor to remind faculty and students of his many years in the military, and although when he believed the occasion required it he could issue orders befitting the old soldier that he was, there is no reason to doubt his utter sincerity when he told the trustees in December 1956, only a few months after his arrival on campus, that “I am trying to get the students to take more responsibility for self-government and to establish an honor system to raise our ethical standards.” Both of these steps, he believed, were “requisites to education, especially in a church-related college.” He hoped to report progress within six months; he was not disappointed.

In the fall of 1956 the General found a student senate composed of elected representatives from each recognized fraternity and

---

207 For some years beginning in 1956 the dean of students and faculty student affairs committee published an annual summary of regulations in an effort to provide “all members of the college community” with “the most important college regulations.” Later, the latter were published in the annual student handbook.

208 The G-Book for freshmen continued to be published through 1962. After a five year hiatus, it was replaced by an annual student handbook, which was still being published in 1984-1985.
sorority, and from the men's nonfraternity and the women's non-
sorority groups, as well as of four faculty members. With varying
degrees of vigor and of success its members tried, then and later, to
carry on the many responsibilities assigned to and assumed by stu-
dent government, always aware that their agency could never be
completely independent of the faculty, administration, and trustees
of the College. Early in 1957 the General assigned to the senate much
of the responsibility for student discipline, retaining to the faculty
and administration the power of reviewing the decisions of the body
to which the senate might from time to time entrust the task of trying
cases. In the years that followed, violations of student conduct were
handled in many ways, but with few exceptions the principle that
major responsibility should rest with students themselves was
observed.209

The preparations for reintroducing an honor system had begun
some time before the General arrived in Gettysburg. Responding to
the efforts of a small group of students, in the early spring of 1955
the senate named a committee to determine student receptivity to
the idea and attempt to develop the widespread interest and support
which were indispensable for a successful honor system. The first
vote, taken in the late spring, was not reassuring: 407 in favor, 321
against. Undeterred, and actively aided by a number of faculty, the
supporters continued their campaign. Following a second vote in
March 1957, in which 767 voted for and 355 against an honor sys-
tem, the faculty in May, by a wide margin, approved both the system
and the constitution which the students had prepared.210

"Gettysburg College will provide a new way of life for its students
with the Honor System," the 1957 G-Book advised the incoming
freshmen, "and you will have the opportunity to be the first mem-
ers of the college family to live under this code of integrity." It soon
became evident that each fall new students needed careful orienta-

209 The 1984-1985 student senate consisted of twenty persons, all elected by the stu-
dent body. The student conduct committee of the faculty, which from 1952 also
included students, was discontinued when the rule governing faculty committees
became effective in September 1957. Until 1971 there was a separate Women's Stu-
dent Government Association which, according to its constitution, existed "to enact
and enforce social regulations and to carry on general business concerning the
women students."

210 The honor system was deliberately limited to academic work, with the
understanding that it might later be extended to other aspects of campus life as con-
ditions warranted. Broad powers to administer the system were vested in the
students; there was serious question at the time whether faculty advisers, who were
to be present at the trials, would be continued after the first year or two. Students
were expected to report all violations which came to their attention; it was
understood that the responsibility for assuring academic honesty was not being aban-
donned, but was being transferred in large part to the students themselves. Severe
penalties were provided for those found guilty of violations, most of whom, it was
assumed at the time, would be required to leave College.
The first honor commission, which began functioning in the fall of 1957, consisted of four seniors, three juniors, and two sophomores. There were also two faculty advisers.

ination to the purposes and the procedures of the system, and that old students needed to be reminded regularly of the commitment which was required of them if it was to become or remain successful. With considerable regularity after 1957 students, faculty, or both questioned whether the honor system was working well enough to justify its being continued. Although students were informed that by entering the College they were agreeing to uphold and obey the honor code, and although by their signing the honor pledge on each piece of work they promised that they were supporting it, many declined to honor the requirement that they report any fellow-students whom they found cheating. This was the very reason why many other honor systems, including the earlier one at Gettysburg, had failed. Nevertheless, in spite of the continuing and perhaps inherent imperfections, the result of each serious questioning of the system was to reaffirm it. The success of the academic honor system at Gettysburg was a tribute to succeeding generations of her students, assisted by many faculty and administrators, who worked tirelessly and in many different ways to make it work.

The 1958 catalogue contained a detailed description of College class-attendance policy and practices, some of whose roots could be traced through faculty minutes back to 1832. The reader was informed that, while "unnecessary absences are neither authorized nor approved," a student was nevertheless permitted a stated number of unexcused absences in each course during each term. Exceeding the limit would result in having hours of work added to one's graduation requirement and in possible dismissal from the course with a failing grade. For a number of reasons, one of which was the conclusion that it was incongruous to penalize absences from class by requiring a student to take more courses, the faculty voted in February 1959 to abandon its historic policy. The catalogue issued two months later, in a much briefer section than had been devoted to the subject, declared that "regular attendance at all classes for
which he is registered is clearly the responsibility of the individual student," who was to be "held accountable for all work missed because of absences." There were still potential sanctions, however, for all those neglecting their responsibilities. An instructor and the dean of students could deal with excessive absences by warning a student or, if that did not work, by dropping him from the course with a failing grade. Reporting on the new class attendance policy in his June 1959 report to the trustees, the General described it as "another step in our program to develop maturity in the students."

Conspicuously absent from the General's list of proposed changes to increase student responsibility was the elimination of compulsory chapel. In fact, as he made quite clear, this was high on his list of College traditions to be preserved, at all costs. A requirement which only a minority of students wholeheartedly approved even before World War II, compulsory chapel was more difficult than ever to enforce after 1945. As long as the exercises were held in Brua Chapel, only half of the student body could attend at one time. In 1946-1947 it was the freshmen and sophomores on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday; and the juniors and seniors on Tuesday and Thursday. In the fall of 1952 Walter Langsam decided to experiment with voluntary chapel, but since only about one hundred students attended he returned to the old system during the following spring term. Even when the much larger Christ Chapel became available in the fall of 1953, the requirement was reduced from its prewar level to three appearances each week.211 "The requirement of chapel attendance has been fairly well accepted by the students," Langsam told the trustees in December 1954, "although a group of dissidents - whose fuss is out of proportion to their number - continues to grumble and gripe."

Even as the administration tried once again, as it had so often in the past, to make the requirement more palatable by changing the chapel period, revising the program, and exhorting the faculty to attend, the grumbling and griping continued. "Our religious activities have prospered but we still have the same chapel complaints," the General told the trustees in June 1959. "It is hoped that an improved program will result in better attitudes but anything compulsory is anathema to this generation." A lengthy report which the religious activities committee of the faculty submitted to the trustees at this meeting, after describing practices at several other institutions, concluded by declaring that "in regard to the require-

211In November 1954, after Langsam informed the faculty that he was going to bring the question of compulsory chapel to the board for discussion and action, by a straw vote 25 teachers expressed themselves in favor of the requirement, 31 were against, and 7 declined to vote. A month later the board reaffirmed the requirement and directed the administration to enforce it.
ment of chapel attendance, the committee is in agreement that the Christian purposes of the College can ultimately best be accomplished in an atmosphere of freedom from external compulsion." The General scrawled on his copy of the report that "the Board does not want any further distribution of this to anyone. They disagree with several parts of it."

During the 1950s members of the board's religious program committee had met regularly on the campus with students, faculty, and administrators. Beginning in 1956 they worked closely with the faculty's religious activities committee. These trustees were aware of what both students and faculty thought of compulsory chapel. They also knew the significant costs to campus morale in continuing it and had reached the conclusion that, in any case, compulsory worship was unwise. Consequently, in June 1960 they recommended to their board colleagues that instead of compulsory chapel there be a voluntary service of worship "at a top-priority hour in the week." In an effort to make their proposal sufficiently palatable to be passable, they asserted that "a student ought to be required to attend convocations dealing with general moral, ethical, and administrative issues." After considerable debate, the board accepted their recommendations, specifying that one compulsory convocation be held each week. After more than a century and a quarter, compulsory chapel came to an end in May 1960.212

Whether they were aware of it or not, the board of trustees had succeeded in transferring the grumbles and gripes from Christ Chapel to the Student Union Building, in which the compulsory convocations were held. On more than one occasion a nationally or internationally renowned speaker was treated to a demonstration of Gettysburg bad manners. In December 1963 the board suspended the requirement for three years, in order to give the administration "the opportunity for experimentation in the convocation-lecture program." At the end of that time, everyone concerned having saved face, no one moved to interfere with the opportunity for indefinite experimentation with a voluntary program.213

Although several major events long associated with commencement weekend and still being observed in 1946 continued essentially unaltered through 1985, changing preferences modified, and in some cases eliminated, a number of others. One of the major changes

---

212 An occasional piece sent to the alumni in October 1960, called News Flashes from Gettysburg College, contained an article which explained that, in moving from a compulsory to a voluntary program, the College hoped to strengthen, not weaken, its religious program.

213 General Paul made no effort to secure repeal of the numerous and detailed rules in effect since 1935 which limited the freedom of women students to come and go as they pleased. Only in the late 1960s and early 1970s were they able to share privileges which men had enjoyed for many years.
occurred in 1951 when, for the convenience of parents, the program was shortened by one day and both baccalaureate and commencement were held on the first Sunday in June.

Commencement weekend still belonged in part to the seniors, but by 1965 the use they were choosing to make of it had changed considerably from what was still the custom during the last prewar years. The traditional class day exercises had actually disappeared in the early 1930s. Ivy day ceremonies ended in the early 1960s. Although an alumnus and respectful of College traditions, the business manager was pleased to see this custom abandoned. Since the ivy which did grow loosened mortar in the walls, Hoffman eventually removed it and what remained for future generations were the ceremonial bricks marking the places where it had once been planted. Although the commencement weekend program might later include a senior class party and dance, many of its members elected to celebrate their last days as undergraduates in informal activities of their own choosing.

As before, commencement weekend also belonged to the alumni, who were more reluctant than the graduating seniors to change the time-tested ways of observing the annual occasion. Among the events which persisted through the period were the Friday evening council dinner, the Saturday morning business meeting, the noon collation (with the class parade, the presentation of awards, and the president's annual report on the state of the College), and the Saturday evening class reunions. Not everything remained the same. There were a few concessions to the changing times: a Saturday evening dinner for members of nonreuniting classes, inaugurated in 1957, and – of considerably greater proportions – moving the class reunions for younger alumni to fall homecoming, inaugurated in 1973. In addition, from time to time seminars, choir concerts, and similar events were scheduled for the special benefit of alumni.

As it had since 1834, commencement also belonged to the corporate entity long known as Gettysburg College. Without the power to confer degrees which the Commonwealth bestowed when it created that entity in 1832, commencement, as most persons understood the word, would be meaningless. Through 1983, the trustees continued to convene during the weekend. Through June 1952 they approved each and every candidate for a bachelor's degree as
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part of the business of this session. As the trustees began holding more than two regular meetings each year, the agenda for the traditional one during commencement became less crowded.

After a quarter century of being held in a place other than a church, the baccalaureate service returned in 1954 to a sanctuary, that of Christ Chapel. It was held there each year through 1985.216 From 1946 through 1962 most of the preachers were Lutheran pastors who were also alumni. In 1963, for the first time in the history of the College, the chaplain delivered the sermon. Except on only five subsequent occasions through 1985 the precedent thus set was followed. As time passed, students and faculty began participating in the prayers and readings of the service.

Commencement exercises held after 1945 presented several problems for those arranging them. Where was there space large enough to accommodate a graduating class which first exceeded 200 in 1948, 300 in 1949, and 400 in 1964 (the record was 467 in 1979), plus all of the relatives and friends whose presence was as important, or almost as important, as that of the seniors themselves? How did one take into proper consideration the fact that on the afternoon of the first Sunday in June the temperature might be ninety degrees, with the only relief to be expected coming from the passage of a heavy thunderstorm, most likely during the commencement exercises? Finally, how did one arrange a program which somehow insured satisfactory recognition of each graduate and yet did not become unbearably long?

For some years, the College dealt with the space and temperature problem by planning to hold commencement on Memorial Field, weather permitting. Either rain or the threat of rain prompted the use of the Majestic Theater in 1946, Plank Gymnasium in 1947-1949 and 1953, and Christ Chapel in 1956 and 1958. This left only six occasions between 1946 and 1958 when Memorial Field was actually used: 1950-1952, 1954-1955, and 1957.

Completion of the Student Union Building led commencement planners to decide upon its large auditorium as the regular place for holding the exercises. Without exception, the classes of 1959 through 1966 were graduated there. Among its advantages was the fact that more than two thousand people could be seated. Also, the College marshal was relieved of the stress involved in deciding whether the gathering clouds in the western sky were likely to produce a soaking shower by late afternoon. But there was a serious disadvantage to using the auditorium. Since there was no air conditioning, and since the fans which were used in its stead seemed to make more noise than difference in the temperature, many if not

216The Majestic Theater was used in 1946-1948, Plank Gymnasium in 1949-1950 and 1952-1953, and Memorial Field in 1951.
most people, even on cloudless days, were soaking wet by the time the ceremonies were over. 217

In 1967 the commencement planners decided to venture outdoors once again. In that year they scheduled commencement in the area south of Pennsylvania Hall, on what they began to call the quadrangle. Here, on what was the original front yard of the College when it moved to the present campus in 1837, there were lawns, trees, and ample space. Threatening or bad weather forced a return to the Student Union Building in 1968, 1971, 1974-1976, and 1979. An approaching storm in 1977 prompted a hurried conclusion to the ceremonies on the quadrangle.

The commencement speakers between 1946 and 1965 were persons with successful and distinguished careers in the military, public service, higher education, business, and other fields. A representative sample includes General Dwight D. Eisenhower (1946); author and commentator William L. Shirer (1954); Professor Roland H. Bainton (1958); Ambassador and alumnus John S. Rice (1963); Air Force Secretary Harold Brown (1967); editor and author William F. Buckley, Jr. (1971); New York State Senator Carol K. Bellamy (1973), an alumnus and the first woman speaker; magazine editor, columnist, and television newsperson Shana Alexander (1976); Pennsylvania State University football coach Joseph V. Paterno (1979); biochemist and author Isaac Asimov (1981); and actor, director, and producer John Houseman (1985). From the 1960s on, the seniors had a significant voice in the selection of the person to address them on their graduating day.

By eliminating everything except what they considered to be indispensable, and by securing speakers who emulated Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg rather than Edward Everett, those planning the commencement programs were able to have every senior present be identified, walk across the stage, receive a diploma, and be greeted by the president, all in a ceremony which lasted about ninety minutes. 218 Beginning in the 1960s the College held a postcommence-

---

217 Appointed marshal in 1922, Frank H. Kramer continued to serve in that capacity until he retired in 1956. His successors were Kenneth L. Smoke (1957-1970), Harold A. Dunkelberger (1971-1983), and A. Bruce Boenau (from 1983). In 1948 Edward W. Glatfelter, York, made a black walnut marshal’s baton, patterned after one used by Oxford University, which replaced an earlier one used since the Granville administration.

218 The national anthem became part of the commencement program in 1944; the College hymn ("Blessing and honor, and glory and power") was dropped after 1959; the alma mater remained. R.O.T.C. commissioning exercises were separated from the commencement exercises after 1942. In the early 1960s program planners discussed and then rejected the suggestion that, in the interests of saving time, the practice of having seniors participate personally in the exercises be discontinued. In 1970 and 1971, for the first time in about forty years, student spokesmen again appeared on the program.
One feature of the printed commencement program which did not change after 1946 was the listing of winners of prizes and awards. The 1985 program included forty-nine of these, a large increase over the thirteen named forty years earlier. Long before 1985 the College had established the practice of announcing some winners of prizes and awards in the fall and others in the spring, entirely apart from commencement. Including any on the program was evidence of the survival of part of an old tradition.

The concerns which the trustees had so often expressed about the appropriate criteria to be used in awarding honorary degrees continued into the postwar years. In December 1946, for example, they debated and then adopted a lengthy committee report which declared that such degrees should be granted “only after mature and thorough deliberation; . . . only for outstanding merit,” and sparingly. All candidates, they decided, should be selected in such a way that in honoring them the College honored itself. Although the committee found that “the average number of degrees granted by the better liberal arts institutions is three,” it recommended, and the board approved, a maximum of eight during an academic year, of which no more than five could be divinity degrees.220

In 1954 the trustees approved awarding an “occasional” honorary degree apart from the commencement exercises. Eight years later they defined more specifically the categories of achievement which the College sought to recognize and directed their committee on honorary degrees to “carry on a continuing but discreet search” for “appropriate candidates.”221 In April 1978, at the beginning of a new administration, the trustees adopted a revised statement of procedures and guidelines. It reaffirmed the normal annual maximum of eight degrees and also the existing goal of recognizing “persons of true distinction who, upon being thus honored, bring honor and distinction to the College.” The 1978 statement included “the Church at large,” scholarship, performing arts and applied sciences, business, and public service as “categories of attainment for recognition” of alumni and nonalumni.

Between 1946 and 1985 the College awarded 283 honorary

---

219 Until 1983 the numbering of commencements followed the faculty decision on the subject, which was announced in the 1878 commencement program. Then, without a similar decision and announcement, the 148th commencement in 1983 followed the 150th in 1982.

220 The committee report stated that during 1942-1946 Gettysburg had awarded 52 honorary degrees, Franklin and Marshall 47, Dickinson 45, and Lafayette 40.

221 The 1982 legislation declared that “to insure uniformly high quality recommendations, the trustee committee concerned must actively seek out the names of persons for consideration.” Beginning with the Paul administration, the faculty were regularly asked to submit names for consideration.
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degrees, a number considerably reduced from the 338 granted during the preceding forty years. Of these, 93 were doctorates in divinity (down from 173 during 1905-1945), 77 were in laws, 44 in humane letters, and 24 in science. Nineteen were awarded to women.


Before 1945 the College often scheduled such major events as the dedication of buildings or the formal presentation of gifts for commencement week, when a large number of alumni would be present. Although this practice continued in the postwar period, the administration found many good reasons to depart from it. A Woman's League convention, fall homecoming, or a day convenient for a speaker or the College might serve the purpose intended equally as well as commencement.

Student Organizations

Except for several fraternities, in the fall of 1945 the Student Christian Association (S.C.A.), founded in 1867, was the oldest student organization on campus. Since 1908 an administrator, who was now the College chaplain, had been assigned to work closely with its members. Since 1922 the organization had its own building, although it had to be shared with the rest of the College. On the eve of the war, about one-third of the student body were members. Preministerial students provided much of its leadership.

In 1945 the S.C.A. resumed its normal program of worship, discussion, and community service. For example, the 1950 G-Book, which the S.C.A. published, listed among its activities Sunday night
worship, Thursday night candlelight services, monthly discussion meetings, regular services conducted at the county home, a weekly program at the small A.M.E. Zion church in Gettysburg, and religion-in-life week (which became religious emphasis week in 1955). In 1953 the College opened a snack bar, called the Bullet Hole, on the ground floor of the S.C.A. building. Although the organization continued during the 1950s to offer a quality program for persons of many different interests, clearly it could no longer claim the active support of one-third of the student body. "The S.C.A. is a strong and vital, but a small part of the entire college," President Paul told the trustees in June 1957. Six months later he stated that, even though it attracted fewer than three hundred students, "its influence is much greater than this number indicates due to its well-developed and well-operated program."

Whether the General knew it or not, even as he wrote these words this old and respected organization was approaching a period of crisis. One of the results of increasing student resistance to compulsory chapel was declining support for the S.C.A. Then, completion of the Student Union Building in the fall of 1959 prompted the College to close the old swimming pool, move the Bullet Hole to the new building, relocate the chaplain and the S.C.A. in Christ Chapel, and convert Weidensall into a classroom and office building. In June 1960 its religious program committee told the board of trustees that the current campus image of the S.C.A. was one of "polite indifference," that there was then "real concern" about the effectiveness of its program, and that active membership had fallen to about 150 students. It was at this meeting that the trustees abandoned compulsory chapel.

A new chaplain, John Vannorsdall, assumed his duties in 1962.223 He was fully aware of the changes which were occurring in American society and, instead of attempting to restore a religious program fitted for times that were past, he proposed to establish one designed for the 1960s. "The strengthening of religious life on the campus," he wrote in the January 1963 issue of the alumni bulletin,

begins with the honest acknowledgment that the Church is a minority movement at work in a changed culture. We cannot depend upon past traditions, but are called to work toward a

---

222In May 1948 the chairman of the board's religious program committee reported that "it has been brought to our attention that a television set might be helpful in the Christian Association building to attract students who might otherwise be tempted to go to places where evil may lurk." He failed to make clear whether it was the building or the set which would deliver them from evil.

223Between the departure of Chaplain Korte in 1960 and the arrival of his successor two years later, members of the department of Biblical literature and religion performed the duties of the office.
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Edwerth E. Korte
(1952-1960)

John W. Vannorsdall
(1962-1976)

Karl J. Mattson
(since 1977)

The three full-time chaplains.

dynamic community, the life of which is nourished in worship and
the Word and which is prepared and willing to engage in effective
dialogue with the academic community in which it lives.

Accordingly, in February 1963 Vannorsdall began conducting
regular Sunday morning worship services in Christ Chapel. Later in
the same year he formed the Chapel Council, which coordinated the
efforts of several student denominational groups and assumed
responsibility for religious emphasis week. In 1965, two years
short of its centennial, the S.C.A. merged with the Chapel
Council.

The program which the chaplain and the Chapel Council now
administered included Sunday morning worship services; weekday
worship services; Bible study; lectures; religious emphasis week
(observed last in 1967); seminars (including one on love, sex, and
marriage as well as one for faculty on religious values); an annual
drive on behalf of World University Service (begun in the late 1950s
to support students in other parts of the world); publication of the
Junto; a tutorial program in the local schools; operation of the In [a
coffeehouse later called the Gangplank and located in Plank Gym-
nasium]; student-faculty exchanges with several other schools; and
a community-of-risk program (described as “an opportunity for

Before 1963 no regular Sunday morning worship had ever been conducted on
campus. No congregation was organized, either in 1963 or later, but most students
and some faculty members who wanted to attend Sunday services now chose Christ
Chapel rather than one of the churches in town. Christ Lutheran church soon stopped
calling itself the College church. At the request of President Langsam, in 1962 the
trustees decreed that “for the sake of good order,” the S.C.A. was to be “the only stu-
dent religious group on the Campus of Gettysburg College.” A decade later this dec-
ree was rescinded, and for a number of years thereafter denominational groups (there
were six in the fall of 1963) met on the campus or in local churches.
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students . . . to explore more fully the meaning of human life, and particularly one's own life). In 1975 the trustees were told that the Chapel Council was directing thirty-six different programs involving some five hundred students.

After a time, some of the features of this program were dropped or transferred to sister campus agencies and others took their places. Some features were more controversial than the S.C.A. program had ever been, if for no other reason simply because they were designed to meet the particular needs of students at a later, and different, time.

The chaplains were especially interested in providing opportunities for Catholic, Quaker, and Jewish students, as well as those of other persuasions, to meet for worship and similar purposes. Partly as a result of their concern, Quaker meetings were first held on campus in 1970. Regular masses on campus for Catholic students began during the 1971-1972 year. At the end of the decade Jewish students organized CHAI.

The religious program committee of the board of trustees repeatedly commended Chaplain Vannorsdall for the work which he and the Chapel Council were doing. In 1972 the president of the Woman's League told the trustees that the women "never cease to wonder at all that Chaplain Vannorsdall accomplishes and the extensive outreach made by the students participating." After one year in office and after the arrival of a new chaplain, President Glassick told the trustees in September 1978 that the College's religious program "is considered one of the models in higher education."

In the fall of 1945 there were ten national and one local fraternities and three national and one local sororities, with which before the war about two-thirds of the students had been affiliated. Once the fraternity houses which the College had taken over during the war were returned to their owners, they provided room for about two hundred male students and board for more than five hundred. Fraternities and sororities sponsored most of the campus's organized social life, the high points of which continued to be the fall and spring houseparties and I.F.C. weekend. During the fifties and into the sixties fraternities competed with each other by elaborately and imaginatively decorating their houses during fall-houseparty weekends. Hundreds of people from the community and elsewhere came to view their handiwork. In the mid-1950s the percentage of male students in fraternities was 69; during the 1960s and 1970s it averaged 65; and between 1980 and 1985 it was again 69.

The 1945 College catalogue was the first ever to list fraternities and sororities by name and to attempt an assessment of their place in the College. "Fraternal organizations are important in the College
Members of Lambda Chi Alpha decorated their house for the 1958 Christmas houseparty weekend. Judges awarded them first place.

program of social development," the reader was now told. "It is their aim to develop a pleasing personality amid a diversity of circumstances, to teach proper and kind manners for social functions, to encourage social versatility, cooperation, and compatibility." Each annual edition of the G-Book repeated these noble goals. According to the 1953 issue, fraternities and sororities offer students a "home away from home." They "stimulate the friendly atmosphere and spirit of college life by creating warm ties of friendship, devotion, and loyalty between . . . [their] members and ultimately all of Gettysburg College." As a result of "their combined efforts the standards and virtues of Gettysburg College reign among the highest." As early as 1953 the National Interfraternity Conference recognized Gettysburg's fraternity system as the best in its class. The award was based upon evidence which the I.F.C. presented of service to the College and the community, as well as commitment to fraternity ideals. During the next eleven years, the award was returned to Gettysburg on five occasions.

However noble the ideals, and however long, hard, and sincerely many young men may have worked to realize them, in the years after 1945 there were recurring criticisms of the fraternity system and

---

225 As late as 1942, the only catalogue reference to fraternities was a statement that there were "three halls erected by Greek letter societies on campus."

226 Gettysburg competed with other institutions having between ten and nineteen fraternities. The service took such forms as campus improvements, participation in blood donor drives, efforts (only partly successful) to abolish Hell and replace it with Help Week, and fraternity cooperation.
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serious questionings of its compatibility with the kind of college which Gettysburg was aspiring to become. "There has grown up in some quarters the idea that fraternity loyalty properly should transcend loyalty to the College," Walter Langsam declared in his final report to the board in June 1955. This was a concept, he wrote, which "should be corrected." In his first report to the trustees a year and a half later, President Paul declared that "the loyalty to fraternities first and to Gettysburg College second is a disturbing factor," which could be corrected only by insuring "that the College and not the fraternity meets the student's needs." 227 Many of the persons who joined the faculty after 1945, even though some of them were fraternity members and advisers to one of Gettysburg's chapters, were less kindly disposed to fraternities than their predecessors had been. They were especially critical of the extent to which fraternity demands consistently interfered with the academic performance of freshmen. 228

Responsibility for regulating fraternities, to the extent that the College was able to regulate them at all, was shared by the trustees, administrators, and faculty. Before acting, the trustees sometimes consulted their counsel to determine what powers they had over separately chartered organizations in possession of their own real estate and personal property. 229 Administrators and faculty assumed that they were free to act in matters which they deemed closely related to the educational program for which they were responsible.

In 1951 the faculty decreed that all fraternity and sorority dances must be held on campus, unless an exception were granted in advance. Two years later the trustees ruled that, by 1960, each fraternity would have to employ a housemother; rejecting a succession of appeals, they refused to retreat from this position. The 1957 catalogue announced that freshmen were no longer permitted to

---

227 The General declared that one way for the College to meet student needs was to require all freshmen to eat in the College's dining hall and live in College dormitories. Few people either then or later observed that the College was at least partly responsible for creating whatever problems the fraternities posed by not always providing room and board for virtually all of its students.

228 For many years before World War II fraternities could use as evidence of their contribution to the academic life of the College the fact that the grade point average of their members was consistently higher than that of nonfraternity men. Beginning with the 1960-1961 year this evidence was no longer available. Between then and 1984-1985 there were only two years in which nonfraternity men did not outrank fraternity men, as far as grade point average was concerned.

229 In a letter dated November 13, 1952, the College counsel advised that "the right and duty of educational institutions to protect the moral and physical welfare of their students is inherent and fundamental" and that "the right to exclude fraternities altogether includes the right to reasonably regulate the methods of their operation."
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have automobiles while on campus and that, beginning with 1958-1959, the prohibition would extend to sophomores. With board approval, President Paul announced in 1957 that all freshmen men would be required to eat in the new dining hall, once it was completed and open for use. Since this step so directly affected fraternity finances, he subsequently deemed it advisable to make a number of adjustments in the rule. In 1961 the faculty ended the quarter-century-long practice of suspending Saturday classes during fall and spring houseparty weekends. As early as December 1956 the General had argued that one early step in reforming the fraternity system was delayed rushing. Many, including some trustees, took up the refrain, but not until October 1966, and only after a year of careful study and debate, was the faculty able to take that step. It recommended to the president that rushing be moved from the fall to the spring semester. The recommendation was accepted.

Two actions which the board took during the general unrest of the late sixties and early seventies recognized the significant changes which were then occurring in the behavior of fraternity members. First, in 1969 the trustees repealed the old College rule forbidding possession or use of alcoholic beverages on the campus (including fraternity houses) and replaced it with one in conformity with state law, which set the minimum drinking age at twenty-one years. Second, shortly thereafter, recognizing that the housemother system was no longer working, the trustees yielded to fraternity requests that it be repealed. The incidence of inappropriate behavior resulting from drinking increased. Most fraternity houses became more and more slovenly. A new calendar in 1969-1970 and student preoccupation with other concerns help explain why, after more than a third of a century, the fall and spring houseparties and I.F.C. weekend were abandoned, beginning in that year.

As these developments occurred, trustees, administrators, and faculty directed an unprecedented level of criticism at fraternity behavior. Several studies were undertaken, the most important of which was made during the summer of 1979 by an administration-faculty-student committee known as the Summer Study Group on Fraternities. The report which it issued in the fall recognized the importance of the social development of undergraduates and that fraternities exist on the Gettysburg campus in order to "provide a

230 This rule was intended to promote scholarship and was not directed solely at fraternities.
231 In 1965, following several years of consultation, the president informed the fraternities and sororities that, beginning in September 1966, each would be responsible for determining its own selection criteria, apart from any national norms, and that race or national origin could not be included among them.
232 See also p. 1007.
233 Activities similar to those of earlier years were resumed later in the 1970s.
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focus for the social life of the member." However, it declared, this focus must be consistent with the main purposes of the institution, which cannot be the case when that life "seems to revolve around a seemingly infinite number of parties in which the indiscriminate use of alcohol is present." Sensing an "impending crisis" in which it might be necessary to consider dismantling the system entirely, the committee reiterated that fraternities exist as recognized organizations within the College, not as a matter of right, but rather as one of privilege. Concluding that its assigned task was to recommend ways of continuing, rather than abandoning, the fraternity system, the committee proposed adopting a set of eleven minimal expectations for fraternities, which in effect would render them neutral forces in the educational program, and also a set of seven aspirations which, if realized, would enable them to make a positive contribution to that program.234

After the trustees and faculty had the opportunity to debate the report and express an opinion, it was finally approved and went into effect in the spring of 1980. In addition to the good sense of the fraternities themselves, the new policy relied for its enforcement upon a strengthened program of chapter advising by faculty members and upon regular review of each chapter's activities by the Dean of Student Life and Educational Services (later the Dean of Student Life). Once the new policy had been decided upon, there was general recognition that the main part of the task remained to be done. In the closing words of the committee report,

only a concerted effort by significant numbers of students, faculty, administrative personnel, and alumni can make the necessary impact so that fraternities in coming years are perceived as "important, integral parts of the College." The task is not impossible of accomplishment but it is a formidable one indeed.

Although the activities of fraternities and sororities were closely related, nevertheless their situations were sufficiently different that they need to be treated separately. To begin with, sororities did not own or rent houses in which their members roomed and boarded.235 For many years after 1945, the College catalogue specified that all women students, whether sorority members or not, and excepting

---

234Minimally, fraternities were directed not to interfere with their members' and pledges' academic work; the honor system; or the College's alcohol, drug, visitation, nondiscrimination, and hazing policies and procedures. Further, they were directed to respect the rights of their neighbors, more than a few of whom had complained about their behavior, and to "maintain their premises in a reasonably presentable and orderly condition at all times." The committee considered, but did not recommend, that an adult once more be required to reside in all fraternity houses.

235From time to time after 1945 sorority members expressed a desire to have their own houses and the administration was generally favorable to the idea. Probably cost was the main reason why no such houses were acquired. In 1974 the board formally accorded sorority women the same room and board provisions which men enjoyed.
only those living at home, were required to room "under dormitory supervision" and take their meals in the College dining hall. Since before the war, sorority women had their Panhellenic Council, which functioned in ways similar to those of the Interfraternity Council. During the later 1950s and early 1960s about two-thirds of the women students were sorority members. The proportion began dropping in the mid-1960s and reached a low point of about one-third in 1971-1974. Thereafter it increased again, and during the
period 1980-1985 about one-half of the women were sorority members.236

On two occasions after 1945 the board of trustees undertook to determine the number of national fraternities and sororities which the College could recognize. In 1955 it set the fraternity limit at twelve. Two years later it increased the permissible number to thirteen and set the number of national sororities at seven. The twelve national fraternities of 1984-1985, including three organized after 1945, were Alpha Chi Rho (formed from Phi Epsilon Nu in 1958), Alpha Tau Omega, Lambda Chi Alpha, Phi Delta Theta, Phi Gamma Delta, Phi Kappa Psi, Phi Sigma Kappa, Sigma Alpha Epsilon, Sigma Chi, Sigma Nu (formed from Phi Kappa Rho in 1954), Tau Kappa Epsilon, and Theta Chi (formed from Alpha Theta Chi in 1952).237 The seven national sororities of 1984-1985, five of which dated from after 1945, were Alpha Delta Pi (1961), Alpha Xi Delta (1949), Chi Omega, Delta Gamma, Gamma Phi Beta (1959), Sigma Kappa (1956), and Sigma Sigma Sigma (1978).238

In the forty years after 1945 the opportunities for Gettysburg students to enjoy or study music, either by listening or performing, were greatly enhanced by the existence of a regularly organized department of instruction, which came into being in 1946. By that time the College choir was already a well-established institution. Its director was the head of the new department and had thirty years of his professional career ahead of him. Parker Wagnild was successful in creating and maintaining a spirit which made participating in the choir an unforgettable and positive experience for almost everyone who ever joined its ranks. In addition to the regular schedule of tours and of appearances in the vicinity of Gettysburg, the choir performed at Lutheran conventions in this country and abroad, at Town Hall in New York City, and in the White House. It toured Europe on several occasions and made a world tour in 1967. When Wagnild retired in 1976, Russell P. Getz succeeded him. In May 1985 both Wagnild and Getz directed the latest in a series of choir reunion concerts given over the years. This performance celebrated half a century in the life of one of the most consistent agencies in creating good will for Gettysburg College.239

236 Through 1961-1962 the grade point average of sorority women was consistently higher than that of nonsorority women. More often than not since that time the reverse has been the case.


238 Phi Mu disbanded at the end of the 1967-1968 year.

239 For more information see Barbara L. Platt, "Every One Sang": A History of the Gettysburg College Choir, 1935-1970 (Gettysburg, 1970), pp. 16-55. Beginning before 1945, the choir made a number of phonograph records and albums.
The 1975-1976 choir and its director. Wagnild retired at the close of this year.

Russell Getz, Parker Wagnild, and members of the 1985 reunion choir in rehearsal.
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While the choir was the best-known College musical organization after 1945, it was not the only one. After a wartime hiatus, the band was reformed in 1946. A chapel choir was organized soon after Christ Chapel came into use in the fall of 1953. There were many other musical groups, most but not all of them under the direction of faculty members of the music department.

In the quarter century before World War II, men's and women's debating teams ably carried on a Gettysburg tradition begun by the literary societies and nurtured by the faculty. In May 1948 President Hanson informed the trustees that, under the direction of the English department, the College had now "resumed its rather extensive work in the field of debating." During the year then ending, College teams had participated in a total of thirty-seven debates, as far north as the University of Vermont and as far south as the University of Richmond, in addition to a tournament at Brooklyn College in which thirteen schools participated. However, this ambitious program did not mean that the level of prewar activity was going to be sustained. President Paul told the trustees in December 1956 that, because of the many demands upon the English department, intercollegiate debating had been abandoned. Although the General considered skill in debating "valuable to all walks of life" and hoped that the additions to the faculty which he was then proposing would include someone able and willing to guide the program, debating did not resume its prewar standing in the College. Even if such a person had been secured, there is no certainty that student interest in intercollegiate debating could have been sustained. There were sporadic revivals after 1956, one of which produced the Debate Union in the early 1980s. During most of the period between 1947 and 1980, when he was a member of the English department, Harry F. Bolich responded to demonstrated student interest in debating by acting as adviser and director.

Along with the College choir and intercollegiate debating, Owl and Nightingale was a firmly established Gettysburg institution at the end of World War II. Professor Arms resumed a full schedule of productions for 1945-1946. Although he retained the title of director of dramatics which the trustees had given him until he retired in 1963, newly appointed members of the English department began to relieve him of his duties as early as 1957. Upon Arms's departure from the faculty, after he had directed more than two hundred plays, Emile O. Schmidt, who had joined the English department in 1962, became director of dramatics. In addition to introducing new theater

240 These were Jerry Jackson (1957-1960) and Karl Harshbarger (1960-1962). In announcing the latter's appointment in February 1960, the General stated that he would be the drama coach, advise Owl and Nightingale, and develop facilities for putting on plays in the Student Union Building.
courses into the curriculum, he gradually developed a broadened program of dramatic activities, of which Owl and Nightingale remained a significant part. By then the oldest student organization, apart from the fraternities, Owl and Nightingale celebrated its seventieth anniversary in October 1984, as a renovated Brua Hall, with its Kline Theatre, was formally opened to the public.  

Although from time to time after 1945 faculty and administrators expressed the view that Gettysburg was one of the most organized of campuses, indeed that it was overorganized, a more thoughtful observation might have been that students and faculty had banded together on so many occasions in order to further interests which they considered desirable in themselves and fully compatible with

---

See A Celebration of 70 Years of Owl and Nightingale Theatre at Gettysburg College (1984) for an informal history of the organization, including a warm tribute to Professor Arms and an evaluation of the state of theater at Gettysburg College under his successor.
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the goals of an undergraduate, liberal-arts education. The situation
was not unlike that in many similar colleges in all parts of the
country.

The list which follows includes most, if not all, of the departmental
organizations in existence in 1984-1985. Dates of organization
are given for most of those which were not in existence in 1945:

Biology: Beta Beta Beta
Chemistry: Sceptical Chymists
Classics: Eta Sigma Phi
Dramatics: Alpha Psi Omega (1955)
Economics: Pi Lambda Sigma
French: Phi Sigma Iota, French Club
German: Delta Phi Alpha
History: Phi Alpha Theta
Mathematics: Mathematics Club
Music: Phi Mu Alpha (1967)
          Sigma Alpha Iota (1967)
Political Science: Pi Sigma Alpha (1983)
Psychology: Psi Chi (1949)
Sociology and Anthropology: Alpha Kappa Delta (1980)
Spanish: Spanish Club

Of the three general honor societies in existence when World War
II began, only Phi Beta Kappa remained forty years later. Pen and
Sword, which became inactive in 1943, was not revived, as its last
officers hoped it would be, after the war. The Gettysburg Honor
Society continued to function until the early 1960s; it last appeared
in the 1963 catalogue. Iota Chapter of Pennsylvania of the Phi Beta
Kappa Society elected 1,012 members in course and 14 alumni mem-
bers between 1946 and 1985. The last alumnus member was selected
in 1961.242

The following list contains a sample of other student organ-
izations which flourished at some time between 1945 and 1985. A
few of them had a continuous existence. More did not:

Alpha Phi Omega (1950), national service fraternity
American Marketing Association
Black Student Union
Booster Club
Caucus Club
Fellowship of Christian Athletes
Intercollegiate Conference on Government

242The list does not include societies in a number of departments, some of which
were in existence before 1945 and some of which were formed after that date, but
none of which survived in 1984-1985. The departments include education (Kappa Phi
Kappa, Kappa Delta Epsilon), military science (Scabbard and Blade, Arnold Air
Society), philosophy (Alpha Kappa Alpha), and physics (Sigma Pi Sigma, American
Institute of Physics). The College's oldest national honorary (Tau Kappa Alpha), in
debating, was listed last in the 1960 catalogue.

243Selection of outstanding seniors for inclusion in Who's Who in American
Colleges and Universities was discontinued in 1960.
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International Relations Club
Model United Nations Team
Outing Club
Pi Delta Epsilon, national journalism fraternity
Preministerial Association

College Publications

The annual catalogue which the faculty published in February 1946 included in its list of College publications the Gettysburgian, the G-Book (which it called the S.C.A. Hand-book), the Spectrum, and the Mercury. It explained that "all the periodicals aim at enlarging the means of communication between the College and its graduates, former students, and friends." The authors of this catalogue gave the reader no intimation that these very words of description had been employed in every catalogue since 1911.

In the forty years after 1945 students continued to publish the weekly Gettysburgian. Into the 1960s the paper closely resembled what it had been ever since its inception in 1897. Its pages contain an invaluable store of information about what was happening on campus, including what the president and dean were announcing; what the different agencies of student government were doing; what programs campus organizations were scheduling; and how competitive the teams were. Successive editors generally supported the administration and faculty, offered strong support for an honor system, and encouraged all other efforts to give the students greater freedom in making decisions affecting their undergraduate careers. As was the case before 1945, the Associated Collegiate Press recognized the quality of the Gettysburgian by a series of awards.

As the campus began to share in the general unrest of the later 1960s, the coverage and tone of the newspaper changed to reflect what was happening. There were more stories about injustice and war; more letters to the editor; more criticism of trustees, administrators, and faculty; and less thorough reporting on the activities of many campus organizations. Elections of members-in-course to Phi Beta Kappa, for example, no longer rated the major coverage characteristic of former years. Meanwhile, undoubtedly unbeknown to the student body, Arnold Hanson was informing the trustees, some of whom were critical of the newspaper, that there was and would be no censorship. More was to be gained than lost, he thought, by allowing the widest possible expression of student opinion, if for no other reason simply because on the campus of a liberal arts college that was the way things should be. In the early 1970s, when the fever subsided and a certain lassitude descended upon the campus, there were several occasions when it seemed all but impossible to recruit a staff to carry on the burden. On one of these occasions, in early 1972,
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there was a five-week hiatus before a new staff took over and began to publish again.

Like the Gettysburgian, the Spectrum for more than two decades after World War II closely followed its traditional and rather formal arrangement. The major change during these years came in 1952, when the senior class decided to break a sixty-year practice and publish its own annual. "It is the custom at other colleges for seniors to publish their own book," the editors wrote. "Any yearbook, for the seniors and of the seniors, ought to be by the seniors." Thus there are two 1952 Spectrums, one published in 1951 and the other a year later. By the end of the 1960s it is obvious from the pages of this publication that there was a decidedly changed mood on campus. Photographs were now considerably more informal, recording new styles of dress and hair for both men and women students. The 1969 annual was the last to feature a Spectrum queen and her court. The administration and faculty which once had a near-monopoly on the front pages now might appear anywhere in the book, and occasionally not at all. After the campus mood changed again in the middle seventies, the air of informality remained a distinctive feature of the Spectrum.

The freshman Bible, the G-Book, which like the Gettysburgian and the Spectrum dated from the 1890s, was again taken over by the S.C.A., which was responsible for its publication from 1948 to 1960. The last issue, in the fall of 1962, was published by the senior class. Since the need for an up-to-date guidebook for freshmen was as strong as ever, the Dean of Students brought out a revised standard version, called the Student Handbook, in 1967. This annual publication continued through the 1984-1985 year.

The Mercury resumed publication in May 1946. Between then and the spring of 1985 it had the longest uninterrupted run in its history. During the 1950s there were usually three issues each year; later there were two; and beginning in 1972-1973 the number was reduced to one (there was no issue in 1980). In 1962 the Student Senate responded to the initiative of several students by sponsoring a journal

WWGC in operation a few years after its opening.
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which published meritorious student papers for the benefit of the entire campus community. The Gettysburg Review ran from 1962 to 1975. The S.C.A. and then the Chapel Council published the Junto, which between 1961 and 1976 afforded an opportunity for students to comment critically on campus and world events, as well as to present to the public their own poetry and prose.

A different form of student publication appeared in April 1948, when the campus radio station, WWGC, began broadcasting from its studios on the third floor of Breidenbaugh Hall. On the air for about three hours during each of six evenings a week, the station was affiliated with the Intercollegiate Broadcasting System. After the Student Union Building opened in 1959 the studios were moved there. In 1976 WWGC became WZBT-FM, an educational FM station. 244

Athletic Activity

The faculty committee responsible for preparing the 1946 catalogue incorporated into its pages the statement that "various athletic sports... are recognized as an integral part of college life" and are so administered "as to interfere as little as possible with the primary work of the institution." Everyone was required to take two years of physical education or military science; in addition, the College encouraged every student "to participate in some organized athletic sport." Unless parents or guardians gave notice to the contrary, students were "permitted to participate in any or all branches of athletics." The information contained in this statement had first entered the catalogue more than a third of a century before 1946. It reflected an intercollegiate athletic tradition of more than half a century. For a long time before the war, many if not most students firmly believed that a strong athletic program was necessary to maintain school spirit and to attract able recruits for the future. For many alumni the Gettysburg intercollegiate teams offered their most ready identification with the College and vied with the fraternities in fostering continuing loyalty to their alma mater. 245

244 The campus radio station was the result of efforts begun in the fall of 1946 by Leslie M. Hartman, of the class of 1950, and several other students who worked closely with him. Between 1945 and 1985 there were other student publications than the ones mentioned here, none of which lasted for very long. In April 1961 the faculty published a greatly revised catalogue, in which the material was presented in significantly different fashion and in which, for the first time in a century and a quarter, there were numerous illustrations.

245 A 1970 faculty committee report explained this phenomenon as follows: "The athletic teams and sporting events provide one of the easiest means of identification with the college for alumni. Identification through athletics is not dependent upon returning to the campus nor even attending athletic events; the news media provide a readily accessible and continual source of information... It is difficult for an alum-
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Although the College had long since taken control of the athletic program away from the students, in the fall of 1945 it was still not vested exclusively in the administration or faculty. A new constitution which the trustees approved for the Athletic Council in the preceding May assigned to that agency responsibility for the "organization, promotion and administration of the entire intercollegiate and intramural athletic program for the students of Gettysburg College." The 1947 catalogue resumed the prewar practice of listing the members of the Athletic Council by name: three alumni, three faculty, three students, one trustee, and two ex-officio (the president of the board and the president of the College). In 1941 the trustees had taken the important steps of assuming its indebtedness and incorporating its receipts and expenditures into the annual budget, but the council obviously retained a significant role in determining both policy and procedure.

The first postwar order of business for the Athletic Council was to arrange schedules for resuming intercollegiate competition in as many existing sports as possible. The second was to make recommendations to the board of trustees for improving the entire athletic program. In December 1945 it presented a report which stressed the importance of "a comprehensive intramural program" as a way of fostering "leisure time interests" of postcollege years, which registered women's needs for program and physical facilities as well as those of men, and which made the assumption that the postwar program at Gettysburg should compare favorably with those "in the better Liberal Arts coeducational institutions" which have teacher education programs. The specific recommendations which the council made, after reviewing information gleaned from a questionnaire returned by twenty-nine institutions, called for improvements to existing and construction of new facilities, for further development of intercollegiate and intramural programs, and for enlargement of staff.246 Taken together, these recommendations involved much greater expenditures than the College could afford at the time, but the trustees did begin to appropriate funds to make possible a number of necessary improvements.

In 1952 the trustees approved a major change in the administration of the College's athletic program, the initiative for which came from an unexpected source. At the last board meeting of the long Hanson era, in May of that year, Clarence Raby, who was trustee

**nus to identify with the college through the department in which he majored . . . . newsworthy events emanating from academic departments will always be infrequent even under the best of circumstances."

246The report recommended either a women's gymnasium (as a separate building or an addition to Huber Hall) or a field house for men, which would free Plank Gymnasium for use by women.
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representative on the Athletic Council and one of the staunchest supporters of the athletic program, reported to his colleagues that the American Council on Education had recently adopted a statement on athletic policy which, he concluded, "poses a number of questions even for Gettysburg." At his suggestion, the trustees authorized appointment of a committee "to review present practices and policies of our athletic program as well as the agency which is charged with the responsibility of administering it, to see if they conform with the regulations set up by the Special Committee on Athletic Policy of the American Council on Education."

Acting upon the numerous recommendations of their committee, in December 1952 the trustees declared that, "as in all other educational activities, the control of athletics shall be held absolutely and completely by those directly responsible for the administration and operation of the College." Accordingly, the trustees abolished the Athletic Council and replaced it with an eleven-person Advisory Committee on Athletics, consisting of trustees, administrators, faculty, students, and alumni. In stark contrast with those of the body being replaced, its duties were simply to consult with the president and head of the physical education department "in formulating and administering the athletic policies of Gettysburg College." The trustees made the physical education department "directly responsible for the administration of the intercollegiate and intramural program in athletics" and declared that henceforth coaches would be full-fledged faculty members whose entire salaries would "be a charge on the College instructional budget." 247

In addition, the trustees specified that the scholarships committee of the faculty would award all financial aid "under the provisions recommended by the Board of Trustees based upon need, scholarship, and character," and that such aid could not be withdrawn, except as a result of failure to meet the conditions under which it was originally awarded. Continued participation in athletics was not one of the conditions. All individuals and groups wishing to support the athletic program were strongly encouraged to make their contributions to the College and allow the money to be spent according to its established rules and regulations. Finally, the board expressed the hope that games might "be scheduled with opponents whose policies and programs are similar to our own" and that a league might be "founded upon these standards." 248

247 The article in the February 1953 alumni bulletin describing this action gave the impression that the new committee would be performing most of the same tasks as the old council. Obviously, this was not the intention of the new president and the other trustees, nor does it describe what happened.

248 During this period the College was a member of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference (usually called the Middle Atlantic Conference), the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. As such it was pledged to obey their rules as well as its own.
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The report which the College submitted in advance of the 1954 Middle States evaluation included the full text of this major policy statement. The visiting team was generally pleased with what they saw and heard while on the campus. "The conduct of intercollegiate athletics at Gettysburg is in good hands," they wrote. There was no "overemphasis," no indication of "undue student concern over athletics," and no attempt on the part of the College "to play out of its class of colleges." Their only reservation was with cost. The College had reported that about 37 percent of all financial aid in the form of scholarships was going to coach-recommended athletes. "Clearly the President and the board of trustees," the visiting team advised, "must watch the costs in terms of the other major needs of the College."

The intercollegiate schedule for men which the Athletic Council was able to arrange for the 1945-1946 year included soccer, basketball, baseball, tennis, and track. By the following year the prewar sports of football, cross country, wrestling, swimming, and golf were restored to the schedule. The only new men's intercollegiate sport between then and 1984-1985 was lacrosse, beginning in 1956. At the end of the war, there were women's intercollegiate basketball and field hockey teams, both only recently organized. Forty years later, in 1984-1985, there were nine intercollegiate sports for women: field hockey, volleyball, cross country, basketball, swimming, lacrosse, softball, tennis, and track and field.249

During the forty years between 1945 and 1985, football, basketball, and baseball, in that order, continued to be the major intercollegiate sports for men. These teams played a total of 1,995 games and won about 51 percent of them, down significantly from the victory figure of 58 percent during the preceding forty years. The College wrestling team won the Middle Atlantic Conference championship seven times and tied for first place an eighth. Since most sports received little or no financial-aid support, they had to depend upon students who played simply because of the personal satisfaction which it gave them. That was often not enough to produce winning teams. Occasionally there were not enough willing students to field a team every year.250

---

249 For more detailed information on the several sports as well as on the athletic program in general, see Bloom, Intercollegiate Athletics, 2: 21-43.
250 For many years amounts equivalent to thirty-eight of the forty-eight tuition scholarships reserved by trustee action for student athletes (all of whom had to meet the standard need requirement) each year were assigned to football (30) and basketball (8) players. During the entire period covered by this chapter, most team players received no financial aid. Into the 1960s faculty members continued the prewar tradition of coaching such sports as soccer (Louis J. Hammann and Guillermo Barriga), wrestling (John H. Loose), tennis (W. Richard Schubart), and lacrosse (James W. Alexander). This listing of faculty coaches is not complete.
The twenty intercollegiate teams of 1984-1985 engaged in 314 contests and won 66 percent of them. This was probably the best record in almost a century of intercollegiate competition. In 1977 the Advisory Committee on Athletics proposed and the trustees approved establishment of a Hall of Athletic Honor to recognize graduates who had demonstrated desirable traits of character and outstanding athletic attainments. By the end of the 1984-1985 year fifty-eight men and women had been elected to membership, some of them posthumously. The Beachem Athletic Award, established in 1937, continued to be awarded through 1984-1985.

In 1945 the trustees took seriously enough the Athletic Council’s recommendation that they build a field house and turn Plank Gymnasium over to the women. For a time it was their top-priority capital item but, unfortunately, there were too many other compelling demands for far too few available dollars. Consequently, about all the trustees succeeded in doing for the athletic program for more than a decade after the war was to authorize funds for repairs and improvements to existing facilities. Conditions improved markedly only upon completion of the Bream Physical Education Building in 1962 (at which time Plank Gymnasium was turned over to women students), Musselman Stadium in 1965, and the Hauser Field House in 1973. In addition, during the fifties and sixties the College added substantially to the number of playing fields and courts.
In the fall of 1945 the physical education department (as it was then called) consisted of three persons: Clayton E. Bilheimer, professor and director of athletics; Henry T. Bream, associate professor; and Margaret B. Zarfos, director of physical education for women and instructor in hygiene. The postwar increase in enrollment and the introduction of a teacher education program in the late 1940s required a much larger staff, with at least one person whose graduate training included a satisfactory preparation for conducting the required teacher training courses. By the end of the 1950s there were thirteen persons in the department, most of whom had both teaching and coaching duties, all of whom were eligible for tenure (if they did not already have it), and all of whom were subject to career-process evaluations which in practice had to be different from those used for most other faculty. The chief argument employed to support this arrangement was that it bound the athletic program and its staff together with the rest of the educational program and its staff.

In part because it eventually appeared that persons whose primary duties were coaching rather than teaching could not be evaluated, in fairness to all concerned, by attempting to use the standards which applied to chemists, historians, or economists, and in part because it was decided that there were other ways in which to accomplish the equitable treatment of athletic personnel, Charles Glassick offered members of the health and physical education department the choice of continuing their established status as faculty members or of entering a new department of intercollegiate athletics, which would be considered part of the College administr-
tion, responsible to the dean of educational services. In 1964-1965 there were five persons who had elected to retain their faculty positions and eleven who were listed in the catalogue as coaches. 251

Although there was much turnover in the forty years after 1945, the continuity in the health and physical education staff was the more notable phenomenon. Between 1928 and 1975 only three persons held the joint titles of professor and director of athletics: Clayton E. Bilheimer (1928-1953), Henry T. Bream (1953-1969), and Eugene M. Haas (1969-1975). 252 Grace C. Kenney began a career in the department in 1948; by 1985 she was the senior College faculty member in years of service. In the latter year there were four men in the department with more than a quarter century of service: Robert T. Hulton, R. Eugene Hummel, Howard G. Shoemaker, and Gareth V. Biser. Romeo Capozzi ended a forty-four year career as College trainer when he retired in 1971.

Four major and closely related questions about the College's athletic program arose during the 1960s and 1970s and demanded answers. The queries were far-reaching enough to involve several constituencies and controversial enough to have potentially harmful effects on the harmony which had long prevailed among them.

The first of the questions was raised soon after Arnold Hanson became president in 1961 and, properly enough, began examining almost every existing College program. Clearly, he wanted to be certain that all of the moneys contributed for the support of individual athletes and their programs were channeled through the College treasury (in so doing, he was simply following the trustee action of December 1952) and he wanted to review critically the percentage of total financial aid for which student athletes were eligible (something which the 1954 Middle States team had recommended that presidents and trustees do). As the word of what was happening spread, many concluded that the new president was about to "deemphasize" the intercollegiate program, which they took to mean cripple it. 253

251 The 1980-1981 catalogue was the first to list coaches with the administration. The tenured faculty who elected to change status retained their tenure and faculty rank. The status of persons hired after 1979-1980 was determined by the duties of their position.

252 A member of the class of 1924, Hen Bream began his coaching and teaching career at Gettysburg two years later. Gene Haas, a 1943 graduate, joined the faculty in 1954. The chairmanship of the department and directorship of athletics were separated in 1975.

253 In December 1962 Hanson told the trustees that it was not his purpose to emphasize or deemphasize the athletic program, for which he said he had a real concern. At the same time, he insisted that "it was a legitimate question to explore the cost of the athletic program in the whole area of college expenditures." This question arose about the same time some were accusing the administration and faculty of trying to turn Gettysburg into another Haverford or Swarthmore.
Nine long-term members of the health and physical education staff between 1945 and 1985.
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Unfortunately, for one reason or another Hanson never succeeded in his relations with the health and physical education department and with the alumni in convincing them of his true purpose. So many alumni complained to individual trustees about what they had heard that in 1962 the board named a special committee to determine the president's intentions relative to the level of funding for student athletes. As might have been expected, its brief report a year later did not settle the matter. A similar committee, reporting in December 1969, indicated that it had reviewed many aspects of the athletic and physical education programs but did not present its findings. It did express the judgment that the intercollegiate athletic program was "basically sound" and should be continued "under present philosophy and emphasis."

The second question dealt specifically with whether the College was spending an unduly high percentage of its limited funds on intercollegiate athletics, particularly in the form of scholarship grants, as opposed to loans or a combination of grants and loans. This was a question which faculty members frequently raised. In February 1970 the faculty directed the dean of the College to appoint a committee "to investigate the question of whether the practice of awarding athletic grants continues to be of benefit to the College." The lengthy and factual report which the committee submitted three months later answered the question positively. The three members (drawn from the departments of biology, English, and health and physical education) agreed that the money being spent for athletic grants was more than offset by the good will and resulting monetary contributions which the program reportedly generated among alumni and other friends of the College. Reducing it, they concluded, would be taking too great a risk. Moreover, committee members

254The two-page report assured the trustees that Hanson had promised to continue the existing level of funding for student athletes for three years. It also urged them to recognize and accept the Middle States Association criteria for an intercollegiate athletic program, criteria to which it is evident the College was already committed. This report and three which followed it (in 1969, 1970, and 1973) are in GCA.

255Writing on the subject of whether athletics represented an asset or a liability, in the October 1960 alumni bulletin, Coach Robert Hulton observed that "to mention scholarships and athletics in the same breath is, in the eyes of some people, comparable to waving a red flag before a bull." Faculty who were seeing red sometimes argued that more attention should be paid to sports other than football and more to intramural activity. Hulton argued that "at Gettysburg intercollegiate and intramural athletics serve to supplement one another."

256Two members of the committee expressed the hope that, in the future, potential contributors to the College would make its intercollegiate athletic prowess less a factor in determining whether to give. The committee report noted that while the dollar amount of grant money going to student athletes increased during the 1960s, the percentage of total grant money for that purpose had declined significantly. However, student athletes continued to receive all grant money, while most other students were receiving a combination of grants and loans.
found that student athletes receiving financial aid were quite similar to all other students in SAT scores, high school class rank, grade point averages, choice of major fields, and attrition rates. They believed that about half of them would qualify for financial aid even if they were not student athletes.

The third question asked whether Gettysburg was any longer engaged in the proper intercollegiate competition. In 1952 the trustees had declared that "if possible games should be scheduled with opponents whose policies and programs are similar to our own." In the fall season of that year Gettysburg football teams defeated Delaware, Western Maryland, Muhlenberg, Lebanon Valley, Dickinson, and Franklin and Marshall, while losing to Albright, Lehigh, and Bucknell. Most of these were teams which the College had met regularly since the resumption of play in 1946. The fact that it had won 34 games, lost 25, and tied 3 during the seven postwar years suggested that Gettysburg was leagued with institutions having similar policies and programs. Then, later in the decade, a reorganization within the Middle Atlantic Conference resulted in Gettysburg's agreeing to be placed in the university division (with schools such as Bucknell, Delaware, Drexel, Lafayette, Lehigh, Rutgers, St. Joseph's, and Temple) rather than the college division (with schools such as Albright, Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, Haverford, Johns Hopkins, Muhlenberg, Swarthmore, and Western Maryland). Gettysburg teams entered the university division over a period of years, from 1954 for basketball to 1962 for baseball. Once in the new division, they were required to play some, but not all, of their games with other teams within its ranks.

From the beginning, university division teams, some of which Gettysburg had been playing for a long time, offered stiff competition for the College, but the athletic director and his coaches argued persuasively that these teams presented a welcome challenge and that, if Gettysburg men played well, they had a fighting chance of winning the game. That was all that they wanted. Many students and alumni believed strongly that membership in the university division brought great prestige to the College and should be continued. All of these arguments were called into question as several of the other institutions in the division began increasing their total expenditures for intercollegiate athletics by amounts which Gettysburg could not be expected to match. The chances for its teams to score occasional wins in contests within the division became increasingly remote. In 1969 and 1970 they won none of the eight games played with Bucknell, Delaware, Lafayette, and Lehigh.

Students, alumni, and others continued to be dissatisfied with the athletic program. In May 1972 the Board of Fellows discussed it and...
then adopted a series of recommendations to the trustees. Convinced that no board action should be taken before a thoroughgoing study could be made, two months later President Hanson named a committee of four faculty and administrators to undertake such a review. When they met in September 1972, the trustees appointed a joint committee on men's intercollegiate athletics. It consisted of eleven trustees, fellows, faculty, administrators, and students (and included the four persons the president had named earlier). The report which the joint committee submitted in March 1973 relied heavily upon information supplied in confidence to the president's committee by eight other institutions in the Middle Atlantic Conference. It demonstrated more fully than any previous effort had just how much less money Gettysburg was spending on intercollegiate athletics than many, if not most, other schools in the university division. The additional amounts required for it to match its competition dollar for dollar (at one point in the report a figure of several hundred thousand dollars annually was mentioned) were obviously much greater than trustees, administrators, and faculty could responsibly approve for Gettysburg. There was a sensible alternative, which the committee recommended and the trustees approved. The College should have an athletic program commensurate with its resources, they decided, and should begin taking steps to insure that it competed with schools having resources similar to its own.  

257 Even before the joint committee made its report to the trustees, the director of athletics, in preparing future schedules, had begun to eliminate some teams in the university division and add others which had been dropped or which the College had never played. Since the National Collegiate Athletic Association approved a major reorganization in August 1973, one which affected all of the regional conferences, it took some time before Gettysburg could make its desired adjustment as a member of the N.C.A.A.'s Division III, which the Middle Atlantic Conference voted to join. In football, the last game with Temple was played in 1969, with Delaware in 1973, with Lehigh in 1977, and with Bucknell in 1979. The first game with Western Maryland since 1957 was played in 1975, the first since 1958 with Franklin and Marshall in 1976, the first since 1953 with Dickinson and Lebanon Valley in 1978, and the first since 1964 with Muhlenberg in 1981.  

258 Previous reports on athletics remained largely internal documents. The findings of the joint committee, as approved by the board in March 1973, were reported in the April 1973 alumni bulletin, p. 3.

258 In the October 1977 alumni bulletin, p. 17, Sports Information Director Robert Kenworthy explained the several conference affiliations of the men's and women's athletic teams. For football, Gettysburg eventually became a member of the independent Centennial Conference (formed 1981, named 1983, and in effect 1984). All eight members were also members of the Middle Atlantic Conference.
The fourth question, which asked whether Gettysburg was providing equal athletic facilities and opportunities for its women students, became more pressing as the number of females in the student body increased and as there was heightened concern that they receive fair treatment in every way. As early as 1945 the trustees had agreed that "the needs for women in both program and physical facilities seem to be [note the phrase "seem to be"] of equal importance with those for men." At the same time, the Athletic Council declared that "it did not favor a highly competitive and formal program of Intercollegiate competition for women." In the decade and a half that followed this pronouncement, there was little disposition to change the policy. The 1960 catalogue listed but three intercollegiate sports for women: field hockey, basketball, and swimming. Women had to share with men the increasingly inadequate indoor space available in Plank Gymnasium. Only in 1962, when the men vacated the building and the women took possession, was there any decided improvement. Although from the time of its opening in 1959 they had access to the swimming pool in the Student Union Building, for many years women had none to the facilities in Bream. It is clear that structure was conceived, planned, and constructed as a men's physical education building, at a time when it was considered proper in physical education to keep the sexes as separate as possible. During the many years when there was a specified number of scholarships reserved for male athletes, there were none designated for women.

In the decade between 1975 and 1985 the College took a number of major steps designed to make equal (or certainly more nearly equal) facilities and opportunities available to its women students. Increased funds were appropriated for their programs. Since the rules for Division III schools prohibited granting the traditional athletic scholarships, both male and female students now competed for financial aid on equal terms. The 1975 catalogue listed five sports in the intercollegiate program for women: field hockey, basketball, swimming, tennis, and lacrosse. Ten years later, with the addition of volleyball, cross country, softball, and track and field, there were nine.

In a matter-of-fact way, the 1985 catalogue stated that "the College has an extensive program of intercollegiate and intramural activities for men and women," one which made it "possible for all students to participate in some supervised sport." Gone from its pages, though not necessarily from the purposes of the institution, was the 1946 declaration that sports were "recognized as an integral part of college life" and that they were administered so "as to interfere as little as possible with the primary work of the institution."
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Although in response to changing times the intercollegiate program was considerably different from what it had been forty years earlier, the fact is that it had survived every questioning and challenge in the interim. There were undoubtedly several reasons for its survival. Almost all of the students who participated in the program had met the College's academic requirements and been graduated. Athletic directors and coaches made it a practice to adhere closely to the rules of the several conferences to which the College belonged and, even more importantly, to its own rules. Albeit not without anguish and misunderstanding, the concerned constituencies had demonstrated their capacity to examine critically and, where finally deemed necessary, alter athletic policies and procedures. The record of intercollegiate teams in the 1980s created good will for the College and offered convincing evidence that, in accordance with the hope of 1952, games were being "scheduled with opponents whose policies and programs are similar to our own."

Although the ambitious goals which were sometimes set for the intramural program were rarely realized, the effort to maintain it was a continuing one. In the mid-1980s there was vigorous intramural activity. In 1985 there remained an all-College requirement in health and physical education, no longer with military science as an alternative. It consisted of one semester of work in each of the following: health science, fitness, and recreational skills. In addition, there was still a teacher education program in health and physical education.

Through the four decades covered by this chapter, the freshman handbook, Gettysburgian, and Spectrum continued to devote attention to the athletic program, but a comparison of the nature and extent of the coverage in 1946 and 1985 suggests that student interest became less intense with the passing years. Gone from the freshman handbook were the cheers and songs which could still be found in the 1962 G-Book. The highly developed rituals for sending off the football teams and welcoming them home had been set aside. Football holidays were a thing of the past. All of this was not to say that student interest in the athletic program no longer existed. It had taken different forms, just as school spirit in general had been transformed.

**College Spirit**

At least some students in attendance during World War II attempted to continue as many College customs as they could, in the belief that former students then in the service should be able to
return, and indeed wanted to return, to a Gettysburg which in spirit would be as much as possible like the one they had left. While most of the intercollegiate athletic schedule could not be continued during wartime, it was still possible to sing the alma mater, cheer the few teams which did play, listen to the choir, and subject the incoming freshmen to customs. When the war ended in 1945, student leaders promptly made a genuine effort to restore what might be called the status quo ante bellum. 259

College spirit depended to a considerable degree, although certainly not entirely, upon the success of student leaders in introducing the new freshmen to their particular vision of what campus life should be like. Their first opportunity to reach each fall’s neophytes was still through the pages of the G-Book, mailed to their home address during the summer. For many years after 1945 it contained a separate section on College traditions. Although each successive staff determined the content and style of this publication, certain themes appeared regularly enough to qualify as major elements of the College tradition.

Because it was the thing to do at Gettysburg, students (and faculty as well) said hello to each other and to all campus visitors. Students were friendly, courteous, and thoughtful in their dealings with each other, faculty members, administrators, and visitors. Because the campus was democratic, Gettysburgians were expected to say what they thought, tactfully of course. Everyone wishing to avoid disgrace and unpopularity observed the three noes: cheating, drunkenness (not drinking), and immorality. 260 They not only learned but also used the many College songs and cheers. The alma mater, which everyone sang, always merited special attention. Used to end every “official function,” it caused men to remove their hats and brought all to their feet. The 1945 G-Book declared that “high scholastic attainment brings the respect of fellow students” and has more long-run value to student and College than “extra curricular achievement.” Finally, the importance of athletics as an ingredient of College tradition was demonstrated by the emphasis placed on good

259 For a fuller treatment of student life in this period, see Anna Jane Moyer, The Way We Were: A History of Student Life at Gettysburg College, 1832-1982 (Gettysburg, 1982). Beginning in the fall of 1945 a traditions committee, which later took other names, engaged in a study designed to help make “Gettysburg College the best small college in the country.” Composed of faculty and students, and guided by Professor Kramer, during the next several years and until its energy was exhausted, this committee ranged over virtually every aspect of College life, both traditional and otherwise. One of its first undertakings was to encourage students to continue the campus hello.
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sportmanship, including participation in pep rallies, parades, bonfires, and cheering at the games. Gettysburg students did not boo referee decisions or treat visiting teams discourteously. They supported the home team in defeat as well as in victory. After every home football triumph they continued the old practice of ringing the Glatfelter Hall bell.261

Staff after staff emphasized that although one could not find these and other College traditions written down in any one place or ever formally promulgated, they were nevertheless real and compelling. "Just as the British Empire has her common law," declared the 1958 G-Book, "so Gettysburg College has her 126 years of deep traditions which, although unwritten, are faithfully kept by her students." Occasionally G-Book writers took the considerable risk involved in advising the freshmen to learn about these "deep traditions" by observing the actions of the upperclassmen. "Our traditions give a uniqueness to life at Gettysburg which causes us, both as undergraduates and later as alumni, to feel a special identification with our Alma Mater," declared the 1960 edition. "These customs bind us together and play an important part in helping us to achieve the goals of a liberal arts education."

Although the 1951 G-Book was the first to establish a direct connection in writing between College tradition and freshmen customs, students had been associating the two for many years before that.

---

261 The Gettysburgian for October 14, 1954 reported what it called an "almost unbelievable legend" resulting from Dean Tilberg's recent accidental discovery of a letter in his files and subsequent communication with his Muhlenberg counterpart. According to the "legend," a farmer living near Allentown sent one of his sons to Gettysburg and another to Muhlenberg. Both made the football team. Fond of the game, the father brought to the 1911 contest between the two schools [it was played at Gettysburg] an old tin cup, described as a valued family heirloom, intending to give it to the son whose team won the game. During the first half, his Gettysburg son, then a senior, kicked a field goal, which registered the only score of the day and gave Gettysburg a 3-0 victory. Unfortunately, he was injured during the second half and had to leave the game. Upon graduation, he presented his tin cup to Gettysburg College with the understanding that it would be used as a feature of friendly Gettysburg-Muhlenberg rivalry, remaining with the team which had won the most recent game. According to the legend, the tin cup was forgotten during 1914-1920, when there was no rivalry, and in 1921, when play was resumed, it was not remembered. In 1954 the Gettysburg and Muhlenberg student newspapers mounted the tin cup, recently "found" at the latter school, on an attractive base, in a successful effort to revive the tradition, which remained in effect thirty years later. Even a cursory examination of the sources demonstrates that what the Gettysburgian printed in 1954, with the tacit support of two deans, was a legend not based on fact and that the two student newspapers were creating rather than reviving a tradition. There was a Gettysburg-Muhlenberg game in October 1911 and Van Buren Dayhoff did kick the field goal which gave Gettysburg a 3-0 victory. However, he was from Steelton; he had no brother on the Muhlenberg team; he was not injured later in the game; he was a student in 1910-1912 and was never graduated; and the Gettysburgians of 1912 and 1913 make no mention of any trophy passing between the teams.
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date. No customs, they had repeatedly declared, no spirit. After the war, students sought to explain this idea to the freshmen in increasingly positive terms. No longer were they told that their proud spirits had to be broken in order for them to become acceptable members of the College community. Instead, they were informed in 1945 that customs were “a distinction reserved for all those who have yet to become initiated into the spirit of Gettysburg College,” in 1946 that “they are as much a part of this campus as apple pie is of the United States,” in 1948 that “disregarding their external appearances, [they] give to you many benefits,” in 1952 that they emphasize “good sportsmanship and fun,” and, finally, in 1962 that they are “designed to help the members of the new class to get to know each other as well as to know the upperclassmen.”

Wisely enough, student leaders decided in 1945 to exempt incoming veterans from customs. Until 1958 the rules for men and women were separately formulated and administered. While the period of freshmen purgatory had in years past sometimes lasted into the spring semester, after 1945 its length decreased. By the end of the 1950s the tug-of-war, which the freshmen usually won, was releasing them only about two weeks into the semester. In the fall of 1959 freshmen succeeded in throwing off customs after the third day.

Successive G-Books described the traditions student leaders believed existed or should exist and strongly implied that the announced freshmen customs had campuswide support and would be vigorously enforced. It is clear from the columns of the Gettysburgian that the actual state of affairs was somewhat different from the published ideal. After 1945 the College was much larger than it had been before the war and many of its students brought new perspectives to the institution. Understandably, few parts of the old and established system of freshmen initiation escaped criticism. On October 9, 1947 an editorial admonished sophomores and upperclassmen to “lead the way towards a better campus life instead of instituting rules which they violate and then mock from the sidelines.” Two weeks later another editorial declared that the existing system was benefitting no one and “operating only under the thinnest veil of tradition.” The issue of October 18, 1951 announced

---

262 The 1945 G-Book proclaimed that “there is no better way for learning about your fellow men than to be placed in a mutually difficult position.” Following rules “develops respect for the institution and self respect by abiding by its laws and traditions.” Thus, customs were “for a purpose” and “full cooperation” was expected of all.

263 The shoe scramble and flag rush, both devised before the war, were early postwar casualties. There were many other changes in the way in which customs were handled after 1945. For example, sentences were no longer carried out on the south steps of Pennsylvania Hall.
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Customs for Freshmen Men, 1955-1956

(1) The custom period will begin on the opening day of school, and will last until after the first home football game. There will be a tug-of-war between the freshmen and sophomores immediately following the football game at the Tiber.

(2) Posters are to be put up warning freshmen to wear their customs. Freshmen will obey these signs.

(3) The following customs shall be worn at all times except when out of town, dinner dates, and Sundays:
   a. The regulation dink (except indoors).
   b. Orange necktie.
   c. Orange stockings with the trousers rolled to the knee.
   d. A sign 6" by 12" containing the freshman’s name, hometown, and state; and to be worn in front whenever possible.
   e. Freshmen will wear orange shoe laces.

(4) Freshmen must greet everyone with the traditional Gettysburg “hello.” freshmen will also tip their dinks by grasping the button and raising the dink, whenever an upperclassman says “Button frosh.”

(5) Freshmen will not walk on the grass at any time.

(6) Freshmen will carry matches for all upperclassmen. They shall smoke only in their respective dormitories.

(7) Freshmen will not date or converse with coeds during the custom period.

(8) Freshmen must not enter any building by the front entrance (except Huber Hall).

(9) Freshmen will not use profanity.

(10) All freshmen must attend home football games and form a double line at the locker room to greet the team at the beginning and at the half time of each game. Dinks must be worn at this time.

(11) Freshmen must know the Alma Mater, College Hymn, and the college cheers, and must carry their G-Books at all times.

(12) Freshmen will observe quiet hours in their dorms.

(13) Freshmen will not put their hands in their pockets at any time except to withdraw such articles as pencils, matches, etc.

(14) If the freshmen lose the tug-of-war following the first home football game, customs will continue for another week, when another tug-of-war will be held.

(15) Freshmen will sit in the reserved section of the chapel consisting of the first rows in the center section. Freshmen must wait until upperclassmen have left chapel before leaving themselves.

Customs will officially get under way as the freshmen leave chapel on September 15. The men’s tribunal and selected men from each fraternity will form a line outside of chapel to welcome the freshmen. At the beginning of chapel the freshmen will be directed to their seats at the front by members of the tribunal. The men’s tribunal will wear black armbands with a white “T,” to be provided by the Student Senate.

There will be trials of freshmen in front of the tribunal every four (4) days to make sure the freshmen are adhering to customs.
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Customs for Freshmen Women, 1955-1956

(1) The dink is to be worn at all times except over weekends, which starts at 6:00 p.m. Saturday and ends 7:00 a.m. Monday.
(2) Signs are to be worn at all times except after 6:00 o'clock each evening until 7:00 o'clock the next morning and from 6:00 o'clock Saturday night until 7:00 o'clock Monday morning. They are to be worn at mealtime. Signs are to measure 12 inches by 4 inches and are to be worn on the back. Name and home town are to be printed on the sign in bold letters.
(3) No make-up, nail polish, or jewelry (except watches, engagement rings, wedding rings, or fraternity pins) are to be worn for the same times as those stated for the wearing of the sign.
(4) Fraternity pins, engagement or wedding rings, and watches must be tied with a blue ribbon for the same time as that stated for wearing the sign.
(5) Do not walk on the grass or any dirt path. Walk only on the pavement.
(6) Know the Alma Mater, all stanzas of the College Hymn, and all songs and cheers in the G-Book.
(7) Say "Hello" to everyone on campus.
(8) Do not attend Men's Tribunal and Roman Holiday (the occasion when Tribunal sentences were carried out).
(9) Freshmen must carry matches for upperclassmen.
(10) Only one bobby pin or clip or comb may be worn in the hair to hold it in place.
(11) No smoking on campus.
(12) Enter and leave Glatfelter Hall by the side doors only. Enter and leave Science Hall by the back door only.
(13) Show respect for upperclassmen by opening doors for them and running errands.
(14) Freshmen must maintain complete quiet during all quiet hours in the dorms.
(15) Freshmen must not use the walk that goes diagonally from Glatfelter to the center light near the library and Brua Hall.
(16) Compulsory line-ups are held several times during the duration of customs. Any disobedience of these rules is then given a penalty.

that customs had been called off after the preceding Saturday's Lehigh game because of a general lack of interest and support. Freshmen who were summoned did not appear, nor did other students whose presence as an audience was equally necessary. "Freshmen should be willing to submit themselves to Tribunal actions," readers were told, "because they should realize that these customs are just a part of the overall plan of orientation to better acquaint them with the campus and its students." This advice ran directly counter to that offered about the same time by local graduate members of all four sororities, who declared that most customs were "clownish activities" which hindered rather than helped first-year students adjust to campus life. An unidentified under-
graduate writing in the April 1959 alumni bulletin complained that during the preceding fall "dinks were at times purposely forgotten; . . . violations were often overlooked, even by Tribunal members; . . . punishments were frequently not carried through; and . . . freshmen, as well as upperclassmen, were hardly aware that 'customs' existed on the Gettysburg campus."

Despite criticisms and freshmen revolts, which became frequent enough that they almost gained the status of a custom, the annual ritual, as regularly amended, continued into the 1960s. Of more than eight hundred students who responded to a questionnaire in March 1959, 89 percent of the men and 98 percent of the women declared themselves in favor of retaining customs. Whether this meant these students were willing to give them more than lip service was another question. The Gettysburgian for February 26, 1959 declared that, as then being practiced, customs were "a farce," and that unless students were willing to "go back to the old way, and preserve an old tradition," they would soon collapse of their own weight.264

The last G-Book, published in 1962, still contained sections on College traditions and customs. After a hiatus of five years, during which there was no comparable publication, it was replaced by the Student Handbook in 1967. The new freshman handbook contained a reference to "the traditions and customs of the college as a whole," but the incoming students could not learn from its pages what these

---

264 According to the Gettysburgian for October 4, 1963, the real losers as the result of a recent riot were the freshmen themselves, who thereby forfeited "the greater part of their chances for unity for the next four years." The 1959 editorial was reacting to the first year's experience with the same customs for men and women.
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were. Instead, there was a section identifying the various friends ready to welcome them to the campus. There were still seven customs for freshmen; these were now being prepared by the Booster Club and approved by the Student Senate. The 1969 Student Handbook was the last issue to refer to freshmen customs, five of which were listed:

1. All freshmen are requested to wear their regulation class dink on campus from Saturday until Wednesday evening, and during the first home football game.
2. Each freshman shall wear with this dink an identification card of the approved type, bearing his name and hometown. This identification will facilitate class acquaintance.
3. All freshmen shall learn the G-burg Alma Mater found on the inside cover of the handbook, and be acquainted with the school’s history.
4. All freshmen shall sit in the freshmen cheering section at the fall athletic games and shall form two lines to welcome the team at the beginning of each game.
5. During the orientation period there shall be one day set aside as Dink Day. The activities of this day will be explained by Orientation Leaders.265

Thus, after almost three-quarters of a century, freshmen now had somehow to be introduced to College life without the sanction of a battery of customs administered by masked men operating at night, by a tribunal meting out what was called daylight discipline, or by a booster club which had always depended upon urging rather than compulsion to accomplish its purposes. The 1970 and subsequent handbooks contained a minimum of exhortation of any kind and a maximum of factual information about College facilities and regulations.266

In retrospect, it is evident that many of the major practices which students had long identified as the sources of an indispensable College spirit never had quite the same appeal after 1945 as they had in an earlier and different day. Even before the turmoil of the 1960s, there were signs that they had altogether or almost run their course.

---

265 The Booster Club was established in 1949 to promote school spirit by encouraging students to participate in pep rallies, attend athletic contests, cheer the home team, and advance the College in many other ways. In the early 1960s it began to participate in developing and administering freshmen customs. When the Tribunal faded from the scene shortly thereafter (the last reference this writer found was to a Tribunal of sophomores and cheerleaders in the fall of 1963), the Booster Club assumed full responsibility for the program. A brief announcement in the April 1968 issue of the alumni bulletin declared that, due in large part to the lack of student interest, the Booster Club had disbanded. The collapse of freshmen customs soon followed.

266 Probably without any knowledge of what the word hazing had meant on the Gettysburg campus in years past, students after 1945 sometimes referred to the Tribunal operations by that name. What hazing there was on the campus after 1945 was carried on by the fraternities.
One need only read *G-Books*, *Gettysburgians*, and *Spectrums* to see what was happening to the old traditions and customs. After the mid-1950s the G-Book section on traditions consisted of little more than a recital of major events occurring during the academic year, beginning with opening convocation and ending with spring house-parties. The Tribunal (after 1935, Tribunals), which had been a staple *Spectrum* item since the mid-1920s, was last pictured in the 1956 edition. By the late 1950s, while still concerned about school spirit, the Gettysburgian gave less and less attention to coverage of freshmen customs. Clearly, any such spirit which might exist in the 1970s and 1980s would have to rest to a considerable degree on different traditions and take different forms.

"We are one big family," declared the 1950 G-Book. "It used to be a nice size: 600-650. The war has changed that, but we can still be one family." As the enrollment increased by more than 50 percent in the decade after 1950, the traditional campus hello gradually became the exception rather than the rule. Nevertheless, prospective students and numerous visitors continued to testify that Gettysburg remained a friendly and inviting campus.

There is no evidence to indicate that anyone ever tried to determine how many post-1945 students, of all classes, had actually honored the prescribed custom of learning and remembering the College songs and cheers. As late as 1982, the *Student Handbook* still prominently featured the alma mater, but it was being used less frequently than in years past and a smaller percentage of students knew it by heart. The College hymn last received wide distribution in the 1962 *G-Book* and thereafter was quickly forgotten by all except a few whose memory was long. The early postwar *G-Books* contained other songs, as well as ten or more cheers. The number of the latter dropped to about five a decade later. Cheers appeared last in the 1969 handbook.267

Student support of intercollegiate athletics, especially football, did not continue to match that of earlier periods in intensity and near...
unanimity, but it remained a considerable factor in school spirit. A 1970 survey conducted by the faculty committee on athletic scholarships resulted in the conclusion that 35 percent of the students were attending athletic events on a regular basis and 55 percent on an irregular basis. More than two-thirds favored continuation of grants reserved for athletes and a majority wanted to see the College remain in the university division. One of the most important developments after 1970 was a significant increase in the amount of intramural as well as individual athletic activity. While it might be difficult to determine how much this activity contributed to school spirit, it cannot be ignored.

In 1985, as in 1945, the College choir and other musical organizations and, in their own ways, the fraternities continued to nourish both tradition and spirit. None of these organizations embraced the entire student body as did the academic honor system, beginning in the fall of 1957. Imperfect instrument though it proved to be during the ensuing twenty-eight years, the honor system nevertheless summoned both students and faculty to develop and sustain a spirit centrally related to the main purposes of the institution.269

Alumni

The organized alumni effort which was in place in the fall of 1945 had been in existence in that form since 1929 and had been in charge of C. Paul Cessna since 1937. By means of the quarterly alumni bulletin and correspondence Cessna kept in touch with individual alumni and tried to cultivate their interest as one of the key constituencies of the College. It was his responsibility to encourage and promote the activities of each of about twenty-five alumni clubs. Working with Alumni Association leaders, he administered the annual Loyalty Fund, which between the time of its inception in 1933 and the end of the 1944-1945 year had yielded slightly more than $100,000. Finally, the alumni secretary coordinated the various activities during fall homecoming and commencement weekend which brought many former students back to the campus. The alumni program was perforce curtailed during the war, but it was not abandoned. Once hostilities ended, plans were made to resume the usual schedule of events. The first postwar fall homecoming, for

269 Ninety-five members of the class of 1983 who responded to a senior survey ranked the things about the College which they wanted to see preserved in this order: fraternity life (although they thought social life should be less dependent on fraternities), relatively small size (the friendliness of students and faculty, they reported, was an important consideration in bringing them to Gettysburg), the honor code, and the beauty of the campus. Members of the class of 1982 who responded to a similar survey reached similar conclusions.
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example, was held in November 1946.

It soon became evident that the task of the alumni office after 1945 was going to dwarf anything it had previously experienced, if only because of the rapid increase in the number of persons to be reached. Between September 1834 and June 1985 the College awarded degrees to some 19,149 students, fully 75 percent of whom were graduated after 1945. Between 1946 and 1985 the College usually awarded degrees to more students in one year than during the entire period from 1834 to 1868. Slightly more than one-third of the postwar graduates were women. At the end of the 1984-1985 year, and including the most recent graduating class, there were some 17,921 names on the alumni rolls, of which 15,588, or 87 percent, were those of post-1945 students.269 One of the major concerns of the Alumni Association and of College administrators during the entire period of this chapter was how to establish and maintain a mutually advantageous relationship with this large and growing body of men and women.270

The Alumni Association founded in 1835 continued to function vigorously after 1945.271 Its presidents were still elected for three-year terms and were ineligible for re-election. The first incumbent from a postwar graduating class was chosen in 1968. Over the years association committees suggested numerous changes in the operation of the College, many of which were adopted, usually with good results. For example, in the early postwar years it was the alumni who urged the College to publish more information about its annual income and expenditures, investigate alumni performance in graduate and professional schools, and establish a public relations office.

269The October 1985 issue of the alumni bulletin, p. 43, was the source for the number of persons on the various class rolls (1912-1984), some of whom were non-graduates. The registrar estimated that about 28,529 students entered the College between 1832 and the fall of 1984. During and immediately after the war, students completed their requirements and left the campus at so many different times that the identity of the class to which one properly belonged was almost impossible to determine to anyone's satisfaction. The alumni office eventually gave the graduates of these years the opportunity to choose whatever class designation they wished.

270Writing in the July 1960 alumni bulletin, the director of alumni relations lamented that "two-thirds of our 10,000 alumni...never cast their ballot, never attend club meetings, never return to campus for homecomings or reunions, and never give a dollar to the loyalty fund."

271The 1953 constitution declared that every matriculated student who left the College in good standing was a member of the Alumni Association, as were non-alumni faculty, trustees, and honorary degree recipients. The 1984 constitution limited membership to graduates; nongraduates who after their class was graduated expressed a desire to belong; non-alumni faculty, trustees, and administrators; and honorary degree recipients. The association constitution underwent major revision on at least six occasions after 1945: 1953, 1960, 1964, 1975, 1979, and 1984.
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In 1946 the Alumni Association returned to the practice of using a mail ballot to all members in order to nominate one candidate annually for election as alumni trustee. This practice prevailed until 1979, when it was replaced by one in which the candidate was chosen by a nominating committee. Making its selection from names submitted by various sources, including classes and clubs, the committee then forwarded its choice for approval by the Alumni Association's executive board (successor of the earlier alumni council). As was the case ever since alumni were first given representation in 1886, it was the College board which actually elected all alumni trustees. Eight of those chosen after 1945 had been presidents of the Alumni Association. After their six-year term expired, several of these persons were elected to regular membership and provided some of the board's most effective leadership. Half of the ten women elected to the board of trustees between 1947 and 1985 were nominated by the Alumni Association.

Paul Cessna continued to serve as alumni secretary until ill health led him to resign in 1957. His departure coincided with President Paul's major reorganization of the College administration. Over the objection of some alumni leaders, the General placed responsibility for alumni affairs within the development office. In 1958 he named Harold A. Dunkelberger Director of Alumni Relations and Development, a position which he held until he returned to full-time teaching two years later. Subsequent alumni secretaries have been Howard B. Maxwell (1960-1962), Richard E. Walker (1963-1971), J. Crist Hoffman (1971-1972), and Robert D. Smith (since 1972). In 1977 Rosea Armor concluded her forty-seven year career as assistant and associate of seven alumni secretaries.

The 1946 catalogue listed twenty-six alumni clubs, located (except for one in India) as far west as southern California and as far south as Louisiana. The number had increased to twenty-eight by the time President Langsam took charge six years later and to thirty-seven as the Paul administration came to a close in 1961. There were thirty-nine clubs in existence in the spring of 1985, located as far west as southern California and as far south as Florida. All of the

---

272 The General named Cessna assistant to the president, adviser of alumni affairs, and College historian, effective July 1, 1957. His health continued to fail and he died in October 1958.

273 The General's 1957 reorganization placed responsibility for all oncampus activities upon the dean of students and for all offcampus activities upon the director of development. The latter's office included alumni relations and public relations (or information), as well as development. The establishment of a public relations office in 1952 was a victory for the Alumni Association, which had strongly urged such a move.

274 Maxwell's title was Director of Alumni Relations. Smith held the same title, by virtue of which he was also executive secretary of the Alumni Association.
presidents since 1945, many faculty members and administrators, and many officers of the Alumni Association joined the successive alumni secretaries in making regular visits to these clubs. Although their vitality continued to depend upon the willingness of at least a few volunteers to provide sustained leadership, their record of survival was definitely better than had been the case with the first district organizations a century earlier. Nevertheless, more than one-third of the clubs of 1984-1985 were listed as being, temporarily at least, inactive. Revitalization of these important bodies was a continuing concern of the Alumni Association.

Fall homecoming and commencement week activities were as much a part of the College program in 1984-1985 as they had been in the years before World War II. For example, commencement weekend still included the Friday evening alumni dinner and the Saturday collation. Successive presidents used the latter occasion to deliver major reports on the state of the College. New features included a dinner for members of nonreuniting classes who returned
for commencement activities; the first of these was held in 1957. A year later the alumni office scheduled the first of many special events with academic content (called seminars, colloquies, or colleges) designed to appeal to alumni of all ages. Although the attendance was usually small, there was enough interest to warrant continuing these efforts. In 1973, at their request, regular reunions of classes having been graduated for twenty-five years or less were moved from commencement weekend to fall homecoming.

Following World War II, the Alumni Association continued to recognize "notable and meritorious service" to the College by graduates of fifteen or more years through its Alumni Meritorious Service Awards, usually presented to two persons each year at the collation. The 1946 recipients were all Gettysburgians who lost their lives in the service of their country during the war. After 1945 the association created three additional ways of recognizing its members. First, in 1959 the Alumni Service Certificate was introduced to honor those "whose service to Gettysburg College, through the general Alumni Association" or through an alumni club, had been "singular and significant." These awards were usually presented at alumni club meetings. Second, in 1962 the first Distinguished Alumni Certificates were awarded. No more than four of these annually were authorized, to graduates of fifteen or more years "who have done outstanding work for humanity or who have distinguished themselves professionally." The presentation was usually part of the spring honors day convocation. Third, in 1982 the Alumni Association established its young Alumni Achievement Award, for which graduates of fifteen years or less were eligible. One award was made annually in recognition of "service to Gettysburg College" and a second of "professional or career development." Recipients were honored during fall homecoming.\footnote{The statements of criteria for these awards were taken from the 1984 by-laws. There is a list of recipients of the meritorious service and distinguished alumni awards in Gettysburg College: Alumni Directory, 1981 (White Plains, N.Y., 1981), pp. xi-xii.}

One of the most effective ways for the College to reach its alumni, both before and after 1945, was through the pages of the quarterly alumni bulletin. Although in the decade after the war this publication continued to include much useful information about campus happenings, alumni clubs, and individual graduates, toward the end of the 1950s the Alumni Association and the administration agreed that a significant change in both format and content, the first in almost thirty years, was in order. The initial number of a bulletin which was described as wearing "the New Look" appeared in January 1959. It promised an undergraduate page, a faculty page, and letters to the editor. Writing in the July 1960 issue, the retiring director of alumni relations asserted that the publication now con-
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tained "a much larger proportion of intellectual meat in keeping with a college's true purpose." In the years that followed, and reflecting the ever changing interests of both oncampus and offcampus constituencies, the alumni bulletin continued to evolve. There was less reporting on the detailed workings of the Alumni Association and its committees, but more on the scholarly and related activities of faculty, students, and alumni. One prominent feature of the earlier bulletin which survived intact was personal information about alumni, arranged by classes.

In response to a suggestion that the College should issue a "simple, inexpensive newssheet" between quarterly bulletins, the first number of News Flashes appeared in October 1960. During more than a decade of existence, this publication had several different names. Postwar alumni directories were published in 1956, 1975, and 1981. In addition, beginning in 1966 directories were sometimes included in the alumni bulletin.

One of the major projects of the Alumni Association beginning in 1933 and continuing through World War II was managing the Loyalty Fund. A recurring question after 1945 was whether the annual drive should continue to be made while the College was engaged in major fund-raising campaigns, which seemed almost always to be the case. In the face of understandable reluctance to approach potential givers with both hands extended at the same time, College administrators argued that current needs demanded such a plea, and thus only occasionally were loyalty and capital campaigns merged.

The annual yields from the Loyalty Fund exceeded $25,000 for the first time in 1951; $50,000 in 1957; and $100,000 in 1963. The average for the remainder of the Arnold Hanson administration was about $175,000. Thanks to renewed efforts, challenge grants, and greater nonalumni contributions, the total reached $500,000 in 1981 and exceeded $1,000,000 in 1985. The number of alumni contributors increased from 625 in 1948 (the first postwar campaign) to more than 3,000 during the Hanson years and to 6,283 in 1985 (in which year there were 7,895 contributors in all). The total amount

276 Assisted by an editorial board, Dorothy S. Bloom was managing editor of the bulletin from 1958 to 1964, after which the task fell to the director of public relations. The April 1958 issue contained a hint of impending changes: a thirty-two page American Alumni Council report on contemporary American higher education. In his introduction to the report, the General declared the alumni needed to know what was happening in other colleges and universities. As was to be expected, the "New Look" bulletin drew criticism from those who were satisfied with things as they were.

277 A frequent bulletin feature, beginning in January 1975, was an "Out of the Past" column which dealt with some aspect of College history.

278 For some years after 1945 the Alumni Association still played the major role in conducting the Loyalty Fund and determining how its proceeds were to be used. Gradually the College administration assumed these tasks.
SERVING THE CAUSE
given during the forty years between 1945 and 1985 was in excess of $7,800,000. The 1984 and 1985 drives achieved participation from about 37 percent of the alumni. In recognition of the facts that for many years nonalumni contributed heavily to this campaign and that alumni could demonstrate their loyalty to the College in ways other than by contributing money to it, in 1982 the name was changed to the Annual Fund.279

The College has always depended in many ways upon its alumni, sometimes acting through their association, but more often acting individually. From criticism of their alma mater there often emerged useful suggestions for improvement. In ways that changed as times changed, the College relied heavily on alumni to help recruit promising students. During the years between 1945 and 1985 about three of every four trustees, those persons who were finally responsible for governing the College, were alumni. It came to be taken for granted that committees chosen to deal with major matters, such as the choice of a president, would include one or more nontrustee graduates. In every postwar drive to raise funds, the College called upon its alumni for major contributions of their own and for their help in attracting support from other sources.

During the first century of the College's existence, it was both possible and practical for the faculty member who was serving as Alumni Association secretary or, after 1929, for the alumni secretary to maintain a reasonably accurate summary of the numbers of graduates who had entered each of about a dozen careers. On a number of occasions, including the 1932 centennial, the College proudly published such a summary as an evidence of its accomplishment as an institution of higher education. After World War II, as the numbers of graduates and careers mushroomed, and as career mobility increased, while it was still possible to summarize as before, it was less and less practical to make the attempt. The 1982 sesquicentennial passed without any statement similar to the one featured in so many publications half a century before. One thing was certain: while some graduates were still going into the ministry, law, medicine, and teaching (at all levels), most of the post-1945 alumni pursued careers in business, using that term in the broadest sense.

By 1985 there were at least thirteen names to add to the list of graduates who had been presidents of institutions of higher learning and who were named in preceding chapters: Harry F. Baughman

279Not all College publications reported the same Loyalty Fund totals. Those used here were taken from the July 1953 alumni bulletin, the report submitted to the Ford Foundation in 1962, and annual giving reports published in the alumni bulletin beginning in 1963. In the spring of 1985 there were still a few alumni who had contributed to every Loyalty Fund drive, beginning with 1933.
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(1910), Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg; F. Eppling Reinartz (1924), Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary; Millard E. Gladfelter (1925), Temple University; Steward H. Smith (1927), Marshall College; A. George David Wiles (1929), Newberry College; Stewart W. Herman (1930), Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago; Donald R. Heiges (1931), Lutheran Theological Seminaries at Gettysburg and Philadelphia; Richard H. Heindel (nongraduate, 1933), Wagner College and Pratt Institute; William H. Kadel (1935), Florida Presbyterian College; John C. Villaume (1938), International Correspondence Schools; Frederick K. Wentz (1942), Hamma School of Theology; Frank H. Bretz (1948), Thiel College and Tarkio College; and Joseph A. Steger (1960), University of Cincinnati.

The Woman's League

As Woman's League members prepared to attend the thirty-fourth annual convention on the campus in November 1945, they could take pride in the fact that they belonged to an organization which had repeatedly proved itself to be one of the most loyal of the College's constituencies. Its 2,854 members and their predecessors had contributed more than $170,000 since the general league was organized in 1911. Their chief monuments were Weidensall Hall and the S.C.A. program of which that building was the center, but beginning in 1935 (and without complaining) the women had accepted the College's challenge to assume what were for the time large new responsibilities. They contributed heavily to the cost of readying Stevens and Huber Halls for use by women students. In 1939 they agreed to raise $25,000 as their contribution to a new College chapel. By February 1945, well in advance of its construction, they had made the last payment on this pledge. While league membership remained steady during the war, giving had actually increased. The 233 delegates who attended the first postwar convention were ready for new and larger ventures.280

In the postwar years, the pronounced spirit of helpfulness which the Woman's League had consistently displayed ever since 1911 remained clearly in evidence. The 1944 convention resolved that "after the raising of the balance on our chapel fund we take up any

280 Valuable sources for study of the league in and after 1945 are the minutes of the annual conventions, which through 1966 were published as the Woman's League number of the GCB. Beginning in 1967, they were issued as separate publications. Direct quotations in this section are taken from these minutes. A second league publication, Highlights, first appeared in 1952. Usually issued twice a year, it offered information about the College and activities of the subleagues. On the occasion of anniversaries, such as the fiftieth in 1961, the league sometimes published special commemorative booklets.
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new project which our president under the direction of Dr. Hanson, may suggest." Thirteen years later, after the dean greeted the 1957 convention, the league president responded by saying that her organization "never tires of its goal to further the education of our youth at Gettysburg College." A man not readily given to flattery, and one whose faculty service began when the league was but nine years old, Professor Arms told the 1952 convention that

I have always considered the Woman's League as the truest and most dependable friend of our College. If I had been one of the three Presidents of Gettysburg College I have been privileged to know, I would have been tremendously and deeply moved that, come prosperity or depression, come fair weather or foul, there was always one group to turn to for loyal, unquestioning help — the Woman's League.

More than a quarter century later, in 1978, the new vice president for College relations, Richard P. Allen, told the league president that "in my thirteen years of fund-raising experience I've never seen an organization that operates as effectively to benefit an institution as the Woman's League of Gettysburg College." While some alumni and others were often critical of the College for its admissions policies and procedures, for abandoning compulsory chapel, and for the manner in which it handled campus unrest, league conventions accepted the changes that were taking place (perhaps often without really approving them), expressed their confidence in the College leadership, and moved on to reach new goals.281

In 1947 the trustees recognized the importance of the Woman's League as a College constituency by electing its retiring president, Minerva Taughinbaugh Baker, as their first woman member. Eleven years later they invited the league to designate a representative to participate in all board meetings. Since that time successive league presidents have been regular in attendance and have served on numerous board committees.

In March 1945, two months before the war in Europe ended, President Henry W.A. Hanson met with the league board of directors and presented to them some of the immediate needs of the College. The women listened and then decided unanimously to recommend two new projects to the November convention: raising $50,000 for establishing a music department (a step which the league had urged as early as 1937) and $10,000 for refurnishing one hundred rooms in

---

281 This is not to imply that the women lacked mettle. In a report to the fiftieth anniversary convention in 1961, Mrs. Frederick J. Eckert, who had been president from 1950 to 1953, explained that on the occasion of the dedication of the new chapel organ in November 1953 Virgil Fox, who was scheduled to give a recital during the ceremony, demanded that the curtain above the altar be drawn when he began playing. "It will improve the acoustics," he explained. Mrs. Eckert's immediate and firm response ended the conversation: "That curtain gets pulled tonight over my dead body."
Stevens and Huber Halls. By accepting the challenge, even before the veterans appeared in full force on the campus, the league had embarked on a postwar career which, without superseding its original commitment to the religious program, quickly transformed it into a general fund-raising agency for the College.

The following is a summary of the developing league stewardship, as reported to the conventions which met between November 1945 and November 1984:

1. Religious program (1945-1984). This was the first and most persistent league concern. In 1953 it gave the College for inclusion in the restricted endowment bonds with a book value of $19,935.59, the income to be used for the chaplain’s salary. This was the remaining balance from the effort begun in 1928 to create an endowment whose income would help pay the salary of the S. C. A. secretary and maintain Weidensall Hall. Through 1962 small annual grants were made to the S. C. A. Beginning in 1963 they were used to support segments of the expanded religious program as administered by the chaplain. In the postwar period these grants amounted to less than 5 percent of league gifts. Total: $39,455.59.

2. Christ Chapel (1945-1979). After having met its $25,000 pledge for a window and the organ by February 1945, the league was called upon to go a second mile and make further major gifts: a supplemental organ pledge, a concert grand piano, and such other things as choir robes and hymnals. Total: $34,890.65.

3. Refurnishing dormitories (1946-1948, 1974, 1984). Long after raising money to help prepare the two women’s dormitories for civilian occupancy after heavy use by wartime cadets, the league was called upon in the 1970s and 1980s to help refurnish other campus dormitories. Total: $17,633.33.

4. Scholarships (1947, 1982-1984). In 1947 the York subleague raised $2,500 as an endowment in memory of Rev. Dr. and Mrs. Joseph B. Baker, both of whom had recently died. He was a long-time College trustee and she had been league president. The income was to be used for a student taking music courses. In 1981 the league pledged to raise money for general scholarships. Total: $15,833.34.
5. Music department (1950-1973). After paying the $50,000 promised in 1945, the league was subsequently asked for money to buy instruments, choir robes, and the like. Total: $66,405.30.

6. Brua Hall (1954-1961, 1975, 1984). The league promise to help turn Brua Chapel into a fine arts building (only the music part ever materialized) resulted in a commitment approaching in scope that of Weidensall Hall. Smaller contributions were made long after the original project was completed. Total: $85,422.01.

7. Student Union Building (1959-1961, 1980-1981). Responding to an appeal by President Paul, the league promised to raise $50,000 for chairs, curtains, and other furnishings for this new building, the construction cost of which was met by a federal loan. Total: $59,216.33.

8. Schmucker Library (1962-1965, 1971). The league decided to use its golden anniversary appeal as the first installment on a $45,000 pledge to pay for equipment and furnishings for the enlarged and renovated library. Here too it went a second mile. Total: $62,500.00.

9. Chapel Intern and Chaplain Ministry (1966-1984). In 1965 the league voted to support a project reminiscent of the Y.M.C.A. secretaryship with which it had begun its existence more than half a century earlier. Beginning in 1980 it was renamed the Chaplain Ministry project. Total: $72,060.82.


11. Glatfelter Hall (1971). This project yielded funds for reception, meeting, and staff rooms. Total: $5,000.00.

12. Dining Hall (1972). When the time came to redecorate the dining hall, after more than a decade of use, the College called upon the league for assistance. Total: $7,500.00.

13. Infirmary (1973-1974, 1978). League funds were used to purchase drapes, blankets, and other items. Total: $2,330.00.

14. Eisenhower House (1975). The league helped to make the admissions office a more attractive place to meet prospective students and their parents. Total: $2,500.00.

15. Funds for guest speakers and performers (1975). Total: $1,300.00.

16. Conference House (1975). The league helped convert this house on the Mummasburg road into a place for many College groups to meet. Total: $1,700.00.

17. Musselman Library (1976-1981). The league participated in the campaign for this facility, first by a $25,000 pledge and then by additional gifts for equipment and furnishings. Total: $42,202.61.

18. Schmucker Hall (1982-1983). When this building was being converted into a center for music and art, the league provided funds for preparation of the second-floor lobby. Total: $10,000.00.

19. Oversubscribed pledges (1969-1984). For some years the league held the major project money it was raising either until the College needed some of it immediately or until the goal was reached. During the later 1960s it began making quarterly payments to the College of all moneys contributed to its projects, most of which were eventually oversubscribed. Later, the excess was either distributed among the projects for which it was intended or used for closely related purposes. Total: $15,105.80.
The total amount of these gifts is $566,055.78.  

As was the case before World War II, by far most league money was raised by a great number and variety of activities the subleagues sponsored, many of which, as expected, yielded only small amounts. From time to time the league also benefited from small, but welcome, bequests. Membership dues and the proceeds from the entering of names in the Golden Books were dependable sources of income. There were four of these books in 1945: Honor, Memory, Jewels, and Victory (originally Civil War Veterans and other Heroes). By 1984 four more had been added to the list: Students (1947), Special Gifts (1951), Youth (1953), and Anniversaries (1957). In 1970 the Victory book became the Service book.

Although its board of directors formulated the plans and made many of the decisions, the general governing body of the league was still the annual convention held on campus early in November, beginning in 1973 on one day instead of the traditional two. The inspirational theme chosen for each year, the hymns, prayers, talks, and even the resolutions adopted imparted a decidedly religious flavor to each convention. The president and other administrative officers of the College who addressed the delegates always praised the league, but they also gave detailed information both about what was happening on campus and about the pressing needs for the immediate future. Many students, most of whom represented the S.C.A. and later the Chapel Council, gave reports of their experiences. Toward the close of the sessions, the convention formally acted upon specific projects for the next year, or longer, as proposed by the directors in consultation with the president of the College.

Between 1945 and 1961 attendance at the annual conventions averaged 220 women. That figure dropped to 145 during the Arnold Hanson years and to 102 between 1978 and 1984. The decrease

---

282The figures above were taken from the league treasurer's reports to the 1945-1984 conventions. They are in current dollars and do not take into consideration the fact that the value of a dollar in 1984 was less than one-fourth of what it had been in 1850. The figures do not include the very small amounts of money needed to operate the league from year to year.

283The sum of $9,278.19 received from the Louisa Paulus estate in 1971 went directly to the College, which placed it in the endowment as the Woman's League for Endowment Fund of the Y.M.C.A. Building and marked it for the maintenance of that building. Through the general league, in 1985 the York subleague presented to the College $20,556.37, the proceeds of a bequest by Laura Hodgson. The money was used to establish the Pearl Hodgson scholarship, named in memory of the testator's daughter, a York teacher through whose efforts the bequest was made. The Paulus and Hodgson gifts are in addition to the sums reported above.

284The numbers of annual entries in these books and the amounts realized at ten-year intervals are as follows: 1945, 268, $1,720; 1955, 327, $3,240; 1965, 178, $2,089; 1975, 191, $1,700; and 1985, 220, $2,745.
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reflected the postwar pattern of general league membership. From 2,854 in 17 subleagues in 1945 it reached a record high of 6,031 in 20 subleagues in 1960, at which point there began a steady decline. Membership dropped below 5,000 in 1967, 4,000 in 1973, and 3,000 in 1984, in which year the reported total of 2,884 was almost exactly the same as that recorded in 1945.

League officers, who had always worked to attract more persons into the organization, were especially concerned as some of the sub-leagues disbanded (seven between 1967 and 1972) and as the rolls thinned. The 1964 convention resolved that "each sub-league emphasize increased memberships, regardless of church affiliation, remembering especially the mothers of newly enrolled students." A decade later, the general league itself began sending literature to mothers of all entering students, asking them either to join a sub-league near their home or to become a member-at-large. Nevertheless, in spite of many vigorous efforts, only eight new subleagues were organized after the war (seven of them between 1946 and 1953 and the eighth in 1965). By the fall of 1984 all of these postwar additions had disbanded. The number of subleagues had dropped from seventeen in 1945 to ten, four of which (York, Harrisburg, Gettysburg, and Philadelphia) were among the seven charter members of the general league when it was organized in 1911. The remaining six (Washington, Baltimore, Altoona, Hanover, Lancaster, and Delaware county) were all founded between 1912 and 1936.

However noble their purposes and exemplary their records, organizations such as the Woman's League do not have automatic leases on life. There are many reasons, some apparently beyond anyone's control, why their members may find it difficult, and at times even impossible, to interest equally committed persons to continue their work into the next generation. There has always been a strong Lutheran character to the Woman's League. Many of its leaders have been active laywomen, including numerous pastors' wives and mothers of students and alumni. In addition, over the

285The members-at-large category, established in 1904, included those who belonged to no subleague. At its peak in 1975 it included 348 members, many of whom were fathers and mothers of students. From 1984 through 1984 Mrs. Florence M. Schroeder, Baltimore, held the title Chairman for Members-at-Large. By means of hundreds of letters she kept in personal touch with these members each year. They reached from Maine to Florida and from New England to California, she reported in 1972, "and even from Germany." Ten years later she declared that "I have yet to get a letter of criticism about Gettysburg College."

286Twenty-nine subleagues were organized between 1906 and 1965. Of these, 19 were in Pennsylvania, 6 in Maryland and the District of Columbia, 3 in New Jersey, and 1 in New York. Although an increasing percentage of students came from New Jersey, except for the years 1965-1972 there was no subleague there after 1952. Efforts to maintain subleagues in northern and southern New Jersey were fruitless.
years there have been many faithful league supporters whose only other connection with the College was their membership in a Lutheran congregation. They regarded league membership as a valued part of their stewardship.

In the immediate postwar years, when Americans placed perhaps record high values on the family, education, and organized religion, it was possible for determined recruiters to push league membership to record high levels. However, especially after 1960, as these values changed, the enthusiasm which long characterized so many league members became more and more difficult to pass along to others. Increasingly, students were attracted to the College from areas where no subleagues existed and where the Lutheran tradition was weak. Increasingly, women who at an earlier time might have become devoted leaguers were setting different priorities for their lives. Meanwhile, the College itself was competing with the league by making its own direct appeals to parents and, in spite of annually rising charges, with success.\footnote{Parents' contributions to the Annual Fund rose from $37,459 in 1980 to $126,448 in 1985.}

Realistic awareness of what was happening to the Woman's League as an organization during the quarter century after 1960 did not deter those who continued to work on its behalf. Measured by current dollars, record annual league gifts reached the College in the late 1970s and early 1980s: a total of about $125,000 between 1977 and 1984. Included among the resolutions adopted by the 1982-1984 conventions was one which demonstrated that the spirit which had always characterized the league was still very much alive: "That we continue to cooperate with the administration and the Faculty of Gettysburg College so that our efforts may be in accordance with the direction of the total program of the College."

Town and Gown

There is a continuity in the pattern of relationships between the College and the community extending from 1832 through 1985. The built-in tensions identified in earlier chapters continued to exist, but rarely reached the level at which they seriously impaired the generally good feelings which usually prevailed. After 1945 there were still a few resident trustees to carry on the old tradition and, when necessary, interpret the campus and community to each other. There was no longer any serious talk of moving the institution to some other place, but there was some speculation about what the College would do if, as rumored occasionally, the seminary campus came on the market. From time to time College spokesmen reminded the community of the amounts of money which the institution and
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its many employees spent in Adams county; for several reasons, the totals greatly exceeded the estimates of previous periods. For example, as reported by the Gettysburg Times for December 30, 1982, Business Manager John Schlegel estimated the amount at more than $12,000,000 for the fiscal year then in progress.

One factor which altered the character of the town - and - gown relationship after 1945 was the doubling and, eventually, more than tripling of the number of College employees and students. Simply put, there were now many more persons associated with the College living for nine months or more each year in or near a town whose population had not grown correspondingly. Not only in the immediate postwar period, but also for many years thereafter, townspeople made hundreds of rooms available to students. In the 1960s and 1970s many who had the choice of a College dormitory room or lodgings in town chose the latter.

Every College president after 1945 tried, each in his own way, to improve relations with the community and urged fellow-administrators and faculty to follow his example. In his first report to the trustees in December 1952, Walter Langsam reported that, as one of the high priorities of his administration, "effort is being concentrated on continuing and making even stronger the fine community relationships established by Dr. Hanson." A year later, he instituted an adult education program, most of whose students were expected to come from the county. Since there was not enough interest to warrant its continuance, the program was dropped in 1955. On a number of later occasions, countians were again given the opportunity to enroll in College courses. The demand remained small. More local residents attended campus athletic events, lectures, and concerts.

Beginning in the spring of 1945, the College and county school administrators sponsored annual career conferences, which sometimes brought one thousand or more county high school juniors and seniors to the campus for information about many possible career opportunities and how to qualify for them. Beginning in 1979 the Gettysburg Area Chamber of Commerce and the College cooperated in what was called a community night, an occasion which brought town and campus together to view exhibits, engage in conversation, and watch a basketball game.

In addition to pursuing appropriate ways in which to make College facilities and programs available to the community, every president also needed to pay attention to any development which was likely at any time to create tension in the relationship. Just as the College was concerned about possible undesirable changes in the residential character of the area adjacent to the campus, there were some persons in the community who considered College purchase of properties in that area, for whatever reason, also
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undesirable. One could regard the nontaxable status of Gettysburg College property as one more example of a historic American policy, but one not favorably disposed to the institution could look upon it as a status which imposed a heavy burden on every local taxpayer who enjoyed no such exemptions. In setting wage and salary scales for all employees other than faculty and administrators, the president and business manager had to determine the extent to which their levels (including fringe benefits) should be consistent with similar scales in Gettysburg and the rest of the county. Finally, the president and dean of students (later dean of student life) had to maintain an understanding with the local police department concerning how to deal with student violations of local ordinances.288

Probably even without encouragement from anyone, faculty, administrators, and their families after 1945 would have continued the long tradition of service to the town and county.289 They served on school boards and town councils; participated in the work of numerous social service agencies (including the Boy Scouts, Community Action Agency, and United Way); were members of service clubs; supported the county historical society and several organizations formed to commemorate the events of 1863; served the local hospital and county library; were active members of churches; participated in musical organizations; delivered countless talks on countless subjects; and in the person of the wife of a faculty member contributed the first woman commissioner in the history of Adams county. College personnel often provided significant leadership to these many organizations, sometimes over a long period of time. Some of them also offered a service, perhaps never greatly appreciated but nevertheless in order: that of the constructive critic of community ways.

As in every previous period in the history of the College, the record of student interaction with the community after 1945 ran the gamut from highly commendable to inexcusable. Working through the S.C.A., the Chapel Council, fraternities, and sometimes on their own, students engaged in projects which reached people of all ages. They tutored children and provided succor to the aged; assisted in cancer society, muscular dystrophy, and Red Cross fund drives; and participated in numerous clean-up expeditions. On other occasions,

288For many years local police turned most violators over to College authorities for disciplinary action. In the 1960s the administration began taking the position that students should face the consequences of their actions off campus and, in some cases, also be subject to subsequent appropriate disciplinary action by the College.

289This is not meant to imply that either before or after 1945 every College employee was much interested in community service. Especially since so many of these employees lived outside the Gettysburg borough limits after 1945, the emphasis must now be on the entire county.
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with no more respect than in the past (and sometimes with less) for the rights of townspeople, some students drew heavily upon the College’s balance of goodwill in the community by engaging in acts which, if directed against them, they would probably have hastened to condemn.

The College and the Lutheran Church

The College trustees did not act immediately upon the proposal which Henry W.A. Hanson made in 1939 that they invite the Central Pennsylvania and Maryland Synods each to choose two persons for election to the board. The president did not repeat the request. Upon learning in 1943 of some renewed synodical interest in representation, the trustees referred the matter to their executive committee and a year later accepted its recommendation that the matter be tabled. During the rest of the Hanson administration, the president continued to address annual synodical conventions and to furnish pertinent information about the College which was used in preparing the annual report to those bodies. The 1947 Central Pennsylvania Synod delegates, for example, learned that, “at the present time, the College is training 65 young men for the Ministry and a number of young ladies who plan to do full-time Christian service.” The 1951 report to the same body referred to the “high moral standards required of both the faculty and the student body” and asserted that every faculty member “must prove himself to be a living witness for Christ.” In his last report to the trustees in May 1952, Hanson declared that “one of the happiest relations which I have experienced has been that connected with the Central Pennsylvania Synod and the Maryland Synod,” whose members had manifested “a degree of cooperation and affectionate loyalty which have contributed more to the success of the past twenty-nine years than could possibly be evaluated.”

Confronted immediately upon taking office in the fall of 1952 with the need to raise money to finish paying for the new chapel and meet other pressing obligations, Walter Langsam decided that regular synodical financial support of the College was the most practical immediate source of funds. Aware that this could not be achieved

290 For an account by a faculty member who was centrally involved in College-church relations during most of this period, see Harold A. Dunkelberger, Gettysburg College and the Lutheran Connection... (Gettysburg, 1975). There is valuable information on the subject in the convention minutes of the several national and synodical church bodies. Quotations taken from these sources are indicated by references in the text rather than by footnotes. See also Richard W. Solberg, Lutheran Higher Education in North America (Minneapolis, 1985).

291 The Central Pennsylvania Synod granted Susquehanna University $15,000 in 1950 and 1951, and $25,000 in 1952.
without a change in College polity, he named a small faculty committee on synodical relations and, at his first board meeting in December 1952, recommended that a special committee be named "to study the possibility of according representation among its membership to supporting Synods." The board quickly concurred, but progress was slow. A year later the committee chairman reported that the task was "very much uncharted" and would "involve time, and consultation, and large quantities of careful and diligent study." Although a show of hands at the June 1954 meeting demonstrated what the minutes described as an "overwhelming majority" in favor of synodical representation, the committee had made no substantive report by the time of Langsam's departure a year later. "Much gain, and no disadvantage," he insisted in his final report, "would result from the early grant of Board representation to the supporting Synods."

It was not until June 1956 that the committee on synodical relations formally recommended and the trustees accepted the principle that three synods should be given the opportunity to be represented on the board. With this vote behind it, the committee met with synodical officers to begin working on the details. In December the trustees allotted a total of six proposed new seats: three to Central Pennsylvania, two to Maryland, and one to West Virginia. Nevertheless, a year passed before they formally authorized application for a charter amendment, which increased the maximum number of trustees from thirty to thirty-six, restated the requirement that at least two-thirds of the members must also be U.L.C.A. members, and authorized the synods to elect (not nominate, as in the case of the Alumni Association) three, two, and one persons respectively. Although the Adams county court did not finally approve the charter amendment until July 7, 1958, all six new trustees were chosen in time to appear at the commencement board meeting a month earlier. Having completed its work, after five and one-half years, the committee on synodical relations was now discharged.292

292 According to a December 1956 report, the trustee committee and the synod representatives first agreed on fourteen new trustees (eight for Central Pennsylvania, four for Maryland, and two for West Virginia) and later on six (two for each synod). Taking into consideration the relative size of the three synods, the trustees made the final assignment of three, two, and one. Believing that it had not been adequately consulted before the final decision was made, a somewhat embittered West Virginia executive board nevertheless recommended that the 1958 convention accept the offer of one trustee, which it did. Believing it should have more than three trustees, Central Pennsylvania voted in 1957 to ask that increased representation be considered "as opportunity for such increase may develop." From the beginning, it was agreed that failure of any synod to participate would not prevent the plan from being carried out with the others; the requirement of unanimous agreement had scuttled the 1923 proposal. See p. 423. The 1956 charter amendment documents were filed with the Adams county prothonotary; they were not recorded.
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At a time when, for one reason or another, many colleges were loosening or severing their formal, legal ties with a church, the Gettysburg board of trustees had done the reverse. Their purpose in moving against the tide was clear enough. Whether it would produce the intended results was quickly put to the test when the College, needing large sums of money for facilities not covered by the federal loan program, embarked upon a major fund-raising campaign in April 1959. The goal was $1,625,000. At its meeting two months later, the Central Pennsylvania Synod agreed to contribute $700,000; the final payment which completed this pledge was made in 1964. Instead of adopting a specific goal, the Maryland Synod decided in 1960 to give the College the proceeds from a specified part of its regular benevolence apportionment for 1961-1963. This eventually yielded $210,743. When the books were finally closed on this campaign in 1965, it was found that these two synods had provided the College with 55 percent of its total proceeds.293

The fund-raising campaign begun in 1959 was still in progress when the United Lutheran Church in America joined in June 1962 with three other national bodies (the American Evangelical Lutheran, Augustana Evangelical Lutheran, and Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Churches) to form the Lutheran Church in America (L.C.A.). The by-laws of the new church assigned to the synods almost complete responsibility for relations with colleges and to a board of college education and church vocations (B.C.E.C.V.) the task of performing the limited, but significant, duties reserved to the L.C.A. The West Virginia Synod now became part of a new Western Pennsylvania-West Virginia Synod, to which Thiel College was assigned. The Central Pennsylvania and Maryland Synods continued to be matched with Gettysburg; in addition, Central Pennsylvania still had responsibility for Susquehanna.294

The formation of the new church required a further change in the College charter, which the trustees requested on March 30, 1963, but

---

293 The West Virginia Synod, whose total annual budget at this time was less than $100,000, did not participate in the campaign. Central Pennsylvania delayed making its payments until it had met the $500,000 Susquehanna University Centennial Appeal, to which it was already committed. Maryland conventions had budgeted for the campaign a total of $239,201 over a three-year period, representing $1.50 for each commuting member per year, but actual receipts yielded less than that amount. The figures used here were taken from the 1961-1965 convention minutes of the two synods. In previous campaigns, synods authorized the College to solicit member congregations. This was the first time the synods participated directly and made payments from their own treasuries.

294 The 1962 L.C.A. by-laws stated that, except for several powers granted to the B.C.E.C.V., "the relations of this church to colleges shall be sustained entirely through the synods." The board tried unsuccessfully to establish the principle that no synod should be related to more than one college. Its reports to biennial L.C.A. conventions, which are valuable sources of information, were included in the published convention minutes, as was the current version of the constitution and by-laws.
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which was delayed in the Adams county court until February 1, 1964. The maximum number of trustees was increased to thirty-eight, of whom Central Pennsylvania was authorized to elect four and Maryland two. In addition, the presidents of each synod now became ex officio trustees.295

Although little was said on the subject – at least little that found its way into the minutes of the College trustees or the synod conventions – almost or altogether everyone understood that the College was inviting synodical representation on its board with the expectation of receiving in return annual synodical grants which could be used for general operating expenses. College authorities and synodical leaders, although not necessarily all delegates to synodical conventions, also understood that, after more than a century and a quarter of existence, Gettysburg College had no intention of altering its character as an independent institution, albeit one under definite Lutheran influence. Accepting these understandings, even before the campaign begun in 1959 was concluded, both synods began including the College in their annual budgets. Central Pennsylvania contributed $20,000 in 1959 and then, after concentrating on its campaign pledge for three years, $100,000 in 1963. Its annual grants gradually increased to $200,000 and remained at that level through 1969. Maryland made its first annual grant, of $6,000, in 1959 and then one of $10,000 in 1960. After having completed its contribution to the capital campaign, it budgeted $30,000 for 1964. By 1969 and 1970 budgeted totals for the College were $68,000, and in four of those seven years actual receipts enabled the synod to pay in full.296

The two synods began their unprecedented manner and level of financial support of Gettysburg College as a number of major changes were occurring in both the College and the church, indeed in all of American society.297 As it was in most other L.C.A. colleges, the Lutheran contingent among Gettysburg faculty and students was

295 These charter amendment documents were also filed with the prothonotary and were not subsequently recorded. The new charter which the College secured in 1974 gave ex officio trustee membership to the two synod presidents and left all other church-College relationships to be determined by the by-laws. The 1894 charter requirement that a stated percentage of the trustees be members of a Lutheran congregation was dropped, apparently on the assumption that synodical representation on the board obviated the need for it. By-laws adopted in 1974 and still in effect in 1985 assigned four trustee seats to Central Pennsylvania and two to Maryland, in addition to the two ex-officio seats.

296 During the 1960s the B.C.E.C.V. urged all synods to increase their support of colleges. In 1963 it recommended a goal of $3 per confirmed member per year. By the end of the decade actual contributions came to slightly more than half that amount.

297 For a comment on the support which synodical trustees gave the College, especially during the later sixties and early seventies, see p. 1014.
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decreasing, but now more rapidly than in the past. Those who tended to equate a compulsory chapel requirement with church relatedness interpreted the elimination of that obligation in 1960 as a sign that the College was now less committed to its church connection. As with each passing year the Gettysburg contingent among the pastors of the two synods decreased, the College lost more and more of the sympathetic but not necessarily uncritical backing which it had long enjoyed from its many pastor-sons in those bodies.298 About the time when social unrest, rejection, and protest began gripping the country, the widespread popular support of organized religion which had characterized the postwar period began to ebb. For example, the communicant membership of the Central Pennsylvania Synod, which stood at 128,413 in 1945, peaked at 174,584 in 1963, and then shrank to 152,492 by 1978. In the Maryland Synod, communicant membership rose from 38,486 in 1945 to 59,339 in 1964, and stood at 50,805 in 1978. Increasingly in the 1960s the pastors and laymen attending the annual conventions and responsible for approving synodical budgets began to raise pointed questions which concerned Gettysburg and Susquehanna. Should higher priority be assigned to projects which promised to serve large numbers of people in obvious need and lower to the support of church colleges? Should the synod provide a larger ministry to the many Lutheran students attending other colleges on its territory? If funds continued to be voted to related colleges, should they be granted for specifically religious purposes only? In all of this, there was less open hostility to Gettysburg and Susquehanna than there was a conviction that other causes now had a greater claim upon the synod's limited resources.299

In 1970 Central Pennsylvania's annual contribution to the College began to drop. From a high of $200,000 in 1965-1969 it fell to half that amount in 1978. After some subsequent increase it was reduced to $75,000 in 1984. The Maryland grant peaked at $65,000 in 1966, fell to $24,000 in 1978, but then also began to increase, reaching $30,000 in 1983 and 1984. As far as financial support to Gettysburg

298 Thirty-seven of the sixty-six men who entered the Gettysburg seminary between 1945 and 1947 and who had the Lutheran ministry in mind were Gettysburg College graduates. In May 1985 there were seven of the latter in a student body of 193 master-of-divinity and master-of-arts-in-religion candidates. There were about 900 pastors on the rolls of the two synods in 1985. Of these, some 245 (27 percent) were graduates of Gettysburg College. Forty years earlier, 378 (56 percent) of about 670 Central Pennsylvania and Maryland Synod pastors were its graduates.

299 Between 1985 and 1989 21.7 percent of the Central Pennsylvania Synod's expenditures went in the form of direct operating grants to Gettysburg and Susquehanna and 12.6 percent to the Gettysburg seminary. Grants to the two colleges were always divided equally between them. The Maryland Synod contributions to the College and seminary during the same period of time amounted to 27.4 percent of its budget.
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SYNODICAL GRANTS, 1959-1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Central Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Maryland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>28,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>64,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>172,500</td>
<td>49,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>158,556</td>
<td>37,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>152,035</td>
<td>39,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>145,840</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>127,100</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>127,100</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>100,028</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>118,750</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>124,700</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$3,185,609   $801,419

Source: These amounts were taken from the synodical treasurer's annual reports in the published convention minutes. The synodical fiscal year was the calendar year. The amounts do not include contributions to the 1959-1965 capital campaign or numerous special gifts to the College.

College was concerned, the overall record of these two synods was most impressive. During the quarter century between 1959 and 1984, they contributed a total of $3,987,028 in general operating funds.300

Beginning in 1962 the B.C.E.C.V. supplemented synodical support of the seventeen related colleges in a number of ways. In the case of Gettysburg, these included loans for faculty study, with liberal cancelable provisions; participation with four other Lutheran colleges in a Far Eastern study program; faculty seminars on religious values; efforts to bring members of both constituencies together for interaction, both on the campus and in the parish; an alcohol educa-

---

300The pattern of fluctuating synodical support existed in the rest of the L.C.A.
tion program; and efforts to increase the number of minority students on the campus.

When Walter Langsam first urged the trustees to take the initiative in allowing for synodical representation, he offered no written explanation of why this was desirable (undoubtedly he thought none was necessary) or of how the College and the synods might be affected for good or ill by this proposed major change in their long mutual relationship. If between 1952 and 1957 the trustees seriously discussed these matters, the secretary saw no reason to record the fact. That not everyone was oblivious to the possible consequences of synodical representation is evidenced by a motion which a Maryland Synod pastor presented, and which the 1959 convention passed, calling upon the leaders on both sides to take immediate steps “to stimulate the congregations of Synod and the administration of the College in their appreciation of their responsibilities to one another.” A year after assuming the College presidency, and after participating in one annual convention of each of the synods, Arnold Hanson told the faculty in September 1962, in the words of the minutes, that “the considerable lack of knowledge on the part of synod delegates as to the nature and function of the College indicates the need for continued communication between the College and these Church bodies, if the interests of the Church and the College are to be served.”

During his entire tenure as president, whether addressing synodical conventions, conferring with synodical committees, or meeting church members in other situations, Arnold Hanson attempted to communicate, within the limits which his natural reserve imposed upon him. He described the College as a strong educational institution aspiring to greater strength, one with a voluntary religious program emphasizing both worship and service, and one in which the questions of young people, including religious ones, could be discussed, and perhaps answered, both freely and openly. On a number of occasions he told the trustees that the College and synods must provide services for each other and that, finally, their relationship should not be dependent, as indeed for years it had not been, upon the College’s continuing to secure annual financial support. He took the relationship seriously enough to tell the trustees, also on a

---

301 Chester S. Simonton, chairman of the synodical relations committee between 1952 and 1957, may have been reflecting his understanding of the deeper issues which synodical representation involved when he said it would take time, consultation, and much study to achieve. See also the GCB for April 1959, in which the two synod presidents, a recent alumnus, and a faculty member discuss what church relatedness should mean for Gettysburg.

302 Several faculty and staff members were elected or appointed to a number of national and synodical boards and other agencies.
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number of occasions, that ways should be sought to reach a fuller and more satisfactory understanding of what being church related meant, and should mean, in the 1960s and 1970s. He soon discovered that there were others who were interested in the same quest.

Although the L.C.A. by-laws specified that the major responsibility for church-college relations was with the synods, they did authorize the B.C.E.C.V. to set standards ( "both of academic excellence and of church participation in their government and life") for determining church relatedness and also to provide counsel and assistance (including, as already mentioned, financial aid) to institutions which met those standards. The board soon began to deal with some of the issues which greatly concerned Arnold Hanson. In the words of its report to the 1970 L.C.A. convention, it began in 1962 to engage in a struggle "to re-evaluate the meaning of church related higher education in an age of revolution on the campus."

In 1966 the B.C.E.C.V. asked President Edgar M. Carlson of Gustavus Adolphus College to prepare a statement describing the church's current work in higher education and proposing a plan for the future. Arnold Hanson was one of the seven members of Carlson's advisory committee; he was the only college president included. The published result of this effort was Church Sponsored Higher Education and the Lutheran Church in America: A Study Document (New York, 1967), which the board approved as such in 1968. As intended, it elicited much discussion. It also confirmed that there were many differing views on the subject within the colleges and synods. After Hartwick College severed its ties with the church in order to qualify for financial aid from the state of New York, in 1968 the B.C.E.C.V. established the Council on the Mission of LCA Colleges and Universities, which during the next year prepared a set of standards for recognition of church-related institutions and described a model relationship which should exist between synods and colleges. Arnold Hanson was one of the council's thirty-two members. The B.C.E.C.V. adopted its report in October 1969 and distributed it widely among the synods and colleges.

In the words of the board's executive secretary, "at the beginning of a new decade and a new era in higher education, after the campus turmoil and revolution of the sixties," The Mission of LCA Colleges and Universities (New York, 1970) was presented to the public as "a

---

303Six of the twenty-one persons elected to the board in 1962 were Gettysburg graduates. Two were college or university presidents. The first president and secretary of the board were alumni. In its report to the 1964 convention, the board declared that it had adopted five premises in determining church-college connection, the first of which was that "the primary responsibility of each LCA college is to glorify God by providing higher education of outstanding quality for its student body."
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definitive statement on the nature of the church-college partnership." It listed four basic requirements for an L.C.A. church-related college: "a commitment to Christian life and learning" in its statement of goals, an affirmation in its charter or by-laws that a relationship with the L.C.A. exists, regional accreditation, and adherence to principles of academic freedom consistent with those of the 1940 statement of the A.A.U.P. and other agencies. In addition, it identified several characteristics which the college should exhibit, such as opportunities for Christian worship, a willingness on the part of its personnel to serve as a resource for the church, and a sense of social responsibility. It defined the duties of synods and the national church in assisting the colleges in many ways, including financially. Finally, it listed the items to be included in the "covenant or agreement relationship" between each college and its supporting synod or synods.304

The preparation of covenants to which Gettysburg College was a party began in 1971. Both the College trustees and the Maryland Synod approved theirs in the same year. The trustees adopted the Central Pennsylvania Synod covenant in 1972 and the synod followed in 1973. In the belief that the Church-college relationship should be a continually evolving one, the B.C.E.C.V. and its successor, the Division for Mission in North America (D.M.N.A.), called for the development and promulgation of periodic restatements. By the time the second Gettysburg documents were being prepared, the name covenant had been superseded.305 The trustees and Central Pennsylvania agreed on a statement of partnership in 1981. A similar document with Maryland was approved in 1983 and amended two years later.306

Not surprisingly, the first efforts at covenant crafting reflected inexperience in drawing up such documents. As far as Gettysburg was concerned, they were without precedent. The covenant with

---

304Teams visited the colleges after these standards were adopted to determine whether they were being met. Arnold Hanson told the board in October 1971 that Gettysburg had passed the test.

305The 1969 B.C.E.C.V. statement may have been intended as "a definitive" one, but in 1978 the D.M.N.A. approved "A Statement of the Lutheran Church in America: The Basis for Partnership Between Church and College," the result of an expensive two-year study by a committee, one of whose eight members was Arnold Hanson. It was intended to provide additional information concerning "the purpose and the potential in the relationship of the church and the college." Although the text continued to use the word covenants, and stated that "these agreements are meant to be reviewed at regular intervals of not less than four or more than eight years," the term "statements of partnership" soon took their place. The text of the 1978 statement is given in the published minutes of the 1978 L.C.A. convention, pp. 460-466.

306The texts of these documents were included in synod minutes. Both the College and synods made them available in printed form. The 1981 and 1983 statements were in effect in 1985.
Maryland actually consisted of two separate statements, one of which bore Arnold Hanson's signature and the other those of the five members of a special synodical committee. Since Hanson had been a member of the committee which had drawn up the 1969 mission statement, he had an advantage which enabled him to describe the many ways, some not so obvious, in which the College demonstrated its church relatedness. He could then assert that "the organized church and the enterprise of higher education have much in common," including a search for truth, definition of value systems, finding solutions to society's problems, and stressing wise use of knowledge. The second statement was presented in the form of a report to the synod which described in detail the long relationship between the two institutions and, almost apologetically, concluded with three resolutions urging that it be continued and improved. The Central Pennsylvania covenant, which came later, was more explicit in stating mutual expectations and promises.

The statements of partnership approved in the early 1980s, but only after several years of discussion and debate, were obviously the products of a college and two synods whose relationship was con-
siderably more mature than at any time during the preceding quarter century. Both sides confidently declared their need of each other. Both recognized that Gettysburg would serve neither itself nor the church unless it strove to become the best liberal-arts college it could possibly be. “The College will maintain the highest possible academic standards in an atmosphere which promotes the free and open exploration of ideas,” the Central Pennsylvania statement declared. “The Synod affirms these standards and recognizes that the pursuit of this academic obligation involves criticism, as well as affirmation, of ideas and institutions.”

Both statements could now boldly declare that, however closely the mission of the College might have been directed in years past by Lutherans and to Lutherans, by the 1980s Gettysburg served the causes of higher education and the Lutheran church in the world by being broadly inclusive. Fortunately, its proclamations going back to the charter of 1832 enabled it to do this without repudiating its past. Significantly, in 1985 the Maryland Synod proposed and achieved two amendments to its covenant by which the College agreed explicitly “to increase its racial and ethnic diversity” and the synod agreed to support it in its efforts “to grow as a community of learning in which the rich diversity of its members becomes an integral part of college education.”

The election of Charles E. Glassick in 1977 brought to the presidency of the College an active Methodist layman who was fully in sympathy with its church relationship and particularly with the directions in which that relationship was evolving. In 1979 he appointed the College’s first director of church relations, whose duties were to represent the College in its many dealings with the supporting synods and the national church. In the same year the College began a special financial aid program, consisting of grants and loans, in an effort to attract more qualified and promising Lutheran students. Soon thereafter, President Glassick began working with other Lutheran college presidents in the lengthy and wide-ranging discussions preceding an intended 1988 merger of the Lutheran Church in America, American Lutheran Church, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches.

Both Gettysburg College and the seminary which had preceded it in 1826 changed greatly after 1945. In the latter year, almost half of the seminary faculty and student body held bachelor's degrees from the College. As late as 1960, about one-third of the seminarians were men who had moved from the College to the school on the hill. Especially after the L.C.A. was formed in 1982, the seminary began to attract students from far beyond the limits of the synods which supported it. By 1985 the 193 candidates for the master-of-divinity
and master-of-arts-in-religion degrees came from twenty-nine states; only seven of these students were Gettysburg graduates. In that year only three of the eighteen faculty members had been Gettysburg undergraduates. The long succession of Gettysburg College men as seminary presidents came to an end in 1976.

As the many old ties between the two institutions were gradually broken, the mutual relationships after 1945 had to be constructed, and were, in new ways. Faculty and staff in both institutions cooperated in pursuing matters of common interest. Libraries of both were available to students of the other. Into the seventies, there were still a few persons who were members simultaneously of both boards. While professor and then briefly as president of the seminary, Herman G. Stuempfe served for twelve years as a College trustee. Arnold Hanson was elected to the seminary board in 1962 and completed his term in 1970. During that time the 1964 L.C.A. convention urged the Gettysburg and Philadelphia seminaries and their synods to "work toward unification...in a university setting." Hanson accepted the difficult task of serving as chairman of a committee representing both seminaries and charged with making recommendations concerning the future of the two schools. The proposals that the committee made in 1970— that the seminaries "continue to function with the closest kind of structural cooperation" and "plan new, varied, and imaginative programs of theological education"— were still being followed fifteen years later.

In the World of Higher Education

By 1945 Gettysburg College had demonstrated frequently and in many ways its awareness that it was an integral part of the world of American higher education. Its administrators and faculty had a long and consistent record of keeping in touch with national educational trends, of cooperating fully in the movement which resulted in the accrediting of colleges and universities, and of joining state and national educational agencies. Clearly, although they talked much about making Gettysburg a first-class or a first-rate college, these administrators and faculty did not seek to accomplish this objective by pioneering in curricular innovation or by providing
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sustained leadership for educational organizations, either or both of which might have secured for them a national reputation.

The only approbation which the College desired and had not received by the fall of 1945 was that of the American Association of University Women (A.A.U.W.). More than a year before, in May 1944, a trustee had urged the College to seek its approval. Both the Alumni Council in 1946 and the Woman's League a year later echoed his sentiments. In December 1946 the trustees authorized another approach to the organization, the first having been unsuccessful. Two and one-half years later, President Hanson informed the trustees that "every effort to qualify for admission" had been made, but with "quite disturbing results," since "each demand, when fulfilled, has been followed by further demands on the part of the Association officials."

The chairman of the A.A.U.W. committee on standards and recognition informed the president on May 13, 1949 that it was not scheduling a "visit of inspection" to Gettysburg because it had concluded that the College "has not committed itself to providing real opportunities for women in higher education," especially by making "provision for women in the top professorial brackets." It should be "immediately obvious to you that I can not drop department heads in order to create vacancies," Hanson replied three days later, with some asperity. "The department heads have been carefully chosen and are all rendering exceptional service. If and when a vacancy occurs in the headship of a department, it may well be possible that a woman will be chosen."

Despite the effort of several female friends of the College, especially Mrs. Minerva T. Baker and Mrs. Luene Rice, the impasse which existed in 1949 was not broken until the arrival of a new president in the fall of 1952. Determined to secure prompt A.A.U.W. recognition, Walter Langsam began a sustained personal effort and

---

307 When the Association of Collegiate Alumnae and the Southern Association of College Women joined in 1921 to form the American Association of University Women, the merging bodies already had a list of about one hundred approved colleges and universities whose graduates were eligible to join the new organization. Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania State College, Swarthmore, and the University of Pittsburgh were the Pennsylvania schools on the list. They were joined by Dickinson in 1923. Beginning in 1933, approval of an institution by the Association of American Universities was a requirement for that of the A.A.U.W.

308 Replying to Hanson's letter seven months later, after the committee had met, the chairman made three points. First, was there no way to become a professor at Gettysburg without becoming a department head? Second, women constitute 15 percent of your student body, but only 10 percent of your faculty. Third, the A.A.U.W. believes that every student should have an annual, rather than an occasional, physical examination. She promised that Gettysburg's application would be reconsidered when these three areas were strengthened. Anna L. Hawkes to Henry W.A. Hanson, Oakland, California, December 15, 1949. GCA.
finally, after appointing two women Ph.D.'s, succeeded. The coveted recognition came, following an inspection visit, in the fall of 1953. The notice arrived in time for the following statement to be included in the February 1954 catalogue: "The College is fully accredited or approved by all the major agencies, including the American Association of University Women." 309

In addition to securing A.A.U.W. approval for the College, Walter Langsam participated actively in the affairs of several state and national educational agencies. He committed time and energy to the Foundation for Independent Colleges, Inc. of Pennsylvania, which thirty-eight colleges and universities founded in June 1952 to make a united annual appeal to business and industry for funds to support higher education. Shortly before leaving Gettysburg, he was elected vice president of the foundation. All of his successors through 1985 also participated in this effort. Langsam was active in the Middle States Association; he served on several evaluating teams and from 1953 to 1955 was a member of its Commission on Higher Education. In January 1955 he was elected to a committee of the Association of American Colleges.

President Paul attended some state and national meetings and encouraged Dean Seymour Dunn in his desire to participate actively in a number of them. The General joined with neighboring schools in promoting Non-Western studies. Going to yearlong operations, he claimed, would establish Gettysburg as a national leader among smaller liberal-arts colleges in dealing with the expected tidal wave of students. The General also hoped to be able to establish institutes for the study of the Civil War and of peace, either of which, he thought, would be worthwhile in themselves and also would focus national attention on Gettysburg.

Arnold Hanson was deliberately selective in choosing the organizations beyond the campus in which he was active. He continued institutional membership in the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges, but channeled most of his personal time and energy into the L.C.A.'s activities in higher education and into the programs of two state agencies: the Foundation for Independent Colleges (on whose executive committee he served from 1967 to 1969) and the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities (of which he was president in 1970). In the 1960s he represented the Association of American Colleges on the

309 The College learned on November 16, 1953 that it had been placed on the A.A.U.W. approved list, which by that time included about 350 institutions. President Hanson told the trustees in June 1950 that the American Chemical Society was placing the Gettysburg chemistry department on its approved list. The society established this list in 1936 as a way to determine the category of A.C.S. membership for which a candidate was eligible. Subsequently, many took A.C.S. approval of a chemistry department to be a form of accreditation, which was not its original purpose.
advisory panel to the Secretary of the Air Force on R.O.T.C. affairs. In 1969 he joined with the presidents of Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, and Wilson Colleges to organize the Central Pennsylvania Consortium of Colleges, whose main purpose was to improve the entire educational program of all four members through a great variety of cooperative undertakings.

Charles E. Glassick was considerably more interested than his predecessor in actively participating in national educational organizations. While still placing a high priority on attention to agencies concerned with Lutheran and Pennsylvania higher education, he read papers before meetings of the American Council on Education in 1961, 1982, and 1984. He also served on the board of directors of the Council of Independent Colleges.310

Between 1945 and 1985 most faculty members belonged to one or more state, regional, and national professional organizations. Many read papers or were commentators at their meetings. Some assumed positions of leadership in the organizations. A number served on accrediting teams of the Middle States Association or the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction (later the Department of Education).311

In its issue of November 28, 1983, U.S. News & World Report published the results of a survey of 662 presidents of four-year colleges who responded to a request that they name the country's best undergraduate programs in either colleges or universities. The institutions mentioned in the responses were divided into five categories: national universities, national liberal-arts colleges, comprehensive universities, smaller comprehensive universities, and regional liberal-arts colleges. Gettysburg was ranked ninth among fifteen leading smaller comprehensive universities (having a liberal-arts and at least one professional program). While this recognition was welcomed and appreciated, in reflecting upon it any prudent student of American higher education would be aware of the difficulty in selecting the criteria adequate to measure the quality of education at any level and then in applying those criteria fairly to a particular institution of learning.

310Founded in 1956, the council was the first national independent college and university association. The 1985 by-laws defined its general purpose as the "promotion and advancement of small, independent private colleges of liberal arts and sciences in their historic and vital contribution to ethical, moral, and spiritual values."

311As before, the College placed its claims before the public by means of its several publications and, after 1952, through a public relations office. Just as in the 1930s its faculty and administrators used the relatively new medium of radio to bring the College to the attention of the nearby public, in the 1950s and early 1960s their successors presented educational programs on television in order to achieve the same end.
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Some Consequential Events

On at least six occasions between 1945 and 1985 the usual routine of College life was broken into by events which were consequential enough in its history to warrant special treatment here.

The Cold War

Within two years after the end of hostilities in the Pacific in August 1945, the United States and the Soviet Union were engaged in a cold war which threatened at any moment to bring these two powers, their allies, and indeed the world to a dangerous confrontation. Gettysburg students who had only recently shed their uniforms to return to College, joined by others who had been too young to fight, used the columns of the Gettysburgian to express their views on the course which the nation should follow. There were editorials, articles, and occasional letters on such subjects as the contest for control of Germany, whether communism should be outlawed in the United States, whether universal military training should be instituted, and the need for a strong bipartisan foreign policy.

In May 1947 the chairman of the board’s religious work committee solemnly reported to his colleagues that, since the last meeting, he had queried the chaplain on a sensitive subject. As far as he knew, the chaplain replied, "there are no organizations with communist tendencies on this campus, nor are there any groups which have set themselves up as being anti-religious." Three years later, the americanization and citizenship committee of the Pennsylvania society of the Sons of the American Revolution queried the Student Senate on the same subject. "I can say unqualifiedly that I have neither heard of, nor suspect any communistic leanings in our faculty or their teachings," replied the senate president. "Until such suspicions or facts reach my attention, I can feel proud of, and can boast of Gettysburg College’s contribution to the American scene."312

The outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950 threatened the College for the third time in a third of a century with a possible struggle for survival. The war began at a time when the College had not yet emerged from what Hips Wolfe called the lean years, when it was not yet evident that Gettysburg could annually recruit a body of 1,200 acceptably qualified students. In the fall, President Hanson estimated that most draft-age faculty and students would be permit-

312President Hanson incorporated a copy of the letter of Robert A. Bley, dated March 5, 1950, into his report to the June meeting of the board.
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ted to complete the school year, but those in the reserves might be called at any time. His December report to the trustees was more pessimistic. Predicting that as many as three million young men would be drafted soon after Congress convened in January, he foresaw a Gettysburg enrollment of no more than 850 students in the fall of 1951. The number of men, he thought, would be reduced from 1,050 to 600. "All enrollments will be seriously affected. I am hopeful, however, that we will be able to complete the year in the black," he told the alumni in February. "It will require many economies. The real test will come next year." Even as he wrote these words, the faculty was reviving its wartime academic credit policy for servicemen and preparing once more to use its summer session to help students complete their work in three years. Still fearing the worst, Hanson notified several faculty members in the spring of 1951 that their services would not be needed in the fall.

Although the fighting continued, the beginning of lengthy peace talks at Panmunjom in July 1951 changed the outlook considerably. Enrollment in the fall totaled 1,164 students, down from 1,231 in the previous year, but largely because of a greatly reduced number of women in the freshman class. Instead of 600 male students, there were 902.

The 125th Anniversary

As the 125th anniversary of the College approached, and during the year in which an administrative committee was managing the institution, the Alumni Association and the board of trustees established a committee of six persons to carry out a proper celebration, recommending that it take the form of special observances during the already established events for the year 1957. There was a student-sponsored weekend of activities in early April (during which it rained); about ten days later the library was formally named in memory of the College's chief founder; Robert Fortenbaugh discussed the institution's beginnings after the alumni dinner in June; the College hosted a banquet for some two hundred members of five Gettysburg service clubs in September; and Franklin Clark Fry, president of the U.L.C.A., preached the homecoming sermon in November. There were other anniversary events, but the one which attracted the greatest attention, both on and beyond the campus, and whose consequences were much in evidence more than a quarter century later, was a three-day conference on the Civil War, which was held on November 17-19, 1957.

The College invited Professor Allan Nevins of Columbia University to organize the conference program. He agreed, with the understanding that its main theme would not be the military aspects
of the war. Using as his topic "The Civil War: An Emergent New America," Nevins invited more than fifteen nationally known scholars to join him in studying the four-year conflict of the 1860s, which he believed marked "the conversion of an unorganized nation into an organized nation, with an irresistible impetus toward greater and greater organization." With about four hundred registrants, the conference was such a success that it was repeated every November through 1961. Each had a different director and was devoted to a different topic.313 By November 1961 almost every major Civil-War-era scholar had participated in one or more of these conferences.314

In his usual blunt and direct way, the General told the trustees in December 1957 that, although the first Civil War conference was a success which "added greatly" to College prestige, "I deplore the lack of student attendance." Four years later, his newly arrived successor measured the continuing three-day event by the same criterion: participation by Gettysburg students.315 Accordingly,

313 The Nevins quote was taken from his conference keynote address, a copy of which is in GCA. David Donald directed the 1958 conference (Why the North Won the Civil War: Economic Considerations); David M. Potter that of 1959 (Lincoln and the Civil War); Norman A. Graebner that of 1960 (Politics in a Dividing Nation); and James W. Silver that of 1961 (Problems of the Confederacy). Two sets of papers were published: David Donald, ed., Why the North Won the Civil War (Baton Rouge, 1960) and Norman A. Graebner, ed., Politics and the Crisis of 1860 (Urbana, 1961).

314 In his December 1957 board report, President Paul paid tribute to "the originator of the idea" of the first conference, Professor Basil L. Crapster. Robert Fortenbaugh was in general charge of the first conference and Robert L. Bloom of the remaining four.

315 This is a clear commentary on the similar priorities of two successive Gettysburg presidents, who differed in many other ways.
since it had not increased sufficiently, as far as the president was concerned, in 1962 the conference was replaced by a lecture, named in memory of Professor Robert Fortenbaugh and beginning in 1966 endowed by his College classmate, Clyde E. Gerberich. Given on or about November 19, by 1964 the twenty-three Fortenbaugh lectures had returned a number of established Civil War scholars to the campus and brought many members of a new generation to Gettysburg for the first time. Between 1958 and 1962 Professor Robert L. Bloom conducted a summer-study group which sometimes attracted more than one hundred Civil War buffs for about five days of lectures, battlefield tours, and discussions.

As early as December 1957, the General shared with the trustees his hope of expanding the November conference into a Civil War institute and of making the College a national center of Civil War studies. After all, he wrote, "it allows us to take advantage of the one thing we have no other college has - location at Gettysburg." He also believed he had the building for it: a renovated Old Dorm. In 1959 the General named longtime librarian John Knickerbocker director of such an institute and turned over to him the small building which the bookstore had recently vacated. After Knickerbocker died in 1964, Arnold Hanson decided to abandon the effort. The books and museum articles were placed in (in many instances returned to) Schmucker Library. Using endowment funds, federal grants, and College appropriations, Professor Bloom and others built the Civil War era collection of books and related materials into one of the strongest segments of the library.

Gabor S. Boritt succeeded Professor Bloom when the latter retired in 1981. Two years later he conducted the first in a series of summer study groups (now called Civil War Institutes). In September 1984 he directed a three-day conference (Lincoln-175), which brought to Gettysburg many of the nation's leading Civil-War-era scholars to discuss the state of Lincoln scholarship on the 175th anniversary of his birth. A major gift from the estates of Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Fluhrer made it possible to establish in 1985 the Robert C. Fluhrer Distinguished Chair in Civil War Studies and also to support those studies in a number of other ways. Fluhrer, of the class of 1912, was a York attorney and College trustee from 1963 until his death in 1970.

---

318 Professor Bloom's popular course on the Civil War and Reconstruction, introduced in 1954, provided a continuing undergraduate demand for the library's resources on the period.
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The Civil War Centennial

In preparation for the observance of the centennial of the battle of Gettysburg and the dedication of Soldiers' National Cemetery, in April 1956 Governor George M. Leader signed a bill authorizing a nine-member state commission to plan for an appropriate celebration. Eighteen months later the governor appointed President Paul, John S. Rice, and Donald M. Swope (of the class of 1935 and a Gettysburg attorney), along with six others, to what came to be called the Gettysburg Centennial Commission.317

Plagued from the beginning by a shortage of funds, the members had to abandon several of their most ambitious plans. Instead of a reenactment of the entire battle, as some urged, the commission agreed to sponsor a symbolic reenactment of Pickett's charge. Instead of the major pageant which they initially planned, they promoted a series of vignettes staged at different places on the battlefield. Inevitably, there had to be a big parade. The ceremonies occurred between June 30 and July 3, 1963. Although thousands attended the several events, it is apparent that many more stayed away because of the predictions of record crowds or that civil-rights groups from outside the county were planning demonstrations at some time during the festivities. Conspicuous by their absence, in contrast with the 1913 and 1938 celebrations, were the Union and Confederate veterans, none of whom were alive in 1963.

The College began its observance of the Civil War centennial on June 29, 1961, exactly one hundred years after its students, with appropriate ceremony, raised a thirty-four star flag over the College building.318 There was music, participation by a local "living history" military unit, and an address by Professor Bloom. In succeeding months, trustees occasionally asked President Hanson about the extent of College participation in the plans which the commission was formulating. In reply to one question, he described it as "limited." Responding to another, he expressed his unwillingness to join in any plan with a battle reenactment, although he welcomed the opportunity to engage in any program "which would honor the occasion with dignity and good taste." The fact is that, unlike the

---

317 Paul resigned when he left the presidency and Rice when he became ambassador to the Netherlands, both in 1961. The governor then named Henry M. Scharf (of the class of 1925 and a Gettysburg businessman) to replace Paul. Swope remained on the commission until its work was completed. The final report of the commission, compiled and edited by Louis M. Simon, its executive secretary, was Gettysburg-1963: An Account of the Centennial Commemoration (Harrisburg, 1964). Its 120 pages include the text of many of the addresses and also numerous illustrations.

318 See p. 182.
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celebrations of 1913 and 1938, this one had limited need for access to College facilities.\textsuperscript{319}

The one remaining task for the Gettysburg Centennial Commission was observance of the centennial of the dedication of Soldiers' National Cemetery. For this event, which would coincide with the 1963 Fortenbaugh lecture, the commission cooperated closely with the College. On the afternoon of November 17, Secretary of State Dean Rusk joined the French and Italian ambassadors and the minister of the British embassy in a discussion of the international impact of the Gettysburg Address. The main auditorium of the Student Union Building was filled to capacity for the program.\textsuperscript{320} That evening, Professor David Donald of The Johns Hopkins University, the Fortenbaugh lecturer, discussed Abraham Lincoln and American nationalism. On the following evening, again in the Student Union Building, Alistair Cooke moderated as four panelists (Judge Raymond P. Alexander, Professor Bloom, Poet Archibald MacLeish, and Iowa Congressman Fred D. Schwengel) discussed the Donald lecture, as well as what Lincoln might be saying and doing were he alive a century later. On November 19, Dwight D. Eisenhower formally rededicated the national cemetery.\textsuperscript{321}

\textbf{Eisenhower and the College}

Although the association of Dwight D. Eisenhower with Gettysburg College was closest during the 1960s, his contact with the community began long before that. In 1915, as a West Point senior, he and his class toured and studied the battlefield. Three years later, he returned to Gettysburg with his wife, in order to command the tank unit at Camp Colt, located on the battlefield. More than a quarter century before Dwight D. Eisenhower was born, as a West Point senior, he and his classmates studied the battlefield of Gettysburg. Three years later, he returned to Gettysburg with his wife, in order to command the tank unit at Camp Colt, located on the battlefield.

\textsuperscript{319}In July, College dorms were used by the state police, band members, and other parade participants. The address on the College and the Civil War, which Professor Bloom delivered on founders' day 1963, was reprinted in the July 1963 issue of the GCB.

\textsuperscript{320}French, Italian, and British diplomats were present on November 19, 1863, as was Secretary of State William H. Seward.

\textsuperscript{321}Conspicuous by his absence from any of these ceremonies was President John F. Kennedy. The commission invited him to deliver an address to the nation from Gettysburg on July 4, 1963. Not until late April did he decline, on the grounds that a planned trip to Europe and a crowded calendar immediately thereafter would have to take precedence in his schedule. The commission then invited him to rededicate the cemetery in November and use that occasion for a major address. Instead, he and his advisers elected to schedule two trips into the South at this time, one of which took him to Dallas, Texas, on November 22. The final commission report (on p. 46) had this observation: "Little did anyone realize how the course of our history might have been changed had President Kennedy's decision been to come to Pennsylvania rather than go to Texas during that week of November, 1963."
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Members of Kappa Delta Rho honor Eisenhower as he reaches seventy-five years of age in October 1965.

century later, as soon as World War II ended, President Hanson invited Eisenhower to deliver the address to the 1946 graduating class and receive the first of many honorary degrees. In 1951 the Eisenhowers purchased a farm in Cumberland township and soon thereafter established their legal residence in Adams county. As already noted, as president of the United States Eisenhower sometimes used the College president's office in Glatfelter Hall during his recuperation from a 1955 heart attack. In the spring of 1956 he suggested Willard S. Paul as a candidate to succeed Walter Langsam, and three years later accepted the General's invitation to deliver the main address during the convocation initiating a major fund-raising campaign.

Since General Paul had vacated the president's residence at 300 Carlisle street soon after his marriage in the summer of 1958, the trustees offered to lease the building to the General Services Administration for use by Eisenhower as an office when he retired from the presidency in January 1961. In the following June they elected him to the board of trustees. Eisenhower continued to use the office and be a trustee until he died in March 1969. While occupying the facilities at 300 Carlisle street, he wrote several books, periodically issued statements which attracted national attention, and conferred with American and world leaders. There was a tacit understanding that persons associated with the College would respect his privacy and not burden him with requests, but this did not prevent them from extending occasional invitations to make brief remarks at some student gathering. There was also an understanding that Eisenhower would not be expected to serve on trustee committees or attend all board meetings, but this did not prevent him from accepting the hon-
Sculptor Norman L. Annis and Mamie D. Eisenhower with the Eisenhower statue on the occasion of its dedication, 1970.

ory chairmanship of the board of associates when it was organized in 1965 or from participating in the dedication of Musselman Stadium in the same year.

Since Eisenhower was obviously convinced of the necessity of education in a democratic society, and was highly effective when expressing his convictions on that subject, he performed his chosen tasks on the Gettysburg campus to good effect.\textsuperscript{322} While Arnold Hanson respected Eisenhower as a person and welcomed him as an international figure and a genuine friend of the institution, he believed strongly that Gettysburg should always maintain a strictly nonpartisan character. Consequently, he tried to avoid anything which would tend to identify the College as a Republican institution.

When Eisenhower died in 1969 and the federal lease of 300 Carlisle street was terminated, the College relocated the admissions office in the building. In October of that year the trustees named it the Dwight David Eisenhower House and directed that a statue of the former president "be commissioned and erected on land contiguous to the House." The sculptor for the statue was Professor Norman L. Annis of the art department. It was dedicated on October 14, 1970.\textsuperscript{323}

\textsuperscript{322}Many associated with the College hoped that the presence of Eisenhower on its board would attract large sums of money. It did not.

\textsuperscript{323}The statue was given by Trustee and Mrs. Joseph T. Simpson. After it was severely damaged during a 1984 storm, Professor Annis created a second statue, which was located slightly to the west of the original.
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In October 1969 several of the late president's friends organized the Dwight D. Eisenhower Society, in order "to promote knowledge and understanding of the accomplishments of the 34th President of the United States and General of the Army; the code by which he lived; and the signal qualities that made him in his time the world's most trusted figure." Beginning in 1970, this society observed the anniversary of Eisenhower's birth (October 14) by exercises at the statue, followed by a convocation in the College Union Building. Between 1970 and 1984 the convocation speakers included General Lauris Norstad, General Alfred M. Gruenther, Governor William W. Scranton, Dr. Edward L.R. Elson, Governor Richard L. Thornburgh, and President Gerald R. Ford. The society has always maintained a close working relationship with the College. By 1985 it had begun to contribute to an Eisenhower endowment fund, part of the proceeds of which were available for scholarships.

Coming Apart at Gettysburg

The social unrest which reached its peak in the late 1960s and early 1970s followed almost twenty years in which the dominant, but certainly never the only, themes were widespread acceptance of the traditional ideals of family life, the worth of organized religion, and the value of education at all levels. At the same time, as late as 1961, after a decade and a half of cold war, an American president in his inaugural address could still vow that "we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

It was perhaps inevitable that sooner or later many Americans would begin to criticize what they insisted was an obsession with material things and a continuing great gap between the ideal and the reality in many aspects of our life. They also questioned whether American foreign policy, however well it might have promoted the nation's interests in the recent past, was now in need of major review and redirection. It was equally inevitable that this criticism and questioning would occur on every live college campus in the country. These were concerns closely related to the future of every young person, whether in college or not. Those who were satisfied with things as they were and who focused their attention on the excesses, both in word and deed, which occurred on many campuses were highly critical of what was taking place. They often threatened to cut off their financial support of certain institutions, and sometimes did just that. Those faculty, administrators, and trustees who were in varying degrees responsible for ongoing college and university programs were often perplexed by the difficulty in turning cam-
pus unrest and protest, which in themselves were largely negative, into constructive channels. Caught between their critics both off and on the campus, they had no practical alternative to making the attempt.

Unrest and protest had not yet descended upon the Gettysburg campus by 1964. The trustees were absorbed in developing a ten-year plan and in raising money for a life science building. The faculty were busily engaged in a review of the teacher education programs, as well as in a Middle States evaluation which centered on ways to make students more responsible for their own learning and to assist them in developing value systems consistent with the liberal arts. If the Gettysburgian was an accurate barometer of campus opinion and behavior, most students still enjoyed the big social weekends. There is evidence that many were pursuing the currently popular goal of academic excellence, but editorials and letters sometimes complained about widespread student apathy. With compulsory chapel and compulsory convocation things of the past, there was at the moment no major issue to divide students and administrators. Nevertheless, letters from Peace Corps volunteers, discussion of a possible exchange of students with a black college in the South, as well as articles about segregation in the community of Gettysburg and whether the College (with one black student) was committed to nothing more than token integration, all of these topics indicated something of the extent to which students were reaching beyond the campus. In his December report to the board, President Hanson commented favorably upon the students' interest in the Johnson-Goldwater campaign and concluded that their "behavior in general displays a remarkable sense of responsibility." 324

It was in the year 1965, during which Congress approved many major pieces of reform legislation (including medicare, an effective voting rights bill, several education bills, and a sweeping liberalization of immigration legislation), but also during which the administration began introducing large numbers of American fighting men into Vietnam, that the campus mood began to change. By the spring of that year, several students accompanied the chaplain to a Washington discussion of the proposed voting rights bill; it was sponsored by national Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish organizations. The student exchange with Knoxville College actually began occurring. Faculty and students engaged in discussions of Vietnam and the operation of the draft.

324 Gettysburgian polls in 1952 gave Eisenhower a 79-19 percent edge over Stevenson, in 1960 Nixon an 82-18 edge over Kennedy, and in 1964 Johnson a 54-43 edge over Goldwater. A total of 1,311 students participated in the 1964 poll.
President Hanson immediately took the position that these and other concerns of students were legitimate and that it was crucial for administrators and faculty to establish and maintain effective lines of communication, however difficult, trying, and wearisome that might be. The In which the Senate and Chapel Council opened in January 1965 was available for this purpose. Beginning in February 1966 the president used a gathering (called the liaison) for regular meetings with students. Later he began holding press conferences, at which larger numbers could be reached. In 1966 the trustees started to confer with students when they came to campus for their regular meetings. Meanwhile, the students were establishing communication with their colleagues on other campuses. Special telephones made possible long-distance group discussions.

By 1967 student activism was expanding to include questioning of many of the College’s conduct and other regulations. Why does Gettysburg continue to say that it has a dry campus, when in fact it does not and should not? Why are there restrictions on the freedom of women students to come and go as they please, when similar restrictions on men were abandoned years ago? Why must some students, but not all, eat in the dining hall? Why are there no more black students at Gettysburg? Why are students not permitted to participate in the tenure and promotion decisions involving faculty members? In seeking answers to these and other questions, the students soon came to the conclusion that, in order to effect the changes in the College which they desired, they needed to know much more than they did about how it was governed. It was relatively easy for them to gain a fair understanding of the role of Arnold Hanson, the several deans, and the faculty. It was far more difficult for them to understand and then accept that the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania had vested ultimate authority for the College, as well as ultimate responsibility for its welfare, in a group of men and women who, as far as many of them could see, were little more than poorly informed absentee landlords.

The years 1968-1970 witnessed student activism at Gettysburg at its peak. College administrators and faculty tried from time to time to put what was happening into proper perspective. “A point of beginning is the awareness that a potent mark of contemporary culture is activism,” Arnold Hanson told the alumni during the 1969 collation, “an activism which is displayed by persons of all ages and varying circumstances throughout the world.” It is putting “traditional college structures and processes” to the test. On the campus, he noted, activism takes many forms, ranging from “support of a proper goal” to “harassment or obstructive action.” The president believed that there were “very few, if any,” students at Gettysburg who were “violence prone.” Rather, he insisted, “the
vast majority of our students are motivated by a genuine desire for good. These young people are idealists and for this all of us should be thankful."

The president was accurate in his description of the activist. Many were convinced that the polity of the College should be altered to give students a much greater voice in its government. Given such a voice, they claimed, they would use it to improve the College as a place of learning, using that word in its broadest possible meaning. These students seemed to sense that the existing mood of the campus and the country offered them a fighting chance to accomplish their aims; if not seized upon, the opportunity would quickly pass, perhaps never in their lifetime to return. "The means of action" which the students were then using to achieve their goals, Arnold Hanson told the alumni, "have been reasonable with significant reliance on regular channels." In spite of their feeling of urgency, Gettysburg students presented those who held the reins of power with comparatively few lists of "nonnegotiable demands," similar to those faced by the governors of some other educational institutions at this time.325

Reacting to the times, as early as 1968 the faculty began adding student members to several of its committees. When a new rule was approved two years later, students were represented on six of the ten regular standing committees. In January 1969 the faculty voted to permit ten designated students to attend their meetings and to make available to all students copies of the minutes, which up to that time were to be regarded as confidential among faculty and administrators.

Consistently during this period Arnold Hanson declared that there would be no censorship at Gettysburg College. As early as the fall of 1967 he took a position unpopular with many off campus when he defended the rights of students and others to invite controversial speakers to the campus. "There are risks involved here," he told the

325 It is instructive to compare Hanson's 1969 collation report (published in the July 1969 GCB) with the one he delivered four years later (and published in the July 1973 GCB), by which time the mood had changed. One of the characteristics of the times was for college students to use provocative language, as well as exaggeration and unreality, to describe the situation in which they found themselves and the remedies which they sought. A student power program for 1969, which bore no signature and for which no one therefore had to assume responsibility, called for additional faculty chairs, faculty salary increases, more scholarships, and more courses, while enjoining the trustees and administration to seek immediate ways to reduce tuition, room, and board charges. In the same document, students who undoubtedly wanted to be treated as adults and who expected to be taken seriously demanded creation of a board composed of an equal number of students, administrators, faculty, trustees, and alumni, which would be the "highest governing body of the school." Copy in GCA.
opening convocation, "but we cannot assume that a responsible effort to probe a sensitive area or to present a person who thinks otherwise represents a dangerous course of action." The limits to which he was willing to go were tested a year later, when a publication called "Eatsit" began appearing. Called "a literary magazine," by its coarseness and vulgarity it more resembled those libelous burlesques of the past. Members of its staff stated openly that the purpose of their text and cartoons was deliberately to provoke the trustees into pressuring Arnold Hanson to try to halt their publication. If successful, they believed, it would allow them to charge abridgement of freedom of the press, draw many students to their side, and finally provoke a major student revolt.

Arnold Hanson declined to take the bait. In a letter to the trustees, dated October 12, 1968, and shared with the faculty, he discussed the difficulty in proving a case against the staff using existing conduct procedures and the risks in circumventing them. "One of the crucial tasks today on college campuses," he wrote, "is that of defining and maintaining academic freedom in the face of efforts to test the limits of that freedom or to exploit it." A college must take some risks because limiting academic freedom "in one instance . . . may threaten other parts of or the whole of its academic freedom." He was hopeful "that if we continue to behave responsibly and with some measure of dignity the few who are offensive will destroy themselves." If action should eventually be required, and he was not certain that it would not be, "I am hopeful that we will . . . [act] on solid grounds and in ways which are appropriate to this kind of institution." "Eatsit" soon ceased publication.\footnote{On October 7 the Student Senate adopted a statement, titled "The Situation" and signed by fifteen students, declaring the subscribers' commitment to change, avowing their opposition to "Eatsit" and its purposes, and urging the president not to take the bait which it offered.}

The first campus confrontation came in the spring of 1969. It concerned the rights of women students. Using somewhat milder language than was customary in the past (the word required was now gone), the 1967 catalogue declared that "all women in the campus community are expected to live in a college residence hall unless they have special permission from the Dean of Students" and that "all women students, except those living at home, . . . take their meals in the College Dining Hall." The 1967 student handbook informed women students that they had to remain in their dormitories between the evening closing hours (which varied by class and day of the week from 10:30 P.M. to 2 A.M.) and 6 A.M. Males could be entertained only in dormitory living rooms and then only between 10 A.M. and closing hours. Women were permitted only in the lobbies of men's dormitories or on the first floors of fraternity
houses. The by-laws of the Women's Student Government Council contained detailed procedures for obtaining exceptions to these rules and prescribed penalties for disobeying them.

Late in 1968 the Women's Student Government proposed that all but first-semester women be permitted to regulate their own hours. On February 25, 1969 some 269 women signed a statement that "Gettysburg College discriminates against women" and affirming (not demanding) that "we all want equal rights." Two weeks later the student affairs committee recommended that the president grant the request. Instead, he offered the privilege of what were called self-limiting hours only to those senior women whose parents gave their approval. This provoked some four hundred students to protest, during the course of which it was agreed to suspend classes for two days to permit extended discussion of many issues, which by now went far beyond hours for women.327

What became known as the moratorium occurred on April 15-16, 1969. Trustees, administrators, faculty, and most of the students discussed the latter's many concerns - it was they who determined the agenda - and how best to deal with them. After the talking was over, it was agreed that two things needed to be done immediately. The first was the creation of a new agency to deal with student affairs. The second was the establishment of a committee which would study the host of matters discussed during the moratorium and then

327 In January 1967 the faculty increased the size of its student affairs committee to six faculty, six administrators, and six students.

328 President Hanson explained to the alumni in June that early in the protest some students decided to spend a night in the Student Union Building. "While some may have hoped that they would be refused permission," he explained, "instead permission was granted."
refer those deemed worthy of more extended consideration and possible action to some existing College body.\textsuperscript{329}

Between mid-April and mid-September 1969 the trustees in a special meeting approved the president's delegating his charter and by-laws authority in student affairs, and the faculty in several meetings delegated their authority in the same area, to what was eventually called the Residential Life Commission, consisting of six elected faculty members, six appointed administrators, and six elected students. The commission was assigned the "full responsibility for student residential life and student conduct and for enacting legislation concerning these matters," subject to review by the trustees in such cases as the president deemed warranted. The commission came into being in the fall of 1969 and immediately began to deal with a large agenda of urgent items.\textsuperscript{330}

One of the first matters to which the commission directed its attention was the College alcohol policy, which had been stated in several different ways over a long period of time. In 1955, when the Interfraternity Council asked the board's committee on fraternities to permit what it called "controlled drinking" in the houses during the big weekends, the committee asked the full board to reaffirm what it considered existing policy: "There will be no storage or consumption of alcoholic beverages on the Campus or in the Campus buildings. This includes all the fraternities." Without recorded debate, the board complied in June 1955. Thus Presidents Paul and Hanson had recent trustee action as authority when they declared that Gettysburg College was a dry campus. Even while making these declarations, they well knew that there continued to be drinking on the campus (as the trustees defined the latter term); that the policy was not being rigorously enforced; that probably it was not practical to attempt rigorous enforcement; and that the only benefit from the policy, apart from its popularity in many circles off campus, was the

\textsuperscript{329}The study and referral committee included trustees, administrators, the members of the faculty executive committee, and students. Its final report in late 1970 did not propose adding either faculty or student members to the board of trustees, as happened in some other institutions. It did recommend establishing a gathering (later called the forum), in which members of the several constituencies could regularly meet and talk. Trustees, faculty, administrators, and students met several times a year in this way through 1975-1978.

\textsuperscript{330}In May 1976 the commission adopted a statement of objectives and goals for residential living, which expressed, certainly not a new vision for Gettysburg College, but one cast in language of the times. In 1980 the Residential Life Commission was replaced by the Student Life Council (four students, four faculty, and four administrators), which was charged with studying residential life and recommending action to the president. Obviously, by this change the faculty was taking back much of the authority it had delegated in 1969, the president was resuming a much larger role, and the trustees were withdrawing from their active involvement, although the president might still refer any pending proposal for their review.
mild deterrent effect it might be having on student drinking. Sometimes the Gettysburgian ran an editorial urging students to honor the prohibition; sometimes it simply called attention to the wide gap between policy and practice.

Studies made in the later 1960s demonstrated that many students, probably a majority, were accustomed to using alcoholic beverages before they came to Gettysburg; that only about half of the parents questioned endorsed the existing policy; and that officers of other institutions reported a trend away from restrictive policies on their campuses. In December 1969 the board of trustees, after considerable debate and obviously with some misgivings, amended slightly and then accepted the Residential Life Commission’s proposed revision of the long-existing and much-ignored policy. The College now declared that it did not encourage student use of alcoholic beverages; that it expected students to obey Pennsylvania’s law, which set the minimum drinking age at twenty-one years; that it would neither enforce that law on behalf of the state nor impede the state’s enforcing it; that it would penalize inappropriate student behavior which went beyond breaking the law; and that it would provide strict guidelines for on-campus drinking. Subject to review a year after adoption, this policy was made permanent in 1971.331

Another topic which came before the Residential Life Commission in the fall of 1969 was the issue which had produced the moratorium in the first place. Why should there be any disparity be-

331The problems which student use of alcoholic beverages created for the College did not disappear with the adoption of this policy. During the 1970s the Residential Life Commission, the administration, and the trustees often had this matter on their agendas, as laws were violated and inappropriate behavior increased. Arnold Hanson and others constantly urged programs to educate students to the dangers in using alcohol. The trustees adopted a revised and briefer statement of policy in 1979 and the Student Life Council subsequently restated the guidelines for using alcoholic beverages on campus.
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tween the rights and privileges enjoyed by male and female students? Gradually, by actions of the commission and the trustees, the distinctions which were instituted when women students returned to Gettysburg in the fall of 1935, which probably for many years virtually all of their parents heartily supported, and which probably most women students long accepted as a given when they enrolled, were eliminated.

By 1972 all women who had parental permission were given self-limiting hours; a year later such permission was no longer needed. By 1973 junior and senior women having a dean's permission could room off campus; by 1974 women were free to acquire sorority houses; and beginning in 1977 only freshmen, both men and women, were required to live in College dormitories. By 1973 junior and senior women could choose where they took their meals, a privilege all juniors and seniors still enjoyed twelve years later. Reluctantly, in 1972 the trustees approved using Apple Hall for both men (in the original part) and women (in the annex). Still reluctant, in 1977 they nevertheless permitted men and women to room, on alternate floors, in Patrick Hall.

The idea whose time the trustees were most unwilling to admit had come was known as open visitation, which meant that a student could entertain visitors in his or her room at any time. Aware of their ultimate responsibility for the welfare of the College, the trustees properly weighed a number of considerations (including, but not limited to, the strong desires of students already on the campus) before sanctioning in 1982 open visitation as one of three options available to students.332

In March 1970, after months of planning, the students carried out a three-day program of speeches, workshops, and discussions devoted to many of the issues which people of all ages, not only college students, were then facing. The main topic was student involvement on the campus, in the community, and in the nation. Many of the more than fifty speakers and discussion-group leaders were nationally known. The trustees, some of whom were participants, were sufficiently impressed by what was called Symposium 70 that they formally commended the students who had formulated and then carried out the idea. The Gettysburgian for

332Open visitation was a matter which the president referred to the trustees for approval before it became effective. The 1970 handbook was the first to contain a rationale for visitation: the College recognized "a natural desire" to entertain members of the opposite sex in surroundings free "from the usual public distractions." At the same time, it had "a positive obligation to protect the right of the individual to reasonable privacy because the learning process depends on extensive reading and thinking in solitude. Residence halls are one of the appropriate places for this activity." Hence there were visitation rules and options.

1008
March 16 accurately described it as "the most colorful, provocative, and exhausting Awareness Week this college has yet seen."

Six weeks after Symposium 70, when President Richard Nixon ordered American troops to invade Cambodia, presumably in an effort to force the North Vietnamese to agree to peace terms acceptable to the Americans, students on campuses all over the country erupted in revolt. The Ohio governor ordered the national guard to restore order in the town of Kent and on the campus of Kent State University. During the days which followed, four students were killed and eleven were wounded. Many Gettysburg students joined the nationwide protest by sending letters to Washington and persuading the faculty to suspend classes for two more days of wide-ranging discussions. By a large majority, the faculty took the most unusual step (in justifying it, one faculty member remarked that the times were most unusual) of deploiring the expansion of the war and calling upon the president to withdraw all American troops from Cambodia and Vietnam.

The crisis was sufficiently unnerving to some that the faculty gave students several options for completing their semester's work, one of which permitted delay into the fall semester. When they met in June, the trustees commended Arnold Hanson and those who worked with him "on their overall handling of the affairs of this institution during the year just passed and particularly because of their ability to meet the situation of the college community and keep

---

333 Many students organized and directed Symposium 70, but the one most responsible for it was the senate president, Geoffrey Curtiss. Symposium 70 is a good example of positive, constructive student activism, designed to bring together rather than to tear apart.
the institution on an even keel in the tumultuous times in which we find ourselves.\textsuperscript{334}

The fever pitch at which the College and the country operated during much of 1968, 1969, and 1970 could not be expected to continue indefinitely. As early as January 1971 Arnold Hanson told the trustees that the campus seemed quieter, that students seemed less concerned "with issues of yesteryear" and more with the academic program, but that there was "still a wide array of strange clothing." By June he was able to tell his fellow-trustees that "the College climate this year is a generally calmer one than last year." In June 1972 he reported to them that "the College is a happier place than it was a few years ago."

At the end of one of the several sessions during which Gettysburg was sitting in what amounted to a committee of the whole, Arnold Hanson abandoned his usual reserve to declare, with some fervor, that Gettysburg would never be the same again. In one sense he was in error, since the power structure, with the long-established division of labor among its parts, survived the crisis years largely intact. However, in another sense, at least during the succeeding decade, his prediction was an accurate one. Certain designated students continued to attend faculty meetings. Students continued to participate in the deliberation of more than half of the regular faculty committees. Their concerns now occupied a more prominent place than ever before in trustee meetings.\textsuperscript{335} Among the other legacies of this period which remained in the mid-eighties were pass-fail grading, the special major, and faculty-sponsored student evaluation of teaching. Among the traditional usages of an earlier period which had not returned by the same time were religious emphasis week, a booster club, fall and spring houseparty weekends, Spectrum queens and their courts, and freshmen customs.

\textsuperscript{334}There were rumors of plans to protest and possibly disrupt during several of the commencements of these years. Arnold Hanson replied in characteristic fashion to a question in the June 1970 board meeting by explaining that students knew "the ground rules for dissent and dissenters" and that he would "adjourn activities should circumstances develop which could be embarrassing to the institution or participants." Some students stood in silent protest during the R.O.T.C. commissioning exercises; some declined to wear caps and gowns; students spoke during the 1970 and 1971 exercises; and in 1971 one student tried to leave the stage after receiving his diploma without shaking Arnold Hanson's hand (he failed). For reactions to the 1971 commencement, see the \textit{GCB} for July and October of that year.

\textsuperscript{335}Legislation in 1980 altered slightly the way in which students were chosen to attend faculty meetings, but not the number entitled to attend. Although the College by-laws were amended in 1968 to permit nonmembers to serve on board committees, not until 1978-1980 were students (and faculty) appointed to any. Once the Student Life Council was established, the trustees were less involved in residential life matters than they had been for a decade.
After more than four years of preparation by administrators, faculty, and students, the trustees in 1974 adopted a statement entitled "The Rights and Responsibilities of Students." Designed to "provide guidelines for the insurance of the rights of Gettysburg College students and for the exercise of their responsibilities as members of this community for education," the statement dealt with such topics as the academic freedom of students, proper use of their official and other College records, their rights and responsibilities as citizens in the College community, and procedures for handling their grievances. Obviously this document invited close comparison with the numerous editions of rules and regulations which the faculty had prepared and the trustees had adopted during the first eighty years or more of the College's existence.

However important it may have been, College response to student activism was not the only reason for change in the early seventies. State and federal equal-rights legislation required the College to move more rapidly than it otherwise might have to remove the last remaining distinctions in its treatment of men and women students.336 The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 resulted in some changes in the way in which student records and letters of recommendation were handled. As state and federal courts began setting aside the precedents which for many years had allowed institutions of higher education virtual free rein in dealing with their students, the College changed course and increased the role of the administration and faculty in its disciplinary procedures.337

336 Title IX of the federal higher education amendments of 1972 stated that sex cannot be used to exclude any person from the benefits of an educational program receiving federal assistance. In June 1973 the trustees declared that "it is the policy of Gettysburg College not to discriminate improperly against any matriculated student, employee or prospective employee on account of race, color, religion, ethnic or national origin, or sex." The declaration dealt with students, employees, and affirmative action. Writing in the January 1975 CCB, Assistant Business Manager Robert C. Nordvall observed that during the preceding fifteen years the College had become subject to at least fourteen state and federal laws pertaining to its personnel. Determining what these laws meant in practice and what they required of the College, he wrote, was taking "an increasing portion of the time of college administrators."

337 From the days of the General until 1972, violations of student rules and regulations were tried by an all-student conduct board, each of whose decisions was then reviewed by an administrative-faculty review board. The tacit understanding was that, wherever possible, the conduct board decision would stand. In 1972 this arrangement gave way to a student conduct review board of nine students, six faculty, and two deans, not all of whom had to be present at any trial. The board's jurisdiction extended to individuals and campus groups; its decisions were binding, but there was an appeal procedure. The student handbook declared that board procedures "do not include all the rules in force in the civil courts . . . What is required is that all of the procedures followed preserve the substance of due process." By 1984-1985 the board consisted of twelve students, nine faculty, and two administrators.
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At no time during the late sixties and early seventies did a majority of Gettysburg students engage in what has here been referred to as activism, although most of them did adopt their own version of the hair and dress styles often associated with that phenomenon.336 Some who were as disturbed as any by the war in Vietnam and injustice at home took the position that their highest immediate priority should be making progress toward completing their College work. Accordingly, they opposed any interruptions in their scheduled classes.

One of the ideas current among college students at this time was that the American economy had developed to the point at which, almost automatically, it could produce enough for all. The problem then was simply to assure that all got a share, which would permit as many as wished to spend their time on more important things. This may help to explain a switch in interest on many campuses from economics and business administration to fields deemed to be more (to use a much overused word of the time) relevant. At Gettysburg these two subjects all but held their own, including 17 percent of the graduates between 1963 and 1967 and 15.6 percent between 1972 and 1976. Grade inflation was a national phenomenon at this time. Undoubtedly for several reasons, the grade-point average for all Gettysburg students increased from 2.61 during the first half of the sixties to 2.71 during the second half, and then to 2.86 during the first half of the seventies. In the fifties and sixties the College chapter of Phi Beta Kappa elected an average of 6.5 percent of the seniors to membership. For several years in the early seventies the number chosen reached or slightly exceeded 10 percent.339

The fact that the campus was a happier place in the early 1970s did not mean that the problems of presidents and others were now things of the past. Administrators continued to be concerned about campus security. As early as 1968, Arnold Hanson began appealing to the faculty and students for help in preventing fires, theft, vandalism, and assaults on students. He tried to limit access to many campus buildings after normal working hours. In 1971 he increased the security force, hired its first professional chief, and announced that the security budget had been tripled. In 1972 he began telling the trustees about the phenomenon known as the "stop out." While more students were turning to economics and business administra-

336 Polls of presidential preferences give some indication of student sentiment. Of 875 responding in 1968, 62 percent favored Nixon, 22 Humphrey, 6 McCarthy, 4 Wallace, and 6 percent other candidates. Of 150 asked in 1972, 58 percent favored Nixon, 37 McGovern, and 5 percent other candidates. Four years later, Ford gained 69 percent of the vote and Carter 22.

339 During the first half of the eighties the grade-point average was 2.63 and about 6 percent of the seniors were being elected to Phi Beta Kappa.
tion, others were deciding that the liberal arts, perhaps all of higher education, were not for them. They left college, with no plans to return. Voluntary withdrawals at Gettysburg, for all reasons, did increase from an annual average of 4.8 percent during 1965-1971 to 6.7 percent during the succeeding decade. Of greater concern were such matters as the energy crisis, the proper level of medical care for which the College should be responsible, and the frequency of alcohol and drug use on the campus.340

Probably few persons were naive enough to believe that the alcohol policy adopted in December 1969 would remove the issue from the College agenda. If anything, the use (actually, what administrators and others considered the abuse) of alcohol became more of a problem as the activism of 1968-1970 passed. There were few trustee meetings at which the subject was not discussed and questions asked about what was being done about it. In responding at the November 1975 meeting, Arnold Hanson reiterated his belief that many students arrive with their drinking habits "already ingrained" and stated that the administration was offering educational programs and some therapy in an effort to modify those habits. In March 1976 the Residential Life Commission resolved to meet with representatives of all organizations sponsoring social events, in order to discuss their concern "about the number of social events and the consumption of alcoholic beverages." The main topic which their motion prescribed for discussion was "the present image of the College as a 'party school,' what effect that image has upon the College's reputation and what effect the 'party school image' has upon the academic and intellectual activities of the College."

In June 1971 Arnold Hanson told the trustees that "there exists a drug problem" at Gettysburg "which is labyrinthian to deal with."341 He attributed it to the fact that "society in general seeks all kinds of releases from reality." Drugs are but one way for students to achieve their release "from what seem to them to be insuperable problems." In a fashion characteristic of the College, he advocated dealing with drug use by trying "to bring older persons into a more meaningful relationship with students in order to reinforce the student's sense of

---

340 The energy crisis began in late 1973 and soon absorbed the attention of administrators, faculty, and students, as the cost of energy doubled by 1977-1978 and then continued to increase. About the same time, the trustees were discussing possible cooperative arrangements with the seminary and local hospital for providing only the necessary minimum of health care.

341 In June 1966 he told them that a representative of the state had visited the campus to discuss drug use and that the College "is free of any known problems in this area." Three years later, he had a different report. By May 1969 the use of drugs had become "a matter of continuing and growing concern."
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security."

Probably few if any persons would have claimed to have mastered the labyrinth as it existed on the Gettysburg campus, but it remained a matter with which staff members continued to deal.342

Any judicious review of the behavior of the several campus constituencies during the later 1960s and early 1970s must reach the conclusion that the vast majority of all of them acted with commendable wisdom and restraint in their efforts to keep the College from coming apart. Arnold Hanson set the example. He would listen; he would bend when he believed bending was an acceptable means to a worthwhile end; he would not censor; he was prepared to act decisively when he believed campus order required it; and he was determined to stand firm as long as he believed bending was not acceptable.343 However much their patience and temper were tried, virtually all other administrators and faculty endeavored to follow his example, keeping the lines of communication open and the level of discourse rational.344 The trustees, many of whom were successful business or professional men accustomed to giving orders and expecting them to be obeyed, proved willing to return to the campus much more frequently than ever before; also to listen; to explain at length why boards of trustees possessed, and should retain, the powers and duties which charters assigned to them; and to agree to altering or abandoning some rules and regulations in which they still personally may have believed.345 Finally, with perhaps fewer than a dozen exceptions, the students of these years must be given credit for the constructive way in which they expressed their sense of social justice, as well as their opposition to an unpopular war which their generation was called upon to fight.

In his address to the alumni in June 1969, Arnold Hanson remarked that "the pace of events ... [and] the complexity of issues" were plaguing the staff in their efforts to communicate with the off-campus constituencies, including the alumni and church people. The volume of his incoming mail increased. "It is not unusual to be

---

342 The transcript of a WWGC interview with a student on the subject of campus drug availability and use was reprinted in the October 27, 1972 Gettysburgian. The newspaper warned that "the opinions of the student are not necessarily those of anyone but him".

343 He lost his temper in public only a very few times. Perhaps even he never fully comprehended the consequences of the strain on his system.

344 Although many were especially active in this effort, none was more assiduous than the chaplain in performing the role of honest broker.

345 Those who counted on the synodical trustees to be the bulwarks of resistance to change on the board were disappointed. Perhaps because the pastors among them functioned within voluntary organizations where persuasion rather than commanding was required, and perhaps because their religious convictions led them to ask some of the same questions the students were asking, the synodical trustees were usually among Arnold Hanson's firmest board supporters.
praised in one letter for an act for which you receive condemnation in the next letter," he said. "It is not unusual to receive letters which, though I am sure are sincere, contain little by way of understanding of the issues being examined." Many off-campus supporters of the College were as perplexed and confused by the times as were the students. Some appeared to believe that Gettysburg should be able to insulate itself from what was happening elsewhere in the nation. They were disappointed when that did not happen, as indeed it could not have happened. Others, perhaps with children or grandchildren of their own who were teenagers, understood and were sympathetic. The level of support from its off-campus constituencies which the College enjoyed both during and after the crisis was evidence that, on balance, their performance in difficult times was also commendable.

The Sesquicentennial Celebration

In January 1978 the trustees authorized appointment of a committee to prepare for the observance of the 150th anniversary of the College in 1982. A month earlier, they had approved publication of a new history of the College and an updated alumni directory.

The committee in charge decided to celebrate the sesquicentennial during the first week in April, to coincide with the actual date of the granting of the first charter in 1832. On April 1 there was an interdisciplinary symposium on the liberal arts in the recital hall of the recently renovated Schmucker Hall. Panelists were Professor Eugene P. Kennedy of the Harvard Medical School, Professor Douglas K. Candland of Bucknell University, and Professor Luther J. Binkley of Franklin and Marshall College. A sesquicentennial dance in the College Union Building on the following day attracted enough people to consume in short order the large birthday cake, once its 150 candles were extinguished and removed. Rain, which had dampened the April event in 1957, cancelled the parade scheduled for April 3, but did not prevent dedication of the plaque

346 For an account of the College's part in the American bicentennial observance, see GCB (January 1976), pp. 4-8.
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In the rain, on April 3, 1982, the College dedicated a plaque in front of the building in which both it and the seminary began instruction. Photograph by P. Ross Ramer.

erected in front of the Reuning house, in which the seminary began instruction in 1826 and the College six years later. Congressman William F. Goodling was the speaker. A concert by the College choir completed the day's events.

On April 4, Palm Sunday, Bishop James R. Crumley of the Lutheran Church in America preached in the chapel and several College choirs joined to present Paul Fetler's cantata, "Hosanna, The Hour Has Come," which was composed for the occasion. On the evening of the fifth, the Waverly Consort performed. On April 6 Dr. David Hartman, of the class of 1972, believed to be the only blind student to complete medical school up to that time in the twentieth century, addressed a special Phi Beta Kappa convocation.

The charter day convocation was held in Christ Chapel on April 7, 1982. Dr. Mark H. Curtis, president of the Association of American

---

Based in New York, and directed by Michael Jaffee, this ensemble of ten singers and players performed music of the twelfth through eighteenth centuries, using instruments of the period.
Dr. Mark H. Curtis addressed the charter day convocation, April 7, 1982. Photograph by P. Ross Ramer.

Colleges, delivered the main address. He spoke of signs of a national renewal for liberal learning and urged colleges such as Gettysburg to display "the imagination, moral courage, and persistence" needed to ask "critical questions about the nature of liberal learning and of developing conceptual principles for undergirding and strengthening it." Both the president of the United States and the governor of Pennsylvania sent greetings. President Glassick awarded four honorary degrees, one of them to his predecessor.349

The final event in the celebration was the dedication of a sesquicentennial sculpture. The creator, Martin Puryear, chose field stone and concrete for the work, explaining that these materials were meant to convey to the viewer a sense of the permanence of the College in its Adams county setting. Placed west of Pennsylvania Hall, it was dedicated on October 30, 1982.

349Part of the senior class gift to the College was used to help pay for a new College entrance, directly across from Stevens street.
A Salutary Influence through Changing Times

The foregoing is an account of the efforts of Samuel Simon Schmucker, his associates, and their many successors to manage an institution of higher learning in such a manner that it would "exert a salutary influence in advancing the cause of liberal education." In large part because those who were responsible for its care over the years recognized what was required of them "to serve the cause of liberal education in changing times," the College survived and prospered. It remains for some future historian – we hope one in the far-distant future – to describe how the undertaking begun in 1832 finally turned out.
John Houseman addresses the members of the class of 1985.
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Appendix 1
Trustees, 1832-1985

When at full complement, the board of trustees between 1832 and 1853 consisted of 21 persons, elected for three-year terms by the board of patrons. Since the act of 1850, which became effective in 1853, the board has been self-perpetuating, except as noted below. From 1853 to 1935 the full complement of trustees was 36 persons, elected for indefinite terms. Since that time, the terms have been six years and the maximum number as follows: 1935-1958, 30; 1958-1964, 36; 1964-1974, 38; and since 1974, 39. F refers to the Franklin College trustees added under the act of 1850. A refers to alumni trustees nominated by the Alumni Association and elected by the board. S refers to trustees elected by supporting synods.

Luther E. Albert (1828-1908), 1870-1908.
Charles E. Anderson, 1984-.
Frederick R. Anspach (1815-1876), 1856-1859.
James G. Apple, 1978-.
Samuel Appold (1814-1893), 1867-1870; 1872-1880.
Alexander W. Astin, 1983-.
J. Emory Bair (1845-1914), 1896-1909.
Henry Baker (1816-1894), 1877-1894.
John C. Baker (1792-1859), 1832-1838; 1853-1856, F.
Joseph B. Baker (1877-1946), 1921-1946, A.
Henry L. Baugher (1804-1868), 1851-1868.
Isaac Baugher (1787-1849), 1844-1848.
Charles Baum (1855-1938), 1902-1938.
William M. Baum (1825-1902), 1861-1902.
William Beates, 1853-1856, F.
Frank E. Beltzhoover (1841-1923), 1880-1894.
Frederick R. Benedict (d. 1890), 1856-1862; 1864-1872.
Kerry M. Berk, 1984-.
Thomas C. Billheimer (1842-1923), 1892-1923, A.
Clyde O. Black, II, 1980-.
Margaret H. Blanchard (later Curtis), 1979-.
Fred H. Bloomhardt (1873-1929), 1907-1922.
Burton F. Blough (1873-1928), 1910-1928.
Calvin Blythe (1790-1849), 1832-1844.
Peter Born (1829-1899), 1871-1878.
Charles H. Boyer, 1912-1925.
Matthew G. Boyer (1839-1927), 1894-1912.
Luther A. Brewer (1856-1933), 1913-1933.
J. Hay Brown (1849-1930), 1892-1899, A.
Alexander D. Buehler (1814-1893), 1856-1888.
David A. Buehler (1821-1887), 1851-1887.
Jacob Buehler (1825-1910), 1880-1904.
Martin Buehler (1806-1880), 1856-1880.
Martin H. Buehler (1861-1894), 1907-1934.
Samuel H. Buehler (1783-1856), 1838-1856.
J. Ilgen Burrell (1829-1877), 1874-1877.
Simon Cameron (1799-1889), 1857-1860.
Jeremiah Carl (1829-1909), 1879-1890.
Henry (Harry) Clabaugh (1856-1914), 1900-1907, A.
John W. Clark, 1963-1969, A.
Paul E. Clouser, 1967-1979, S.
Jacob A. Clutz (1848-1925), 1908-1925.
John J. Cochran, 1865-1872.
Frank E. Colvin (1862-1945), 1908-1945.
Frederick W. Conrad (1816-1898), 1844-1851; 1862-1898.
Thomas J. Cooper (1797-1875), 1834-1844; 1848-1851.
Fred B. Dapp, 1963-1969, A.
Frederick B. Dapp (1894-1951), 1939-1951.
Charles R. Demme (d. 1863), 1853-1856, F.
Charles Dengler, 1876-1879.
J. McCrea Dickson (1889-1939), 1932-1939, A.
Charles W. Diehl, Jr., 1965-1977, A.
George Diehl (1814-1891), 1856-1891.
William Dock, 1856-1859.
Roy C. Dougherty (1879-1963), 1939-1951, A.
Jacob R. Drege, 1856-1862.
Paul B. Dunbar (1882-1966), 1938-1949, A.
William H. Dunbar (1852-1920), 1890-1920, A.
C. William Duncan (1897-1967), 1935-1965, A.
Guy S. Edmiston, 1977-.
Edward Ehlers (1876-1952), 1943-1952, A.
Lewis Elchelberger (1803-1859), 1848-1851.
Luther P. Eisenhart (1876-1965), 1907-1916.
Donald E. Enders, 1969-1975, A.
Daniel Eppley (1817-1887), 1882-1887.
William Ernst, 1833-1838.
Edward G. Fahnestock (1829-1907), 1872-1885.
James F. Fahnestock (1825-1901), 1861-1879.
Samuel Fahnestock (1798-1861), 1838-1860.
Edith D. Fellenbaum (1898-1985), 1950-1956, A.
J. Frank Fife (1900-1978), 1963-1968, S.
Reuben A. Fink (1824-1895), 1868-1894.
Charles J. Fite (1876-1938), 1910-1938.
Paul L. Folkemer, 1973-1985, S.
Albert F. Fox, 1899-1904.
J. Harry Fritz (1834-1909), 1902-1907.
Walter E. Garman (1896-1972), 1954-1960, A.
W. Emerson Gentzler, 1952-1958, A.
William J. Gies (1872-1956), 1908-1920, A.
David Gilbert (1803-1868), 1834-1865.
Hart Gilbert (1845-1898), 1895-1898.
W. Kent Gilbert, III, 1886-1972, A.
Charles E. Glassick, 1977-.
Philip H. Glatfelter (1837-1907), 1888-1907.
John P.S. Gobin (1837-1910), 1900-1904.
John George Goettman (1840-1905), 1877-1905.
Bruce S. Gordon, 1983-.
Daniel Gottwald (1793-1843), 1834-1843.
Luther A. Gotwald (1833-1900), 1873-1886.
John E. Graeff (1820-1898), 1864-1898.
Christopher Graff, 1869-1872.
Edmund D. Graff (1846-1912), 1890-1912.
J. Francis Graff (1857-1918), 1916-1918.
John Graff (1822-1901), 1873-1877.
William A. Granville (1883-1943), 1910-1928.
Henry W. Graybill, Jr., 1977-.
Frank E. Grzelecki, 1883-.
Donald A. Haas, 1984-.
Christopher Hager, 1853-1856, F.
Angeline F. Haines, 1973-.
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Robert D. Hanson, 1974-.
Herman Haupt (1817-1905), 1859-1873.
Charles A. Hay (1821-1893), 1851-1893.
Ernest L. Hazellius (1777-1853), 1832-1834.
John Heck (1809-1861), 1859-1861.
Warren C. Heinly, 1958-1965, S.
Arthur Hendley, 1951-1957, A.
John Christian Frederick Heyer (1793-1873), 1832-1833; 1834-1837.
Harry C. Hoffman (1877-1942), 1921-1939, A.
John N. Hoffman, 1838-1844.
Percy D. Hoover (1882-1940), 1914-1940.
David Horner (1797-1858), 1844-1851.
Robert L. Hosking, 1976-1978, A.
Adam Hoy (1827-1887), 1884-1887.
Henry S. Huber (1814-1873), 1853-1873.
Albert Hummel (d. 1865), 1872-1874.
George H. Hummel (1890-1961), 1923-1949, A.
Charles W. Humrichouse, 1881-1899.
Edwin W. Hutter (1814-1873), 1859-1862; 1864-1870.
C. Harold Johnson (1909-1979), 1964-1976, A.
Edwin T. Johnson, 1977-.
Richard E. Jordan, 1983-.
Leslie M. Kauffman (1869-1931), 1915-1931.
Luther R. Keefer, 1889-1899.
Adam Keller, 1853-1858, F.
Benjamin Keller (1794-1864), 1838-1844; 1846-1864.
Emanuel Keller (1801-1837), 1832-1837.
Jeremiah N. Keller, 1897-1902.
Judith W. Kip, 1974-.
Marion J. Kline (1871-1934), 1916-1920.
Frederick H. Knobel (1870-1945), 1914-1945.
Augustus Kountze, 1874-1877.
Charles Philip Krauth (1797-1867), 1832-1833; 1844-1867.
Charles Porterfield Krauth (1823-1883), 1851-1870.
John M. Krauth (1846-1890), 1879-1890.
George F. Krotel, 1856-1862.
George Krug, 1853-1856, F.
Ernest J. Kruse, 1984-.
Charles A. Kunkel (1847-1919), 1898-1907.
Benjamin S. Kunkle, 1880-1905.
George B. Kunkle (1868-1942), 1908-1942.
Benjamin Kurtz (1795-1865), 1832-1834; 1835-1844; 1848-1865.
T. Newton Kurtz (1822-1881), 1870-1881.
Daniel F. Lafean (1861-1922), 1899-1907.
Charles T. Lark (1876-1946), 1922-1946.
John Loats (1814-1879), 1862-1871; 1872-1876.
Augustus H. Lochman (1802-1891), 1832-1851; 1853-1889.
Daniel F. Lafean (1861-1922), 1899-1907.
Charles T. Lark (1876-1946), 1922-1946.
John Loats (1814-1879), 1862-1871; 1872-1876.
Augustus H. Lochman (1802-1891), 1832-1851; 1853-1889.
Benjamin Kunkle, 1880-1905.
George B. Kunkle (1868-1942), 1908-1942.
Benjamin Kurtz (1795-1865), 1832-1834; 1835-1844; 1848-1865.
T. Newton Kurtz (1822-1881), 1870-1881.
Daniel F. Lafean (1861-1922), 1899-1907.
Charles T. Lark (1876-1946), 1922-1946.
John Loats (1814-1879), 1862-1871; 1872-1876.
Augustus H. Lochman (1802-1891), 1832-1851; 1853-1889.
Benjamin Kunkle, 1880-1905.
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Paul M. Orso, 1968-1983, S.
Jonathan Oswald (1805-1892), 1838-1844.
William A. Passavant (1821-1894), 1859-1869.
T. Blair Patton, 1894-1904.
James A. Perrott, 1975-, A.
Henry (Harry) C. Picking (1859-1925), 1898-1925.
Winslow S. Pierce (1857-1938), 1912-1918.
A. S. Pratt, 1870-1873.
A. N. Pritzker, 1961-.
Dwight F. Putman, 1962-1966, S.
Clarence L.S. Raby (1887-1968), 1945-1954, A.
Abraham Reck (1790-1869), 1832-1838.
William M. Reynolds (1812-1876), 1856-1859.
John W. Rice, 1871-1893.
Muriel L. Rice, 1879-1895.
Ruell K.G. Rice (1899-1945), 1941-1945, A.
Luther W. Ritter, 1957-1963, A.
Frederick Ruthrauff (1796-1859), 1851-1856.
Jonathan Ruthrauff (1801-1850), 1832-1848.
George Ryneal, Jr. (1835-1917), 1873-1917.
Benjamin Sadlier (1823-1901), 1862-1877.
Charles F. Schaeffer (1807-1879), 1838-1844; 1851-1864.
Charles W. Schaeffer (1813-1896), 1844-1851; 1855-1873.
David F. Schaeffer (1787-1837), 1832-1837.
Charles A. Schieren (d. 1915), 1865-1891.
John George Schmucker (1771-1854), 1832-1844; 1853-1854, F.
Samuel D. Schmucker (1844-1911), 1875-1911.
Samuel S. Schmucker (1799-1873), 1832-1873.
Solomon Sentman (1807-1871), 1856-1871.
Arlene E. Shannon, 1981-, S.
Daniel Sheffer (1783-1880), 1832-1844.
William A. Shipman (1852-1934), 1897-1934, A.
George Shryock (1791-1861), 1856-1861.
Arthur S. Sipe, 1958-1964, A.
Frederick Smith, 1844-1848; 1851-1856.
John E. Smith, 1876-1889, (1887-1889, A).
Joseph Few Smith [also Fewsmith] (1816-1888), 1844-1848.
Stewart H. Smith (1904-1983), 1956-1962, S.
Walter S. Smith, 1969-1978, S.
Edward G. Smyser (1820-1887), 1869-1880.
Luther H. Snyder (1910-1966), 1961-1968, A.
George D. Stahley (1850-1939), 1887-1890, A.
Thaddeus Stevens (1792-1868), 1834-1868.
Charles F. Stiefel (1848-1827), 1899-1927.
Charles M. Stock (1855-1913), 1894-1913.
Charles A. Stork, 1877-1883.
Theophilus Stork (1814-1874), 1851-1857.
James Strong (1842-1908), 1896-1908.
Herman G. Stuempfle, 1965-1977, S.
Daniel H. Swope, 1844-1848.
John A. Swope (1827-1910), 1882-1907.
Samuel McCurdy Swope (1850-1931), 1890-1931, A.
L. Ralph Tabor (1907-1973), 1949-1955, A.
James I. Tarman, 1970-, A.
James R. Thomas, 1961-, A.
Alexander Thompson, 1832-1834.
Howard Trexel, 1963-1975, S.
Levering Tyson (1889-1960), 1935-1937, A.
John Ulrich (1808-1862), 1844-1851; 1853-1862.
Richard L. Unger, 1981-, S.
Milton Valentine (1825-1908), 1888-1906.
Alpheus E. Wagner (1856-1936), 1907-1933.
John Wagner (1852-1935), 1893-1934, A.
Louis S. Weaver (1877-1939), 1918-1939.
Augustus C. Wedekind (1824-1897), 1856-1897.
Henry B. Wile (1855-1899), 1894-1899.
Ira Williams, 1974-1978.
William Willis, 1891-1892.
Clarence A. Wills (1885-1871), 1946-1964.
David Wills (1831-1894), 1877-1894.
Christian Yeager, 1866-1869.
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John J. Young (1846-1914), 1897-1914.
Earl W. Zellers, 1979-, S.
Edgar D. Ziegler, 1961-1969, S.
Jeremiah Zimmerman (1848-1937), 1917-1937.
Morris G. Zumbrun, 1982-, S.
Appendix 2
Administrators and Faculty, 1832-1986

A. Presidents of the College
1834-1850 Charles Philip Krauth (1797-1867).
1850-1866 Henry Lewis Baugher (1804-1868).
1868-1884 Milton Valentine (1825-1906).
1884-1904 Harvey Washington McKnight (1843-1914).
1977- Charles Etzweiler Glassick (1931-).

B. Other Administrators
The January 1928 College catalogue was the first to list the administration separately from the faculty. Only the president, dean, and registrar were set apart in that way, but then and later other persons were named as "additional officers" and "assistants." Only beginning in 1953 were all administrators listed together under one heading. With the exception of a few persons whose positions were given catalogue standing for only brief periods of time (for example, the College counsel) and the presidents (listed above), the following is a list of all administrative personnel whose names appeared in the catalogues between 1928 (for the 1927-1928 year) and 1986 (for the 1985-1986 year). In some cases, their service began before 1927. In a few cases, the College eventually recognized that it began at the time of their initial employment in some staff capacity. Only the beginning date is given after the names of persons holding administrative office at the end of the 1985-1986 year.

Albertson, Colette, 1982-1984; coordinator of women's athletics and head volleyball and tennis coach.
Allen, Richard Page, 1978--; vice president for College relations.
Anderson, Donald L., 1982--; admissions counselor, head men's basketball coach.
Anderson, Gary L., 1973--; bookstore manager, director of auxiliary services.
Apgar, Esther W., 1954-1955; dining hall manager.
Arend, Ralph W. Jr., 1975-1983; associate dean of students, associate dean for student life, acting dean of student life, associate dean for educational services.

Armbr, Rosea B., 1930-1977; secretary to the alumni secretary, administrative assistant to the alumni secretary, administrative assistant to the director of alumni relations, administrative assistant in the alumni office.

Arms, Richard A., 1952-1959; director of the summer session.


Beach-Viti, Ethel, 1980-1982; assistant dean of the College.

Beachem, Charles W., 1929-1937; associate dean of student life, acting dean of student life, associate dean for educational services.


Behler, Donna M., 1965-; health services director.

Bence, Nancy Nord, 1985-; assistant director of annual giving.


Bigelow, Bruce, 1983-; director of major gifts and planned giving.

Bock, George, 1953-1956; bookstore manager.


Bornheimer, Deane G., 1960-1965; admissions counselor, assistant dean of admissions, assistant director of admissions.

Bowers, Lois J., 1982-; coach, coordinator of women's athletics, field hockey and women's lacrosse head coach.

Brady, Susan M., 1982-; dean of student life.

Breaux, Darwin P., 1985-; head wrestling coach, assistant football coach.

Breighner, Kim S., 1975-; computer operator.

Brown, Jay P., 1947-; office of the treasurer, bursar.

Bucklew, Maxwell D., 1952-1953; director of public relations.


Burel, Mary G., 1970-1986; assistant acquisitions librarian, acquisitions librarian, technical services librarian.


Campbell, Sally M., 1983-1985; assistant director of career services.

Campo, John W., 1985-; assistant football and baseball coach.

Carlson, Allan C., 1979-1981; assistant to the president.

Cato, Oliver W., 1971-1973; admissions counselor.

Cessna, C. Paul, 1937-1958; alumni secretary, assistant to the president, historian.

Cessna, Esther C., 1938-1949; bookstore manager.

Chandler, Louise F., 1950-1952; assistant librarian.

Chen, Gina, 1967-1968; assistant technical services librarian.

Ciolino, Salvatore, 1971-; director of financial aid, associate dean of educational services.

Clooson, Harold O., Jr., 1959-1968; director of the student union.

Clooson, Harold O., Sr., 1963-1971; assistant College physician.

Coffman, John, 1971-1972; assistant director of the student union.
Coleman, John, 1979-1981; director of physical facilities.
Connelly, Elizabeth A., 1941-1942; dean of women.
Crabill, Martin L., 1985--; acting director of physical facilities, director of physical facilities.
Crist, Chester G., 1932-1947; associate medical director, medical director.
Cronlund, Martin H., 1957-1973; admissions counselor, associate dean of admissions, director of admissions, associate dean of the College.
Darrah, William C., 1955; director of adult education.
Davies, William V. H., 1929-1930; S.C.A. secretary.
Davis, Raymond S., 1957-1965; assistant to the director of development, director of public information.
Davisson, Bernard J., 1985--; assistant dean of student life.
DeVost, Brian J., 1985--; director of intramurals, recreation, and fitness.
Dithlale, Markus, 1985-1986; assistant chaplain.
Dorich, Bernadine, 1979-1984; director of public relations.
D'Ottavio, John, 1979-1982; coach.
Drexel, Doreen M., 1984--; women's volleyball and tennis head coach.
Dufendach, John, 1985--; medical director.
Dundon, Daniel A., 1972--; assistant director of admissions, associate director of admissions.
Dunn, Denise, 1985-1986; admissions counselor.
Dunn, Seymour B., 1955-1962; administrative committee, dean of the College, acting director of development.
Evans, Karen E., 1985--; assistant director of annual giving.
Forness, Norman O., 1966-1968; assistant dean of the College, director of the summer session.
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Forney, Deanna, 1978-; director of career services.
Fortenbaugh, Robert, 1955-1956; vice chairman, administrative committee.
Frank, Lewis B., 1957-1968; special counselor, counseling psychologist.
Free, Melvin L., 1946-1947; training officer, Veterans Administration Guidance Center.
Frick, Janet (Jean) R., 1980-1985; admissions counselor, assistant director of admissions.
Gelb, Lois, 1974-1975; associate in campus ministry.
Gingrich, Denise Dwight, 1980-1983; assistant director of career services.
Glatfelter, Charles H., 1959-1966; assistant director of the summer session, dean of the College, director of the summer session.
Grimm, Anna D., 1955-1960; assistant in charge of library stacks.
Grimm, Karl Josef, 1909-1929; librarian.
Groft, Ruth S., 1946-; secretary to registrar, secretary to dean of admissions, recorder, part-time work for admissions, secretary in alumni and development, recorder.
Gulden, Jean, 1945-1948; assistant librarian.
Gustafson, Delwin K., 1967-; guidance counselor, admissions counselor, director of admissions.
Gutting, Mary D., 1979-; assistant director of the College union, assistant dean of student life, associate dean of student life.
Hafer, Joyce P., 1984-1985; head nurse.
Halek, David C., 1979-1983; assistant dean of student life, associate dean of student life.
Hamilton, John B., 1889-1933; superintendent of buildings and grounds, plant engineer.
Hammer, Donald P., 1948-1950; assistant librarian.
Hansen, Roland E., 1973-; assistant to the business manager.
Hartzell, Mildred H., 1928-1971; secretary to the dean and president, assistant to the dean of the College, registrar.
Haskell, David F., 1976-1977; acting assistant dean of the College.
Haskell, Karen, 1972-1977; assistant dean of students.
Hedrick, David T., 1972-; circulation librarian, audio visual librarian, special collections librarian.
Heffner, Margaret A., 1974-1976; news bureau director.


Higgins, Kevin, 1982-1985; football and baseball assistant coach.

Himes, Mary H., 1916-1945; assistant librarian.

Hinrichs, Donald W., 1982-1984, 1986; associate dean of the College, acting dean of the College.


Holder, Leonard I., 1975-1979; dean of the College.

Holland, Donald J., 1958-1959; admissions counselor.


Hubbard, Willis M., 1983--; librarian.

Hubbell, Susan E., 1985--; program director of the College union.

Huber, Charles H., 1935-1941; director of the women's division.

Hulton, Robert T., 1979--; coach, director of intercollegiate athletics.

Hummel, R. Eugene, 1979--; coach, head baseball coach.

Hurst, Anne K., 1984-1986; head women's basketball and softball coach.

Huseman, Dwight A., 1971--; serials and documents librarian, systems and serials librarian, director of church relations.


Jackson, Lawrence, 1970-1972; bookstore manager.

Jacobs, Bruce A., 1983-1985; assistant dean of student life.

Jensen, Blanche, 1974-1975; associate in campus ministry.


Jones, Darryl W., 1985--; admissions counselor.

Jones, W. Ramsay, 1956-1975; dean of men, associate dean of students.

Jones, William H., 1964--; guidance officer, director of guidance services, coordinator of counseling.


Kane, Ruth, 1964-1984; nurse, head nurse.

Kefalas, Carol, 1984--; director of public relations.


Kemler, Doris M., 1959-1975; assistant librarian, audio visual librarian, audio visual and reserve librarian.

Kennedy, George E., Jr., 1980-1985; swimming coach and bowling supervisor.

Kenworthy, Robert D., 1965--; sports information officer, associate director of public relations.

Kiesel, Kevin R., 1984-1985; head wrestling coach and assistant football coach.
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Knickerbocker, John H., 1929-1964; librarian, historian, director of
Civil War Institute.
Knoche, H. Gerald, Jr., 1969-1974; assistant chaplain, associate
chaplain.
Krafft, Jack S., 1970-1985; assistant director of safety and security,
director of safety and security.
Kunes, Robert L., 1957-1958; assistant to the president, director
of development.
Lagle, Linda, 1984-1986; associate director of public relations.
Langa, Miriam Carter, 1982-1985; program director of the
College union.
Larkin, George R., 1943-1952; superintendent of buildings and
grounds.
Lee, Dorothy G., 1942-1952; dean of women.
LeGros, Jean L. Kaminski, 1976-; admissions counselor, assistant
director of admissions, associate director of admissions.
Lehr, Robert E., 1980-1984; head basketball and cross country
coach.
Leser, Katherine E., 1976-1978; admissions counselor.
Linn, Timon K., 1985-; director of safety and security.
Locher, Nancy C., 1968-; dean of women, associate dean of
students, associate dean for educational services, dean of stu-
dent advisement.
Long, David M., 1961-1966; director of guidance and placement,
placement and financial aid officer.
Lowe, Gary, 1978-; director of development, associate vice presi-
dent for College relations.
physician, medical director, clinical consultant.
McConnell, Margaret E., 1985-; assistant director of development
for special support programs.
McGrath, J. Michael, 1982-1985; clinical consultant, consulting
psychiatrist.
McKittrick, Ann, 1974-1979; assistant director of the College
union.
McManness, Edward F., 1970-; director of the College union.
Maddox, Rex, 1956-1978; superintendent of buildings and
grounds.
Malewicki, Michael, 1976-; assistant dean of students, director
of personnel.
Marari, Luka, 1984-1985; assistant chaplain.
Marsden, Jane, 1953-1954; head nurse.
term, assistant dean of the College.
Matthews, Harry B., 1985-; associate dean of minority advance-
ment.
Maxwell, Howard B., 1960-1962; director of alumni relations.
Meston, Jean P., 1974-1976; counseling psychologist.
Miller, George R., 1943-1952; consulting engineer.
Miller, Margaret, 1925-1940; head nurse.
Miller, Roy D., Jr., 1958-1960; assistant to director of development and alumni relations.
Miller, Shelley, 1977-1979; assistant dean of students.
Miller, William T., 1979-1984; coach.
Morrow, Kristin Ardell, 1985-; admissions counselor.
Moyer, Anna Jane, 1961-; assistant readers' services librarian, readers' services librarian.
Musselman, Carrie, 1922-1949; assistant librarian.
Neal, Joni Diane, 1982-1983; admissions counselor.
Neubauer, Beth Spitzner, 1981-1983; assistant chaplain.
Nordvall, Robert C., 1972-; assistant business manager, assistant dean of the College, associate dean of the College.
Otterman, Helen, 1969-1970; resident advisor for women.
Parker, Frances, 1970-1972, 1980-; resident advisor for women, assistant dean of students, psychological counselor, counseling psychologist.
Payne, Martha N., 1984-1986; catalog librarian.
Pelsis, Inta, 1966-1967; assistant technical services librarian.
Pennington, Elizabeth, 1952-1954; dining hall manager.
Pennington, Sally, 1972-1974; assistant director of the student union.
Peterson, Oliver A., 1927-1929; S.C.A. secretary.
Peterson, Paul G., 1959-1960, 1962-1979; assistant in admissions, director of development, administrative assistant to the president, assistant to the president.
Phelps, Mabel A., 1941-1952; Huber Hall business manager.
Phizacklea, Thomas, 1982-; assistant manager of the College store, College store manager.
Pickel, Robert A., 1974-1982; assistant bookstore manager.
Pickering, Anne, 1954-1957; nurse, head nurse.
Plank, Allan B., 1930-1931; superintendent of buildings and grounds.
Platt, Barbara L., 1958-1964; acting director of guidance and placement, assistant director of guidance and placement.
Playfoot, Frances H., 1970-; assistant technical services librarian, assistant readers' services librarian, catalogue librarian, assistant readers' services librarian.
Potts, David B., 1979-1986; dean of the College.
Radsmo, Douwe L., 1961-1985; College physician, medical director.
Ramsey, Julie L., 1981-; assistant to the president.
Rau, Robert B., 1940-1952; secretary to the president, assistant to the president.
Rawleigh, Michael K., 1985-; head swimming coach.
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Rawlings, Elwyn, 1974-1975; visiting associate in minority affairs.
Reynolds, Melvin, 1981-1982; acting director of physical facilities.
Rice, John S., 1955-1956; chairman, administrative committee.
Richards, James H., 1974-1983; librarian.
Riddagh, Dorothy J., 1952-1965; assistant librarian, catalogue librarian.
Riggs, J. Edward, Jr., 1984-; head track and cross country coach.
Rost, William, 1979-1980; coach.
Russell, James, 1972-1974; acting bookstore manager, assistant bookstore manager.
Schlie, Carolyn J., 1979-1982; coach, coordinator of women's intercollegiate athletics.
Scott, Nancy C. Hodges, 1960-1985; assistant librarian, assistant catalogue librarian, technical services librarian, catalogue librarian, special collections librarian.
Seller, Jennifer, 1984-1986; admissions counselor.
Shainline, John W., 1954-1965; assistant registrar, associate dean of admissions, dean of students.
Sheldon, John, 1950-1957; assistant librarian.
Shryock, Robert L., 1949-1952; bookstore manager.
Shumway, Clare N., 1977-1985; medical director.
Sisley, Rebecca, 1984-1986; career counselor.
Smith, Robert D., 1972-; alumni secretary, director of alumni relations.
Smith, Jean V., 1967-1969; resident advisor for women.
Smyser, Lila May, 1965-1968; assistant technical services librarian.
Snyder, Samuel F., 1912-1920, 1923-1928; assistant to the president.
Stahley, George D., 1920-1939; medical director.
Staub, Ronald D., 1958-1961; assistant to the director of public information.
Stewart, Mary Margaret, 1978-1980; assistant dean of the College.
Storek, Martha, 1953-1967; dean of women.
Stover, Clyde B., 1912-1943; registrar.
Streeter, Barry H., 1979-; coach, head football coach.
Strohecker, Edwin C., 1949-1950; assistant librarian.
Strohm, Raymond, 1956-1961; bookstore manager.
Sweezey, Gall, 1983-; admissions counselor.
Tarman, James I., 1953-1958; director of public relations, director of information, admissions counselor.
Tate, John, 1979-1981; administrative systems analyst.
TenBrook, James, 1982-1985; director of physical facilities.
Terwilliger, Paul N., 1959-1963; director of reading services.
Thomas, Daniel D., 1966-1967; public information officer.
Thomson, David F., 1968-1976; resident advisor for men, assistant dean of students.
Tilberg, Wilbur E., 1927-1955; dean of the College.
VanArsdale, William P., 1985-; treasurer, business manager.
Vannorsdall, John W., 1962-1976; chaplain.
Wagnild, Parker B., 1944-1946; chaplain.
Warren, Susan G., 1985-; associate director of development.
Wasserman, Arthur G., 1983-1986; assistant director of development for special support programs.
Westine, Sarah B., 1957-1972; assistant librarian, readers' services librarian.
Williams, Frank B., 1966-; dean of students, dean of student life and educational services, dean of educational services.
Wills, Clarence A., 1955-1957; treasurer.
Wilson, John W., 1946-1947; chief of Veterans Administration Guidance Center.
Winkler, Preston H., 1973-1975; assistant dean of the College.
Wolf, H. Wayne, 1965-; audio visual services coordinator.
Wolfe, Charles R., 1943-1964; registrar and dean of admissions, director of the Veterans Administration Guidance Center, administrative committee, dean of admissions.
Wood, Mary Elizabeth, 1971-1977; assistant College physician, assistant medical director.
Wright, David W., 1986-; head soccer coach.
Yoder, Donald G., 1969-1972; assistant to the business manager.
Young, R. David, 1959-1962; clinical consultant.
Zamborsky, Joseph E., 1973-1980; admissions counselor, assistant director of admissions.
Zelenz, Marguerite Carroll, 1977-1985; admissions counselor, assistant director of development, director of annual giving.

C. Faculty

The list which follows includes information about more than 950 men and women to whom the College awarded the customary faculty ranks of professor (first used in 1832), associate professor (first used in 1926), assistant professor (first used in 1914), and instructor (first used in 1906). The sources of the information were the College catalogues, as well as faculty and staff directories published for 1963-1964, 1965-1966, 1967-1968, 1969-1970, and 1973-1974, years during which no annual catalogues were issued. While the list is almost complete, undoubtedly there were a few persons between 1832 and 1986 holding one of the four ranks whose names for one reason or another did not get into the catalogue.

Over the years the College used a number of titles (including lecturer, assistant, and private instructor) for persons engaged in part-time or temporary work and whose names are not included in this listing. At one time or another, some of these persons did hold faculty rank and are listed for those years. In 1979 the College began using the adjective adjunct to describe the position of persons assigned one of the four usual faculty ranks, but who held term or annual appointments and were not eligible for tenure. Most of the adjunct faculty were not full-time teachers. The abbreviation adj. is used to identify them.

The word economics is used to identify most persons in the department of economics and political science, later of economics and business administration, between 1915 and 1985, when a separate department of management began to function. H.P.E. refers to members of the department known as physical education between 1927 and 1947, and as health and physical education after that time. Religion refers to a department which began as English Bible in 1892, was later Biblical literature and religion, and which became religion only in 1969. The letters R.O.T.C. refer to unit mem-
bers holding faculty rank since its establishment in 1917; some were in the air force, while most were in the army detachment. Romance languages refers to a department dating from 1911 and offering instruction in French and Spanish (and occasionally other languages) until a separation into two departments occurred in 1981. Sociology refers to a department established in 1953 and renamed sociology and anthropology in 1961.

Abrams, George E., 1934-1939; R.O.T.C.
Ackley, Sheldon C., 1946-1950; philosophy, psychology.
Agard, James, 1982--; art.
Aguirre, Angela, 1977-1979; Romance languages.
Ahrens, Frederick C., 1946-1963; German.
Albig, John W., Jr., 1922-1923, 1960-1962; English, social science.
Alderson, Henry F., 1923-1930; R.O.T.C.
Alexander, James W., 1957-1962; history.
Alkhafaji, Abbas, 1985--; management.
Allen, Chester, 1915-1918; engineering.
Altland, Paul D., 1937-1946; biology.
Amspacher, Preston F., 1930-1935; mathematics, physics.
Anagnos, Costas, 1923-1924; Romance languages.
Anderson, Charles L., 1954-1956; R.O.T.C.
Anderson, Jerome F., 1969-1972; R.O.T.C.
Andrews, Richard T., 1953-1956; R.O.T.C.
Armster, Charlotte E.S., 1984--; German.
Armstrong, Robert B., 1939-1941; economics.
Arnold, Elijah C., 1939-1942; R.O.T.C.
Ashworth, John H., 1915-1918; economics.
Auer, Charles H., 1959-1963; R.O.T.C.
August, Mary Kay, 1985--; psychology (adj.).
Bachman, Albert, 1931-1963; Romance languages.
Bachman, Joseph S., 1960-1962; history.
Baird, Paul R., 1951-1985; economics.
Balch, John W., 1985-1988; management (adj.).
Baldwin, Perry L., 1922-1923; R.O.T.C.
Baltzly, Alexander, 1958-1959; history.
Barclay, Patrick W., 1957-1961; art.
Barnes, Robert D., 1955--; biology.
Barney, Winfield S., 1916-1918; Romance languages.
Barrick, Dorothea, 1985; art (adj.).
Barriga, Guillermo, 1951-1981; Romance languages.
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Barthle, Donna H., 1985-; R.O.T.C.
Bartholomew, Clarence, 1947-1959; H.P.E.
Baskerville, Edward J., 1956-; English.
Baskerville, Mary T., 1979-; interdepartmental studies, English [adj].
Basset, Gardner C., 1930-1943; philosophy.
Bastyr, George P.G., 1948-1949; economics.
Baugher, Henry L., 1832-1868; Greek, belles-lettres, intellectual and moral science.
Baugher, H. Louis, 1869-1880, 1883-1896; Greek.
Baxter, Eugene M., 1919-1922; Romance languages.
Baxter, John F., 1942-1943; chemistry.
Beach, Neil W., 1960-; biology.
Beach-Viti, Ethel, 1978-1984; Romance languages.
Becker, Horace G., 1921-1922; economics.
Beckie, Donald W., 1965-1968; music.
Beechinor, Robert M., 1957-1960; R.O.T.C.
Beerthuis, Mark A., 1966-1970; R.O.T.C.
Beeson, Harold, 1936-1944; H.P.E.
Beirne, Daniel R., 1957-1960; R.O.T.C.
Bell, Morris E., 1951-1952; R.O.T.C.
Belt, F. Eugene, 1966-; music.
Benson, John E., 1961-1964; chemistry.
Berg, Temma F., 1985-; English.
Berlind, Robert E., 1963-1964; art.
Berterand, Michele, 1968-1973; Romance languages.
Bertram, Edward H., 1931-1936; R.O.T.C.
Bikle, Charles A., 1930-1931; biology.
Bikle, Henry C., 1930-1932; biology.
Bikle, Philip M., 1874-1925; physics, astronomy, Latin.
Bilheimer, Clayton E., 1927-1953; H.P.E.
Billheimer, Albert, 1912-1930; Greek.
Birkner, Michael, 1978-1979; history.
Birnbaum, Norman, 1962-1983; history [adj].
Biser, Gareth V., 1959-; H.P.E.
Blake, Graham O., 1964-1965; chemistry.
Bloomingdale, LeRoy, 1946-1948; H.P.E.
Bloss, M. Esther, 1953-1968; sociology.
Boenau, A. Bruce, 1957-; political science.
Bohm, Edwin H., 1917-1918; modern languages.
Bolich, Harry F., 1947-1980; English, speech.
Bookwalter, Edwin B., 1970-1972; R.O.T.C.
Boritt, Gabor S., 1981-; history.
Borock, Donald M., 1974-; political science.
Boughton, Jesse S., 1928-1934; philosophy.
Bowen, Earl, 1939-1965; biology.
Bowers, Teresa, 1981-; music (adj.).
Brady, Kathleen, 1976-1977; psychology.
Bream, Elizabeth G., 1945-1948; English.
Bream, Henry T., 1926-1989; H.P.E.
Brede, Charles E., 1898-1900; German.
Breidenbaugh, Edward S., 1874-1924; chemistry, mineralogy.
Brewster, Grace A., 1946-1947; H.P.E.
Broad, Yolanda S., 1964-1965; French (adj.).
Brower, Keith H., 1985-1986; Spanish.
Brownley, Edward R., 1965-1971; H.P.E.
Budde, Marie, 1958-1972; music.
Burdick, Marcus L., 1917-1918; English, public speaking.
Burgess, Ronald D., 1980-; Spanish.
Byers, Cecil W., 1942-1944; physics.
Cahill, Charles R., 1972-1974; H.P.E.
Camac, Mary K., 1984-1985; psychology.
Campbell, Debra, 1983-1986; religion.
Campbell, William A., 1967-1972; R.O.T.C.
Campbell, William H., 1985-; R.O.T.C.
Carpenter, John B., 1958-1966; H.P.E.
Carr, John K., 1951-1953; physics.
Carter, Henry C., 1949-1951; R.O.T.C.
Cavaliere, A. Ralph, 1966-; biology.
Cavalluzzo, Linda C., 1978-1979; economics.
Cerasa, Charlene M., 1979-1980; economics (adj.).
Core, Ronald C., 1983-1985; Spanish.
Charles, Norman, 1957-1959; English.
Cheney, Elliott W., 1927-1934; physics.
Christenson, Robert L., 1971-1973; R.O.T.C.
Chronister, Charles W., 1967-1971; H.P.E.
Claiborne, Janet M., 1985-; H.P.E.
Clarke, John F., 1966-; English.
Cline, Thomas L., 1922-1947; English, argumentation.
Clutz, Frank A., 1929-1930; religion.
Clutz, Frank H., 1918-1940; engineering.
Cocks, Alan R., 1974-1977; R.O.T.C.
Cole, Clyde H., 1946-1951; H.P.E.
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Coleman, John L., 1949-1951; R.O.T.C.
Collier, Charles F., 1974-1978; economics.
Collier, Glendon F., 1957-1983; German, Russian.
Colunio, John W., 1972-1976; H.P.E.
Condie, William M., 1962-1965; R.O.T.C.
Conrad, Victor L., 1867-1870; natural science.
Cook, James D., 1972-1975; R.O.T.C.
Coon, Betty R., 1974-1975; English.
Coover, Melanchthon, 1904-1905; religion.
Corsen, Chester R., 1946-1948; English.
Coulter, Chan L., 1958-; philosophy.
Covington, William R., 1956-1959; R.O.T.C.
Crane, John H., 1967-1971; Romance languages.
Crapster, Basil L., 1949-; history.
Creager, Paul S., 1915-1918; physics, engineering.
Criswell, Vance A., 1946-1947; English.
Croll, Luther H., 1866-1889; mathematics, astronomy.
Crone, Douglas A., 1949-1952; R.O.T.C.
Cronlund, Martin H., 1929-1931; Romance languages.
Crook, Joan T., 1961-1967; Romance languages.
Crowners, David L., 1967-; German.
Culver, Roland A., 1974-1978; R.O.T.C.
D'Agostino, Paul R., 1969-; psychology.
Daniels, Theodore C., 1954-; physics.
Davies, Robert E., 1955-1957; H.P.E.
Davies, William V., 1929-1932; religion, orientation.
Davis, David H., 1982-1983; political science [adj].
Deaner, Doris M., 1979-1980; education [adj].
Deardorff, Eugene, 1959-1960; chemistry.
DeBorde, John, Jr., 1951-1955; R.O.T.C.
DeLong, Leo R., 1926-1927; education.
DeLongchamps, Robert D., 1973-1978; R.O.T.C.
Denham, William O., 1946-1948; R.O.T.C.
Denison, Barbara J., 1985-; sociology [adj].
DeNys, Mary L., 1980-1981; English [adj].
Depfer, John F., 1948-1950; chemistry.
deQuintero, Beatriz C., 1985-; Spanish [adj].
deVegvar, Carol L. Neuman, 1981-1982; art.
Deveny, Thomas, 1980-1981; Romance languages [adj].
Diaz, Jose A., 1978-1982; Spanish (adj.).
Dibble, Uel E., 1932-1938; biology.
Dickson, James A., 1914-1927; chemistry.
Diehl, Erle K., Jr., 1947-1948; chemistry.
DiPesa, Pamela, 1976-1978; English.
DiStasi, Lawrence W., 1967-1968; English.
Doherty, H. William, 1979-1981; economics (adj.).
Dombrowsky, Thomas S., 1985-; R.O.T.C.
Donolli, Joseph D., 1971-; H.P.E.
Downing, Oscar M., 1946-1948; R.O.T.C.
Dracha, Richard, 1979-1981; sociology (adj.).
Drum, Alice, 1979-1980; English (adj.).
Dryden, Charles E., 1904-1908; German, French.
Earwood, John H., 1985-; R.O.T.C.
Eckhardt, Frederick P., 1951-1952; religion.
Eddins, Edgar L., 1951-1957; psychology.
Eddy, John H., 1960-1964; R.O.T.C.
Edwards, Preston H., 1926-1927; physics.
Eismann, James F., 1951-1954; R.O.T.C.
Emmons, Charles F., 1974-; sociology.
Erwin, John T., 1915-1916; mathematics.
Evelan, R. Ray, 1951-1952; English.
Everman, Harold, 1953-1955; R.O.T.C.
Evins, Donald E., 1953-1955; R.O.T.C.
Evjen, John O., 1905-1909; religion.
Ewing, James R., 1918-1920; economics, political science.
Fager, Charles B., 1946-1949; chemistry.
Farley, George E., 1962-1965; chemistry.
Ferm, Deane, 1985-1986; religion (adj.).
Fierrier, Edsall, 1866-1872; English.
Fick, George H., 1967-; history.
Finstad, Barbara L., 1963-1964; music (adj.).
Finstad, Kermit H., 1970-; music.
Fiscus, Robert, 1951-1954; R.O.T.C.
Flaugher, Patricia A., 1967-1969; H.P.E.
Flesner, David E., 1971-; mathematics.
Flood, Ralph J., 1962-1965; English.
Flynn, Helen S., 1980-1981; English (adj.).
Forness, Norman O., 1964-; history.
Fortenbaugh, Robert, 1923-1959; history.
Fortnum, Donald H., 1965-; chemistry.
Foster, Thomas L., 1975-1979; R.O.T.C.
Fox, Lloyd R., 1947-1949; R.O.T.C.
Fox, Robert W., 1965-1967; German.
Franco, Angel, 1946-1956; Spanish.
Frank, James C., 1927-1928; H.P.E.
Frank, Lewis B., 1957-1986; psychology.
Fuglister, Jayne, 1984-1985; economics.
Fulk, James W., 1964-1967; R.O.T.C.
Fulton, Charles E., 1951-1954; R.O.T.C.
Fundenburg, George B., 1918-1919; Romance languages.
Gable, Bonnie, 1982-1983; English (adj.).
Gallion, Donald, 1950-1951; religion.
Gapp, Kenneth S., 1929-1931; Greek, Latin.
Garci-Gomez, Miguel, 1971-1973; Romance languages.
Garman, Raymond P., 1945-1946; chemistry.
Garrett, Robert B., 1966-1968; H.P.E.
Garshak, Francis D., 1964-1967; R.O.T.C.
Gauger, Charles, 1925-1928; economics.
Gay, Judith, 1976-1979; psychology.
Geiser, Patricia D., 1960-1962; chemistry.
Gemmill, Robert M., 1958-; economics.
Gill, Sandra K., 1984-; sociology.
Gillespie, Robert T., 1961-1966; political science.
Gimpel, Thomas G., 1954-1955; R.O.T.C.
Girard, Harry V., 1942-1943; R.O.T.C.
Glad, Harold L., 1959-1965; H.P.E.
Gladys, John A., 1954-1955; R.O.T.C.
Glatfelter, Charles H., 1949--; economics, political science, history.
Gleason, Clyde W., 1925-1926; philosophy.
Glenn, James D., 1923-1924; chemistry.
Glenn, John G., 1925-1966; Latin, classics.
Gobbel, Gertrude G., 1968--; psychology.
Gobbel, H. Roger, 1949-1950; religion.
Godard, Elizabeth H., 1961-1962; English.
Goldberg, Leonard S., 1982--; economics.
Gondwe, Derrick K., 1977--; economics.
Gotay, Carolyn C., 1977-1979; psychology.
Graham, Frank L., 1917-1918; R.O.T.C.
Granville, William A., 1910-1913; intellectual and moral science.
Gray, Ernest D., 1963-1966; R.O.T.C.
Green, A. Wigfall, 1927-1928; English.
Green, William F., 1950-1953; physics.
Greenfeld, Anne M., 1985-1986; French.
Greenholt, Homer R., 1925-1931; history.
Gridley, James M., 1955-1957; R.O.T.C.
Grimm, Karl J., 1906-1940; German.
Grissinger, John M., 1948-1950; English.
Grzybowski, Joseph J., 1979--; chemistry.
Gubitz, Albert C., 1922-1923; economics.
Gutmann, George F., 1929-1944; German.
Haas, Eugene M., 1954-1979; H.P.E.
Hackmann, Augustus, 1936-1937; religion.
Hagen, Sivert N., 1916-1924; English.
Hair, J. David, 1981-1984; English.
Hair, Peggy H., 1982-1984; education (adj.).
Hall, Charles W., Jr., 1928-1929; chemistry.
Hall, Francis G., 1956-1958; R.O.T.C.
Hallas, Edward J., Jr., 1949-1951; R.O.T.C.
Haller, Margaret E., 1946-1947, 1949-1950; English, Spanish.
Hamilton, Margaret McGurk, 1941-1944; H.P.E.
Hamme, Elmer G., 1947-1948; chemistry.
Hamme, Herbert G., 1922-1923, 1924-1964; Romance languages.
Hampton, Joseph B., 1957-1959; political science.
Hand, Jacqueline F., 1979-1983; H.P.E. (adj.).
Hankey, Ralph L., 1925-1927; Romance languages.
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Hanna, Bertram, 1950-1951; biology.
Harbaugh, Marion, 1950-1952; Romance languages.
Hanson, Jerome O., 1984-; English.
Harned, Louise, 1959-1962; political science.
Harrison, William H., 1845-1846; languages.
Harshbarger, Karl F., 1960-1962; English, dramatics.
Hartman, John, Jr., 1981-1982; R.O.T.C.
Hartman, Michael J., 1983-1986; R.O.T.C.
Hartshorne, William D., Jr., 1928-1959; Romance languages.
Hartzell, Jean A., 1947-1949; English, Spanish; and 1979-; English [adj.].
Harvey, Ann, 1979-1980; education [adj.].
Haskell, David F., 1970-1975; English.
Haupt, Herman, 1837-1839, 1845-1847; engineering, architecture, mathematics.
Hauptman, Johannes, 1924-1927; German.
Hauser, Ludwig J., 1928-1930; education.
Hay, Charles A., 1844-1847; German.
Hays, Peggy Lou, 1983-; economics, management.
Hayward, John C., 1947-1951; psychology.
Hazelius, Ernest L., 1832-1834; Latin, German.
Hedge, George R., 1932-1934; R.O.T.C.
Hefelbower, Samuel G., 1902-1910; German, intellectual and moral science.
Heiges, Donald R., 1934-1944; philosophy, orientation.
Heincer, Clement J., 1979-1982; R.O.T.C.
Heininge, Patricia A., 1983-1984; French [adj.].
Heissenbuttel, Ernest G., 1928-1929; English.
Held, John T., 1960-; education.
Helmrich, Oliver W., 1953-1956; psychology.
Hendrickson, Caroline M. Cameron, 1959-1984; Romance languages.
Hendrix, Sherman S., 1964-; biology.
Hensley, Marvin M., 1951-1958; biology.
Henssler, Frederick W., 1956-1957; sociology.
Hershey, Robert D., 1932-1935; religion.
Hertzbach, Janet Stavropoulos, 1978-; English.
Hesse, Grace R., 1960-1961; Romance languages.
Hesser, Harvey A., 1923-1924; German.
Heyman, Eugene F., Jr., 1977-1980; R.O.T.C.
Hill, Edmund R., 1961-; economics.
Himes, John A., 1873-1914; English, political science.
Hinkeldey, Howard W., 1946-1948; religion.
Hinrichs, Donald W., 1968-; sociology.
Hirstel, Coco J., 1972-1975; H.P.E.
Hitchcock, Barry W., 1980-1981; R.O.T.C.
Hogan, A. Patricia, 1979-1986; English, interdepartmental studies (adj.).
Holl, Karl, 1985; German, history.
Hollinger, John C., 1940-1942, 1945-1946; R.O.T.C.
Homan, Donald, 1959-1960; physics.
Hook, Melverda, 1979-1984; music (adj.).
Hornig, Vernon F., 1955-1958; R.O.T.C.
Howard, Charles H., 1923-1924; economics.
Howell, Esther V., 1955-1956; economics.
Hoyle, Jeffrey, 1984-1985; chemistry.
Hoyt, John P., 1928-1929; mathematics, physics.
Hubbard, Marilyn, 1963--; Spanish (adj.).
Huber, Eli, 1892-1904; religion.
Huffman, Virginia M., 1963-1967; H.P.E.
Hulton, Robert T., 1957-1979; H.P.E.
Hummel, R. Eugene, 1957-1979; H.P.E.
Humphries, Albert, 1948-1952; R.O.T.C.
Hutton, Glenn K., 1967-1970; R.O.T.C.
Hyson, Edward W., 1927-1928; chemistry.
Idle, Dunning, 1931-1949; history.
Ikeler, Donald F., 1916-1917; public speaking, debating.
Ingraham, Vernon L., 1963-1965; English.
Jackson, Jerome C., 1923-1927; education, philosophy.
Jackson, Jerry L., 1957-1959; English.
Jackson, Mary-Garland, 1962--; Spanish.
Jackson, Robert, 1954-1955; R.O.T.C.
Jacobs, Henry Oyster, 1870-1883; Latin, Greek.
Jacobs, Michael, 1832-1866; mathematics, chemistry, natural philosophy.
Jacobson, Carolyn M., 1983--; economics.
James, Sidney G., 1961-1963; English.
Jameson, Donald L., 1985--; chemistry.
Jarvinen, Dorothy C., 1979-1981; music (adj.).
Jenkins, Holman W., 1948-1950; economics, political science.
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Johnson, Elmer J., 1951-1955; R.O.T.C.
Johnson, Lester O., 1930-1971; education.
Johnson, Philip, 1953-1957; political science.
Johnson, Steven L., 1985-1986; sociology.
Johnston, Arnold V., 1920-1924; economics, political science.
Johnston, Jack M., 1983-1984; English (adj.).
Jones, Eben R., 1954-1957; R.O.T.C.
Kadel, Byron R., 1928-1930; biology.
Karshner, Gary B., 1985--; physics.
Karsteter, Robert B., 1978-1982; R.O.T.C.
Kearns, Daisy Morales, 1956-1957; Romance languages.
Keeny, Spurgeon M., 1915-1916; English.
Keiter, Herman S., 1927-1929; Latin.
Keller, Franklin L., 1947-1948; Greek.
Kelly, Fred E., 1929-1932; education.
Kelly, John D., 1974-1975; music.
Kelly, Nancy J., 1958-1960; H.P.E.
Kenney, Grace C., 1948--; H.P.E.
Kepler, Kurt, 1946-1951; German.
Kerr, Frederick L., 1982-1985; economics (adj.).
Kilmer, Elizabeth B., 1949-1951; Romance languages.
Kindig, Carl H., 1929-1930; engineering.
King, Karen E., 1981-1986; education (adj.).
King, Randall M., 1975-1979; mathematics.
Kirby, Richard S., 1911-1915; engineering.
Klein, Laura F., 1978-1979; sociology.
Klett, Guy S., 1921-1923; English, history.
Klinger, Oscar G., 1896-1912; Greek.
Knight, Grant C., 1919-1921; English, public speaking.
Kochonour, Eva M., 1949-1950; French.
Kogler, Henry C., 1946-1950; psychology.
Koran, David, 1977-1978; chemistry.
Kostopulos, Celeste, 1979-1983; Spanish.
Krall, Harry L., 1927-1928; mathematics, physics.
Kram, Paul F., 1949-1950. religion.
Kraus, Michael G., 1984; art (adj.).
Krauth, Charles P., 1833-1850; intellectual and moral science.
Krebs, Richard L., 1984-1985; psychology (adj.).
Kriissinger, Richard H., 1928-1928; Romance languages.
Kromhout, George A., 1941-1942; biology.
Kuklick, Henrika, 1973-1974; sociology.
Lacoste, Maria-Elena, 1967-1969; Romance languages.
Lakich, Joseph S., 1950-1951; R.O.T.C.
Lambert, Elizabeth R., 1984-; English.
Lamneck, Philip, 1982-1985; R.O.T.C.
Lampert, Lester L., 1936-1940; R.O.T.C.
Landgren, Sara N., 1979-1981; music (adj.).
Landis, Joseph B., 1974-1977; sociology.
Langa, Bheki F., 1983-1984; English (adj.).
Langerhans, Heinz, 1947-1957; German, sociology.
Langerhans, Ilse, 1958-1962; German.
Lank, John, 1973-1974; political science.
Larkin, George R., 1928-1956; economics.
Lawver, Kenneth E., 1948-1949; chemistry.
Learnard, Richard B., 1930-1931; physics.
Leatherman, Paul K., 1926-1927; chemistry.
Lee, S. Rebecca, 1948-1949; Romance languages.
Lehr, Robert E., 1971-1975; H.P.E.
Leiby, Robert W., 1982-1983; chemistry.
Leinbach, L. Carl, 1967--; mathematics, computer studies.
Lentz, James S., 1952-1957; H.P.E.
Leonard, Max T., 1951-1954; R.O.T.C.
Lewis, Ada G., 1977--; economics (adj. 1985-).
Lindeman, Lani, 1979-1986; interdepartmental studies (adj.).
Lindeman, Ralph D., 1952-1984; English.
Lipsey, William M., 1952-1954; R.O.T.C.
Livingood, John N.B., 1938-1942; mathematics.
Locher, Jack S., 1957--; English.
Loveland, Franklin O., 1972--; sociology.
Lovell, John R., 1921-1923; French.
Luckenbill, Faye E. (later Whitehead), 1955-1958; H.P.E.
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Lunday, James E., 1980-1981; sociology (adj.).
Lutz, James P., 1953-1955; R.O.T.C.
Lyons, Vernon M., 1952-1953; R.O.T.C.
Macdonald, M. Stewart, 1914-1915; economics, political science.
MacLean, Craig, 1976-1977; political science.
Magness, Carolyn M., 1982--; mathematics.
Maguire, Marcia, 1947-1948; H.P.E.
Majd, Mohammad G., 1984--; economics.
Malmberg, Constantine F., 1926-1928; philosophy.
Malmi, Carol L., 1973-1975; English.
Malone, Eubert H., 1924-1928; R.O.T.C.
Mara, Richard T., 1953--; physics.
Marconi, Katherine, 1976-1977; sociology.
Marks, Mollyanne, 1970-1972; English.
Marsden, Donald A., 1965-1968; English.
Marsden, John H., 1832-1835; mineralogy, botany.
Marsh, Marie T., 1947-1948; Romance languages.
Marsh, Robert P., 1924-1939; biology.
Martin, Adam, 1869-1898; German.
Mashburn, James, 1930-1937; R.O.T.C.
Mason, Francis C., 1925-1965; English.
Mathias, Charles W., 1951-1953; psychology.
Matsinko, Carol, 1980-1982; music (adj.).
Matsinko, Michael, 1976--; music.
Mayer, Alfred M., 1865-1867; natural science.
McAllister, Walter G., 1923-1925; psychology.
McCadle, Arthur, 1969--; German.
McCaslin, Joseph G., 1953-1955; R.O.T.C.
McKeand, Floyd H., Jr., 1951-1955; R.O.T.C.
McKenney, Alfred E., 1946-1950; R.O.T.C.
McKeon, James, 1956-1957; psychology.
McKnight, Harvey W., 1884-1904; intellectual and moral science.
McLaughlin, Virginia J., 1985; art (adj.).
McLennand, Marie, 1955-1971; English.
McQueen, James E., 1944-1946; R.O.T.C.
McReynolds, Wilbur R., 1928-1932; R.O.T.C.
Meals, L. Kenton, 1944-1945; mathematics.
Medcalf, Todd S., 1961-1982; music.
Meinecke, Bruno, 1956-1957; Latin.
Melko, John T., 1947-1948; R.O.T.C.
Mellerski, John J., 1980-1984; French (adj.).
Menkee, Ernest D., 1922-1923; engineering.
Merkler, Tessa B., 1965-1966; English.
Merrick, Carol Ann, 1977-1980; Romance languages.
Meyer, Werner F.G., 1963-1964; German.
Michelman, Fredric, 1973--; Romance languages.
Mikesell, Jan E., 1973--; biology.
Miller, George R., 1920-1953; physics.
Miller, John C., 1973-1979; Romance languages.
Miller, Lawrence L., 1974-1977; R.O.T.C.
Miller, Pamela Ann, 1965-1967; English.
Miller, William T., 1977-1979; H.P.E.
Mills, Fred C., 1922-1923; swimming.
Mitchell, Alan L., 1948-1949; R.O.T.C.
Mitchell, Arlo W., 1941-1942; R.O.T.C.
Mitchell, Nancy K., 1958-1963; H.P.E.
Moayedi, Roxanna, 1981-1982; sociology (adj.).
Moore, Robert D., 1964-1967; R.O.T.C.
Morden, Frederick, 1976-1977; music.
Morrill, John D., 1952-1955; R.O.T.C.
Morris, William S., 1928-1931; R.O.T.C.
Moser, Franklin W., 1914-1915; English.
Moss, Robert E., 1966-1968; R.O.T.C.
Mott, Kenneth F., 1966--; political science.
Mower, A. Glenn, 1947-1948; economics.
Moyer, Robert F., 1947-1948; R.O.T.C.
Muchinsky, Paul M., 1983-1984; psychology (adj.).
Mueller, Otto, 1926-1931; Romance languages.
Muhlenberg, Frederick A., 1850-1867; Greek.
Muller, Hollis L., Jr., 1950-1953; R.O.T.C.
Munie, Marsha A., 1976-1979; art.
Munshower, Carl W., 1924-1926; mathematics.
Musselman, Larry, 1981-1985; economics (adj.).
Myers, James P., Jr., 1968-; English.
Myers, Jeri A., 1976-1979; H.P.E.
Navickas, Anthony J., 1951-1955; R.O.T.C.
Nielsen, Arne H., 1961; Romance languages.
Niño, Katsuyuki, 1972-; economics.
Nixon, Major C., 1921-1924; R.O.T.C.
Noe, David M., 1981-1982; R.O.T.C.
Notz, Frederick William Augustus, 1868-1869; German.
Novak, Joseph D., 1929-1930; mathematics, physics.
Nyitray, Joseph P., 1974-1983; political science.
O'Leary, Harriet L., 1963-1966; Romance languages.
Olinger (Olinger-Rubira), Paula, 1979-; Romance languages.
Oliver, Edward J., 1942-1943; R.O.T.C.
Oliver, J.W., 1921-1923; R.O.T.C.
Olson, Bruce, 1978-1982; R.O.T.C.
Olson, Ralph W., 1963-1984; economics (adj.).
Orth, A. Park, 1945-1946; economics.
Ostrander, Edward R., 1957-1960; psychology.
Ostrom, John W., 1928-1936; English.
Pacenza, Rosemarie R., 1963-1984; music (adj.).
Packard, Bruce L., 1971-; education.
Paparazo, Arnold L., 1960-1964; R.O.T.C.
Parker, William E., 1967-; chemistry.
Parks, Howard C., 1966-1980; classics.
Parks, James A., 1948-1952; R.O.T.C.
Parsons, Barbara, 1963-1964; biology.
Parsons, Louis A., 1907-1925; physics.
Patnode, Gerald R., 1985-; management.
Patterson, Jeffrey L., 1976-1979; economics.
Paulson, Alan, 1978-; art.
Paulssen, Bertha, 1942-1947; philosophy.
Pavlantos, Clio, 1983-1985; H.P.E. (adj.).
Pavlantos, Ruth E., 1963-; classics.
Peddy, Thomas E., 1947-1951; R.O.T.C.
Pensyl, Jon P., 1963-1966; R.O.T.C.
Percival, Allen C., 1948-1951; Romance languages.
Perry, Edward K., 1946-1947; German.
Peters, Martin F., 1957-1960; R.O.T.C.
Peterson, Leonard O., 1955-1959; R.O.T.C.
Peusch, Millard R., 1950-1951; R.O.T.C.
Pittman, Nathan S., 1975-1977; R.O.T.C.
Pittman, Thane S., 1972--; psychology.
Plank, Wilbur L., 1932-1934; engineering.
Plutsch, Maynard R., 1956-1968; Romance languages.
Pickering, Edward K., 1941-1944; economics.
Quilly, Ingolf, 1956-1982; art.
Quillian, William F., Jr., 1941-1945; philosophy.
Quinn, R. David, 1969-1971; Romance languages.
Rabinowitz, Sima, 1983--; Spanish.
Raffensperger, Charles H., 1979-1984; economics (adj.).
Rahn, David P., 1976-1979; H.P.E.
Railing, Jennifer M., 1979--; economics, management (adj.).
Railing, William F., 1964--; economics.
Raines, Laura F., 1984; art (adj.).
Raith, Charles, 1950-1953; political science.
Reider, Ray R., 1962--; H.P.E.
Rae, Richard F., Jr., 1973-1976; R.O.T.C.
Radin, Constance L., 1964-1969; German.
Reus, John R., 1948-1952; R.O.T.C.
Rhoads, Robert W., 1942-1943; history.
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Richards, Joyce A., 1969-1973; Romance languages.
Richards, William F., 1950-1952; R.O.T.C.
Richardson, Elizabeth M., 1984-; French.
Richardson, Norman E., Jr., 1945-1979; philosophy.
Richardson, William F. III, 1960-1962; R.O.T.C.
Ridinger, John, 1956-1962; H.P.E.
Riechel, Donald C., 1961-1963; German.
Riggs, J. Edward, Jr., 1963-1984; H.P.E.
Riggs, Janet Morgan, 1981-; psychology.
Riley, Patrick E., 1982-1985; R.O.T.C.
Riley, Robert C., 1947-1951; economics.
Rion, Ira S., 1951-1954; R.O.T.C.
Ritterson, Michael L., 1968-; German.
Roberts, Donald R., 1946-1947; chemistry.
Roberts, John R., 1946-1949; economics.
Robinson, Donald W., 1954-1956; art.
Rodeck, Herbert A.F., 1937-1939, 1940-1941; German.
Rodgers, Charles F., 1926-1928; biology.
Rogers, Leonard D., 1948-1949; R.O.T.C.
Rose, Nicole A., 1978-1980; Romance languages [adj].
Rosenbach, William E., 1984-; management.
Rosenberger, Noah B., 1919-1920; mathematics.
Rosenstengel, Rudolph, 1918-1932; engineering.
Ross, Frederick U., 1923-1924; English.
Rost, William, 1974-1979; H.P.E.
Roth, Catharine E., 1981-1983; English [adj].
Rourke, Dennis M., 1985-; R.O.T.C.
Rowland, Alex T., 1958-; chemistry.
Russo, Rosemarie C., 1971-1972; chemistry.
Ruszczyk, Ronald J., 1985-1986; chemistry.
Sabol, Joseph G., 1975-1978; H.P.E.
Saby, Rasmus S., 1924-1950; economics, political science.
Sachs, Martha, 1950-1952; English.
Sadtdler, Samuel P., 1871-1874; natural sciences.
Saltzer, Bertram H., 1923-1940; engineering.
Saltzer, J. Blaine, 1946-1951; economics.
Sanborn, William L., 1953-1969; Romance languages.
Sand, Diane Z., 1983-1984; German [adj].
Sanders, Charles F., 1906-1941; philosophy.
Sauve, James W., Jr., 1969-1977; H.P.E.
Sauve, Judith A., 1969-1972; H.P.E.
Sawyer, Teresa A., 1984-; psychology.
Schaeffer, Charles F., 1858-1864; German.
Schaeffer, Klaus H., 1945-1946; German.
Schildknecht, Calvin E., 1959-1979; chemistry.
Schlack, Theodore C., 1950-1952; English.
Schlie, Caroline J., 1975-1979; H.P.E.
Schmersahl, Carmen B., 1981; English (adj.).
Schmidt, Earl M., 1959-1963; R.O.T.C.
Schmidt, Emile O., 1982-; English, theater.
Schmucker, Samuel Simon, 1832-1833; intellectual and moral science.
Schneider, Henry III, 1964-1981; German.
Schuh, Robert F., 1944-1945; R.O.T.C.
Schwartz, Judith A., 1979-1982; English (adj.).
Seamens, Howard J., 1967-1971; R.O.T.C.
Sehrt, Edward H., 1922-1928; Romance languages.
Seidel, Ethan A., 1982-1983; economics (adj.).
Sells, Clemens A., 1947-1948; philosophy.
Senft, Cletus A., 1926-1927; religion.
Shaffer, W. Frederick, 1931-1962; Greek.
Shainline, John W., 1948-1954; H.P.E.
Shannon, Gerald, 1979-1980; history (adj.).
Shapelle, Benjamin F., 1911-1916; Romance languages.
Sharma, Chandradhar, 1963-1964; philosophy.
Sharpless, Frank E., 1943-1945; R.O.T.C.
Sheads, J. Melchior, 1946-1947; history.
Sheaffer, Avery, 1957-1961; sociology.
Sheffer, John A., 1923-1934; chemistry.
Sheppy, Kathleen E., 1981-1986; Spanish.
Sherbine, K. Bruce, 1965-1969; biology.
Shipherd, Henry R., 1914-1916; English.
Shoemaker, Howard G., 1957-1985; H.P.E.
Siegel, Eva S., 1981-1984; sociology (adj.).
Simon, Carl R., 1923-1925; Latin.
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Singer, James N., 1946-1948; religion.
Skidmore, Charles L., 1962-1964; R.O.T.C.
Slaybaugh, James F., 1964--; education.
Slaybaugh, Nancy A., 1979-1982; education (adj.).
Sloat, C. Allen, 1927-1966; chemistry.
Small, Alden C., 1968-1974; political science.
Small, Carol Daborn, 1969--; art.
Smith, Chester R., 1972-1975; R.O.T.C.
Smith, George W., 1924-1926; English.
Smith, Harry B., 1927-1928; education.
Smith (Schmidt), Henry I, 1838-1843; German.
Smith, LeRoy W., 1951-1955; English.
Smith, Lewis J., 1982-1985; R.O.T.C.
Smith, Paul H., 1936-1937; religion.
Smith, Robert D., 1965-1972; H.P.E.
Smith, Roger W., 1943-1944; mathematics.
Smith, Welda A., 1958-1962; R.O.T.C.
Snively, Carolyn S., 1982--; classics.
Snodgrass, James G., 1975-1978; R.O.T.C.
Snow, George, 1979-1980; history (adj.).
Speck, Frederick A., 1983--; music.
Speck, Pam, 1985-1986; H.P.E. (adj.).
Speich, Douglas S., 1965-1968; Romance languages.
Spicer, Cyril B., 1949-1952; R.O.T.C.
Squires, Paul C., 1922-1923; psychology.
Srebrnik, Patricia T., 1984--; English.
Stahley, George D., 1889-1920; hygiene, biology.
Stamm, Raymond T., 1922-1923; religion, history.
Starr, William T., 1940-1945; Romance languages, German.
Steckel, George D., 1946-1950; physics.
Steele, Ruby J., 1963-1967; H.P.E.
Stemen, John R., 1961--; history.
Stephenson, Helen, 1982-1983; music (adj.).
Stewart, Mary Margaret, 1959--; English.
Stoever, Martin L., 1843-1870; history, Latin.
Stone, Elizabeth V., 1961-1962; English.
Storms, William N., 1958-1962; R.O.T.C.
Stover, Clyde B., 1910-1943; chemistry.
Stover, Lynn, 1984-1985; music (adj.).
Straley, Luther S., 1927-1929; religion.
Strassberg, Donald S., 1969-1972; psychology.
Streeter, Barry H., 1975-1979; H.P.E.
Stright, I. Leonard, 1982-1985; mathematics (adj.).
Strohm, Raymond, 1937-1944, 1945-1946; R.O.T.C.
Strong, Philip L., 1960-1962; English.
Sundermeyer, William X., 1939-1964; German.
Swivel, Loren E., 1977-1978; H.P.E.
Sylvester, Christine M., 1981-; political science.
Tannenbaum, Amie Godman, 1966-; Romance languages.
Tannenbaum, Donald G., 1966-; political science.
Taylor, Dewey F., 1964-1967; R.O.T.C.
Taylor, Katherine Kressman (later Rood), 1947-1966; English.
Terry, Kenneth, 1945-1946; mathematics.
Teufel, Karl C., 1955-1959; R.O.T.C.
Theobald, Erika E., 1961-1964; German.
Thompson, C. Kerr, 1865-; Spanish.
Thompson, Samuel C., 1922-1926; R.O.T.C.
Thornburg, Robert B., 1946-1947; English.
Thornton, Billy G., 1982-1983; psychology.
Thurmond, James, 1979-1982; music (adj.).
Townsend, Freda L., 1955-1959; English.
Trainor, Patrick, 1983-1984; H.P.E. (adj.).
Trauger, Wilmer K., 1923-1925; English.
Trevelyan, Amelia M., 1985-; art.
Trivoli, George W., 1965-1966; economics.
Trone, Robert H., 1956-; religion.
Truxell, Fred G., 1914-1916; mathematics.
Tuthill, Tracey E., 1918-1919; R.O.T.C.
Tuttle, Shelby M., 1919-1921; R.O.T.C.
Uehling, Carl T., 1948-1949; religion.
Uhler, Horace S., 1925-1926; physics.
Unger, Guinn E., 1953-1955; R.O.T.C.
Valentine, Milton, 1868-1884; intellectual and moral science.
Valentine, Milton H., 1916-1930; religion, history.
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Valerius, Millard R., 1962-1964; R.O.T.C.
Valiela, Isabel, 1985-1986; Spanish (adj.).
Van Ingen, John V., 1957-1959; economics.
Villaume, John C., 1941-1942; history.
Viti, Robert M., 1971-; Romance languages.
vonSchwerdtner, Ernst O., 1927-1937; German.
Vossen, Francis, 1976-1978; R.O.T.C.
Wagner, John F., 1929-1930; physics.
Wagner, John H., 1923-1925; religion, history.
Wallace, Elizabeth, 1979-1982; English (adj.).
Waltemyer, William C., 1929-1960; philosophy, religion.
Walters, Kerry S., 1985-; philosophy.
Ward, James E.H., 1973-1975; H.P.E.
Warger, Thomas, 1979-1980; Romance languages.
Warrington, Don J., 1954-1955; R.O.T.C.
Warthen, George Saylor, 1924-1954; English.
Washington, Lawrence M., 1951-1953; German.
Wastler, Franklin A., 1981-; music (adj.).
Watson, Sherman E., 1972-1975; R.O.T.C.
Watts, John A., 1946-1947; R.O.T.C.
Weaner, Janis Hathorn, 1957-1985; Romance languages.
Weeks, Lewis E., Jr., 1948-1951; English.
Weikel, Dexter N., 1982-; music.
Weiland, Glenn S., 1946-1947; 1949-1974; chemistry.
Weinfeld, Tim, 1980-1981; English (adj.).
Weissman, Cheryl Ann, 1982-1984; English.
Wenk, Emily C., 1983-; computer studies (adj.).
Wentz, Abdel Ross, 1909-1916; religion, history.
Wescott, Richard T., 1966-1984; H.P.E.
Wetzal, Gerald H., 1968-1971; R.O.T.C.
White, Paul E., 1942-1944; R.O.T.C.
White, Thomas, 1979-1983; psychology.
Whiting, George W., 1916-1917; English.
Wickerham, Janet S., 1987-1969; H.P.E.
Wienhorst, Sue E., 1959-1960; English.
Wilken, John F., 1866-1868; German.
Wilkinson, B. Lane, 1987-1969; Romance languages.
Williams, Conway S., 1949-1960; economics.
Williams, Donald G., 1954-1957; R.O.T.C.
Williams, John C., 1951-1953; R.O.T.C.
Williams, Nina J., 1956-1957; biology.
Williams, Suzanne, 1984-1985; education (adj.).
The faculty which the trustees elected in 1832 consisted of five men who were given the title of professor. Later, they began engaging the services of persons to offer optional instruction in a modern foreign language (they were called teachers) or to give a few lectures a year on such subjects as anatomy, physiology, or zoology (they were called lecturers). The first person chosen to help carry the burden of the chemistry professor (a recent graduate who was appointed in 1874) was called an assistant, and this title was used in the cases of almost all of the second or third teachers who were subsequently added to other departments, beginning in 1906. Some of these persons were later advanced to the rank of instructor. During the first twenty years of the Henry W. A. Hanson administration (1923-1943), all of the teachers held one of the four usual faculty ranks. The need to engage temporary and part-time personnel during and immediately following World War II led the president to resort to such titles as special instructor and assistant.

The 1953 catalogue, the first published after Walter C. Langsam became president, listed three categories of teachers beyond the usual four ranks: lecturer, private instructor in applied music, and assistant. During the next quarter century, lecturers were named for part-time work in many departments. Several of the private instructors in music, who played a key role in the early years of that depart-
ment, served for fifteen years or more. Almost all of the assistants were biology laboratory instructors, some of whom also had long periods of service. Several of the lecturers and private instructors were eventually given faculty rank and became eligible for tenure. For many years, noncommissioned men attached to the College R. O. T. C. were given the rank of instructor; beginning with the 1955-1956 year they were designated assistant instructors, a title also used by several other departments. With the introduction of adjunct ranks in 1979, further changes were made in the designation of part-time or temporary faculty.

In the Gettysburg College Archives there is a list of some 250 persons who held the titles described above between 1832-1833 and 1985-1986.
The basic sources used in preparing this work were primary materials relating to the College, most of which are housed in the Gettysburg College Archives. Fortunately, the minutes of the board of trustees and the faculty, beginning in the summer of 1832, have survived, as have many reports which the president and faculty submitted to the board of trustees or to one or more of the institution's constituencies. The Henry W. A. Hanson administration is the first for which a sizable body of additional papers has survived. President Granville claimed that when he took office no such papers were given to him. In turn, he left an incomplete file when he resigned in 1923. Minutes of College organizations, including the alumni association, are quite incomplete. The present lack of minutes of the latter for about a quarter century before 1930 makes it impossible to gain a fully satisfactory understanding of organized alumni activity during those years.

The College catalogue (beginning in 1837), journal or newspaper (beginning in 1877), student yearbook (beginning in 1891), and alumni magazine (beginning in 1930) yielded invaluable information, much of which would not otherwise be available. For many years Gettysburg newspapers featured College news, as did the Lutheran Observer, which began publication in 1831 and whose editors were usually strong supporters of the two educational institutions at Gettysburg.

The author's recollections, as well as those of a number of others long associated with the College, have been used to complement and supplement other sources of information.

As the footnotes testify, many sources, both primary and secondary, were employed to make comparisons between Gettysburg College and its sister institutions in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. Two works helpful in attempting to place the College in its state and national settings were Saul Sack, *History of Higher Education in Pennsylvania*, 2 vols. (Harrisburg, 1963), and Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York, 1962).
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Beachem Athletic Award, 620, 944.
Beachem Portico, Pennsylvania Hall, 604, 607, 736.
Beaver, James A., 256.
Bedford, 141, 416, 454.
Beers, John H., 753.
Beldielean, Harry H., 413, 619, 668.
Bell, secured 1847-1848, 107-8, 257, 836.
Bellamy, Carol K., 922.
Bell, Peter G., 568.
Bell lecture, 568.
Belzhoover, Frank E., 72, 97, 100, 294.
Benedict, Frederick, 89, 109.
Bequests to the College, 84, 212, 215-6, 437, 442-3, 769, 995.
Bergson, Henri, 477.
Berk, Kerry M., 756.
Berkey house, 834.
Berks County, 7, 57.
Berlin, Germany, 766.
Beta Beta Beta, 639, 937.
Beta Lambda, 621.
Bethany College, 465, 472, 488.
Bethlehem, 387.
Bicycle Club, 357.
Bilheimer house, 834.
Billheimer, Albert, 486, 499, 560, 602.
Billheimer, Thomas C., 199, 369.
Binkley, Luther J., 1015.
Biological Society, 638.
Biser, Gareth V., 946-7.
Bissell, Edward H., 268.
Bittinger, Eliza, 218.
Bittinger, Joseph B., 119, 158, 234.
Bittinger, William, 217, 252.
Bittinger professorship, 218, 231, 470.
Bittle, Daniel H., 168.
Bittle, David F., 168.
Black, Clyde O., II, 756.
Black, Jeremiah S., 312.
Black, John, 22.
Black, Luther S., 270.
Black Student Union, 937.
Black students, 913, 1001-2.
Blackwelder, Maggie M., 275.
"Blessing and honor, and glory and power", 603-4, 681, 685, 922, 960.
Bley, Robert A., 992.
Blister, 651.
Blockley Almshouse, 145.
Bloom, Dorothy S., 966.
Bloomhardt, Fred H., 414.
Blough, Burton F., 416, 442, 657.
Blough professorship, 442.
Blue and Gray, 642.
Blue Crocodiles, 653.
Blue Cross and Blue Shield, 821.
Blythe, Calvin, 3, 4, 38, 42, 76, 78.
Blythe, Ezra, 44.
Boarding students (see Dining Hall).
Board of American Missions, Lutheran Church, 413, 485, 712.
Board of Associates, 771, 999.
Board of College Education and Church Vocations, Lutheran Church, 979-80, 982, 984-5.
Board of Education, Lutheran Church, 459, 588, 590, 593, 707, 712, 723.
Board of Fellows, 771, 949.
Board of Foreign Missions, Lutheran Church, 84.
Board of Home Missions and Church Extension, Lutheran Church, 413.
Board of Publication, Lutheran Church, 775.
Board of Regents of the State of New York, 410, 456, 486, 714-6.
Board of Surveillance, 673-4.
Board of Theological Education, Lutheran Church, 784.
Board of trustees (see also alumni trustees and synodical trustees), 38, 75-81, 195-207, 412-24, 745-57, 1002-15.
Board of trustees, members of (1832-1985), 1021-28.
Boenau, A. Bruce, 873, 922.
Bolich, Harry F., 811, 935.
Bookstore, 525, 527, 832, 836, 841, 892, 995.
Booster Club, 937, 959, 1010.
Boritt, Gabor S., 995.
Boston, Mass., 253, 605.
Boston Normal Institute of Physical Education, 246.
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Bowdoin College, 214, 219, 441, 694, 760.
Bowen, Earl, 502, 846.
Bowen Auditorium, 846.
Bowers, John Z., 924.
Bowles, Frank H., 904-5.
Bowman, Earl J., 619.
Boy Scout movement, 704, 976.
Bradford County, 12.
Bradley, Bill, 861.
Brady, Susan M., 803, 911.
Brayman, Harold, 749.
Brazll, 533.
Bream, R. William, 414, 589, 703, 713.
Brede, Charles F., 233, 281, 325.
Breidenbaugh Science Hall, 517, 521, 524-6, 560-1, 607, 832, 841, 843, 851, 853, 891, 940.
Brenneman, Lavern H., 748-50, 756.
Bretz, Frank H., 968.
Bristol College, 55, 60.
British Empire, 954.
Broadway, 638.
Brooklyn College, 935.
Brooklyn, N.Y., 201.
Brown, Harold, 922.
Brown, J. Hay, 369.
Brown, James A., 188, 199.
Brown, Jay P., 794, 797.
Brown University, 694.
Brua, Catharine, 254.
Brua, John P., 254, 256, 258, 262.
Brua, Peter, 254.
Brua Chapel (later Brua Hall), 254, 258-9, 262, 287-8, 325, 343, 380, 405, 476, 506, 524, 528, 529, 569, 582-3, 603-4, 611-2, 635-6, 699, 831, 836-7, 850-1, 853, 918, 971.
Brumbaugh, G. Edwin, 848.
Brumbaugh, Martin G., 466.
Bryn Mawr College, 989.
Buchanan, James, 136.
Buckley, William F., Jr., 922.
Bucknell, William, 212.
Bucks County, 5, 55.
Buehler, Alexander D., 77-8, 80, 171, 173, 198-9, 201, 375-6.
Buehler, Charles H., 199.
Buehler, David A., 80, 96, 171, 173, 198-201, 204, 272, 377.
Buehler, Huber G., 241, 272.
Buehler, Martin, 199.
Buehler, Martin H., 414-5, 417, 840.
Buehler, Samuel H., 25, 78, 80, 171, 173.
Buehler Hall, 840.
Bugbee, Bruce W., 879.
Bullet Hole, 841, 825.
Bureau of Appointments, 559.
Burgess, John W., 195, 410.
Burkhardt, Albert R., 749.
Burlesque, 297, 326-7, 394, 851, 1004.
Burroughs Adding Machine Company, 570.
Burroughs Corporation, 897.
Business Manager, 777, 781-3, 790-1.
Business office, 777.
Butler, John G., 196-7, 267.
Butler, Robert E., 771, 791.
Butterfield, Daniel, 380.
Canonsburg, 21.
Cap and Kirtle, 636.
Capital University, 101.
Capozzi, Romeo, 662, 946.
Carl, Jeremiah, 199.
Carleton College, 484.
Carlisle Indian School, 359.
Carlson, Edgar M., 984.
Carlyle, Thomas, 477-8.
Carnegie, Andrew, 41, 193, 446, 448, 450, 459, 468, 511.
Carnegie Foundation (Corporation) of New York, 450, 522, 577.
Carnegie Foundation of New York, 450, 522, 577.
Carnegie units, 540, 542, 583, 901-2.
Carney, William H. B., 697.
Carroll, Charles, 3, 6.
Carroll, William, 312.
Carter, Jimmy, 1012.
Carthage College, 237, 374, 377, 396, 463, 697.
Carver, Joseph L., 509, 528-30, 855.
Cashman, George, 247.
Cashier, 620.
Cass, Lewis, 163.
Catton, Bruce, 924.
Caucus Club, 937.
Cemetery Hill, 58.
Centennial Celebration (1932), 525, 724-6.
Centennial Conference (football), 950.
Centennial exhibition of 1876, 205, 372, 404.
Central Pennsylvania Conference, 858.
Central Pennsylvania Consortium of Colleges, 991.
Central Pennsylvania Synod (1855-1823), 210, 387-8, 390, 392, 395, 399.
Central Pennsylvania Synod (1938), 20, 712, 746, 752-3, 761, 763, 786, 977-81, 985-7.
Centre County, 206.
Cessna, C. Paul, 694, 961, 963.
CHAI, 927.
Chapel (see also Bräu Chapel and Christ Chapel), 68, 253, 257-8, 336, 437.
Chapel attendance, compulsory, 151, 322, 609, 612-4, 778, 789, 809, 916-9, 925, 969, 981.
Chapel Council, 926-7, 940, 972, 976, 1002.
Chaplain of the College, 446-7.
Chemical News, 291.
Chemical Society, 640.
Chemistry Club, 640.
Chemistry laboratory (see McCreary Gymnasium).
Chess Club, 643.
Chester County, 5.
Chi Alpha Sigma, 621.
Chi Omega, 621, 933.
Chi Omega Alumnae Prize, 604.
Chi Phi, 166, 336, 339.
Chicago, Ill., 193, 195, 218, 474-5.
Chisholm, Shirley, 881.
Choir, Chapel, 935.
Choir, College, 632-3, 702, 732, 933-4, 961.
Christ Chapel, 119, 242, 526, 734, 787, 792, 794, 836-8, 842, 851, 918-9, 921, 925-6, 935, 968-70, 1016.
Christianity, 557.
Chritzen, F. M., 632.
Chritzman, George and Henry, 112, 119.
Church attendance, compulsory, 117, 152, 322, 609, 611-2.
Church Extension Society, Lutheran Church, 218.
Church Sponsored Higher Education and the Lutheran Church in America: A Study Document, 984.
City College of New York, 775.
Civil War, 82, 89, 114, 163, 181-90, 215, 244, 246, 248, 287, 318, 380, 389, 588, 720, 745, 788, 895, 990, 995.
Civil War Institute, 892, 995.
Civil Works Administration, 724.
Clabaugh, Harry M., 368.
Clapsaddle, Joseph, 111.
Clark, John W., 756.
Clark University, 787.
Clarkson, Michael C., 38.
Clarkson Memorial College of Technology, 697.
Class attendance policies, 304-5, 597, 917-8.
Class day, 307, 601, 920.
Class memorials and other gifts, 527, 601, 688, 1017.
Class of 1904, 688, 695-6.
Class of 1916 Prize, 604.
Class of 1926, 853.
Classical school (see Gettysburg Classical School).
Cleopatra, 618.
Cleveland, O., 195.
Cline, Thomas L., 501, 547, 549, 634-5, 637, 659.
Closter, Paul E., 746.
Clutz, Frank H., 497-8, 566.
Clutz, Jacob A., 414, 475, 589, 681.
Coble, Owen D., 472.
Goci, Claire, 895.
Codori House, 720.
Cold War, 740, 992, 1000.
College and University Council, Penna., 406.
College appropriation bill (1834), 41, 42, 44-55, 58.
College church (see Christ Lutheran Church).
College edifice (see Pennsylvania Hall).
College Entrance Examination Board, 470, 539, 759, 901-2, 904.
College financial contribution to the community, estimates of, 382, 705, 975.
College Guards, 182.
College History Series, 1015.
College Ladies Aid Society of Gettysburg, 899.
College of Philadelphia, 5-6.
College Prohibition Association, 643.
College Scholarship Service, 902.
College Union Building, 765, 801, 837, 840-1, 844, 852, 919, 921-2, 925, 935, 940, 951, 971, 997, 1000, 1015.
Collier, Glendon F., 873.
Colombia, 533.
Colorado, 317.
Colorado College, 219, 441, 760.
Colors, College, 363, 980.
Columbus, Christopher, 298.
Colver, Michael, 185.
Colvin, Frank E., 416.
Coming Apart, 741.
Coming apart at Gettysburg, 1000-1015.
Commencement week activities, 132-3, 308-12, 600-7, 961, 964.
Commencements, numbering of, 308, 923.
Commerce Department, U.S.A., 416.
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, Middle States Association, 715, 779, 990.
Committee on Higher Educational Statistics, 715-6.
Common Service, Lutheran Church, 393, 400.
Communism, 649, 741, 992.
Community Action Agency, 976.
Compiler, 43, 45, 47, 182, 265, 452-4, 460.
Comprehensive examinations, 548, 870-1, 876.
Computer equipment, 897-8.
Congregationalists, 15, 93.
Connecticut, 11, 912.
Connelly, Elizabeth A., 489, 498.
Conrad, Victor L., 91, 236, 312, 327.
Conrad professorship, 237, 287.
Contemporary Civilization course
(see General Education courses).
Conway Hall, 598.
Cooke, Allstair, 997.
Cooke, Jay and Company, 211.
Coolidge, Calvin, 649.
Cooper, James, 111.
Cooper, Thomas J., 33, 36, 46, 63, 67, 80, 139.
Cooper, Thomas Y., 885.
Cooper Union Institute, 253.
Cooperative programs, 778, 871.
Cornell, Ezra, 180, 212.
Cornell College, lowa, 219, 441, 760.
Cornell Review, 344.
Cottage Hall (see Professors' houses), 513.
Couchman, G. Ronald, 907.
Coulter, Chan L., 879.
Council of Independent Colleges, 981.
Council on the Mission of LCA Colleges and Universities, 984.
Counseling service, 915.
Counterculture, 741.
Count of Paris, 390.
Covenants, with supporting synods, 985.
Cox, Ralph W., 749-50, 754, 799.
Craft, 643.
Crapster, Basil L., 791, 806, 994.
Cret, Paul Philippe, 523, 730.
Criterion Club, 621.
Croll, Luther H., 136, 159-60, 231-2, 238, 240-1, 246, 313, 320, 323, 329,
368, 379.
Croll, Phillip C., 206.
Cronlund, Martin H., 901.
Crounse, L. L., 185.
Crumley, James R., 1016.
Cuba, 533.
Culp's hill, 582.
Cupola Society, 772.
Curriculum, 104, 122-34, 276-98, 538-72, 886-91.
Curtin, Andrew G., 183.
Curtis, Margaret Blanchard, 756.
Curtis, Mark H., 1016-7.
Curtiss, Geoffrey, 1008.
Customs, freshmen, 670-8, 952-9, 1010.
Customs, sophomore, 671.
Cyclopedia of Education, A, 705.
Dayton, O., 89.
Dean, John, 881.
Dean of educational services, 803.
Dean of men, 777.
Dean of student life, 803, 931.
Dean of students, 790-1, 803, 939.
Dean of the College (or faculty), 231-2, 777, 790-1, 803.
Dean of women, 489, 777.
Dean's Honor List, 596.
Deaths of students, 157.
Debate Union, 935.
Debating and oratory, 161, 332, 342, 633-5, 845, 935.
Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges, 835.
Debating Council, 634.
Debus, Richard C., 781-3.
Decade of Achievement: Gettysburg College (1960-1970), 860.
Decker, Arthur C., 619.
Declaration of Independence, 3, 6.
Degrees granted (1834-1985), 127, 310, 585, 908.
Delaware Breakwater, 59, 60.
Delta Gamma, 621, 933.
Delta Hall, 340.
Delta Phi Alpha, 641, 937.
Delta Sigma Chi, 621.
Delta Sigma Kappa, 621, 624.
Demarest, John K., 202.
Democrats, 43-5.
DeMolay, 643.
Dempsey, Jack, 569.
Denver, Col., 786.
Department of Defense, U.S.A., 880.
Department of Education, Penna., 991.
Department of Forests and Waters, Penna., 534.
Department of Highways, Penna., 843.
Department of Public Instruction, Penna., 557-9, 717, 991.
Department of State, Penna., 754.
Departments, academic, 281, 499.
Detweiler, John S., 377.
Deutsche Gesellschaft, 641.
Deutsche Verein, 641.
Development office, 763.
Dickinson, John, 7, 12.
Dickson, J. McCrea, 414.
Diehl, Charles W., Jr., 748.
Diehl, George, 121, 171, 196.
Diehl, Harold S., 607.
Diehl, Jacob, 607, 697.
Diehl, Joseph Dale, 629.
Dinges, Wilton C., 885.
Dining facilities (see also Dining Hall), 147-50, 191, 272, 512-3, 532, 624, 733.
Dining Hall, 639, 851, 971, 1004.
Director of church relations, 887.
Director of development, 763-4, 771, 790-1, 803.
Discipline of students, 154-7, 323-8, 610-1, 879-80, 916, 1011.
Distinguished Alumni Certificates, 965.
Distribution requirements, 545-6, 546, 866, 882.
District of Columbia, 168, 973.
Division for Mission in North America, Lutheran Church, 985.
Division of College and University Work, National Lutheran Council, 794.
Dobbin, Alexander, 22-3, 170, 471.
Documents and Readings in the History of Europe Since 1918, 775.
Doll, Mary, 84.
Donald, David, 994, 997.
Dougherty, Roy C., 747.
Douglas, Lloyd C., 603.
Downing, Augustus S., 715.
Drais, Bess M. (later Layman), 304.
Dramatics, 343, 635-9, 935-6.
Drexel University, 949.
Drug problem, 1013.
Dunbar, William H., 196, 369, 403.
Duncan, C. William, 416, 753.
Duncan, Charles S., 354, 368, 687, 869-90.
Duncan, Schmucker, 583.
Dunkards, 7.
Dunn, Seymour B., 785-6, 790-1, 806, 823, 866, 990.
DuPont Company, 416.
Durkee, Daniel, 141.
Dutch Reformed Church, 13-5.
Dysinger, Holmes, 377.
Earle, Mrs. George H., 729.
Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference (E.C.A.C.), 656, 683-4, 942.
Easton, 21, 201, 211, 227, 237.
Eatsit, 1004.
Eckert, Mrs. Frederick J., 909.
Eclipse of 1869, 249.
Economics and business administration, 553-4.
Edmiston, Guy S., 756.
Edmonds Act of 1921, 557, 559-60.
Educational Society, 640.
Educational Testing Service, 902.
Ehrhart, Kenneth S., 472.
Eichelberger, Matthew, 216.
Eichelberger, Percy S., 637.
Eisenhart, Luther P., 414, 464, 542, 607, 715.
Eisenhower (Dwight David) House, 971, 999.
Eisenhower (Dwight D.) Society, 1000.
Eisenhower statue, 999.
Elective studies, 276, 278-9.
Eliot, Charles W., 277-9, 289, 370.
Elson, Edward L. R., 1000.
Emmert, Wellington R., 685.
Emmitsburg, Md., 84, 349.
Endowed professorships, 86-7, 90-1, 216-9, 995.
Energy crisis, 1013.
Engineering program, 467, 470, 550-3, 562, 579.
Engineering Society, 640.
Engineers' Council for Professional Development, 552.
English in Pennsylvania, 5, 10, 13.
Enrollment (see Students in College).
Enrollment limits, 586-7, 906-7, 909.
Epicurean Club, 341.
Episcopallians, 15, 912.
Epplcy, Daniel, 199.
Equipment, 139-41, 315-8, 579-81, 895-8.
Equitable Life Insurance Company of Iowa, 821.
Erle, 431.
Erle Canal, 42.
Eta Sigma Phi, 640, 937.
Eternal Light Peace Memorial, 730.
European Theater of Operations, 787.
Euterpean Society, 165.
Evangelical Review, 174, 188.
Evangelicals and Reformed, 595.
Everett, Edward, 922.
Evergreen cemetery, Gettysburg, 157, 171-2, 189, 774, 799.
Evjen, John O., 491, 494, 568, 573.
Evolution, 583.
Executive Board, Lutheran Church, 485.
Eyster, George S., 239, 291-4, 371.

Fackenthal, Benjamin F., Jr., 441.
Fackenthal Library, 576.
Faculty, lists of long-time members, 499-500, 826-7.
Faculty, members of (1832-1986), 1038-60.
Faculty career process documents, 815-8.
Faculty committees, 504, 829-31.
Faculty handbook, 778.
Fahnestock, Henry J., 168.
Fahnestock, Samuel, 33, 35, 46, 80, 171, 173.
Fair Educational Opportunities Act of 1961, 913.
Fairbanks, Douglas, 618.
Falkler, Charles H., 748.
Fantastical parade, 297, 378, 671.
Far Eastern study program, 982.
"Farewell Song", 685.
Farm, proposed purchase of (1846), 118.
Farmers and Merchants Trust Company of Chambersburg, 263.
Farmer's day, 582.
Father's day, 483, 583, 899.
Fausold, Samuel, 697.
Fayette County, 36.
Federal League, 518.
Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, 784.
Federal Reserve Board building, 523.
Federalists, 43.
Federation of Gettysburg Clubs, 463, 689-90.
Feeder-college theory, 910.
Feeser, Angeline E. (see Haines).
Garver Greek Prize, 604.
Garver Latin Prize, 604.
G-Book (see Student handbook).
G-Club, 643.
Geiger, Hezekiah R., 312.
Gemmill, Robert M., 879.
General, the [see Willard Stewart Paul].
General Alumni Fund, 687.
General Council, Lutheran Church, 383-4, 386-7, 393, 708.
General Education Board, 410, 431-5, 440, 446, 471, 575, 708, 714.
General education courses, 866-70, 877.
Gerberich, Clyde E., 747, 753, 882, 995.
Gerhardt, William, 206.
German army, 689.
German church in Gettysburg (later St. James Lutheran and Trinity Reformed), 25, 38, 55, 116.
German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium in Pennsylvania and Adjacent States (see also Lutheran Ministerium), 18.
German professorship, 35, 39, 44, 87-8, 125-6, 176, 180, 196, 216, 233, 234-7.
German society (student), 165, 341.
Germans in Pennsylvania, 5, 7-9, 11, 13, 23, 34, 38-9, 53, 55, 57, 175.
Germantown, 198, 317.
Germany, 178, 193, 233, 253, 992.
Gettys, James, 22, 106.
Gettys, Samuel, 22, 106.
“Gettysburg”, 680.
Gettysburg Academy (institution and building), 3, 21, 23-8, 33, 35, 38, 41, 55, 69, 75, 85, 97, 104, 106, 118-9, 147, 170, 1016.
Gettysburg Academy, 1916-1935 (see Preparatory department).
Gettysburg and Harrisburg Railroad, 259.
Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association, 230, 379.
“Gettysburg Battle Song”, 632, 685.
Gettysburg – Black’s Tavern Turnpike, 242.
Gettysburg Centennial Commission, 996.
Gettysburg Challenger, 434.
Gettysburg Chamber of Commerce, 704, 727, 799, 975.
Gettysburg Classical School, 26-8, 32, 180.
“Gettysburg College: Its Future” (1959), 863.
“Gettysburg College: The Direction of Its Future” (1964), 859, 909.
Gettysburg College Archives, 895.
Gettysburg College Associates, 771.
Gettysburg College Monthly (see Pennsylvania College Monthly).
“Gettysburg College Plans to Meet the Needs of Returning Veterans”, 899.
Gettysburg College Press Association, 206.
Gettysburg Dramatic Club, 343.
Gettysburg Female Academy, 92, 108.
Gettysburg Gas Company, 171, 218, 379.
Gettysburg Guards, 38.
Gettysburg High School, 531, 694.
Greek revival architecture, 59-61, 848.
Green, John C., 212.
Greensburg, 223.
Grimm, Karl J., 491, 494, 498, 503, 566, 574-5, 578, 641, 718.
Group curricular system, 544-5, 562, 589, 582, 595.
Gruenther, Alfred M., 1000.
Gunther, John, 924.
Gustafson, Delwin X., 901.
Gustavus Adolphus College, 465, 984.
Gwinner, John F., 201.
Gymnasium [see Gettysburg Gymnasium, McCreary Gymnasium, and Linnaean Hall].

Haas, Donald A., 756.
Hafer, William W., 263.
Hagerstown, Md., 16, 18-21, 110, 211, 227, 360.
Hahnemann University Medical School, 885.
Halnes, Angeline F., 650, 749, 756.
Haines, Harry L., 728.
Hake, Peter, 108.
Hall of Athletic Honor, 944.
Hamilton, John B., 265.
Hamilton College, 104, 219, 233, 441, 760.
Hamme School of Theology, 968.
Hammam, Louis J., 868, 943.
Hamme, Herbert G., 505.
Hamme, J. Alfred, 522-4, 836.
Hamme, John B., 523.
Hampshire, John H., 895.
Hamscher, M. Roy, 986.
Hanover, 135, 253, 349, 413, 453.
Hanover Junction, Hanover, and Gettysburg Railroad, 172.
Hanson, Anne Keet McGlynn, 790-9, 834.
Hanson, Carl Arnold, 751, 754, 756-9, 767, 769, 793-9, 803, 807, 809, 812, 815, 817, 819-20, 824, 826-8, 831, 833-4, 844-5, 847-8, 855-60, 890, 897, 899, 909, 913, 935, 946, 948, 950, 966, 972, 983-6, 988, 990, 994-6, 999, 1001-15, 1017.
Hanson, Elizabeth Painter, 481-2, 643, 699, 729, 773-4.
Hanson, James C. M., 573.
Hanson, Jean Landefeld, 794, 798.
Hanson, Robert D., 756.
Hanson (Elizabeth Painter and Henry W. A.) Hall, 250, 832, 836, 839, 909.
Hanson (Henry W. A.) scholarship, 886.
Harding, Warren G., 510.
Harkey, Simeon W., 169.
Harper, Robert C., 33, 43-4, 46, 50, 57-8, 78, 80, 98, 106, 147, 171, 183, 190.
Harrisburg, 33, 36, 44-6, 51, 54-5, 83, 81, 89-91, 183-4, 199, 210-1, 218, 353, 357, 390, 405, 413, 418, 537, 774.
Harrison, Philip L., 272.
Harshbarger, Karl, 935.
Hartman, Cora E. (later Berkey), 303-4.
Hartman, David, 1016.
Hartman, Leslie M., 940.
Hartshorne, William D., 682.
Hartwick College, 697, 984.
Hartwick seminary, 15, 697.
Hartzell, Mildred H., 828, 907.
Harvard Medical School, 1015.
Haskins, J. Richard, 684.
Hasskarl, Gottlieb C. H., 293.
Hassler, Charles W., 158.
Hassler Latin Prize, 156, 311, 605.
Hatter, George C., 843.
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Housing and Home Finance Agency, 764.
Howard, Oliver O., 135, 380.
Hubbard, Willis M., 895.
Huber, Charles H., 272-3, 275, 364, 432, 489, 513, 530-6, 542, 607.
Huber, Eli, 121, 239, 272, 285, 393-4, 447, 575.
Huber, Henry S., 80, 102, 171, 173.
Huber Hall, 512-4, 518, 526, 532-8.
Hughes, Charles Evans, 567.
Hulton, Robert T., 946-8.
Hummel, George H., 416, 659, 661, 685.
Hummel, R. Eugene, 946-7.
Humphrey, Hubert H., 1012.
Hunter, Samuel, 68.
Hymn, College, 603-4, 681, 685, 922, 980.
Ikeler, Donald F., 837.
Illinois State University, 89, 101, 129, 168, 374, 387.
In, the, 926, 1002.
Independent, 616.
India, 168, 293, 345, 963.
Indiana, 232, 377, 568.
Indiana, Penna., 413, 590.
Indiana County, 86.
Indiana State Teachers College, 697.
Indianapolis, Ind., 231.
Infirmary, 107, 257, 433, 506, 514, 526, 832, 834, 639-40, 971.
Inglebert, Carrie E. (later Dougherty), 304.
Institute for Public Service, 446.
Insurance Economic Society of America, 471.
Intercollegiate Broadcasting System, 940.
Intercollegiate Conference on Government, 937.
Intercollegiate Newspaper Association, 650.
Interdenominational Seminary, Puerto Rico, 697.
Interfraternity Council (I.F.C.), 627-8, 929-30, 932, 1006.
International Correspondence Schools, 988.
International Relations Club, 843, 936.
Iota Lambda Delta, 339, 621.
Iowa, 249.
Ireland, 168.
Irving, Washington, 601.
Irving College, 274, 593.
Italy, 193.
Ivy day, 307, 601, 920.
Ivy League, 904.
Jackson, Andrew, 43, 180.
Jackson, Jerome C., 488, 631, 637.
Jackson, Jerry, 935.
Jacobs, David, 26, 29, 31, 98.
Jacobsen, Hugh Newell, 849.
Jaffee, Michael, 1016.
Janitors, 147, 265-6, 528-30, 855-6.
Japan, 293, 370, 734, 740, 766.
Jarvis, Chester E., 616.
Jefferson, Thomas, 34, 139.
Jefferson Medical College, 99, 143, 145, 885.
Jeffersonians, 43.
Jepson, Sophia, 607.
Jews, 595, 927.
Johnson, Andrew, 115.
Johnson, Arthur S., 619.
Johnson, C. Harold, 746, 748.
Johnson, Edwin T., 749-50, 756.
Johnson, Lester O., 505, 559, 566, 818.
Johnson, Lyndon B., 1001.
Johnson-Goldwater campaign, 1001.
Johnson’s New Universal Cyclopaedia, 383.
Johnstown, 196, 201, 413.
Jones, W. Ramsay, 914.
Jones, William G., 137.
Jones, William H., 914.
Juniata College, 274, 637.
Junior year abroad, 871.
Junto, 940.
Kadel, William H., 968.
Kaltenborn, Hans V., 603.
Kansas, 182, 635.
Kappa Delta Epsilon, 640, 937.
Kappa Delta Rho, 621, 933, 998.
Kappa Epsilon Alpha, 641.
Kappa Phi Kappa, 640, 937.
Kauffman, Charles H., 685.
Keefer, Luther R., 256.
Keeney, Dorothy J. (later Peterson), 620.
Keeny, Spurgeon M., 472, 676, 656, 686, 924.
Keller, Benjamin, 78, 87, 102, 106, 171.
Keller, Emanuel, 76.
Keller, Frederick A. M., 108.
Keller, Hiram H., 747, 749-50, 753.
Kelly, Jones, and Company, 281.
Kennedy, Eugene P., 1015.
Kennedy, John F., 899, 997, 1001.
Kenney, Grace C., 946-7.
Kent State University, 1009.
Kenworthy, Robert, 950.
Kessler, George W., 689.
Keysville, Md., 275.
Kinard, Michael M., 293.
King, Henry C., 568.
Kip, Judith W., 756.
Kipling, Rudyard, 477.
Kirkpatrick, William S., 256.
Kline (Josiah W. and Bessie H.) Foundation, 851.
Kline Theatre, 851, 936.
Klose, William H., 293-4.
Knickerbocker, John H., 576-9, 705, 891-2, 995.
Knight, Grant C., 837.
Knoxville College, 1001.
Knubel, Frederick H., 413, 421, 589, 603, 709.
Korean War, 773, 871, 992.
Korte, Edwerth E., 777, 925-6.
Kramer house, 834.
Krauth, Charles Porterfield, 93.
Krauth, Harriet, 96.
Krauth, John M., 198-9, 377.
Krauth, Sarah P. (Sallie), 314, 572, 574.
Kroh, Millard L., 472.
Krug, Albert M., 840.
Kruse, Ernest J., 756.
Kuhn, Margaret E., 924.
Kunes, Robert L., 791.
Kunkle, Benjamin S., 199, 253.
Kunkle, George B., 416, 442.
Kurth, Arthur L., 868.
Kurtz, Benjamin, 19-20, 76, 78-9, 171, 174, 178, 190.
Kutztown normal school, 292.
Lafayette, Marquis de, 34, 172.
LaFollette, Robert M., 649.
Lambda Chi Alpha, 621, 928, 933.
Lancaster, 11-12, 14, 21, 75, 78, 87, 226, 337, 405.
Lancaster County, 7, 38, 318.
Land-grant colleges, 141-2.
Langsam, Julie E., 776.
Langsam, Walter C., 751, 758, 763.

Lark, Charles T., 416, 685-6.
Larkin, George R., 505, 553, 632.
Latest Out, 327.
Latourette, Kenneth S., 587.
Latrobe, Benjamin, 59-61.
Laurel Lake, 534.
Law department, 141.
Lazy Club, 341.
Leader, George M., 996.
Leathers, Doyle R., 534-5, 660, 662.
Lebanon, 11, 196.
Lebanon County, 7.
Lebanon Valley College, 359, 949-50.
Lee, Dorothy G., 489, 499.
Lefever, Jacob, 43, 46.
Lehigh County, 7, 36, 57, 318.
Leitzell, Charles W., 697.
Lemnitzer, Lyman L., 924.
Leuchtenburg, William E., 740.
Leuws, Elsie Singmaster, 591, 607.
Leuws, Harold S., 636.
Lewis, Dio (Dioclesian), 246.
Liaison, 1002.
Liberty Loan Drive, 704, 722.
Library (also Samuel Simon Schmucker Library), 68, 135-9, 161, 168, 257, 313-5, 572-9, 618, 832, 843-4, 850, 891-5, 993, 995.
Lieber, Francis, 164.
Lincoln, Robert, 244.
Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania, 704.
Lincoln-175, 995.
Lindbergh, Charles A., 409, 569.
Lindeman, Ralph D., 816.
Linnaean Association, 108-12, 130, 163-4, 245, 334-5, 373.
Linnaeus, 163.
Lippincott Company, 775.
Literary Foundations course [see General Education courses].
Literary Record and Journal of the Linnaean Association of Pennsylvania College, 164.
Literary societies [see Philomathæan and Phrenakosmian Societies], 159-63.
Loats, John, 199, 214.
Locher, Jack, 873.
Locher, Nancy, 914.
Lochman, Augustus H., 76, 78-9, 190, 196, 253.
Lock Haven High School, 299.
Logan, Rowland E., 879.
Longwood Foundation, 768, 846.
Loomis, Edna (later Hefelbower), 304, 455.
Loose, John H., 884, 943.
Loucks, Lester, 685.
Louisiana, 963.
Lovejoy, Clarence E., 904.
“Loyalty Song”, 685.
Luray Caverns, 318.
Luther, Martin, 298, 603.
Lutheran, 591.
Lutheran Church and the College, 173-9, 382-403, 705-13, 977-88.
Lutheran Church in America, 752, 979, 984-5, 987-8, 990, 1016.
Lutheran College for Women, 590-1, 593.
Lutheran liturgy of 1766, 8.
Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago, 908.
Memorial Athletic Medical College Admission Day, 582.
Memorial Day, 582.
Mencken, Henry L., 895.
Menges, Franklin, 239, 293-4, 334, 401.
Mennonites, 718.
Merrimac, 156, 75.
Merrimac Academy, 299.
Mercury (College Mercury), 345-6, 645-7, 653, 939, and passim.
Messiah Lutheran Church, Harrisburg, 476.
Methodists, 301, 493, 595, 801, 912, 987.
Metzger, Frederick E., 697.
Mexico, 533.
Middle Atlantic Conference (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference), 656, 942-3, 949-50.
Middlecoff, David, 46, 55.
Middle States accrediting visits and reports, 779, 783, 789, 805, 808, 810, 812, 814, 819, 823, 829, 861-3, 870-2, 874-5, 880, 885, 889-90, 892, 895-6, 905, 943, 946, 948, 1001.
Middle States Association, 300, 405-6, 410, 412, 427, 471, 486, 492, 536, 539, 541, 575, 584, 715-7, 775, 815, 901, 910, 990-1.
Middleton, Robert W., 43, 45.
Middletown, 122.
Midland College, 488, 697.
Mifflin, Thomas, 11.
Military ball, 519, 626.
Military instruction or science, 143, 294-5, 585.
Military Memorial Prize, 604.
Miller, Anna R., 275.
Miller, Benjamin K., 575.
Miller, Daniel R., 340, 369.
Miller, George R., 498.
Miller, Harvey C., 416.
Miller, Henderson N., 293-4.
Miller, Margaret E., 514.
Miller, Robert S., 619.
Miller, Thomas C., 33, 36, 38, 44, 46, 58, 63, 67, 76, 80.
Miller, William J., 413.
Miller Hall, 340.
Millersville Normal School (later State University), 353.
Milton, John, 234.
Milwaukee, Wis., 575.
Ministerial Association, 643.
Ministerium of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America, 19.
Minstrel and Dramatic Troupe, 343.
Mission of LCA Colleges and Universities, The, 984.
Missionary Institute at Selinsgrove (see Susquehanna University).
Model United Nations Team, 938.
Modern Book Club, 577, 643, 892.
Modern Language Association, 405, 718.
Montgomery County, 7.
Montour County, 215.
Moody, Dwight L., 335.
Moore, Carey A., 822.
Moorhead, M. Scott, 822.
Moravians, 7, 15.
Morgan, Edwin 8., 213.
Morgan, William, 43.
Morrill Act of 1862, 141-2.
Morris, Charles A., 78, 190, 212, 216.
Morris, Elizabeth C., 317.
Morris, Robert, 11.
Moser, Franklin W., 636-7.
Mother's day, 483, 583, 899.
Motter, Murray G., 292.
Mount St. Mary's College, 131, 153, 349, 875.
Moving the College from Gettysburg, proposals, 51, 170-1, 178-9.
Moyer, Will D., 660.
Mudd, Samuel A., 879.
Muhlenberg, Frederick A., 87, 101, 156, 171, 176, 179, 182, 190, 222, 231-2, 384-5.
Muhlenberg, Henry, 11-2.
Muhlenberg, Henry Melchor, 14.
Muhlenberg, Hister H., 83, 137, 140.
Muhlenberg, Peter, 11.
Muhlenberg Freshman Prize, 158, 311, 605.
Muller, Steven, 924.
Music department, 969, 971.
Musical organizations, 165, 341-2, 629-33, 645, 654, 933-5.
Musselman, Carrie, 574, 576.
Musselman, Christian H., 787, 792.
Musselman, Emma C., 787.
Musselman, John M., 749.
Musselman Foundation, 788, 846, 882.
Musselman (Emma C.) Foundation, 787, 789, 844, 848-51.
Musselman (Emma C.) Hall, 839.
Musselman Library/Learning Resources Center, 738, 840-50, 853, 894-6, 971.
Musselman Stadium, 845, 944, 999.
Musselman Visiting Scientist program, 882.
Muste, A. J., 587.
Myrtle Terrace, 835.
Nader, Ralph, 881.
Nagle, Robert S., 865.
Napoleonic Wars and German Nationalism in Austria, The (1930), 775.
National Collegiate Athletic Association, 942, 950.
National Conference on Immigration and Americanization, 471.
National Education Association, 539, 901.
National Flag Conference, 510.
National Interfraternity Conference, 926.
National Lutheran Educational Conference, 471, 708.
National Register of Historic Places, 848.
National Science Foundation, 760, 897.
National Teachers' Examination, 890.
National Youth Administration, 724.
Nebraska, 835.
Nevins, Allan, 924, 993-4.
New Deal, 649.
New England, 90, 635, 973.
New Haven, Conn., 233.
New Jersey, 7-8, 558, 594, 912, 973.
New Market, Va., 18.
New Oxford, 250.
New Recitation Building (see Glatfelter Hall).
New York (state), 8, 15, 42, 233, 236, 558, 594, 912, 973, 984.
New York and New Jersey Synod, 403.
New York Library School, 576.
New York Public Library, 576.
New York State Education Department, 717.
New York Synod, 18-9.
New York University, 274, 486, 576, 781.
Newberry College, 168, 293, 374, 697, 968.
Newfoundland, 447, 450.
News Flashes from Gettysburg College, 919, 966.
Newton, John, 380.
Newville, 227, 455.
Newville road, 58.
Niagara Falls, 318.
Nicely, George W., 619, 659.
Nicholas, Jacob R., 619.
Nicholas Bible Prize, 604.
Nicholson, John Page, 466.
Niebuhr, Richard, 587.
Nineteenth Century Club, 278.
Nixon, Richard, 1001, 1009, 1012.
Nixon Field, 355-6, 653, 655, 657, 672, 721, 849, 855.
Noes, three, 484, 679, 953.
Non-Western studies program, 874-5, 990.
Nordvall, Robert C., 1011.
Normal schools, 142, 274, 295, 557.
Norris, Thomas C., 756.
Norstad, Lauris, 1000.
North Central Association, 784.
Northampton County, 7, 318.
Northern Illinois University (see Illinois State University).
Northfield Y.M.C.A. Conferences, 335, 365, 618.
Northwestern College, 233.
Nott, Eliphalet, 180-1.
Notz, Frederick William Augustus, 233, 241, 327, 385, 492.
Nunamaker, Norman K., 893.
Oakland, Cal., 430-1.
Observatory, 246-50, 286, 405, 506, 514, 526, 843.
Ockershausen, Adolphus F., 90, 216-7.
Ockershausen, George P., 90, 199, 216-7, 266.
Off-campus study, 871, 878.
Ohio, 588.
Ohio monument, 360.
Ohio Synod, 18.
Old Dorm (see Pennsylvania Hall).
"Old Dorm in the Moonlight", 685.
Old Ladies' Home Journal, 652
Ohio, 517.
Omicron Delta Kappa, 642.
One hundred twenty-five anniversary of the College (1957), 993-9.
"On Gettysburg", 681.
Open visitation, 1008.
Oracle of Delphi, 477.
Orange and Blue Club, 772.
"Orange and the Blue, The", 365-6, 680.
Oriental art collection, 895.
Orientation course for freshmen, 548, 595, 866-7.
Orientation program for freshmen, 483, 595, 898, 915.
Orso, Paul M., 749.
Osaga, 534.
Osaga Lodge, 534, 536, 620.
Ostrom, John W., 685.
Our Centennial Olio, 347, 363.
Our Olio, 271, 347, 363.
Outing Club, 938.
Owl and Nightingale, 519-20, 636-8, 645, 837, 935.
Oxford University, 635.

Packard, James W., 441.
Pacific School of Religion, 697.
Packer, Asa, 180, 213.
Painter, Julia, 293.
Pardee, Ario, 212.
Parsons, Louis A., 474, 491, 494, 497-8, 580.
Paterno, Joseph V., 922.
Patrick, William H., Jr., 747, 753, 782, 839.
Patrick Hall, 839, 1008.
Patrons of Pennsylvania College, 28, 35, 38, 46, 57, 75-6.
Patterson, James, 44-6, 51-3, 55, 57.
Patton, George S., 787.
Paul, Luella Musselman Arnold, 792, 844, 853.
Paul, Ruth Sieurin, 792.
Paul (Willard S.) Hall, 838, 840-1, 849.
Paul (Luella Musselman) Recital Hall, 851.
Paulsen, Bertha, 499.
Paulus, Louis, 972.
Pavlantos, Ruth E., 893.
Paxton, William, 25, 38.

Peace Corps, 1001.
Pearl Harbor, 730.
Pearson, Davis, 217.
Pearson professorship, 217, 232.
Peery, Rufus B., 293-4, 697.
Penn, William, 5.
Penn-Harris hotel, Harrisburg, 416.
Penn proprietors, 5.
Pennsylvania, 533, 558, 594, 743, 912, 973.
Pennsylvania Association of College Dramatic Clubs, 838.
Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities, 990.
Pennsylvania Chautauqua, 230.
Pennsylvania College and the Lutheran Church, 386, 396.
Pennsylvania College Base Ball Club, 349.
Pennsylvania College Monthly, 343-5, and passim.
Pennsylvania College of Gettysburg, 3, 34, 39, 54, 69, 73, 76.
Pennsylvania College of Gettysburg, proposals to change the name, 205-7, 420-2, 687.
Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776, 5.
Pennsylvania Female College, 205.
Pennsylvania Gazette, 9.
Pennsylvania Hospital, 145.
Pennsylvania Industrial Welfare and Efficiency Conference, 471.
Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Oratorical Union, 342, 634-5.
Pennsylvania Military Academy, 295.
Pennsylvania monument, 582.
Pennsylvania Motor List Company, 843.
Pennsylvania Railroad, 102, 443.
Pennsylvania Senate, 799.
Pennsylvania State College (later University), 142, 205-6, 295, 315, 360, 631, 656, 989.
Pennsylvania State Education Association, 640.
Pennsylvania State Library, 575.
Pennsylvania Synod (see Lutheran ministerium).
Pennypacker, Samuel W., 380.
Pennypacker Club, 341.
Pensions, 208, 447-50, 483, 503, 821.
Peterson, Oliver A., 619.
Peterson, Paul G., 771, 791, 797.
Pew Memorial Trust, 769.
Pfeffer, Fred G., 472.
Ph.D. programs (honorary and in course), 292-4, 312-3, 457-8.
Phi Alpha Theta, 641, 937.
Phi Beta Kappa, 241, 471, 474, 486, 642-3, 717, 725, 776, 882, 910, 937-8, 1012, 1016.
Phi Beta Kappa Visiting Scholar Program, 882.
Phi Delta Epsilon, 653, 938.
Phi Kappa Eta, 641.
Phi Lambda Sigma, 640, 937.
Phi Sigma Alpha, 937.
Philadelphia Athletics, 519.
Philadelphia-Baltimore railroad, 61.
Philadelphia College of Medicine, 146.
Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, 236.
Philadelphia County, 5.
Philadelphia Phillies, 519.
Philadelphia Press, 258.
Philadelphia Public Schools, 466.
Philadelphiaische Correspondenz, 9.
Philhellenic Society, 640.
Philo Dramatic Club, 343.
Philomathaean Hall, 107, 161, 257, 332-3, 618.
Phrenakosmian Hall, 107, 161, 257, 332-3, 618.
Physical training (or education) requirement, 288-9, 563-5, 866, 952.
Pi Delta Epsilon, 653, 938.
Pi Kappa Eta, 641.
Pi Lambda Sigma, 640, 937.
Pi Sigma Alpha, 937.
Pickering, James D., 791, 806.
Pickett’s charge, 185, 996.
Picking, Harry (Henry) C., 199, 201, 368, 375, 377, 418, 424, 475, 487, 687, 690, 703, 713.
Pillsbury, Charles A., 193.
Pinchot, Gifford, 567.
Pine Grove, 301.
Pittsburgh, 21, 42, 172, 193, 195-6, 223, 416, 443, 698-9, 746.
Pittsburgh Synod, 174, 210, 387-8, 394.
Pitzer, Rosa B., 275.
Plank, Edward S., 519.
Plank, Ira D., 660-1.
Plank, Rosa E., 275.
Plank Field, 855.
Planning, 752, 755, 796, 802, 835, 849, 856-61.
Platt, Charles E., 873.
Playing fields, 119, 246, 250, 944.
Renshaw, James, 44.
Reserve Officers Training Corps (R.O.T.C.), 419, 534, 554-6, 564-5, 607, 722-3, 733, 845, 871, 880, 922, 991, 1010.
Residential Life Commission, 1006-7, 1013.
Resources and Standards of Colleges of Arts and Sciences... (1918), 438, 492, 531, 582, 715.
Reuning house, former Gettysburg Academy building, 1016.
Revelator, 326.
Revett, Nicholas, 62.
Rhodes Scholarship program, 458, 471, 656.
Rice, Arthur E., 659.
Rice, John W., 199, 303.
Rice, Luene, 729, 989.
Rice, Paul B., 416.
Rice (John S.) Hall, 838.
Richards, James H., 894-5.
Richardson, Norman E., 811, 869, 874.
“Rights and Responsibilities of Students, The”, 1011.
Riis, Jacob, 567.
Ritner, Joseph, 43.
“Rivals, The”, 638.
Robinson, Edward, 93-4, 103.
Rock Creek Presbyterian Church, 22.
Rockefeller, John D., 41, 193, 431, 434, 446.
Rockefeller Foundation, 420.
Rockey, Keller E., 924.
Rockey, Ordean, 656.
Rockingham County, Va., 18.
Rogers, Charles, 632.
Roister Doister Club, 343.
Roman Catholics, 7, 15, 302, 595, 912, 927.
“Romancers, The”, 636.
Roosevelt, Theodore, 649.

Rosenberger, Russell S., 868.
Ross, Edward A., 568.
Roth, Elias, 250.
Roth, Henry W., 377.
Rothrock, John L., 441, 607.
Rowe, Joseph E., 455-6, 572, 607, 697, 727.
Rowland, Alex T., 879.
Royston, Carroll W., 749.
Ruby, George W., 312.
Rudisill, Earl S., 697.
Rudolph, Frederick, 125.
Rush, Benjamin, 6-7, 9-13, 22.
Rusk, Dean, 997.
Russia, 193.
Rutgers University, 694, 949.
Ruthrauff, Albert, 848.
Ruthrauff, Frederick, 19.
Ruthrauff, Jonathan, 76.
Ryneal, George, 197, 199, 253.

Sabbatical leaves, 483, 500-2, 813.
Saby, Rasmus S., 501, 549, 553, 563, 640, 712.
Sacajawean Club, 643.
Sadler, Benjamin, 236, 377.
Sage, Henry W., 212.
Sager, Adeline, 219, 442.
Sager professorship, 442-3, 583.
Sages, 641.
Sahm, Peter and Susan, 443.
Sahm, William K. T., 443, 689.
Sahm professorship, 443.
St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, 230.
St. Francis Xavier Roman Catholic Church, Gettysburg, 625.
St. James Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, 25, 87, 172, 325, 403, 434, 809.
St. Joseph’s College, 875.
St. Joseph’s University, 949.
St. Louis, Mo., 519.
St. Luke’s Lutheran Church, Pittsburgh, 478.
St. Olaf College, 632.
St. Paul, Minn., 441.
St. Paul's A.M.E. Zion Church, Gettysburg, 379, 925.
Salaries, faculty and administrative, 82, 220, 444-7, 819-23.
Salzer, Bertram H., 831-2, 837, 885.
Sanders, Charles F., 426, 432, 497-8, 503, 548-9, 553, 556, 559-60, 575, 583, 634, 641, 705.
Sandlas, William H., 747, 753.
Saunders, Leon C., 534.
Saunders, William, 267.
Sayre, Francis B., 734.
Scabbard and Blade, 641, 937.
Scandinavia, 178, 193.
Sceptical Chymists, 640, 937.
Sceptical Chymists Prize, 604.
Scherer, James A., 8, 293-4, 697.
Scherer, John Jacob, 377.
Scherian, Charles A., 199, 214, 253.
Schildknecht, Calvin E., 884.
Schlegel, John J., 791, 797, 803, 975.
Schmidt, Emilie O., 935-6.
Schrack, Henry M., 882, 996.
Scharf Lecture (Henry M. Scharf Lecture on Current Affairs), 882.
Scott, Hugh, 924.
Scott, J. Bion, 239.
Scott, Walter, 139, 307.
Scott, Walter J., 884.
Scranton, William W., 1000.
Sculpture, sesquicentennial, 1017.
Seal, College, 422.
Seabrook, and Company, 570.
Second Continental Congress, 4, 6.
Second Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, 61.
Secretary of Education, Penna., 754.
Secretary of the Air Force, U.S.A., 991.
Seebach, Margaret Himes, 607.
Selective Service appeal board, 485.
Sell, Edward H. M., 289.
Semester hours, 544.
Seminars, 878-9, 883.
Sentinel (later Star and Sentinel), 33, 38-9, 43, 47, 68, 173, 182-3.
Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill of Rights), 742.
Sesquicentennial celebration (1982), 768, 967, 1015-7.
Settlement, Frederick H., 756.
Seventy-fifth anniversary of the College (1907), 430, 719-20.
Seventy-fifth Infantry Division, 787.
Seward, William H., 997.
Seymour, E., 141.
Shafer, Raymond P., 845.
Shafer, W. Frederick, 492, 502, 566, 632.
Shainline, John W. (Jack), 790-1, 911.
Shand, John D. (Jack), 822.
Shannon, Arline E., 756.
Sheets, Howard F., 624, 625, 933.
Sheffler, Daniel, 42, 44, 46, 76.
Sheffield Scientific School, 465.
Shenandoah County, Va., 18.
Shenandoah valley, 183.
Shepherdstown, W. Va., 95.
Shipman, William, 413.
Shipman, William, 413.
Shirer, William L., 822.
Shoemaker, Howard R., 946-7.
Shryock, George, 58.
Shryock, Richard H., 145.
Sibbet, Robert L., 289.
Sickles, Daniel E., 360.
Sieber, Paul R., 747, 753, 840.
Sieber-Fisher Infirmary, 840, 851.
Sigma Alpha Epsilon, 339, 620, 624, 933.
Sigma Alpha Iota, 937.
Sigma Chi, 166, 336, 339-41, 620, 624, 933.
Sigma Kappa, 933.
Sigma Nu, 933.
Sigma Pi Sigma, 937.
Sigma Sigma Sigma, 933.
Stillman, Benjamin, 164.
Silver, James W., 994.
Silver Spring, Md., 590.
Simonton, Chester S., 637, 746-7, 753, 983.
Simpson, Joseph T., 748, 999.
Singmaster, John A., 607, 697.
Sircia, John J., 924.
Sittler, Joseph, 924.
Sketch Club, 643.
Slaybaugh, James F., 893.
Sloat, C. Allen, 472, 505, 823.
Slocum, Henry W., 380.
Smeltzer, Josiah P., 168.
Smith, Adam, 484.
Smith, Allen J., 466, 606.
Smith, Charles Emory, 258.
Smith, Edgar Fahs, 145, 291, 516, 542, 606.
Smith, Henry I., 128.
Smith, John E., 369.
Smith, Joseph J., 260-1.
Smith, Margaret Chase, 924.
Smith, Robert D., 963-4.
Smith, Stewart H., 966.
Smith, William H., 131.
Smithsonian Institution, 234.
Smoke, Lillian L., 892, 894-5.
Smoke Laboratory Suite, 846.
Smokers, 627.
Smyser, Edward G., 199.
Snyder, Samuel F., 432, 475, 487.
Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 718.
Soldiers' National Cemetery, 172, 188, 198, 267, 568, 704, 996-7.
Soldiers' Orphans' home, 172.
Somerset County, 36.
Songs and Hymns for Commencement, 681.
Songs, College, 385-7, 680-5, 960.
"Sons of Gettysburg", 680-1, 683, 685.
Sons of Hercules, 360, 653.
Sons of the American Revolution, 992.
Sophomore Band, 673, 676.
Sophomore Players, 636, 662.
Sororities, 339, 621, 927-33.
South College [see McKnight Hall].
Southeast Asia, 739-41.
Soviet Union, 739-41, 992.
Spanish-American War, 379.
Spanish Club, 641, 937.
Special students program, 292, 546.
Spectrum, 347-8, 650-1, 939, and passim.
Spock, Benjamin, 881-2.
Sprecher, Samuel, 169.
Spring Garden Band, 685.
Spring Grove, 201, 252, 414.
Springer, Francis, 169.
Springer, Nancy Connor, 895.
Spring Hotel, 307, 366.
Sproul, William C., 603.
Sputnik, 741.
Stahler, Harry L., 528.
Stahler Memorial Gardens, 528.
Stahley, George D., 235, 237, 239-41, 260, 288-90, 317, 334-5, 351, 353-4,
Stahley (George Diehl) Hall, 842, 849, 851.
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