

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

The University of Montana: Institutional
Mythology and Historical Reality

George M. Dennison

2017

The University of Montana: Institutional Mythology and Historical Reality

George M. Dennison

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/theuniversityofmontana>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Dennison, George M., "The University of Montana: Institutional Mythology and Historical Reality" (2017).
The University of Montana: Institutional Mythology and Historical Reality. 1.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/theuniversityofmontana/1>

This Manuscript is brought to you for free and open access by the George M. Dennison at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Montana: Institutional Mythology and Historical Reality by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA:
INSTITUTIONAL MYTHOLOGY AND HISTORICAL REALITY

by

George M. Dennison
President and Professor *Emeritus*
Senior Fellow
The Carroll and Nancy O'Connor Center
for the Rocky Mountain West
The University of Montana

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	P. 3
--------------	------

VOLUME I

INTRODUCTION.....	P. 12
-------------------	-------

CHAPTER I: THE FORMATIVE YEARS, 1893-1916.....	P. 41
--	-------

CHAPTER II: LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE, 1916-1920.....	P. 136
---	--------

CHAPTER III: THE MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITY, 1921-1935.....	P. 230
--	--------

VOLUME II

CHAPTER IV: THE INSTITUTIONAL CRISIS, WORLD WAR II, AND THE ABORTIVE EFFORT TO RE-INVENT THE MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITY.....	P. 1
--	------

CHAPTER V: MODERNIZATION AND GRADUATE EXPANSION, 1946-1972.....	P.
---	----

CHAPTER VI: THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA AND THE MONTANA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM, 1972-1995.....	P.
--	----

EPILOGUE: THE RESEARCH UNIVERSITY, 1995-2015.....	P.
---	----

GUIDE TO PRIMARY SOURCES.....	P.
-------------------------------	----

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	P.
--------------------------	----

END NOTES.....	P.
----------------	----

INDEX.....	P.
------------	----

PREFACE

The history of The University of Montana entails much more than celebrating great leaders, reconnecting with old friends and mentors, or debunking the myths that helped to shape the campus culture and reified the intellectual ambience. It also involves more than celebrating the "Harvard in Missoula" or invoking first President John Oscar Craig's famous epigram: "The University of Montana -- It Shall Prosper."¹ Institutional leaders embody the institutional persona, old friends and mentors exert a very strong appeal for universal reasons, and campus myths persist because of the human desire for explanations of developments otherwise seemingly inexplicable. As examples, most people know of the myth about The University of Montana as a "graveyard of presidents;" or the one concerning the malevolent influence of the Anaconda Copper Company; or still another detailing the consequences of a distributed higher education system rather than one consolidated university. Others, less general but still quite influential, abounded.

In a real way, the University shared and shares with the state a seemingly irresistible attraction to the "commemoration of myth and not of fact," as K. Ross Toole commented.²

Because the truth is that the average Montanan, even if he is perceptive and well read, knows very little about his real heritage. He has, rather, created one for himself. He idealizes the unfortunate Thomas Francis Meagher by placing a heroic equestrian statute of him on the Capitol lawn; as Walter Prescott Webb pointed out, he makes the cowboy into a noble knight of the prairies, and makes a Titian out of Charles M. Russell. From tragedy and hardship of the era of the open range he somehow makes romance. He makes a national monument of the Big Hole battlefield and somehow ignores the

incompatibility in the fact that the descendants of Chief Joseph today huddle in misery on their reservations.

Why have people succumbed to this emotional tendency? In that regard, Toole argued, "It is easier to ignore the past, or to deny that it has meaning for the present and the future, than to be confronted with the unclear composite in which an approximation of the truth shifts and moves in time." Be that as it may, the University community and the people of the state must eventually come to grips with a "real heritage." Persistent myths invariably exert a dynamic if always changing influence in historical development, revealing themselves in full only gradually as constituent elements of the living history identified through scholarly analysis and explication. In Requiem for a Nun, published in 1951, William Faulkner reminded us that "The past is never dead. It's not even past;" and, even earlier, in The Sound and the Fury (1929), that "A man never gets anywhere if his facts and his ledgers don't square."

When I first wrote these words, the presidential campaign of 2016 brought squarely before the public the imperative for historical truth and fact checking in what has become the "post-truth" era when only personal perception counts.³ An attempt to understand and explore the interrelationships of institutional mythology and historical reality, while paying some attention to the fond memories of old and new friends, the perspectives of mentors, and the ambitions of former leaders, shaped this study of the development of The University of Montana. Along the way, some occasional excursions seek "The Road to Character," as David Brooks so elegantly put it.⁴

The history of the University breaks naturally into seven distinct periods. The first, from 1893 to about 1916, encompassed the frontier or formative years, culminating in the dramatic act of the State Board of Education that unified the four semi-autonomous campuses into one University for a time.⁵ This last development contradicted or rather finessed the voters' overwhelming rejection of consolidation of the four institutions in the 1914 election. During the second period from 1916 to about 1921, a Chancellor of the multi-campus University of Montana established the structure, policies, and procedures necessary to sustain it and tested them in operation. The third period, 1921 to 1935, focused on the emergence of a mature undergraduate university in Missoula and the sporadic if futile efforts at reform and reinvention. It ended in the chaotic disarray caused by the Great Depression and the abrupt termination of the lengthy and remarkably successful administration of Charles H. Clapp.⁶

The fourth, from 1935 to 1945, bracketed the most traumatic period in the University's history. The period began with the bitterly divisive tenure of George Finlay Simmons and ended with the resignation of Ernest O. Melby after a brilliant if futile effort to heal the conflict and distrust of the Simmons years, manage the impact of WW II, and rationalize Montana higher education by imposing new functional missions on the six separate and virtually autonomous campuses for the post-war world. The fifth, from 1945 when Melby resigned in frustration to 1972, marked the modernization of the campus organizational, administrative, and academic structures. During these years, the State Board of Education assigned equal status to the State University, once again named The University of Montana, and the State College, renamed Montana State University. The period witnessed the expansion of graduate education

generating a host of conflicts about franchises and missions and culminated in the establishment of the Montana University System under the state's new Constitution in 1972.⁷

The sixth, from 1972 to 1995, centered on the clarification of campus roles and missions, the balance between campus programs and budgets in view of declining state support, the maturation of shared governance on the Missoula campus, and the implementation of strategic planning for the prudent use of scarce resources.⁸ The period closed with the unification of the several campuses into two multi-campus Universities, The University of Montana and Montana State University, within the Montana University System in 1994.

During the seventh period, from 1995 to the present, the mature research university took shape in Missoula. Harry Fritz, Emeritus Professor of History who has served the University for the better part of five decades, wrote the "Epilogue" covering this period of the University's history, including some consultation with the author. Annual expenditure of externally generated funds for research increased from less than \$6 million to more than \$80 million, with a corresponding increase in the number of doctoral and first professional degrees awarded in the sciences and selected professions. The undergraduate enrolment initially diversified, with an ever larger presence of nonresident students combined with a larger market share of the annual graduates from Montana high schools, followed by steep enrolment declines after 2010.

Most of this study focuses on the first six distinctive periods, exploring the convoluted pathway to mature university status. Each of the periods exhibits unique characteristics, four of growth and maturation, one of laying new foundations, and one of repairing damage that threatened the very existence of the University and an abortive effort to shore up the multi-campus

University. At four natural break points, a new institutional order emerged each with its own dynamic. The "Epilogue," written primarily by Professor Fritz -- the modern counterpart of Professor Morton J. Elrod⁹ -- sketches briefly the developments after 1995, with some speculation about prospects for the future.

II

Research for the book explored holdings of the voluminous K. ROSS TOOLE Archives and Special Collections, from the private papers of participants, minutes of governing entities, newspaper accounts, and relevant secondary sources. In addition, the author completed a professional biography of Professor Morton J. Elrod, one of Montana's premier educator-naturalists and nature photographers whose active career at The University of Montana covered most of the first four decades.¹⁰ Two other scholars attempted to publish histories of the University, one successfully and one still in manuscript form, and this study took full advantage of their works.

In the 1950s, Mrs. Mary Brennan Clapp, widow of the second longest-serving President of The University of Montana, Charles C. Clapp, traced the development of the undergraduate and seven professional school programs to the end of her late husband's tenure in 1935.¹¹ Based on discussions with President James A. McCain and several administrators, she eschewed footnotes in the interest of readability, although she frequently quoted at length from her late husband's letters and papers and other sources. More in the nature of a memoir than a history, her conclusions at times raised more questions than they answered and predictably aroused extreme criticism. She sought to enliven the pages with personal observations about people, events, and local and national developments during the years from 1921 to the late 1950s. When relatives of some important figures objected strenuously to certain of her characterizations, she opted not to publish the manuscript. As one of her major contributions,

she persuaded President Carl McFarland to purchase the microfilm of the Duniway Papers for the Toole Archives, an invaluable source. Mrs. Clapp's personal acquaintance with most of the principal figures and intimate familiarity with the events covered by the "Narrative" provides insights not otherwise available.

In the 1950s, H. G. Merriam, Chair of the Department of English, supported Mrs. Clapp's work to do the "Narrative," serving as source, critic, and editor on request.¹² A decade later, in 1968, the seventy-fifth anniversary of the chartering of the University, President Robert T. Pantzer identified the need for a readable history to facilitate his interactions with legislators and friends of the University. About the same time, Merriam and Professor Edmund L. Freeman proposed a brief, informative history of the University to educate the public generally. Pantzer invited Merriam to do the project with financial support from the University Foundation.¹³ In part, Pantzer accepted Merriam's proposal as a way to assist a distinguished retired Professor who, as many of the long-time faculty, enjoyed only a modest pension., at best a pittance given his years of distinguished service. Former President Charles H. Clapp had done the same when Professor Elrod suffered a paralytic stroke during the depths of the Great Depression.¹⁴

After two years of aggressive research, drawing extensively on his personal recollections and Clapp's "Narrative" which he did not cite (on President Pantzer's advice), Merriam published the only extant history of the University.¹⁵ In most respects. the Merriam History provides a personal memoir of his years as a member of the faculty, tracing the University's development from his arrival on campus in 1919 to 1970.¹⁶ While consciously striving to stand aloof from the events and controversies in which he had actively participated, Merriam focused

unbendingly on the achievements of the twelve presidential administrations. In fact, well aware of Mrs. Clapp's experience, he rigorously avoided conflict and accorded good intentions to all except George Finlay Simmons, where he found even neutrality impossible. As Simmons's son commented acidly, Merriam's "relations with Finlay Simmons (hatred on his side, and on Simmons' side a conviction that he -- Merriam -- was a major trouble-maker) are reflected in the fact that in a seven-page Introduction to this history, in which he informally discusses all of the other presidents, the name of Finlay Simmons is nowhere to be found."¹⁷ Nevertheless, Merriam's intimate knowledge of people and events, even within the context he created, rendered his work invaluable.

III

All caveats aside, Merriam's eloquent and elegant description of The University of Montana toward the close of his memoir *cum* administrative history captures attention and captivates the imagination. Borrowing from his long-time colleague, Professor Edmund L. Freeman, Merriam observed that in the history of The University of Montana,

Two facts stand out. The first is its resolute progress toward excellence, first as an undergraduate institution and then as a university with a complement, not yet full, of offerings both undergraduate and graduate. The second is its development in spite of happenings which might have wrecked it. Emeritus Professor Edmund L. Freeman has likened the University to 'a pine tree on a mountainside, tall and tough, but with many narrow growth rings and a number of gnarled limbs.' One might add what is implied, namely, that it has had a restricted amount of soil for cultivation and heavy winds and

icy winters to withstand. Yet, there it is, testimony to the age-old idea that success may come through the overcoming of difficulties.¹⁸

The following chapters seek to recount a vibrant story of human and institutional growth and maturation. The resultant narrative hopefully will carry the reader along the meandering paths of campus myths while also exploring the strategies, accomplishments, and failings of the people who built the University over the last century. Throughout, even while offering judgments based on cited evidence, the narrative strives to avoid partisan disputation in the full realization that the author came to the role of historian with biases generated by earning two degrees from and serving two decades as President of The University of Montana. In the end, however, as will become clear, he, too, as all of his predecessors, wrote from the perspective of founding President Oscar John Craig's immortal epigram: "The University of Montana -- It Shall Prosper!"¹⁹

IV

This project depended at the outset upon the support provided by then Commissioner of Higher Education Sheila M. Stearns and subsequently by President Royce Engstrom, in the form of a post-retirement contract and office space. In addition, several alumni and friends contributed generously to establish a fund to help cover the expenses of research and publication. Without listing these wonderful friends and supporters, I extend my sincere appreciation and assure them that their generosity made the difference for the project. In addition, Harry Fritz has contributed much more than the insightful "Epilogue" he produced.

The members of the Cosmos Club -- a town-gown group in Missoula that meets monthly except during the summer to hear papers by one of the members -- provided a forum for portions of

chapters of the earlier book on Morton J. Elrod and the history. I must also mention the willingness of Professor *Emeritus* James R. Habeck to share with me the results of his long-term fascination with the details of the history of the University and its people. Finally, I cannot exaggerate the support, attention, and assistance of University Archivist Donna McRae and her staff, especially Mark Fritsch. This project depended upon access to the voluminous and extensive archival and other collections of The K. Ross Toole Archives and The Mike and Maureen Mansfield Library of The University of Montana. Donna and her expert staff always found ways to assure access for me.

(PARAGRAPH HERE ON THE EDITOR, EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS , AND INDEXER, AS LENGTHY AS NEEDED).

Finally, I dedicate the book to Jane I. Dennison, who personally contributed significantly to the University during the years from 1990 to 2010. In the words of Mike Mansfield -- former Professor, Representative, Senator, Senate Majority Leader, and Ambassador, and also one of the University's most distinguished alumni -- concerning Maureen Mansfield, "What we have done, we have done together." Those words ring true as well for the nearly seven decades that I have enjoyed the support and guidance of a person whose tolerance and encouragement never wavered. Words alone cannot convey the depth of my appreciation.

INTRODUCTION

Among its early sovereign acts, the Legislature of the new State of Montana in 1893 adopted Charters to establish four quite distinctive types of higher education institutions. The extremely acrimonious discussion prior to adoption left something less than a clear picture of legislative intent.¹ Senator Paris Gibson of Great Falls argued strenuously for a single university located in Great Falls, and he committed that city to provide 320 acres of land and a cash endowment of \$100,000.² Opponents accused him of trying to buy the institutions and introduced separate bills to establish a Normal School in Dillon, a School of Mines in Butte, a College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts in Bozeman, and a State University in Missoula. Gibson unsuccessfully countered with amendments either to consolidate the four institutions in Great Falls or to require donations of land and cash from the communities aspiring to host them.³ The opponents then charged him with trying to sell the institutions. Borne amidst hot political controversy, the Montana institutions survived in large measure because of their adaptive capacity to navigate the Montana political thickets.

The Missoulian reporter sought valiantly to clarify the issues hidden beneath the surface that inflamed the acrimony. In early 1893, the Legislature had before it the seemingly impossible tasks of naming a second Senator to represent Montana in Washington and identifying the permanent site for the State Capitol. Before 1913 and the adoption of the Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution, state legislatures elected national Senators. The fight over the location of the Capitol had dominated state politics for three years until referred to the voters in 1894. Michael Malone explained the political antics within the context of the feud

between William Andrews Clark and Marcus Daley for control of copper-rich Butte and the state.⁴ Clark fiercely pursued a Senate seat while advocating for Helena as the Capitol, and Daley fought to have Anaconda anointed as the state Capitol.

Republican Governor John E. Rickards urged the Legislature in 1893 to charter and locate the state institutions of higher education, but he took no position about their locations.⁵ The political jockeying to resolve the impasse over the election of a Senator and the location of the Capitol caused daily realignments on the higher education bills. However, even before the debates resumed in January 1893, the Missoulian reporter had found little evidence of interest in "bunching" the four institutions. As he stated, "that proposition may be said to have already failed." People wanted the colleges, cared little about their nomenclature, but stoutly fought for the desired locations. Whether the spokesmen arguing for either consolidation or segregation of the institutions actually meant what they said, they nonetheless initiated a rhetorical battle that resonated over the ensuing century, long after the election of a Senator and the designation of the Capitol in Helena, giving rise to a distinctive Montana higher education mythology.⁶

Although few if any of the participants in the debates realized the fact, in large measure they rehearsed the at times bitter arguments that had flared in most of the states during the years from 1862 until the end of the nineteenth century.⁷ By 1890, the advocates of a new type of institution, different from the classical colleges and universities, had won the upper hand. Details concerning the breadth and scope of offerings remained for determination, but spokesmen for the new institutions established under the Morrill Act of 1862 such as Daniel

Coit Gilman, Andrew Dickson White, and Evan Pugh shared the vision that these "National Schools of Science" had an awesome responsibility. Success for these schools demanded that the leaders "maintain their institutions on as elevated a plane as the means at their command will permit" in order to train "men of science" to meet the needs of the emerging American industrial economy.⁸ To these visionaries, the issue involved much more than simply "bunching" a state's colleges and universities. They welcomed an entirely new type of institution, although the defenders of the traditional college saw them as merely feeble imitators at best.

The consolidators in Montana stressed the faulty economics of trying to sustain four separate institutions in a state sparsely populated by about one person per square mile.⁹ Other states had created truly great but integrated or consolidated universities. Experience during the late nineteenth century appeared to validate these arguments. Nonetheless, the segregationists, even those from Missoula, replied caustically that "It would be too much to hope that in time Montana can have the greatest university in the world." They warned that experience in other states demonstrated that consolidation threatened three of the proposed institutions by allowing an inherently expansionist university to dominate and commandeer most of the resources. In their minds, the inevitable culture wars had always favored elite versus practical education. The State Farmers' Alliance of Montana, suspicious as ever of the motives of the ruling elite, resolved unanimously against any such "centralization of power."¹⁰ Rather than one weak institution, they advocated four strong ones, without explaining how to achieve that goal. As they countered, keeping the institutions "separate and distinct" with regard to courses of study and funding promised in time a good, if not great, university without "crushing

our technical schools."¹¹ They claimed differences among institutional types that proved more apparent in theory than actual practice for many years.

Without question, these frontier advocates leaned more toward vocational or technical training for success in life and participation in the work force rather than immersion in an educational milieu of the liberal arts and sciences mixed with the new and emerging professional and scientific fields. Denying the claim that educational experts in other states all supported consolidation, they countered that only the presidents of existing universities favored consolidation, not presidents of schools of mines, agricultural colleges, or normal schools. In that regard, they accused the consolidators of deliberately suppressing letters from outside the state urging segregation. According to their counts, only eleven of forty-five states and territories had opted for consolidation to date, and five of the eleven had subsequently segregated their institutions. However, these numbers failed to reflect the convoluted course of development in each of the states.¹² Whatever the merits of their arguments, the segregationists had numbers on their side representing the vociferous local interests in the communities aspiring to host the institutions. Very few people concerned themselves with the larger implications argued by educational reformers such as Gilman, White, and Pugh. The Montana debates differed little from those earlier in other states, and the outcome followed suit.

I

The proponents of segregated institutions representing widely dispersed communities pressed their claims and searched for allies within the Legislature. James M. Hamilton, Superintendent

of Schools in Missoula, led the University Club organized in 1892 and dedicated to winning legislative approval of the Charter the members drafted for The University of Montana in Missoula.¹³ According to campus mythology, Hamilton and his allies succeeded because of lavish reliance on hard spirits, cigars, entertainment of various sorts, and perhaps cash, liberally distributed.¹⁴ Relatively early in the effort, Hamilton reported his discovery of a conspiracy initiated in a secret meeting in Helena to bargain a consolidated University in Great Falls in exchange for the Capitol in Helena. Unaware of these secret machinations, he had initially voted for consolidation when proposed during the closing session of the Montana State Teachers Association (MSTA) in Helena on 3 January 1893. However, he recanted immediately when he learned of the conspiracy.¹⁵ Other rumors of conspiracies had circulated, notably one a year earlier about a consolidated university in Helena and the Capitol in Butte.¹⁶ As Hamilton warned, the situation required discretion and vigilance.

Two decades later, A. L. Stone, some time Editor of Marcus Daley's Anaconda Standard and then of the Missoulian, brother-in-law of future Representative, Senator, publisher of the Missoulian, and Governor Joseph M. Dixon, and later founding Dean of the University's School of Journalism, provided a more nuanced explanation of the political intrigue of the early 1890s. Stone viewed the struggle over consolidation or segregation as equal in importance to either of the other two issues, with perhaps even more important ramifications for Montana society. He credited Missoula Senator Elmer Dickson Matts with successfully navigating these treacherous political waters and securing the University Charter for Missoula.¹⁷ According to Stone, who offered few details because of a pledge to the by-then deceased Senator, Matts arranged secret deals with the partisans of the other two issues in order to win approval of the

Charter exactly as drafted by the University Club.¹⁸ Michael Malone identified Matts as a Daly ally in the fight to prevent the election of Clark as Senator and to put the Capitol in Anaconda. Gibson strongly supported Helena for the Capitol, as did Clark.¹⁹ Once Matts used the other interests to gain approval of the university bill, segregation prevailed and Charters for the other three institutions easily passed. At the time, however, even after Matts successfully carried the university bill through second reading, Gibson and the advocates of consolidation fought for the lost cause until the bitter end.

The prevailing arguments in 1893 seemingly manifested specific legislative intent to locate the separate campuses once and for all, to restrict three of them to specific technical course and program offerings, and to authorize appropriate but differentiated funding levels for all four. The generic names of the four institutions reinforced that intent: A school of mines, a school to prepare teachers, a technical college for agriculture and the mechanic arts, and a university. Gibson and his critics agreed that the university had the capability to host the programs associated with the other three types of institution, although they disagreed about the most likely outcome of merging all four. No one ever explained why the Missoulians, keen to have the university, supported segregation.

Perhaps, as Stone suggested, most people at the time accepted Senator Matts's shrewd assessment that the price for siting the university in Missoula required close cooperation among all of the communities seeking to host the four institutions as well as concessions and political deals.²⁰ On the other hand, as Hamilton warned, alignment with Gibson for consolidation in all likelihood entailed losing the university to Great Falls. Local interests

ultimately prevailed in this highly charged but remarkably open political environment. Years later, Governor Sam V. Stewart, an avid opponent of consolidation and committed proponent of protecting the technical schools from the advocates of "elite" education, reified the Charters approved by the Legislature in 1893 into solemn and legally binding contracts between the state and the host communities.²¹ Stewart's rhetorical flourishes strengthened the mythology that developed about the importance of a distributed or segregated system of higher education in Montana.

Perhaps in some measure a consequence of the deals that Matts arranged in 1893, the political fight over the Capitol ended when the voters in 1894 opted for Helena. William Andrews Clark funded the successful campaign for Helena, while Marcus Daly of the Anaconda Company supported the mining town of Anaconda.²² In a very close vote, the major political and business leaders in Missoula produced a majority for Helena over Anaconda. As Stone recalled, Matts never recovered from the political animosity aroused by his adherence to the commitments he made in 1893 to gain approval for the university Charter.²³ From President of the state Senate in 1893, he fell into political oblivion.

In the sequel, Montana became the epicenter of political corruption and the Senate in Washington refused to seat Clark because he openly bribed the members of the state Senate to claim the Montana Senate seat in 1899.²⁴ However, he ultimately won designation by the Montana Senate in 1901 and served until 1907, succeeded by Paris Gibson in 1900 and Joseph M. Dixon in 1907. In part as a lasting consequence of Clark's political amorality -- he stated that he had never "bought a man who wasn't for sale" -- the requisite state legislatures

overwhelmingly approved the Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution in 1913 for the direct election of Senators.²⁵

Subsequent developments and conflicts in Montana and those earlier in other states demonstrated that the four types of higher educational institutions chartered in Montana amidst a political maelstrom differed far more in theory than in practice. Despite tirades against vocational or practical training versus elite cultural education, it soon became clear that any fledgling institution of higher education had necessarily to offer a basic core of courses as the foundation for cultural, technical, and other programs, in the process arousing the universal proclivity of faculties everywhere to venture into advanced and specialized offerings. As a result, left to themselves, the institutions imitated and mirrored each other as they vied for the attention of prospective students. In higher education as in all human endeavor, failure to attract and hold supporters, customers, or clients augured disaster. Grow or die, even if gradually, became the mantra, much to the chagrin of academic traditionalists who preferred institutional focus and educational efficiency. Theoretical niceties easily gave way before the imperative for survival.

Within this competitive context in 1893, the inherent unstable and expansionist character of the university in contrast to the technical institutions impressed even the supporters of the latter. Concern about its capacity to dominate weighed heavily in favor of segregation, and rampant Western populist parochialism condemned centralization of power or authority in any form. In fact, the explicit terms of the 1893 Charter of "The University of Montana" envisioned an expansive array of courses and programs. The franchise extended to "the

different branches of literature, science and the arts" and their "varied applications" offered through a preparatory school, a "department" or college of "literature, science, and the arts," and all the "professional and technical colleges as may . . . be added thereto or connected therewith."²⁶ Anticipating the closure of the prep school when the state had an appropriate number of accredited high schools, the Charter authorized expansion of "instruction in the sciences, literature and the arts into distinct colleges or departments of the University, each with its own Faculty and appropriate title." Close observers at the time observed that nascent colleges and universities everywhere had to begin with prep schools in view of the scarcity of accredited high schools.²⁷

Although the wording begs specific questions, subsequent sections of the university Charter suggested the status of *primus inter pares* for the university, hosting a number of internal departments, schools, and colleges, as compared to the other three separately chartered technical institutions. Corroborating that relationship, the Charters of the Normal School, School of Mines, and Agriculture College contained provisions limiting their programs of study to specified technical fields and also allowing the State Board of Education, on discretion, to connect them to The University of Montana.²⁸ This latter possibility in time gave rise to speculation and aspiration within the university and concern among the technical schools. As it turned out, the separate Charters, when parsed closely, surrendered desired even if contradictory interpretations. Moreover, the national development of the agricultural colleges introduced a dynamic overlooked by the disputants in Montana.

As mentioned, the breadth and scope of chartered university courses and programs explicitly encompassed all of the arts and sciences disciplines and "their applications in the industrial arts." That the Charters of the technical schools authorized specialized and applied programs derived from the arts and sciences obviously did not necessarily or even logically preclude similar programs within the university. Conversely, as Gilman, White, and Pugh successfully argued in the 1870s and the Montana founders seemingly overlooked in the 1890s, the land-grant agricultural colleges had the dual mission of providing for the practical *and* liberal education of the students, thus ushering in the arts and sciences by the back or side door.²⁹ However, the lack rather than clarity of intent mattered far more when the academic competition for students and resources escalated and generated conflict over allegedly chartered franchises. As it happened, the expansive future envisioned in 1893 for "The University of Montana" not only invited emulation from the other state institutions, especially the agriculture college, it also attracted political intervention to circumscribe the mission of the university and to constrain its development by withholding resources.

Charged to serve all qualified students regardless of sex, just as the university, the technical schools heeded from the outset the demands of their supporting communities and prospective students. All four institutions had to accept qualified applicants, defined immediately as those in possession of high school diplomas and residence in the state for one year, with "tuition forever free," a practice established first in California. However, only the university Charter authorized tuition for students in the law and medical schools or in graduate study, while all four had authority to charge non-residents tuition, if approved by the State Board of Education. As had also become increasingly common, the Charter mandated instruction in

military tactics for all male students without handicap or disability with the equipment provided by the state.

From the outset, the State of Montana assumed a significant role for private philanthropy in public higher education. To that end, the institutional Charters prescribed that "all means derived from other public or private bounty shall be exclusively devoted to the specific objects for which they have been designated by the donor."³⁰ Then, following the example set by Michigan, the Montana Legislature directed the establishment of a University Fund for receiving, holding, and disbursing any public or private contributions, annual and perpetual appropriations, and all revenue from tuition and matriculation fees, fees for services, and leasing or selling land or timber from the federal land-grants. To assure compliance with expenditure guidelines, the Charter required the transfer of all funds committed to the university or any of its colleges and departments to the Treasurer of the State Board of Education for safe keeping and use solely by the university and its component colleges and departments. The intent seems clear enough, to protect allocated, earned, or donated funds from diversion. Despite high expectations and clear intentions, private support remained miniscule during the first century of the university's existence and conflicts flared and raged over the alleged diversion of other institutional funds.

The Charters of the other three institutions strongly suggested that the Legislature intended them to serve very specific purposes, as their titles and missions indicated. The similar debates and subsequent developments in other states suggested the fragility of that assumption, however, especially with regard to the land-grant colleges of agriculture.³¹

Original intent to the contrary notwithstanding, the Montana institutions almost immediately responded to the demands of their host communities, students, and prospective students, just as institutions did in other states. Commenting on this radical tendency in 1915, the former Montana Representative and Senator and publisher of the Missoulian, Joseph M. Dixon, observed that when a new President arrived on the Bozeman campus in 1904, he “found hardly a semblance of an agricultural college there.”³² Dixon implied that he and his contemporaries knew what “agricultural college” explicitly meant. Even more to the point, however, Dixon thought that because all of Montana’s institutions ignored their Charters, they increasingly looked alike.

Seven years earlier, in 1908, long-time Missoula resident and Editor of the Missoulan A. L. Stone expounded a more radical conclusion. Citing as his authority the President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, he claimed that the scramble for students by the separate agriculture colleges in those states that had them had resulted in lowered standards and duplication of programs.³³ In Montana, according to Stone, the agriculture college deliberately violated its Charter as a “vocational school” and duplicated The University of Montana courses and programs, following the pattern in other states. However, he calmly assured his readers that the situation “will adjust itself” in time, an optimistic assumption that flew in the face of the developmental trajectory of the agriculture colleges, including the one in Bozeman, Montana.³⁴ Of course, the agricultural college advocates reciprocated with the charge that the university violated its Charter by sponsoring science and technology fields.

An amusing personal exchange in 1902 between Governor J. R. Toole and founding University President Oscar John Craig illustrated the persistence of the deep-seated concerns and fears about the structure of higher education in Montana. Because of limited state appropriations, Craig and the other Presidents had issued bonds approved by the State Board of Education to pay for the construction and maintenance of campus facilities. They ultimately used the income derived from the federal land grants to pay the interest and retire the bonds.³⁵ However, agitation over the practice became very heated, with the critics arguing that the benefits accrued only to those living near the campuses, not to all Montanans. Ultimately, some activists sued the State Board of Education to challenge this use of revenue derived from the federal land grants.

Governor Toole complained to President Craig that the campaign of misinformation about the use of the land-grant revenue threatened to deprive the state institutions of valuable and legitimate support.³⁶ That most of the expenditures occurred in the four host communities, he argued, did not diminish the benefits available to all Montanans whether or not they chose to enroll in the institutions. Toole suspected a conspiracy behind the malicious allegations based on an unfounded assumption "greatly detrimental to our institutions and state." As he said, some of the institutions had defaulted on their bonds before they began to draw on the land-grant income. Toole charged Paris Gibson with initiating this deliberate plot to starve the institutions and force the Legislature to consolidate them in Great Falls, just as he had planned in 1893.

Toole's charges more nearly manifested political suspicion than reality. For in 1905-1906, the Montana Attorney General, state Supreme Court, and ultimately the U. S. Supreme Court ruled the financing scheme for the bonds illegal and restricted all land-grant income from sales, leasing, or interest exclusively for the operation and maintenance of the institutions.³⁷ This highly detrimental decision limited institutional development until finally reversed in 1934.³⁸ Fortunately, however, the voters approved a 1907 referendum authorizing the state to assume the outstanding bonded indebtedness and restore the institutional endowments.³⁹ Although benign in outcome, the incident attested to the generative influence of myths about higher education in Montana.

Without constraint, the practice of offering courses and programs helter-skelter in the scramble for students, the almost complete disregard for or meaninglessness of institutional Charters or missions, the rising concern at the University about institutional stature and status, and the scarcity of resources in Montana inevitably fueled conflicts. Interestingly, in view of the imminent transfer of his Department and its faculty to the Agriculture College, Professor Nathaniel R. Craighill of the University Department of Engineering first raised the status issue in 1908. Craighill's explanation rested solidly on a perceived interaction between institutional well being and status and a divisive higher education mythology that proved exceptionally resilient in Montana.

In a lengthy, confidential letter to President-elect Clyde A. Duniway in 1908, Craighill affirmed that "the condition of things in general is bad; but I do not believe it to be nearly so bad as I understand has been represented to you."⁴⁰ In fact, he said, "The greater part of the

difficulties has been removed with your election,” an obvious reference to the forced retirement of founding President Oscar John Craig in 1908.⁴¹ As had Professor Morton J. Elrod and others, Craighill castigated Craig's excessive attention to numbers and not enough to standards.⁴² But even more critical, “The University has been belittled ever since it was founded by being classed with the School of Mines and the Agricultural College,” invidiously diminishing the state's only university. Former President Craig had often spoken publicly “in this manner,” thus damaging and negating the distinction between higher education and vocational or technical training.

Within the circumstances of 1908, Craighill's comments fed a neophyte President's ambition for higher institutional status and sparked a controversy that terminated a promising administrative career in Montana.⁴³ More importantly, the higher education structural issue and its associated mythology continued to plague Montana higher education institutions for decades, increasingly entangled with presidential and institutional aspirations and strategies. In fact, their responses to the issue arguably damaged and shortened the careers of five Presidents of The University of Montana -- Clyde A. Duniway (1908-1912), Edwin B. Craighead (1912-1915), George Finlay Simmons (1936-1941), Earnest O. Melby (1941-1945), and Carl McFarland (1951-1958) -- bringing the total political fatalities to six, counting Oscar John Craig.⁴⁴ People at the time and later discerned some dark and mysterious force at work.

The more or less abbreviated careers of these six of nine Presidents who served during the period from 1895 to 1958 also provided the basis for another myth about the University as a "graveyard of presidents."⁴⁵ Adding to the list, during the State Board of Education hearing

concerning President Simmons in 1940, some people identified former President Edward Octavius Sisson (1917-1921) as a probable seventh victim, although he coined the phrase itself even as he took particular pains to deny it. Only Charles H. Clapp (1921-1935) and James A. McCain (1945-1950) of the first nine Presidents went unscathed.⁴⁶ Sisson considered the myth so potentially debilitating to the University that he wrote from retirement in California to quash the claim of his forced departure and to deny any basis for the virulent myth itself. Nonetheless, it lingered over the years as evidence of the deep emotional, largely mythic, responses to the structure and functioning of higher education in Montana.

II

By 1893 when The University of Montana received its Charter, American higher education had begun to take its modern form and structure and to claim its modern purpose.⁴⁷ In the years after the Civil War, largely in response to the demands and needs of a rapidly industrializing society and economy, colleges and universities experienced tremendous growth and change. In anticipation of these new demands and to create institutions capable of serving the needs of a growing population that traditionally had access only to limited public school education, if that, Congress adopted legislation beginning in 1862 that, although not unprecedented, ultimately proved revolutionary in impact.⁴⁸

The land-grant legislation sponsored by Senator Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont in 1862 came after two decades of futile effort by many people. Earlier proponents found themselves stymied by Southern members of Congress and Democrat Presidents such as James Buchanan, unwilling to extend federal authority likely to create precedents for interference with state and local institutions.⁴⁹ Since the colonial period, the colonies and then states had supported and

controlled education, as most other domestic institutions including slavery. George Washington once suggested some kind of federal higher educational institution but dropped it when it never gained traction. Thomas Jefferson and other members of the Revolutionary generation believed and acted on the premise that a republican form of government depended upon the engagement of an educated citizenry.⁵⁰ To assure that condition, the Confederation Congress and the Congress under the Constitution of 1787 adopted or confirmed land and territorial ordinances in 1785 and 1787 and subsequent acts that granted land to townships, counties, territories, or states in trust for the establishment and support of public schools and a "high seminary" or university.⁵¹

These grants reappeared in Enabling Acts for new states admitted to the federal Union with more detailed requirements for the care and use of the land granted. Some states also adopted legislation providing for state-chartered agricultural colleges, notably the Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Michigan schools that provided the model for the federal land-grant agricultural colleges after 1862.⁵² The constraints on further federal involvement dissipated with Southern secession in 1861 that sparked the Civil War. In a burst of creativity, the much reduced Congress adopted three acts that promoted the emergence of a national economy and society: The Homestead Act, Morrill Act for Land-Grant Colleges, and Railroad Act, all signed by President Abraham Lincoln in 1862.⁵³

The Homestead Act of 1862 came in response to agitation and illegal "squatting" on federal land that had become common by 1860. An impatient citizenry demanded access to the public domain. However, Southern defenders of slavery opposed homestead grants or minimal

purchases as part of an abolitionist plot to claim the federal lands in the West for future free states by enticing settlers from the more populous Northern states. When Congress approved homestead legislation in 1860, President James Buchanan vetoed it in the interest of preserving the Union. However, the election of Abraham Lincoln by the Republicans committed to "free soil" led to Southern secession, thus removing the obstacle to final passage of a homestead act. As Robert J. Gordon reported, "Between 1862 and 1913, the federal government granted 2.5 million homestead claims, and 4 million settlers filed claims to 270 million acres in thirty states, 10 percent of the area of the United States at the time."⁵⁴ With several amendments and extensions, the Homestead Act democratized the federal policy of getting the land and resources of the country into the hands of those with the gumption and wherewithal to develop them.⁵⁵

The Morrill Land-Grant Act offered support for a new kind of higher education in the existing states of the federal Union in 1862. It provided 30,000 acres for every member of Congress of the eligible states, not to include mineral rights and not to exceed one million acres to any one state.⁵⁶ These grants added to the grant of one or two townships typically provided in the state enabling acts for the support of a university.⁵⁷ The Act of 1881 also provided grants for schools of mines and normal schools in addition to the grants for a university and an agricultural college. Anticipating the sale of the land to create endowments for the higher education institutions, the Land-Grant Act of 1862 required each receiving state to charter at least one college of "agriculture and mechanic arts" without "excluding scientific and classical studies . . . to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes." With those caveats and the requirement to teach military tactics to able-bodied male students, the

Act allowed the state legislatures to approve the courses and programs of study and to allocate the granted land among its chartered state institutions. In 1889, the Montana Enabling Act granted land for a university, school of mines, normal school, and certain other public institutions and facilities in addition to the grant for a college of agriculture and mechanic arts.⁵⁸ By that date, the separate grant for a university typically conveyed 46,080 acres, or two townships. Those states without federal land received the authority to choose land in other states with surplus federal land, and a few of the original states made such selections.

After the War and Reconstruction of the Union, Congress extended the benefits of the Morrill Act to the former states of the Confederacy. Moreover, to assure education of the freedmen, Congress also required the establishment of land-grant colleges for any groups excluded from the colleges created under the original act and any amendments. This extension provided for the historically black land-grant colleges.⁵⁹ As Roger Williams demonstrated, the collaboration between the Department of Agriculture, also established in 1862 to extend the benefits of science and experimentation to American agriculture, and the burgeoning professional agricultural organizations led to the Hatch Act of 1887 and the second Morrill Act of 1890.⁶⁰ These two acts created the impetus for development of the land-grant colleges by providing \$15,000 each for experiment stations associated with the colleges and direct funding to support the education offered by the colleges.

The Populists and agrarian Granges across the country hotly opposed these developments because they perceived a deliberate effort to ignore the purely agricultural and technical mission they thought the Morrill Act of 1862 prescribed. The agrarians opposed the

broadening of the college curricula beyond agriculture and the mechanic arts and successfully called for a federal investigation of the alleged fraud against Congressional intent. However, the advocates for the new land-grant colleges, such as Daniel Coit Gilman (California), Andrew Dickson White (Cornell), Evan Pugh (Penn State University), and George W. Atherton (Penn State University), persuaded Congress that these new "National Schools of Science" had the assigned responsibility not only to train scientists and engineers but to provide for the "liberal and practical education of the industrial classes" to meet the needs of the emerging American industrial economy.⁶¹ The new colleges transformed the earlier concept of colleges as high seminaries of learning into engines of democracy. As it turned out, Atherton and his colleagues defeated the agrarian opposition ironically allied with the defenders of the traditional colleges and universities led by Presidents Noah Porter (Yale), James McCosh (Princeton), and Charles Eliot (Harvard) in the higher education cultural battle of the late 19th century. In the sequel, the Morrill and Hatch Acts of 1887 and 1890 laid the foundation for the modern, broad-gauged, comprehensive, research-oriented, land-grant colleges and universities.⁶² Ultimately, the 1862 Act resulted in the granting of 17,400,000 acres and other direct federal support to the states to develop higher education.

The Railroad Act of 1862 and those that followed used land grants and federal bonds to subsidize the construction of transcontinental railroads with rapid and revolutionary economic, social, and political impacts upon the country.⁶³ Most dramatically, these far-reaching acts, while bestowing huge rewards to entrepreneurs who leaped at the opportunities, linked the different sections of the country into one large market. As Robert Gordon summarized, "During the two decades between 1850 and 1870, the federal government granted fully 7

percent of the area of the continental United States to railroads, mainly in the south and west."⁶⁴ The last four decades of the nineteenth century witnessed the hectic scramble, first, to claim the land grants by completing the roads, and, second to reap the profits of opening vast areas of the country to settlement and development. The resultant impacts completed the transformation of a village society of remote, isolated communities into an integrated national market economy and necessitated the emergence of a national governmental structure and regime capable of imposing and maintaining order on the new nation.⁶⁵

The implementation of the disruptive technologies associated with the revolutions in transportation, agricultural production, rationalized factory manufacturing, professionalized financial and related services, and systematic management required new skills and expertise. More importantly, the changing demands and characteristics of the workplaces across the country appeared to millions of Americans as a threat to a cherished way of life.⁶⁶ While people welcomed the accompanying rise in living standards, they also suffered from the volatility of an economic system that appeared to swing from boom to bust as technological innovation in successive bursts of creative destruction undermined old and tried habits and life styles.⁶⁷ More and more people rightly concluded that the benefits of the social and economic changes accrued only to those at the top.⁶⁸ Despite a sixty percent increase in real wages between 1860 and 1890, the labor strife, concentration of wealth among the most wealthy, and seeming lack of concern among the wealthy elite about the impact of their actions on the mass of Americans ultimately generated reform movements to restore order within a fractured society.⁶⁹

The relatively rapid emergence of the industrial economy demanded and depended upon workers possessed of the skills and attitudes or habits conducive to production on the vast scale made possible by the advent of interchangeable parts, mechanized processes, and electrical power. Moreover, the mass emigration of people from Central and Eastern Europe during the last half of the nineteenth century, introducing ethnic groups different from those of the antebellum period, and their tendency, forced or otherwise, to congregate in constricted urban areas generated concern about their assimilation into American society.⁷⁰ Building upon the foundations created earlier and in direct response to these new challenges, the purpose, character, content, and methods of American education began to change.

During the antebellum years, the common school movements enshrined the public schools as the "Temples of Freedom" described by James MacGregor Burns.⁷¹ Relying on these "temples," Americans pursued social ends with little careful thought about the symbiotic purposes even as they sought at once to broaden educational opportunities and impose standards and order on the society at large through the public schools.⁷² For those of a conservative bent, the public schools inculcated an ethic of social responsibility and an attitude of respect for order within society, while liberals celebrated the opening of opportunities through the nurturing and honing of critical skills. Over time, conservatives and liberals, republicans and democrats, moved toward consensus about the value of the public schools if not the specific purpose. As Rush Welter concluded, "Whereas republican educational institutions had been intended to serve the needs of the people, democratic institutions were much more likely to respond to their wants."⁷³ In either case, the social compact binding the generations imposed an obligation on each to educate the next.⁷⁴ Successful fulfillment of the

compact augured continued progress for the American experiment in ordered liberty and prosperity.

Just so with higher education. The advent of the land-grant college clearly announced a shift from reliance on college-educated elites to control the society to the practical application of knowledge to change society, two quite distinctive approaches to societal harmony.⁷⁵ Initially celebrated as high seminaries of learning, these new institutions almost immediately manifested their democratic proclivity to respond to wants rather than serve prescribed needs, as Welter and Loss noted.⁷⁶ The late nineteenth century witnessed a cultural struggle between the advocates of traditional, elitist education and the proponents of preparing young and not so young people for productive and meaningful lives in the modern world, one of many such successive cultural conflicts about higher education over the years.⁷⁷ Access to an appropriate education became the means to improve one's standing and position within society and also to assure American prosperity and social harmony.⁷⁸

Manifesting this new social imperative, higher education became a growth industry during the late nineteenth century.⁷⁹ High school graduates rose from two percent of seventeen-year-olds to nine percent between 1870 and 1900. At the same time, enrollments in higher education more than doubled, rising from 62,839 to 156,756; the number of colleges increased from 583 to 977, and the average enrollment per campus from 112 to 243, as student enrollments outpaced the creation of new colleges; and the number of baccalaureates granted rose sharply from 9,371 to 15,539, while the master's degrees conferred went from none to 1,015. The growth during the half-century before 1910 laid the foundation for truly

astonishing development during the following half-century. The United States clearly led the world in providing higher education to serve the citizenry and the economy. In time, the rest of the world took note of the benefits and followed suit, recognizing the critical importance of higher education to the human resource economy taking shape.

In 1916, Professor Morton J. Elrod of the State University of Montana, not a growth proponent, calculated that one person enrolled in an American college or university for every 400 citizens, or every 300 including the normal schools, a ratio far too high for effective education.⁸⁰ While somewhat exaggerated, Elrod's claim highlighted the point he had in mind. He thought the flood of students had fully inundated the institutions and the faculty. To manage the numbers, temporary and part-time instructors did most of the teaching, with fewer full professors and a rising percentage of instructors and assistants. The responsible administrators pursued numbers rather than the quality of the education and wooed more students even in the face of inadequate resources. Significantly, Elrod attributed most of the growth to massive increases in vocational, technical, and professional education and extension or outreach education in response to social and economic demand rather than the need for the liberal education of the students. "Educational institutions . . . have gone mad on the utilitarian side, due largely to the development of the professional school."⁸¹ Elrod, as other traditionalists, found little to applaud in recent developments.

Be that as it may, the traditional college curriculum of prescribed courses soon gave way to student choice of major program of study and free electives, displaced over time by general education support courses, choice of major, and free electives.⁸² Professor Elrod, a

traditionalist at heart, sought to marry traditionalism with student choice by introducing choice among required electives, a marriage of convenience which did not last.⁸³ As it turned out, The University of Montana became the battleground for curricular debate and conflict that persist in the present.⁸⁴ In many respects, the Montana faculty members followed the trajectory discussed by Louis Menand in the effort to define general education without undermining the classical argument that higher education involved the search for truth and understanding, not vocational preparation for the workplace.⁸⁵ But all of that lay hidden in the womb of the future as founding President Oscar John Craig prepared to launch The University of Montana in 1895.

III

The relatively new state of Montana, not yet a decade old in 1895, had a population of roughly 142,900 people, not even one person per square mile, with only twenty-four counties, not the fifty-six of modern times.⁸⁶ The new state incarnated what remained of the rapidly passing American frontier in 1895. No one had an automobile and the roads more or less resembled trails. The Territory and State grew in fits and starts in sync with the boom and bust rhythm of the unstable frontier economy, from fewer than 21,000 people in 1870 -- not counting thousands of Indians -- to nearly 243,300 with only 11,340 Indians in 1900.⁸⁷ Initially accessible only by foot, horseback, horse and wagon, mule train, or river boat, the completion of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern Railroads in 1883-1894 quickened demographic and economic growth and fueled the mining booms at first for gold and silver in the 1860s and then for copper around the flourishing metropolis of Butte. Open range ranching, timber

harvesting, wholesale and retail business, and farming followed, all in thrall to mining and fostered by national policies to get the country's natural resources as quickly as possible into the hands of those capable of developing them.⁸⁸

The Great Northern received no federal assistance but the Northern Pacific alone claimed some seventeen million acres of timber and range land in alternate sections along the route through the Territory and State. Ranchers and homesteaders scavenged for land or simply appropriated allegedly unoccupied land, pressing the aborigines onto relatively undesirable areas on six -- later seven -- Reservations by 1888, and searched for ways to reduce the reserve areas by the 1870s.⁸⁹ Decades of intermittent warfare against the Indians combined with the slaughter of the native bison or buffalo -- the major food source for the Indians -- after the transcontinental railroads split the great herds, resulted in "the starvation period for the Indians."⁹⁰ Still not satiated, the land-hungry migrants scrambled for even more land. Aided by the noble if misguided desire of reformers to civilize and protect the savages, the settlers gained access to most of the Reservations after 1887.

The Dawes Allotment Act of 1887 brought to an end the national policy of confining the Indians to more or less undesirable areas. By 1900, Montana had six Reservations, with a seventh in the making, and the influx of settlers had changed perceptions about the attractiveness of the Indian lands. Under the provisions of the Act, Congress adopted statutes that authorized the President to survey the reservations and make small allotments to individual Indians and open any remaining land to white settlers. Ultimately, implementation of the Act reduced the Tribal lands in the country by some ninety million acres.⁹¹ Only the last Reservation established in

1916, the Rocky Boy (Stone Child) north of Great Falls, escaped allotment, and roughly fifty percent of Tribal lands in Montana ended in the hands of individuals, most of them white settlers.⁹² By 1900, the Indian population reached its nadir and then recovered slowly over the following century.

The terrible blizzard of 1886-1887 wreaked havoc on unprotected cattle herds, with losses of more than 360,000 head, and ushered in a new era of enclosed ranching, wool growing, and homesteading.⁹³ During the decade of the 1880s, the immigrant population increased by 265 percent, and the numbers continued to rise during the homestead frenzy early in the 20th century stirred by railroader Jim Hill's alluring promises to inexperienced settlers who quickly threw up fences and turned the range "grass side down," as Montana's cowboy artist Charlie Russell lamented. Towns sprouted in sheltered valleys as miners, farmers, and traders identified opportunities for gain and permanent communities emerged gradually.

Montana politics trailed in the wake of national developments. The economic depression of the 1890s marked the high point of mid-western and western Populism bringing together farmers and laborers in search of federal or national restoration of order in their lives as the old village society of the 19th century collapsed and the national industrial economy emerged.⁹⁴ Ross Toole captured these developments in an encompassing description of the plight of various groups that has resonated with changes in detail over the years.⁹⁵

The farmer was on the edge of peasantry; industrial development had been inspiring to say the least, but the process had depressed large segments of society; depressions were monotonously cyclical; there was chronic unemployment, a gross imbalance of

wealth, and an increasing industrial arrogance. So there arose a new consciousness of man's inhumanity to man, a sudden awareness of economic and social inequality, and an abhorrence of rapidly developing class distinctions. A reform movement swept America.

The reform movement incorporated various groups in new alliances that worked for a time, not through natural affinities but because of commonly perceived oppressors.⁹⁶ The adherents strongly supported a federal income tax, estate taxes, and equitable corporate taxes to disrupt the concentration of wealth they saw all around them. They also called for federal regulation of railroads and corporations; prohibition of child labor; and wage and hour regulation, all transferring power from the states to the federal government. For government itself, they advocated more direct democracy through open primaries, popular election of national Senators, and the initiative and referendum. And, while not all agreed, some urged "free silver" -- the unlimited coinage of silver -- to end the economic domination of the rising industrial and financial elites.

The reform agenda failed initially in 1896 and 1900, but remnants of the farmer-labor-silver coalition merged their agenda with that of the ebullient middle-class Progressive reformers to support woman suffrage, elimination of child labor, prohibition, workable and transparent municipal and state governments, and state and national social services previously provided by religious and other private or charitable groups and organizations. The new alliances emerged with a restructured agenda, not every provision of it accepted by all components of the alliances, and the reformers won a number of victories.⁹⁷ For a little more than a decade after

the economic crisis of 1907, the changing alliances persisted in Montana, typically pitting Progressive Republicans against Farmer-Labor Democrats supported by the Non-Partisan League.⁹⁸ During this period, Montana adopted woman suffrage, popular election of Senators, prohibition, the initiative and referendum, tax reform, and state regulation of railroad rates and child labor. However, the reform surge ultimately succumbed under the weight of war demands for patriotism and national security and the economic recession that struck Montana and exacted a heavy toll during the 1920s.⁹⁹

State politics during the years after 1894 turned briefly on the Clark-Daly feud until Clark and his allies won the vigorously contested election and Daly's death in 1900. Thereafter, Clark made peace with the Anaconda Copper Company in exchange for the Senate seat he wanted so badly and held from 1901 to 1907, and he ultimately sold his Butte mining interests to the Company in 1910.¹⁰⁰ In 1903, the Company resorted to the tactic of closing all its operations in Butte, bringing the city and the state to their knees in a display of power that forced the last standing Copper King, Frederick Augustus Heinze, to concede defeat and sell his mining interests as well. Thereafter, new and younger leaders such as Joseph M. Dixon, Thomas Walsh, Burton K. Wheeler, and Jeannette Rankin emerged and threw their leadership and support behind the eclectic reform agenda, usually targeting the Company as the oppressor.¹⁰¹ The myth of Company dominance had a very real foundation in these early turbulent years. But gradually the Company changed its methods with the times, according to Michael Malone, as Montana grew in population and what remained of the imagined frontier faded.

CHAPTER I: THE FORMATIVE YEARS, 1893-1916

Over the first two decades of its existence, The University of Montana witnessed personal and institutional trauma as it matured to become a comprehensive undergraduate institution. H. G. Merriam's comment that it somehow managed to survive "happenings that might have wrecked it" aptly applies to the formative period. In several respects, the events of this period shaped the course of future development, some positive and some detrimental. Over these years, conditions within the state and the nation changed rather dramatically as well, at times from one week to the next. Nevertheless, people undoubtedly found comfort in the fact that the institution never lost its bearings, despite occasional sharp veering to avoid disaster.

As an example of a decision with lasting consequences, the State Board of Education in 1914 transferred the University's Department of Mechanical Engineering to the Agriculture College.¹ Because of this early decision, never revisited, The University of Montana encountered special challenges to compete for the external support critical for a research university in the twentieth century.² The Board acted under public pressure after 1912 to find ways to control the costs of providing the education that Montanans needed and demanded. With the virulent persistence of the arguments of 1893 about the segregation or consolidation of the state's higher education institutions, and the inclination of the individual institutions to duplicate popular or necessary courses and programs, the Board sought to circumscribe their specific missions. By 1910, the major program duplications involved the University and the Agriculture College, but the Normal School also exhibited aspirations as the state's designated school of education. In 1914-1915, to resolve these issues, the state Legislature, Governor, State Board,

campuses, and the general public once again rehearsed familiar arguments about consolidation versus segregation.³ As a direct result, the structure of Montana higher education changed radically between 1912 and 1916 from four semi-autonomous institutions to four campuses of one university under the direction of a Chancellor.⁴

I

In 1893-1894, the Missoula residents by and large remained aloof from the fight over the capital, but they rallied to bring the state university to their town. According to recollections of those involved, James M. Hamilton, the Missoula Superintendent of Schools, led the lobbying effort, with assistance from a group of dedicated Missoula residents. In the event, the chartering legislation "established . . . at the City of Missoula an institution of higher learning under the name and style of 'The University of Montana.'" It also authorized the State Board of Education to acquire, by purchase or gift, at least forty acres within three miles of the city for the permanent site of the new institution.⁵

President James M. Hamilton and other members of the University Club persuaded E. L. Bonner and Frank Higgins to donate forty acres of grazing land across the Clark Fork River from the city center, bereft of all but scrawny shrubs and Bitterroot plants. In an immediate response, the State Board of Education mandated the opening of the University in September 1895. Mary Brennan Clapp, spouse of later long-term President Charles H. Clapp, described the site as a barren plain extending to Mount Sentinel, covered with Bitterroot plants and yellow bell flowers in late spring, burned brown by the sun in the fall, and "the playground of Hellgate blizzards" in winter.⁶ Missoula's unpaved streets fairly boiled with dust during

summer, stirred frequently by the hoofs of Texas Longhorn steers so formidable to encounter on the original Higgins Avenue bridge. "One old resident of the city told of having to climb over the bridge railing and hang on from outside while a herd passed."

In 1902-1904, the University acquired, through a federal grant arranged by Senator Paris Gibson and Representative Joseph Dixon, another 480 acres extending about one-third of the distance to the top of Mt. Sentinel, thus making it the only university with a mountain on campus.⁷ President Craig also persuaded the Northern Pacific Railroad to release its claim to an adjoining forty acres east of campus to assure access to Mt. Sentinel where, as Professor Frederick Scheuch reported, the President proposed the build an observatory.⁸ Craig failed to accomplish this long-time objective, but in the mid-1950s, as a tribute to Scheuch arranged by President Carl McFarland, the campus map identified the "Scheuch Planetarium" located in a small building constructed with Public Works Administration funding, assisted by the Missoula Women's Club, in the 1930s.⁹

The University of Montana grew significantly in student and faculty quality and numbers during its first two decades. Only some fifty students enrolled for Fall 1895, with but five actually qualified for college admission, although the total number grew to 135 by year-end, taught by five faculty members with a budget of about \$20,600. For several years, the vast majority of the students took courses in the prep school the University maintained until 1911 because of the paucity of accredited high schools in the state.¹⁰ Most colleges and universities found it necessary to maintain prep schools during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries for the same reason.¹¹

In fact, until 1898, Missoula County merged the local high school with the University in order to achieve adequate numbers in both, and thereafter the University required a matriculation fee of twenty-five dollars for enrollment in the prep school to protect the local high schools.¹² As late as 1907, fully one-third of the University students enrolled in the prep school. The University finally phased it out as accredited high schools proliferated across the state between 1908 and 1911, eliminating one year of its curriculum and admitting no beginning students to the prep school each year.¹³ During the years of its existence, while it served the University and the state quite well, the prep school became a source of discontent among the faculty increasingly concerned about institutional status and quality. Nonetheless, its closure resulted in enrollment declines that took a few years to reverse.

As the seat of the University with a population of 4,800, Missoula had become and remained until late in the 20th century the state's fourth (now second) largest community.¹⁴ In 1895, it had no cement or brick sidewalks, all boards or dirt, but boasted a street car pulled by mules with a route to the University first housed south of the Clark Fork River in the old Willard School refurbished and loaned to the University. The town, not yet a city, included 867 homes, thirty stores (including the Missoula Mercantile and the Daily Meat Packing Company), twenty-five (five fewer) saloons, and something like twenty telephones. The Missoula Electric Street Railway, an interurban train, linked Missoula and the surrounding communities, covering parts of Missoula, Ravalli, and Flathead Counties.¹⁵

The presence of the University, a seminary of higher learning, attested to the progressive ambitions of the community. In 1895, however, the University had no facilities of its own, not

even student housing until 1902-1903 and then only for women.¹⁶ Residence halls for male students seemed a waste to most people on campus, even after new President Clyde A. Duniway began to advocate them in 1908. As late as 1916, a campus committee considered residence halls for men superfluous, a "relic of boarding and military schools."¹⁷ Years later, Professor Elrod rhapsodized about the academic life in the old Willard School building loaned by the town. "From the very first Missoula seemed a delightful place," as he remembered fondly.¹⁸

In the old building, the University quickly became "a happy and hopeful family." The attic served as the University's assembly hall for daily chapel, mandatory for all students and faculty even after it became a convocation scheduled only one day a week and then every other week. Chapel exercises began with remarks by the President followed by discussion of "leaflets" he distributed that contained five hymns and reasons for prayers of thanksgiving each day of the week. In Elrod's gilded memories, no one at the time thought any of this an intrusion on personal time or preference.¹⁹

On the heels of a terrible blizzard in 1898-1899, as Elrod recalled, the University moved to Main Hall on the new campus still lacking of amenities, leaving the Missoula high school behind in the Willard School.²⁰ "The students and faculty built a four plank walk from sixth street" and it served well until the City constructed a permanent walk thirteen years later. In those early days, "It took about a week to plow the oval, several men handling teams" to remove hundreds of wagon loads of snow. As a convenience, students rode a "subsidized transfer wagon" to campus for ten cents. "The bottom step of the front entrance was on a level with the wagon

bed.” For a time, Main and Science Halls constituted the University's facilities until the construction of Craig Hall for female students and a Gymnasium. Before students actually lived on campus, “hot lunches, soup and coffee, were served for years in the biological rooms.”

Undoubtedly, some people had much darker memories of these early experiences than Elrod.

Fences donated and erected by Missoula residents protected the University campus from animals and other intrusions. However, the bare plain hardly met expectations and the Missoula community took action quickly to rectify the defect. On Arbor Day in 1896, with the Missoula Board of Trade (Chamber of Commerce) providing the funding for materials and the faculty, students, and citizens contributing voluntary labor, the community planted between four and five hundred Poplar trees to begin a double row around the exposed north, west, and south sides of the campus, sprinkled during the first few years by a water wagon for want of an irrigation system.²¹ By 1897, the number of trees had grown to 1,000, vastly improving campus aesthetics.²² In 1900, a double row of Poplars surrounded the Oval as well, along with a graveled road.²³ According to Professor Elrod's eulogy on Ryman's death in 1927, J. H. T. Ryman, member of the original Local Executive Committee, conceived and helped to implement the landscaping plan for the University, personally choosing the shrubbery and trees.²⁴

From the outset, no one doubted the commitment of the community to the University. Years later, Joseph M. Dixon, future Representative and Senator, recalled with fondness his involvement in planting trees and laying the corner stone for University (Main) Hall.²⁵ On the occasion of the dedication of Main Hall, a long parade of Missoulians walked or rode from

downtown to the campus for the celebration.²⁶ Several interesting mementos filled the copper box specially prepared by the Kohn Jewelry Company for placement in the corner stone laid by the Masonic Order on 8 June 1898, with the purpose and date engraved on the lid: A copy of the June Kaimin; several newspapers dated 8 June 1898; the first nickel received that day for the Anaconda Standard, donated by Editor A.L. Stone; a \$100 Confederate bill donated by D. N. Ross; a Knights of Pythias pin deposited by Judge J. H. Evans; a badge given by the Missoula contingent of the Grand Army of the Republic; and a Bible laid in the box by President Craig. Without question, however, President Craig provided the most inspirational gift in the epigram he used for the first time on this memorable occasion but which has echoed with occasional verb changes resoundingly down the years: "The University of Montana -- It Must Prosper."²⁷

II

On 3 June 1895, the Board named Oscar John Craig as the founding President and charged him to prepare for opening the University in September, scarcely three months away.²⁸ Merriam described him as a "schoolman from Indiana," most recently Assistant to the President and Professor of History and Political Science at Purdue University.²⁹ Craig had also served as Inspector of Schools in Indiana, undoubtedly experience that helped with his candidacy. However, candidates for a University not yet in operation proved difficult to attract. The President of North Dakota State University declined the appointment and Craig accepted his first and last presidency.

The enabling statute delegated governance of "the several colleges of the University" to the "Faculties," presumably of each academic department as they emerged, and identified the President as one of the Professors, the Secretary, and the "Executive head" of the University.³⁰ Without further explanation, the statute also vested in the President the authority "to give general direction to the instruction, practical affairs and scientific investigations of the several colleges." The new President fully appreciated and maximized the extent of the authority. In characteristic manner, he delayed until 1901 before charging a faculty committee to draft by-laws for the governance of the University, which he subsequently approved without discussion.³¹

The balding Craig habitually wore a skull cap in the classroom and a toupee on ceremonial occasions, clear indicators of his strong sense of the gravitas required of a President. Despite his somewhat rigid formality and sensitive awareness of his position as President, Craig nonetheless inspired respect if not admiration. Merriam noted that he managed an exceptionally heavy overload, organizing and administering the University, working with educators across the state, and teaching two or three classes each semester.³² J. B. Speer, who served as his Secretary and later in many administrative positions at the University, applauded his astuteness, suggesting Craig's rather deliberate use of his salient attributes.³³ Professor Elrod, who at the time openly criticized Craig for low academic standards, years later praised his "unbounded faith" and concluded that "His devotion to the institution has not been surpassed."³⁴ On balance, it appears that Craig's place in the University pantheon rightfully derived from his position as founding President as well as his bulldog pursuit of a clear vision for the University and its place in the state.³⁵

While Craig consulted or at least informed the faculty about curricular and other matters, he protected his prerogatives and maintained strict protocols and procedures much in the manner of the "old time" college president.³⁶ Clapp considered the emergence of faculty committees as evidence of faculty involvement in governance, but "shared governance," in the modern sense of that term, hardly existed on the campus until after 1920.³⁷ Faculty meetings during Craig's presidency regularly consisted of a "weekly grind of considering student petitions " and minor curricular matters such as 8:00 classes, athletic eligibility, schedules of grades, approvals of student organizations, unexcused absences, and the like. Detecting "some disharmony in the faculty," Clapp discreetly dismissed the faculty comments critical of Craig's approach and style as "denunciatory."

Nonetheless, President Craig's sense of his prerogatives and dignity as President increasingly alienated people. One member of the founding faculty, Professor William Aber, lamented that the President's sensitivity about his dignity and executive perquisites made open discussion of serious issues among the faculty nearly impossible.³⁸ Professor Elrod simply refused to abide some of Craig's rules, for example by purchasing supplies and equipment directly from vendors, corresponding directly with members of the State Board of Education about the Biological Station, and sending the Station annual report directly to the Board rather than through the President, despite the President's instructions and tirades.³⁹ As a result, in part, of this near insubordination and other perceived slights to his dignity, Craig refused to reappoint Elrod in June 1908, with only three months notice.⁴⁰ Aber fumed that Elrod had become the President's "mark" because of his public insistence on high academic standards and his utter devotion to the University.⁴¹ In vehement terms, Aber castigated the "wrong done [to] Dr.

Elrod . . . [as] so monstrous that I feel about it as Zola did about the Dreyfus affair – to compare a small thing with a greater one.”⁴²

Understanding this seemingly minor incident provides insight into the development of persisting University myths, but also requires a bit more background. During 1905-1906, Professors Elrod and William Draper Harkins worked together as expert consultants for the plaintiffs in a suit for injunctive relief from the toxic smoke spewing from the massive Washoe Smelter the Anaconda Copper Company operated in the Deer Lodge Valley.⁴³ The case proved uneventful at the time, except for the effect on the Deer Lodge Valley farmers and Elrod's poor performance and public embarrassment, because the federal judge decided not to issue the injunction and the Company declined to arbitrate with the Deer Lodge farmers. Over the following years, the federal government assumed the responsibility to deal however belatedly with the toxic smelter fumes issues in Montana. Nonetheless, the participation of these two University faculty members as expert witnesses against the Company gave rise years later to a myth that the Company retaliated against them and ultimately engineered their dismissal from the University. However, that myth surfaced in virulent form long after the events that gave rise to it.

In an apparently unrelated action, the Board in 1907 rejected a recommendation by the University Committee to reappoint President Craig for another term when his contract expired in 1908. Instead, as Board member and State Superintendent of Instruction W. E. Harmon explained, Craig had become so unpopular on and off campus that the Board demanded his resignation or retirement when his contract expired.⁴⁴ Craig purportedly based his decision

not to re-appoint Elrod on the facetious allegation that Elrod misused private funds donated to the Biological Station by former Senator William A. Clark and to spare the new President the trouble caused by an egregious campus dissident.⁴⁵ Upon learning of Craig's rationale, Professor Aber expostulated scathingly: "I never saw a more obvious case of stealing the livery of Heaven for the service of the Devil."⁴⁶

J. H. T. Ryman, long-time member of the Local Executive Committee, stated flatly that Craig maliciously persuaded amenable Board members of Elrod's disloyalty and untrustworthiness. "He charges Elrod with being instrumental in his retirement when as a matter of fact Elrod was absolutely innocent of any conniving."⁴⁷ In addition, Craig may well have learned of efforts to persuade the Board to appoint Elrod as his successor, an outcome fully unacceptable to him.⁴⁸ Harmon, who served on the search committee and knew of the nomination of Elrod, asked caustically why the person forced to leave had the authority to decide who stayed.⁴⁹

During most of the ensuing summer, his future at the University in grave doubt, Elrod labored at the Biological Station at Flathead Lake awaiting the arrival of the new President, Clyde A. Duniway, from Stanford University.⁵⁰ Even before the starting date of his first term as President, a sympathetic but punctilious Duniway cautiously arranged the re-appointment of Elrod -- "to succeed myself," as Elrod put it -- in late August. Shrewdly, the new President isolated the Board members seeking Elrod's ouster, led by Board member John M. Evans, and the Board finally approved Duniway's reappointment motion unanimously. In a significant way, the Craig-Elrod episode shed light not only on Craig's administrative style, it also figured in the growth of three resilient myths about the University.

All extant accounts report that the founding President retired in 1908 because of ill health after having accomplished his goals.⁵¹ The first myth began to take form when Craig died prematurely three years later of Bright's disease, leaving a deep void caused by the "personal bereavement to every Missoula resident," as A. L. Stone remarked.⁵² The actual details of his administration and style quickly faded from public awareness, with only fond memories remaining. The Craig funeral procession of more than 200 grateful Montanans marched to the campus and paid final tribute to a "remarkable" leader, "forced to resign his position" in 1908 because of "ill health," who had "lived long enough to see his work nobly and successfully accomplished," in the poignant comments of his long-time colleague, Frederick C. Scheuch.⁵³ Even Elrod, who narrowly escaped dismissal by Craig, years later praised Craig's "unbounded faith" and "His [unsurpassed] devotion to the institution."⁵⁴ As time passed, Craig's mythical status solidified in the public mind with reinforcement by the universal invocation of his courageous example and memorable epigram on ceremonial occasions, "The University of Montana -- It shall prosper."⁵⁵

However, as mentioned, members of the State Board and the Local Executive Committee remembered that the separation involved deception, dissimulation, and rancor.⁵⁶ Still other people knew of or suspected a coerced parting of the ways and some spoke publicly to that effect. For example, Mrs. Tyler Thompson mused in 1915, when a presidential crisis again engulfed the University, "Three times we have gone through this awful ordeal in seven years," referring to Presidents John Oscar Craig, Clyde A. Duniway, and Edwin B. Craighead. In 1921, during yet another crisis, the crusading journalist, Miles Romney, identified "Craig, Duniway, Craighead, and Professor [Louis] Levine" as victims of arbitrary dismissal by the State Board,

acting under external influence.⁵⁷ However, the extant evidence suggests that Craig sought another presidential position in Missouri and retired only after the search failed.⁵⁸ From these auspicious seeds planted in soil made fertile by adversity, a second and related myth about a "graveyard of presidents" at The University of Montana developed gradually over time.⁵⁹

A third myth also originated in the Elrod case which rivals the congenital mythology about the structure of higher education in Montana. Both exhibited a virulent capacity to morph with seemingly endless variants, corroborating Ross Toole's concept of the "commemoration of myth and not of fact" in Montana history and culture.⁶⁰ The claim that the Company engineered Elrod's dismissal first appeared publicly in a fugitive 1936 West Coast labor journal, the Pacific Weekly. Embedded in a scurrilous attack on President George Finlay Simmons for his alleged abuses of academic freedom and arbitrary treatment of faculty members, the myth that began with the claim of an alleged Company attack on Elrod served also to illuminate authoritarian governance at the University.⁶¹

The allegation reappeared, this time including Harkins as a victim as well, in Merriam's history in 1970, relegated to a footnote without evidence and with no reference to the Pacific Weekly attack, which he did discuss in a subsequent chapter on the Simmons administration. That same year, Arnon Gutfeld's scholarly account of abuses of civil rights and academic freedom during the WW I period in Montana repeated the charge, citing only an American Federation of Teachers' broadside that offered no evidence. Finally, in 2006, James R. Habeck, a retired Professor of Botany, stated that the Board fired Elrod on Company orders, again with no

evidence, although he explained privately some years later that he had relied on Merriam's unsupported footnote.⁶²

Clearly, this myth, as the others, took root and flourished not because of reasonable or even arguable evidence, but because people needed to find a person or agency to blame for the malevolence affecting the University and the faculty; or to praise as an inspirational example. The heroic struggle of President Craig to build a university from nothing proved perhaps of greater emotive importance than the Company's arrogant dominance of Montana politics and press after 1920. Each, however, contributed to an energizing mythology that reified small kernels of truth in the University community's historical reality.

III

As others, James M. Hamilton, a faculty member during the early years at the University and subsequently President of the Montana College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, credited Craig with building the University from scratch. In addition, as the designated Inspector of the Public High Schools, Craig directed the development and implementation of the University preparatory and public high school curricula in the state, with only five accredited high schools in 1895.⁶³ From the outset, the high school accreditation curricula, quite typical for the time and based on models from other states, included the usual array of academic coursework.⁶⁴ However, since only two high schools in the state offered Greek until after 1900, students studied Greek at the University or with private tutors, particularly those interested in graduate scholarships.

For admission to high school, the student had to have a diploma indicating completion of "the work of all eight grades when arranged."⁶⁵ Accredited high schools had to offer the prescribed courses for the Classical, Science, or English Curricula -- with a Business Curriculum added later -- for the four years including mathematics, specifically algebra through quadratics, plane and solid geometry, and a half year of the "science of arithmetic;" English, including ten works from the list for "critical study," ten works from the list for "reading," two years of writing (with grammar, composition, and rhetoric), and one year of literature and growth of the English language; one year of chemistry or biology and one year of physics -- with half of the time in the sciences in laboratory work; one year of general history (Grecian, Roman, and English) and one year of American history and civics; two years of Latin (four books of Caesar and four books of Cicero), or for other than the Classical curriculum, two years of any modern language; and electives related to the chosen curriculum. As accredited high schools increased in number, the University finally withdrew from preparatory work in 1911.⁶⁶

The State University curricula led initially to the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Philosophy, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering degrees.⁶⁷ Students typically carried course loads of fifteen to eighteen credits, with four credits assigned for lecture or "recitation" one hour a day for four days a week through each of nineteen weeks. The B.A. and Ph.B. candidates had to take two years of Greek and three years of Latin. However, Greek disappeared as a requirement after 1900 and soon thereafter modern languages (French, Spanish, and German) shared status with Latin. The students following the B.S. or B.M.E. curricula had initially to take only one year of Latin but more science. The University catalogue listed twenty-six required courses, leaving six as electives, and all students had to take one-half

a course in gymnasium practice; one course each in Rhetoric, Drawing, and Political Economy; one and one-quarter courses in Chemistry and Psychology-Ethics; and two courses in Literature and Biology. Finally, all seniors had to present a senior thesis for graduation.

These very traditional curricular requirements soon gave way before more practical ones. In 1900 and again in 1905, President Craig recommended collapsing all the degrees into the B.A. and B.S. degrees. However, the traditionalist majority of the faculty rejected change on both occasions.⁶⁸ A responsive University education, Craig argued, “contributes to the development of all the interests of the State, whether industrial or intellectual,” and he labored to establish curricula focused on preparing Montana youth for “positions of honor and trust.”⁶⁹ To that end, he planned as early as 1898 to establish a School of Pharmacy. However, when the Board approved the School in 1906, he declined for lack of resources and space. As a result, the Board shifted the authority to the Agriculture College, reinforcing the widespread opinion about the irrelevance of institutional Charter or mission.⁷⁰ Notably, Craig never again proposed a professional school.

However, Craig did agree in principle with Elrod's later proposal to develop a professional Forestry curriculum within the Department of Biology to serve state needs. Elrod argued that the University's Biological Station at Flathead Lake and the existing O'Brien sawmill near Somers offered ideal sites for training graduates to manage Montana's forests, produce lumber, and make ties for railroads.⁷¹ In addition, including Forestry enabled the Department to respond to an increasingly critical state need to manage its invaluable renewable resources.

As Elrod accurately predicted, “the forests of the east cannot last long . . . no more than 10 or 15 years.”

Nonetheless, it soon became clear that the two men held differing views about the trend toward professional or technical education. Elrod had proposed a Forestry emphasis within a traditional degree program. Despite his advocacy of a specialization within Biology or Botany, Elrod criticized the President for a misplaced emphasis on “practical,” “industrial,” and professional education as another indicator of giving numbers priority over quality. In the President's view, however, the state owed a responsive and relevant education to its citizens.

The increasingly critical faculty majority agreed with Elrod's growing concern that emphasis on "subjects and such only as may be directed to money making channels" threatened to undermine the "spirit of study for the purpose of acquiring knowledge and becoming acquainted with the world's best things in science and literature." ⁷² As he concluded a few years later in his Charter Day address, "If we have not gone mad on the utilitarian studies we are certainly strongly headed that way." Based on the record, however, Craig resisted accommodation of the modern trend toward student choice of majors, reducing required courses, increasing electives, and more professional training. Those developments blossomed during the years from 1908-1915, and they continued to elicit faculty criticism into the decade of the twenties. However, not only faculty intransigence but inadequate resources held back the advent of the new order.

Craig created more trouble for himself with his recommendation that graduates under any one of four high school curricula from accredited high schools automatically qualified for admission

to the University. Elrod predicted that the abandonment of the University admission examination threatened to undermine academic standards, since the high schools under that arrangement decided which students graduated and thus satisfied the requirements for admission.⁷³ Within a few years, the University faculty approved for admission purposes any course taught by an accredited high school, thus confirming Elrod's prediction. By 1908, the high school graduation requirements no longer reflected the array of subjects deemed likely to prepare students for college work. To resolve the problem, the critics demanded more specific admission requirements and advocated independently administered tests such as the ACT and SAT, then in development.⁷⁴ Moreover, the apparent lowering of standards contributed to rising tensions on campus until reversed by President Clyde A. Duniway who succeeded Craig and announced new admission and persistence standards after 1908.

At the time, President Craig held stubbornly to cooperation with the public schools to assure access and quality. In the President's view, "The influence of the University in strengthening and unifying the public school system of Montana has been very marked and is becoming more and more apparent."⁷⁵ Quite clearly, for this "school man" and academic administrator, guidance of and support for the public high schools ranked as one of the highest priorities.⁷⁶ Perhaps to share the workload or to assuage the sensitivities of his presidential colleagues, Craig urged the State Board in 1905 to appoint a high school board comprised of the four institutional Presidents and the State Superintendent of Instruction to supervise the work with the high schools of an Inspector of High Schools appointed by the new "board."⁷⁷ Critics on campus viewed this recommendation as proof of the President's willingness to accord equal status to the vocational or technical schools, thereby diminishing the stature of the University.

However, the State Board rejected Craig's recommendation and the University President remained the Inspector of High Schools until the Board assigned the responsibility to the State Superintendent of Schools after 1913.⁷⁸ In time, as elsewhere across the country, insistence upon a close relationship with the public schools gave way before institutional ambitions and other priorities.

In 1907, Craig advocated certification as teachers of all University graduates who completed the required pedagogical methods courses in order to meet the state's need for teachers. The Normal School prepared elementary and rural teachers but had other ambitions and objected to this alleged duplication of effort. In an uncharacteristic outburst, but with the strong agreement of his critics, Craig labeled the legislative refusal of his proposal as "an injustice . . . detrimental to the general good of education."⁷⁹ Craig and his successor, Clyde A. Duniway, persisted in the effort to secure certification for University graduates but found the Normal School opposition and the concern about encroachment on its claimed franchise too strong to overcome until 1911.⁸⁰ Thus, in 1909, Governor Edwin L. Norris, who had represented Dillon in the Legislature, vetoed a similar bill largely because of the Normal School's claim for the exclusive franchise to prepare teachers in Montana.⁸¹ In the end, however, Governor Norris finally relented and signed a nearly identical act in 1911, acquiescing to the University's pleas and the rising demand for teachers in Montana.

To shore up the budget, Craig solicited private support and joined his colleagues in inventing student fees to generate essential revenue, i.e., matriculation, building, activity, athletic, health, supplies, equipment, and ultimately an incidental (*aka* tuition by another name) fees,

all approved by the State Board. However, the University budget rarely exceeded \$40,000 in the early years, and barely covered the salaries for the President and sixteen faculty members, five assistants, and a librarian and the instructional expenses. The University managed largely because of the loyalty and dedication of the faculty despite extremely low salaries, a condition that persisted over the years into the twenty-first century. As examples, Craig had a salary of \$2,500 in 1895, and Professors Merritt and Aber received \$1,800 and \$1,400, respectively. For comparison, the University of Nebraska paid its first Chancellor \$4,000 and its faculty members \$1,500 to \$2,000 in 1871.⁸² Relief came gradually, but not until after 1908.

Nonetheless, Craig made progress. Total University income grew from \$13,551 in 1895-1896 to \$59,658 in 1907-1908, his last year in office, a significant increase with a tripling of enrollments.⁸³ In 1907, 393 students matriculated, the majority at the collegiate level and representing all accredited state high schools.⁸⁴ In addition, several of the 121 alumni had enrolled for graduate study in Universities such as Chicago, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Bryn Mawr, Harvard, Stanford, Yale, Dartmouth, and Michigan. President Craig reported "Not a single case of failure."⁸⁵ Even more impressive, two University graduates won prestigious Rhodes Scholarships to study at Oxford University in England: George E. Barnes in 1904 and J. F. Thomas in 1907.⁸⁶ Barnes earned a First Class, one of the eight awarded to his cohort of Rhodes Scholars. Craig insisted that these accomplishments manifested the benefits of a practical curriculum that prepared the graduates for the changes in the state and the world.

As conclusive evidence of the qualitative maturation of the University, President Craig reviewed a Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching ranking in 1907 that placed

The University of Montana at fourteen, in a range from five to fifteen for thirty-seven state universities, with fourteen universities ranked fifteen and only seven at fourteen.⁸⁷ The Carnegie Foundation conducted the ranking in order to determine which if any of the state universities qualified for participation in its programs. Craig and his successor, Clyde A. Duniway, urged the Board to pursue membership in the Carnegie Foundation to provide access to the retirement program the Foundation offered for the faculty and administrators of member institutions. Craig also thought the membership requirement of an annual budget of at least \$100,000 likely to assure much better support from the state. As early as 1900, he had suggested a dedicated mill levy to achieve that desired result but the suggestion attracted little support until after World War I and membership in the Carnegie Foundation never materialized.⁸⁸

IV

The early appropriations of \$15,000 to \$20,600 annually dictated frugality in operations. Few opportunities for unnecessary duplication or other expenses existed. However, the state legislature authorized construction in 1897 of the first two facilities, University (Main) Hall and Science Hall, with \$100,000 in bonding using land-grant income to pay interest and retire the bonds.⁸⁹ Craig's vision for construction drew heavily on the facility plan of the old Purdue campus he knew well, with the academic buildings placed around an oval. Professor Frederick Scheuch who accompanied Craig from Purdue recalled, "When further buildings were needed a second row was to be built behind the first."⁹⁰ Modified somewhat by Cass Gilbert, the famous architect, in 1917 and more radically in the twentieth century, the Craig plan remains evident today on a widely heralded, beautiful campus.⁹¹

From the outset, then, the historic campus Oval and the centrality of academic buildings claimed highest priority in the development of the University campus. Craig's plan, somewhat modified and fleshed out in 1917, envisioned:

tapestry brick buildings of three to four stories, grouped in rectangles about a central oval at the terminus of University avenue. The first or outer rectangle . . . is the residence group. The second rectangle flanks the oval . . . terminated on the north by the general library . The 'line' next is the full length of the rectangles and faces the oval. The center building on the axis is the Administration building and auditorium. At the rear of this 'line' are the stadium and playing fields. At the opposite ends of the stadium and playing fields are the men's and women's gymnasiums.⁹²

Craig entrusted this grand design to a relatively young local architect who transformed the vision into reality.⁹³ A. J. Gibson migrated to Butte and worked under the tutelage of H. M. Peterson, a successful architect, contractor, and builder, who became his mentor and friend. Having learned the essentials from Peterson, Gibson relocated to Missoula to launch his career. By 1897, he had acquired stature in large measure because of the houses he designed and built in and around Missoula, his participation in the construction of the new facility for St. Patrick Hospital in 1890, and the construction of the Gibson Block in downtown Missoula in 1895. President Craig and consecutive Building Commissions unanimously accepted Gibson's successive bids to design and build the first five structures on the University's new campus: Science Hall (1898), University (Main) Hall (1899), the Women's Building (1902), the Gymnasium (1902), and the Library (1908).⁹⁴

With these buildings, Gibson enshrined Craig's plan as an integral component of his design, drawing heavily on the Romanesque Revival, Italian Renaissance, and Neoclassic styles, as Rafael Chacon has expertly explained. The least expensive of the five structures, the Gymnasium, reflected utility and frugality but nonetheless fit the ambience Gibson had created. As Chacon noted, University (Main Hall) became the showcase and remains today emblematic of The University of Montana campus. For the occasion of the dedication, J. M. Hamilton and seven other members of the State Board attended along with the faculty and the public.⁹⁵ Gibson's Romanesque Revival style featured a great bell tower, a rusticated granite-block foundation, and an arched entry. In 1902, the Legislature appropriated funds to purchase an eight-day clock for the tower.⁹⁶ A majestic structure set against the back-drop of Mt. Sentinel, Main Hall has become a photographic icon symbolizing American higher education.

Most importantly, Gibson insisted upon final authority to manage the construction process, to hire and fire contractors and workers, and to require replacement of defective work or materials. The Gibson buildings served the University community well for some fifty years and, even with the removal of Science Hall and the Gymnasium, contributed significantly to the historic preservation movement in western Montana.⁹⁷ With renovations over the years, the other three continue in service today, and the Ian and Nancy Davidson Honors College occupies the place of honor adjacent to the Oval, south of Main Hall, vacated by the razing of Science Hall.⁹⁸ By way of contrast, the original structures at the University of Nebraska in Lincoln proved seriously flawed either in design or construction.⁹⁹ With the exception of the

Natural Science Building completed in 1918, Gibson's last project on campus ended construction until after the passage of a bonding referendum in 1920.¹⁰⁰

For these buildings, Craig secured State Board approval of bond issues by pledging land-grant revenue.¹⁰¹ However, in 1905-1906, the state Attorney General, state Supreme Court, and U. S. Supreme Court ruled this use of land-grant revenue illegal, confining to operations and maintenance all use of land grant revenue of any kind, a decision unchanged until 1934.¹⁰² Fortunately, the voters approved a referendum in 1907 to assume the bonded indebtedness and restore the institutional endowments.¹⁰³ When Clyde A. Duniway replaced Craig as President in 1908, he halted the sale of land-grant acreage in order to protect the institutional endowment.¹⁰⁴ Unfortunately, sales by 1915 accounted for more than twenty-eight thousand of the original forty-six thousand acres.¹⁰⁵ Fortunately, again, the state authorized general obligation bonding in 1907 to finance the construction of a new Library, a Natural Science Building, and the renovation of the Heating Plant.¹⁰⁶ However, with funds prematurely depleted, the new Library had to await the outcome of the bonding referendum in 1920.

V

In early 1895, the State Board of Education accepted the Governor's appointments of the members of a Local Executive Committee charged with organizing, staffing, equipping the University for operations, and supervising it.¹⁰⁷ The Committee, composed of attorney T. C. Marshall, Judge Hiram Knowles, and businessman J. H. T. Ryman, promptly secured State Board approval of the University's admission requirements and curricula modeled after those of institutions in other states.¹⁰⁸ The Montana Constitution and relevant statutes vested the governance and control of all four institutions in the State Board of Education, consisting of

three elected officials -- Governor, Attorney General, and Superintendent of Public Instruction -
- and eight members appointed by the Governor, with Senate approval, which also governed
the public schools.¹⁰⁹

The Board initially delegated most direct governance authority to the Local Executive
Committee of each campus consisting of three local residents appointed by the Governor, with
the approval of the State Board. For most of its business, the State Board depended upon
recommendations made by the Local Executive Committees and the Board Committees for
each of the four institutions, comprised of the local President and three Board members.
During the early years, the Presidents, with little discretion, implemented policies initiated by
the Local Executive Committees and approved by the Board Committees and the Board.
Initially the Board met only twice annually, unless convened in special session by the Governor,
who served as Chair of the Board. In 1919, the Legislature required quarterly meetings by the
Board to handle the increasing business of the four-campus University established in 1916.¹¹⁰

This system worked so long as all participants shared common purposes and goals and the
issues remained fairly simple. Differences soon surfaced because of scarce resources
contested by the Presidents, program sensitivities among the Presidents, rising concerns
among legislators and Board members about costs and duplication of programs, and the need
to control costs. As early as 1902, critics again urged consolidation to prevent program
duplication and reduce costs. That same year, Governor John Toole informed President Craig
of a consolidation conspiracy involving Paris Gibson, the consolidation advocate in 1893.¹¹¹
However, President Craig never deviated from the counsel he provided as early as 1897 to his

colleagues and the Board. "The course of Higher Education demands not so much upon consolidation of schools and colleges as their proper adjustment. "¹¹² As he affirmed, "Let each be employed in its own work . . . within the limits set by the statute." The State Board obviously agreed and resolved in 1902 that "It is not advisable or proper at this time to attempt the consolidation of the State Education units."¹¹³

Resolutions to the contrary notwithstanding, agitation of this congenital issue persisted and gained strength with the appointment of a new President in 1908.¹¹⁴ Craig's successor, Clyde A. Duniway, came to his first presidency with high ambitions for himself and the institution. His progressive ideas about higher education reflected his graduate work at Harvard and experience at Stanford and his interactions with national leaders such as Presidents Charles William Eliot (Harvard), Andrew Dickson White (Cornell), and David Starr Jordan (Stanford), all of whom recommended him for the presidency at Montana. He also exuded strong confidence in his own rectitude and ability that many who met and worked with him came to regard as impatient arrogance.¹¹⁵ After accepting the appointment, he solicited counsel from faculty members, alumni, school officials, and others within the state.¹¹⁶ The responsive comments and suggestions he received from the faculty and high school principals, a veritable unanimous call for higher standards, persuaded him of the need for prompt action to enhance the standing of The University of Montana and set a proper course for its development.

In 1908-1909, immediately after arriving on campus, Dunway confirmed the termination of the University prep school and issued public statements asserting the status and stature of the *only* University in the state. Quite clearly, Professor Nathaniel Craighill's complaint about the

public image of the University had impressed the new President.¹¹⁷ In December 1908, he also mounted a campaign to rationalize the Montana system of higher education with the University at its center.¹¹⁸ After considering at least two alternative structures and eliminating physical consolidation as unfeasible because of local opposition, he proposed the administrative attachment to the University of the other three institutions in their current locations and with their current missions, each campus administered by a Vice President or Director. For governance of the University, he urged one President responsible to a Board of Regents subordinate to the State Board of Education and the elimination of the Local Executive Committees.¹¹⁹ To assure a stable budget, he called for a dedicated mill levy, as suggested earlier by President Craig.¹²⁰ Given his ambition and aspirations, he probably saw himself as President of the restructured University, with his colleagues as Vice Presidents or Directors in Bozeman, Butte, and Dillon. However, the public and Board response to his proposal preempted those details. Throughout his first year, he seemed oblivious to the reaction stirred by his public statements extolling the University or the obvious advantages of the proposed administrative merger for himself and the University.

As it turned out, Governor Edwin L. Norris had reform in mind as well but his version ran counter to Duniway's plan. Norris in 1909 proposed to require the institutions to expend all available land-grant and other funds for operation and maintenance expenses prior to drawing upon state appropriations.¹²¹ With Duniway and Hamilton united against the Governor, the Legislature rejected Norris's first proposal but approved his second. The latter altered higher education governance by confining authority over all academic programs and policy to the State Board of Education but required approval of all educational expenditures by a new Board

of Examiners, consisting of the Governor, Attorney General, and Secretary of State.¹²² The legislation also abolished the Local Executive Committees, as Duniway had recommended. While consolidating fiscal control with the new Board of Examiners, Norris ignored Duniway's effort to consolidate administrative control. After abolishing the Local Executive Committees, the Governor's bill established Local Executive Boards for each of the institutions, consisting of the local President, as Chair, and two members from the local community appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Board of Education, with the Boards' powers limited to duties and responsibilities *explicitly* delegated by the State Board of Education or the Board of Examiners.¹²³ For roughly forty years, argument waxed and waned concerning the extent of the authority of the Board of Examiners – merely administrative in the distribution of available funds in accordance with appropriated levels, or quasi-legislative in the re-allocation of appropriated funds or the allocation of reductions to the institutions when available funds failed to meet the appropriated numbers.¹²⁴

In December 1908, prior to the legislative session, the State Board assigned Duniway's proposal for administrative unity to a Committee of two Board members and charged another *ad hoc* committee to develop rules and procedures to assure cooperation among the institutions and prevent duplication.¹²⁵ Duniway thought these developments promising and immediately worked with Board members to initiate a private fund-raising program. However, he publicly condemned Norris' experiment in higher education governance.¹²⁶ Rather than eliminating the competing local governance entities, he fumed, the legislation allowed the State Board of Education to delegate authority at will to the restructured Local Executive Boards, thus defeating the unity he had envisioned.

Even more damning in the President's mind, Norris had separated academic from fiscal control. Doing so threatened to undermine the integrity of Montana higher education, with "the board appointed to supervise and control educational institutions . . . deprived of all financial power and unable to apportion the expenditure of lawful resources."¹²⁷ While artfully stated, strong feelings permeated his counsel to the Board: "If an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, it is not too early to begin to consider amendments to a system which might, under some future administration, put the higher education interests of the State in jeopardy through the partisanship of any two of three members of a politically elected board with complete power of the purse."¹²⁸ Without question, he foresaw real peril from the centralization of fiscal control of higher education out of the hands of educators.

Whether correct in his assessment, with the Governor who proposed the legislation and several supporters as members of the State Board of Education and the new Board of Examiners, Duniway's comments sounded provocative at best. Governor Norris's Commencement Address on the Missoula campus in June 1909 publicly joined the issue with the President. The Governor explained that the legislation intentionally placed authority over the daily operation of the campuses in the restructured Local Executive Boards, with the local President as the Chair, subject to oversight by the Board of Examiners on business matters and the State Board of Education on academic matters.¹²⁹ He thought the arrangement provided for appropriate oversight to control costs and prevent duplication, while also preserving as much local autonomy as feasible. Despite Norris's bland assurances, the addition of the Board of Examiners further complicated the already labyrinthine structure of State Board, Board University Committee, Local Executive Board, and President, which ultimately elicited

condemnation in 1915 by an American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

Investigating Sub-Committee.¹³⁰

The Board of Examiners' actions after a very successful Legislative session in 1911 forced Duniway back into the fray. He had lobbied hard during the session, so hard that the Board received complaints. His efforts paid off, however, as the outcome produced a University budget with \$167,000 for operations, \$2,000 more for extension work, \$10,000 for an academic Summer School, \$12,000 for a new School of Law, \$40,000 to purchase land becoming scarce around the campus, \$50,000 for an Engineering building, \$5,000 for a building for the Biological Station at Flathead Lake, and roughly \$8,000 in endowment interest, for a total budget of \$294,000.¹³¹ However, because of alleged insufficient state revenue, the Board of Examiners immediately suspended the entire amounts for the acquisition of land, Summer School, and the Engineering building, and \$3,000 of the Biological Station funds, removing \$103,000 from the University budget.

Nonetheless, Duniway expressed optimism about the new School of Law in September 1911 and a School of Forestry by 1913, assuming a favorable budget in the 1913 session. However, he complained sharply that the loss of the Engineering building, the Summer School, the additional land around the campus, and the Biological Station facility "postpones the development of the University." Despite his impassioned complaints and public criticisms, the Board in the June meeting commended Duniway for excellent leadership, extended his contract to 1 September 1912, and approved a salary increase.¹³² At the same time, the Board charged the Governor to appoint yet another committee of three Board members to develop a

plan to halt program duplication. With the Governor as Chair of the State Board of Education and Board of Examiners, and his allies ensconced in both, Duniway's antipathy to the reform of the governance system hardly augured a smooth road before him.

VI

For the first few years, Craig found it necessary to accept applicants for faculty positions with limited experience but strong recommendations regardless of degree attainment. Of the original faculty, only the President held a doctorate. Most of the others had taught either in high schools or briefly at the college level. In that regard, Morton Elrod taught for almost a decade at Illinois Wesleyan and William Aber for a few years at Utah, but neither had a doctorate.¹³³ Elrod subsequently enrolled in the first external doctoral program offered in the United States and earned the Ph.D. based on assigned reading and laboratory work, no further didactic courses, and a dissertation on Montana butterflies awarded by Illinois Wesleyan University in 1905.¹³⁴

Aber never pursued an advanced degree, and most of the early appointees followed his example, since they primarily taught courses in the University prep school or for undergraduate students. Without doubt, the level of instruction remained low, just as Robert Knoll observed during the early years at the University of Nebraska.¹³⁵ Although The University of Montana awarded its first graduate degree to Earl Douglass in 1899, a Master of Science, graduate education claimed very little attention until after World War II.¹³⁶ In fact, by 1942 the University had conferred only 256 master's degrees and no doctorates, with Education accounting for the largest number (seventy-five) of graduate degrees.

As the University matured, the degree attainment of the faculty rose. More of the early appointees pursued advanced degrees, although typically without institutional support.¹³⁷

William Draper Harkins and Jesse P. Rowe took leaves without pay to earn traditional doctorates, and an increasing percentage of new appointees came either with doctorates in hand or as doctoral candidates, such as J. H. Underwood (Economics, Ph.D.), J. E. Kirkwood (Botany, Ph.D.), and G. F. Reynolds (English, Ph.D.).¹³⁸ By 1910, one graduating senior student boasted that ninety percent of all freshmen took courses from Professors, not Instructors, and that forty-three percent of the faculty held earned doctorates.¹³⁹

Some of these faculty members contributed significantly to the development of the University. As an example, Professor Elrod, founding Chair of the Department of Biology, persuaded the President and the State Board to create an emphasis in Forestry, resulting ultimately in the School of Forestry in 1913, to assist with the management of the state's renewable resources. He also maintained a weather station on campus until 1934 when he suffered a stroke, and unsuccessfully urged an academic program in meteorology.¹⁴⁰ In another area, he took personal responsibility for the University Museum which, he boasted in 1915, contained "not a plant or a bug" when he arrived in 1897.¹⁴¹

By 1915, Elrod's Museum included the initial, quite small mineral collection donated at the founding of the University in 1893; some archaeology material from Earl Douglass's graduate work on neocene lake fossils; 150 insect cases filled with thousands of specimens of numerous species; 1,500 skins from 324 bird species mostly native to Montana, but no painted birds because of lack of space; several hundred skins of small mammals, a few heads and horns of

larger animals, and one mounted mountain goat (the gift of Allan Toole); shells of sixty-five mollusk species and thousands of others, including the exquisite collection presumably donated by Homer Squyer; 6,500 mounted plant specimens, primarily the work of Professor Joseph E. Kirkwood who taught Botany and Forestry after 1910; small collections of Indian artifacts, old coins, and works of arts; and thousands of photographs taken to chronicle the development of the University and document scientific excursions, with 4,000 cataloged (supplemented by a significant donation from the Missoula Camera Club).¹⁴² By 1930, the University valued the collection at \$430,000, and growth continued slowly over the decades.¹⁴³

Elrod's activities extended well beyond the confines of the campus. In 1898, he persuaded President Craig and the State Board to approve the establishment of a Biological Station at Flathead Lake for research purposes which today ranks as one of the finest freshwater stations in the world.¹⁴⁴ Working with President Craig and Representative Joseph M. Dixon in 1906-1910, he successfully secured a grant of roughly 160 acres for the Station in three locations around Flathead Lake. From 1900 until 1933, he strove to identify the fish population of Flathead Lake and provided the first comprehensive assessment of the Lake's fish production capacity in 1933.¹⁴⁵ In 1904-1907, he helped to establish the National Bison Range in the Ravalli hills under the aegis of the American Bison Society led by William Hornaday. He also explored the area that became Glacier National Park, collecting specimens of the flora and fauna, and worked with friends and colleagues for the establishment of the Park in 1910. Then, between 1922 and 1930, in collaboration with the Park Service and the Glacier Park Hotel Company, he established the Nature Guide Service within the Park and published and sold thousands of copies of Elrod's Guide and Book of Information of Glacier National Park.¹⁴⁶

Other early faculty also made individual contributions. Professor J. P. Rowe conducted extensive studies of Montana geology and mineral resources, subsequently continued by President Charles H. Clapp and other colleagues.¹⁴⁷ J. W. Kirkwood, recruited in 1909 as Professor of Botany and Forestry to initiate a Forestry program, published a leading study on the trees and shrubs of the northwest.¹⁴⁸ William Draper Harkins conducted chemical analyses, often funded by local groups such as the Deer Lodge Farmers Association, and later earned international prominence as a nuclear chemist at the University of Chicago.¹⁴⁹ Eloise Knowles, one of the first two graduates of the University in 1898, developed the University's Art program and, with the assistance of Robert Silbey, established the Penetralia Society that subsequently became the Mortar Board Chapter at the University.¹⁵⁰ Francis Corbin, former Principal of Butte High School, taught generations of Montana students how to think as they learned to write. The University named a residence hall in her honor in 1927.

By 1908, the University had attained considerable stability. The faculty accepted the challenge of developing programs despite the lack of resources and also provided the social capital that allowed the University to function.¹⁵¹ Enrollments remained a challenge, since most parents with the wherewithal thought first of well known eastern or west coast colleges and universities. While Craig's work with the public schools paid dividends, the other three campuses also shared the benefits. As Nathaniel Craighead pointed out, in order to attract a larger share of Montana resident students and more from outside the state, the University had to enhance its image as a university committed to delivery of education of the highest quality.¹⁵²

VIII

With determination and energy, President Clyde A. Duniway propelled the University toward mature status with the academic reforms he brought to the campus. During his short tenure of four years, he laid the foundation for a modern undergraduate university by establishing student choice of majors and electives and launching professional schools to prepare the students for productive careers in Montana and the nation. In an ironic twist, the administrator who gave full credit to the chorus of academic traditionalists calling for higher standards and recognition of faculty needs and rights also ushered in a new regime responsive to a changing student population with needs and demands of its own. At times, the demands of the two groups clashed.

Most students celebrated Duniway's reforms. J. W. Streit, President of The University of Montana Alumni Association, and J. B. Speer, Secretary, assured students and alumni in 1909 that Duniway's elimination of the prep school heralded a new era for the University and its students.¹⁵³ By implication, Streit and Speer emphasized that the new student population consisted of maturing young people with the elimination of the high school adolescents. To accommodate that change, Duniway's reforms recognized the students as individuals capable of making their own decisions and regulating their own conduct.¹⁵⁴ In addition, he provided more curricular flexibility that allowed students to take control of their own education.

Echoing Duniway, Streit and Speer identified the University as the only collegiate institution in Montana, as attested by the quality of the faculty, admission criteria, and high academic standards. Most notably, in their view, the antiquated curricula with the long list of

requirements no longer existed. Instead the student devoted roughly one-third of a self-selected program of study to restricted electives, one-third to free electives, and another third to a major. This new academic plan combined a general or liberal education with special training in a chosen field. It soon became clear, however, that not all faculty members applauded the change.

At the same time, the President tightened the admission criteria and alienated some potential students. The old criteria quite simply had gradually deteriorated and allowed admission to the University after graduation from an accredited high school by completing four years of coursework offered by the high school. Duniway's new criteria returned to specific required courses, with four years of English literature and composition, two years of language, two years of mathematics, one year of science, one year of history, and five free elective courses.¹⁵⁵ Students planning to study science, engineering, and other technical fields had to offer for admission more science and mathematics satisfactorily completed in high school. Most important, the accredited high schools agreed to mesh their graduation requirements with the University's revised admission criteria.

On campus, Duniway implemented an honor system that allowed students to control much of their own conduct and limited faculty involvement in student government. A similar change in the management of the Kaimin seemingly placed the student editors or the Associated Students of The University of Montana (ASUM) in control. The President also established strict rules for athletic eligibility, stressing academic success to participate in athletic competition. As he stated, "We are determined to maintain the right standards Since things have not

been right athletically in the University I am taking a great deal of pain this year to put them in good order."¹⁵⁶ Although the football team went undefeated in 1909, boosters on and off campus greeted Duniway's new rules less than enthusiastically. Much the same occurred with his refusal to allow fraternities to recruit freshmen and his insistence upon proper social conduct in the Greek houses.¹⁵⁷ Finally, his refusal to work with Silent Sentinel, a student organization formed to promote cooperation among students, faculty, and administration which operated under a code of secrecy, sparked hostility.¹⁵⁸ These actions tested student tolerance, and the Kaimin editors vented the outrage.

Although very supportive of professional school development, Duniway established only two during his tenure. In addition, he secured authorization for the University to offer training for and licenses but not degrees to Certified Public Accountants.¹⁵⁹ He also encouraged student management of the Kaimin, authorized Professor George Reynolds to grant academic credit for Kaimin reporting in 1911 through the Department of English, but did not propose a School of Journalism.¹⁶⁰ He finally secured certification as high school teachers for graduates of the University who completed the pedagogical methods courses, supported the establishment of an Educational Museum in 1910, and recruited Professor Howard K. Stoutemeyer who initiated student teaching in Missoula County in 1911. While the Department of Education flourished after 1913 with the appointment of Professor William K. Kemp as Department Head, it did not become a School until 1930.¹⁶¹

The School of Forestry actually grew out of the curriculum developed in the Department of Botany by Professor J. E. Kirkwood, recruited originally into Biology at Elrod's instigation.

Kirkwood also established the Forestry Nursery and University Herbarium.¹⁶² To foster further development in Forestry, Duniway persuaded President Hamilton of the Agriculture College to abandon a Forestry effort because of the burgeoning cooperation between the University and the U. S. Forest Service with offices in Missoula.¹⁶³ Prior to the formal establishment of the School, Duniway initiated a joint program with the Forest Service to provide a short course for foresters which, following a troubled start, continued for several years. The Pinchot-Ballinger controversy over conservation that led to Pinchot's resignation in 1910-1911 interrupted plans at Montana as well other Forestry schools throughout the country.¹⁶⁴ As a result, the School did not become official until 1913, although it existed as a program within the Department of Botany beginning in 1909.¹⁶⁵

Elrod and Harkins collaborated on a Public Hygiene course in 1910 which they designed as part of a premedical program, although Duniway dismissed the need for a medical school in Montana for several years.¹⁶⁶ Almost from the day of his arrival, however, Duniway invoked the Charter as the authority to establish a School of Law immediately and a medical school at the right time.¹⁶⁷ He surveyed the lawyers in the state, talked at length with colleagues and Law School Deans around the country, studied the curricula of state law schools, and sought public and private support for a School of Law.¹⁶⁸ With Senator Joseph M. Dixon, he secured the donation of the Law Library of W. W. Dixon, a long-time leader of the Montana Bar and attorney for the Anaconda Copper Company, along with an endowment to support the Library and a Professor of Law.¹⁶⁹ Finally, in 1911 the Legislature approved the establishment of the School and appropriated \$6,000 to support it.

However, the appointment of a Dean and the faculty proved contentious.¹⁷⁰ The ensuing discussion with Board members degenerated into heated argument, with Duniway insisting on the prerogative of the President to nominate the faculty and administrators.¹⁷¹ Missouliau Editor A. L. Stone agreed with Duniway about the imperative "to keep the institutions free from politics."¹⁷² In the angry debate, Duniway detected a conspiracy among Board members to appoint their friends and "partisans." In fairness, some people opposed his insistence on two years of college before admission to the School of Law and his advocacy of the case method of legal instruction.¹⁷³ Duniway later recounted to friends outside the state that he had to fight hard to protect the School.¹⁷⁴

After an extended stand-off, Duniway arranged a compromise with the Governor and other Board members and hoped for an outcome similar to that in the earlier Elrod controversy.¹⁷⁵ In this instance, however, while he prevailed on the compromise appointments, he lost concerning the President's prerogative to initiate and approve all appointments. As a direct result, although the State Board had commended him and extended his contract for another year in June 1911, the acrimonious struggle proved his undoing. He explained later that he had worried about possible fallout, but he had not anticipated the actual denouement.¹⁷⁶ In fact, with his usual naïveté partially based on conversations with the Governor and other Board members, he assumed that the divisiveness he feared had dissipated.

Having tired of Duniway's demanding truculence, Governor Norris charged the Board University Committee, without Duniway's participation, to investigate conditions at the University, citing a few letters from disgruntled alumni.¹⁷⁷ Charles Hall, who had led the fight

for the appointment of Montana attorneys to the School of Law and Chair of the Board's University Committee, conducted the investigation during Duniway's absence from campus, although he later disingenuously claimed unawareness at the time of Duniway's scheduled absence.¹⁷⁸ In an *ex parte* investigation, the Committee ignored the Local Executive Board and summoned named students and faculty to Hall's office for interrogation. Hall's two colleagues stayed an extra day and met briefly with Duniway when he returned to campus; Duniway reported that they said they had learned "nothing of any significance which might affect the University." The Governor provided the same assurance during a subsequent lunch with Duniway. However, the Governor later disputed Duniway's claim; he stated that he had merely expressed relief that the report did not confirm his worst fears.¹⁷⁹ Whatever the conversations, Duniway missed the signs of trouble.

In December 1911, during an executive session of the State Board, the Committee reported extensive complaints about unrest among the students and alumni, refusal to cooperate by the faculty, and disaffection among prospective University students in the high schools.¹⁸⁰ To protect the University from further damage, the Committee recommended against renewing Duniway's contract when it expired on 1 September 1912. In the absence of the Governor and Attorney General, out of the state on government business, the members of the State Board present at the meeting unanimously adopted the recommendation. Although he attended the December Board meeting and sat outside the room during the executive session purportedly convened to deal with an unrelated issue, Duniway did not learn of the Board decision until two days later. The Board members departed immediately after the executive session, some informing him that nothing of any consequence had occurred, claiming later that the Board

members had taken an oath of secrecy to protect Duniway.¹⁸¹ The secretary of the executive session, State Superintendent of Instruction W. E. Harmon, one of Duniway's friends and supporters on the Board, nonetheless immediately sent a letter stating simply that the University no longer required his services after 1 September 1912.¹⁸²

Upon receipt of the letter, Duniway immediately informed the faculty, claiming no prior knowledge of the abrupt nonrenewal decision or cause for it.¹⁸³ However, he suspected that "They had expected me to plead for consideration and to seek humbly for an opportunity to resign." He refused to give that satisfaction.¹⁸⁴ Board members explained subsequently that they had, in fact, kept the decision secret to provide Duniway the chance to resign and avoid embarrassment.¹⁸⁵ As the principal figure behind the decision, Hall advised faculty members, students, and the local community that "the Board did not want any agitation or discussion," underscoring the finality of the decision. He claimed that the Board members all held Duniway in high regard for his "scholarship[,] . . . sincerity and earnestness of purpose," but they agreed unanimously that the "impossibility of avoiding friction between himself and the board has become apparent."¹⁸⁶ Hall did not, however, explain how and why opinions had changed so radically after the Board unanimously commended and reappointed Duniway six months earlier.

Merriam concluded disconsolately that the Board "had several times taken summary action without hearings and adequate investigations against both presidents and faculty members."¹⁸⁷ Despite Merriam's lament, the Board had no obligation to renew Duniway's contract or to provide a reason for refusing to renew it. In addition, the Board provided timely

notice in December 1911 of the intention not to renew the contract when it lapsed in September 1912. Thus, the Board broke no new ground with the Duniway decision. Nevertheless, the decision contributed significantly to the growth of the myth of a "graveyard of presidents" in Missoula because of comments by Merriam, other University faculty members, and an AAUP Investigating Subcommittee charged three years later to investigate the refusal to renew Edwin B. Craighead's contract.¹⁸⁸ At the time, most people accepted the decision as final even if not procedurally elegant.

For example, Eloise Knowles, Instructor in Art, stated flatly that "Dr. Duniway is inefficient; he is a millstone about our necks," with no further explanation. Professor Aber wrote that "'Some good men are opposed to Duniway'" but he, himself, had "not yet heard a good reason from one of them."¹⁸⁹ By contrast, Professor Max Farrand of Yale wrote Duniway that he felt "as if I were consoling a man on the loss of his wife."¹⁹⁰ President David Star Jordan comforted Duniway with the observation that "the reactionaries have taken advantage of their opportunity."¹⁹¹

A voice from the past, former Senator Paris Gibson, assured Duniway that he had become the latest victim of an irresponsible Board of Education motivated by political concerns rooted in the segregation of the institutions of higher education.¹⁹² As he concluded, Duniway's courageous attempt to rectify the educational dysfunctions inherent in distributing the state higher education institutions around the state caused his fall. As he assured Duniway, "The hope of Montana lies in the consolidation of its higher education and the creation of a non-

partisan board of regents." Gloomily, however, he predicted a similar fate for Duniway's successor if he proved independent, an omen of more graves to come.

As a result of the few protests about the lack of a hearing, the Board invited Duniway to a special meeting in April 1912 to hear the Board's concerns and defend his record.¹⁹³ In preparation, Duniway solicited letters from high school principals and others to challenge and refute the charges leveled against him.¹⁹⁴ Several Board members questioned any need for reconsideration, but the Attorney General insisted on a hearing to refute the allegation of a "Star Chamber" proceeding. Since he and the Governor had not attended the December meeting, they wanted to make their opinions known. Despite his preparation, Duniway initially refused to offer any defense, since he, too, believed the Board had already decided not to renew his contract.

Hall seized the opportunity to deny once again any personal animosity toward Duniway. As he explained, the Governor and all other Board members held Duniway in high personal regard, but they found his leadership abilities inadequate. However, Hall made no attempt to reconcile the nonrenewal with the Board's commendation of Duniway in June. As he reported, the Governor had indeed requested the investigation of disruptive issues on the campus, but the findings, rather than providing the specific cause for the nonrenewal, actually manifested "the culmination, the last straw" in the erosion of confidence and trust. The Board had simply and finally concluded that Duniway had to go.

Hall and other Board members included a few specifics. Hall charged that Duniway had conducted an active campaign to undermine the Board by raising questions about higher

education governance. The Attorney General agreed and added that the Board had found Duniway's ideas interesting and challenging but impractical because too far "in advance of the times." More specifically, he criticized Duniway's lack of tact and discretion and pointed out that he had ignored the Board's wishes on many occasions. Almost from his arrival on campus, he had acted as a "lobbyist without request" or permission by the Board, continuously agitating before the legislature. Finally, the Attorney General denied Duniway's public allegation of secret machinations to force him to resign. If anything, the Board had taken deliberate steps to protect Duniway and his reputation, notably with the oath of secrecy. Duniway himself had released information about the Board's decision to the public, not any member of the Board.

Despite his initial reluctance, Duniway responded with a few brief remarks in defense of his record. He sharply denied that he had ignored the Board's wishes on any occasion, but he deigned to argue at length before a "Judge and Jury" already set against him. Had anyone informed him of the depth of the disaffection, he stated, he would have resigned immediately without rancor. However, no one, not the Governor or any of his personal friends on the Board, notified him of the loss of support. In fact, his friends only later explained that they supported the recommendation for nonrenewal only when it became clear that the overwhelming majority of Board members supported it.¹⁹⁵ In seeming confirmation, after Duniway concluded his brief statement, the Board unanimously reaffirmed the nonrenewal decision, charged Hall's Committee to identify candidates to replace Duniway by June 1912, and granted leave with pay to Duniway after the June Commencement for the remainder of his term. In the end, Duniway's demand for change at his initiative, combined with an insistence upon his

terms and an attitude of self-righteous rectitude, alienated too many people. Merriam sadly concluded that "Dr. Duniway lacked the warm personality that draws people toward one; though always a gentleman, he seemed severe, with his mind always on the University."¹⁹⁶ Without much public notice at the time, Duniway's early departure from the University added to the developing mythology of a "graveyard of presidents."

However, before leaving for Wyoming to assume another presidency, Duniway convened the faculty to elect Professor William Aber as Acting President.¹⁹⁷ Because of Aber's absence from campus, Frederick Scheuch served and became much disturbed by continued agitation relating to the School of Law.¹⁹⁸ Duniway, himself, posted dire warnings to Superintendent Harmon about the persistence of the 1911 conspiracy to seize control of the School of Law and the University, with Hall and Emeritus Dean J. B. Clayberg as the principal agitators. Clayberg claimed discretionary authority over the School of Law, subject only to the State Board, with support from Hall, who acted as if he held the presidency.¹⁹⁹

Harmon already knew of the continuing controversy about the School of Law, but he downplayed it. He congratulated Duniway on his appointment as President of the University of Wyoming and informed him of new discussions about combining The University of Montana and the Agriculture College at some neutral and convenient location.²⁰⁰ These developments reflected the chaos loosed when Duniway opened Pandora's box in 1909 with his plea for administrative unity. Before the frenzied effort to close the box succeeded, the University lost two Presidents, two faculty members, the Dean of Women, the School of Engineering, and its separate institutional identity. In the sequel, the mythology surrounding the institutional

structure of Montana higher education and of a graveyard of Presidents gained greater virulence.

A Missoulian editorial by A. L. Stone after Duniway's final Board meeting commended him for "rare scholarship, high ideals and earnest purpose" in the struggle to develop the University.²⁰¹ Unfortunately, his "utter elimination of self" to serve the larger purpose marked him "for the political guillotine." During the Alumni Banquet staged for the Commencement celebration on 5 June 1912, George H. Greenwood of the Alumni Association, despite his differences with Duniway about student organizations, defended the departing President: "Our University must be educational; not political."²⁰² Most importantly, "This University cannot progress while its president has to dance attendance on the legislature in order to secure funds." He thought a dedicated tax the only way to assure adequate revenue, and he also proposed an autonomous board of regents with final authority over the University. Greenwood's idealistic prescription for the University left out of account the reality of higher education politics in Montana.

In response, Duniway offered a new toast for ceremonial occasions, although he lacked the rhetorical effusiveness of President Craig's epigram: "The University of Montana – an inspiration; an opportunity." Seemingly in partial agreement with Greenwood and drawing into question the findings of the Board's University Committee, the class of 1912 presented to Duniway a silver cup and planted a tree on campus in his honor. The class also secured a life-size portrait of President Oscar J. Craig to hang in the University Library, apparently in the belief that the Board had ousted Craig as well, actually a correct assessment.²⁰³ In his final report to the Board in June 1912, Duniway boasted that faculty numbers had increased from

eighteen in 1908-1909 to thirty-three in 1912-1913 (Professors from thirteen to sixteen; Assistant Professors from one to five; and Instructors from four to twelve); student numbers from 150 to 203; and the University budget from \$64,310 to \$105,585.25 (after suspensions by the Board of Examiners).²⁰⁴ Two Board members objected that Duniway's reflections had no relation to the best interests of the University, so the Board buried them in an addendum.

In a hard-hitting statement, Duniway proclaimed "Nothing . . . more impressive than the defects in the system of divided institutions and their government in Montana."²⁰⁵ Four semi-autonomous and competing institutions generated duplication and wasteful rivalry with no offsetting benefits. He had proposed changes to initiate a public conversation about possible solutions before institutional inertia precluded any resolution.²⁰⁶ But the only response came in the convoluted governance structure imposed in 1909 granting financial control of higher education to the state's three highest political officers with no educational expertise, a clear prescription for disaster. Policy based on personalities or politics subverted all principles and undermined any system, in Duniway's mind.²⁰⁷ With pride of accomplishment, regret that the public dialogue aborted, and uncompromising rectitude to the end, he predicted that "Consolidation as even administrative unification seems . . . a dream, not to be realized because of the . . . force of localism."²⁰⁸ Nonetheless, "I leave this service with personal good will and with nothing but good wishes for the University of Montana and all who cherish and labor for it." Yet just four years later, the State Board established the administrative unity Duniway had so vigorously sought, but its emergence and ultimate fate remained unknown and unanticipated.

Despite the failure of his major project, Duniway left an irrevocably changed institution. Thereafter, University governance, wasteful program duplication, inadequate salaries, and the conspicuous lack of faculty perquisites and rights claimed prominent places on the higher education agenda. In 1908, the University faculty had seized the opportunity created by Duniway's appointment to press for salary adjustments. After conducting an exhaustive survey, twenty-four faculty members signed a memorial in 1910 requesting relief. The data revealed an average salary for the faculty of all universities between St. Paul and Seattle at \$2,975, with the University of Montana at \$2,200 and the cost of living in Missoula roughly twenty-five percent higher than elsewhere.²⁰⁹ The faculty demanded rectification of the disparity.

Even earlier, Duniway had recommended to the State Board 1) a revised salary schedule with a \$3,000 maximum for senior full Professors; 2) an additional rank of Assistant Professor for new appointees of promise not yet qualified for Professor; 3) the continuous tenure for Assistant Professors and Professors reappointed for three consecutive years, with dismissal thereafter only for retirement or cause; 4) faculty access to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching retirement program; and 5) sabbatical leaves every seven years at half-pay for full Professors.²¹⁰ By December 1912, the Board had accepted only the first two of his proposals.²¹¹ In his parting comments, Duniway cautioned the Board of the consequences of further delay. In a very real sense, he prepared the way for Chancellor Edward C. Elliott's major achievements after the 1916 establishment of the multi-campus University of Montana. However, the State Board of Education and the political leaders still had some painful lessons to learn in modern higher education politics and governance.

IX

Duniway's departure failed to suppress public discussion of unification or consolidation of the Montana institutions of higher education. Thus, in October 1912, the University faculty in Missoula discussed a resolution concerning duplication adopted by the faculty of the Agriculture College for consideration by the State Board in June 1913.²¹² The resolution asserted that the state lacked the resources to allow duplication of physical science and engineering programs and urged the Board to prevent or eliminate it. In the June 1912 meeting, the Board had adopted a similar resolution offered by the Governor, both apparently suggesting consolidation of programs rather than institutions.²¹³ During that same period, University Economics Professor J. H. Underwood, in a letter to the Missoulian editor, described plans by the Agriculture College to consolidate engineering on the Bozeman campus.²¹⁴ Another letter cited editorials in the Bozeman press arguing that the time had come to merge the duplicating programs, not the institutions.²¹⁵ In Underwood's opinion, the Agriculture College had the advantage if and when program consolidation occurred because of its federal funding and superior facilities for instruction and research. Many suspected imminent change. The suspense ended in December when Lt. Governor W. R. Allen and a group of citizens proposed consolidation of the four institutions to the State Board of Education. Few doubted the involvement of Governor Norris in the development of the proposal. After Professor W. W. Kemp of the University Department of Education presented the rationale, the State Board unanimously adopted Governor Norris's resolution that "we favor the consolidation . . . [of the four institutions] into the Greater University of Montana" and committed the Board to "use all honorable means to the same."²¹⁶ Then, on 27 December, the MSTA reaffirmed its long-term

support for consolidation and resolved to assist the State Board however possible. As had others, Merriam noted the membership of the MSTA resolution committee included J. M. Hamilton, President of the Agriculture College.²¹⁷ Despite or perhaps because of the abruptness of its introduction, consolidation immediately commanded public attention in Montana.

Missoulian editor A. L. Stone initially leaned in favor of the Board resolution.²¹⁸ The plan for merging the four institutions specifically called for use of the original four campuses for new polytechnic high schools. The state needed occupational and vocational training as a critical supplement to an effective higher education program. For financing, the proponents called for a dedicated levy of one and one-half mills to generate an estimated \$600,000 to \$1,000,000 annually, donated land, and an endowment sufficient to the purpose. Stone noted that petty politics had defeated consolidation in 1893 and also foiled Duniway's valiant effort to correct that costly error. While the State Board and the politicians had ignored Duniway's suggestions, Stone thought he had obviously struck a public nerve.

For reasons not apparent, the Missoulian's tentative support soon became criticism if not outright opposition. Some accounts attributed the cause for the switch to the rising antipathy between Joseph M. Dixon, the Missoulian publisher, and new University President Edwin B. Craighead. The conflict grew out of Craighead's early decision to award the printing business to a Missoulian competitor at a higher price.²¹⁹ Dixon sneeringly referred to Craighead later as a dangerous pied piper of discord. As Dixon claimed, Craighead's "inordinate vanity," combined with a "brass band, red fire and rah rahs" style, led to "continued warfare and

bickering with everybody in Montana who would not pay due homage at his shrine."²²⁰ The hostility of the Missoulian intensified after Stone resigned as editor and accepted Craighead's invitation to become Dean of the University's new School of Journalism in 1914.²²¹ Dixon blamed Craighead for the political chaos of the divisive consolidation campaign and its dismal aftermath.

Following a search when Duniway departed, Governor Norris had invited Edwin B. Craighead, then President of Tulane University, to become President of The University of Montana in June 1912.²²² Merriam remarked on the stark contrast between the two men. "Where Dr. Duniway was meticulous and severe he [Craighead] was easier-going and tolerant. The Duniway need for strict adherence to regulations he replaced by a more clement operation."²²³ Without saying so, Merriam implied that Craighead's affability at times undermined his judgment. Clapp found Craighead's energy astonishing for a man two years older than Craig when the first President arrived and eleven years older than Duniway.²²⁴ However, she also considered his decision to ship forty palm trees for planting on the campus in Missoula symptomatic of his impulsive personality.²²⁵ Both Merriam and Clapp thought Craighead obsessed with consolidation, although neither suggested his recruitment because of that passion.

Charles Hall, the Chair of the Search Committee, never mentioned consolidation as the basis for Craighead's selection. In fact, no direct evidence demonstrates that Craighead got the position because of his reputation for creating a single institution from disparate elements. However, Stone thought it significant that Craighead had successfully integrated Tulane University during his presidency.²²⁶ Governor Sam V. Stewart, Norris' successor, stated later

under trying circumstances that Norris had told him Craighead promised *not* to pursue consolidation if appointed.²²⁷ However, Stewart's opposition to consolidation, Norris' support for it, and Craighead's activities immediately upon arrival in September 1912 cast grave doubt on Stewart's allegation. If not recruited specifically to promote consolidation, Craighead certainly acted the part with the support and encouragement of Governor Norris and other consolidation supporters.

Jules Alexander Karlin, Dixon's biographer, described Craighead as an able administrator, gifted with energy and imagination, but hampered by a tendency to bluntness and a lack of tact.²²⁸ He also had a large ego and became even more abrasive under the influence of alcohol, which, according to the historian of Tulane University, "always seemed to bring out the worst in him." In any event, Karlin concluded that Craighead espoused consolidation from the outset. Shortly after his arrival in Montana, he wrote confidential letters to several state leaders outlining his thinking about consolidation.²²⁹ By December, when the State Board adopted the consolidation resolution, Craighead had already exerted his influence in the background.²³⁰ On 26 December 1912, he greeted the 300 attendees to the MSTA Convention in Missoula by reading the resolution the MSTA had adopted in 1893 supporting consolidation and closed with the fervent hope for an equally memorable outcome in 1912.²³¹ The Convention complied with a new and even stronger resolution.²³²

In January 1913, the new President revealed his intentions in several letters. To Henry Pritchett, President of the Carnegie Foundation, in order to strengthen the University's application for membership, he explained that Governor Norris planned to establish a Board of

Regents composed of nonpartisan appointees to govern the University and to secure a dedicated levy of one and a half mills for its support.²³³ He neglected to mention that Norris had to accomplish that feat quickly because of the end of his administration. Craighead's use of his national contacts to nominate Norris as President Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of the Interior indicated the close relationship he had with the Governor, although the nomination itself failed.²³⁴ Craighead had met Wilson, then President of Princeton University, when they participated in chartering the Carnegie Foundation in Washington, D.C.

In late January, Craighead confidently predicted a successful outcome of the consolidation movement.²³⁵ He castigated President Hamilton and the Agriculture College faculty for abandoning a commitment to consolidation and refusing to accept Norris's counsel to limit the College courses and programs as appropriate for an agriculture college. It defies credibility to assume that he did not know that the land-grant college representatives had defeated a similar effort in the late nineteenth century.²³⁶ Yet Craighead and Norris launched an abortive national campaign to prevent duplication across the country as well as in Montana by persuading Congress to circumscribe the programs of the agricultural colleges.²³⁷ Berating President Hamilton for succumbing to public pressure in Bozeman, Craighead counted on the other two Presidents for assistance. He regretted that he had made some enemies in Bozeman and a few in Missoula, but the cause required both words and action.

It soon became evident that Craighead's optimism lacked any basis in reality. As Karlin, Merriam, and Clapp agreed, he frequently mistook his preferences for facts. In early January 1913, even as he credited Craighead and some misled but sincere and influential people for

generating a movement, Stone detected a more sinister and hidden source of the consolidation agitation. He suspected that corporate interests had hijacked consolidation for reasons having nothing to do with improving higher education. Stone charged that the Anaconda Copper Company and its bipartisan supporters planned to divert attention away from the critical issues before the coming legislative session by invoking the disruptive power of the mythology surrounding the structure of Montana higher education. The charge by implication also invoked the mythology of Company political dominance. Stone mentioned specifically the Company opposition to a proposed workman's compensation bill and the Company's determination to sustain its influence over legislative agendas, tax reform, and woman suffrage.²³⁸ He also identified Governor Stewart as a member of the Company's bipartisan group of political supporters and warned the educational reformers of this Trojan horse of deception with so much at stake.

Stone thought it significant as well that faculty members from the other three institutions stayed at home and attended to their responsibilities while University faculty swept across the state promoting consolidation.²³⁹ Several of them publicly proclaimed that the University "amounts to nothing;" while demonstrably false, Stone thought the accusation the likely outcome if the campaign continued along its current path. In response, several people faulted Stone for failing to take note of the lobbying activities of the College faculty and of the Bozeman newspapers demand for consolidation of Engineering at the College.²⁴⁰ Nonetheless, Stone's editorials and articles increasingly defended the University and denied that consolidation offered a viable means of improving an already fine institution.

When Lt. Governor Allen convened the Association for Consolidation in Helena to draft the consolidation legislation, he barred all but his carefully selected twenty-five Committee members.²⁴¹ As a result, only the larger communities had representatives, with not a farmer on the Committee, a likely sign of hubris. Stone and others called for replacing the Committee with a special representative commission to deal with the matter. One opponent from Missoula argued that only Helena and Great Falls had the capability to meet the Committee terms that required firm commitments of 5,000 acres and a million dollars to endow the consolidated university.²⁴² In any event, the writer doubted that the state had the authority without federal permission to abandon the land grants and federal funds already provided for the Agriculture College in Bozeman. Stone and several others foresaw growing opposition and predicted failure in the Legislature.

In late January 1913, Stone completely repudiated the Craighead plan as a clever, self-serving, and unproductive diversion from the difficult task of securing the resources the University needed to grow.²⁴³ As had many before and after him, he argued that maintenance of the four segregated institutions afforded the best possible service to the greatest number of Montanans.²⁴⁴ During a meeting with business leaders in Missoula, Craighead objected when Stone referred to consolidation as "the Craighead Plan." After all, the President noted, the State Board of Education had first publicly endorsed it.²⁴⁵ Stone countered that several members of the Board denied having any part in originating the plan; they had not even heard of it until the Board meeting in December. Lt. Governor Allen actually introduced it but Stone had no doubt about the proposers: none other than the new President of the University and the outgoing Governor.

J. H. T. Ryman and the majority of the Missoula business community shared Stone's and Dixon's antipathy. Ryman wrote to former President Duniway in Wyoming that the Missoula business community debated and obliterated the Craighead plan during a luncheon meeting lasting more than four hours.²⁴⁶ Craighead agreed that the outcome of the meeting had not met his expectations and he blamed Ryman and Dixon.²⁴⁷ On an earlier occasion, as he recalled, the Missoula Chamber of Commerce Executive Committee had unanimously endorsed consolidation, and Missoula Mercantile owner C. H. McLeod had volunteered to commit 5,000 acres and to raise the endowment funds in Missoula. Craighead exuded confidence that most Montanans preferred a large campus with all its advantages. He intended to continue the fight because of the importance of the issue, still very upbeat about ultimate victory.

Unfortunately, but perhaps predictably, the consolidation bill failed in late January to win a majority in the state Senate by the vote of eighteen to twelve. Stone caustically announced the defeat and associated it with the defection of the Company forces after the reformers vainly tried to gain control of the legislative agenda.²⁴⁸ Having sustained control, the Company lobbyists and supporters no longer had any interest in consolidation. The lack of direct evidence of the hidden forces at work apparently revealed the cunning of the shrewd manipulators, and the myth of Company domination became stronger with every such incident. The Fergus County Democrat agreed about the loss but made no mention of the Company.²⁴⁹

Immediately Craighead's supporters announced a new plan to secure signatures to require a voter initiative on the issue in the 1914 election. However, opponents in the Senate devised a

different approach in a substitute bill introduced by Senator Ira A. Leighton (Republican, Jefferson County). The Leighton Act incorporated Duniway's administrative unity -- "consolidation in name only" -- and ultimately won legislative approval late in the session, with Governor Stewart's endorsement. The Act maintained the four institutions in their current locations with their current functions, reasserted the governance authority of the State Board of Education, and authorized the Board to appoint a Chancellor to administer the four campuses of a restructured University of Montana, also occasionally referred to as "the Greater University of Montana."²⁵⁰ Two years after he left the state in defeat, Duniway from afar witnessed the state approval of his proposal.

Despite news of its death, however, consolidation proved astonishingly obdurate. The Butte Miner put the matter in perspective. "It seems that of late every time the state university changes its president that new official immediately undertakes to have undone the action which the people of Montana took years ago, and with which they appear to be pretty well satisfied today."²⁵¹ Stone considered the Leighton Act a desirable outcome of the agitation.²⁵² Having the institutions under the direct control of a single executive charged to eliminate unnecessary duplication augured a better future for higher education and the state. However, he completely ignored the initiative campaign. On the other hand, Craighead assured Norris of several state Senators "with me on the initiative." They intended to salvage as much as possible from the failed statute, especially the dedicated mill levy. In any event, Craighead optimistically opined that the Leighton Act "has some merit if they can get an able and tactful chancellor. Of course, they will try to eliminate me and they will doubtless make a very strong appeal to Stewart."²⁵³ He recommended an effort to persuade or force Governor Stewart not

to change the membership of the State Board of Education, once again revealing his refusal or inability to recognize reality.

In tandem with his persistent support of consolidation, Craighead moved vigorously to secure a significant increase in University support during the 1913 session. He advocated with considerable success a new approach to state appropriations that took account of the federal funds going to the Agriculture College and the Agricultural Experiment Station housed on the Bozeman campus.²⁵⁴ In March, the Appropriations Committee recommended \$340,000 for the University compared to \$260,000 for the College, since the College also received \$100,000 from the federal government.²⁵⁵ After a compromise, the University received \$315,000 and the College \$272,000. Nevertheless, Craighead had scored his point.²⁵⁶ The Board of Examiners later adjusted the University budget to \$296,000 for 1913-1914 but increased it for 1914-1915 to \$327,000.²⁵⁷ Craighead lost the first round but won the second, and the initiative campaign for an appeal to the people still looked promising for the third round.

During the State Board's special meeting in April 1913, Stewart made his first counter move by placing the Leighton Act on the Board agenda along with *pro forma* consideration of institutional budgets for the coming year.²⁵⁸ Craighead requested an expanded Summer Session courses for returning teachers, without consultation with the Normal School, and some other courses that duplicated College offerings. Predictably, the Normal School objected to the courses for teachers and the College to the duplication of its courses. The Board allowed the teachers' courses, with a caveat preventing reimbursement for teacher travel, but denied any other new courses to the University. As the main event, the Board charged a committee to

recommend the processes necessary to implement the Leighton Act and to curb unnecessary duplication for consideration during the June Board meeting. Governor Stewart's intentions seemed clear enough, supported by a reconfigured and supporting State Board of Education.²⁵⁹

In June, the Governor and the Board moved with dispatch to preempt the initiative effort as well.²⁶⁰ The Board approved the implementation of the Leighton Act and authorized the Governor to appoint committees to identify how to eliminate unnecessary duplication, equalize faculty salaries across the institutions, and design a Seal for the unified four-campus University of Montana on 1 July 1913. After hearing Craighead's requests for additional faculty members in Law, Commerce and Accounting, and Engineering, the Board adjourned to executive session and, upon re-convening, approved new faculty members in Law, English, Domestic Science, Public Speaking, and German or French, but none in Commerce and Accounting or Engineering. Having revealed its intentions with little subtlety, the Board adjourned until July.

The duplication committee made campus visitations but failed to reach consensus about the elimination of unnecessary program duplication when the Board convened in July.²⁶¹ The committee members, however, viewed Engineering at Missoula as "the only important duplication existing." To resolve all unnecessary duplication, the committee urged a conceptual approach designed to assure 1) an agriculture college "devoted exclusively to technical and industrial learning" and 2) a university confined "to the fine arts and liberal learning."²⁶² The committee and the entire Board either ignored or did not know of the

unsuccessful effort of the Populists and academic traditionalists in the late nineteenth century to limit the land-grant colleges. In any event, they either assumed that, once implemented, the conceptual approach required each institution to operate "within a different sphere," or that the appointment of a Chancellor assured the accomplishment of that objective.

Anticipating some action about Engineering during the July meeting, Craighead came armed for combat. In an opening statement, he argued that both the University Charter and specific legislation since 1893 authorized Engineering at the University. Of equal importance, the synergistic relationship between Engineering and Forestry, with the latter dependent upon the former, threatened to weaken the new School by denying Engineering support. He reminded the Board of the critical importance of both Forestry and Engineering to the state. In fact, he limited the Board to only two choices about how to eliminate unnecessary duplication, since everyone rejected the status quo. Either make the College entirely technical, leaving the other two institutions to their specific purposes, and allow the University to become a full University; or merge the other three with The University of Montana in a comprehensive university. He rather obviously commended the second choice.

Actually, as Craighead explained, only the second option met the tests of feasibility and practicality: "If you cut out engineering . . . It will bob up again." The University must have Engineering to serve the community, region, state, and nation, and he made no effort to conceal his determination to assure that The University of Montana fulfilled its mission. In support, J. H. T Ryman pointed out that the defeat of consolidation in January left the two institutions as originally chartered. Both Engineering programs had viable enrollments, thirty-

six students at Missoula and fifty-one at Bozeman. Why reduce the opportunities for Montana's young people. Hall joined in and predicted female student predominance at Missoula without Engineering. More important, he argued that a growing state needed the two programs with different specializations. As a default, Hall considered the issue so significant that it required referral to the Legislature.

However, the Board majority doubted that the state, now or in the near future, had the resources to support two Engineering programs. Therefore, it followed that federal funding for the College swung the balance. The Governor prompted Hamilton to explain that federal funds paid the faculty salaries and the cost of equipment for Engineering at the College. Hamilton also seized the opportunity to supplement Ryman's numbers. While only fifty-one College students majored in Engineering, fully 135 students in Agriculture and other disciplines enrolled in Engineering courses. Board member Largent spoke for the majority to emphasize that consolidating the Engineering program at the College offered the means to cut in half the cost to the state for facilities and limited the need for operational support significantly because of the federal funding.²⁶³ Craighead's ploy of calling attention in his budget request to the federal funds going to the College backfired disastrously.

After discussion in executive session, the Board reconvened and announced a six-part decision that 1) transferred Mechanical Engineering with three faculty members from the University to the College; 2) authorized new courses and programs at the University in Journalism, Commerce and Accounting, and Household Arts and Design; 3) requested the release of the Forestry funds by the Board of Examiners to the University, including two new Forestry faculty

members; 4) approved three additional faculty members for the University in Biology, Law, and Music; 5) transferred Pharmacy from the College to the University, with two faculty members; and 6) eliminated the programs at the College in Vocational English, Mathematics, Physics, and General Science, and confined Fine Arts to Technical Art, consistent with the new conceptual approach.²⁶⁴ These dramatic changes manifested the new conceptual approach and evinced the Board's intention to remove any vestige of duplication likely to lend support to the consolidation initiative. Largent voiced the majority conviction of the necessity to act to preempt the voters.

In December 1913, the State Board removed the last semblance of overlapping programs by limiting Education at the University to secondary and higher education and assigning the primary grades and rural schools to the Normal School in Dillon.²⁶⁵ To enforce the new regime, the Governor charged a Committee on Publications for the unified University to insure that all published curricula "of the several departments of said University . . . correspond with their several educational functions." Then, in June 1914, the Board rejected Governor Stewart's motion to delay all facility requests until after the November election.²⁶⁶ Thereupon, the Board approved every request, including \$10,000 for the Forestry building at the University and twenty percent salary increases for the University faculty, signaling the majority consensus about the preferred fate of consolidation, since no request violated the new conceptual approach. The budget allocations for the coming year augured the benefits of administrative unification and denied the need for consolidation.

The State Board also took positive action in the June meeting on three other proposals explicitly designed to influence the outcome of the November election. First, the Board rescinded the Norris resolution of December 1912 supporting consolidation, purportedly to allow the voters to decide the issue.²⁶⁷ However, the rationale for the rescission left each Board member free to support or oppose consolidation but proscribed intimidation of faculty, staff, students, alumni, or the public. Second, the Board adopted a resolution prohibiting "turmoil, agitation, and intemperate discussion of public questions" on any University campus, and excoriated even "the idea of conducting any campaign on any public matter before the people" on or off the campuses. Underscoring the purpose, the State Board emphasized that the members viewed "with disfavor the continuing of any campaign either within state institutions or from within state institutions." Third, the Board approved sabbatical leaves of one year at half-pay for Professors and Assistant Professors with six or more years of service.²⁶⁸ Combining the stick with the carrot, the Board sought not just to sway but to dictate faculty opinion.

X

Having lost the battle with the State Board, Craighead expanded the war by committing the University to the statewide initiative campaign.²⁶⁹ Governor Stewart later confirmed that the resolution of June 1914 had deliberately targeted Craighead and the University faculty. As he told the AAUP Investigating Subcommittee, the Board ultimately released the other three institutions to engage in active campaigning when Craighead and the University faculty refused to stop.²⁷⁰ The University provided a large group of faculty and administrators to work closely

with the Citizens Committee for Consolidation, former Senator Paris Gibson as Chairman, including Professors Elrod, Aber, and Kemp and Dean of Students Mary Stewart.²⁷¹

H. A. Davee, Superintendent of Public Instruction, organized teachers, students, and alumni from all the campuses. Morton Elrod, at Craighead's insistence, became the owner, publisher, and editor of The Inter-Mountain Educator, the official organ of the MSTA, and brought it to bear in support of consolidation.²⁷² Davee labored to prevent the politicians "from playing these institutions each against the other," and Elrod urged righting an old wrong.²⁷³ The initiative sponsors had no difficulty securing the necessary signatures and waged a vigorous campaign. The opponents answered in kind, with Presidents and faculty volunteers from the other campuses.

Despite reports of popular enthusiasm for the initiative, various state leaders and the public at large soon developed second thoughts. Governor Stewart and former Senator Dixon contributed to that outcome when they clarified their positions. During a public meeting in Missoula in January 1914 with the Governor, former Senator, and both Presidents attending, Dixon warned of the unintended consequences of continued agitation over consolidation.²⁷⁴ He left no doubt that all of the institutions had violated their Charters. However, he shared Governor Stewart's hope that the Leighton Act offered a solution if the public wanted one. Despite areas of agreement with the Governor, he made it clear that he considered the Board's transfer of Engineering from Missoula to Bozeman a terrible but correctable blunder. "A state university, running without an engineering school, is a joke." However, continued agitation made rational discussion impossible and promised only conflict that fed divisiveness. As for

himself, he doubted any need to centralize higher education and denied the prudence of curtailing programs. Instead, he challenged Governor Stewart to “make a Cornell at Bozeman and a Harvard at Missoula.”

Governor Stewart apologized for entering the fray, having done so, he explained self-righteously, only to supply the facts in a one-sided public discussion.²⁷⁵ He equated the consolidation campaign with the imbroglio over the state capitol in 1889-1894, predicting huge costs in societal strife and little benefit. In carefully chosen words, he dismissed Dixon’s challenge because of the expense, although he also warned about the divisiveness certain to accompany continued agitation.²⁷⁶ Stewart urged people to keep in mind that the existing arrangements for Montana higher education had worked well, reflective of the synergistic fit between each institution and surrounding community. In his opinion, the state had entered into a solemn, binding, and irrevocable contract with each host community.²⁷⁷ The communities had respected the terms of the contracts and the state in turn had to abide them.

For Stewart, Norris's 1909 statute had clarified the State Board of Education’s control of the institutions, and the Leighton Act “in reality consolidated these institutions” in their existing locations. These two legislative acts and the resultant Board actions to reduce program duplication promised to resolve all problems afflicting Montana higher education.²⁷⁸ The Board had confined all Engineering except Mining Engineering to the Bozeman campus and transferred some programs from the College to the University as an explicit response to the Legislature's directive to prevent unnecessary program duplication. Finally, by proceeding with the appointment of a Chancellor, the Board had taken the final step “to bring . . . higher

education . . . to those who need it most, instead of endeavoring to provide . . . a superior brand of culture" for the few. He thought the "healthy rivalry" among the institutions offered far more benefits to the state than one large, bureaucratic, centralized institution of higher education.²⁷⁹

In this same speech, Governor Stewart also strove to put the best possible face on the Board resolution of June 1914.²⁸⁰ As he explained, the State Board supported open and free discussion of all issues. In fact, the Board had adopted the resolution to quell turmoil, agitation, and intemperate discussion, and warned against intimidation of others, interference with academic functioning, or dereliction of duties. He, himself, had advised those who persisted in agitation to resign and find places elsewhere, while indignantly reaffirming his and the State Board's commitment to open and free discussion. He disclaimed any intention to force resignations, and spoke out merely to demand decorum. "What I did say was that those employees of the state institutions who were going about and apologizing for the state's educational system and belittling its institutions should in all decency, first sever their connection with the same."

Professor Aber challenged the Governor's threatening commands.²⁸¹ A good society depended upon active and involved citizens. He welcomed rational argument and denied that the Governor had the right "to censure and threaten anyone in the faculties or any state official for supporting consolidation" or "stating facts about the institutions or 'apologizing for the Montana's educational system.'" As for Stewart's concern about irrevocable contracts, Aber asked rhetorically, invoking Thomas Jefferson, "Should the dead hand of the past forever block

useful change?" Surely the people have the right to change dysfunctional institutions. After reciting statistics to prove the financial case for consolidation, he closed by ridiculing Stewart for failing to see that "in this state the whole drift of education sets so strongly towards manual arts that cultural education is being swamped." Consolidation promised the means to address the drift into mindless mediocrity.

Elrod opened the pages of the Educator to all proponents of consolidation, with opponents appearing only as foils. In addition, he printed in full the original initiative and all revisions and wrote biting editorials urging adoption of the initiative and condemning the political intervention of the Governor and the State Board's attempted gag rule.²⁸² He blasted the Leighton Act as a façade since it placed "the institutions under the name, the University of Montana, but left the four heads of the four institutions to act independently."²⁸³ He also excoriated the Butte Miner and the State Board for the incorrect assumption "that the body of thinking men and women, who are doing a great deal to make sentiment for everything that is good and elevating, have neither the right to an opinion nor the expression of an opinion on this education subject." As evidence of public opinion, he boasted that the citizen group proposing the initiative had secured the required signatures within less than two weeks.²⁸⁴

For the most part, the proponents and opponents rehashed arguments from 1893, adding new data about student and faculty numbers, the cost of education with or without consolidation, the duplication of course and program offerings, and the loss of prior public investment by abandoning the current campuses and facilities. The proponents tried hard to keep the focus on the advantages of a large university with its expanded array of programs and economies of

scale and downplayed the possibility of a bureaucratic behemoth. In response, the opponents emphasized the costs of consolidation because of relocation, loss of access caused by centralizing higher education, and the erosion of quality because of the anonymity in large institutions.

Public meetings and letters in the press featured heated exchanges that personalized the often bitter debates but provided very little new information. In mid-October 1914, Dean of Women Mary Stewart “found a large number of people astonishingly ignorant of the Consolidation measure.” She urged President Craighead to convene “a lot of big meetings where a big audience could be attracted.” She had talked to small groups in Big Timber and Conrad but warned that success in the campaign required much more effort. Craighead wrote to the alumni of the University urging them to become active but to speak “on a high plane” to correct the erroneous arguments of Governor Stewart and others opponents.²⁸⁵

In perhaps the last exchange between the two major protagonists, Craighead accused the College of duplicating University programs; President Hamilton of grossly exaggerating enrollments and graduates in agriculture and engineering; and the College faculty of aggressive lobbying while simultaneously refusing to sign public statements because of fear of reprisals. By intended contrast, he committed himself and the University to “freedom of speech and freedom of thought.”²⁸⁶ Hamilton denied any hostility toward the University he had helped to establish. In detail, he reaffirmed the validity of the statistics he had cited earlier and claimed that all but one of the College's agricultural graduates continued to work in agricultural pursuits. As perhaps the most critical point in the discussion, Hamilton echoed the arguments

of his predecessors in the late nineteenth century culture wars that the Morrill Act required land-grant colleges to provide a "liberal and practical education" for the industrial classes. The College had not encroached on the University, but had respected in full the Morrill Act directive.²⁸⁷ In the end, however, academic arguments failed to overcome parochial interests linked to impact on local economies and residents.

The public agitation continued unabated until the voters rejected consolidation overwhelmingly in November by a margin of 15,846 votes, 30,465 for and 46,311 against.²⁸⁸ Clapp asserted that people in remote areas became energized when rumors spread of strong support for consolidation, reinforced "by propaganda that vested interests, mainly the A. C. M., were backing consolidation."²⁸⁹ At the time, Elrod offered a diametrically opposed explanation that the large corporate interests, including the Company, school boards, chambers of commerce, and the railroads, captured the newspapers across the state and prevailed against consolidation.²⁹⁰ In this instance, the popular mythology pitted the Company both for and against consolidation, although no solid evidence supported either claim. For Elrod, even getting the chance for people to vote on the matter amounted to a victory. He thought that "consolidation is right and will prevail. If not now, then on some future time, when it will cost more. But the more an article costs, the more it is liked." Mythology counted far more heavily than evidence in his and other allegations and conclusions.

Most people probably thought the overwhelmingly negative vote put a period to any further discussion. Very little good had come of the wasted time, energy, relationships, and resources. At the end of the day, nothing much had changed, although questions remained about the

Leighton Act's utility to assure unity and prevent duplication. Then, too, no one knew for certain whether President Craighead meant to continue the campaign. Contrary to Elrod's prediction of victory for consolidation some day, most commentary welcomed an end to futile agitation. As examples, the Butte Miner proposed a constitutional amendment to secure the existing campuses in their current locations; and the Missoulian cautioned that "This s a good question to let die."²⁹¹

XI

Governor Stewart and the State Board moved promptly to secure the victory. A divided vote of seven to four authorized a committee of Stewart, Attorney General D. M. Kelly, and Billings Superintendent Ward G. Nye to launch the search for a Chancellor.²⁹² During the same meeting in December, Craighead projected a three hundred percent increase in University enrollment since 1912, from 343 in 1912-1913 to 1,000 by the close of the current academic year.²⁹³ The responsive state appropriation had funded significant salary increases and the recruitment of several excellent faculty members. He boasted of six new departments or schools and the steady growth of Extension and Correspondence Courses.²⁹⁴ For the coming biennium, the State Board recommended ten percent increases for the State University and Agricultural College, \$5,000 more each for the School of Mines and the Normal School, and \$20,000 to support the Chancellor.²⁹⁵ While the prognosis for the restructured University seemed promising, storm clouds formed once again when the Legislature met.

With the stage set, the final days of Craighead's tenure opened inauspiciously. He considered the favorable vote of more than 30,000 people in the election as proof of growing support for consolidation, auguring success if he rallied the forces. He, too, thought large corporate

interests had undercut the popular crusade, specifically the Company, liquor combine, and major railroads.²⁹⁶ He dismissed any concern about possible retaliation if he persisted, the Duniway example notwithstanding, convinced of sufficient popular support to sustain him. Perhaps revealing his denial of reality once again, he missed completely the significance of the State Board's investigation in January 1915 of a talk in New York by Professor Carl Getz of the School of Journalism allegedly libeling the Governor.²⁹⁷ It hardly required inspection of the entrails of a goose to glimpse the future in early 1915.

Determined to persevere, Craighead counted on his popular and legislative support to terminate Stewart's unification plans. To that end, and at Craighead's request, Representative Ronald Higgins of Missoula introduced and secured passage of a bill to repeal the Leighton Act.²⁹⁸ Stewart and the Democratic majority sought to table the bill in the House but failed. Craighead's supporters rallied in an acrimonious debate in both the Senate and the House and the bill passed easily. However, the House subsequently sustained Stewart's veto of the measure late in the session. The Speaker of the House justified that outcome because of the imperative need for an executive officer "to control the political situation in Missoula."²⁹⁹ Thus, Stewart preserved his and the Board's preferred means of unification and signaled the end to Craighead's last ditch but abortive campaign.³⁰⁰

As early as May 1914, rumors had circulated that a majority of the State Board members intended to terminate Craighead.³⁰¹ Nothing came of the rumor at the time, but the pundits recognized that Craighead had few options. Governor Stewart explained in July 1915 that removal of Craighead had come up several times between December 1913 and April 1915, but

that on each occasion he successfully deflected it.³⁰² After the first of the Board discussions, he explicitly informed Craighead that the Board had his contract under review and warned him to stop agitating. When other Board members conveyed the same message, Craighead mended his ways until after the June 1914 meeting. However, when he threw the University into the initiative effort in the fall of 1914, Stewart found it extremely difficult to restrain the Board. He later claimed that he took special steps to assure that dismissal or nonrenewal of Craighead's contract did not originate within the Board itself. Nonetheless, he anticipated nonrenewal of the contract in September 1915, if not termination earlier.

Craighead, however, innocently feigned ignorance and denied that he had any inkling of the Board's intent. He had opportunities, he said, to accept other positions, and had rejected the most recent one because he preferred to remain in Montana. He also stated that the Governor had specifically reassured him, dismissing any concern.³⁰³ Governor Stewart heatedly denied Craighead's claims. "I said to him flat footed that the position of the board was not favorable, and that if he had a position in view in any other place that he had better take it, and I told him that, but he gave me to believe that he wanted to stay in Missoula and would endeavor to do so, and that seemed to be his desire." Other members of the Board confirmed the Governor's explanations, including some who voted to renew Craighead's contract in June 1915.

According to Karlin, Craighead probably unintentionally sealed his own fate when he instructed faculty members and friends during the late spring to write letters to Hall and the Board extolling his administration.³⁰⁴ The directive caused considerable consternation among the

faculty, some of whom refused to comply and worked either overtly or covertly with J. H. T. Ryman to persuade the Board to dismiss Craighead. As a member of the Local Executive Board, Ryman appeared before the State Board during the June meeting and reported on conditions at the University. He explained later that the Board already had full knowledge of Craighead's flawed management, and that he based his charges on widespread public knowledge.³⁰⁵

To support dismissal of the President, Ryman's charges covered the water-front, ranging from misuse of funds to falsifying documents, paying student athletes, fomenting letter writing campaigns, alcohol abuse in public, and dereliction of duty. In specific, Ryman pointed to the numerous fiscal errors the state audit examiners found in the University accounts, bespeaking "a lack of system and good executive ability."³⁰⁶ An AAUP Investigating Subcommittee subsequently found several of the charges had merit, although concluding that most involved minor oversights or lack of adequate controls.³⁰⁷ In the end, Ryman concluded that Craighead deserved dismissal for "hammering the consolidation issue" in violation of the Board's clear preference and policy.³⁰⁸

Be that as it may, the Board never debated or evaluated Ryman's charges but simply tabled them. In executive session, the majority of the members agreed instead not to renew Craighead's contract when it expired and affirmed that conclusion in a seven to four vote in open session.³⁰⁹ Board member C. F. Morris of Havre explained in a letter to C. H. McLeod of the Missoula Mercantile that Stewart had appointed individuals to the State Board in January 1913 with that ultimate end in mind.³¹⁰ Immediately after the vote, the Governor charged the

Attorney General to verify the Board's legal authority to appoint a Chancellor, accepted the resignation of President Hamilton of the College, upon the appointment of a successor, and named Professor Frederick Scheuch as Acting President of the University when Craighead's contract lapsed. As it turned out, Scheuch continued as an interim appointee until after the first Chancellor assumed office.

Craighead reacted professionally to the Board decision with a letter to every current and admitted student urging them to enroll in the fall.³¹¹ Rather than protest by staying away, he counseled them to return and continue the struggle to build a great university. The future of the University depended not "upon me or any one man or any number of men. It is greater than governors and state officials, greater than political parties." Several faculty members stated in a public meeting that Craighead had asked them to protest the Board decision, although no confirming evidence exists.³¹² Nonetheless, the nonrenewal of Craighead's contract led to great consternation in Missoula, in contrast to the passive acceptance of Duniway's departure. Perhaps Merriam's emphasis on the differing persona of each explained the disparate public reactions.

Some 1,200 people attended a mass protest meeting in Missoula on 9 July that lasted from 8:30 in the evening until 1:00 in the morning.³¹³ Dixon and Ryman attended to defend themselves, interrupted frequently when they spoke. Most attendees came seeking redress of a grievous wrong, although the Governor publicly announced the finality of the decision.³¹⁴ Mrs. Tyler Thompson, a prohibition leader in Missoula who ignored the alcohol abuse charges against Craighead, lamented that "Three times we have gone through this awful ordeal in

seven years."³¹⁵ Craig built the University from nothing, and they "let him out;" Duniway elevated the quality, and they "let him out;" Craighead, "second to none in the United States, personal friend of Woodrow Wilson, member of the Carnegie Foundation Board of Directors," transformed the University, and they "let him out." She concluded that the State Board wanted "a nice, perfect lady of a gentleman." Most unfortunate of all, Craighead had no notice of the impending decision. "We give our servant girl a two weeks' notice," she snipped. The myth of the graveyard of Presidents received its most vociferous articulation during the Craighead mass meeting.³¹⁶

After several other speakers, former Senator Dixon took the floor and recounted his many services to the University, beginning with laying the corner stone of Main Hall and planting trees around the campus.³¹⁷ He chided the participants for foolishness in following a man who came to Missoula ambitious to lead a consolidated university and whose "activities have cost you the charter of the state university now merely a department of the state university ." Craighead had pursued his objective by offering the University to the highest bidder, whether Missoula, Bozeman, Great Falls, or Helena. Having spent money blindly in the crusade, he refused to stop even after the people resoundingly defeated consolidation. Dixon urged everyone to cease and desist.

The protest meeting ended in mass confusion. Dixon's editorial in the Missoulian the next day reported that the resolutions supporting Craighead won resounding approval well before anyone read them or had spoken. No opinions changed, no new facts emerged, and nothing much occurred except "Washing dirty linen in public."³¹⁸ However, a collateral issue remained

for resolution. Craighead actually had notice of the likely nonrenewal of his contract in September, but three professors "who had not seen fit to bow to Craighead's shrine" did not have notice. Craighead's friends -- Board members Hall, Dietrich, and Largent of the Board's University Committee -- unanimously recommended against renewing their contracts because those three individuals refused to support Craighead and allegedly assisted Ryman with preparing the charges against Craighead. Unaware or dismissive of the facts, the Board blithely accepted the recommendations.³¹⁹

Mary Stewart, Dean of Women and Instructor in Languages, probably did assist Ryman, reportedly infatuated with her.³²⁰ Years later, when he died in 1926, Ryman left most of his substantial fortune to the University to support a library, student scholarships, and graduate fellowships in Economics. However, he set aside a portion for the lifetime support of Mary Stewart, to revert to the University upon her death. Ryman's motives in providing the support undoubtedly reflected his sense of gratitude for her assistance in preparing the charges against Craighead. However, his actions also corroborated the "unpleasant rumors" about the relationship between Ryman and Dean Stewart that Merriam discreetly mentioned in a footnote and Karlin verified.³²¹

The two faculty members, Professors G. F. Reynolds of English and T. L. Bolton of Psychology, had criticized Craighead for lowering academic standards and they refused to write supporting letters.³²² According to Clapp, the two faculty members did not have reputations as trouble makers.³²³ Some people found Bolton's Freudian analyses offensive, and Reynolds directed some plays that attracted public criticism. Both faculty members had sterling scholarly and

teaching records, and both earned distinction later in their careers. Several other faculty members also refused with impunity to send letters, since only about two dozen did. Craighead took no part in the three nonrenewals but actually intervened to protect other faculty members who did not support him. Karlin and others accepted the explanation that Hall, the Chairman of the University Committee, presented the motion not to renew the contracts because of his support for Craighead and the Board approved it to placate Hall.³²⁴ Perhaps, but no direct evidence supported that claim.

Because of complaints from Missoula women's groups and a petition to the AAUP Committee on Academic Freedom, the State Board found the collateral damage of the three nonrenewals without notice distasteful.³²⁵ In a bizarre sequence of events beginning during a special meeting in October 1915, the Board denied any critical intent and abruptly reinstated the three if they accepted leaves for 1915-1916, without pay for the two men and with half-pay for the Dean of Women.³²⁶ Whether they ever accepted or rejected the terms, they never had the opportunity to return to the campus during or after the 1915-1916 academic year.³²⁷

The Governor had convened the special meeting in October 1915 to consider Charles E. Elliott as the leading candidate for the Chancellorship.³²⁸ Dean of the Wisconsin School of Education, noted Education scholar, charter member of the American Association of University Professors, and member of the AAUP Committee of Fifteen on Academic Tenure and Academic Freedom, Elliott visited Montana in September 1915 and subsequently informed the Governor of his willingness to accept an offer.³²⁹ Prior to appearing before the Board, Elliott listed ten conditions for his acceptance and the Board satisfied them all.³³⁰ In addition to the salary,

term, and perquisites of office, the most important of Elliott's conditions required the Board to approve his contract unanimously; commit to an academic tenure policy for the faculty; authorize the Chancellor to recommend all appointments, salaries, promotions, and grants of tenure to faculty; and confirm the Chancellor as the executive officer of the State Board. His first term began on 1 February 1916.

During the period from June to October 1915 when Elliott actively pursued the position in Montana, the AAUP Committee on Academic Freedom appointed him as a member of the Investigating Subcommittee for Montana. According to Frank Burrin, Elliott said he did not learn of the Board's reinstatement of the three faculty members until some weeks after it happened, although he discussed the case itself with the Board during the October meeting. In October, he bluntly informed the Board that failing to renew the three contracts without notice "violated every essential principle of academic administration" and the "ordinary requirement of equity."³³¹ After accepting the position as Chancellor, Elliott resigned from the Committee of Fifteen and the AAUP and wound up his affairs in Wisconsin.

Since Elliott did not assume office until February 1916, Governor Stewart had to deal with the faculty leaves of absence, although he tried hard to shift the responsibility to Elliott. In response to inquiries, he assured the AAUP Committee of the Board's commitment to the three faculty members, explaining that the Board had restored them as University employees on approved leaves.³³² The Board had corrected the flawed process by approving the leaves and reinstating the three individuals. More important, to prevent such errors in the future, the Board intended to adopt new policies and procedures based on faculty tenure of office and

assuring due process, timely notice and hearing, and appeal for all suspensions or dismissals, with the Chancellor as the administrator. The Governor and the Board expected the Chancellor to take appropriate action to this end after his term began on 1 February 1916.

However, during the regular Board meeting in December 1915, Chancellor Elect Elliott declined any involvement in the fiasco before or after he assumed office in February.³³³ Reynolds and Bolton visited Elliott in Wisconsin and Elliott reaffirmed his refusal. One or both also specifically requested to return to campus in 1916-1917. Elliott corresponded throughout a lengthy process extending into 1917 with the AAUP Committee, the Investigating Subcommittee, the Governor, Reynolds and Bolton, and the Board members. However, it fell to Board Executive Secretary H. H. Swain to notify the three individuals that the Board refused again in executive session on 28 April 1916 to renew their contracts.³³⁴ In response to an inquiry from the AAUP Committee, Chancellor Elliott confirmed that outcome, mentioning that the Governor had dissented because the Board had still not provided hearings.³³⁵

Although Elliott rejected any role in the matter, he nonetheless counseled the Board that reinstating the three on approved leaves had magnified the original error. In communications with the faculty members, he agreed that he had the responsibility to present recommendations to the Board if they requested to return to campus. Nonetheless, he informed them that the Board considered the matter closed and intended to discharge them as unfit for their positions after hearings if they sought to return.³³⁶ Clearly, the new Chancellor promised only a *pro forma* process culminating in an inevitable and foreordained outcome. In

the final analysis, he suggested resignations as the best possible resolution of an unfortunate if not impossible situation.³³⁷

Frank Burrin exonerated Elliott on the grounds that he had to sacrifice the rights of three people in order to protect the restructured University, not yet a reality.³³⁸ In his view, Elliott "could hardly have been expected to start his career under the shadow of a particular faction." President Clyde Duniway had faced the same dilemma in 1908 with the Elrod situation but had opted for principle. The AAUP Investigating Subcommittee rejected Burrin's rationalization in a decision that nonetheless revealed uncertainty about principles and their emanations as the nascent AAUP searched for firm footing. In fact, the AAUP used the Montana decision to invent policy and procedure for such cases, bringing the details of institutional governance within its purview.

In that regard, the AAUP final report began by condemning the convoluted governance system in Montana that Craighead sought to reform, and specifically commended Elliott for planning to change it.³³⁹ After confessing uncertainty whether the Montana controversy involved the freedom to teach and learn, the Committee nonetheless opined that "problems of academic freedom were concerned."³⁴⁰ Eschewing a full review of Craighead's administration to assess the validity of the charges brought against him, since the Board had tabled the charges, the Subcommittee focused on academic freedom as illuminated by "certain phases of the relationships of governing board, president, and faculty," whatever that meant.³⁴¹ In an evasive discussion, the conclusion became apparent if not logically clear.

The AAUP found that the State Board dismissed Craighead because of his leadership of the reform campaign, "or, technically speaking," did not renew his contract.³⁴² Although apparently recognizing a semantic and substantive difference between dismissal and nonrenewal, the AAUP report failed to sustain the differentiation. Without evaluating the allegations leveled against Craighead by Ryman, the Subcommittee identified only a few of them by denying their validity or relevance. Returning to the major premise, the Subcommittee concluded that the Board summarily "dismissed" Craighead "in reality . . . because of . . . his attitudes on consolidation," not because of the unproven allegations, in a hasty and unjust decision "prejudicial to the best interests of higher education in the state."³⁴³ In fact, the Board took no action on the Ryman charges. But the Subcommittee defined the Craighead "dismissal" as "a direct blow at the principle of university freedom" since it resulted from "his activities on behalf of consolidation."³⁴⁴ In a circular argument, the conclusion followed from the initial assumption that a dismissal, even if putative, occurred.

In fact, no one explained precisely how the statements concerning Craighead's alleged dismissal related to academic freedom and academic tenure. In the final analysis, the Subcommittee seemingly held that neither the Governor nor Board had the authority or rightful power, whatever the circumstances, to prevent University officers and faculty from speaking or acting on public policy issues, or to take cognizance of any such speaking or acting if in opposition to Board policy deliberately adopted. Moreover, the decision never reconciled that holding with the State Board's constitutional authority and responsibility to decide and implement higher education policy and insure that the institutions fulfilled their missions

under approved policy. In the end, the AAUP report never got much beyond ridiculing the higher education governance system adopted deliberately by the State of Montana .

The Subcommittee did criticize Craighead and Hall for soliciting and directing supporting letters from the faculty, but judged those acts as simply "unfortunate and indiscreet." At the same time, the Subcommittee conceded that Craighead actually threatened not to support anyone who failed to support him.³⁴⁵ Craighead admitted that he only refused to support one faculty member for disloyalty, but did not name the person.³⁴⁶ In addition, the Subcommittee found that Craighead knew of payments to student athletes but took no action.³⁴⁷ More generally, the Subcommittee found wide-spread faculty agreement that Craighead's policies and actions, while not deliberate and intentional, resulted in lowered standards , inequity, and a decline in research, and that his administration lacked clear policies, standards, or a functional budget system.³⁴⁸ Nonetheless, in the Subcommittee's view, Ryman's charges did not rise to the level meriting dismissal, never mind that the Board had tabled and never evaluated them and did not dismiss Craighead. In the end, the AAUP Subcommittee faulted the Board for using nonrenewal of contract to avoid dismissing Craighead but offered no explanation for finding fault with a deliberate exercise of legitimate Board authority.

As for Stewart, Bolton, and Reynolds, the Subcommittee found solid ground to support a claim of gross violation of applicable principles and due process procedures, and condemned the nonrenewals and then dismissals as arbitrary retaliation and -- ironically -- placation of Craighead's supporters on the Board.³⁴⁹ Reinstatement on approved leaves after non-renewals followed by dismissals without hearings proved the abuse. The Subcommittee also

faulted Elliott for standing aloof and dodging his responsibility. By counseling the Board about the error of reinstatement, Elliott actually intervened and incurred some of the responsibility.³⁵⁰ Chancellor Elliott responded with the insouciant complaint that harassment by the Investigating Subcommittee caused delay in developing the Board's new policy for faculty appointments and dismissals, an objective "for which the committee on academic freedom was established."³⁵¹ Apparently, the new beginning for higher education in Montana and the restructured University required a willingness to get on with the changes whatever the unanticipated challenges, effects, and collateral damage.

With that resolution, the matter ended. The AAUP had no authority to provide remedies for violations of principle and no power except exposure to enforce sanctions. Over time, as the principles advocated in the 1915 statement became widely accepted and endorsed, the AAUP used a censure list and public opinion to aid those deprived of due process.³⁵² In addition, the AAUP recruited a trained staff to provide direct assistance. In 1916, Reynolds, Bolton, and Stewart went on to successful careers in higher education and other pursuits, as had Duniway before them, apparently little affected by the dismissals in Montana.³⁵³ Karlin mused whimsically that the outcome aptly demonstrated "the accuracy of the adage that a faculty member dismissed by the University of Montana will better himself."³⁵⁴

Unsatisfied, the University students launched an effort to oust Ryman from the Local Executive Board or his dismissal by the State Board of Education.³⁵⁵ Ryman refused to resign but met with the students and simply ignored their demands. Acting President Frederick Scheuch assured the students of their right to petition but urged them to verify all allegations. In a

private communication to the Chancellor, Scheuch regretted the ASUM resolution condemning Ryman, an egregious affront to an old and trusted friend of the University. In the sequel, the Board heard, tabled, and took no action on the student request. After his arrival in 1916, the Chancellor assured the students of an appropriate resolution. Nonetheless, Ryman remained a member of the Local Executive Board until he resigned in 1923 to accept appointment by his old friend, new Governor Joseph M. Dixon, to the State Board of Education and served until his death in 1926.

Neither chastened nor converted, former President Craighead entertained no doubt that he had always acted with honor and integrity. He let friend and foe alike know that he intended to defend himself.³⁵⁶ He also assured students and alumni that he had no complaint against the Board for its actions. Rather than continue a futile effort, he accepted the position as Commissioner of Education in North Dakota where he served for two years.³⁵⁷ During his tenure, he launched a campaign to consolidate the institutions in that state only to suffer another defeat when the Governor vetoed legislation authorizing his salary.³⁵⁸ Thereafter, with the assistance of his sons, he founded a newspaper in Missoula, The New Northwest, to compete with Dixon's Missoulian as an independent voice in state politics. In 1920, although by then Dixon had sold the Missoulian, Craighead plunged into an unsuccessful battle to elect Burton K. Wheeler over Dixon for Governor.³⁵⁹ The newspaper struggled until his death in 1920 when his sons sold it to a group including a faculty member in the University School of Law purportedly interested in establishing a "community" newspaper.

During his brief tenure, Craighead moved the University closer to maturity. While obsessed with consolidation, he nonetheless championed significant progress. Elrod actually said more with what went unsaid when he gave the former President credit for expanding collegiate work and adding professional schools, with the laconic comment that Craighead retired after the people opposed consolidation.³⁶⁰ Jules Karlin described him as "arrogant, stubborn, unalterably convinced of the correctness of his judgments and fortified by a belief in his invulnerability."³⁶¹ In Karlin's jaundiced view, Craighead's reckless and futile crusade to defeat Governor Stewart led to "a campus strewn with symbolic wreckage and portents for the future."

Mary Brennan Clapp found it very difficult to strike a balance. As a result she devoted almost as many pages to interim President Frederick Scheuch as to Craighead, despite the critical importance of the Craighead years.³⁶² Beginning with Craighead's own heroic statement that "men are not so much the product of the times as the times are what men make them," she concluded by comparing him to Claude Debussy, the French musical Impressionist who "seemed to make his own scale, but unfortunately introduced thus an unharmonious interval that although drawing a larger audience, temporarily broke up the chorus."³⁶³ Whatever she intended, her characterizations angered Craighead's son who inflicted on her a most "severe psychological wound" and determined her to shelf the unpublished "Narrative."³⁶⁴ Barclay Craighead sneered at Clapp's "Maurice Avenue gossip about the University," denigrating the "Narrative" as an outrageous waste of University resources. He found it particularly egregious that Mrs. Clapp "has gone through the semi-private correspondence and selected random bits in an effort to paint this picture" of President Craighead as "a Madison Avenue huckster and a

foolish one." He considered it "fortunate that Maurice Avenue has been closed, so that some sweet lady will not in 2005 send to Dr. McFarland's son the same sugar poison about his father's resignation [*sic*], labeled as history."

More objectively, H. G. Merriam wrote in 1944 that "No really grand plan seems to have been conceived [for Montana higher education] since President Craighead tried to unite the units of the University, and made the mistake of insisting on Missoula as the location."³⁶⁵ Merriam's comment to the contrary notwithstanding, most people thought Craighead erred in the plan itself, since he always remained open about the location. In the History, Merriam offered an even more positive assessment. He credited Craighead with bringing to the University an aggressive expansion of students, professional schools, undergraduate and graduate programs, facilities, athletics, and University involvement in the state at large.³⁶⁶ As a result of his efforts, enrollment doubled in three years, the number of faculty members nearly doubled, the number of graduates increased by about fifty percent, and the budget by approximately fifty percent.³⁶⁷ Only research failed to flourish under Craighead's leadership, as he terminated the University bulletin series that began in the 1890s because of cost concerns and other priorities.

Changes in quality occurred as well. Craighead recruited faculty members with sterling credentials and recommendations who accepted the challenge to develop programs: N. J. Lennes (Ph.D., University of Chicago) in Mathematics, with 135 publications when he retired in the 1950s, most of them focused on mathematics education; R. H. Jesse (Ph.D., Harvard) in Chemistry, subsequently Dean of Men, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Dean of the Faculty; W. W. Kemp (Ph.D., Columbia), subsequently President of San Jose State Teachers

College and Dean of Education at the University of California, Berkeley; Carl Holiday (Litt.D,) who taught in five states in addition to Montana; DeLoss Smith, Dean of the School of Music, who himself made violins and cellos, transformed the campus into a forum for visiting artists, and served until his death in 1939; A. L. Stone, founding Dean of the School of Journalism, who lived to occupy a new building in the 1940s; Dorr Skeels, former Supervisor of the Kootenai National Forest and founding Dean of the School of Forestry, who raised the School to a level comparable to Yale and Michigan; Thomas G. Spaulding, who succeeded Skeels as Dean of Forestry, and who personally secured a large land donation for the University from the Anaconda Mining Company in 1938; William R. Bateman (A.M., Stanford), Professor of Chemistry, also a poet and musician who taught in China prior to coming to Montana and retired in 1947; C. W., Leaphart (J. D., Harvard), faculty member and Dean of the School of Law, who retired in 1954, after two absences from campus on other assignments; S. B. Langmaid (J.D., Harvard), Professor Law; L. J. Ayer (J.D., Chicago), Professor of Law; and Carl Getz (M.A., University of Washington) Professor of Journalism.³⁶⁸

As for programs, Craighead launched the School of Forestry under the approval secured by Duniway. The University also received from the State Board the authority for Schools of Commerce and Accounting (Business Administration), Domestic Science (Home Economics), Journalism, Pharmacy, and Music.³⁶⁹ However, as Professor R. H. Jesse noted years later, Craighead allowed administrators of academic Departments or programs to claim titles as Deans of Schools, including Journalism, Pharmacy, and Music, later ratified retroactively and quietly by the State Board at Chancellor Elliott's request.³⁷⁰

In any event, Craighead's efforts enabled the University to enter the next era in its history with a significant array of programs supported by a distinguished faculty. In addition, as perhaps his most important contribution, Craighead secured University accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1914.³⁷¹ Even considering the collateral damage of the consolidation campaign, Craighead assured the students in the Fall of 1915 that the State University "would run of its own momentum for a year or two." In any event, he assured them that he considered Vice President Scheuch fully qualified to handle the duties of Acting President.³⁷²

XIII

Through the dedication and hard work of administrators, faculty, and students, the campus environment and ambience changed radically during the first two decades of the University's existence. Quite naturally, as the old Willard School building and the barren plain gave way to A. J. Gibson's masterly structures, so campus life became more social, agreeable, and attuned to the sensibilities and interests of increasing numbers of young people. Professor Elrod vividly memorialized that "The character of faculty and students, not the number, is what gives results."³⁷³ With "clear headed , optimistic, energetic, and hopeful" faculty working diligently with students "in capacity and ability . . . the peers of students" everywhere, the University had prospered as it changed and developed a new character, despite chronic underfunding.

On the other hand, again according to Elrod, the University's modest enrollments and small but dedicated faculty provided an educational environment supportive of individual students, characterized by intimate interactions between students and faculty mentors. As the years

passed, Elrod and his colleagues looked back wistfully on the early years and sought ways to reclaim that mythical ambience. Elrod himself agreed with the observation of one of his students, Harold Urey, future Nobel Laureate in Chemistry and one of the University's most distinguished graduates, that small institutions enhanced student growth and maturation by flattering "their vanity, their self-regard and . . . [inducing] them to do an enormous amount of work which otherwise they might not do."³⁷⁴ The increasing numbers of students and faculty eroded that supportive environment, but the pursuit of it remained a characteristic of The University of Montana in Missoula.

As examples of faculty attention to academic nurturing, Elrod, William Aber, and Eunice J. Hebbell fostered the first student publication, initially a monthly that ultimately became the daily Kaimin in 1909 and thrives today.³⁷⁵ Elrod wrote one of the first articles for the new journal.³⁷⁶ As an example of campus cultural activity, new Professor George F. Reynolds of the Department of English received harsh criticism from the community when in 1909 he directed "The Silver Box" by John Galsworthy. His public reply that "Anybody who says the play is immoral has no more brains than a bat" perhaps partially explained the decision not to renew his contract in 1915.³⁷⁷ However, he apparently overcame the earlier criticism with his production of Moliere's "La Malade Imaginaire" in 1910 as announced in the Kaimin: "The performance will begin promptly at 8:30. Carriages may be ordered for 10:45." Clapp noted, however, that even by that date "no paved streets or cement walks or car line " ran to "University Heights."

Elrod also collaborated with Professor J. P. Rowe and Coach Hiram B. Conibear to organize and direct the first Interscholastic Meet at the University in 1904. Designed to attract students to the campus, the first meet hosted the participation of students from twenty state high schools in track and field events and seventeen schools in declamation and debate.³⁷⁸ Officially sponsored by the State High School Athletic Association, the annual meet proved invaluable for recruiting purposes, so much so that Presidents exerted themselves to keep it in Missoula.

Largely through student initiatives, the University by 1908 boasted a YMCA and YWCA; the Pentralia Society for female honor students; several literary societies, including the Shakespeare Club, Quill and Dagger, Clarkia for women, and Hawthorne for men; an Associate Mechanical Engineers Club; a Science Association for faculty and student scientists; an official University Debate Team that competed against teams from the western states and at the national and international levels; and a Music Club, Glee Club, Sextette, and Orchestra with weekly performances and for ceremonial occasions.³⁷⁹ Two sororities, Kappa Gama (1909) and Kappa Alpha Theta (1909), met for years in the Women's Building under the guidance of Preceptress (later Dean of Women) Alice Young.³⁸⁰ For men, Sigma Nu (1905) and Sigma Chi (1906) fraternities had national charters, but to some appeared to lack appropriate decorum.³⁸¹ In addition, at least three local Greek letter associations thrived during these years. One organization, Silent Sentinel, founded initially to improve relations between the President and faculty and the students, became controversial during Duniway's tenure because of its code of secrecy. Punctilious to the end, Duniway refused to interact with it but Silent Sentinel persisted without his approval.

The students presented plays, carefully monitored by supervising faculty who refused to allow anything too risqué, as for example "Ten Nights in a Barroom" in 1897. They also arranged dances (chaperoned by the faculty), sponsored debates, published an annual entitled the Sentinel beginning in 1904 (under faculty supervision), an alumni journal beginning in 1905 (also faculty supervised), and staged various social events (typically chaperoned), as students did everywhere.³⁸² In 1911, the faculty voted to give the students the authority to plan and conduct the required convocation, which had replaced Chapel, every other week.³⁸³ In addition, the students organized the Associated Students of The University of Montana (ASUM) in 1906, with Elrod, Harkins, and other faculty members assisting and participating, an organization that persisted in various forms into the twenty-first century.³⁸⁴

Several campus traditions began during these early years. The first Arbor Day celebration occurred in 1895, according to J. M. Hamilton, when students, faculty, and community members planted trees on the campus.³⁸⁵ A. L. Stone claimed 1899 for the first Aber Day when the community planted more trees and cleaned the campus, and he cited Scheuch's diagram of the trees with attached names.³⁸⁶ Hamilton also recalled the first Commencement in 1898 with two graduates, Ella Robb Glenny (A.B.) and Eloise Knowles (Ph.B.), held in an "old frame theatre on East Main Street." Alumna Kathryn Wilson (1902) described it fondly and memorably in the Montana Alumnus (February 1907).³⁸⁷

The first graduation exercises -- what an event! Held in the 'Grand Opera House', another relic of 'first things', whose bareness was decently covered with flags and bunting in class colors; its draughty stage honored by the presence of state officials

and members of the faculty, -- and, oh yes, the two graduates -- and its shifty chairs bearing up as best they could under a large audience; it was a scene long to be remembered, for did not the guests sit quietly and appear interested while the class read its two theses? Indeed, yes; and when it was all over, lo, there were the first two alumnae and the nucleus of an Alumnus Association.

Clapp also described the first "Singing on the Steps" in 1904, a Homecoming event in later years, arranged originally by Robert Sibley who "brought it from Berkeley, where someone else had brought it from Princeton." Whether the repertoire included "Old College Chums" as today remains unknown. Sibley circulated an invitation to the students: "'Be at the steps below the tower at 7:30 this evening. It will be fun; and a tradition will be established.'"³⁸⁸ Members of the founding generations realized their obligation to establish traditions binding the students, faculty, and alumni to the University. That same year, according to Clapp, George Greenwood wrote the music and Gertrude Knapp the words for "Montana, My Montana" as the University song. Charter or Founders' Day began in 1905 and continued each year with a campus-wide celebration.³⁸⁹ In 1911, the freshmen painted the M for the first time, a tradition that persisted until a permanent structure existed.³⁹⁰

Intercollegiate athletics began with the first University football and track teams in 1897, evoking strong student and faculty support, and the first basketball team played in 1902.³⁹¹ Montana Field, later Dornblazer Field, did not exist until 1902, so the football team played the first games "on a field they marked off on the flat at the east end of South Fifth Street," so close that the ball often landed in the Clark Fork.³⁹² Initially, University rules prevented the

women's basketball team from playing in public, but the rules soon changed. The faculty disallowed contests on Sundays and warned Coach Conibear against any profane language on the field, whether successfully remains unknown.³⁹³ Elrod mused that the University began without athletics but still managed to attract worthy students and faculty.³⁹⁴

The football team played six games in 1897 -- three against the "Tigers," a local non-collegiate team (all ties) and two against the Butte Business College (both wins) -- and made its opening debut in Bozeman defeating the Agriculture College team by a score of eighteen to six (touchdowns counted for five points until 1912).³⁹⁵ Chemistry Professor Fred Smith served as the first coach and played in several of the games the first year.³⁹⁶ In the early years, the team played against high schools as well as colleges, and the coaches often played on the teams. The Montana State Intercollegiate Athletic Association finally established new rules in 1898 allowing only students (initially requiring six credits but raised to ten to prevent professional athletes from playing and transferring) as players and setting the season from the first of September to Thanksgiving. The University did well in competition, earning the state championship in several years, and playing Syracuse to a tie in 1915, with Paul Dornblazer and Harry Adams as team members that memorable year.³⁹⁷ However, concerns quickly surfaced, especially when President Craig insisted that the Bears, Bruins, or Grizzlies -- the name remained unsettled until the twenties -- had to win.³⁹⁸ In any event, Craig left to Duniway the resolution of problems related to athletics as well as those involving fraternities and secret societies.

By 1918, the State University, with an endowment of \$539,715, mostly from the sale of 30,668 of its federal land-grant of 46,560 acres, and an annual budget of \$309,410, employed sixty-five regular faculty members (forty-five percent held doctoral degrees), nineteen lecturers, and seven librarians, for a total professional staff of ninety-one.³⁹⁹ Enrollment had reached 941 students that year, 638 women and 304 men, and the University boasted 488 alumni. The major sector of the University, the College of Arts and Sciences, offered regular courses in Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Economics, Education, English, Fine Arts, Geology, History and Political Science, Home Economics, Latin and Greek, Mathematics, Modern Languages, Physics, Psychology, Public Speaking, and Physical Education, but not all through separate Departments as yet. In addition, five professional schools offered undergraduate or first professional degrees, specifically Business Administration, Forestry, Journalism, Law, and Pharmacy, with the School of Education authorized in 1918 but not yet established and a School of Music not yet offering degrees.⁴⁰⁰ Programmatically, the University awarded the A.B., B.S., and very few selected master's degrees. Quite clearly, despite inadequate resources and obsolescent and dysfunctional policies and procedures, the University had fulfilled the expansionist thrust of its 1893 Charter.

The physical campus included fifty acres on the plain in 1918, with an additional 520 donated acres at the foot of and on Mt. Sentinel and 160 acres at Flathead Lake. The University boasted a number of facilities: University (Main) Hall, Science Hall, Craig Hall (for female students), the Library, the Natural Science Building, the Gymnasium, and two frame barracks and an infirmary built originally for Army trainees during WW I, housing a men's dormitory, YMCA, and Hospital for fifty patients.⁴⁰¹ The Library held 40,000 volumes, including

government reports as a government repository, 18,000 pamphlets, and 400 subscription periodicals.⁴⁰² Finally, the Legislature had recently authorized a new Library, but the funding remained in doubt.

The future looked promising as the formative era came to a close for The University of Montana, recently renamed the State University of Montana. While some mourned the loss of the earlier identity as a relatively autonomous institution, most members of the campus community welcomed the restructured, multi-campus University, anticipated benefits from the predicted governance, policy, and academic reforms, and looked to the future with renewed excitement and anticipation. All indicators supported the belief that conditions had changed dramatically for the better with the end of the War, and that Montana higher education had achieved maturity and stability at long last. A new era beckoned with its promise of adequate funding and new facilities.

CHAPTER II: LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The bruising and abortive consolidation campaign actually opened the way to the future for the renamed State University of Montana. It did so in part by raising awareness about policy and procedural matters demanding attention because of painful experience, collateral damage, and changes sweeping across the country. Chancellor Edward C. Elliott brought with him to Montana intimate knowledge of emerging educational reforms as well as the new trends in educational administration making pseudo-scientific use of data about student numbers, program costs, and faculty rights and responsibilities.¹ A founding member of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915, Elliott also served on the AAUP Committee of Fifteen that formulated the standards and guidelines concerning and protective of academic tenure and freedom. As it turned out, American entrance into the war in 1917 soon produced conflicts when universities dismissed at least twenty faculty members across the country -- none in Montana -- who disagreed with the Wilson administration reasons for entry, overall war aims, and the wartime restrictions of freedom of expression.² The principles and procedures to protect faculty rights under circumstances took time to develop.³

In 1916, Elliott immediately set about developing a systemic University Code; clear procedures related to setting the agendas for and conducting Board meetings; a standardized budgeting and accounting system with strict controls on purchasing and expenditures; equally strict protocols for proposing and approving new academic courses and programs; facility plans for the campuses; policies concerning faculty appointments, tenure of office, ranks, equitable salaries, sabbatical leaves, and resolving grievances; and expanded faculty involvement in

institutional governance. Not welcomed by everyone, the accompanying trend toward centralized controls, emphasis on efficiency and economy, and rigid discipline clashed sharply with two decades of near autonomy in Montana.

In addition, the Chancellor conceived and led a successful referendum campaign to accomplish the long-desired goals of a dedicated mill levy to support higher education operations and a bond issue for construction on the campuses. His achievements and emphasis on adherence to policy and procedures, while frequently nettlesome or even cumbersome to administrators and faculty, nonetheless provided a flexible framework for the maturation of the four campuses over the next two decades. Elliott himself served two terms and then accepted appointment as the President of Purdue University. His successor as Chancellor, Melvin A. Brannon, strove mightily to continue Elliott's system but found himself forced to resign early in the Great Depression largely because of his successes.⁴ During that period, particularly until about 1932, the multi-campus University encountered few problems with duplication of programs, thanks to Elliott's reforms and accomplishments. Most of the new challenges centered around academic reform and the adequacy of resources despite or perhaps because of the dedicated mill levy.

I

The turmoil of the run-up to and American involvement in WW I dramatically disrupted social life in the nation and states, sweeping into Montana and exploding in societal chaos as the two waves originating on the east and west coasts collided. President Woodrow Wilson ultimately found it necessary to ignore the unauthorized 1916 campaign theme that "He kept us out of

the War" in order to assert and defend the rights of neutrals. Almost immediately after war began in 1914, however, the United States became the crucial supplier of funding, food, industrial, and other products for the belligerents with dramatic economic benefits for American financiers, farmers, and manufacturers.⁵ Actually, during the period from about 1890 to 1930, the United States entered upon a period of dramatic growth as the rapid implementation of the inventions and technologies of the second industrial revolution changed the economic and social conditions within the country.⁶ Neutrality for non-belligerents certainly suited the Americans, but not the belligerents who did their best to sway American opinion their way. Most Americans, as most Montanans, preferred neutrality, and, if they had to choose, inclined toward the Allies. However, a significant segment of the population remembered their German, Irish, or Scandinavian heritage and opposed outright support of the British as part of the Allies. Nonetheless, when Wilson found it necessary to choose war in 1917, the Congress and vast majority of Americans agreed.⁷

As Merriam reported, for the first three years of the war, the campus hardly took notice.⁸ The Kaimin focused on "athletics, debates, dances, Hi Jinks, lectures by professors, and Sneak and Aber Days," with the "typical watery" Kaimin editorials complaining about "small attendance at Singing on the Steps, the wearing of green caps by freshmen, lack of enthusiasm at University games," and the like. Even the sinking of the "Lusitania" in 1915 claimed only five inches of space deep inside the paper. In 1916, Clarence Streit, future Rhodes Scholar (1920), foreign correspondent, and originator of the Atlantic Union concept, became editor and gradually made the campus aware of war in Europe.⁹ Still the football team's fight to a tie against Syracuse in the Fall of 1915 claimed far more attention than international or national events.

The pace picked up a bit during 1916-1918, with students questioning the Physical Education graduation requirement. However, they also protested the punishment of the student athletes who played in the football game in Bozeman without clearance or authorization. The State University became a member of the Northwest Athletic Conference in December 1916, entering into regular competition with the Universities of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho and Washington State, Oregon State and Whitman Colleges.¹⁰ The enhanced competition helped attendance but did little for the win-loss record, and American entrance into the war cancelled the 1918 season. Although the Kaimin ran no announcement of the American declaration of war, much changed almost immediately on campus. By 5 May 1917, over one hundred males had departed the campus for some kind of War service. In recognition of new war concerns, Chancellor Elliott issued an edict to fly the flag every day on all campuses.¹¹

With Scheuch as Acting President for two years after Craighead's contract expired, the center of attention and action shifted to the Chancellor's Office in Helena. Once shed of the Craighead controversies, Chancellor Elliott took the time to inform himself about conditions on the campuses prior to implementing the academic and administrative reforms he had promised. In words of praise tinged with acid, Merriam described Elliott as "a dynamic man, full of confidence and given to hard work, and those characteristics dictated the taking over of some matters which should have remained on the campuses."¹² President Charles H. Clapp, who worked with Elliott as President of both the School of Mines and the State University, warned Elliott's successor that Elliott's tendency for meddling with minutiae "made the Chancellor's office hated not only in the State University but in this entire community."¹³ In fact, he counseled Brannon, with the Elliott policies in place and the Executive Council

functioning well, he thought the time had come to focus on the internal administration of the campuses.¹⁴ In the end, Clapp gave Elliott great credit for the coordination that eliminated bickering among the campuses.¹⁵

A quick study, Elliott outlined his concerns for the 1917 Sentinel.

More adequate salaries with which to retain and secure superior teachers are indispensable. Additional buildings to contain properly equipped laboratories, libraries, and other facilities for educational work are demanded. Dormitories for men as well as women must be erected. Every day I have spent at the University has caused me to wonder how so much has been done with so little and in the face of so many obstacles.¹⁶

These pointed remarks received a warm welcome on the campus, and succeeding administrators claimed them as their own over the years because of chronic conditions.

Nonetheless, in 1916, the signs appeared promising for Elliott's aspirations for the University. The economic stimulus provided by wartime demand pushed state revenues to new levels, and enrollment reached new heights by 1915-1916.¹⁷ The 1917 Legislature appropriated \$1,500,000 for new University buildings along with \$200,000 for maintenance and \$20,000 to acquire more land. This appropriation supported the construction of the Natural Science Building to provide appropriate space for the Science disciplines heretofore stuffed into Main Hall.

Despite the apparent drift toward war and lack of funding, the Board authorized the new Chancellor in 1916 to develop facility plans for the campuses.¹⁸ At the State University, the

Physical Plant Committee promptly reported a plan for "the extension and betterment of the buildings and grounds."¹⁹ Even considering the numerous new programs and the dramatic increases of students and faculty, the campus had not grown in physical size because funds to acquire needed land had never materialized. Asserting that further delay threatened the future of the University, the Committee ambitiously projected a student population of 4,000 to 6,000 within the next decade, urged purchase of about forty-eight acres around the campus, and proposed a clinker-brick wall for protection, the two entrances from the west and north guarded by wrought-iron gates with arches. Over the next decade, the proposed expenditures for new facilities and repair and renovation of older buildings required \$685,000 in five two-year time segments: 1917-1918, \$200,000; 1919-1920, \$100,000; 1921-1922, \$110,000; 1923-1924, \$125,000; and 1925-1926, \$150,000. Calling for buildings of a uniform style to accommodate existing and emerging departments and programs, the Committee proposed the expansion of only Main Hall among the existing buildings, with skylights and windows added to brighten the east side and the third floor.

The first period involved the construction of Natural Science Hall for the science disciplines still housed in University Hall; the renovation and expansion of University Hall to provide a large auditorium and space for the anticipated move to Missoula of the multi-campus University administration, an eventuality that never occurred; construction of a School of Music practice facility; repair and renovation of existing buildings; and fire protection, an adequate water supply, and power generation. The succeeding four periods called for a Women's Building to accommodate the Departments of Home Economics and Fine Arts and Handicrafts and the Dean of Women; a new Library with office space for the Humanities and Social Science

faculties; a new Women's Gym; another Women's Dormitory; a second unit for the Heating Plant; renovation of the old Library for the School of Law and the Department of Mathematics and Old Science Hall temporarily for Forestry; and completion of the expansion and remodeling of Main Hall. Finally, the Committee urged acquisition of even more land for experimental forestry and the solicitation of private funds to construct a Chapel and Museum joint facility for worship and fellowship and to house the University's collections of valuable artifacts and specimens of Montana cultural and natural resources. While only partially implemented over the years, the 1916 plan laid out an aggressive and often consulted blueprint for the expansion of the State University campus.

The Chancellor's planning also called attention to necessary repairs and provided the impetus for modernization of the Missoula campus. In 1917, Campus Engineer James H. Bonner compiled a comprehensive listing of needed repairs and renovations, although the work awaited the identification of funding and success in locating the increasingly scarce skilled and unskilled laborers to do the work.²⁰ To initiate the modernization, C. H. Farmer, the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, in 1918-1919, proposed walks, fire plugs, an electric distribution system and electric lighting, wash basins, drinking fountains, roadway improvements, steam lines and radiators in the buildings, kalsomining and painting walls and ceilings, removal of old and rotting wooden structures, and auditorium seats in the new Natural Science Building, all at a cost of \$11,000.²¹

President Sisson also initiated the successful effort to acquire a President's House, but with the occupant paying rent at the market rate, at least during Sisson's tenure.²² A decade earlier,

Duniway had proposed to build a president's house on campus, but the Board refused the offer, fearful of the cost when Duniway left. Because of a housing shortage, the owner of the first house Sisson rented sold it and he rented the private residence that President Craig had built. The owner, Craig's son-in-law, Warren Wilcox, who priced the house at \$8,300 agreed to sell it to the University for \$7,800. The Board of Examiners approved the acquisition on 30 April 1919, with the understanding of a rent sufficient to pay off the note. The purchase included three lots and Sisson submitted a list of University-related activities planned for the residence. The house proved well worth the price, as it remained the President's House until the Board purchased a new home at 667 Beckwith for new President Ernest O. Melby in 1941. Afterwards it became, in succession, the Women's Center, then the military Infirmary during WW II, then the Student Health Center, and then the Alumni House until destroyed in 1964 to make way for new construction.²³ As with most of the old wooden buildings, it served well during its time.

As evidence that the University had entered the modern era, Farmer replaced an old horse (original cost of \$200) and badly used wagon with a gas-driven lawn mower (\$300), a light Ford truck (\$300), and a new wagon. To complete the modernization process, he arranged for the city to keep the campus roads free of snow in the winter at no cost, and achieved sufficient savings in the cost of heating to finance the renovation of the boilers in the heating plant and installation of a thermostat system for the five main buildings.

Despite this promising beginning, the modernization process proceeded at a slow pace because of resource constraints. Thus, in 1920, Chancellor Elliott approved Sisson's request to

purchase two army surplus trucks without bodies on the chasses and probably in need of repair parts at \$300 each -- usual price of \$5,000.²⁴ Yet by 1927, the State University owned only one truck, having sold vehicles earlier as surplus, and had strict use rules for the remaining vehicle with research as highest priority in 1938.²⁵ In 1940, the University had three trucks again -- 1929, 1934, and 1935 -- with plans to sell or junk the 1929 model.²⁶ But, in 1942, the Board of Examiners allocated nine vehicles to the State University, models from 1924 to 1941 (a Ford sedan). As in all areas, development took time at the State University

The Chancellor also secured the services of Cass Gilbert and Charles H. Carsley to prepare architectural plans for all four campuses, including the identification of necessary land purchases.²⁷ Gilbert's plan essentially extended Craig's original design. As mentioned, the Legislature approved funding for the new Natural Sciences Building in 1917, and it came on line in 1919, providing critically needed space at a cost of \$102,477. Problems with the brick exterior and basement floors soon developed with no new funds or recourse to the builder.²⁸ The new Library did not fare as well. The State Board of Examiners withheld the funds appropriated in 1919 because of inadequate revenue, and the Library had to wait until the early 1920s. The success of the bonding referendum in the election of 1920 opened an era of construction on all of the campuses, and the State University fared quite well.²⁹

II

War engulfed the country in 1917 ushering in a period of rising turbulence in Montana and across the region. Labor unrest stirred by abominable working conditions and depressed wages in the Northwest lumber and mining industries pitted traditional unionists against radicals such as the Wobblies, the Industrial Workers of the World, in struggles for

leadership.³⁰ By 1917, federal troops had occupied Butte and other trouble centers several times in order to protect property and preserve order.³¹ In that year, unknown "vigilantes," Company goons, or union enemies assaulted and hanged Frank Little, a Wobbly organizer, from a railroad trestle outside of Butte.³²

Under such conditions, the patriotic furor that accompanied American involvement in the war generated innumerable abuses against people who disagreed with either this war or any war.³³ The Federal District Attorney in Montana, Burton K. Wheeler, had investigated Little's activities and found no basis to prosecute him under the federal Espionage Act, which covered interference with the wartime draft or war effort. Absurdly accused of contributing to the hanging by not finding a reason to arrest Little, Wheeler's concern for individual rights soon placed his position if not his own life in jeopardy.

Once war began, Montana followed the other states in establishing Councils of Defense at President Wilson's request to help in the war effort.³⁴ The Montana State Council quickly tired of Wheeler's refusal to prosecute "radicals" and subversives without good cause and called for his resignation or dismissal. For more responsive law enforcement, in light of Wheeler's concern for rights interpreted by some as pro-German or pro-labor sentiment, Governor Stewart convened a special session and the Legislature adopted a Sedition Act targeting false statements about the form of the federal or state governments, officers of government, and enforcement of the wartime draft. In Washington, Montana Senator Thomas Walsh helped to push through a federal Sedition Act modeled on the Montana Act.³⁵ Once state enforcement channels opened and Wheeler resigned, out of concern for Walsh's re-

election in 1918, prosecutions began in earnest. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, Law and Journalism students at The University of Montana conducted a campaign that culminated in posthumous pardons for many of those convicted in Montana.³⁶

During the early months of war, the State University increased German language offerings, especially during the Summer Session, on the premise that young people needed to know German because of the hostilities.³⁷ However, as most others, the state ultimately suspended all German language instruction and ordered the removal of books in German from libraries, including university and college libraries.³⁸ An exchange in May 1918 between President Owen Nelson of the University of Wyoming and new State University President E. O. Sisson revealed pained reluctance to suspend German language instruction, "but if public sentiment demands it, we might need to yield."³⁹ A handwritten and unsigned manuscript in the files, more than likely written by President E. O. Sisson or F. C. Scheuch, simply entitled "German," argued eloquently and at length against the ban and removal, quoting twenty-five national leaders and defending the two German professors at the State University from all allegations of disloyalty.⁴⁰ As it happened, public sentiment prevailed.

In April 1918, Chancellor Elliott issued "Administrative Memorandum No. 95" proscribing German instruction, identifying books for removal from the library shelves and circulation, and ordering the cancellation of all German periodical subscriptions.⁴¹ Ironically, because of his involvement in an industrial start-up company as part of the War effort, Fletcher B. Holmes tried to purchase all technical publications the University removed from the shelves. However, the Chancellor advised that the Montana Defense Council had exempted "German technical

publications" in the University libraries from the removal order.⁴² With little choice in the matter, and despite their preferences, State University administrators, faculty, and students acquiesced in this cultural proscription.

When the hostilities ended, the State Board of Education considered the reinstitution of German language instruction on several occasions, usually at the initiative of the Presidents.⁴³ As early as 1920, the Chancellor approved "elective courses in German . . . as recommended by the faculty" of the State University "as soon as the orders of the State Council of Defense become ineffective by limitation or proclamation."⁴⁴ More than a year later, probably delayed by the "red scare" after the War, President Charles H. Clapp informed Professor Scheuch on 3 October 1921 that the Chancellor had "definitely authorized the reestablishment of instruction in German at the University." Without further delay, he instructed Scheuch to plan the courses for Winter and Spring Quarters in 1922.⁴⁵

Beginning with independent study, the Languages faculty quickly reinstituted courses in German language and literature. In April 1923, the Curriculum Committee, President, and Chancellor approved several curricular change forms from the Department for courses previously taught as independent study for the benefit of German majors. The forms explicitly identified the courses as existing but taught under other titles.⁴⁶ Although Mary Brennan Clapp reported resumption of German instruction in 1925, the courses actually began in 1922 as independent studies and then became regular courses in 1923.⁴⁷ The State University delayed the suspension of German language instruction and the removal of German books

from circulation until forced to act, and then restored instruction and circulation as soon as possible. Nonetheless, the damaging effects lingered.

After the War formally ended, unplanned demobilization and the collapse of wartime demand and government spending led to economic stagnation and more societal unrest. Labor unions seeking to regain wage losses prior to and during the war years resorted to strikes labeled as incipient revolution modeled after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 in Russia, an unparalleled evil deemed threatening to the civilized world.⁴⁸ In this context, social agitation and labor demands for better pay and shorter hours struck many as the ominous harbingers of revolution. In defense posture, the federal and state governments focused on stabilizing budgets and containing unrest. The economic impact in Montana combined with a change in the weather cycle from wet to dry caused a recession that persisted through the decade and worsened during the Great Depression after 1929. As a result, Montana state government responded to other pressing needs and provided little immediate assistance to the restructured, multi-campus University. Nonetheless, enrollments began to rise rapidly and quickly resulted in overcrowded classrooms and overloaded faculty members.

III

During the War years, however, enrollment virtually stopped at colleges and universities across the country. The State University President, Deans, and Chairs worked hard to sustain their programs for the few students who attended, but several of the professional schools closed for the duration for want of students.⁴⁹ From 1917-1918 to 1918-1919, enrolled males dropped from 238 to 198 and females from 366 to 326, and ten to twelve faculty entered the military.⁵⁰ The students formed a Student Defense Council and assisted local draft boards. The State

University and State College faculties developed a collaborative preparatory course to prepare more young women for accelerated programs in nursing schools.⁵¹

Slightly different on each campus but designed to provide the science and general education coursework nursing students required, the program shortened the professional training program to about two and one-half years. In addition, after 1918, as the War injuries and casualties created a demand for more nurses than existing nursing schools supplied, Professor Elrod and two colleagues developed a nine-week short course at the State University that provided the science and general education foundation for an accelerated training program for practical nurses.⁵² Unfortunately, after the War ended, the state Department of Public Health ended the short course as unnecessary in peace time, and the University failed to develop a full nursing course.⁵³

Adjusting the academic calendar to meet wartime demands, the State University implemented the quarter system, adding course and program changes to the already burdensome wartime tasks of the administration and the staff.⁵⁴ Regular courses gave way before the needs of the community and special student groups. Enlisted men stationed at Fort Missoula enrolled in classes on drawing, mapping, and surveying, while other students focused on pharmacy, contemporary history, current events, and ordinance, and all male students learned semaphore and Morse code. Faculty members enlisted in government service if not the military. For example, History Professor Paul C. Phillips worked in the Department of State's National Board of Historical Service editing 160 articles from fifty contributors on international relations that became a college textbook in the twenties. Some 22,000 people across Montana

participated in Dean DeLoss Smith's community song fests to promote social harmony and unity during the War.

Chancellor Elliott became one of eleven regional directors of the Students' Army Training Corps (SATC) established by the Wilson administration in July 1918.⁵⁵ By dint of persistent effort, he finally secured recognition of the State University battalion in August 1918. According to J. H. Wigmore, the national program trained 25,000 men as officers for the 1919 spring offensive with an Army of two million men; saved 500 higher education institutions from disintegration by preventing a second draft in 1919, their faculties already depleted by late 1918; and allowed 150,000 young men to continue their education, saving them from the draft.⁵⁶ To others, including faculty, it appeared that "some five hundred colleges and universities were converted into de facto army boot camps."⁵⁷ The State University SATC contributed little to the war effort, since the Spanish flu epidemic and early armistice interrupted mobilization. However, it significantly boosted State University enrollment with some ninety-two cadets residing on campus for study with room and board, uniforms, and equipment provided in addition to pay as Army privates.⁵⁸ The SATC enrollments themselves proved problematic, however, because of scheduling conflicts, regarded as trifling by Wigmore when compared to the benefits.

Although the SATC never mobilized for active duty, to the regret of many of the student cadets, several University graduates and students served on active duty during WW I. At lowest count, thirty-two lost their lives in combat, including the former football star, Paul Dornblazer.⁵⁹ Moreover, after the War ended, disbanding the SATC also became problematic.⁶⁰ The Army delayed decision and the University lost the papers for some thirty-three enrolled men.

President Sisson ultimately decided to continue the SATC with a modified curriculum, eliminating the military courses until the War Department reached a decision. As it turned out, the federal government authorized Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) battalions in 1919 to replace the SATC, with ROTC mandatory for male students enrolled in land-grant institutions. At the State University, male students voted 130 to fourteen against a mandatory ROTC, but Sisson left the decision to the faculty who opted for mandatory ROTC training. However, controversy about the program's presence on campus waxed and waned over the following years.⁶¹

In recognition of the sacrifices by State University students and alumni, Professor Elrod and Dean A. L. Stone successfully proposed Memorial Way, beginning near the Van Buren Street Bridge and ending at the Oval just west of Main Hall, for the Arbor Day ceremony in 1919.⁶² He and Stone also facilitated the installation of the Memorial Rock on the Oval and the planting of thirty-two Yellow Pine trees along the Way memorializing the University casualties with metal name plates on the trees.⁶³ At the request of the State University in September 1919, the State Board approved a name change for Montana Field, the football stadium, to Dornblazer Field in honor of Paul Dornblazer, the famous Montana football player who died in the War.⁶⁴ The SATC also left in its wake three frame buildings on campus, two named to honor Claude Simpkins and Marcus Cook, the first students killed in the war. Simpkins Hall became the first men's dormitory and subsequently the Little Theatre, Cook Hall served later as the Forestry Annex, and the SATC hospital or gym remained as the campus infirmary before providing facilities for the State University ROTC battalion.⁶⁵ Built as temporary facilities, these buildings remained useful for more than three decades.

Added to the trials of war and the burden of calendar conversion, the State University also endured the Spanish influenza pandemic in the Fall of 1918.⁶⁶ The pandemic infected an estimated 500,000,000 people world-wide and resulted in about 100,000,000 deaths. In the United States, about 30,000,000 million suffered and roughly 600,000 died. By comparison, the State University experienced fairly high relative numbers of infected persons and deaths. Beginning with sixteen infected soldiers and eight faculty members in the early Fall, the number rose to between fifty and one hundred cases by late Fall -- thirty-nine cadets died -- along with twenty people suffering from scarlet fever.⁶⁷ In an effort to block the spread of the disease, the State University sent uninfected students home, quarantined those with the flu on campus as well as all residents of the women's dormitory, and allowed uninfected students living in Missoula to come alone to campus to confer with uninfected faculty members. The pandemic persisted until late January 1919 when the University lifted all restrictions. As Clapp mentioned, those responsible learned well how to respond to such challenges and managed another influenza attack two years later without incident.

IV

In 1917, with the Chancellor in place, the State Board conducted a search for a new President of the State University. Born in England, brought to the United States where he remained and became a naturalized citizen after his parents returned to England, and educated at Kansas State, Chicago, and Harvard, Edward Octavius Sisson came to Montana after service in Washington and Idaho higher education.⁶⁸ Merriam said of Sisson that his "Greatest services were the forwarding of the democratic procedure in administration, stimulus to the dormitory system, and his warm humanism."⁶⁹ He added the caveat that Sisson's dislike for

administration "allowed some details which should have remained with him to fall into the willing hands of the Chancellor." Mary Brennan Clapp credited Sisson with "the first formal step . . . towards faculty participation in administration in higher education in Montana."⁷⁰ Her husband who followed Sisson in the presidency thought internal campus administration undeveloped because of "the unhappy combination of Elliott and Sisson." Elliott tended to "intervene even in minor details" and Sisson exhibited a "willingness to 'pass the buck,'" a combination that made the Chancellor "very cordially hated."⁷¹ All three, however, shared the view that President Sisson "kept the campus thought, feeling and action sane and steady throughout the difficult years."⁷²

Sisson arrived in Montana six months after American entry into the war, a time when passions ran extremely high. He immediately lent support to a community forum founded to keep the public informed about the war and war effort.⁷³ Sisson himself spoke about the world order aborning in the throes of war, especially for young people; and Dean A. L. Stone defended the free speech rights of the Wobblies.⁷⁴ Faculty offering timely information for discussion received a warm reception, but a speaking invitation to a socialist aroused the ire of the local American Defense Society, a private organization not affiliated with either the State or Missoula County Defense Councils. The Defense Society demanded dissolution of the forum, the State and County Defense Councils refused to intervene, and the Mayor urged termination of the forum to preserve the peace. Sisson and the founders complied rather than create more trouble.

Subsequently, Sisson received an invitation to join the Defense Society, with a veiled threat if he refused from "the chief representative . . . of the most powerful corporation in the state."⁷⁵ He declined, although he knew "the shadow of the 'Big Company' was heavy indeed." In fact, however, Sisson always doubted the extent of Anaconda Copper Company dominance, although he knew that people "generally believed that the Big Company held strings on almost all the newspapers" in the state. He declined the invitation because he rejected the required oath of loyalty to the Society itself. Despite the threat, he suffered no consequences.

In his inaugural address, Sisson indicated his familiarity with the structure of the multi-campus University and expressed strong approval.⁷⁶ In fact, he welcomed the presence of the Chancellor because it enabled him to focus on internal campus affairs, which he much preferred. In that regard, he committed the State University to work collaboratively with colleagues on the other campuses, while competing in academics and athletics, assured students of a student-centered campus, and asked them for their engagement. He thought educational benefits possible only through personal effort and commitment. Most importantly, he warned the public of the need for care and support of higher education, "lest we lose our birthright." Specifically, he cited the challenges of war and the clear evidence of the rising cost of college, an omen that a "pseudo-aristocracy has stalked in with much ostentation." He took hope because the new colleges and universities in the West had not yet succumbed to the lure of money or class.

A few years after the Missoula forum folded and the state Senate completed an investigation denying allegations of socialism at the State University, the press nonetheless continued to

herald sensational headlines about the State University "Soaked in Socialism" and pro-German sentiment.⁷⁷ President Sisson ultimately responded to this incendiary rhetoric in a letter to the Missoulian, with reprints distributed across the state, resolutely defending the State University and the faculty.⁷⁸ He denied the allegations, invoked the state Senate Education Committee report of no evidence to support them, and vehemently condemned rumor mongering. He had decided to speak out because experience taught the importance of defending the good name of an institution as well as that of an individual.

The President urged everyone to suspend judgment and bear in mind that some people will always condemn while others will commend because of the very nature of human beings and universities. "Indeed if a university never did anything that aroused criticism from any source, there might be a suspicion that it was not much of a vital force for either education or the common welfare." The State University faculty attended responsibly to their duties and responsibilities and conducted themselves as "law-abiding and loyal" Americans. Sisson reminded all Montanans that "every member of the staff is also a person and a free citizen, and may not be gagged, muzzled, or intimidated." Young Montanans preparing for meaningful lives of freedom and democracy "must learn at the feet of men and women who are also free." What a "pitiful spectacle" it made if the State University faculty sat back and waited timidly "for the mandates of the daily press as to what they might or might not say or teach or do."

Careless and false accusations served no good purpose but "tend to undermine the morale of the institution and poison the minds of the people." Most importantly, in his view, it made perfect sense that some faculty members identified themselves as Democrats, some as

Republicans, and some as independents. This quite natural division of opinion assured representation of all Montanans, not just one faction. He had found the State University faculty as conservative as all American university faculties, committed to the preservation, extension, and transmission of American culture. In that regard, the political opinions and affiliations of a faculty member, as of every citizen, had to remain freely chosen, personal, and unregulated. If not, democracy could never endure and the University could not fulfill its mission in society.

In his Commencement Address in 1919, Sisson provided an overview of developments since his arrival on campus.⁷⁹ The formation of the Student Army Training Corps and successful effort to deal with the ravages of the Spanish influenza left the campus fairly well exhausted and with little to show for it aside from the bravery and fortitude of the cadets, with thirty-one deaths caused by the flu, and three wooden buildings constructed on the campus. The armistice brought welcome change, with 789 students enrolled for Fall 1919. Reflecting his reform-mindedness, Sisson announced three new initiatives to assist students to succeed: Grading on the quantity *and* quality of work undertaken, and credit as possible for war training and experience; administration of the Army Alpha test as academic and personal guidance for the students; and use of a "personality index," still in development, focused on student "qualities of will, of character, of disposition, and of habit."⁸⁰ He pledged the State University to do all possible to assist veterans, returning students, and new freshman to identify and pursue meaningful academic programs.

The challenges for the coming year, however, began with rebuilding the professional schools of Law, Forestry, and Pharmacy, all but eliminated by the war. Signs of new life pointed toward a healthy revival. As for the huge enrollment burst, he assigned highest priority to competitive salaries to retain the current faculty members and recruit new ones. Second, the University had only one modern facility, the new but as yet incomplete Natural Science Building, and needed many more. His list included renovation and expansion of the Heating Plant and steam distribution system, a fire-proof and expanded Library, gymnasium with a swimming pool, residence halls for men and women, Music Hall and buildings for the Forestry and Law Schools, the Department of Chemistry, and the Pre-Med program. With these facilities, a reconstructed faculty, and resources to allow the best in educational methodology, the University stood ready to meet the challenges of the post-war world. But most critical, the University needed the support of the people and State of Montana.

In 1919, while on a special leave for three months to allow him to recuperate from the stress of the war and the Spanish flu epidemic, Sisson outlined his goals and objectives for the State University in the post-war world.⁸¹ Among other aims, he called for the development of loyalty and solidarity among the students and faculty and a firm commitment to the University. At the same time, he thought it critical to "keep the University [and its students and faculty] in touch with real life" in the new post-war era. Succeeding in that goal required substantial changes in the programs of study offered to young people, with new emphases on physical education, physical fitness, and athletics for all as well as home economics, economics, sociology, and political science. Most importantly, Sisson called for the faculty to engage the students in the mastery of the content of the courses, paying less attention to the credits, assignments, and

grades and leaving behind obsolete "grammar school" methods. Well educated students developed the capability to pursue topics of interest and learned to think for themselves rather than "conning over lessons assigned by instructors."

Shortly after his initial appointment, Sisson had occasion to begin the process of institutionalizing his philosophical propensities. In doing so, he initiated shared governance at the State University with the establishment of the campus Welfare Committee in 1918. Mary Brennan Clapp erroneously assumed that the policy and procedures of the State University Welfare Committee, developed collaboratively by President Sisson and the State University faculty, provided the model for the University of Montana Committee on Service for each campus.⁸² The two committees actually differed markedly in function, structure, and originating authority. However, Clapp correctly recognized that the Welfare Committee marked a dramatic departure from past practice for the State University.

In fact, the Welfare Committee originated on and applied only to the State University campus. The impetus for it began when Sisson reduced Professor William Aber's leave pay without consultation, unwittingly stirring a robust protest on the campus. To resolve the issue and to provide a mechanism to guard against missteps in the future, President Sisson proposed and Professor N. J. Lennes moved approval by the faculty of a Welfare Committee. As approved, the Committee consisted of three elected faculty members charged to advise the President on "administrative matters involving the policy of the institution and particularly affecting the personel [sic] of the staff."⁸³ This development at the State University meshed well with the

Chancellor's initiatives, strongly supported by President Sisson, to involve the faculty more actively in the governance of the campuses and the multi-campus University.

However, Clapp erred in assuming that the Chancellor used the State University's Welfare Committee as the model for the Committees on Service on each campus. The Committees on Service had specific duties and responsibilities related to faculty suspensions and dismissals. The differences became clear during subsequent discussions on the campus of the State University Welfare Committee and its policies and procedures. In that regard, the faculty adopted motions by Professors Lennes and Elrod charging the Welfare Committee to review *any* matter at the request of a faculty member and to send reports to the State University faculty and President and the Chancellor.⁸⁴ Clearly, the Welfare Committee had a more general role and function within State University governance than Elliott's Committees on Service within the multi-campus University governance.

President Sisson later explained that he had created the Welfare Committee in collaboration with the faculty as advisory to the President, giving it no decisional authority. Nonetheless, he accepted the obligation to consult the Committee on all "appointments, promotions, terminations of service, and any other questions which affect the personal relation of any staff member" to the State University.⁸⁵ To assure its advisory status, Sisson specifically charged the Committee members to respond to all queries and report findings but to refer all questions about the merits or reasons relating to the referred matters to the President who alone had the decisional authority, responsibility, and accountability.⁸⁶ While certainly democratic in his leanings, Sisson nevertheless guarded the decisional authority of the President.

Shortly before these developments occurred on the State University campus, as Sisson recalled, Professor N. J. Lennes had served as the "chairman of a committee on university organization . . . appointed by the chancellor before I became president."⁸⁷ Both he and Chancellor Elliott had advocated "a type of organization in which the Faculty should share in the large administrative problems of the institution. This committee is a preliminary and experimental step toward such a policy."⁸⁸ After the Lennes committee reported its recommendations to the Chancellor and the Chancellor secured Board approval of his policies containing a provision for a Committee on Service for each of the four campuses, the State University faculty voted unanimously to keep the Welfare Committee separate from the Service Committee.⁸⁹ Without question, Sisson deserved credit for expanding shared governance at the State University, with the approval of the Chancellor.⁹⁰ Equally clear, the State University Welfare Committee did not provide the model for the University of Montana Committees on Service, although they shared common philosophical roots.

V

Chancellor Elliott ventured into unexplored territory when he accepted the challenge of implementing the new structure for higher education in Montana. He, himself, rightly described the Montana plan as *sui generis*, assigning to the Chancellor as it did the responsibility and authority, as the chief executive for the State Board of Education, to administer and coordinate four separate and very different institutions, each with its own President, history, and preference for autonomy.⁹¹ Professor Elrod had branded the Leighton Act dysfunctional because of its multi-headed structure.⁹² In a letter to Elliott before the Chancellor-elect's arrival in Montana, Elrod argued specifically that the position of the

Chancellor rendered campus presidents superfluous because the Chancellor administered the entire University.⁹³ Therefore, he urged Elliott to co-opt the faculty of each campus by replacing the former president with an annually elected Chairman of the Faculty possessed of no executive authority. He also recommended the elimination or drastic reduction in the number of Deans, the "source of discontent and jealousy" at the State University. Elliott chose to coordinate the actions of the Presidents in a good-faith effort to manage the new decentralized system as designed rather than force it into an older, unitary mold.

In a talk delivered to the Bankers' Association in 1916, Elliott outlined the tasks before him.⁹⁴ Establish good relations among the four institutions; coordinate the institutions and eliminate program duplication; achieve more efficiency in the use of available resources; and inform the stakeholders and the policymakers of the needs and accomplishments of the institutions. To this list, he added his own insistence upon policy reform for faculty tenure of office; clear procedures for faculty appointments, tenure recommendations, promotions, suspensions, and dismissals; and adequate provision for appeals of all decisions affecting faculty and staff members.⁹⁵ After extensive consultation and careful research on the campuses, he succeeded in establishing policies, processes, procedures, and rules that either accomplished the goals or set in motion plans and initiatives toward those ends.

Some of the goals lent themselves to technical or mechanical solutions. To control course and program offerings, the Chancellor mandated standard catalogues for the separate campuses of the University, listing the courses and programs approved for each campus and requiring his explicit approval of every course and program proposal following faculty and administrative

review on the campuses.⁹⁶ He collected information concerning all approved courses for freshmen and sophomores with objectives clearly outlined, describing the scope and content, and stipulating the method of instruction (lecture, recitation, laboratory, etc.), required texts and readings, and required out-of-class work and preparation, complete with up-to-date syllabi, special instructions, and means to improve them.⁹⁷ He also required "interchangeable credits" for freshmen and sophomore courses to facilitate transfer among the campuses, a challenge that persisted without full resolution into the twenty-first century.⁹⁸ Finally, he required from each Chair or Dean a statement of policy and procedures for faculty and staff evaluation and improvement.⁹⁹

To assure that these changes applied to interactions with students, the Chancellor created a special committee of faculty members to develop plans for academic advising. Freeman Daughters, Chair of the State University Department of Education, served as the Chair of the Chancellor's committee and presented a fulsome report in late 1916.¹⁰⁰ Daughters began with the premise "that the greatest thing the university can do for its students is to afford them inspiration to the achievement of a well-rounded culture, to cultivate true and abiding intellectual and social sympathies, sound moral judgment and at the same time to direct their energies, at least in later years of college life, into vocational channels." To that end, the committee defined one of every faculty member's "duty" to "cultivate close relations " with students and to inspire "a true college spirit." The committee recommended charging a faculty committee to advise freshmen and sophomores and the assignment of students to individual professors for major program advising.

The survey revealed that no one, student or faculty member, defended the current largely unstructured advising system. Based on surveys of faculty and students and of other institutions, the committee urged the development of specific courses for freshmen and sophomores, thus assuring ease of transfer, and advocated prescribed major courses of study for upper division students with "limited" electives and an upper bound on credits per term. Such a structure, the report argued, simplified registration and prevented "academic anarchy in the students' work." The approach must have proven out, with one major change, since a new State University rule in the 1920s stipulated that "Only faculty members of professorial rank or heads of departments may act as advisors." Thereafter, the institution assigned an advisor to every student on entry.¹⁰¹

The outcome of these changes produced catalogues similar to the old ones but with about half as many pages. By comparison, Craighead's last "Register," the term he preferred, ran to more than 400 pages and included not only descriptions of courses and programs but lists of students and alumni by class year, as well as paragraphs identifying each of the administrators and faculty members. By minimizing descriptions of courses, programs, administrators, and faculty, the new and slimmer catalogues still included the list of students and alumni. When the Chancellor's position went into decline in the 1930s, only President Clapp continued to send course and program change requests to the Helena office, since the Board's Executive Secretary had no approval authority.¹⁰² The vacuum of authority gave rise to a sense of no supervising authority, an assumption predictably appealing to Presidents. Only Clapp considered a record of approved changes absolutely essential. With the constraints removed,

program duplication quickly proliferated until it engendered demands from the State Board, policy makers, and the public for reform.

For control and efficiency, Elliott persuaded the State Board to standardize procedures for conducting Board business. All matters came to the Board through the Chancellor, who controlled the Board agenda, with space for the Chancellor's calendar having priority.¹⁰³ The Board also mandated a budgeting and accounting system and appointed an accountant as part of the Chancellor's staff to review and recommend approval of all budgets and to monitor all expenditures for adherence to approved budgets.¹⁰⁴ In the past, each campus had used its own unique budgeting and accounting processes, virtually devoid of similarities. Moreover, as had become clear during the Craighead controversy, the campuses relied on more or less *ad hoc* budgeting systems. While well intentioned and functional for at time, the complexity of monitoring four disparate and isolated campuses imposed such heavy burdens that the system ultimately became dysfunctional. As early as 1921, President E. O. Sisson listed three major failings leaving the campuses without the information needed to control budgets.¹⁰⁵ In fact, budget and cost controls remained an issue for Montana higher education into the twentieth-first century.

The Chancellor's system mandated strict purchasing rules to assure the integrity of the campus budgets. He also compiled a unified budget for the multi-campus University, based on submissions from the campuses, and, following approval by the State Board, presented it to the appropriate legislative committees. For the legislative session in 1917, the Board adopted a policy stipulating that the Chancellor spoke for the University and, at the Chancellor's

request, prohibited the Presidents and their representatives from presenting individual requests, allowing them to respond to inquiries for information only after consultation with the Chancellor.¹⁰⁶ These budgeting, accounting, and lobbying rules made clear the determination to prevent program duplication and campus efforts to curry favor with legislators or advocate for individual priorities. Moreover, the Leighton Act that established the Chancellor plan had anticipated and authorized this development.¹⁰⁷ This kind of control ultimately produced complaints about "gag" rules and bureaucratic centralization in later years.

As perhaps his most effective mechanism to pursue his goals, Elliott established in 1916 an Executive Council for the University.¹⁰⁸ The Council consisted initially of the four Presidents and two additional faculty members or administrators each from the State College and the State University -- the Experiment Station and Extension Service Directors from the College and two faculty members from the University. During the twenties, the Chancellor eliminated the additional representatives of the University and the College because of the addition of the Presidents from the two newly established colleges in Billings and Havre and concern about equity.¹⁰⁹ The Council met typically on a monthly basis, subject to special call by the Chancellor, and kept minutes of its meetings and actions. Elliott took all proposals to the Council for discussion without votes. In subsequent years, after the Chancellor's position fell vacant, the Council typically voted on campus and University-wide proposals, including proposals for new programs. As Elliott emphasized, the Council functioned by providing advice to him. After the Chancellor's position languished, the Council related directly to the State Board and ultimately became the modern Council of Presidents.

Working with the Council, Elliott strove mightily to develop a University Code consisting of all federal and state legislation affecting the four institutions, all Board actions, and all internal policies and procedures of the four campuses. This monumental task proved beyond the capacity of Elliott and his colleagues, and it soon became limited to official University policies because of the inability to maintain it as planned.¹¹⁰ Nonetheless, it served a very useful purpose by providing in one place a clear statement of the multi-campus University policies and procedures. During the years of the Chancellorship, roughly from 1916 until 1953 with a hiatus during the most of the decade of the thirties and part of the forties, the Code guided the activities of the four campuses of the University.

The goal that caught faculty attention involved personnel policies and procedures. Montana higher education employment contracts in the years before 1916 ran for one year, subject to annual renewal or lapse, except for a few Presidents' term contracts of two or three years. Moreover, the Board policies contained no provisions for due process in dealing with faculty grievances, advance notice of termination, or appeals and hearings. Each campus had minimal practices for promotions, practices that proved less than adequate after the adoption of faculty ranks other than Professor and Instructor, as occurred during Duniway's tenure as the University's President. The absence of procedural detail and attention to academic due process became painfully obvious during the Elrod and Craighead controversies. Perhaps of most immediate importance, as a charter member of the AAUP and an appointed member of the AAAUP Committee of Fifteen on Academic Tenure and Academic Freedom, Elliot had demanded and received from the Governor and the State Board a commitment to adopt

policies for faculty tenure of office and revised procedures for faculty appointments, grievances, suspensions, and terminations.

To assist in the development of the new policies and procedures, Elliott appointed a faculty committee and consulted with the Executive Council.¹¹¹ New President Sisson explained in 1918 that he and the Chancellor "favored a system by which the Faculty should share the responsibility and the authority of directing the University." How much of the faculty counsel Elliott accepted never became clear. As a former member of the AAUP Committee on Academic Freedom, Elliott knew the approaches taken at other institutions and brought that knowledge to bear in preparing policies and procedures for the multi-campus University of Montana. In doing so, he earned a deserved reputation for fairness as well as for intruding into the minutiae of campus administration.¹¹²

The University policy promulgated by the Chancellor defined the faculty ranks as Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Instructor, and Assistant, thereby bringing the restructured University into conformity with practices across the country.¹¹³ For the first time in history, Board policy authorized continuous tenure for faculty members on quite generous terms. Professors and Associate Professors earned tenure if reappointed for three sequential years, or following reappointment for three sequential years after serving satisfactorily for an initial one-year or two-year term, with termination thereafter only for age or cause following a hearing. By implication, but without explicit statement, the policy contemplated and differentiated between term and tenure-track contracts for other than instructors, lecturers, or assistants.

Similarly Assistant Professors qualified for tenure after an initial two-year appointment followed by reappointment for three sequential years. The other three ranks of Lecturer, Instructor, and Assistant remained on one-year term contracts, with renewal based on performance and institutional need not right, as in the past for all faculty. While seemingly clear, the definitions and procedures inevitably left lacunae for subsequent determination. As but one example, a faculty term contract automatically lapsed and became void with no obligation for renewal. But whether a faculty member automatically acquired tenure by serving on sequential term contracts -- i.e., a second and third term contract -- after the initial term contract lapsed, remained untested until the late 1930s. After all those years, the Montana Supreme Court ruled in favor of a University faculty member who claimed tenure on that precise ground.¹¹⁴ In addition, faculty members soon demanded advance notice of a decision not to renew a term contract despite the statement that term contracts depended solely on institutional need and lapsed automatically unless renewed.

The policy and procedures allowed suspension of a faculty member by the Chancellor for “gross inefficiency, reprehensible conduct, or insubordination” until the next regular meeting when the Board considered the suspension. Suspension included withholding the salary from the effective date of suspension unless the Board declined to sustain the suspension.

Reinstatement also restored the salary retroactively. In addition, the procedures allowed removal of a faculty member or other employee 1) at any time by the Board following a hearing; or 2) by the Board on the recommendation of the Chancellor accompanied by the report of the campus Committee on Service also established by the policy. The policy and

procedures did not require State Board acceptance of the findings of the Committee on Service, although the faculty almost immediately made that assumption.

Each campus Committee on Service consisted of three faculty members, one appointed by the Chancellor, one by the President, and one elected by the faculty; and had the responsibility to "examine fully into the circumstances and charges" and report the findings to the person suspended and the President for transmission to the Chancellor and the State Board.¹¹⁵ The Board then considered the charges and Committee findings during the next regular meeting and the individual involved had the right to appear and present a defense. Clearly designed to protect the faculty from arbitrary acts, the policy and procedures nonetheless respected the authority of the Chancellor and Board of Education. On 29 June 1918, Chancellor Elliott sent Administrative Memorandum No. 100 to the campuses promulgating the new policies and procedures.¹¹⁶ The University of Montana had finally entered the modern era.

During this same period, the Chancellor and Board sought to clarify University policy concerning the outside or external activities of faculty, staff, and administrators, a concern that first emerged during the consolidation campaign of 1913-1914. While affirming its commitment to open and free communication, the Board had included language in the resolution of 1914 that condemned "turmoil, agitation, and intemperate discussion of public questions," on or off the campus, and even "the idea of conducting any campaign on any matter pending before the people."¹¹⁷ The AAUP Subcommittee that investigated the Craighead incident denied the authority of the Board to prevent the faculty and administrators from speaking on public issues as a right of all citizens.¹¹⁸ However, the Chancellor, Governor,

and Board understood the responsibilities of faculty and staff in a much more nuanced way, as soon became clear.

For example, in 1917 during the biennial legislative session, the Chancellor sent a message to the Presidents and other institutional representatives instructing them not to “attend a meeting of this board or of the legislature” for the duration of the legislative session and to refrain from speaking or writing “to various members of the legislature” about campus needs.¹¹⁹ The Board affirmed and endorsed Elliott's instructions, defining advocacy for the University as exclusively within the purview and responsibility of the Chancellor as the chief executive officer. Again, in 1917 following review of a complaint about a consulting report prepared by Professor J. P. Rowe for a private oil company, the Chancellor recommended the Board’s “emphatic disapproval” of the report because of certain unscientific statements he judged easily misinterpreted as promoting the sale of stock by the sponsoring company.¹²⁰ While finding no basis for "summary action" against Rowe, who objected strenuously in writing to the allegation of an ethical lapse, the Board solemnly endorsed the Chancellor's recommendation of "emphatic disapproval" of Rowe's report as not based solely on scientific fact and thus subject to interpretation as a sales pitch. As the Chancellor emphasized, faculty members who engaged in external activities had to respect strict ethical standards to avoid conflicts of interest and to protect the reputation of the University.

To guard against such problems in the future, the Board charged the Chancellor to consult the Presidents, affected Department Heads, and relevant professional associations to develop and promulgate a set of guidelines for faculty and staff members who engaged as expert witnesses

or consultants with compensation from external entities.¹²¹ The Chancellor prepared and presented the guidelines in December 1917 as University Act No. 514 concerning compensated "Scientific and Other Services" provided by the faculty to external organizations or individuals.¹²² The statement outlined "regulations to govern the scientific and special services performed for compensation by members of the staffs of the institutions."

According to the regulations, the faculty and administrators had to fulfill their University duties and responsibilities, remain up to date in their professional fields, and conduct relevant research. If free time remained, the regulations allowed them to provide compensated services to external entities "only with the approval of the president." During such engagements, they had to identify published or unpublished reports as private, explicitly disclaiming use of the University name or resources. More specifically, the regulations prohibited the preparation of any reports, even if *entirely unsupported* by the University, for profit or to promote the sale of stock, and proscribed any services in competition with the private sector. As the only exception, "Routine work of an editorial or scientific character may be permitted under exceptional circumstances, only upon the approval of the Chancellor of the University." A concluding caveat explicitly exempted preparation of text books, other technical books, or scholarly articles. While offering guidance to the faculty concerning external activities, the application and interpretation of the regulations remained to test their effectiveness. In any event, Elliot had fulfilled his reform commitments to the faculty and the State Board.

The disruptions during the period from 1918 to 1920 made for a challenging time to implement the Elliott reform policies and procedures. As mentioned, after the United State entered the War, the State University faculty collaborated to offer extension courses for the edification of the public about the war. However, as it turned out, the issues that affected the Montana population at large also entered into campus discussions and sparked conflict.¹²³ The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia complicated matters even more after the Bolsheviks gained the upper hand and ended Russian involvement in the war against Germany. For example, several faculty members, including Professors N. J. Lennes (Mathematics), Louis Levine and J. M. Underwood (Economics), Freeman Daughters (Education), and President Sisson planned a speaker series on the causes and aims of the war. Their heretofore obscured philosophical differences soon surfaced.

Levine and Underwood, to a lesser degree, had interpreted the war from the outset as a result of the economic interests and burgeoning conflicts between England and Germany, with Russia pulled in because of the huge loans made to Russia by the English and French. While they supported American intervention in support of the rights of neutrals, they doubted the rationale of a war against authoritarianism. Levine celebrated the Bolshevik success and approved ending the war in which the new Russia, the country of his birth, had no real interest. Lennes and Daughters among others, viewed the war as a crusade against authoritarianism, and Lennes regarded any questioning of that cause as at the very least inimical to world peace and justice. In that vein, Lennes publicly and vehemently labeled Levine as a traitor who undermined the overall war effort, not just that of the United States. The quarrel became very heated and ultimately came to the attention of Chancellor Elliot and the State Board. Elliott

and Sisson managed to quell the public argument, but the speaker series ended on a sour note and contributed to public suspicion of the State University.

The first real test of the relevance, responsiveness, and effectiveness of the tenure, outside activities, and dismissal and suspension policies and procedures that Elliott implemented occurred in February 1919. The test also involved Professor Levine, castigated as a Bolshevik sympathizer by Lennes and defended by Underwood, Sisson, and Elliott in the 1918 controversy about the speaker series. Undoubtedly, most people soon forgot about the speaker series dispute, although some probably recalled that Levine had defended the Bolshevik revolution in Russia. The 1919 suspension of Professor Louis Levine, a tenured member of the State University Economics faculty, required policy interpretations by the Chancellor, the President, the State University Service Committee, the State Board of Education, and an AAUP Investigation Subcommittee.¹²⁴ The case required the interpretation of the policies and due process for suspension of tenured members of the State University faculty and established a lasting precedent.

Shortly after his arrival on campus in 1916, Levine had agreed to provide assistance to Chancellor Elliott on the development of legislation for a dedicated mill levy and bond issue to support the University.¹²⁵ Subsequently, he also accepted a special assignment to study state tax policies that occupied him from 1917 to 1919. Partially because of the quality of his work, and also because of his training and experience, he earned promotion to Professor with tenure in 1916-1917. Thereafter, he undertook to prepare a series of University Bulletins on tax reform to equalize the burden across the state, an issue that had gained considerable support

by 1917.¹²⁶ In a letter dated 18 February 1918, Sisson informed Levine that he and the Chancellor approved the proposed plan of work and reduced Levine's teaching schedule to accommodate it.¹²⁷ The Chancellor also asked Levine to assist the Tax Commission created by the Legislature to draft some tax reform bills for consideration.

In the course of his research, Levine participated in a tax conference in Lewistown and exchanged radically divergent views with a representative of the Anaconda Company about the appropriate methods of mine taxation. The state Constitution specifically limited taxation of mining property to the original price paid the federal government for the land, exempting the value of all improvements made to the property, but allowing deductions to tax liability for the costs of making those improvements.¹²⁸ Specifically, Levine provided some highly unfavorable comparisons of Arizona and Montana mining and mineral tax policies. The inequitable Montana mine taxation policies had claimed widespread attention in and out of the state. As Levine's work became known, former Senator Joseph Dixon, publisher of the Missoulian, Progressive Republican, and an outspoken critic of the Company, solicited articles from Levine on the issue, and the legislative Tax Commission used some of Levine's work.

In April 1918, Levine reduced the number of pamphlets to three or four, the first on mine taxation, viewed by virtually everyone except Company loyalists as the critical topic for tax reform. The Chancellor and President approved the revised plan, although not necessarily the order of publication, with the Chancellor entering a caveat requiring prior review because he thought the topic demanded "good sense" as well as "sound scholarship."¹²⁹ According to Mrs. Sisson's account written years later, President Sisson "expressed doubts of the wisdom of

making public such controversial work at that uneasy time," but he "yielded to the views of the Chancellor and Levine."¹³⁰ However, Sisson raised no objections at the time.

Complicating matters, J. Bruce Kremer, a Board member from Butte very closely associated with the Anaconda Copper Company, had heard the exchange in Lewistown between Levine and the Company loyalist. In June 1918, he complained to the Chancellor that Levine and his colleagues at the State University taught and advocated socialism, and he demanded an immediate investigation of the Department of Economics.¹³¹ The Chancellor ignored the allegations for lack of specific evidence until November when Governor Sam Stewart, identified by A. L. Stone as a member of the bipartisan Company coterie, demanded a full report on the Kremer accusations. Then, during the December 1918 meeting, the Board reviewed the situation and discussed whether to invoke the Board's 1914 resolution directing the faculty to avoid involvement in partisan activities.¹³² The Board apparently considered that teaching socialism or conducting research on controversial public issues amounted to partisan activities.¹³³ In all likelihood, Board members remembered Levine's earlier public support for the Bolshevik revolution, although Chancellor Elliott apparently harbored no suspicions. Nonetheless, in view of these developments, the Chancellor advised Levine to delay publication because of the charges against him and the Department of Economics and the State Board's uneasiness.

In late November, Levine submitted the first draft of the bulletin on mine taxation and requested review by the President and the Chancellor. Sisson wrote Chancellor Elliot in early December 1918 praising the work as "beyond criticism both in its substance and in its form."

Without hesitation or equivocation, he urged publication because nothing in print rivaled it and he judged it “the sort of work for which the University should have credit.”¹³⁴ Levine later claimed that the Chancellor also thought it a “‘conspicuous’ piece of work,” but the Chancellor remembered “misgivings.” To resolve the matter at the time, Elliott asked Levine to submit the bulletin in printed form without the title page for review by the State Board. Levine agreed but insisted on his right to publish it himself if the Board declined to approve a University Bulletin. The Chancellor and the President accepted Levine's contingency.¹³⁵

In late December, Levine submitted the printed copies before he left for Washington, D.C., to perform some work under contract for the federal government. Upon his return in January, the Chancellor informed him that the Governor objected to publication of the bulletin, adding specifically that he concurred with the Governor.¹³⁶ Upon reflection, Elliott considered the piece amounted to untimely and inappropriate advocacy about a sensitive issue and amenable to interpretation as overt partisan lobbying since the Legislature had specific tax proposals under consideration. He explained to Levine and subsequently to the State University Committee on Service that he had erred when he approved Levine's proposals, and he reminded Levine and the Committee of the requirement for scholarly impartiality and neutrality. To Levine, he reiterated that “the personal bias of your argument has always been my principal criticism of your present study,” and he identified several specific instances of apparent bias.¹³⁷

Levine immediately offered to modify or eliminate all offending sentences and paragraphs, but the Chancellor refused to reconsider. In view of the public charges of socialism against Levine

and the Department of Economics, the uneasiness of the Board, and the Legislature in session, he thought it “best for the larger and permanent interests of the University that *any* publication of this bulletin be indefinitely postponed.”¹³⁸ Quite clearly, the Chancellor intended to forbid publication in *any* form to protect the University. Merriam speculated that the Chancellor fretted about the potential impact on the planned mill levy to support higher education.¹³⁹ Futilely, Levine reminded the Chancellor of his right to publish privately: “You agreed that it would be a bad precedent to submit the private publication of a member of the faculty to the censorship of the Board of Education. I was willing to publish the bulletin as my private enterprise. But you claimed the University . . . had a ‘vested right’ in it.”¹⁴⁰ He had acquiesced in review of a University Bulletin, but not of his private publication. Since the Chancellor barred a University Bulletin, he planned to publish the pamphlet himself, as the earlier agreement stipulated.

In February 1919, B. W. Huebsch of New York City published Levine's monograph and it immediately claimed national and state attention.¹⁴¹ Invoking Board policy, the Chancellor promptly suspended Levine on 7 February 1919 without pay for insubordination and “unprofessional conduct prejudicial to the best interests of the University.” President Sisson strenuously disagreed, and, according to Clapp, pondered resignation rather than implement it.¹⁴² Clapp quoted from a letter Levine wrote years later that he persuaded Sisson not to resign pending the outcome of a review by the State University Committee on Service.¹⁴³

At the time, the President lamented that the suspension presented a “tragic dilemma” for him personally and struck a “heavy blow to the University.”¹⁴⁴ After the suspension, he claimed

that he had preferred deferral of publication to avoid trouble when Levine and the Chancellor disagreed. He also thought the Chancellor's action rendered Levine's "reinstatement . . . almost beyond the limits of possibility." Nonetheless, he promised Elliott to avoid any "unnecessary action or utterance," and he gave no hint of a possible resignation. For his part, the Chancellor reluctantly participated in the Committee on Service's open hearing, preferring a closed session, and provided a written statement denying that he had charged Levine with unprofessional conduct. He again admitted his error in supporting Levine's work, a serious mistake likely to "alienate certain friends . . . in the Legislature."¹⁴⁵ He evidently had more concern about the effect of Levine's actions on appropriations, the mill levy, and the bonding bill than about academic freedom and tenure.

Professor Elrod, Chairman of the first State University Committee on Service, served with Professor of History Paul C. Phillips and Professor of Law Walter L. Pope, all senior faculty members with tenure under the Board's new policy.¹⁴⁶ Elrod claimed in his draft of the Committee report that neither the Chancellor nor the Board had consulted the faculty about the tenure policy and procedures concerning suspensions and dismissals.¹⁴⁷ Perhaps he meant that the consultation had no impact on the final policies and procedures. However, when the State University faculty met for an unauthorized preview of the Committee on Service report concerning the Levine suspension, the policy on tenure and the review procedures for suspensions and dismissals stimulated considerable discussion.¹⁴⁸ Professor N. J. Lennes proposed an amendment to the suspension procedures to assure that any faculty member suspended by the Chancellor received "a written and detailed statement of the specific reasons." More specifically, the Lennes amendment sought to limit insubordination narrowly

to official, not personal, acts of a faculty member in pursuit of assigned responsibilities.¹⁴⁹

Lennes had very personal reasons for his proposed amendment, specifically the reaction to his public criticism of Levine about the nature of the war other matters not yet public.

The Lennes amendment passed without dissent, although unclear in its effect since it purported to interpret or alter Board policy. Lennes obviously intended to restrict the scope of the suspension policy to official acts within the scope of a faculty member's assignments and not to a faculty member's private acts as a citizen. Given the timing and details of the Levine case, he sought to direct the Committee's attention to the irrelevance of the Chancellor's charges in view of Levine's decision to publish his own work. Whatever Lennes' intent, Elrod subsequently offered a motion calling for a faculty committee to amend the dismissal procedures by requiring notice of dismissal of a faculty at least three months prior the end of a contract, undoubtedly because of his own painful experience in 1908, an amendment irrelevant to the Levine case. This motion passed unanimously as well, although even more unclear as to effect. The faculty apparently anticipated some response from the Chancellor and State Board, but no evidence suggests that Board members received and reviewed the proposed amendments.

In February 1919, the state Senate Committee on Education conducted an investigation of the charges of socialism against Levine and the Department of Economics.¹⁵⁰ After he testified, J. H. Underwood, Chairman of the Department, informed the press that the Committee had the best interests of the University at heart and that his testimony had nothing to do with Levine's suspension. On an earlier occasion, he had privately expressed disgust for the anonymity of

the attackers. "What I have heard of our opinions as quoted back to us are [*sic*] more amusing than some of those we get back from freshmen."¹⁵¹ He flatly denied the allegations but doubted any efficacy in view of the personal and partisan nature of the attacks. Sisson also wrote the Committee in support of the faculty and Department, thanking the members for the opportunity to quash the rumors having such a damaging impact on the University.¹⁵² The Committee report straightforwardly denied the validity of the allegations against Levine and the Department.¹⁵³ Contrary to mythology, in this instance the alleged Company antipathy or hostility had no effect on the Senate Committee or the investigation. Friends of the Company certainly circulated rumors about Levine and the Department of Economics but no one except the Chancellor paid much attention.

Interestingly, Elrod, the Chairman of the State University Committee on Service and editor of the Inter-Mountain Educator (the official journal of the MSTA), summarized the Levine case in the February issue of the Educator even before the Committee had completed its review.¹⁵⁴ He listed the Committee members, with himself as Chairman, and reviewed the Board procedures for suspensions and dismissals. In conclusion, he explained that the Board "is in no wise governed by the service committee" report, but he thought Levine's arguments dispositive of the case. The Chancellor had not ordered but only suggested the postponement of publication, thus obviating any charge of insubordination against Levine. In the article, Elrod summarized information at the time available only to the Committee. In fact, the Committee delayed its report until April, after Levine and the Chancellor testified, an AAUP investigation had begun, and the state Senate Committee completed its investigation.

During March, the AAUP dispatched the Chair of an Investigating Subcommittee, F. S. Diebler, in response to Levine's request for an investigation. Diebler met with Levine, President Sisson, Chancellor Elliott, and others in an effort to mediate the dispute. In a note to Sisson, who continued to believe the suspension unfounded, Diebler reported that the Chancellor "is quite emphatic in making insubordination the cause of suspension."¹⁵⁵ The State University Committee reviewed the testimony and other evidence provided by Levine and the Chancellor and, as Elrod had predicted in the Educator, found the evidence insufficient to sustain the charges. The Committee report urged the Board not to sustain the Chancellor's suspension decision.¹⁵⁶

As the Chair of the Committee, Elrod had the primary responsibility to present the final report. However, as entered in the Board records, the official report differed in significant ways from Elrod's handwritten draft, perhaps the influence of Professor Pope, the lawyer on the Committee. Focusing specifically on the right of a faculty member "to publish . . . in his chosen field, whether or not the university may have assisted" the research, the Committee conceded that Levine knowingly disobeyed the Chancellor's muted but nonetheless specific instruction not to publish the results of his research.¹⁵⁷ Doing so allowed the Committee to deny categorically the authority of the University or any administrator to interfere with the right of a faculty member to publish the results of good faith research, thus rendering a charge of insubordination moot.¹⁵⁸

In equally blunt terms, the Committee rejected the argument that the University or its agent possessed the authority to discipline a faculty member who refused even a polite request not

to publish the results of legitimate research. In the Committee's judgment, the University or its agent had no rightful authority to order faculty members to avoid controversial or political topics or subjects on or off the campus. Authority of that nature interfered with the academic freedom of the faculty to teach within their areas of expertise and conduct research. As all citizens, the faculty also enjoyed the rights guaranteed by the national Constitution, which included freedom of speech and expression. For support, the Committee cited President Abbott Lawrence Lowell of Harvard University that no middle ground existed: Either faculty members stood responsible for their speech and publications or the University incurred the responsibility for all that faculty members said or wrote. Principle and pragmatic reality required faculty members to incur the consequences of their actions.¹⁵⁹ The Committee warned of the unintended but significant consequences if the Board or the University accepted the Chancellor's reasoning.

Undoubtedly reflecting Pope's influence, the Committee emphasized the "vast difference between a private trust and a public trust." Conceding that the chief executive officers of private businesses had the authority to suppress objectionable work or control the activities of corporate employees, the members denied any parallel to the relationship of faculty members and administrators of higher education institutions. They held instead that neither the Chancellor nor the State Board had the authority to decide the validity of faculty research, barring flawed methods, falsification of results, or fraud. The marketplace of ideas alone determined the validity and relevance of *bona fide* research. Moreover, in this instance, the University had waived any claim to Levine's work by agreeing to personal publication rather than as a University Bulletin. In the end, the Committee rejected Levine's own characterization

of his monograph as a private publication. Levine had merely arranged a contract with a private firm to publish the result of his work as a faculty member, work partially paid for by the public and rightfully belonging in the public domain. In conclusion, the Committee commended Levine for acting responsibly as a member of the faculty to fulfill the obligation to conduct research and publish the honest results.

Not even concern about the damaging impact on the University of an untimely publication sufficed to suppress good faith research. In making such a claim, the Chancellor had seriously damaged the integrity and reputation of the University by violating faculty freedom of thought and action. In straightforward terms, the Committee ruled *ultra vires* any claim of authority by the University or its agents to interfere with the pursuit of truth through careful and professional research and open and free communication. The only course open to the State Board, in the Committee judgment, required a refusal to sustain Levine's suspension.

Professor Elrod's handwritten draft of the report contained even more strident statements of the underlying principles and their implications.¹⁶⁰ He warned that if the University had the authority to claim ownership of the scholarly work of faculty members, the University then had the power to deny public access to any information it chose to withhold. Such a policy "would, if persisted in, cause a cessation of cooperation between members of faculties and institutions." Every faculty member shared the responsibility to discover and communicate truth. If universities had the power to require faculty members to avoid controversial or political topics, they then had the authority to ban research or teaching about such topics as evolution, women suffrage, public health, international relations, the League of Nations, and

the like, a proposition no reasonable person accepted. Moreover, in this instance, the University, through the Chancellor, had authorized Levine's research, supporting it with salary and expense funds, and incurred the obligation to assure public access to the results of the research the public had financed. Elrod found it contradictory, even farcical, that the Chancellor had invited a faculty member to participate in activities planned to culminate in publication and influence legislation and then sought to quash the results.

Elrod's summary restated the principles clearly.

The individual faculty member is more than a hired man in the institution . . . in his chosen field, he should stand in the same relation to the Executive or governing board as does a judge to the governor or president who appoints him. He is chosen because of special fitness for the work he is to do. He should be given the utmost freedom in the discussion of his own line of work in his classes. He alone should be responsible for his utterances, and not the person or persons who appointed him. Outside of the class he should have the same freedom as other individuals not in the university to write or to publish, and should be encouraged to present investigations in his field of endeavor, for by such methods only will progress be made.

Only the societal respect for robust "academic freedom" encouraged "men of ability, courage and capacity" to enter and remain in the academy. "They are now leaving fast, and fewer are entering each year." In Elrod's view, the "Greatest good will come through expression, not repression, . . . especially in institutions supported by taxes from the people of the whole state." The Chancellor had concluded that Levine's unilateral action brought the Board's new

tenure policy into jeopardy. Elrod asked rhetorically, “what kind of tenure” allowed the Chancellor to abrogate it when a faculty member fulfilled his professional responsibilities in good faith? As he concluded caustically, “there have been several cases where members of the faculty have been dismissed, without notice, without charge, without a hearing, and that after years of faithful and distinguished service,” an obvious reference to Stewart, Bolton, Reynolds, and to himself in 1908. Good sense and sound policy dictated rejection of Chancellor Elliott's misguided attempt to fetter faculty research and expression, for only the protection of the freedom to research and publish served the public interest.

Prior to the Board review of the testimony by the Chancellor and Levine in a special meeting in April 1919, Levine refused to accept probation instead of suspension or dismissal as suggested by the Chancellor to settle the case.¹⁶¹ He demanded a ruling by the Board on the legitimacy of the suspension. Immediately after the testimony, the Board rejected a motion to dismiss Levine. Instead, the members voted six to three to sustain the Chancellor's suspension and seven to two to reinstate Levine and restore his salary retroactively.¹⁶² With no further explanation, the Board formally amended the policy to allow review of suspensions during special as well as regular Board meetings, thus preventing long delays before responding to appeals.¹⁶³ The meaning and precedential value of the decision remained for future determination.

In the April Educator, Elrod ridiculed the Board's casuistry in refusing to dismiss Levine, upholding the Chancellor's suspension, and then reinstating Levine and restoring his salary retroactively.¹⁶⁴ Elrod assumed that the Board's refusal to dismiss Levine and approval of his

reinstatement invalidated the Chancellor's suspension. That assumption rested on the premise that dismissal always followed an approved suspension, a faulty premise, and that reinstatement invalidated suspension, also faulty. President Sisson, who credited the Chancellor with good faith, welcomed the Board decision as vindicating the Chancellor while correcting a grievous error.¹⁶⁵ In Sisson's view, the Board approved the suspension as an act the Chancellor took in good faith to protect the University under exigent circumstances, and then exonerated Levine also for acting in good faith as a faculty member after the crisis had passed. By doing both, the Board defended the Chancellor's authority to act as the situation warranted and simultaneously respected the right of the faculty member to a fair hearing after the emergency dissipated.

Mary Brennan Clapp offered a somewhat similar explanation relating to the distinction and relationship between suspension and dismissal.¹⁶⁶ The latter did not always follow the former. In Clapp's view, Elliott suspended Levine to avoid his dismissal by the Board, suspecting that outcome based on discussions with the Governor if he failed to act. The Board procedures allowed the Board to dismiss any employee after a hearing. Elliott feared a Board hearing in February 1919 as the prelude to dismissal, so he took action to preempt the Board. As Clapp put it, Elliott's swift action delayed Board involvement while shifting the dilemma about the suspension to the Board after the dust settled.

Clapp thought the Chancellor's suspension left the Board members with the option to "do but one thing, put a knob on each horn" of the dilemma and to support the Chancellor and the new policies simultaneously even if in seeming contradiction. Auguring that outcome, the

public had accepted the relevance and timeliness of Levine's publication, which sold out and went into a second printing; the Senate Education Committee repudiated the allegations against Levine and the University, finding no evidence to support them; and the State University Committee considered the Chancellor's suspension unwarranted. Resolving the dilemma, the Board at once sustained the Chancellor and validated his new procedures. In another sense, however, it soon became clear that the Board's decision gave rise to an impression that the faculty recommendation counted for more than the administrative act. Under that view, shared governance implied faculty dominance. Finally, in this instance as with Elrod in 1908, contrary to the dominant mythology, the Company lost if indeed the Company instigated the effort to oust Levine.¹⁶⁷

The Board's decision made resolution of the case quite simple for the AAUP Investigating Subcommittee. In fact, the decision mooted the case. The Subcommittee Chairman submitted an abbreviated report, consisting for the most part of the Committee on Service Report. At the same time, Diebler seized the occasion to commend the State University Committee for "an admirable understanding of the principles underlying academic freedom " and for applying them "with fairness, discrimination, and courage."¹⁶⁸ In his view, the University of Montana faculty had no need to worry about the "freedom to pursue research and to publish" if the precedent prevailed in the future.¹⁶⁹ His prediction proved correct over the long term.

In the sequel, former Senator Dixon ran successfully for Governor in 1920 on a platform including a plank calling for reform of mine taxation.¹⁷⁰ The Company hounded Burton K. Wheeler to defeat and remained quiet about Dixon who seemed the lesser of two evils.¹⁷¹

When Dixon's proposed legislation failed because the Company rallied its supporters against the measure and against Dixon, the people of Montana approved an initiative the Governor sponsored that amended the state Constitution concerning mine taxation as Levine had proposed. Dixon suffered defeat in the same election, but the popular vote finally mandated more equitable taxation in Montana. The myth of Company dominance did not always explain developments.

As for Levine, he received an offer from the New York World in September 1919 and requested a leave without pay to accept it. Perhaps with unintended consequences, he stated in the request his intention to resign if the Board denied it.¹⁷² The Chancellor denied the leave ostensibly because of the timing and peremptorily accepted Levine's resignation, as President Sisson informed Levine.¹⁷³ Thus, Levine chose to terminate his employment for reasons that made sense to him, not because the University terminated his contract or interrupted his pay. In subsequent years, Sisson wrote letters supporting Levine's applications for academic positions elsewhere, recommending him highly as "one of the two or three ablest teachers" at the University. The President knew of nothing to raise any doubt about Levine's capability and performance as a professor.¹⁷⁴

Under a different name, Levine subsequently enjoyed a successful career as an author, economist, educator, journalist, and consultant to governments and private entities. However, the taint of radicalism clung to him into the 1940s and 1950s when he came under McCarthyite attack as a "commie" sympathizer.¹⁷⁵ Largely as a result of the frustration caused by Levine's suspension, some State University faculty members organized a local chapter of the American

Federation of Teachers (AFT) in Missoula which lingered for a few years but never attracted many members.¹⁷⁶ Somewhat ironically, in late 1938, University President G. Finlay Simmons - hardly a radical -- invited Dr. Lewis Lorwin – a.k.a., Dr. Louis Levine, the Russian-born brother of piano virtuoso Levinsky who had performed in Missoula in the 1920s – to present a lecture on international relations. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately by avoiding yet another controversy on campus, Lorwin’s schedule prevented acceptance.¹⁷⁷

As mentioned, the Board adopted an amendment to the suspension and dismissal procedures allowing review during special as well as regular meetings.¹⁷⁸ Also, during a special meeting on 25 April 1921, the Board approved another amendment that removed “gross” before “inefficiency” as a cause for suspension. Finally, the Board subsequently revised the policy to require notice of a decision not to renew a contract by 15 April prior to its termination date, typically 1 September annually, with no indication that the amendment came from Professor Elrod or the faculty.¹⁷⁹ These developments and the Levine decision itself suggested that the Chancellor and the State Board viewed the protected activities of faculty members somewhat differently than the faculty. Nonetheless, the Levine episode in academic politics vindicated the faculty right to publish the results of good faith research with impunity, whatever the source of the objections.

Providing perspective on the policy differences, the Board directed the Chancellor during the April 1919 meeting after deciding the Levine appeal to revise the 1914 resolution prohibiting faculty involvement in campaigns on or off campus.¹⁸⁰ While reaffirming freedom of expression on and off the campus, the proposed revision stated emphatically that the Board

intended to hold employees “strictly accountable if they bring the institutions . . . into disrepute or . . . involve them in unnecessary political controversy.” The carefully chosen wording inevitably left room for disagreement because of susceptibility to differing interpretations, e.g., “bring . . . into disrepute” and “unnecessary political controversy.” In response to Sisson’s inquiry about a newspaper article reference to the resolution of 1914, and in accordance with his practice of consulting the Executive Council, the Chancellor sent copies of the proposed revision to the Presidents for comment.¹⁸¹ In a handwritten note on the copy of the revision, Elliott explained that the “Board seeks to conserve the proper freedom & health of the professor in his life as a citizen,” a goal warmly espoused by the faculty.

However, the State University Committee on Service objected strenuously to both the unrevised and revised resolution.¹⁸² Professor Elrod, for the Committee, castigated the 1914 resolution because of its “express purpose of stopping speeches or addresses in favor of consolidation.” When consolidation failed in November 1914, the resolution remained buried and unused “until the Levine matter.” Recent appointees to the State University faculty knew nothing about its history and viewed the revision with concern. In the Committee opinion, “the resolution has no place whatever in connection with faculty members, and should be abrogated. It is susceptible of double meaning, one . . . laudatory , the other quite vicious.” Faculty members who have “chosen teaching as a life work, are tremendously interested in the institutions with which they are engaged, and will protect the good name of the institution and state.” As the Committee counseled, “Rare and extreme cases may be handled without such a resolution.” A handwritten note on the file copy indicated that the proposal never resurfaced

after April 1919, undoubtedly in large part because of the strong negative reaction from the State University.¹⁸³

In confirmation of the difference in perspective, and providing the reason for Lennes' earlier proposed amendment, the Board, in April 1919, acted promptly after receiving a complaint about some offensive remarks in one of his private letters. The previous December, Lennes wrote on University letterhead to Max Cederbaum, a Jewish businessman, making extremely offensive and racist remarks, subsequently made public by the Anti-Defamation League of Chicago in a complaint to President Sisson and the Chancellor.¹⁸⁴ Sisson upbraided Lennes about the letter and advised him to go elsewhere for his own and the University's good. However, the President chose not to press for a sanction at that time.¹⁸⁵ After reviewing the letter, the Board adopted a resolution that provided further clarification of the limits on faculty personal expression.¹⁸⁶ Classifying the letter, even though on University letterhead, as private and personal and "not reflective of the views of Professor Lennes as a member of the faculty," the Board nevertheless instructed the Secretary to convey regret to the complainant and to Professor Lennes about the offensive remarks. Moreover, the Board expressed the fervent hope and trust that "in the future such indiscretions would not be committed." Perhaps intended as a response to Lennes' earlier proposed amendment concerning insubordination and unprofessional conduct, the Board sharply disagreed with his effort to distinguish between official and personal acts, and warned against indiscrete statements even in private letters.¹⁸⁷ Without question, the faculty views differed from those of the Chancellor and the Board, and these divergent views augured conflict sooner or later unless reconciled.

The outcome of the Levine case also engendered new thought about policies and procedures among the State University faculty. For the Service Committee, Elrod surveyed the faculty in late spring 1919 and proposed seven revisions to the President.¹⁸⁸ First, the faculty recommended that individual faculty contracts must list specifically all requirements and regulations, with nothing left for interpretation or clarification. Second, notice of intent to allow a term contract to lapse must occur at least six months prior to the end of the term. Third, a suspension required a written statement in advance indicating the specific cause, with clear and concise definitions of "insubordination" and "reprehensible conduct." Reflecting disagreement with the Levine suspension, Sisson, himself, had recommended restricting insubordination to refusals to perform "official contractual duty" and defining reprehensible conduct as "flagrant acts of immorality and notorious indiscretion." Fourth, the salary of a suspended faculty member continued until after the hearing and Board confirmation of the suspension, with no more than three weeks from announcement of the suspension to completion of the hearing. Fifth, the Committee on Service hearing must occur prior to imposing suspension, with appeal to a panel of the Chancellor, President, and designated Board members. Sixth, a suspension applied exclusively to extreme instances of immorality or criminal behavior. And, seventh, the faculty preferred a larger role for the campus President in applying the policies and procedures.

The revisions revealed concern about vague and undefined terms and the dominance of the Chancellor in enforcement. In his memorandum to the Committee, Sisson also expressed an uneasiness not shared by the faculty about the definition of faculty tenure. He feared that academic employment with tenure, just as vested employment in the federal civil service,

virtually disallowed the removal of those who failed to perform.¹⁸⁹ The faculty ignored Sisson's concern but accepted several of the specific revisions he proposed. The President submitted the proposed revisions to the Chancellor for conveyance to the Board, but nothing changed except the minor amendments adopted by the Board in April 1919. These differences in perspective augured continuing disagreement about the tenure and suspension policies and procedures.

VII

The State University Committee on Service soon had another occasion to hear allegations against a faculty member and interpret the policy and procedures, seizing the opportunity to cite the Levine case as binding precedent. However, this case involved circumstances substantially different from those in the Levine case.¹⁹⁰ During World War I and for some years afterwards, the country succumbed to rampant patriotic fervor and xenophobia ignited by the labor strife, the war, and the radicalism of the Russian revolution. Americans in general, and Montanans specifically, lost their equilibrium and subjected people deemed deviant to persecution and harsh treatment.¹⁹¹ Into this rather inhospitable if not hostile environment, Professor Arthur Fisher, recent graduate of Harvard Law School and disciple of Professors Felix Frankfurter and Roscoe Pound in the pursuit of social justice, came to the University in 1920 on a two-year term contract to teach in the School of Law.¹⁹² Fisher's father, Walter, had served as President William Howard Taft's Secretary of the Interior and later publicly raised questions about the American entry into World War I. Fisher himself had requested and received exemption from military service by his draft board because of physical unfitness.¹⁹³

Fisher's subsequent critics charged that he initially sought exemption as a conscientious objector and then feigned a disability when that stratagem failed. However, Sheila Stearns reviewed the selective service records and found that Fisher inadvertently checked all the possible reasons for exemption on the form, including religious or political objection, but his draft board ruled only on and confirmed his physical disability.¹⁹⁴ Thereafter, Fisher accepted an appointment with the federal War Risk Insurance Bureau and served with distinction during the war.¹⁹⁵ However, he participated in one or two protest events that some people considered unpatriotic, although he explained that he only supported and participated in protests to persuade President Woodrow Wilson to clarify American war aims and peace terms.

On several occasions, he claimed the right of every American citizen to seek termination of a legally declared war, as some Americans in 1812, Abraham Lincoln after 1846, and other Americans in 1898.¹⁹⁶ He also willingly took the oath to support the U. S. and state Constitutions, expressed strong support for the form of government in the United States and Montana, and repudiated violent revolution.¹⁹⁷ Finally, he denied that he had knowingly requested exemption from military service as a conscientious objector, since he condoned killing in self-defense and in a just war. Nonetheless, he believed that every American had the right to use all legal means to avoid killing in a war deemed unjust. Hardly novel and largely unobjectionable on their merits, these claims of right nonetheless struck many who heard them as gratuitous, confrontational, and abstract, and magnified several times over by Fisher's sententious and seemingly unending rhetorical fusillades.

Arriving in Montana in 1920 during the turmoil of the Palmer raids, deportations of radicals, and the hotly contested gubernatorial election between Joseph Dixon and Burton Wheeler that year, Fisher ignored the counsel of family friends who urged him to learn about his new state before launching crusades. Instead, he immediately initiated extra-curricular activities that outraged Montanans across the state, especially certain people in Missoula. Specifically, he became an investor and director in the purchase and reorganization of the New Northwest (founded by former President Edwin B. Craighead) as a community newspaper, in itself a worthy undertaking but instantly causing irritation because of competition with the Missoulian. He remained a part-owner and director with limited editorial influence over the paper which nonetheless consumed a considerable amount of his time, much more than he admitted.¹⁹⁸ In addition, during the annual meeting of the MSTA in Billings, he unsuccessfully advocated affiliation with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), viewed by some as a radical proposal. President Sisson, who attended the meeting and opposed the proposal, defended Fisher's right to make it.¹⁹⁹ In brief, Fisher seemed bent on outraging people everywhere, even his University colleagues.

After learning of Fisher's modest protest activities, the state Executive Committee of the American Legion condemned him because he did not conduct himself as an upright citizen. Martin Hutchens, who had purchased the Missoulian from Joseph Dixon, exposed Fisher's protest activities to the Legion in his ongoing effort to crush the New Northwest, a competitor for readers and printing contracts. Hutchens labeled Fisher a political radical certain to commit the community paper to subversive ends, and he literally bombarded the Chancellor with defamatory material.

Slow to react, Elliott bided his time, although he soon concluded that Fisher's involvement with the New Northwest, which he viewed as a partisan paper, led directly to the Legion allegations and also raised questions about his commitment to teaching.²⁰⁰ The unsuccessful effort to affiliate the MSTA with the AFT only added to the stigmata of radicalism. Finally, Fisher's idealism, unconscious condescension and seeming arrogance, sententious intellectualism, and other mannerisms alienated people initially attracted to him. Without doubt as well, he relished the raging controversy that soon surrounded him.

Hutchens waged almost constant warfare against Fisher, sending letters filled with exaggerated charges and invective to the Chancellor who retained a file of complaints about Fisher.²⁰¹ The Fisher and Hutchens families had enjoyed warm relations in Chicago before either Hutchens or Fisher came to Missoula. However, the attitude and behavior of the younger man combined with the threat to Hutchens' newspaper soured the relationship. Ever the cautious administrator, Elliott refused to take any action against Fisher without evidence of an overt act in violation of law or policy, as he persistently told Hutchens. He also counseled President Sisson not to get into the press brawl and to avoid any political entanglements likely to become detrimental to the University's best interests. Everyone, it appears, expected trouble sooner rather than later for Fisher, perhaps embroiling the State University as well.

Fisher ignored the allegations in the press and asked his friends to do the same. Occasionally, to correct egregious accusations, he explained his positions and actions privately to the Chancellor and the President. President Sisson continued to support Fisher, defended his right to express himself and engage in public activities, and, with three faculty members including

the Dean of the School of Law, futilely arranged a private meeting with Hutchens in the hope of ending the attacks. During late Spring of 1921, Sisson probably anticipated a welcome surcease to the public controversy when the University of Oregon offered Fisher a position with a salary much higher than possible if he stayed at Montana.²⁰² Unable to match the offer, the President recommended to the Chancellor a salary increase a bit lower than Dean C. W. Leaphart proposed. The Chancellor reduced the increase because of doubts he expressed to Sisson about the quality of Fisher's teaching. While lower than originally suggested, Fisher's salary increase signaled at least satisfactory performance.

In any event, Fisher ultimately decided to remain at Montana because he thought the School of Law needed him, refused the Oregon offer, and committed himself to more community newspaper work. The stipend he received from the New Northwest compensated for the salary differential between Oregon and Montana, and he concluded he that had to protect the investment he had made in the paper. Shortly after Fisher declined the Oregon offer, the Legion Executive Committee staged a Star Chamber inquiry, actually inviting Fisher to testify which he did under protest.

Finally, on 11 July 1921, the Legion Executive Committee filed vague charges against Fisher with the Board, essentially condemning him because of his beliefs and opinions and demanding his dismissal to remove a corrupting influence.²⁰³ The Montana State Newspapers Association sent resolutions supporting the Legion and the Montana Trades and Labor Council and the World War Veterans memorialized in defense of Fisher. Fisher attended the meeting scheduled by the Board to receive the charges, resolutions, and memorials and attempted to

defend himself. Following that session, the Board ordered an investigation and referred the charges to the Chancellor and new State University President Charles H. Clapp, and Fisher appealed to the State University Committee on Service.²⁰⁴ The Board announced the intention to review the allegations and the reports from the Chancellor, President, and Committee on Service during the September meeting.

New President Charles H. Clapp soon learned more about Fisher than he wanted to know. To initiate the learning process, Fisher wrote on 28 July inquiring about the President's interpretation of academic freedom.²⁰⁵ He unconsciously irked Clapp with gratuitous counsel that he saw "no great difficulty in separating the issues of my views on the war or international affairs in general from that of freedom of opinion in the University." He added that Hutchens had used fear mongering to create a distorted image of his project to establish a community newspaper. The President reacted with some impatience, sensitive to the no so subtle slight to his intelligence and competence, and scrawled a penciled note on the letter, "trouble maker – not going to tolerate," an inauspicious beginning of the relationship.

Clapp also requested a report from Elrod and the Service Committee on Fisher's teaching and his "operation of a partisan newspaper," specifically mentioning his reputation as a "trouble maker."²⁰⁶ Years later, Mary Brennan Clapp observed that "Mr. Fisher's own statement showed that teaching was by no means a main interest," a conclusion undoubtedly influenced by the views of her deceased husband.²⁰⁷ Elrod promptly asked for details about Fisher's "trouble making," since the Committee had to have "definite complaints or charges."²⁰⁸ With deliberate intent, he referred the President to the Committee's earlier Levine report

concerning faculty involvement in outside activities as a precedent. Nonetheless, he agreed to look into Fisher's relationship with the New Northwest because of the novel issue of "operating a partisan newspaper." Curiously, Elrod never mentioned his own role as editor of the Educator, a paper committed to education, teachers' welfare, and the MSTA, nor did Clapp.

In response, the President confessed that he had no specific knowledge about Fisher's activities or behavior, having access only to hearsay and newspaper articles.²⁰⁹ To inform himself, he instructed the Committee to review Fisher's activities prior to coming to Montana, his abortive attempt to affiliate the MSTA with the AFT, his unpopularity with Law students, his ongoing war with the Missoulian, and the Legion allegations. Based on what little he had heard or read, he explained, he suspected that Fisher lacked the "common sense understanding . . . and . . . judgment" essential to success in the classroom. These comments revealed that Clapp considered an upright character, good judgment, common sense, appropriate reserve, acceptable comportment, and solid professional conduct as the necessary attributes of a faculty member in a public institution. While he never questioned Fisher's beliefs and principles, his queries revealed an initial impression, strengthened over time, that Fisher's extracurricular involvements detracted from his attention to teaching and other University responsibilities. To allow time for his own study and reflection, he requested the Committee report well before the September Board meeting.

On the same day, Clapp wrote to Fisher assuring him that they shared a commitment to academic freedom and that he valued a community newspaper. Directly to the point, however, he warned Fisher that academic freedom did not shield "ineffective" teachers from

accountability for poor performance. In addition, he expressed serious doubts about the prudence of Fisher's involvement with a partisan newspaper and specifically noted that he had asked the Service Committee for counsel on that issue. Clapp's letters to Fisher in early September conveyed the implication that Fisher used the University to suit his own ends, a suspicion that became a conviction in time.²¹⁰ His letter of 14 September stated straightforwardly, however, that he expected Fisher to provide evidence of improvement in his teaching and attention to University duties as the conditions for renewal of his contract in 1922.

Elrod served as the Chair of the Committee for the Fisher inquiry despite his commitments at the Biological Station, position as editor and publisher of the Educator, and personal relationship with Arthur Fisher.²¹¹ He undoubtedly believed that most people viewed the Educator as a nonpartisan voice for education, and he also thought the Levine decision left the judgments about private engagements to the faculty member. Nonetheless, his personal involvements called for careful review before accepting such an assignment, given the potential for conflict of interest. No one raised an issue at the time, perhaps because of Elrod's standing on the campus or because the intimacy of a small campus led to unavoidable personal relations. In any event, Elrod never entertained a doubt about his own rectitude.²¹²

In fact, Elrod's personal relationship with Fisher went beyond shared membership in a small faculty. Fisher had boarded with the Elrods during the prior year and still occupied the Elrod home by himself during the summer of 1921.²¹³ Fisher speculated whether the case "would make life a little too exciting" if he roomed with the Elrods again for another year. Elrod

simply ignored the question. In his letter to Fisher, he identified the members of the Committee and reviewed progress to date; and then he asked about the term of Fisher's contract, his relationships with the New Northwest and the American Legion, his teaching performance, and his involvement with the MSTA.²¹⁴ He assured Fisher that "We have no joy in doing this work, except insofar as we may be able to render justice." However, he wanted to know of any "skeletons in the closet," advising that "The most difficult part of this seems to be that the students are against you." To explore the latter issue, the Committee intended to survey the students and faculty. He concluded by urging Fisher to provide all the information he had "that will in any way deal with the case."

On 13 September 1921, just prior to the Board meeting, Elrod submitted the Committee's report that concluded the evidence did not warrant any interference with Fisher's contract that ran until 31 August 1922. To support the conclusion, the report discussed the terms of Fisher's contract, the Law Dean's assessment of his teaching, the result of the survey of faculty and students, the nature of Fisher's external involvements, and a comment about his activities prior to arriving in Montana.²¹⁵ With regard to Fisher's contract, the salary increase for 1921-1922 reconfirmed the original term, subject to notice of nonrenewal by 15 April 1922.²¹⁶ The Committee found no evidence of unsatisfactory teaching or neglect of University responsibilities. The survey of faculty and student opinion revealed nothing of substance, and the Dean of the Law School found his teaching at least satisfactory. No one found his newspaper work detracting from his performance on campus.²¹⁷ Those responsible for granting the salary increase in 1921 knew the details of his exemption from service during World War I and his activities prior to coming to Montana; his involvement with the New

Northwest and the MSTA; and his unpopularity with some students. With regard to his activities prior to coming to Montana, the Committee asked caustically, "If Mr. Fisher did not take his academic quibble about 'rights' seriously enough to violate the law or resist the draft, why should anyone else squander time four years afterward in giving it serious consideration?"

Treating Fisher's beliefs and his involvement with the newspaper and the MSTA as matters of personal choice, the Committee reaffirmed the right of a faculty member to use personal time on discretion, subject only to the constraints imposed by University responsibilities, common sense, and good judgment. The members conceded that faculty members had the responsibility to avoid violations "of law involving moral turpitude" or any actions "hostile to the University" or that impaired instructional effectiveness. They found no evidence that Fisher had violated any law or University policy or that any administrator had informed him of any such violations. While strong in support of faculty rights, the Committee included the usual caveats that allowed the responsible administrators to protect University interests.

In a conclusion best regarded as *obiter dicta*, the Committee rejected the "current notion that professors should keep their mouths shut on all subjects of a controversial nature, for fear of offending some one."²¹⁸ No respectable University accepted the preposterous mandate that professors "teach only undisputed facts, and all opinions should be carefully kept within their heads." While agreeing that faculty members must "use common sense and good judgment," the Committee denied that external critics were the "judges of when professors may or may not talk." The public benefitted when faculty members shared their wisdom informed by carefully weighing the evidence and analyzing problems for relevant solutions.

Most critical, the Committee stated that faculty members incurred a public duty to share their knowledge and speak the truth as they found it. Other professionals had no such obligation. Lawyers represented clients; businessmen pursued profit; and most people followed their own inclinations. Paid by the public with tax revenue, the faculty member's capital derived wholly from a reputation for impartial knowledge and fairness. Fulfilling such awesome responsibilities required the "courage to talk and to take a stand" rather than "to follow the path of least resistance and keep still." The Committee warned that "Conditions at present are such that most professors keep still because they are human, and sometimes have families." Consonant with the Levine decision, the Fisher report stood squarely behind the right, duty, and obligation of faculty members to cultivate and share their expertise for the benefit of society.

The September meeting of the Board exploded into a raging debate about the resolution of the Fisher case. President Clapp and Dean Leaphart submitted a joint statement of their recommendation for an equitable outcome, based on available evidence and applicable policy.²¹⁹ Stearns found the joint statement far more negative about Fisher's teaching than the evidence warranted.²²⁰ She suggested that Fisher's use of the Langdell case method of teaching he learned at Harvard outraged faculty traditionalists and some administrators at the State University. However, Dean Leaphart not only knew the method but advocated it, and he assured Chancellor Elliott in July 1921 that the vast majority of Law professors everywhere used the case method.²²¹ With regard to teaching, the Dean had stated in his response to the Committee survey that Fisher needed time and effort to develop as a teacher.²²² Moreover, although Leaphart had recommended a salary increase in 1921 for Fisher based on his

excellent education, maturing scholarship, and progress as a beginning faculty member, he had specifically noted the need for improvement. He also added that he thought Fisher's involvement with the New Northwest interfered with his responsibilities to the School and the University.

Leaphart and Clapp evaluated Fisher's teaching as "unsatisfactory" at best because he failed to exercise tact and good judgment.²²³ In addition, they observed that Fisher exuded, perhaps unconsciously, an antagonism that aroused student resentment similar to the that stirred among people off campus with whom he interacted. The two administrators strongly criticized Fisher's dismissive attitude toward his University responsibilities as revealed in a flippant response to a question during a meeting with the Chancellor and the Executive Council. When asked why he remained with the Law School, given his newspaper activities, he said he chose to do so because "to be a member of the University staff helped him to gain his ends."²²⁴

Despite these specific comments about the lower quality of Fisher's teaching and his lack of attention to his University responsibilities, Leaphart and Clapp concluded that Fisher had the potential to mature as a good faculty member if given time to gain "experience, acquisition of more common sense, and . . . a modification of his teaching methods as well as his methods in dealing with others." In brief, they viewed him as a potentially effective faculty member if he applied himself to improve his performance. To provide the time for him to address the deficiencies, they recommended a reprimand, a request that he withdraw from the newspaper and attend to University duties, and a commitment to improve his teaching. Seeking to find a

reasonable compromise, the two administrators offered a recommendation responsive to the needs of a neophyte academician and the University.

To dismiss the specious allegations and focus on the salient issues, Chancellor Elliott prepared an evaluation of the evidence against Fisher and offered two resolutions for Board consideration.²²⁵ He summarily dismissed the Legion charges as irrelevant because bereft of evidence showing an “overt act violating law or policy.” In the Chancellor's opinion, the Legion objected solely to Fisher's beliefs and opinions and wanted the Board to dismiss him on that basis. Mincing no words, he stated flatly that to honor the Legion demand threatened the integrity, even the very existence, of the University by imposing "arbitrary restrictions upon the freedom of personal beliefs and opinions of the teachers in the University."²²⁶ To allow such a travesty to occur forever precluded "a University worthy of the confidence of those who view civilization and progress as a constant search for truth." To preempt that outcome, he urged Board support for his first resolution that thanked the Legion Committee for interest in the University, explained that Fisher had not violated law or University policy, and pledged to monitor Fisher's future activities, soothing rhetoric that masked a flat rejection of the Legion demand for Fisher's dismissal.

Nonetheless, the Chancellor recognized and detailed Fisher's performance problems which he thought derived almost entirely from his involvement with a partisan newspaper. Moreover, he considered Fisher's entanglement and activities with the paper damaging to the University. In fact, Elliott believed the Board of necessity had to prohibit not just Fisher but all faculty members from active participation "in political contests and controversies," a position arguably

infringing upon the civil rights of faculty members. However, Elliott denied that any employee had “the right to put the welfare or interest of the University in jeopardy” by allying “with a single political faction,” using the extreme case. Apparently, Elliott subscribed to the adage that the faculty member or administrator must “get on” with the general who took the field. Although not cited, the guidelines he had developed and promulgated in University Act No 514 in 1917 warned against bringing the University into disrepute, without more definition, allowing “Routine work of an editorial or scientific character . . . under exceptional circumstances, only upon the approval of the Chancellor of the University.”²²⁷ Fisher had never sought permission and Elliott thought his newspaper activities interfered with the effectiveness of his teaching by consuming too much of his time and, simultaneously, put the University's interests at risk. He had approved a lower salary increase than requested for Fisher because of questions about his teaching and involvement with the partisan newspaper.

To deal with the legitimate charges against Fisher, Elliott asked the Board to endorse his second resolution. The resolution specifically placed Fisher on probation, directed him to withdraw from active involvement in the newspaper and to avoid further entanglements, and required improvement of his teaching. The Chancellor recommended probation until the Board considered Fisher's contract for possible renewal in April 1922, and also subjected Fisher to summary dismissal if he violated the terms of his probation. Finally, the Chancellor committed to providing periodic progress reports to the Board beginning in December.²²⁸ With stringent but not impossible terms, the resolution offered a pragmatic solution to the Fisher controversy.

The less than fulsome minutes of the Board's discussion alluded to a search for a way to balance the interests of the University against the rights of a faculty member on a term contract.²²⁹ Relying on leaks to the press and other unofficial sources, Stearns reconstructed the debate of several hours concerning whether to accept one or the other of Elliott's resolutions, rather than both or neither.²³⁰ Actually the two resolutions addressed very different issues raised by the divergent allegations against Fisher. No one, barring the Legion Executive Committee, disagreed with the Chancellor's first resolution stressing the "freedom of personal beliefs and opinions of the teachers in the University" and his curt dismissal of the Legion complaints. As for his second resolution, the proposed probation, while more severe than the President and Dean recommended, allowed Fisher time to correct performance problems focused specifically on University responsibilities. As usual, Elliott defended academic freedom but also insisted upon attention to University responsibilities and interests. Unquestionably, he found Fisher's newspaper involvement problematic, a finding shared by the President and Dean.

After hours of debate, one Board member offered a substitute resolution based on the Board discretionary authority under the relevant policies and procedures. As the resolution stipulated, the welfare of the University and the best interests of students required relieving Fisher of his teaching obligations with a paid leave of absence for the remainder of his contract. In brief, by adopting the resolution the Board reassigned Fisher to leave with pay for a full year. Predictably, the substitute resolution generated more and different arguments. Governor Dixon wanted to dismiss the specific charges and delay any decision until after Fisher's performance evaluation in April 1922. Some Board members objected to paying a

faculty member to do nothing and others wanted explicit reasons for any sanctions, apparently interpreting reassignment as a sanction. Perhaps sheer exhaustion or the desire to end the conflict and move forward explained the close vote of six to five to reassign Fisher as proposed.²³¹

Governor Dixon and four Board members refused to support the resolution because it provided no reason for reassigning Fisher; yet they also rejected the Chancellor's recommendation which identified the performance problems. Dixon strenuously opposed a personnel decision without a reason, having "seen it done three times, and for the good of the institution, I do not want to see it done again."²³² He obviously had in mind the dismissals of Stewart, Bolton, and Reynolds in 1915-1916, which he had condemned in a Missoulian editorial at the time. He thought more unexplained Board actions likely to "break up the university." He preferred to view the proceedings as a warning to Fisher before his next evaluation in April 1922. Far better, he cautioned, to supervise Fisher closely and then allow his contract to expire without fanfare in 1922 if he failed to perform satisfactorily. Even so, his proposed solution simply handed the problem back to Elliott, Clapp, and Leaphart with little guidance.

Nonetheless, Dixon's comments recognized that the vote turned not on whether to dismiss Fisher but whether to allow him to teach under supervision or to reassign him to leave with pay.²³³ It bears noting that no one recommended Fisher's dismissal. With the reassignment, the Board respected Fisher's legal right to full salary for the entire period of his contract, reassigning him to his own devices much as the Board had done with Duniway in 1912 for a shorter period of time. Hardly new and novel when used again for Fisher in 1921, this

pragmatic expedient became the accepted rule for such cases in subsequent years. After the vote, the Board adopted a resolution to discuss the outside activities of faculty members during the December meeting, revealing some confusion and differences among Board members. However, in December 1921, after a quick review of existing policy and earlier discussions, the Board abruptly tabled the matter.²³⁴ Just as the Levine decision in 1919, the Fisher decision finessed the issues involved by protecting the interests of the University while respecting the legal rights of the faculty member.

Seeking to draw a moral for the public, the sub-title of a Missoulian editorial advised that “The dismissal of Arthur Fisher from the law faculty of the university is not a cause for gloating.”²³⁵

Despite erroneously equating reassignment with dismissal, the headline sounded fully out of character for Martin Hutchins who had waged virtual war against Fisher for so long. With the war over, Hutchens expressed sympathy for a young man, his career ruined, who incurred indelible stigmata certain to brand him for life. Born with a silver spoon in his mouth, he had enjoyed all the benefits but sadly lacked the capacity to adjust. An alien in his adopted state, he never understood what mattered to these Montanans “who had sacrificed for the war.”

Reverting to character, Hutchens's conclusion completely missed the mark by holding that the American Legion and the State Board assured a better future for the state and the University by dismissing Fisher. While Fisher obviously preferred that outcome, the Board never dismissed Fisher but instead allowed his contract to expire. Most importantly, the Board either brusquely ignored or rejected the Legion allegations as irrelevant.

Captain Miles Romney, the crusading journalist and active but dissenting member of the American Legion, differed vehemently with the Legion Executive Committee. He lamented that Fisher “must walk the well worn plank trod by Presidents Craig, Duniway, Craighead, and Professor Levine! All victims of rotten politics.”²³⁶ Concerned that “academic freedom must be kept alive within the walls of our state university,” he demanded a halt to “this damning habit of discarding every instructor who dares to venture an opinion. University professors must be men, unafraid to take exception; they must be men of strength and initiative ready and eager to take issue with one another – even with the Missoulian! They must not be thoughtless, cringing members of the mob.” Very emotional in tone, Romney's argument paralleled that of Elrod's Service Committee report. Nonetheless, Romney's ringing defense of academic freedom added nothing of substance to Chancellor Elliott's statement or to an understanding of the earlier cases he mentioned. Instead, institutional mythology at once explained and drew added substance from his fervent commentary.²³⁷

Romney's eloquence notwithstanding, the Board simply declined to renew Fisher's contract, as with the three former Presidents. However, the flaming rhetoric about firings and dismissals gave new virility to the myth of a "graveyard of presidents" and faculty in subsequent generations. At the time, Fisher continued his work with the New Northwest and also tried a similar venture in Billings.²³⁸ When both failed, he returned to Chicago to practice law and then enjoyed a successful career as Associate Registrar for Copyrights of the Library of Congress, contributing significantly to the Universal Copyright Convention of 1952.

The Board decision failed to end the Fisher case, although little appeared in the press compared to the uproar in 1919 over the Levine suspension. Stearns attributed the silence to the absence of any large corporate interests, with the Company and railroads uninterested.²³⁹ Perhaps, but Stearns's argument invoked even as it denied institutional mythology as reflected in Romeny's passionate response. In October, Elrod included a brief comment in the Educator, regretting that "Montana is again in the lime light."²⁴⁰ He condemned the State Board for treating a faculty member unfairly by arbitrarily placing him on leave with pay for no reason. In fact, he accused the Board of inventing the leave with pay stratagem to side-step the Legion and other allegations about Fisher. As a result, "The very important question as to what treatment faculty members shall be given on account of personal views is left unsettled." That harsh judgment failed to recognize the Chancellor's ringing dismissal of the Legion allegations on academic freedom grounds, and the Board's refusal to accord any credence to those irrelevant allegations.

However, the faculty apparently shared Elrod's concern. Three months after Fisher's contract lapsed in 1922, fifty-two State University faculty members submitted a petition to the State University administration and the Board protesting the Fisher decision because it lacked an explanation.²⁴¹ The faculty agreed with the Chancellor on the irrelevance of Fisher's physical disability exemption, and with the Committee on Service, Clapp and Leaphart, and the Chancellor on the irrelevance of the Legion charges. In conclusion, they differed with the administrators and agreed with the Committee that the University had no authority to interfere with Fisher's involvement with the newspaper on the claim that he had the right of every citizen to engage in legitimate public activities. The petition respectfully requested the

Board's justification for placing Fisher on leave with pay as a guide to the faculty in the future. While describing it as an indignant petition, Stearns thought the protest tepid at best.²⁴² Even worse, she claimed, the student Law School Association members voted in December against any effort to reopen the Fisher case because they liked his replacement. The MEA completely ignored Fisher, and the Board simply filed the faculty petition without further ado.

But the case still lingered. In response to a request from Fisher and three colleagues, the AAUP launched an investigation and F. S. Deibler once again visited Montana as Chairman of the Subcommittee.²⁴³ Member schedules and other disruptions delayed the report until 1924, three years after the incident and two years after Fisher's contract lapsed. Deibler's report simply repeated the findings of the Service Committee. The, in an apparently meaningless caveat that "Academic Freedom is not here directly under consideration," Deibler went on to discuss the case at some length, never once providing an explicit rationale for an AAUP finding at this late date.

This curious admission and omission did not prevent lengthy *obiter dicta* scattered throughout the report. As a possible justification for the AAUP investigation, he asserted that "Participation in outside activities – whether in the service of corporations, political parties, newspapers or churches or in any other field of interest – should be left to the good judgment of the individual instructor." However, he immediately offered a caveat to the asserted rule: "The responsibility of prohibiting these activities from interfering with the performance of college duties should rest *solely* with university authorities."²⁴⁴ Deibler failed to mention and thus did not attempt to refute the plainly stated conclusions of Clapp, Leaphart, and Elliott that

Fisher's involvement with the newspaper negatively impacted his teaching performance and put the interests of the University at risk. The Service Committee also failed to take note of the Dean's direct statement in his evaluation that Fisher's involvement conflicted with and distracted from his teaching and other University responsibilities.

Instead, Deibler found the Board guilty of grave dereliction of duty by preventing a faculty member from teaching without reason. As had the State University Committee, he assumed that the faculty judgment alone decided the matter, even as they recognized that university authorities had an important role in such decisions. Further, Deibold denied any possible justification for breaching "a contract professionally even though it be honored financially." He apparently defined the injury in non-monetary terms with no room for judgment about the quality and responsiveness of the performance. Finally, Deibold thought it "should be impossible to appoint a professor on the condition that he refrain from any partisan activity." The choice of words, "should" not "shall," revealed an exhortation rather than a rule or principle. Actually, both Deibler and the Service Committee recognized institutional authority to prevent conflicts, perhaps by limiting the time committed to their external activities by faculty members or activities that interfered with the functioning of the University, both arguably actions to protect the interests of the institution.

Before closing the investigation, AAUP Secretary A. W. Vernon requested a comment from President Clapp. Clapp declined, explaining that the case began prior to his acceptance of the presidency. Nonetheless, he judged the case moot and reminded Vernon that the Board had not dismissed Fisher but simply allowed his contract to expire with notice. While correctly

noting that the Board allowed Fisher's contract to lapse in 1922, Clapp incorrectly invoked Fisher's poor teaching performance and external involvements "harmful to the University" as the bases for the decision.²⁴⁵ In fact, the Board gave no reason and had no obligation to state a reason. In any event, Clapp observed that the expiration of Fisher's contract two years earlier had ended the matter.

President Clapp's views on academic freedom and the issues raised by the Fisher case changed little if at all during his service as President. He agreed with Chancellor Elliott's guidelines concerning the external activities of faculty members. A candid response to Professor John Hollen, University of Texas, a decade later concerning academic freedom and the outside activities of faculty provided insight into his views.²⁴⁶ As Clapp restated institutional policies and practice, the State University of Montana placed no restrictions on a faculty member's discourse in or out of class, except to require the exercise of good judgment and common sense. At base, as he noted, appropriate professional behavior dictated that faculty members had "to get along with the community." In his mature opinion, anyone finding these simple rules difficult to follow probably lacked the attributes of a successful faculty member. Although Clapp did not mention the analogous case, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, ruled in McAuliffe v. Mayor of New Bedford (1892) that "A policeman may have a constitutional right to [speak his mind], but he has no constitutional right to be a policeman."²⁴⁷ He also thought it unwise, although not specifically prohibited, for a faculty member "to take a very active part in politics in the way of support or antagonism to any particular candidate or to be a candidate for a public office *while receiving a salary* from the

state."²⁴⁸ Similarly, while everyone had the right to drink, excessive use of alcohol rendered an individual unfit as "a member of the faculty."

An insistence upon the exercise of common sense combined with good judgment and appropriate deportment bounded acceptable faculty behavior for Clapp. The administrator monitoring the guidelines had to balance the rights of the faculty member against the interests of the University. In that regard, he justified employment outside the institution only to further the faculty member's expertise without distracting from University responsibilities or competing with the private sector. In Montana, he wrote, "It is regarded as unethical for a faculty member to participate as an expert in litigation within the state." That ethical rule had come up only with regard to mining, so far as he knew, and the ethical mandate had only affected him. The last comment revealed the limits of his knowledge of the rules and regulations. Faculty consulting in Montana dated at least to 1905-1906, when Elrod and Harkens served as expert witnesses in the smelter fumes litigation.²⁴⁹ Nonetheless, Clapp's views fairly well summarized Montana practices.

After nearly half a century, the academic perspective concerning the Fisher case changed little. Merriam recalled in 1970 that the faculty, with "the Levine and Fisher unhappy incidents . . . fresh in mind," feared that "the chancellor system might reduce the presidents from administrators to executives and faculty to mere employees."²⁵⁰ Nothing of the kind happened at the time or later. A year earlier, in 1969, Sheila Stearns concluded her master's thesis at the University with the statement that the State Board "fired Arthur Fisher primarily because he

irritated its members.”²⁵¹ Both observations contributed more to mythology than to an understanding of what actually happened in 1920-1922.

As already discussed, the Board reassigned, never fired, Fisher, and his contract expired in 1922 with notice in 1921. , Moreover, despite Stearns's statements in her thesis, the Fisher case had nothing to do with the tenure of office policy which continued to provide critical support for faculty members, as both Merriam and Stearns knew. Even so, Stearns argued specifically that the Board “denied Arthur Fisher his rights, through the principle of academic freedom, the tenure security, and his personal political beliefs.” Precisely what that statement meant she never explained. In fact, Fisher served on a two-year term contract with no possibility of tenure without renewal for three more years, and the Board exercised undeniable discretionary authority, without stating a reason, to allow the contract to lapse after two years with notice.²⁵²

Stearns relied on the contention that the hostile actions of Martin Hutchens and irrelevant allegations of the Legion Executive Committee explained Fisher's "firing" in her words. Fisher's mortal enemies “conceived, manipulated, and expanded” the image of a radical subversive and caused the Board to terminate his services. Stearns argued that by failing to defend Fisher, as had Sisson, the Chancellor and the Board disgraced the University. But the record reveals clearly that the Chancellor sternly and curtly rejected the Hutchens and Legion Committee allegations as irrelevant and based on personal hostility, and he stoutly defended academic freedom, as Stearns recognized. She also agreed that Fisher contributed to his public image with his own erratic behavior and rhetoric. Yet she concluded that the Board violated Fisher's

tenure and academic freedom by allowing his contract to lapse with notice but without a stated reason, a claim as extraordinary in 1969 as in 1921.

In fact, the principles in play in the Fisher case lacked definitive form early in the twentieth century and continued to evolve well into the twenty-first. However, even the most expansive interpretation has never questioned the authority of an appointing institution to refuse to renew a term contract with notice but without stating a reason.²⁵³ In fact, that became standard practice even for tenure-track contracts in order to respect institutional prerogatives and limit litigation. Similarly no conceivable interpretation of academic tenure extended tenure to an individual serving on a term contract.²⁵⁴ Academic freedom certainly applied and applies to faculty members on term contracts, but, as Deibler conceded, no evidence existed to show infringement of academic freedom in the Fisher case. Most assuredly, breaching a contract warranted compensation, usually in the form of salary payment to the end of the term. In this instance, no breach occurred and Fisher received full payment under his contract.

Academic freedom traditionally has entailed freedom to teach and freedom to learn in a suitable environment. In an oft-cited concurring opinion in the U. S. Supreme Court case of Sweezy v. New Hampshire, Justice Felix Frankfurter defined the *four freedoms of a university*.

It is the business of a university to provide that atmosphere which is most conducive to speculation, experiment and creation. It is an atmosphere in which there prevail '*the four essential freedoms of a university—to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study.*'²⁵⁵

In accordance with Frankfurter's explanation, modern legal theory associates academic freedom most directly with the host college or university rather than the individual faculty member. Nonetheless, the host college or university typically, if not universally, finds it beneficial, even necessary, to protect the freedom to teach, learn, research, and share expertise within the limits of common sense or good judgment, proscribing acts of moral turpitude and respecting the interest of the institution. Without more explanation than she provided, it becomes very difficult to apply Frankfurter's guidance to Stearns' passionate exhortations.

In the end, Stearns called for the vindication of either Chancellor Elliott's responsibility to protect the institution or Fisher's right to engage in outside activities with impunity. However, the Board rejected either extreme and pragmatically resolved the dispute by allowing Fisher's term contract to run its course and reassigning him to leave with pay, thus protecting the rights and interests of both. Stearns' conclusions, however, reflected the intent of her study, specifically "to dust off the Fisher case and restore it to the disgrace it deserves in the chronicle of Montana higher education."²⁵⁶ As she stated, she set out to disentangle "all of the causes for the dismissal of Fisher" or his "suspension" or "firing," never settling on one descriptor, and accordingly never finding firm ground from which to argue. As a result, she failed to identify clearly all of the complicated, interrelated, and interdependent variables. Stated differently, she offered a lawyer's brief to prove a violation of academic freedom and to vindicate Arthur Fisher, not a full historical explanation of what happened. Alexander Bickel once characterized that approach as "imagining the past and remembering the future," thereby clouding rather

than illuminating the issues.²⁵⁷ As a result, Stearns at once reflected and contributed more to campus mythology than to historical understanding.

Once again, the Fisher case did not end there. In the sequel, Professor Elrod requested funds from President Clapp to survey “the restrictions placed upon the outside activities of college and university staffs elsewhere.”²⁵⁸ Speaking for himself and the Chancellor, Clapp declined, claiming scarcity of funds in all likelihood to dodge an inquiry he deemed unnecessary. For Clapp, as for Elliott and Elrod, although they sometimes differed about its application, the use of common sense defined the restrictions. As a result, the policy context remained somewhat ambiguous and amenable to differing interpretations, as most legal and policy statements.

The State University Committee on Service during the brief period from 1918 to 1921 articulated and relied on theories, positions, and arguments directly in line with the development of academic freedom during the twentieth century. Most importantly, both the University and the Committee relied on emerging precepts protecting academic freedom and individual rights, but always within the boundaries of common sense and institutional integrity. In some respects, the Committee anticipated developments reflective of conflicts about faculty rights and responsibilities within a relatively free, open, and litigious society.²⁵⁹ In other respects, the usage reflected the concerns of the time, as faculty members through their own and the actions of their professional associations sought protection from arbitrary acts as the Levine and Fisher cases illustrated. Without doubt, the policy framework developed by Chancellor Elliott allowed them to succeed. The persistence of disagreement over the years about the precise points through which to draw the lines in order to maintain the balance

between institutional protection and individual freedom attests to and assures the health and vitality of the academy.²⁶⁰

VII

Even with his brief tenure, Edward O. Sisson made vital contributions to the State University. He initiated shared governance, defended the rights as well as the responsibilities of the faculty, and guarded the freedom of students to learn through engagement. In his memoir, Merriam praised Sisson for yet an even more vital contribution during a trying period.

Significant for the welfare of the University was development of a hard core of faculty members . . . consisting of able persons of character who had decided to give their all to the University no matter what winds might blow. They liked Missoula and the country about it and were willing to meet the challenges which the University continually threw out. They harbored a devotion to the University which became highly important in the University development. As persons they differed from one another in nature and in ways of thought and action, but each subconsciously knew that the others could be depended upon to act in what each considered the best interests of the University. No understanding existed among them; the core was no cabal; they did not really sense that they did form a hard core. Year by year it was joined by new persons of character and ability. In spite of frequent changes in the presidency and the chancellorship this core held the University steady and progressive during the financial times and disrupting circumstances.²⁶¹

Merriam's comments celebrated the cadre of dedicated and able faculty he joined and welcomed after his arrival on campus in 1919. For roughly four decades, he shared with them and recounted in his History the challenges and accomplishments of academic life at the State University, renamed Montana State University during the thirties and then again as The University of Montana in the sixties.²⁶² Within the fold, he included some who arrived earlier and had already made their influence felt -- Elrod, Kirkwood, Aber who died in 1919, Smith, Skeels, Corbin, Rowe, Lennes, Leaphart who left for a time and then returned, Merrill, and Jesse. To these, President Sisson added W. E. Schreiber (Physical Education), Leaphart (Law) who returned, G. R. Coffman (English), E. L. Freeman (English), A. Orbeck (English), J. E. Swain (History), H. S. Hughes (English), R. A. Coleman (English), H. M. Jones (English), and H. G. Merriam (English).²⁶³ The faculty cadre provided the intelligence, dedication, and loyalty required for the mature undergraduate institution to develop.

As for campus life, war commanded student attention for the duration and the usual campus activities simply disappeared. Students joined the Defense Council, enlisted in the Army or Navy, or became part of the SATC. The influenza attack made life miserable even for those who escaped its ravages. The usual celebratory events stopped immediately when the U.S. entered the war, as did the football games except for the one with the College and the influenza forced its cancellation.²⁶⁴ Not until after the Armistice in 1918 did life return to a new and altered normal. Nothing remained the same because of the disruptions of the war, demobilization, and social change. As Professor Elrod and others argued, the automobile, electricity, radio, airplane, and urbanization ushered in the modern world with all its challenges and benefits.²⁶⁵

Student numbers began to rise sharply after the war ended, and soon pressed hard on available resources. In 1919, Sisson despaired that the war had interfered with the college plans and aspirations of young people across the civilized world.²⁶⁶ In Montana, a smaller fraction enrolled each year. Those who came needed assistance in the form of affordable tuition and the provision of suitable living accommodations at less than twenty dollars a month. The State University soon had no room for more because of scarce state resources. In response, Sisson proposed the construction of barracks similar to the SATC frame buildings and a new requirement for all freshmen to live on campus. Having them on campus provided the opportunity to develop their academic skills and instill proper habits for living together. At a cost of about \$20,000 each for three buildings, unaffordable to the state for at least three years, he proposed private fund raising as a solution. Unfortunately, nothing came of his farsighted proposal.

Despite crowded conditions and scarcity of resources, the State University more and more looked and felt like a mature institution. Interest in fraternities and sororities awakened again, with Sigma Phi Epsilon and Alpha Phi established in 1918, Phi Sigma Kappa in 1923.²⁶⁷ Homecoming began as an annual tradition in 1919, but the University suspended it during much of the twenties and thirties because of transportation challenges and inadequate connections with the alumni. By 1921, the students had fairly well regained "what in campus life had been lost or weakened" by war. The 1921 yearbook featured Charter Day, painting the M, Sneak Day, Aber Day, the tug-of-war over the slough, May fete, Singing on the Steps, the Interscholastic Meet, and football games under new Coach Bernie Bierman from Minnesota by

way of Butte high school.²⁶⁸ In 1921, the campus began to show the effects of the new funding made available by the referendum of 1920.

Even before the United States entered World War I, the State University felt the pinch of inadequate resources. Faculty salaries and the repair and renovation of existing facilities fell to new lows, causing the Chancellor and the Board to discuss enrollment limits and reductions in instructional staff to deal with the problems.²⁶⁹ In response to the worsening resource crisis, Chancellor Elliott began in 1916 to study ways to assure adequate financial support for the institution.²⁷⁰ He quickly identified a voter referendum as the only possible solution. However, the Montana statute concerning initiatives and referenda did not apply to appropriations.

In the end, working closely with the Presidents, Elliott persuaded the Board to approve a test case with a University Funds Campaign sponsored by the alumni of all the campuses and funded with private support. The dedication of a mill levy still required legislative appropriation of the funds, as did a bond issue. With no challenge forthcoming, however, the sponsors secured the 20,000 registered voter signatures in short order, placing two initiatives on the ballot in the election of 1920: Number 18 for a levy of one and a half mills dedicated to University operations, and Number 19 to authorize a five-million dollar bond issue for construction on the campuses.²⁷¹

The Chancellor and the Presidents supervised the campaign, with Professor W. F. Brewer of the Agriculture College as the campaign director.²⁷² Brewer divided the state into sixteen districts, each with a Professor as manager of numerous volunteers, mostly alumni. The

Chancellor and Presidents delivered talks on demand in the towns and cities across the state, beginning on Charter Day at the State University on 17 February 1920. Brewer distributed more than six thousand copies of the "Workers' Handbook" containing information about state tax rates and yields, state allocation of funds, and University needs. Interrupting the cooperative and collaborative campaign Professor N. J. Lennes publicly criticized Brewer for too much emphasis on the bonding measure and not enough on the mill levy, predicting failure of the former certain to sink the latter.²⁷³ When his unsolicited agitation created great consternation, Sisson and Elliott managed to quiet Lennes.

Despite predictions of failure because of gloomy economic conditions and the changing weather cycle, but perhaps because of the robust reform gubernatorial campaigns of Joseph M. Dixon and Burton K. Wheeler in 1920, the initiatives passed by a combined margin of 25,204 votes. Roughly an average of fifty-eight percent of the voters supported the initiatives, with 90,441 for and 66,237 against the bond issue, and 82,669 for and 71,169 against the mill levy.²⁷⁴ The alumni had raised \$12,857 to support the campaign that cost about \$12,000. To show appreciation, the Board authorized a full report on expenditures distributed to every donor.²⁷⁵ The generous action of the people of the state set the mould for similar approvals every decade in the future even as the mill levies increased in amount.²⁷⁶

After the glorious election, the University administrators and faculty members had every reason to feel good about the future. On Charter Day, 18 February 1921, the Missoula and State University communities joined in an elaborate and inclusive gala celebration of "victory and promise," as Chancellor Elliott described it in his keynote address.²⁷⁷ In later years, this

Charter Day program served as the model for the annual event.²⁷⁸ With classes dismissed, Professor Elrod and the managers exhorted the faculty and students to "Pack the room to capacity. It is earnestly desired and expected that every university member, faculty and student, should take part in the day's program" in the Main Hall auditorium.²⁷⁹

The day began with a convocation in the Auditorium at 10:00, A.M., followed by a luncheon for all at 12:30. At 2:00, a guided tour surveyed "the proposed campus with its many buildings" laid out in accordance with the 1917 Gilbert plan, finally feasible with the successful bonding initiative. Knowledgeable faculty and students stationed at each site provided information about planned facilities and programs. Promptly at 3:00, classroom visitations began, with faculty and students present in the various buildings and rooms to meet, greet, and interact with the guests. Then, at 4:15, the Masquers Club presented a play. During the early evening, students shared the Gym with visitors for fun and interaction, preceded by a reception for community visitors and students and faculty and their families.²⁸⁰ A dance into the evening brought the day to a close.

Chancellor Elliott 's celebrated the impact of the successful initiative campaign. Leaving to more knowledgeable people the origins and development of the State University, Elliott reviewed general statistics chronicling a decade of growth for Montana and the State University and projected the trend line into the future.²⁸¹ Between 1910 and 1920, the state's general population increased by more than fifty percent. At the same time, the state's high school enrollment went from 3,000 to 15,000, high school graduates from 300 to about 1,500, and State University baccalaureate enrollments from 200 to more than 1,000. High school

graduates accounted for one in 1,190 people in 1910 and for one in 370 in 1920; State University students accounted for one in every 2,400 people in 1910 and for one in 600 in 1920. In fact, as he concluded, the number of University students increased eight times faster than the state population.

Elliott predicted a State University enrollment of about 2,500 by 1931 if the trend continued, an outcome portending great benefits for the entire state. As usual, however, the accuracy of the Chancellor's upbeat prediction remained veiled in the future. If the past served as prologue, a curious but critical listener undoubtedly raised some hard questions. The first two decades of the history of the State University, while filled with accomplishment, also offered lessons about the peril of hasty assumptions.

In 1922, well after the Armistice ended the War and after the approval of the mill levy and the bond issue, the State University Committee on Campus Development proposed a stately Soldiers Memorial for the center of the Oval, with walkways to it from all four directions.²⁸² Covered with an open-sided, circular dome supported by ornate columns, the Memorial listed the students and alumni lost during the War. The Chancellor agreed to present the plan to the Board but never did because of lack of funds. Thus, the Oval remained unmarred by structure or walkway until the 1960s. Nonetheless, the Committee's encompassing vision for the campus, however grandiose, revealed a deep yearning for a new era in Montana higher education.

Despite the celebrated success, the great campaign resulted in a severe test for Professor N. J. Lennes. His public hostility toward Professors Levine, Underwood, and Daughters aroused

during planning of the proposed speaker series during the war, his vicious and racist attack on Max Cederbaum in 1919, and his destructive interference with Brewer during the mill levy campaign finally convinced Sisson to act.²⁸³ He had told Lennes to find another position "more than two years ago" and hoped for Lennes' agreement. While he still considered the charges against Lennes not amendable to judicial proceedings, just as he had in 1918, he thought it time to resolve the issue one way or another. Lennes had chosen neither to leave nor to change his behavior. As a result, in March 1921, when Lennes applied for a sabbatical, Sisson ordered him to resign. When Lennes refused, Sisson sent a recommendation to the Chancellor, approved unanimously by the Local Executive Board, to terminate Lennes.

However, the Chancellor chose not to present the recommendation to the State Board because of the timing. Too many critical issues required the Board's undivided attention with no public distractions: 1) A positive policy proposal concerning salary increase allocations for the faculty made possible by the passage of the mill levy; 2) the imminent allocation of bond funds for the building programs on the campuses; 3) the full implementation of the tenure of office policies; and 4) a new state administration and State Board of Education. Sisson acquiesced because of the circumstances, and Lennes, in turn, asked Sisson to submit the entire matter to the State University Committee on Service. Sisson refused because of the nature of the charges. Lennes then notified Sisson in writing that he intended to seek a position elsewhere and that he planned to withdraw his application for a sabbatical leave if Sisson or the Chancellor initiated dismissal proceedings against him during the coming year.²⁸⁴

As it turned out, Sisson and Elliott agreed not to press charges immediately and approved Lennes' request for a year-long sabbatical leave at half-pay for 1921-1922 on the condition that he submit monthly reports of progress on his plan to complete his analysis of "Sets of Points" or "Connected Sets," a sophisticated and unresolved mathematical problem.²⁸⁵ Shortly thereafter, perhaps in part because of the squabble with Lennes, Sisson resigned and returned to Reed College to teach, leaving the Lennes matter unresolved. When Lennes inquired in June 1922 about his position at the State University, he informed new President Charles H. Clapp that he had declined a position at Pittsburgh because of his sabbatical obligation to return to Montana, which he planned to honor. He also mentioned Sisson's earlier efforts to "get" him. Most of the people involved in the controversy had retired or resigned, except Professor Underwood, and Professor Elrod knew the details. Lennes urged the President to talk to Elrod. Clapp assured Lennes of fair treatment if "upon your return you . . . proved that you were willing to play the game with us." Specifically, Lennes had to "cooperate with the administrative officers . . . more fully than it has been reported you have done in the past."²⁸⁶

Lennes agreed to the terms, Clapp ultimately found salary funds to raise his salary to the new maximum for Department Chairmen, and Elliott resigned and assumed the Presidency of Purdue. With the slate cleaned, Lennes never again during Clapp's tenure acted in ways that raised any concern. Years later, he explained that Clapp had given him the file Sisson compiled "to do something to me" at Governor Joseph Dixon's request and that he had burned the contents.²⁸⁷ As frequently happens, Clapp retained a copy in Lennes's personnel file that came back to haunt him.

When Lennes joined the faculty opposition to new President G. Finlay Simmons in 1936-1940, Simmons used the file in an unsuccessful effort to force Lennes's retirement in 1939-1940.²⁸⁸ On that occasion, Lennes once again escaped unscathed and finally retired voluntarily in 1944 with *emeritus* designation. His resume when he left active status included 113 items, some of which focused on the theory of "Sets of Points" or "Connected Sets."²⁸⁹ The little known conflict with Levine and Underwood, Sisson and Elliott and his indiscrete private communications nearly cost him his extended career at Montana. In the end, however, he fulfilled the commitments he made to President Clapp and remained an active member of the University's stalwart and loyal faculty cadre celebrated by Merriam.

CHAPTER III: THE MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITY, 1920-1935

Chancellor Elliott served the University of Montana for two terms before accepting appointment as the President of Purdue University. During his six years, he transformed the new organizational structure from concept to reality. In fact, as even critics agreed, the restructured University functioned much more effectively and efficiently with its four campuses than any one of the four campuses ever had alone. He not only fleshed out the administrative and policy framework, he also masterminded the initiative campaign for a dedicated mill levy and a bond issue to rebuild the campuses. The test of his work fell to his successor, Melvin A. Brannon, who strove mightily to continue Elliott's system. However, Brannon ultimately found himself forced to resign early in the Great Depression largely because of his successes.¹

Until about 1932, the multi-campus University encountered few problems with duplication of programs, thanks to Elliott's reforms and accomplishments.² Most of the challenges for the State University, renamed Montana State University in 1935, centered around the inadequacy of resources and need for academic reform despite or perhaps because of the dedicated mill levy.³ The building program financed by bond revenue went smoothly enough, although it took longer and accomplished less than anticipated because of the economic doldrums in Montana. Nevertheless, the State University found it possible to accommodate increasing numbers of students from Montana and around the country and world. In fact, enrolments grew so rapidly that they soon threatened to overwhelm the restricted faculty numbers. Late

in the decade, Brannon led the campaign to renew the mill levy at an increased level and secure another bond issue but without as much success.

Joseph Dixon's election as governor in 1920 proved the last progressive victory in Montana for more than a decade. The conservative Democrats won in 1924 with John E. Erickson and remained in control until Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal coalition of the mid-thirties ousted them.⁴ During the years from 1924 to roughly 1932, a conservative majority held down state spending, cutting budgets despite the ominous onslaught of the Depression. As property valuations fell in the late twenties, the revenue from the dedicated mill levy followed. Policy makers looked for ways to limit or reduce higher education funding and became concerned again about program duplication. In some years, the legislature limited the appropriation to the mill levy amount, and in others required the institutions to expend all other funds -- including the mill levy allocations -- prior to drawing on the appropriation of other tax revenue. As a result, by the middle of the decade of the thirties, the MSU budget had fallen well below the level in the twenties.

The Montana economy never really recovered from the recession just prior to the end of the war. The war years, coinciding with a wet period and massive immigration in response to the efforts of Jim Hill to settle and develop the open space to provide business for the Great Northern Railroad, misled thousands.⁵ As Michael Malone reported, the state population more than doubled between 1900 and 1920, from 243,329 to 548,889, and homesteaders claimed some thirty-five million acres to reap the wartime bonanza.⁶ However, drought and wind, the abrupt decline in demand for agricultural products after WW I, and hard times forced

thousands to abandon their dreams and move farther west or go back home. As a result, the population in Montana declined more than two percent during the 1920s.⁷ Between 1919 and 1925, one of every two farmers lost the land, with two million acres passing out of cultivation, and Montana farm land declined by fifty percent in average value.⁸ Over those same years, 214 of the commercial banks went bankrupt, more than half of the total in the state.⁹

The economic recession in Montana moderated during the mid- to late 1920s when the rains returned for a few years, a period when most of the rest of the country grew rapidly because of what Robert Gordon has called the second industrial revolution.¹⁰ During these years, the economy boomed as the innovations of the late nineteenth century reached most urban households -- electricity, gas, water, sewers, automobiles, household equipment, and the like. However, households in rural areas still lacked those amenities at the beginning of the Depression but made considerable progress even during the Depression and WW II. For the country at large, however, the advent of the Depression spelled a temporary end to economic growth until after WW I. Nonetheless, the New Deal programs followed by the massive build-up of American manufacturing to serve the war effort laid the foundation for rapid growth from 1945 to about 1970, with some fall off during the 1950s. For the most part, Montana remained in the doldrums until the late 1940s.

The election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1932 led to a virtual revolution in federal activism to restore prosperity.¹¹ The New Deal programs began with an emphasis upon central planning and industrial regulation of output and prices, a radical departure from American traditional resistance to centralized control.¹² In addition, FDR exercised executive authority

to manipulate the value of the American dollar to restore prices to pre-Depression levels.¹³

The Supreme Court intervened in 1935 to halt the experiment in centralized planning and control, with the result that the New Deal focused on ways to use existing and intermediating private and public entities or agencies to achieve its objectives.¹⁴

As Malone and Roeder pointed out, under either New Deal approach, federal funds flowed into Montana on a massive scale, financing projects such as the Fort Peck Dam; the Roosevelt Highway (Route 2); water, river, and land management; schools and municipal buildings (including campus facilities and beautification); and trails and landscapes. The fight over FDR's attempt to pack the Supreme Court in 1936-1937 and his effort to balance the federal budget in 1938 shut off the flow.¹⁵ The political fallout of the Court fight pushed Senator Wheeler into the opposition in Montana in a restructured conservative coalition. However, before that happened, the State University fared well in the search for federal grants and loans for construction and renovation of facilities and National Youth Administration (NYA) funds for students, the precursor of work study funding that came during the mid-1960s.¹⁶

Most accounts of the radically new federal activism during the Depression under the impetus of FDR's New Deal say little about the role of higher education. Recently, however, Christopher P. Loss altered the narrative with the argument that federal support for state and local projects came as a critical part of Roosevelt's strategy of co-opting private entities and components of state governments, including higher education, to circumvent the American suspicion of centralization of power and authority. Thus, "Higher education helped the New Deal achieve administrative capacity in a political culture uncomfortable with a sprawling

national bureaucracy."¹⁷ Situated "between citizens and the [federal] state," channeling not only federal assistance but information about New Deal objectives and services, colleges and universities "naturalized the New Deal's expanded national reach" by making "it palatable to average Americans" in critical need of the assistance, since it came through familiar auspices. In many ways, the "New Deal's experiment in using higher education to connect with and shape the polity's political beliefs " foreshadowed developments beginning with the G. I. Bill in 1944, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Higher Education Act of 1965.¹⁸

The major programs Loss analyzed to buttress this conclusion included the NYA, the New Deal work study program that provided federal assistance to some 620,000 students across the country; the Works Progress Administration (WPA), channeling income assistance to roughly 120,000 young people annually during the depth of the Depression; the WPA, that funded the labor and the Public Works Administration (PWA) that funded the construction projects -- including football stadiums -- contributing some \$200 million to colleges and universities; the various versions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act -- the Supreme Court struck down the original act in 1935 -- working through the Extension Service of the sixty-six land-grant colleges -- including the State College in Montana -- to convince millions of farmers to adjust (limit) production by agreeing not to plant certain portions of their land in order to sustain profitable prices and to implement land conservation despite their opposition to "big government;" and the Federal Forum, funding local discussion groups that depended upon colleges and universities for expertise and educated some 2.5 million Americans about the New Deal administrative state and its goals, methods, and benefits.¹⁹

These programs made extensive use of the internal administrative structure of public and private higher education to link citizens to the New Deal state, thus changing the long-held public perceptions about the dangers versus the benefits of the concentration of power in Washington by visibly displaying its local roots. During these years, based on this altered perception, constitutional scholars and laymen alike began to talk of "cooperative federalism," a concept focused on the coordination of jurisdictional authority and action rather than the limits of jurisdiction based on strictly defined and circumscribing boundaries.²⁰ While most of the programs disappeared during WW II, their legacy remained available for future use by many participants who rose to positions of power during the fifties and sixties, such as Lyndon Baines Johnson, the administrator of the Texas NYA.²¹

Throughout most of this period, the State University had the benefit of long-serving leadership familiar with and supportive of the federal programs. President Charles H. Clapp accepted appointment in 1921 on a trial basis because of his awareness of the tension and conflict on the Missoula campus, decided after a year to remain, and then served with distinction until 1935 when he died in office.²² The twenties opened with ecstatic expectations of growth and development but ended with the chaos of the Great Depression. While most faculty members had considered the years before the great world war difficult and miserly, they came to view the formative years in a perspective altered by the dreariness of economic stagnation, rampant unemployment, growing student numbers, declining resources, and recognition that survival depended upon academic and organizational reform. In many respects, during the Clapp years and through WW II, Montana higher education ingested the Elliott reforms at the system level

only to see them repudiated by state government. Change again became necessary as economic conditions worsened followed by yet another world war.

I

With millions to support operations and construct new facilities, it appeared to students, faculty, and administrators alike that Montana higher education had indeed entered a new era. Even before the election in November 1920, the debate began about spending the money. Chancellor Elliott had successfully achieved most of the goals he set in 1916, especially with regard to new academic policies and procedures and bringing order to the business of the Board.²³ In recognition, the Board reelected him in 1918 for another four years with an annual salary of \$10,000, significantly higher than any other official in the history of the state.²⁴ Elliott set about establishing priorities for the new operating and construction funds.

In December 1919, the Chancellor secured Board approval of a conceptual proposal for faculty salary increases.²⁵ He subsequently proposed the effective date of 1 March 1920, even without an appropriation to finance them. In a meeting in December 1920, the University Executive Council cautiously warned against any public discussion of specific levels of salary increases before the Legislature acted.²⁶ Nonetheless, the Board endorsed a plan that involved 10, 15, and 25 percent increases for defined groups of faculty by current salary ranges -- \$3,000 and up, \$2,000 to \$3,000, and up to \$2,000, respectively -- but required performance evaluations to justify individual increases. Anticipating the likelihood of fiscal problems in the absence of an appropriation, the Board requested special funding from the Board of Examiners to prevent deficits.²⁷

During two meetings in April 1921, the State Board, reconstituted after the Republican victory in 1920, discussed in detail the priorities for the University budget, targeting disastrously low faculty salaries and pressing campus facility needs.²⁸ Already convinced, the Executive Council endorsed the process to allocate salary increases, including a provision for faculty participation in promotion recommendations.²⁹ Only President Sisson welcomed the educational value of including faculty consultation about the increases, except automatic promotion increments; the others sided with the Chancellor who asked querulously whether "the present small faculties have not already as much responsibility as they can carry." Elliott's appetite for shared governance had limits.

As the Board dictated at the Chancellor's recommendation, detailed performance evaluations served to identify the meritorious faculty from those "only to be tolerated." As Elliott put it, salary adjustments had the potential to stem critical faculty losses when distributed to those who performed well. He emphasized specifically that faculty members teaching only "elementary work" and essentially doing nothing else "are not entitled to marked increases," limiting the numbers receiving merit. With only a few equity adjustments since 1915, average salaries on all four campuses had dropped well below 1914 levels. The State University alone had lost thirteen Professors, thirteen Assistant Professors, and eleven Instructors during the lean war and post-war years. Most went for higher salaries and their departures left serious gaps in instructional expertise. In the hope of addressing these issues, the increase process required an estimated \$50,000 and won unanimous Board approval. For a time, these increased had a remarkable influence on faculty morale.

By contrast, the Board deliberated facility priorities at great length because no one knew the boundaries of State Board of Education authority versus that of the Board of Examiners. In the end, the Board of Education ranked the facility proposals, based on dimensions and estimated costs, but left final approval to the Board of Examiners. To fund the facilities, the State Board initially recommended a bond issue of \$2,260,000, including some funds for other agencies governed by the Board. Of the total, \$1,000,000 went to the State University for the new Library approved in 1917 and a new Heating Plant, Gymnasium, Forestry Building, Women's Residence Hall, and Men's Residence Hall, with \$50,000 for repair and renovation.³⁰ Only the Men's Residence Hall added to the facilities proposed by the Campus Development Committee in 1916.

However, the final Board of Examiners decision allotted \$1,500,000 each to the State University and State College, \$450,000 to the School of Mines, and \$300,000 to the Normal School.³¹ Because the School of Mines and the Normal School required additional funds, President Clapp arranged a transfer of \$45,000 each from the State University and State College, \$85,000 to the Normal School and \$5,000 to Mines. A portion of the State University allocation went to remodel Craig Hall -- the original women's dormitory -- for a Mathematics Physics Building with offices and classrooms.³² However, when completed, that project ran over budget by \$5,261, whereupon Clapp secured a rescission of excess funds from the School of Mines to cover the overrun. In brief, the construction process went well at the outset.

When he accepted the State University Presidency in 1921, Clapp took over Sisson's building program and then added to it over the years. As it turned out, implementing the construction

program proved difficult and time consuming because of resource constraints. As one example, remodeling the Mathematics Physics Building required seven years, not finally completed until 1928. As another, President Sisson had to advertise for bids on the new Library three times because of delays in developing acceptable plans.³³ Nonetheless, the revised plan failed to provide for enrolment and program growth and by and large left the State University with obsolete space and services.³⁴ Even after he resigned and returned to Reed College in 1921, Sisson found it necessary to remind Elliott and Clapp of a committed supplementary allocation for the new Library. The State College had gotten \$100,000 for repairs and equipment, the State University only \$50,000 with another \$50,000 reserved for books and equipment in the new Library and renovation of the old Library for the School of Law in accordance with the 1916 action plan.³⁵ With this final commitment, and in spite of the lack of foresight in construction, the new Library served the State University into the 1960s.

The Library ultimately accommodated 80,000 volumes and provided space for library services and offices and classrooms for the Departments of History and English, although the mixture of functions soon proved very difficult.³⁶ The old Library welcomed the School of Law and Department of Languages.³⁷ In addition, the School of Forestry finally got the building promised in 1911, with a plaque inside bearing the name "Gifford Pinchot Hall," bestowed by Governor Dixon. However, for unknown reasons, no one except Dixon ever used the name.³⁸ While the new and renovated facilities transformed the State University campus, ongoing planning, financing, and construction had their challenges.

Predictably, aging infrastructure emerged as a major issue. In 1922, T. G. Swearingen, the Maintenance Engineer, cautioned President Clapp that the University sewer dumped directly into several cesspools and the Missoula (Clark Fork) River and no longer satisfied public health requirements.³⁹ The City planned a south-side sewer system with capacity to handle the State University, but its completion date remained uncertain. Therefore, Swearingen persuaded the City Council to allow the University to construct a separate system. The new plan called for renovation, expansion, and improvement to the current University system that started at the Missoula River just north of Maurice Avenue and rerouted it to handle the new buildings, channeling the "raw sewage" through a treatment facility before draining into the River north of the campus(no residential use of River water for more than a hundred miles downstream). For treatment, the Board of Public Health approved a tank with a capacity of one hundred gallons per minute with three and one-half hours for retention located 300 feet from the River. The new system served the University until the 1950s when President Carl McFarland negotiated the integration of the University into the City's new system.⁴⁰

Clapp also resumed acquiring land around the campus, using appropriated funds when available and borrowing when necessary. The first major expansion pushed north toward the River and the railroad tracks.⁴¹ To facilitate loans, Clapp organized the Alumni Challenge Athletic Field Corporation, initially to reconstruct Montana Field (later renamed Dornblazer Field) and the baseball diamond east and north of Main Hall.⁴² The Corporation borrowed \$15,000 using the revenue from the two facilities as collateral and issued certificates of indebtedness to individuals for another \$10,000 to finish the construction and build bleachers directly east of Main Hall.

These impressive beginnings on a suitable campus infrastructure soon ran headlong into resource constraints.⁴³ Clapp then found it necessary to identify new revenue streams to support his aggressive campus plans as enrolments continued to grow. The bond revenue paid the construction costs of two new dormitories, North (women) and South (men) Halls. North Hall, renamed Brantley Hall, subsequently featured a new wing in the 1950s joining it with Corbin Hall, another women's residence hall constructed with earned income and other revenue as collateral for notes in the late twenties.⁴⁴ The subsequent acquisition of the land and the financing for Corbin Hall construction involved extensive discussions to resolve nettlesome issues. The initial plan envisioned a land purchase with appropriated funds and the use of \$40,000 from bond revenue, \$25,000 from housing revenue, and \$45,000 from pledged notes to finance construction.⁴⁵ Raising questions about the financing plan, the Attorney General delayed issuing the warrant for the purchase of the land and branded the current use of housing revenue illegal.⁴⁶ President Clapp denied the need for further state involvement, citing an Act of 1919 that "annually" and "perpetually" appropriated to the University the "income from all permanent funds and endowments and from all land grants, all fees and earnings from whatever source they may be derived from public or private."

The Attorney General stood firm, allowing repayment of bonds with trust funds, but specifically defined revenue from residence halls and dining rooms as state money since it derived from the use of state-owned buildings. As it turned out, Chancellor Brannon and President Clapp avoided further argument at the time and financed the construction with remaining bond revenue and \$50,000 from certificates of indebtedness issued by the Local Executive Board with the approval of the Board of Examiners, not pledging housing revenue.⁴⁷ The issue

remained in abeyance until Attorney General Arnold Olsen interpreted a Montana statute of 1947 to authorize the State Board of Education to issue bonds to erect, equip, and improve residence halls and other facilities, to commit the associated revenue from the facilities to defray the bonds, and to use unobligated revenue to pay architects to design new residence halls and other facilities.⁴⁸ Until that ruling, however, financing campus construction proved frustrating.

Nonetheless, Clapp persisted, with no alternative except to limit enrolment which also limited tuition and state revenue. During the late twenties, he developed a list of needed improvements for the campus physical plant that anticipated another bond issue in 1930:⁴⁹ Women's Health and Gymnasium, Chemistry-Pharmacy, Journalism, Large Classroom, Green House, Home Economics Practice, and Bacteriology Buildings; an additional boiler and added steam tunnels and lines for the Heating Plant; additional water mains; renovations to the Old Science Building and the Library stacks; and more funds for land acquisitions -- some already secured by notes -- all initially with state funds. Using other available funds, Clapp also proposed further land acquisitions, including the payment for the Golf Course acquired with debt earlier, a Women's Athletic Field, an auditorium large enough to accommodate the students and faculty in convocation, a student union building, and three new dormitories. The grand total amounted to \$1,815,000, with \$993,000 from the state.

When the state Supreme Court invalidated the 1930 bond initiative on a technicality (the initiative failed to state the tax increase necessary to defray the bonds), Clapp revised the list based on potential revenue sources and program criteria.⁵⁰ He had in mind President F. D.

Roosevelt's program of public works that provided grants and loans for community and municipal projects of various kinds.⁵¹ The federal projects required state authorization of both the specific proposals, operation and maintenance, and the plan for repayment of the associated federal loans.⁵² As it turned out, the State University relied on several sources of funds as collateral, including user fees, student building fees, and land grant revenue, the latter after the state Supreme Court overruled the earlier prohibition on that use of land grant revenue.⁵³ In contrast to his colleague at the State College who moved slowly to secure federal funds, President Clapp explored every seeming possibility with the assistance of students and Forestry Dean Thomas C. Spaulding who managed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) funds for relief work in Missoula County.⁵⁴

In 1932, the state Supreme Court also upheld a 1929 statute allowing the State Board of Education to construct residence halls on campus on conditions of 1) no commitment of state funds and 2) no impact on title to the land.⁵⁵ On the basis of several test cases, University Counsel J. C. Garlington assured Clapp's successor, G. Finlay Simmons, in 1936 that state emergency legislation and the reversal of the decision concerning the use of land grant revenue arguably reinforced the State Board's authority to borrow and pledge revenue to construct both academic and other needed University facilities for "educational purposes." To expedite the process in Washington, D. C., Clapp requested assistance from his former Secretary and future University President Carl McFarland, then serving in the U.S. Department of Justice.⁵⁶

By early 1932, Clapp had five self-liquidating federal projects in the planning stages, all with student involvement, and he intended to proceed with the first two: A men's residence hall, a Student Union Building (SUB), a facility to house three fraternities and another for three sororities, and an Infirmary with fifty beds.⁵⁷ The SUB had surfaced years earlier and garnered increasing support during the twenties. The University needed the men's residence hall for 125 incoming freshmen males and sited it adjacent to South Hall. However, Clapp dropped the fraternity and sorority houses because of the Attorney General's opposition and criticism within the Missoula community.⁵⁸

With his student-centered focus, Clapp chose the SUB as the major project to establish the legal pathway for federal funding. As early as 1913, the Kaimin had featured news stories urging the construction of a student union to provide space for student activities.⁵⁹

Discussions continued over the years, always futile because no funding source existed. Several people, including President and Mrs. Clapp and Professors Elrod and Jesse, doggedly supported the project. To that end, Clapp and the State Board approved a student fee of one dollar per student each quarter to build up a fund to help with the financing.⁶⁰ Clapp also suggested a larger fee at the appropriate time to assure repayment of the federal loan without fail. By 1932, Clapp with his assistants and the student committee had developed the facility plan to include a large auditorium and a large ballroom as well as space for student organizations and activities at an estimated cost of \$300,000. Built nearly as planned, the SUB became the largest building on the campus and the first of its kind funded by the federal Public Works Administration (PWA) under the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA). Clapp secured state and State Board approval of the project and the funding, with the required caveat of no state

funds for construction or repayment of the loan, and personally presented the request in Washington, D.C.

As usual with federal projects, it took far more time than anyone expected to complete the negotiations and turn the first shovel of dirt. The PWA required statutory action by the state and approval by the State Board of Education as well as a decision by the state Supreme Court in a friendly suit to establish the need to move forward without the usual delay to allow a possible referendum on the matter.⁶¹ Finally, in early 1934, the PWA authorized a \$60,000 grant and \$240,000 loan and, on 24 July, the President turned the first shovel of dirt.

According to the revised financing plan, the loan amounted to \$203,000, with a grant of \$37,000, and the total cost including interest projected to 1963 estimated at \$331,500.⁶²

Future earnings of the facility provided assurance of roughly \$90,000 annually for the SUB.

Perhaps presciently, President Clapp seized the occasion to talk directly to the students in 1934:

Although I disagree strongly with such pessimistic philosophy as that written by James Harvey Robinson, -- "Suspicion and hate are more congenial to our nature than love, for very obvious reasons in this world of rivalry and common failure" -- nevertheless, I do believe that we learn to live with one another successfully only by training and experience, which is education. And I do believe that the promotion, by providing the opportunity, of successful human relationships is one of the great tasks of education.⁶³

In that spirit, he celebrated the new Student Union Building as a venue to foster "the wise use of leisure time and the improvement of man's relationship to man," the two greatest challenges of the modern era.

Unfortunately, Clapp died in May 1935 before the completion of construction and missed the dedication during Homecoming that fall. The students tentatively adopted the name "Memorial Hall" and planned to change it later to honor President Clapp. According to Merriam, however, Clapp wanted no buildings named for him.⁶⁴ Tanya Smith suggested that the lack of a formal naming policy on campus ultimately prevented the renaming, but that had not stopped other naming proposals. In any event, the new facility remained the SUB until replaced in the 1950s by the Lodge, when the SUB became the Fine Arts Building, stirring some new controversy on campus.⁶⁵

Over the next few years, Clapp continued the search for federal funds for facilities as well as student support. Thus, he secured NYA and PWA funds to support small payments to students to work in Federal Emergency Relief Administration(FERA) projects on the campus, the precursor of work-study funding in the 1960s.⁶⁶ For example, in 1935 he added to his growing list of projects an Indian Building (\$30,000), roofing (\$3,350), painting (\$1,800), brickwork (\$1,500), gym repair (\$1,000), and a Recreational Park (\$46,650), many of them involving work-study.⁶⁷ Clapp also included surveying projects, campus beautification work, community pageants, and forestry field work in his FERA lists. The students themselves initiated a fee of fifty cents a quarter to bring to campus outstanding lecturers, artists, and performers and cooperated with the State University administration and the City of Missoula to broaden the

reach of their limited funds. In addition, Clapp sought ways to involve students in the effort to plan and secure grants, a fervent believer in the academic benefits of student engagement.

Clapp's initiatives, many of them continued by his successor after his death in 1935, resulted in yet another transformation of the campus. Leaving aside the FERA work-study and beautification projects, the facility additions between 1929 and 1943 included the SUB with its Auditorium, Journalism Building, Fine Arts (Women's) Building, Women's Residence Hall, Chemistry-Pharmacy Building, and the Natural Science Addition. Funding included \$344,460 in federal grants, \$225,000 in private loans, and \$556,236 in fee revenue and University funds.⁶⁸ President Clapp's legacy paralleled founding President Craig's and remained unmatched until the McFarland administration in the 1950s.

II

Discouraged by the dreary conditions, weary of bureaucratic minutiae, and eager to return to scholarship and teaching, President Sisson resigned in April 1921. To reclaim his life and career, he returned to Reed College to teach and write.⁶⁹ When Sisson refused to reconsider, the Board invited Charles H. Clapp, then President of the School of Mines, to move from Butte to Missoula as President of the State University. After some thought, Clapp accepted on a provisional basis, deferring his final decision until after a year on campus to assess the fit.⁷⁰

In his 1922 campus report, Clapp cited a record enrollment of 1,894 students, 340 more than the prior year and nearly 1,000 more than in 1918.⁷¹ The challenge for the future, he opined, involved not attracting students but restricting admission to applicants willing to apply themselves. He praised the modern physical plant under construction, thanks to the bond

revenue and the prudent administration of Physical Plant Director T. G. Swearingen and Business Manager J. B. Speer. With repairs and renovations for Science Hall and other facilities, the campus welcomed even more students.

As one of his first official action, Clapp established several faculty committees to facilitate shared governance. This presidential initiative followed logically from the Chancellor's emphasis on engaging the faculty appropriately in University affairs with the emphasis on consultation, and also reflected his own convictions. In doing so, Clapp also responded to recommendations presented to former President Sisson by a faculty committee in 1921.⁷² As it happened, Clapp arrived in Missoula just as a wave of higher education governance, academic, and curricular reform swept across the country and into Montana.⁷³ The prospects for reform appeared bright, heightened by Elliott's policy successes and the funding bonanza.

The impetus for academic reform at the State University actually began prior to the welcome approval of additional funding for higher education in 1920. In fact, a theme in the consolidation campaign of 1912-1914 had emphasized the regrettable but seemingly inexorable drift toward vocational and professional training rather than a broad grounding in the arts and culture. Professor Elrod had called for steps to control the influence of the professional schools on the curriculum and University policy.⁷⁴

From almost his first day on campus in 1919 as Chairman of the Department of English, H. G. Merriam, a Rhodes Scholar, sounded that same note. In two letters written the same day in 1921 to President Sisson, he condemned the "professionalizing influence" at work on the campus.⁷⁵ While supportive of professional training, he repudiated the "professional spirit as

the dominating one in this institution." To differentiate the State University from the State College, he urged President Sisson and Chancellor Elliot to issue a joint statement stressing the humanistic program of the State University as guidance for the faculty and information for the general public. Echoing Elrod, he thought inspirational influence and not mere numbers more appropriate for a "University."

To that end, he urged Sisson to dedicate the next five or six faculty positions to the humanities, mandate final comprehensive examinations in major fields of study, authorize Honors Reading classes, and institute a modern civilization course for all freshmen students. Restoration of Philosophy and Classical Studies lost during the war years required two or three of the new positions. He also argued that success in the refocusing effort required the University to reduce the committee and routine administrative tasks burdening the faculty. He predicted a positive faculty response to a firm policy that rewarded scholarly work as well as good teaching. However, to halt the trend toward vocational training, the faculty had to "teach thinking rather than mere reading," which required lighter teaching loads. Under the current arrangement, the "courses are spread too thin and too much in the Prussianized spirit." As a final dictum, he warned against sanctioning such absurdities as "Forestry Botany and Pharmaceutical English." Merriam's strictures echoed themes already well rehearsed by the State University faculty.

Several other faculty members offered similar prescriptions to bring about meaningful reform. For example, even Professor Lennes got into the act and urged Sisson -- with little likelihood of a response, given their deteriorating relationship -- to segregate the faculty into three

categories: 1) Research teaching; 2) non-research teaching; and 3) unclassified teaching, the latter category reserved for young people just beginning their careers ⁷⁶ Lennes proposed average teaching loads for the unclassified faculty members, granting them five or ten years to establish themselves in either of the two major categories; heavier than average loads for the non-research teaching faculty; and light loads for the research teaching faculty, such as himself, once they established themselves and so long as they remained active scholars. To eliminate the routine committee burden, he proposed more administrative staff members or one-person committees, a more efficient and effective way to handle administrative tasks. Lennes echoed Merriam's insistence that the time consuming committee work and heavy teaching loads prevented the interested faculty members from engaging in research and publication.

In March 1921, enthralled by the opportunity for reform, Professor Merriam drafted and secured faculty endorsement of a "Memorial" raising several critical questions about the University that the faculty, President, Chancellor, and Board of Education had to confront. ⁷⁷ Far ranging in scope and supplemented later with addenda supporting a more functional University academic and administrative structure, Merriam sought answers to pointed questions about the future of the State University. First, he raised again Professor Elrod's questions about the appropriate role of the professional schools in relation to the College of Arts and Sciences. As he pointed out, the current focus on technical training ignored the unique character of the State University, the only one of the four campuses with "University" in its name. Although Merriam arrived on campus after the consolidation struggle had ended

in administrative unification, he emphasized the concerns raised earlier by Craighill , Duniway, Elrod, and Aber about the status of the State University and its programs.

More specifically, Merriam asked for an explicit list of the academic programs slated for re-establishment, expansion, or discontinuance, referring specifically to the damage to Languages and Philosophy during the war years. He argued for more collaborative budget allocation protocols to enable the faculty to advise the administration about effective ways to assure the academic integrity of the University. As had Lennes, he also called for mechanisms to assure a fair balance between the instructional demands of students and the research and creative obligations of the faculty. Finally, he discussed student life in general, including student involvement in their own education, their responsibility for their own conduct, and their appropriate role in University governance. He clearly shared Duniway's view of students as young people capable of handling responsibility for their own education and conduct with proper faculty guidance.⁷⁸ The huge increase in enrolments demanded more attention to an environment supportive of student growth and development as engaged citizens. Merriam envisioned a new organizational structure to promote both student and faculty engagement.

To those ends, Merriam proposed folding the existing academic Departments in the College of Arts and Sciences into Divisions of related disciplines with elected Chairs rather than Deans for more efficient use of faculty talents. He thought radical reorganization necessary to empower the faculty to respond to the new societal demands of the post-war world through interdisciplinary collaboration and participatory University governance.⁷⁹ In addition, he recommended an active and regular program of distinguished lecturers, scholars, visual artists,

musicians, and other dignitaries to mitigate the isolation of the University, a program he thought necessary to "serve the State's largest need of intellectual leadership." Far reaching in its implications, Merriam's Memorial sounded themes that became the tocsin for reform during the "transition from small institution to large university," as Professor R. H. Jesse described the dynamic of the twenties.⁸⁰

Professor J. H. Underwood, Chairman of Economics and of the University Curriculum Committee, agreed with Merriam's call for a radical restructuring of the State University.⁸¹ He proposed replacing Chairs and Deans with Program Leaders elected by the faculty, thus transforming the six professional schools and Merriam's four divisions into ten Senior Colleges. He obviously shared with Elrod a deep mistrust of Deans, in fact, all administrators with a few exceptions. In Underwood's plan, the Senior Colleges relied on stringent academic criteria to select students for admission to advanced study, putting a timely end, he growled, to the embarrassing indignity of "bidding, as now, for uneducated students." Only the School of Law currently used the Underwood approach, but without the recommended high standards for admission.

To overcome the lack of "scholarliness" and engagement, Merriam and Underwood both proposed a Junior College for freshmen and sophomore students within the State University administered by a Director. For the Junior College students, the two reformers urged a curriculum consisting of general survey or omnibus courses taught by faculty drawn from the Senior Colleges and coordinated by the Director.⁸² Every Junior College student had to earn admission to a Senior College within two years on pain of dismissal. Quite clearly, the

academic reform pot had begun to boil on the Missoula campus. How, if, or when the ideal got translated into the real remained unclear.

Inherently, the new ambience inspired faculty and administrators to pay attention to academic reform. In July 1921, Chancellor Elliott sent a copy of the Merriam Memorial to Clapp and invited him to lead a discussion of it during the next Executive Council meeting.⁸³ Clapp's discussion elicited a follow-on by State College President Alfred Atkinson about curricular reforms in progress on the Bozeman campus.⁸⁴ The reform wave gained momentum as discussions on all four campuses involved more administrators and faculty members.

Shortly after his arrival on the Missoula campus in 1921, Clapp appointed himself "Chairman of the Curriculum Committee which includes all full professors" for a thorough academic review. Working with the Committee, he sent questionnaires to the faculty soliciting advice about the strengths and weaknesses of the curricula and used the results in a challenging memorandum to the Curriculum Committee.⁸⁵ The memorandum called on the faculty to address the identified weaknesses.⁸⁶ Clapp specifically cited an excessive number of duplicative elementary courses, thirteen in Botany alone, and urged the discontinuance of most of them, followed by the development of a few multidisciplinary courses to introduce the major areas of study and their methods. He also proposed strict rules to exclude freshmen and sophomores, except truly extraordinary ones, from upper division courses to assure truly advanced coursework. He placed the emphasis upon practical ways to focus on mastery of content rather than accumulation of credits, an unarticulated call for competency-based instruction.

Clapp thought the number of free electives and their lack of academic rigor appalling. Urging a reduced number, he insisted upon increased rigor, with only a few well defined pathways to baccalaureate degrees supported by electives that had direct relevance to the student's academic objectives to engage the student. Far too many students enrolled and then dropped classes, a clear waste of resources. To correct the problem, he proposed a limit on drops and emphasis on achievement of academic objectives. No more shopping for easy credits. Finally, he doubted the justification of academic credit for practicum and internship experiences without strict academic performance criteria.

Clapp fleshed out this argument in his inaugural address delivered in 1922 after the trial year, revealing all he had learned and sending a clear signal about his vision for the State University.⁸⁷ Having received his training and worked exclusively in technical and engineering schools, he puzzled about his selection as President of the State University. Even so, he pledged to do his best to function simultaneously as "a leader of education, a businessman, an engineer and contractor, a scientist and artist, a democrat and an autocrat, one of the students and at the same time a father and teacher . . . a politician and a financier." He accepted the challenge primarily because of his admiration for Chancellor Elliott who had recruited him from the University of Arizona to become President of the School of Mines. He praised the Chancellor's achievements, especially the new budget process, the establishment of the Executive Council for collaborative government, and the successful ballot initiatives in 1920. Despite a great loss to the state and the University when Elliott moved to Purdue, Clapp thought the multi-campus University had a bright future because of Elliott's good work.

Clapp stated frankly his view that the State University had to overcome the disadvantage of a "lack of purpose" among the students and the faculty.⁸⁸ Professional schools had the advantage of inherent purpose and explicit discipline through a prescribed curriculum focused on competent professional practice. Students accepted these requirements because they had chosen the profession. Importantly, however, even if they sloughed off and wasted time in school, they quickly made up for the loss because professionals learned as they grew into the practice. Not so for students in the State University with its focus on a liberal and well rounded education; students in the arts, humanities, and science disciplines had to develop their own internal sense of purpose and discipline. They had to prepare themselves broadly for advanced study or for a wide variety of careers; success for them depended on how much and how well they learned in college. Frequently, they erred by devoting excessive attention to extra-curricular activities, easy but unrewarding courses, and high grades to earn admission to professional schools for advanced degrees.

As Clapp noted, some people laid the blame for this lack of purpose among liberal arts students on the "elective system:"

that . . . lack of system under which for every student who gains a distinct advantage by its license, several of his purposeful companions seek and find a path of least resistance, enjoy comfort and ease in following it, and emerge at the other end, four years older, but no more capable of service than when they entered. Many another youth, neither lazy nor idle, but lacking both rudder and chart, angles diligently in shallow water, goes no deeper than the introductory course in any department, comes

out with many topics for conversation, but no real mental discipline and but little power to think.

President Clapp wanted much more for the students, possible only if they became actively engaged in their education.

Other critics blamed the credit system itself which pulled students in different directions with no more rationale than six credits here, four there, and three elsewhere, until the student compiled 180 unrelated credits for graduation. Still others assigned the blame to departmental autonomy, jealous protection of turf, and lack of academic coordination. Whatever the reason for and significance of these distractions, Clapp emphasized that most liberal arts students exhibited a passionate interest in some aspect of college life, whether in athletics, student affairs, or extra-curricular activities. Because students selfishly searched for purpose in their lives, liberal arts educators had the means to recombine work and culture separated centuries earlier by the ancients.⁸⁹ Citing Thomas Carlyle's celebration of the expert craftsman and the deep thinker, both of whom exhibited the discipline instilled by an inner sense of purpose, Clapp called for the faculty to find ways to foster student purpose, discipline, and competency.⁹⁰

To respond to the challenge, Clapp proposed an institutional insistence upon student engagement and implementation of grade curves based on the quantity and quality of the work performed. He thought it defied reason to believe that all the students in a class performed above average. Highly critical after his review of existing curricula, he urged prerequisites for advanced courses to protect rigor; called for drastic reduction in the number

of elementary courses; demanded coordinated and sequenced advanced courses; and denied credit for "work" a student should long ago have mastered. With these comments, Clapp spoke directly to the traditionalists on campus and called for academic reform to instill a sense of purpose and discipline among the students and the faculty.

Shortly after his arrival in Montana, new Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon in 1924 alerted Clapp about "a very earnest review being made of our curricular conditions" sweeping across the country. He thought the time right to engage the State University faculty and to modernize existing curricula. Clapp apprized the Chancellor of work already done or in progress.⁹¹ By 1924, several procedural reforms had occurred, with the Committee currently evaluating means to reduce class absences beyond an established number, develop more continuous courses -- i.e., requiring enrollment for year-long courses to earn a grade -- and provide informative course descriptions. He had also begun and continued to share reports of reforms either made or in progress at other institutions, notably Chicago and Yale.⁹² Quite clearly, Clapp envisioned a sweeping review followed by substantive change to improve the quality of the State University.⁹³

III

Merriam's Memorial also insisted upon more inclusive campus governance for the academic and co-curricular reforms to succeed. His questions and recommendations about the allocation of the mill levy windfall and campus planning convinced President Sisson to act. The Welfare Committee Sisson established in 1917-1918 had introduced shared governance on the campus, and the mill levy promise of new money fueled the faculty desire for involvement in its proposed uses. Seizing the moment, President Sisson appointed an *ad hoc* committee in

April 1921 consisting of Professors M. J. Elrod, C. W. Leaphart, J. H. Underwood, and J. P. Rowe to draft a recommendation for a faculty committee on University policy and the allocation of the budget.⁹⁴ Shared governance had arrived at the State University, although it lacked clear definition.

On 17 May, the *ad hoc* committee proposed a standing Committee on Budget and University Policy to provide advice to the President, soon shortened to Budget and Policy and consisting of seven elected members and the President *ex officio*: Two members each, one elected annually, from the Arts and the Sciences; two members, one elected annually, from the six professional schools combined; and one member at-large. The faculty, including those from the six professional schools, unanimously approved the recommendation, as did President Sisson, President-elect Charles H. Clapp, and Chancellor Elliott, all of whom attended the faculty meeting on 7 June. The Committee had the charge to maintain open communication between the administration and the faculty on all matters of University policy, budget development, and planning, and also any matters referred to it by the Chancellor, President, or the faculty. To assure communication, the Committee had to present annual reports to the faculty and the administration. As it turned out, the charge provided a *carte blanche* remit depending on the aggressiveness of the Committee members and the faculty at large and the acquiescence of the President.⁹⁵

The implementation of shared governance endorsed by Chancellor Elliott and Presidents Sisson and Clapp moved toward the objective but in careful and limited steps. In fact, the dominance of the President in campus governance persisted, although both Sisson and Clapp supported

faculty consultation while Chancellor Elliott held tightly to the reins of University governance. From the twenties through the fifties, governance of the State University remained closer to the practices and traditions of the past than to visions of the future. J. B. Speer, Business Manager, Registrar, and administrator of all things from time to time, analyzed the State University governance in an article published in 1932 and not much changed until after World War II.

Tracing the history of governance, Speer began with the five original faculty members functioning as a group on most issues, including student advising.⁹⁶ The first committees took form in about 1900, many of which gave way to functional officers. For example, with the appointment of a Dean of Men, the Student Affairs Committee disappeared. Within academic departments, the senior Professor became the line officer when assistant professors became common. Over time, four major sectors took shape -- instructional; administrative, control, and policy; plans, preparation, and equipment for instruction; and auxiliary or facilitating services. Speer commented that finance remained "largely with the legislature" or, after 1916, with the Chancellor, thus largely external to the campus as late as the thirties.

In instruction, the line of authority ran from the President to department Chairs and professional school Deans, thereby assuring certainty and stability, as Speer said, with the President directly in charge. Until the forties and fifties, the College of Arts and Sciences did not have a Dean. Board policy allowed the Chancellor to appoint a Vice President annually to assist the President, but not as a line officer. Although Speer made no mention of the potential, incapacitation of the President posed serious problems as occurred when Clapp

became seriously ill during the thirties. Speer argued specifically, however, that that this highly centralized structure required too much of the time and energy of the President, School Deans, and Department Chairs, and he urged the development of junior staff positions to assist with and coordinate routine management. Until changed much later, the School Deans and Department Chairs managed personnel, classes, curriculum, purchasing, and all routine matters, under the direct supervision of the President with a span of control virtually unimaginable today.

During the early years, the President consulted through general faculty meetings, but consultation decreased as numbers increased, limited to those the President identified or to special function committees. In 1921, reformers pushed hard for faculty representation and successfully imposed a staff perspective in governance with the Committee on Budget and University Policy. Nonetheless, the President retained direct and final authority. Since the membership of the Committee on Budget and University Policy never included functional experts, Speer concluded, it offered only opinion and perspective, not expertise and management skill. He considered this defect seriously detrimental to good government.

Speer listed about ten administrative officers who assisted in management and also answered directly to the President, including the Business Manager, Registrar, Deans of Men and Women, Directors of the Residence Halls and the Health Service, Engineer, and Librarian. Although these administrators offered advice to the President and School Deans and Department Chairs, the Deans and Chairs retained authority within the Schools and Departments, subject only to the President. Once again, Speer strongly urged more

functional experts in charge of specific sectors and services with a lesser role for committees, since he viewed committees as given to log rolling. He strongly urged these junior positions to provide some relief from minutiae for the President. In his view, "Co-ordination is based on authority, not necessarily autocratic," and he defined coordination as the "great organ of synthesis." As he concluded, effective organization depended upon authority flowing one way to achieve the vision through strict reliance on facts, science, and logical order. Chancellor Elliott or President Clapp might well have made that statement.

Within this context, the State University Presidents after 1921 worked closely with the Committee on Budget and Policy, some more successfully than others. Early in the decade of the sixties, the Faculty Senate displaced the General Faculty and the Committee on Budget and Policy morphed into the Executive Committee of the Senate. J. H. Underwood served as the first Chair of the Committee on Budget and Policy and reported a few curricular recommendations as well as repetitious warnings of the dire need for more resources. During Underwood's leave of absence and after his death in 1926, Professor Elrod served as the Chair in 1922-1923 and from 1926 to 1933. During Elrod's terms, most of the Committee activity related to worsening economic conditions as the Depression deepened after 1930. Some faculty members, especially those most affected by the Depression, worried that Elrod actually became President Clapp's "stooge," according to President G. Finlay Simmons, an accusation of questionable credibility because of its source and the elective nature of the position.⁹⁷

As a long-serving member, Merriam observed that the Committee on Budget and Policy kept the channels open and played a critical role in assuring harmonious relations on the campus.⁹⁸

Over time, the faculty view of the Committee changed perceptibly from merely advisory to actually vested with approval and veto authority. The administrative view did not change, however. But these gradual and not so subtle shifts took time to eventuate. In 1926, Clapp described the Committee to President Alfred Atkinson of the State College, which had no such committee until decades later, as "the most effective piece of machinery that we have ever set up."⁹⁹ However, his reasons differed from those the faculty adduced. While the faculty found the Committee an effective instrument of shared governance, giving the faculty a seemingly increasing role, Clapp emphasized its value as a forum to inform the faculty of administrative perspectives. Perhaps even more revealing of his personal view, he assured Atkinson that "I have not found the committee very fertile in ideas," whatever the issue.

In fact, Clapp's approach to University governance, closer to Speer than to the faculty, minimized the number of faculty committees, hence reducing consultation even while freeing faculty from what many regarded as busy work. With faculty endorsement, he assigned most of the routine work to "one man committees," the Registrar, or other administrators, thus allowing the faculty to devote attention to teaching and research, although few engaged in serious research or accepted heavier teaching loads.¹⁰⁰ Those changes and the success of the Committee on Budget and Policy reduced the number of long meetings and limited the extended faculty discussions, welcome relief in Clapp's mind.¹⁰¹ The President identified other important administrative benefits as well. "It has also been possible to fire chairmen of departments without faculty rebellions and also to make very marked changes in re-distribution of funds to certain departments . . . which was greatly handicapped" before the Committee existed. Undoubtedly, most faculty members had a very different perspective.

Within a brief period, Clapp concluded, the tendency toward quarrelsomeness and conflict on the State University campus literally dissipated. In the end, he described a "harmonious faculty" at the State University working collaboratively with the administration on important issues. With considerable skill, he managed shared governance by consulting frequently with the Committee on Budget and Policy, the consultation typically resulting in the acceptance of his administrative decisions presented by the Committee as unanimous recommendations and accepted by the General Faculty. Shared governance worked for Clapp because of his outgoing personality, administrative acumen, artfully deferential style, and willingness to listen. His success, perhaps combined with the dire and ever worsening economic conditions, explained the willingness of the faculty in 1933 to authorize "the President . . . to set aside whatever faculty rules he deemed necessary as a measure of economy."¹⁰² That outcome, approximating a presidential dictatorship, while reflective of developments at the national level, hardly meshed with the expectations of Elrod, Lennes, Underwood, and Merriam at the outset.¹⁰³

The Clapp approach worked so long as governance rested on consensus, a happy condition not always present. Trouble inevitably erupted after his extended incapacity and untimely death in 1935 because of violent disagreements and near rebellion that separated new President G. Finlay Simmons, appointed by the State Board over faculty objections, and the faculty.¹⁰⁴ As tensions reached the flash point in 1939, Professor Edmund Freeman charged that, even though it continued to meet and discuss matters, "The Budget and Policy Committee has gone out of existence so that the faculty no longer has a voice in the affairs of the institution, and a lot of trouble has come out of that loss."¹⁰⁵ To counter the charge, President Simmons argued

that "it is not customary in American universities for the administration to be turned over to faculty-elected committees or any other committee." Customary or not, Montana State University faculty members believed they had lost a valuable prerogative because of Simmons's authoritarian approach to governance. In the words of Professor R. H. Jesse, a man not given to enthusiastic comments: "Dr. Simmons 1) had a streak of vindictiveness; 2) possessed a flair for intrigue which he used to divide men, and 3) made equivocal statements," hardly attributes essential for successful relations under shared government on a university campus.¹⁰⁶

Professor Harold Tascher, Department of Sociology and Social Work, argued specifically that the earlier faculty acquiescence in a presidential dictatorship, however warranted by circumstances, ultimately eroded and weakened State University governance. Tascher thought the resulting "functional deficiency" generated serious difficulties.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, Professor Freeman, Secretary of the Committee on Budget and Policy, suggested in 1941 "that it might be well to raise the question as to whether too many duties and responsibilities may have become assembled in too few hands of University members."¹⁰⁸ Freeman and Tascher articulated the deep faculty concern that ultimately led to the establishment of the Faculty Senate in the 1960s. But long before that ultimate denouement, the Clapp years featured an era of amicable relations that lasted well into the 1930s, but also, as usually happens, gave rise to differing perspectives ripe for subsequent controversy and conflict.

IV

With an open and inclusive approach and a seriousness of purpose, Clapp easily won the support of the State University faculty and staff by 1922 after the trial year. Merriam

applauded Clapp's tenure of nearly fourteen years marked by "comparative quiet and slow, sound development."¹⁰⁹ Over the next twelve years, Clapp led a reform effort that built on incremental change prior to a massive effort in 1934 for a radically new organizational structure and curriculum. The sweeping changes Clapp proposed at the height of the Depression included a new organizational structure, higher admission standards for entering students, satisfactory academic performance for retention, mandatory promotion to enter junior standing, and demonstrated performance for graduation. Until 1934, however, Clapp pursued a gradualist approach.

During the years before his untimely death in 1935, Clapp maintained good relations with the faculty and staff despite a firm insistence on his final authority and ever more inadequate resources. Over his entire tenure, the University experienced only one faculty controversy of any significance, the case of Professor Arthur Fisher that actually began earlier. Although he assumed the presidency well after the case started, Clapp took a major role in the process but emerged unscathed. Until he suffered a disabling stroke in 1934, Professor Elrod served continuously as Chair of the Committee on Service and never convened the Committee for a meeting after 1921.¹¹⁰ Nonetheless, Merriam's description of "comparative quiet and slow, sound development" glossed the kaleidoscopic panorama of the increasingly desperate struggle for institutional survival and its catastrophic impact on the State University.

When Clapp assumed the presidency in 1921, the State University had thirty-one Professors, three Associate Professors, twenty-two Assistant Professors, twenty-one Instructors, ten teaching assistants, and twenty-five student assistants, with five faculty members on sabbatical

leave, in all a substantially larger teaching staff than in 1918.¹¹¹ The State University itself consisted of a College of Arts and Sciences with seventeen Departments; six professional Schools, including Business Administration, Forestry, Journalism, Law, Music, Pharmacy, and Graduate Study, with Education authorized by the Board in 1918 (but not yet established) to replace the Department in the College of Arts and Sciences; and academic programs in Pre-Med, ROTC, and the Biological Station. To serve all the students, Clapp expanded the Dean of Men to make the position equivalent to that of the Dean of Women. He intended thereby to assure timely and effective management of all student behavior and scholarship.

In the first few years, Clapp's budget requests identified a specific listing of academic needs, aside from facilities: More faculty members in Philosophy and German language; support for faculty research and scholarship; and development of the University's Extension and Outreach programs. He also stressed the imperative to provide adequate student housing . As he warned, "Not until at least all the freshmen who do not live at home, are in dorms can student conduct and scholarship possibly improve." While supportive of the Gilbert-Carsley Campus Plan of 1917, as an avid proponent of student housing, he believed that students learned valuable social skills and critical insights by living together in dormitories.

In 1928, Clapp provided an outline of the "Program for Decade 1928-1938 for the State University of Montana, undoubtedly as a part of the planning for the mill levy renewal campaign in 1930. Beginning with the data for 1917-1918, he projected for 1927-28 and 1937-38:¹¹²

1917-1918

1927-1918

1927-1928

Enrolments	525	1,500	2,200
Faculty	60	101	145
Maintenance	\$218,000	\$477,000	\$700,000
Student Fee	\$182,000	\$359,000	\$520,000
Mtnce			
Plant	\$556,000	\$2,300,000	\$4,000,000

He listed as one of his major goals the establishment of a Dean of Faculty position for curriculum development and coordination of the Schools and Departments, instructional improvement and enhanced student performance, and freshmen advising. He intended as well to expand the Dean of Men functions to include social and co-curricular activities, leadership development, effective management of residence halls and the Greek societies, and stimulate student-faculty interactions. Clearly, he intended something like the modern Vice President for Academic Affairs or Provost, although he had not yet decided how to deal with the College of Arts and Sciences, and understood that the reforms he envisioned also required some administrative restructuring to include an administrator for student services. As the last two goals, he outlined the need for personnel and public relations functions.¹¹³ Finally, he anticipated the need for a large staff in the as yet unannounced School of Education as well as in Philosophy, Geography, Summer Session and external studies. The plant needs he identified reappeared in his campus development plans.¹¹⁴

As these plans revealed, Clapp oversaw the undergraduate University as it matured rather than expanded significantly. The dominant element of his advanced planning focused on the administrative reforms he deemed essential to the desired academic development. For his own personal involvement, he lectured and participated actively in the elective course Sisson had introduced on "College Education" to introduce entering students to campus life.¹¹⁵

Before his departure, Sisson had proposed its adoption as a core course for all freshmen to replace "Freshman English, Compulsory Assembly, College Education, and all Freshman offerings in history and social science." However, Professor J. H. Underwood reported ineffable faculty objections.¹¹⁶ Nonetheless, the Montana "College Education" elective course attracted attention across the country as a "rather well worked out college life course."¹¹⁷ As the reform effort developed, however, the Curriculum Committee unanimously approved a motion in 1923 to dispense with "College Education" because the majority of the Committee members declined to require it for all freshmen.¹¹⁸ As always, reform came slowly and painfully, seemingly with a trajectory all its own.

Predictably, given his focus on reform, Clapp's tenure witnessed only minor increases in academic programs or departments. Four academic changes of significance occurred at the State University during the years from roughly 1924 to 1935, and the last one far outweighed all others since the adoption of administrative unity in 1915. The first involved the approval of an affiliated School of Religion without public support after a prolonged debate about its appropriateness at a public institution.¹¹⁹ Students participated in the School functions and enrolled in a limited number of courses for academic credit, but the School did not offer degrees until years later. The second involved the maturation of renewed collaboration with the public schools and the belated establishment of the School of Education in 1930.¹²⁰ The third reflected new academic orientations for the School of Music with the approval of the Bachelor of Music degree in 1933 (the School had offered private lessons and musical services to the State University in prior years); for Education with the expansion of training for professional educators leading ultimately to the Educational Specialist and EdD degrees; for

expansion of the Pharmacy degree program to four years with enhanced Chemistry and related science requirements; and the new professional thrusts in Forestry in the Master of Forestry degree and in the Journalism degree program.¹²¹ After 1936, as Merriam commented, the academic program array of the University remained essentially unchanged until the 1950s.¹²² Clapp's aversion to professional schools and the campus turmoil during the Simmons years and WW II discouraged further program development.

The approval of the new student teaching agreement between the State University and Missoula County School District ranked as one of the most significant academic initiatives during the 1920s.¹²³ In substance, the agreement put the University back on the pathway of cooperation with the high schools of the state, founding President Craig's highest priority. Sisson enthusiastically supported the agreement and proposed to appoint Professor Freeman Daughters, Chairman of the Department of Education in the College, as the Dean and Director of Teacher Training in a School of Education. Chancellor Elliott advised Sisson to hold off until he resolved the budget issues. Subsequently, Elliott and new President C. H. Clapp refused almost annually on fiscal grounds to establish a School of Education as authorized by the State Board in 1918.¹²⁴ Missoula County Superintendent Ira B. Fee requested twenty-one rather than fourteen cadet teachers for Fall 1921, adumbrating a much larger task for the Department of Education than initially envisioned. Daughters estimated the cost for supervising teachers over the year at \$1,260, justified as a critical benefit for students aspiring to become teachers. Daughters continued to urge a School of Education to facilitate this and other such agreements certain to follow.

During the decade of the 1920s, a movement to elevate the normal schools across the country to stand-alone Colleges of Education stimulated new concerns for Clapp.¹²⁵ Immediately the issue of program duplication surfaced again. Complicating the matter even more, the state approved another normal school in Billings and an industrial arts and vocational education school in Havre late in the decade.¹²⁶ Predictably, the Dillon and Billings institutions soon proposed four-year curricular and degree programs for their graduates. Clapp occasionally offered rhetorical support but worried about duplication of the State University College of Arts and Sciences, already occurring in his opinion at the State College.

In 1928, President S. E. Davis of the Normal School in Dillon requested a huge budget increase for operations and capital construction to support a four-year curriculum for elementary and rural teachers and to train elementary and rural principals and superintendents.¹²⁷ With the cat struggling to escape the bag, Daughters strongly objected because of duplication and insufficient demand.¹²⁸ He warned Clapp to respond. In his opinion, the State University, with the unwelcome and unauthorized production of the State College, had the capacity to meet the demand in the public schools for administrators. Actually, Daughters wanted to limit the training for superintendents and principals to the State University. In addition, he probably doubted the possibility of restraining the grasp for turf of the normal schools and thus their institutional scope if authorized to offer three- or four-year degrees.

That suspicion appeared well grounded by the expansion in Education that had already occurred without specific authorization at the State College. The gradual entry into Education began at the State College with correspondence courses under the terms of the 1917 Smith-

Hughes Act for vocational and technical education.¹²⁹ Sisson had protested and argued unsuccessfully for the State University to provide the needed courses on pedagogy and the history of education.¹³⁰ Perhaps as a sop or a compromise, the Chancellor also recommended the participation of the State University in the federal program for the preparation of Home Economic teachers with courses in Home Economics and Household Arts as well.¹³¹ Over the years, the State College had begun to certify high school teachers, especially in the sciences and mathematics, using the Vocational Education authority.¹³² From small beginnings, much larger entities developed and duplication soon reemerged as a major issue in Montana. But, until 1930, Clapp adamantly resisted the creation of a School of Education. When he finally acquiesced, protection of University turf provided the major reason.

To explain his refusal to create a School, Clapp invoked principle and inadequate resources. Late in the decade, the California public school systems refused to recognize the certificates of teachers trained and certified by the State University because they had not graduated from a School of Education. Nonetheless, Clapp remained obdurate, although it required only a proclamation to create the School because the State Board had authorized it in 1918.¹³³ In his view, the Department in the College facilitated the involvement of collaborating faculty to train teachers properly and he declined to surrender to external demands. At the same time, however, he doubted the need for the Normal School in Dillon to offer four-year curricula for primary and rural teachers; more importantly, he flatly denied its capability to train superintendents and principals. He specifically took note that the Billings normal school had not increased the overall number of elementary and rural teacher candidates; it merely redistributed them between Dillon and Billings.¹³⁴ Why duplicate even more?

In his response, Clapp minced no words: "training superintendents, principals, and high school teachers as well, is the function of the State University." The array of supporting fields and the quality of the students justified that exclusive function, not merely the Board mandate.¹³⁵

With the handwriting on the wall in 1928, Clapp finally relented and agreed with the Chancellor to establish the State University's preapproved School of Education, implement a two-year program for pre-medical education advocated by Professor Elrod, and create a graduate school primarily to educate principals and superintendents.¹³⁶ When Northern Montana College proposed to train high school teachers in vocational education, Clapp demanded designation as a junior college status of that upstart institution.¹³⁷ Not since 1913-1915 had so much discussion focused on duplication of programs.

Chancellor Brannon agreed with Clapp's proposals because of changing conditions across the country. He acquiesced to three-year programs in the normal schools as inevitable, but he wanted a State University School of Education and Graduate School to preempt academic drift at Dillon and Billings.¹³⁸ A State University press release in 1930 announced the School of Education as the seventh professional school on the Missoula campus. Clapp held to his guns on one point, however: "The school has been established without any immediate increase in expense."¹³⁹ Thus, President Clapp finally created the School of Education a dozen years after the Board authorized it in order to protect the State University's chartered functions and turf.¹⁴⁰ However, his dilatory action merely delayed the inevitable as became clear in the 1950s.

During the twenties, the University also began to study closely the profile of the entering freshmen classes in order to establish meaningful admission standards and the identify ways to mesh the services of the institution and the needs of the students.¹⁴¹ At the same time, the Chancellor urged Clapp to establish a special institute to provide testing services and technical assistance to the public schools. The Department of Psychology oversaw testing services on the campus, but little else occurred except communication with the public schools. The report concerning the 1923 class provided base line data to evaluate the implementation the following year of the rule requiring applicants to rank among the upper two-thirds of their graduating high school classes. Studies continued over the years in accordance with Clapp's goal to admit only academically competent students with the necessary work ethic.

With rapidly rising enrollments, the State University faculty came under great pressure to offer new courses relevant to the students. For example, Professor Elrod added a new course in “Eugenics” in 1920 and an earlier course in Bacteriology continued to do well. He also advocated courses for nurses and again recommended the first two years of medical education, a call at times supported by the President.¹⁴² Earlier, in 1916 and again in 1918, Elrod had proposed the first two years of medical school because “the state of Montana can and should add to the facilities offered its young men and women in professional study.”¹⁴³ Professional training existed in agriculture, mining, engineering, dairying, law, teaching, pharmacy, and forestry, but not in medicine. While he understood the concern about costs, the State University had the chartered authority, facilities, and resources to do the first two years.

A faculty committee subsequently confirmed Elrod's analysis but settled for a catalogue statement: "The State University of Montana *has not yet*, because of the many requirements in the way of faculty, buildings, and equipment, an organized medical school."¹⁴⁴ The faculty obviously thought the State University Charter mandated medical as well as legal education.¹⁴⁵ However, the Chancellor and the Board agreed with the faculty in 1916 and afterwards with the result that the State of Montana delayed any venture into medical education until the 1970s and then at the State College rather than the State University.¹⁴⁶ Original charters and mission statements had long since lost any inherent influence on institutional development.

Clapp's reluctance to establish professional schools reflected his commitment to liberal education that he shared with Elrod and Merriam as well as his concern about costs. Even when a professional school already existed, he refused to approve proposals to admit freshmen directly to the school.¹⁴⁷ In his usual differential style, however, he cautioned Dean S. J. Coon, School of Business Administration, to proceed carefully with such recommendations; the faculty might conclude "that we are . . . trying to slip something over on them." Over the decade, Clapp also opposed proposals to reorganize the Department of Library Economy in the College into a School of Library Science to offer the Bachelor of Library Science.¹⁴⁸ He refused to seek funds for the proposed School because "I . . . am opposed to the establishment of a separate professional school." He thought the Department competent to offer the training necessary without "destroying the unity of our work . . . by increasing the number of . . . professional schools."¹⁴⁹ Fortunately, the voters approved a three mill levy in 1930 which provided the resources to sustain the Department of Library Economy.¹⁵⁰

The Library itself became more troublesome than the school issue during the late twenties and early thirties, despite Gertrude Buckhaus's efforts to create a School of Library Science.¹⁵¹ The new facility built with bond revenue in 1923 provided the space to accommodate 80,000 volumes and some 10,000 periodicals, essential services for the students and faculty, and offices and classroom space for History, Economics, and English.¹⁵² However, as student and faculty numbers increased, so did the work load, escalating demand for more acquisitions and imposing new pressures on the facility. By the late twenties, the Library held 110,000 volumes and 40,000 periodicals and pamphlets, exceeding its capacity. Moreover, Ms. Buckhaus managed the Library in the fashion of old-time librarians with more concern about the used than the user.

To illustrate, Ms. Buckhaus's 1927 "State University Library Staff Manual" offered detailed instructions for every possible situation.¹⁵³ Strict rules regulated fines and when to collect them, and every staff member had the responsibility to search brief cases and packs "with a smile" for objects belonging to the Library. The staff had strict instructions not to allow students to converse or study together, and if they did to send them to classrooms or other buildings. Most importantly, "Watch students to see if seem to be pocketing or planning to remove books." One special room, the "Treasure Room," held books and materials relating to the history of the Northwest, accessible "only to students having special permission of Dr. Phillips."¹⁵⁴ Having students in the mausoleum only exacerbated management challenges with no worthwhile benefit, in Ms. Buckhaus's mind.

In 1918, Ms. Buckhaus had launched the Library Economy instructional program especially for students planning to work in the public school libraries. In 1919, she orchestrated the first request for a School of Library Science.¹⁵⁵ President Sisson declined but assured the petitioners that the University intended to offer Library Science courses for the foreseeable future, if funding permitted. Two years later, Acting Librarian Lucia Haley warned the President of the likely impact of recent staff resignations, including hers, for want of necessary support.¹⁵⁶ She reiterated "that if much constructive work is not done on the catalog classification and other records, before moving into the new building, there will be what may be described as 'one grand mess.'"

From his new location at Reed College in Oregon, Sisson wrote to recommend the use of the \$50,000 reserved from the bond issue to acquire the books and equipment needed in the new Library and remodeling of the old one, as pledged by Elliot on 25 April 1921.¹⁵⁷ Through the remainder of the decade and into the 1930s, Clapp rejected every appeal for a School of Library Science. At the same time, he managed to find the funds for more acquisitions and to make the existing space work for the Library. Exasperated by the theft of \$450 worth of books annually from the Reading Room of the Library, he instructed Business Manager J. B. Speer to levy a forty-five cent fine on every student.¹⁵⁸ He understood the fine seemed unfair to some students, but he justified it with the argument that every student had the obligation to abide the rules and assure that their peers did as well.

In 1926, at Clapp's initiative, the State University participated in a comparative survey of western university libraries organized by President A. G. Crane of Wyoming. The State

University Library had just over 95,000 volumes, with about 48,000 in circulation at any given time.¹⁵⁹ The staff consisted of seven Librarians , one and one-half support staff, and \$2,000 for student assistants. He explained that the Librarians also taught Library Science courses for prospective teachers and for students seeking the BA in Library Economy. Costs had risen steeply since 1921 from \$17,200 to \$27,000. Over that same period, the University operating budget had not increased, yet "The Librarian still howls about the small size of her staff." By comparison, the State University Library appeared in better shape than the one at the University of Wyoming.¹⁶⁰ Ms. Buckhaus agreed that Clapp had treated the Library well but years of prior neglect left Librarian salaries well behind the faculty in general.¹⁶¹

Crane's comparisons of fourteen western institutions placed the State University of Montana third with 95,000 volumes behind the Universities of Colorado and Kansas with 170,000 each.¹⁶² The State College stood well back with 30,000 volumes. Of the fourteen institutions, the State University ranked eighth in enrolment, but well ahead of all others with 48,000 volumes in circulation and tied in second place with North Dakota for the number of staff. Only the University of Utah had more student assistance funds than the State University. Despite the resource scarcity, Clapp had treated the Library generously..

Over the next few years, however, the State University Library Committee's annual reports documented declining levels of support and lost ground compared to peers.¹⁶³ The specifics revealed severe financial challenges, including the lowest salaries in the region; 50,000 Library materials not yet cataloged and thus not in use; seating capacity to accommodate only about twenty-two percent of the student population with rapid enrolment growth; demand

overwhelming capacity in the Reserve Room; and almost no vacant shelving space. To catch up on the work with the current number of catalogers required at least ten years; to make progress, the University needed to double the staff and bring the salaries to peer levels. As only one indicator, the student population had increased by 600 percent between 1913 and 1927, the number of volumes in the Library by 300 percent. Even so, the Committee ranked the need for appropriate and adequate research material as the highest priority.

As conditions in the state economy worsened, the State University suspended all Library Science instruction for the duration.¹⁶⁴ In view of this development, Buckhaus finally persuaded Clapp to apply to the Carnegie Foundation for a three-year grant to institute a School of Library Science that met the American Library Association accreditation standards. If funded, the proposal had the potential to support the School until the mill levy of 1930, if the mill levy won voter approval. As it turned out, the Carnegie Foundation declined, the mill levy passed, and the State University reinstituted its Library Economy program for a few more years.

Ms. Buckhaus died in 1931 without realizing her vision of a School of Library Science.¹⁶⁵ Prior to the search, Psychology Chairman F. O. Smith advised Clapp to appoint "a man as the head of the library staff." He thought the Library "more important from an executive standpoint than any single department in the University." If it proved impossible to find a man to accept the position, then secure "the most capable woman available . . . with broad training and wide and successful experience, especially on the executive side." Clapp conducted a search and Philip O. Keeney emerged as the most qualified applicant for State University Librarian in 1931,

although a "very poor choice" as it turned out, according to long-time Secretary Lucille J. Armsby.¹⁶⁶ Support for Armsby's assessment soon emerged.

J. B. Speer's report in 1936 indicated some improvement in Library conditions after the drastic low point of 1933-1934 when the book acquisition budget fell to \$3,007 -- less than a third of the amount in the early thirties -- the binding budget to \$1,342 -- also less than a third of the earlier total -- and the periodical budget to \$1,401 -- less than half of the earlier total.¹⁶⁷ The new Librarian added the final statistic, noting the loss of three Librarians since 1931, from nine to six, partially offset by an increase in student assistant funds. But Clapp had provided salary increases throughout these difficult years.¹⁶⁸

Clapp had followed Smith's misogynous advice in selecting Keeney for this critical position, but with unfortunate results as it turned out. Ever on the bright side, Mary Brennan Clapp, who knew the people involved and her husband's dilemma, made the best of a serious mistake.¹⁶⁹

The faculty had met him [Keeney] that summer and been impressed with his professional experience and general erudition. In three or four years he became the cause of considerable conflict that came to a climax in the following administration. He and Mrs. Keeney showed great courage in the difficulty. He was ill for some time [afterwards] but when able to do so worked in special capacities in a number of libraries, one of them in Japan.

She said nothing else in her "Narrative" about Keeney and his troubled relationship with Presidents Clapp and Simmons.

Revealing the problems, President Clapp informed Keeney in 1932, after the first year of employment, that he considered his performance unsatisfactory and specifically renewed Keeney's contract for only one additional year. Keeney later denied having received any notice of the change in status from tenure track to term contract. In fact, however, Clapp used the University's term contract form to extend Keeney's contract every year until he, himself, died in office in 1935.¹⁷⁰ Keeney signed each of the term contracts. In addition, in 1934, when Keeney returned late in the fall from vacation, Clapp shared with Keeney a list of his failings, specifically that he had caused dissension among the Library staff, exhibited little interest in the Library or the University, refused to cooperate with University staff or the Business Manager, never consulted the Library staff on the issues, and revealed an utter lack of organization and attention to detail.

"Far from completely satisfied," Clapp wrote in an understatement. He specifically noted that he had used "annual contracts" to indicate unsatisfactory performance to Keeney. He also found Keeney's personal "peculiarities" -- unspecified -- "rather marked," and, alluding to the counsel he had received during the search for a new Librarian, revealed his own misogynous side with the conclusion that he had "Wanted *man* and not woman."¹⁷¹ Despite his dissatisfaction, Clapp retained Keeney on annual contracts from 1931 through 1934-1935 and in doing so produced unintended consequences for his successor. He explained these contradictory actions because of reluctance to dismiss Keeney during the severe economic conditions of the mid-thirties with virtually no jobs available anywhere.¹⁷² In this instance, the cynics had it right: No good deed ever went unpunished.

From year to year during the twenties, President Clapp repeated the list of academic needs he had outlined in 1922, anxiously reciting enrolment increases accompanied by either budget stagnation or reduction. In 1923, University enrolment exceeded 2,100 for the first time in history, seemingly fulfilling Elliott's optimistic predictions in 1921.¹⁷³ That year, a Senate Committee Investigation of the State University revealed a sound operation, despite challenges. From 1919 to 1922, the operating budget went from \$227,360 to \$406,415; capital funds from \$135,400 to \$365,430; and the repair and maintenance budget from \$4,741 to \$26,724.¹⁷⁴ The report noted that with the 1920 increases, faculty salaries appeared in line with other costs and peer institutions. More importantly, the cost per student declined from \$301 in 1920-1921 to \$290 in 1922-1923, although largely because of the increased numbers of students. The expenditure per student exceeded that in Washington and Idaho, for which the Senate Committee praised the greatly improved efficiency.

In his budget request for the 1925 biennium, Clapp emphasized tightened admission standards to exclude unprepared applicants, limited registration in some subjects, and dismissals of students unwilling to work hard.¹⁷⁵ Even so, he anticipated more than 2,000 students on the campus again in 1925. In his analysis, the State University needed at least twenty more faculty members, perhaps half as graduate assistants and the rest as regular faculty, because of demand for advanced coursework in English, Chemistry, Languages, Business Administration, Philosophy, and German. He also asked for assistance with Summer Session and Correspondence Studies and requested the restoration of funding for the Biological Station, closed in 1921, and the Museum.¹⁷⁶

The President also became increasingly concerned about the possible diversion of dedicated mill levy revenue from instruction to other purposes. In October 1924, he provided a detailed analysis of the State University income and expenditures to the Curriculum Committee and warned of potential peril.¹⁷⁷ The available revenue included local funds (essentially nonresident and professional school tuition and student fees) of about \$18,800, federal funds (yield on endowments) of roughly \$26,500, self-support funds (dormitory charges, correspondence study, music lessons, student activities, some designated endowments, and the like) of \$56,400, and a state appropriation of \$359,000, including the dedicated mill levy revenue.

As President Clapp and Chancellor Brannon noted, the State University faced serious challenges because of overcrowding in all programs, limited or no regular coursework in German and Philosophy, far too few faculty members, and essentially nothing to maintain the two million dollar physical plant. Yet the policy makers increasingly viewed the dedicated mill levy revenue as the upper expenditure limit in order to protect the state tax revenue.¹⁷⁸

During a special session in early 1924, the situation deteriorated further when the Legislature set an expenditure limit for each campus that authorized the use of state General Funds *only* after exhausting all other revenue. Clapp criticized the limit as a zero-sum game that eliminated all incentive to develop new sources of revenue.¹⁷⁹

Serious as these developments seemed, Clapp thought the real danger lurked in the service agencies, the Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service at the State College, also supported by local, federal, and state funding.¹⁸⁰ Because of the new directive, the State

College, as all the campuses, had to exhaust all other funds prior to drawing on state General Funds. If the legislature or the State Board defined the service agencies as integral parts of the College, these agencies also had access to the dedicated mill levy revenue. To avoid that outcome, Chancellor Brannon arranged a taxpayer suit against the Board of Examiners in 1926, and the Supreme Court ruled that the State College merely hosted the federal agencies, hence making them ineligible for mill levy support.¹⁸¹ Further, the Court denied that the Board of Examiners had the authority to alter the mill levy appropriations once set by the General Assembly or to prevent the four campuses from drawing mill levy funds as needed. These developments provided a brief respite.

In 1925, the state Senate invited Clapp to review the budget and other issues detrimentally impacting higher education.¹⁸² Probably because of the taxpayer challenge to protect the dedicated mill levy revenue, he focused on the zero-sum effect of the 1924 directive and urged respect for the Constitution's assignment of the higher education institutions to the State Board of Education for management. The chain of authority and accountability had run originally from the State University to the Board of Education, state Auditor, and state Treasurer. Over the years, the legislature had increased the bureaucratic red tape by adding intervening boards and officers, such as the Board of Examiners. As he concluded, "The constitutional powers of the State Board of Education, now largely destroyed by statute, should be recognized and the administrative officers of the University should be made directly responsible to that Board in all matters." Clapp's plea and the court decision resulted in the removal of the legislative mandate on the use of appropriated funds, but it had no effect on the fiscal control of the Board of Examiners. Years later, because of a sharp conflict over the

redirection of bond revenue in 1951, the legislature finally eliminated the fiscal control of the Board of Examiners.¹⁸³

The search for new revenue preoccupied Brennan, Clapp, and other University administrators during the late 1920s. For example, in 1927 the Chancellor helped to develop legislation to reorganize the State Land Department in an effort to increase the return from leases and royalties.¹⁸⁴ Harking back to the earlier success, attention naturally focused on the dedicated mill levy. The legislature had begun to use the mill levy revenue as the maximum appropriation. Therefore, Brannon planned an appeal to the voters for an increase in the reauthorization campaign of 1930. Discussion began as early as 1925 and the proposed level ranged from one and a half up to five mills. To assure wider support, with Clapp's acquiescence, the new language also specifically extended mill levy support to the Experiment Station and the Extension Service.¹⁸⁵ Three mills emerged as most likely to win approval, accompanied by a three million dollar bond issue for construction.¹⁸⁶

As it turned out, the mill levy and bonding referenda won handily. Comparison to the votes in 1920 revealed continuing if slowly declining public support: Mill Levy, 1920, 82,669 for and 71,169 against, and Mill Levy, 1930, 70,548 for and 61,207 against; Bond Issue, 1920, 90,441 for and 66,169 against, and Bond Issue, 1930, 77,761 for and 58,312 against.¹⁸⁷ However, the state Supreme Court ruled the bonding referendum unconstitutional on a technicality (the ballot failed to state the rate of the tax increase to retire the bonds) and the reduced property valuation and tax delinquencies caused by the deepening Depression together deprived the campuses of most of the anticipated benefit.¹⁸⁸ Before the middle of the Depression decade,

mill levy revenue fell nearly to the 1925 level even with the 1930 doubling from one and one-half to three mills.

On the other hand, Clapp's collaborative working arrangement with the State University faculty allowed improved institutional management. It also helped to ameliorate the animosity typically engendered by stressful conditions. In 1924, Clapp added Foreign Language classrooms to the list of space needs, commended the growth of faculty research and the improvement in student scholarship, reiterated the request for faculty members to teach Philosophy and German, and proposed more comprehensive or omnibus survey courses, particularly in the sciences and mathematics. Clapp's 1924 call for omnibus courses in sciences and mathematics reflected his awareness of reforms implemented elsewhere and his recognition of the need for curricular revision to do more with less. Increasingly over the years, he pushed the campus community closer to consideration of the relatively radical ideas suggested by Merriam and Underwood in 1921. In 1933-1934, he finally proposed them for serious review.

Before that, however, enrollment growth overran the existing personnel and space provided by the refurbished physical plant Clapp had praised in 1921, even with configuring existing space for new uses. He also reiterated his plaintive pleas for several more experienced faculty members and an end to the practice of allowing only junior appointments. More and better equipment, a hefty increase in library acquisitions, and Summer School funding rounded out the same request repeated *ad nauseum*.¹⁸⁹ All through this trying period, he begged for academic and general campus improvements. In 1928, he proposed to house the increased

student numbers by constructing and leasing fraternity and sorority houses on University land.¹⁹⁰ Clapp persisted in this effort until as late as 1934 against the opposition of critics in the legislature and local realtors until the Attorney General ruled it illegal, but it resurfaced in the 1950s when similar conditions occurred in Missoula and Bozeman.¹⁹¹ By 1929, he reported that the instructional costs per student at the State University had fallen from \$290 to \$230 over four years as a result of enrolment growth and budget stagnation.¹⁹² That year, the President stepped in as Acting Chair of Geology to allow a sabbatical leave for Professor Rowe. Funds simply did not exist for a replacement.

Always in search of more land as well, Clapp also oversaw the purchase of the former site of the Missoula Country Club south of the campus, at the time in use by a group of private citizens as a municipal golf course.¹⁹³ The Alumni Challenge Athletic Field Corporation, an entity he had created in 1923 for just that purpose, facilitated the acquisition.¹⁹⁴ As his predecessors, Clapp bought land as it became available to provide living room for the University, often using private or unobligated institutional funds. The use of funds borrowed from a student reserve account to finance the Country Club loan subsequently led to controversy and a legislative investigation.

Mary Brennan Clapp blamed the controversy on dissatisfied athletic boosters, student athletes irritated by strict academic and competition standards, fraternities and sororities unhappy with conduct requirements (especially prohibition of liquor), and student activists certain of administrative diversion and misuse of funds.¹⁹⁵ The legislative investigation revealed nothing of consequence, no "dishonest" purposes or "misuse of students' money" through improper

loans. The legislative committee found that the land acquisitions benefitted the University but ordered more formal procedures for such loans in the future, including increased student involvement, approval of acquisitions by the State Board, and notice to the State Accountant.¹⁹⁶ The University ultimately repaid the loans from the student reserves, including the one for the golf course, but ASMSU later agreed either to loan funds or to fund directly a variety of projects including renovation of the old golf course.¹⁹⁷ In any event, the land became the property of the State to benefit the University for use as needed.

In 1927, with the help of the Montana Congressional delegation, the School of Forestry received authority from the U. S. War Department to manage Fort Missoula's Timber Reserve in Pattee Canyon, roughly 1,500 acres of virgin timber replete with opportunities for faculty research and student hands-on training.¹⁹⁸ The 1916 facilities plan had stressed acquisition of land for experimental forestry. Shortly after WW I, the University had requested the transfer of the Fort Missoula Reserve as unused surplus land.¹⁹⁹ The War Department ultimately approved only a permit for collaborative research in 1922. Representative John M. Evans blocked the transfer of the land because of his vehement opposition to the War Department's rumored plan to close Fort Missoula.²⁰⁰ Nonetheless, the School of Forestry made good use of the opportunities the lease permitted.

Clapp and Forestry Dean Thomas Spaulding also pursued a much larger donation of land by the Anaconda Copper Company in the Blackfoot River drainage. Spaulding notified the President in 1923 that he had discussed the gift of Company land located between Salmon and Seeley Lakes northeast of Missoula.²⁰¹ In the late twenties, Clapp made a formal request for a gift of

10,838 acres, since the University had no funds to purchase the land. The Company had already harvested most of the timber and the effort to sell the Company land in the area had failed.²⁰² While interested and amicably disposed, the Company preferred to take all of the timber before gifting the land and put the request on hold for a few years.

During the late 1920s, the University also secured a federal contract to grow seedling trees for distribution to farmers across the state for use as wind breaks and shelter belts and to prevent erosion. This opportunity led to a turf battle between the State University and the State College, with each side attempting to out-bid the other. The Extension Service Director made good use of his contacts in the U. S. Department of Agriculture to negotiate an arrangement for a School of Forestry at the College in Bozeman to manage the Nursery. Chancellor Brannon brusquely informed the Department of Agriculture that the State University had the state's only School of Forestry, the State Board of Education prohibited program duplication, and the Board had assigned tree growing to the School of Forestry and tree distribution and planting to the Extension Service.²⁰³ The Department of Agriculture and the State College reluctantly acquiesced. Even so, conflicts persisted between the School of Forestry and private nursery owners, specifically about competition with the private sector in growing trees for distribution to farmers and ranchers, and with the Extension Service about direct interaction of Forestry personnel with the farmers and ranchers.²⁰⁴ Nonetheless, the project succeeded, producing and shipping more than 420,000 trees in 1940 before the advent of WW II led to its closure.²⁰⁵

VI

As the State University matured, the faculty exhibited a growing awareness of and pride in the institution's quality and integrity. Reflective of this confidence in 1929, the State University

Phi Beta Kappa Association consisting of townspeople, faculty, and administrators, with Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon (Illinois Beta, 1912), as the Chair, submitted the first of several petitions over the years for a Phi Beta Kappa charter.²⁰⁶ A glossy printed brochure surveyed the history of the State University and reviewed its accomplishments. The cover featured a photograph of the iconic Main Hall and the Seal of the multi-campus University, and it stressed the State University's unique attributes. In contrast to the Agricultural College, School of Mines, and Normal Schools, the State University hosted a full array of the arts and sciences and six professional schools with students from across the state and country, and a few from other countries. "There are no other accredited institutions in the state where similar fields of study are offered," the petitioners boasted. The University awarded the BA, BS, LLB, MA, and MS degrees.

The petition provided relevant data, arrayed chronologically, allowing the numbers to speak for themselves with very brief analysis and explanation (see Chart I below). In 1928-1929, the Library contained 70,000 volumes, with 20,000 more in the Law Library, and 635 periodicals. The University budget included a state appropriation of \$358,000, land-grant income of \$29,485, student fee revenue of \$80,951, trust and endowment income of \$5,705, self-support revenue of \$17,483, and miscellaneous receipts of \$3,643, for an overall budget of \$496,164. By comparison, the budget in 1900 totaled \$23,810, twenty times higher in 1929 with enrolment only ten times greater. The record detailed impressive progress, especially with the impact of the dedicated mill levy in 1920 that doubled the budget between 1915 and 1921.

The layout of the campus followed the Cass Gilbert plan of 1917, with the Oval rightfully commanding the viewer's attention. The petition explained the Gilbert design, attributing priority to academic and student space within an elegantly conceived vision. More than half of the students, counting those enrolled in general education courses, studied in the College of Arts and Science, the remainder in the professional schools. Montana resident undergraduates comprised the overwhelming majority of the students, with only about 160 from other states, ten from other countries, and some forty-five pursuing graduate degrees. The College of Arts and Sciences counted eighty-six of the 108 faculty members in its seventeen academic departments, but only twenty-four of them had earned doctoral degrees, a modest number for an institution seeking a Phi Beta Kappa charter.²⁰⁷ Nonetheless, the students, faculty, and campus environment revealed the emergence of the State University as a mature undergraduate institution.

CHART I					
STATE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA, 1895-1928					
YEAR	BUILDINGS	BUDGET	FACULTY	STUDENTS	DEGREES AWARDED
1895-6	1	12,521.71	7	135	0
1900-1	2	23,809.97	15	235	9
1907-8	4	59,334.68	30	291	23
1911-2	4	94,811.91	35	230	30
1914-5	4	142,460.26	57	843	44
1920-1	8	315,280.57	70	1,534	97
1924-5	11	452,807.37	92	1,941	185
1928-9	12	488,639.27	108	2,352	-

Nonetheless, the Phi Beta Kappa application failed in 1929 and several times over the following years. President G. Finlay Simmons later attributed the failure to "'a feeling that the academic departments of the University should be materially strengthened'" and "the lack of higher college degrees by many of the older members of the faculty and their lack of productive research."²⁰⁸ The University continued to experience budget, faculty, facility, and curricular challenges that time failed to overcome. In the "new normal" of the 1930s, requests for more University support of any kind did little good, as President Clapp had concluded by 1930.

When the voters approved an increase in the dedicated levy to three mills in 1930, the yield nonetheless declined during the escalating depression of the early 1930s. More critically, the legislature frequently limited the state appropriation to the mill levy revenue, or even below the approved mill levy, with no consideration of falling property values or delinquent taxes.²⁰⁹ Recognizing an impossible situation, Clapp declined to enumerate the campus needs as an exercise in futility and simply repeated prior requests.²¹⁰

In response to the increasingly dire financial conditions, Chancellor Brannon and Clapp undertook quantitative, comparative, and other studies to inform the general public and the policy makers of the desperate condition of the University. In a long memorandum to the legislature for the 1925 session, Brannon laid the foundation with a comprehensive review of the history of the multi-campus University of Montana.²¹¹ The adoption of the Chancellor plan in 1916 led to the elimination of "unseemly and unwise competition" for funds and program duplication, and established centralized control of programs, policies, and budgets. During its three decades of existence, the multi-campus University had educated 25,000 students in all fields. Just as had happened in Japan during the Meiji period of the late nineteenth century,

Brannon argued, higher education had modernized Montana society and culture.²¹² For internal comparison, Brannon noted that Montanans spent \$190 per person annually on luxuries but the state expended only \$1.39 per resident for higher education. Similar comparisons in the future failed to elicit much attention.

With the statistical studies he initiated, Clapp became for a time the leading expert on comparative higher education appropriations in the region. He conceived of his major study, the "Montana Educational Survey," as a critical component of the campaign to renew and increase the dedicated mill levy in 1930.²¹³ Under his direction, a State University staff member did the work guided by Lloyd Morey, Controller of the University of Illinois, who had conducted a similar study of Virginia. Morey spent a week in Missoula verifying the data and analyses and certified the report. The most extensive compilation of data and analysis about Montana higher education to date, the Clapp survey set a very high bar while also making a strong statement for public support. Professor R. H. Jesse thought President Clapp's study "more accurate than those of any state officer, or interested banker," an admittedly biased opinion. Mary Brennan Clapp in an overstatement reported that "after the publication of the study, not again during that time were any protests made about extravagance or waste or relatively high costs at the University."²¹⁴ Yet uninformed protests continued over the ensuing years and nothing much changed as a result of Clapp's invidious comparisons.

As a state, Montana ranked above average in material resources, but, with low taxes and debt, spent about one-third less than the average of the other states proportional to population for education. As a result, Montana expended on average ten percent less per student than all

other states in the study and thirty percent less than the other four states in the Northwest. On the other hand, the state devoted higher than average percentages of its budget to health care, charities, corrections, pensions, agriculture, and conservation. At the same time, enrolment in the Montana colleges and university ran fifteen percent above the average based on population and had increased by 110 percent since 1920, with state support increasing by only seventy-seven percent. Faculty salaries compared favorably for the lower and dismally for the upper ranks. Interestingly, however, Montana ranked fourth among the states with regard to the investment in the physical plant, perhaps because of the distributed campuses and the bond issue in 1920. Even though the fee levels for residents remained well below those in other states, while a lower percentage of Montana high school graduates remained in the state for education than in the other states. Quite revealing, the comparisons produced no discernible change in state appropriations at the time. As its major outcome, Clapp's work initiated the practice of supporting University budget requests with quantitative data in the perennial struggle for relief.

Over the next few years, the Montana Taxpayers' Association, under the direction of Fred Bennion, conducted similar studies concerning the cost of higher education in Montana, not always agreeing with Clapp's conclusions. In late 1934, shortly before his premature death, Clapp took issue specifically with Bennion's advocacy of consolidation of the several campuses.²¹⁵ As he remarked, if consolidation had occurred twenty years earlier, it "might have been feasible and, I believe, desirable." As people grew accustomed to the regional distribution of campuses, Clapp thought the total elimination of higher education easier to accomplish than consolidation of six campuses into one, primarily because of demand for

access during the Depression. Moreover, as he had discovered in his studies during the late 1920s, consolidation elsewhere had not reduced but actually increased the cost of higher education. To exemplify the challenge, he estimated a cost of \$3,000,000 for a physical plant of appropriate size in Bozeman or Missoula at a savings of a paltry \$200,000 per year. Overall, however, he stressed the absolute imperative to educate the citizens to deal intelligently with the international appeal of dictatorships.²¹⁶

In his major study of income in Montana versus higher education expenditures and enrolments on the six campuses between 1926 and 1938, Bennion argued that "Efficient operation requires a well coordinated and intelligent plan of administration, control, and support," nonexistent in his opinion.²¹⁷ Several conclusions stood out, especially the duplication of courses and programs, hugely exacerbated by the establishment of the new campuses in Billings and Havre; those campuses by and large had the effect of moderating enrolments elsewhere, especially in Butte and Dillon; the failure of expenditures to keep up with enrolments despite the escalation of student fees; instructional expenditures falling from fifty-six percent of the total to less than forty-three percent after 1931, with a resultant decline in quality; nonetheless, fairly stable low enrolments courses because of the emphasis on advanced upper division and graduate courses; salaries accounting for ninety-eight percent of instructional costs; sharp increases for physical plant operation and maintenance after the federal funding became available -- primarily at MSU; and MSU and MSC responsible for three-quarters of enrolments and five-eighths of facilities.

Bennion also identified a huge turn-over of faculty because of resignations and retirements and filling in by and large with junior and temporary faculty. In brief, he found neither logic nor efficiency in the operation, all to the detriment of the Montana taxpayers who paid the costs.²¹⁸ Despite the faculty turn-over, the six campuses still had far too many elderly people and needed either a voluntary or mandatory retirement program to restore vitality and quality. In his view, taxpayers had to demand change in administration and control in order to assure to Montanans the education they needed.

A study based on MSU data done in 1936 by Alex Blewett, a student in the Business Office under the supervision of Business Manager J. B. Speer, provided a comprehensive review of the State University from 1922 to 1936.²¹⁹ In "A Survey of Higher Learning at Montana State University, Missoula," Blewett stressed the shifting emphases in higher education, from a tight focus on developing "civic and social responsibilities" to "personal development," the development Clapp had emphasized. Taking account of that shift, Blewett substituted "learning" for "education" in his title. After reviewing the various factors involved, he singled out a few that contributed to the lower cost of higher education in Montana: "Size of enrollment, size of classes, number of faculty members, teaching loads, salary schedules, curricular offerings, and efficiency in the use of the facilities." To demonstrate their interaction, he presented forty-three pages of data, charts, and analyses.

Degrees granted by the University increased from seventy-five in 1920 to about 250 annually by 1931, then dropped back to 220 in 1935. Total enrollment rose from less than 1,340 in 1920 to more than 2,100 in 1936, not nearly as rapidly as degrees granted, with almost a tripling of

the percentage of graduates per year. The number of full-time faculty changed very little over those years, hovering around eighty, although part-time faculty increased as full-time faculty declined. As a result, class sizes virtually exploded between 1932 and 1936, from about twenty students per class to more than thirty. As perhaps the most apparent consequences, fully forty-six percent of all classroom time involved classes of 110 and up, only thirty-three percent of classes with forty or less. Predictably, the average teaching load per faculty member climbed from 769 to 980 credit hours and the student-faculty ratio went from about fifteen to one to twenty-two to one.

During those same years, the cost per student declined from about \$285 to \$198, and the instructional cost as a percent of the total cost went from about sixty-five to less than fifty-seven percent. The cost per credit hour fell from over seven to about five dollars. At the same time, average salaries fell for all employee groups but most for full Professors in real terms as well as by comparison to peers. Equally predictable, library acquisitions sank to new lows, thus further weakening an already inadequate collection, with library expenditures per student falling from about \$7.50 to about \$3.40. Nonetheless, enrollments went up substantially as more students opted for college with no jobs available, even though scholarships fell by about half the earlier total. The operating budget showed a similar profile, dropping from \$476,867 in 1927-1928 to \$383,237 in 1934-1935, with the state appropriation accounting for a smaller percentage of the total every year.

These studies, whatever their conclusions, placed increasing emphasis on controlling costs. Periodically during the decade of the twenties after Elliott's departure, legislators had

questioned the need for the added expense of the Chancellor's office, although minor as a portion of total expenses, largely because they saw no benefits.²²⁰ In a paper for the National Association of State Universities in 1933, President Clapp reported a bill in the legislature every year beginning in 1915 seeking to abolish the office, passed but vetoed by the Governor in 1915 and 1933. In late 1922, after Elliott's departure, he informed the State University Committee on Budget and Policy of "a suspicious attitude toward the University and a distinct tendency to drive the institutions into politics."²²¹ While initially skeptical about filling the vacant Chancellorship, he changed his mind after reflection. In contrast to the past, Clapp urged the expedient course of finding the "right man" for the job, "not so much an educator" as an experienced academic politician who "can sell the University," but certainly not him. Whatever happened, he reassured the Committee, the State Board would not appoint anyone unacceptable to the State University and State College.

When Brannon accepted the position in 1923, he already knew the conditions in Montana quite well, having considered and declined the Chancellorship in 1916. Over the years, he had also developed professional relationships and personal friendships with Clapp and President Alfred Atkinson of the State College. In fact, he agreed to accept the chancellorship in 1923 only if Clapp and Atkinson endorsed him.²²² As Chancellor, Brannon exerted himself actively on behalf of the multi-campus University, stirring no little consternation and rancor among legislators interested in reducing rather than increasing higher education budgets. Moreover, his obvious leaning toward the two larger institutions and willingness to restrict the activities of the newer institutions in Billings and Havre made no friends for him in those communities.

Finally, his open involvement in the successful suit against the Board of Examiners and the legislature to protect the dedicated mill levy only worsened relationships.²²³

In 1929 and 1931, identical bills came before the legislature to abolish the position of the Chancellor, to substitute a University Business Manager, and to alter the governance by putting the University directly under state control.²²⁴ Brannon managed to kill both bills. In 1931, Clapp also urged the Chancellor to propose a "lump sum" appropriation so as to preserve the authority of the State Board of Education to allocate the funds to the various campuses, thereby circumventing the Board of Examiners and curbing the tendency for campuses to lobby for themselves.²²⁵ Despite the passage in 1930 of the referenda for a three-mill dedicated levy and a three million dollar bond issue (subsequently struck down by the state Supreme Court on a technicality), trouble began in December because of falling state revenue.²²⁶ When the appropriation limited the mill levy funds to two and a half rather than three mills, the State Board ordered budget reductions. Clapp prepared the plan for the six campuses based on an agreement with President Atkinson of the State College for the two larger campuses to take the hit for the "weaker" institutions.

The members of the State Board traveled the state to sell the proposal, finding it necessary to fight off efforts to abolish campuses and cut salaries even more. The Havre and Billings Presidents lobbied hard to increase their funding at the expense of the other four, forcing Clapp and Atkinson to defend the compromise reduction proposal. Clapp lamented the damage done to Elliott's fair and equitable "legislative procedures." The Billings and Havre delegations finally deserted the University position completely and secured additional funds

for their campuses, with the result of a ten percent reduction in budgets for the State University, State College, and Normal School and a smaller cut for the School of Mines. Brannon's ability to manage developments began to slip badly, by and large benefitting the two new institutions. The traumatic experience led Clapp to consider the possibility of going elsewhere, as he confessed to former Chancellor Elliott in 1931, much as he disliked the role of "high pressure salesman."²²⁷

Declining property values and delinquent taxes meant that the mill levy revenue never reached the appropriated level for expenditures from 1931 through 1933. By 1933, overdue University warrants of \$241,000 carried forward as a debit against the 1933 appropriation with the result that proposed expenditures for the year exceeded revenue by \$448,550.²²⁸ In fact, the margin became even wider, reaching \$522,583 by 30 June 1933. Quite clearly, the anticipated crisis had arrived. In an Executive Council meeting, the Chancellor and five of the Presidents agreed on a strategy to manage the looming deficits by basing initial budgets on the revenue from the three mill levy, dedicating half a mill to debt retirement, estimating tax delinquencies, and allocating the remaining amount proportionally to the campuses.²²⁹ If the legislature imposed additional reductions, then further cuts loomed.

In recognition of these crippling decisions, Clapp advocated and hoped for a coordinated strategy involving all the campuses. During the session, Brannon reported an even more dire situation, since predictions put the appropriated mill levy revenue as low as one and one-half mills. With the threat of no budget recommended at all for higher education, Brannon urged the Presidents to ramp up the lobbying effort. However, in response, the legislature intervened

once again by adopting a bill that abolished the position of the Chancellor. In order to save the position, Brannon agreed to resign if Governor John Erickson agreed to veto the bill.²³⁰ Erickson vetoed the bill, saved the Chancellorship but not Brannon, and then appointed himself Senator to replace Thomas J. Walsh who had died in office. As a result, both Erickson and Brannon escaped the trauma in Montana.²³¹

During the worst financial year of the Depression, the multi-campus University of Montana lost its fierce but coordinative leader who had worked hard to defend it. The six institutions managed the challenge by reducing all salaries an average of twenty percent and severely cutting all other expenses, much as other institutions across the country. Executive Secretary H. H. Swain reported in June 1934 an improved annual total in unpaid warrants of \$298,561, compared to the \$522,583 for 1933.²³² With the coordinator gone, Clapp and President Atkinson searched for ways to manage Board relationships and assure unity.²³³ The two of them had collaborated closely for nearly a decade and had managed to mitigate problems. They agreed to leave all routine matters to Swain, the Board's Executive Secretary, and to encourage each President to present important matters to the Council before going to the Board. As Clapp summarized, the "presidents should have more intimate Board contacts under the present arrangement than they have had in the past." Hoping to keep disagreements to a minimum, he and Atkinson emphasized the necessity to hold together. Once again, however, unanticipated developments disrupted their plans, as Clapp died in office in May 1935 and Atkinson accepted the presidency of the University of Arizona in 1937. Just before that happened, however, Atkinson apologized to Clapp for an article in the State

College newspaper proposing consolidation of the campuses, an echo from the distant past.²³⁴

He assured Clapp that he personally thought that "the distribution of educational opportunity made possible by a number of institutions has its advantages" in a state as bereft of religious and other schools as Montana. If Clapp responded, the letter has disappeared. However, given his exchange with Bennion in 1934, he clearly preferred the coordinated approach to higher education governance pioneered in Montana by Elliott and Brannon to consolidation of the campuses into one institution. The departure of the two collaborative leaders boded ill for that approach.

VII

The final academic change during the Clapp years augured a virtual revolution through radical organizational, curricular, and philosophical innovation, the ultimate result of a rising demand for reform and worsening economic conditions.²³⁵ Almost cataclysmic in their potential, the proposed changes wrenched the State University from its traditional moorings and cast it into the troubled waters of reform and reinvention. Nonetheless, Clapp assumed the continuance of some attributes of the State University, fundamentally its differentiation "from that of engineering and normal colleges" because of the "Emphasis . . . placed on the College of Arts and Sciences."²³⁶ For a time, the recommendations of Merriam, Underwood, and other reformers captured the faculty imagination, and the reinforced yearning for reform and survival smothered objections. Implementation, however, proved much more difficult than conception, especially within the context of a compromising pragmatism in the WW II and post-WW II years. In the end, the war and its traumatic impact upon the entire world channeled the idealistic yearnings of the thirties into a frantic search for stability.

In the throes of the Depression, President Clapp finally persuaded the faculty in 1930 of the imperative for sweeping academic and organizational change.²³⁷ As he emphasized, even at poverty-levels, the salaries consumed an unsustainable eighty-three percent of the budget compared to about seventy percent for peer institutions. Just to pay the low current salaries required the curtailment if not elimination of most other expenditures. Nonetheless, the President shrewdly assigned highest priority to protecting and improving the salary schedule while also meeting student needs within the constraints of existing resources.²³⁸ The search for alternate funding had produced nothing and the crisis had arrived.

The President made the point with some striking comparisons.²³⁹ In 1915-1916, the State University had educated 504 regular students with a faculty and library staff of fifty-six, a physical plant of six buildings, and an appropriated budget of \$230,000; by 1933-1934, most of the numbers had changed dramatically to 1,500 regular students, a faculty and library staff of ninety-two, a physical plant of thirteen buildings, but an appropriated budget of only \$235,200. With a thousand more students, the University had thirty-six more staff members and seven more facilities and \$5,200 more in the budget. To date, the University had eliminated all inefficient practices and duplicate courses, imposed multiple regulations to keep costs down, and imposed stringent accounting rules to prevent slippage. In addition, Clapp had reduced the number of faculty committees and increased either the ranks of lower administrators or the number of one-person committees. As he belatedly and painfully realized, "The result has been to greatly increase the expense and complexity of administration and to relieve the faculty and students . . . of much of the responsibility that they should bear." The University had to change and quickly.

On reflection, Clapp saw clearly that his creative steps during the twenties to relieve the faculty of administrative minutiae had exacerbated rather than ameliorated the fiscal problems, an unintended and certainly unexpected consequence. He had instituted those reforms and projected other administrative changes to improve institutional effectiveness and efficiency, only to learn a hard lesson. As perhaps the most debilitating outcome, neither the faculty nor the students accepted responsibility for enforcing the rules, academic or otherwise, most of which they did not even know. The resultant dilemma left the University with only one of two choices, as he counseled the faculty: Either engage the students in their education under the guidance of the faculty or allow meaningless and often unsuccessful credit hunting to continue in an increasingly barren hunting ground. He strongly urged academic and organizational reform. After the faculty agreed, he committed the University to radical reinvention.

Clapp's proposal incorporated the ideas offered by Merriam and Underwood and others and from the institutional reform reports Clapp had collected.²⁴⁰ In 1930, the proposal remained in conceptual form, lacking details, when endorsed by the Curriculum Committee and the entire faculty. In several meetings between 1930 and 1934, he emphasized the challenge of addressing academic weaknesses while respecting the restricted budget. Any chance of success entailed working harmoniously and collaboratively, even then a long shot.²⁴¹ Before allowing a vote on the final proposal, he set as a pre-condition the near if not unanimous acceptance of the associated responsibilities by the faculty. He warned that his proposal called for the virtual elimination of the mid-level administrators and one-person committees he had established, shifting the burden back to the faculty and students. By unanimous vote, the Curriculum Committee accepted and the General Faculty endorsed the implementation of

Clapp's proposal which began with the segregation of the University into one Junior and several Senior Colleges.²⁴²

The Junior College hosted the freshman and sophomore students and consisted of faculty members drawn as needed from the four Arts and Sciences Divisions and the seven professional Schools. Each of the Divisions and Schools had responsibility for a minimal curriculum of large lecture or omnibus courses, thus reducing costs while introducing the students to the various fields of knowledge. With faculty advice and counseling, the students selected and followed one of the minimalist curricula provided by the Divisions and Schools, supplemented by any other available coursework chosen voluntarily, carrying sixteen to eighteen credits each term for two years. The quality of the performance in a course rather than time expended determined the credits earned. After two years, all students had to pass a written or oral comprehensive examination for admission to a Senior College or leave the University. While not clearly stated, those who failed to perform at the level to earn sufficient credits (sixty-four) had two summers to make up for deficiencies.

The four Divisions and seven Schools became the eleven Senior Colleges and the students had to satisfy the admission and graduation criteria set by the chosen Senior Colleges. At the advanced level, each discipline imposed minimalist curricular requirements, again leaving the students free to choose any other available coursework if they satisfied the prerequisites. The students who met the minimalist curricular requirements for graduation received the formal grade of Pass, and those who successfully sat for baccalaureate written or oral comprehensive examinations qualified for Honors. The Clapp plan required the faculty and students to assume

accountability for the quality of the education, with the few remaining administrators confined to record keeping and paper work. The faculty and students collaboratively monitored student progress and certified the graduates. While radical by comparison to American higher education, the plan reflected the influence of the English system on Merriam, a former Rhodes Scholar and one of the architects, and others. Clapp himself denied that the roots of the State University approach came from the German universities. Instead, the State University focused on the development," physically, socially, spiritually, and vocationally as well as intellectually."²⁴³ In brief, he emphasized two "great aims," the education of young people for productive and meaningful lives and the development of Montana.

However attractive and logical Clapp's reforms appeared, the final academic and organizational structure revealed the predictable impact of reality upon ideality, and unfortunately the loss of impassioned leadership with his premature death in 1935.²⁴⁴ In brief, the University retained the professional Schools with their appointed Deans who successfully kept the general education or omnibus course requirements to a minimum for their students. The academic Departments in the College of Arts and Sciences fell into one of the four Divisions, each with an appointed Chair, but the Department Chairs retained nearly all of their former administrative responsibilities. The Divisional structure became the most visible outcome, actually expanding the administrative surface of the University, while little of substance changed. The new structure made the work of the Divisions dependent upon the decisions of the Department Chairs, since the Division Chairs had the responsibility only for the omnibus or general education courses taught by faculty selected and tenured on the recommendations of the

Departments.²⁴⁵ The Department Chairs also determined faculty availability to teach the omnibus courses with predictable long-term results.

Even so, the University successfully imposed new admission and graduation requirements; provided a student-level coordinated class schedule that reduced conflicts and facilitated student movement toward graduation; reduced drastically the number of elective courses; imposed Lower Division retention and Upper Division admission criteria, but never made the formal segregation into Junior and Senior Colleges; revised all major curricula; and adopted a number of revisions to the Mathematics, English Composition, Speech, Language, Military Science, and Physical Education graduation requirements.²⁴⁶ Yet, for all the change, a great deal looked the same.

In the end, the academic reforms of 1933-1934 retained most of the older structure and policies. All students had to complete at least two of the year-long omnibus or core courses developed by the four Divisions (outside the student's major field of study). In addition, they had satisfy basic skills requirements in Composition, Speech, Mathematics, Military Science for male students, Language, and Physical Education. The major fields of study required roughly sixty-five credits (exclusive of the omnibus courses and skill requirements), leaving a few credits selected from a very restricted list of free electives. Finally, the Curriculum Committee and the faculty restricted the core courses to freshmen and sophomore students in the College of Arts and Sciences, with special admission by permission of a few juniors and seniors in the professional Schools.²⁴⁷ Nonetheless, the intent to restrict admission to the professional schools to juniors failed before the opposition of the professional school faculties. Only the

School of Law retained its admission requirement of two and later three years of college before finally requiring undergraduate degrees.

Nonetheless, Clapp welcomed the emergence of a curriculum affording fewer but more significant choices while assuring educational breadth. He enthusiastically predicted graduates better prepared for the real world by avoiding premature specialization. In his inimitable style, he called on the Division and Department Chairs and School Deans to lead the way into reform and reinvention of baccalaureate education. As he mused, the new regime of enhanced admission and graduation standards opened a new era for the State University: "We are the sweet, May all the rest be damned; Hell was made for the residue, We'll not have heaven crammed."²⁴⁸ Not everyone on campus shared his enthusiasm or aplomb, but they knew that change had to come and appreciated the invitation to participate in the process.

VIII

Without question, the chaotic financial crisis threatened institutional survival and mandated change for all of higher education in Montana and across the country. H. H. Swain, Executive Secretary to the Board of Education, reported to colleagues elsewhere that salary reductions of nearly twenty percent between 1932 and 1934 decimated salary schedules and living styles.²⁴⁹ Filling only the essential vacant positions, Clapp managed to keep the salary reductions to an average of twenty-one percent by reducing the lowest paid faculty less than twenty percent, low performers by twenty-eight percent, and satisfactory performers by twenty percent.²⁵⁰ The legislative Select Committee on University Finances in 1935 praised the campuses for tight budget management, but warned that salaries still consumed fully seventy-five percent of the total budget even after the twenty to twenty-five percent reductions.²⁵¹ The report also took

note of the continued challenge of outstanding and unpaid warrants because of the unrelenting decline in property valuation, by then just forty-three percent of the level in 1918. The situation allowed a very slim margin for error.

The new structure and curriculum lacked the clarity and focus of Clapp's ideal but reflected stark reality. On the other hand, radical changes in teaching practices had become commonplace by 1934, threatening to undermine the quality of education. Much of the new curriculum consisted of large lecture courses to hold down costs, eliminating the few remaining laboratories except in advanced courses.²⁵² In 1934, Clapp reluctantly approved requests for more graduate student assistants to teach courses otherwise unavailable to students for lack of faculty.²⁵³ The Department of History abandoned Spanish American, Canadian, and Ancient History, and Political Science combined State and Local Government with American Government. Even as he approved the requests, Clapp lamented that students "need contact with the best teachers and with experienced teachers." However, he had no recourse. As another example, language classes of up to one hundred became the rule despite protesting letters from across the country. Clapp poignantly instructed the Department to provide make-up sessions for students who failed to keep pace. He justified these extreme measures as the only way to protect an already inadequate salary schedule while also meeting student needs.²⁵⁴ Reform and reinvention entailed unintended consequences and unwelcome outcomes.²⁵⁵

Nonetheless, individual faculty members continued to search for new program opportunities with the potential to generate income as well. Professor Elrod and other faculty members

contributed lectures for nursing students at St. Patrick Hospital in Missoula, and Elrod suggested to President Clapp the development of a laboratory technician program.²⁵⁶ Aware of Clapp's skepticism about internships and practica, Elrod proposed to "offer credit for cadet work in the city hospitals for about one quarter, full time, with supervision such as . . . given in Education." Nothing resulted from his proposal at the time. In fact, the only relief from the constant pressure of declining resources and increasing student numbers came with the availability of federal funds for student employment on campus and to support correspondence study for students unable to come to campus.²⁵⁷

In 1934, in the hope of generating more state support, Clapp approved a report to inform the legislature concerning the contributions of distinguished State University alumni and the faculty.²⁵⁸ Harold Urey (1917), the future Nobel Laureate in Chemistry in 1935, headed the list of alumni, followed by Jeannette Rankin (1902), first Congresswoman in American history and peace advocate in 1917; Grant McGregor (1902), engineer; Clarence Streit (1919), Rhodes Scholar (1920), author, and journalist; Carl McFarland (1928), lawyer and Special Assistant to the U. S. Attorney General; Gordon Watkins (1914), University of California Professor of Economics; Justin Miller (1913), Dean of the University of Southern California and Duke University Schools of Law; Josiah J. Moore (1907), pathologist in Chicago; George Greenwood (1904), President of Seattle Pacific National Bank; and George Emerson Barnes (1902), the first University Rhodes Scholar and clergyman in Philadelphia.

The faculty members identified for noteworthy accomplishments included C. H. Clapp, Geologist, fundamental geological studies of western Montana; C. F. Deiss, Geologist, studies

of the Cambrian paleontology of the Northwest; M. J. Elrod, Biologist, studies of Flathead Lake; J. W. Howard, Chemist, research on halogen substituted alcohol; J. E. Kirkwood, Botanist, author of Rocky Mountain Trees and Shrubs; N. J. Lennes, Mathematician, author of an extensive series of mathematics text books; H. G. Merriam, English, editor of The Frontier and Midland, a literary journal, and expert on the literature of the Northwest; Paul C. Phillips, Historian, studies of the history of the Northwest and the fur trade; F. O. Smith, Psychologist, investigator of visual and auditory perception; and T. C. Spaulding, Forest and Range Management, a planner who supervised the development of state and federal relief work in Montana. In a handwritten note, Clapp observed that "I would rather substitute for my work, the name of Waters, C. J., Blister rust control on the white pine stand of the Northern Rocky Mts." With the comment, he included Waters in the list without excluding himself.

Clapp obviously took great pride in the accomplishments and the research and service of these alumni and faculty members. To enhance the research productivity of the State University, he approved sabbatical leaves and employed other means to encourage and support more faculty members who undertook advanced study or earned advanced degrees.²⁵⁹ As examples, Merriam studied at Columbia and in England for the doctorate, earned in 1939; Freeman conducted research on English literature in England, but never earned the PhD; Merrill and Miller went abroad to study international relations and statistics; and Clark completed the doctorate in Classical Studies at the University of Chicago. Louise Arnoldson went to France and completed the doctorate in French, bringing back to campus an exquisite collection of puppets she used to stage serious plays. She also played violin, an Amati crafted in 1643 that her family had owned for 150 years, and served as the first Concert Master for the University

orchestra in which she performed for three decades. Clapp's successor, G. Finlay Simmons, erroneously denied anything voluntary about the program: "The late President Clapp forced many to complete their Ph. D. or M. A. and M. S. degrees" and thereby greatly improved the profile of the faculty.²⁶⁰ The comment provided an apt indication of the stark contrast in style between Simmons and Clapp, who rarely found it necessary to resort to coercion.

The President's encouragement of scholarly engagement resulted in an array of studies illustrative of the promise and potential of the faculty and the State University. Professors Sidney Cox and Edmund Freeman collaborated on a collection of readings for literature courses entitled Prose Preferences in 1926, with a second edition in 1934, used on college campuses for many years.²⁶¹ They planned the anthology "'to disenchant through enchanting, to clarify through assisting the student to perceive the mixedness of life. We hope to activate the sense of humor through fun, whim, and the perception of irony.'" Professor Merriam prepared in mimeograph format a bibliography of promising Northwestern writers in 1933, later expanded and published in 1943 by Professor Rufus Coleman under the title of Northwest Books.²⁶²

In addition, Merriam initiated "English Notes," a monthly aid and guide to high school English Composition teachers which Professor Lucia Mirrielees continued for years.²⁶³ Mirrielees also became very influential in the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), subsequently elected as Second Vice President responsible for organizing the NCTE annual conference in Chicago in 1948. During summers, she taught "The Art of Teaching" at the celebrated Breadloaf Graduate Program in Creative Writing in Vermont, helped to establish the State Library Extension Commission in 1929, published extensively on teaching Composition and

Literature, and edited The Pacific Spectator, a philosophical and literary journal, during its existence. Known as a "meddler" on campus, she and Mary Brennan Clapp ultimately forced the male bastion of the Authors' Club, organized by Professors Lennes and Kirkwood, to admit them as regular members.

Lennes continued to revise and publish mathematics text books and added scholarly articles to his resume. Professor Harry Turney-High of Economics, Sociology, and Anthropology launched a series of ethnographical and linguistic studies of Montana Indians focused specifically on the Salish.²⁶⁴ Subsequent linguistic work by Montana faculty members expanded this project into a nationally recognized and comprehensive study of Salish language and ethnography. History Professor Paul Phillips edited the historical and cultural segment of Merriam's Frontier and Midland and became an expert on the exploration and fur trade of the Northwest.²⁶⁵ To foster and encourage scholarship, President Clapp and several faculty members helped to organize the Northwest Scientific Association in 1923, and Clapp served as its president in 1926-1928. His parting address, entitled "Natural Resources and International Problems," called for international cooperation to manage the sharing and use of increasingly scarce resources and expressed the hope for an alliance of nations to outlaw war as a means of resolving disputes.

IX

Of the faculty members who engaged in scholarly activity, Professor H. G. Merriam's accomplishments despite severe challenges laid bare the obstacles researchers encountered at the State University in the Depression years.²⁶⁶ Educated at the University of Wyoming (BA, 1905) and Oxford (BA, 1907) -- as a Rhode Scholar -- Merriam did graduate work at Oxford

(MA, 1912), Harvard, and then Columbia (1939, PhD); taught at several colleges and universities in the years from 1908 until he came to the State University of Montana in 1919 as Chair and Professor, Department of English;²⁶⁷ taught English for the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) in Paris to French officers during WW I; and the YMCA transferred him to London after the war where he assisted American service members to secure access to education in English universities. His academic standing by 1920 led to an offer for a similar position at Reed College with a salary of \$4,000, which Sisson promptly committed to match.²⁶⁸ An avid academic reformer and advocate of a liberal arts education (not essentially classical), Merriam helped to launch the effort that resulted in the radical reforms proposed by President Charles H. Clapp during the depths of the Depression. From 1919 until his death, he participated in the successful State University of Montana Rhodes Scholar program.²⁶⁹

In 1919, shortly after his arrival on campus, he took charge of a fledgling creative writing program and launched a new literary journal to publish the work of promising creative writing students.²⁷⁰ Over the years, he also changed the content and thrust of courses in literature in American colleges and universities by broadening the curricula to include American writers, particularly those either working in or focusing on the Northwest. Almost from the outset, he had to confront and overcome community objections about the content of both coursework and the new journal, threats of administrative censorship, and resource constraints. His espousal of creative writing did not, however, deter him from bringing the expertise of the Department of English to the high school composition teachers of the state through "English Notes," which Professor Lucia Mirrieles continued for years.²⁷¹ However, the literary journal became his preoccupation and cross to bear.

For the new journal, he chose the title of Montanan but changed to Frontier in 1920 because the State College used the former for a periodic newsletter.²⁷² At the same time, he altered the participation to promising writers --including students - - in the region and shifted to a regional rather than a state focus. On an occasion in 1922, a student poem that referred to a young woman's ankles and the language in an article by Professor Sidney H. Cox, who also taught creative writing, affronted some readers as well as the President and Chancellor and led to public criticism of the journal and the editor. While personally critical of the two pieces, Merriam nonetheless strongly opposed the President's suggestion of limiting the distribution of the journal, and he cautioned that word had somehow leaked of the President's inclination.²⁷³

Merriam denied having leaked Clapp's suggestion. However, because he agreed with the students and faculty about the chilling effect of a "suppression" on student "creative activity," he warned the President against taking that action. In response, he issued an ultimatum based on his position as editor that required him to "judge [the quality of the work accepted] or else [be] adjudged incompetent." Clearly, he viewed a negative decision "as a lack of confidence in him" as Professor, Chair, and editor, requiring his resignation. Clapp chose to acquiesce and avoid a crisis, despite the Chancellor's concerns. Two years later, however, he informed Merriam that the Chancellor had rejected a salary increase for Merriam because he considered him "cynical" and disloyal to both the President and the Chancellor.²⁷⁴ Merriam pledged to repair relations after he returned from sabbatical leave.

Managing the journal in Merriam's absence from campus in 1926, Professor Cox created a virtual firestorm when he accepted for publication a student piece with the term "son-of-a-bitch" prominently included.²⁷⁵ Although Clapp supported Cox, the Chancellor disavowed all further University responsibility for The Frontier.²⁷⁶ As parts of the resolution process, Cox accepted a position at Dartmouth and Merriam assumed ownership of the journal with agreement by Capp and Elliott for continuation of the small University subsidy.²⁷⁷ Chancellor Brannon complained that the Department of English caused "more disturbance" than "all other Departments" together.²⁷⁸ Believing that they had erred in retaining Cox earlier, he charged Clapp to make certain that Merriam identified a suitable faculty member as a replacement. To that end, he sent along the name of one he found highly qualified and appropriately sensitive to public concerns. Clapp followed through on all of the Chancellor's directives. More importantly, Merriam acquiesced in good spirit, expressing his appreciation for Clapp's support and Brannon's "handling of the rumpus," promising once again to do all in his power on return from sabbatical to improve relations with the Chancellor.²⁷⁹

Until after Clapp's death, the State University continued the subsidy for the journal that consisted of \$150 a year to send the journal to all state high school libraries and designated newspapers.²⁸⁰ In addition, the State University maintained an account to receive and disburse funds designated for The Frontier, allowed the use of University letterhead and some clerical assistance, and provided varying amounts of money annually to pay for copies to exchange with other universities in the United State and abroad. In addition, the State University retained the exchange copies until mailed and any excess in its inventory of publications. As it turned out, the exchange copies ultimately became a major cost issue and

Merriam did not have a reliable list of those colleges and universities that sent publications in exchange or even how many copies he needed for exchanges each year. As a result, by 1937, the inventory of back issues reached into the hundreds.²⁸¹ Merriam also paid little attention to the actuality of exchanges, with copies going to at least twenty-nine American universities and several in foreign countries, including Russia and the United Kingdom. Finally, Merriam also offered discounts to subscribers in order to maintain circulation and for a number of related academic purposes.²⁸²

In 1933, Merriam came to the rescue of another regional journal, Midland, suspended because of financial difficulties. He merged the subscriber lists of the two journals, changed the name to Frontier and Midland, and assumed all costs of production and mailing.²⁸³ Merriam sought to raise external funds to help support the journal, but with little success. In 1937, the Northern Pacific Railroad decided to end its advertising in the journal because of the low circulation (900 subscribers and another 600 for sale) and because of the alleged decision of the State University to cease support.²⁸⁴ Merriam urged Simmons to write to Nelson and clear up the issue of State University support. He feared other terminations if the NP stood firm, especially the Milwaukee Railroad, and he needed the revenue.

By 1937, however, Merriam's problems with President Simmons had placed the State University subsidy and thus the future of the journal in serious doubt.²⁸⁵ That controversy will receive full attention in the next chapter. Suffice it to say here that a group of faculty members including Merriam publicly opposed Simmons's appointment to replace Clapp in 1936. In addition, Simmons had inherited from Acting President Scheuch a very serious issue created

when the State Board banned from circulation, or use in courses, books such as Vardis Fisher's Passions Spin the Plot as inappropriate -- no further definition -- for young readers. Merriam believed that Simmons intended to impose censorship through a committee of faculty members to ban works on the basis of taste.²⁸⁶ On the other hand, Simmons believed that Merriam organized a letter writing campaign critical of Simmons for censorship which Simmons denied. Thus, relations between the two became quite difficult.

Nonetheless, Simmons continued to support The Frontier and Midland, authorizing Merriam to solicit external funds, paid the cost of mailing 1,000 copies, and at least listened to requests for more resources so as to maintain the journal and English Notes.²⁸⁷

During these lean years, with virtually no opportunity to recruit senior faculty members, the only option required identifying young people of promise and fostering their development.²⁸⁸ Merriam found it "almost incredible" that Clapp attracted so many talented young people who remained at the University for their entire careers, many of them also graduates of the State University. He mentioned specifically E. A. Atkinson (Psychology), W. P. Clark (Classical Languages), Helen Gleason (Home Economics), Robert C. Line (Business Administration), David Mason (Law), J. E. "Burley" Miller (History), Mike Mansfield (History), Lucia B. Mirrielees (English), Anne Platt (Home Economics), and G. D. Shellenbarger (Physics). In addition, Clapp recruited and collaborated with Charles Deiss ,who virtually built the Department of Geology before leaving for Indiana University, and John Crowder, who developed the School of Music before leaving.

Clapp also provided support for efforts to enliven the campus during the summers. In the late twenties, he assumed the responsibility as Director of the Summer Session and secured advertising assistance from the Missoula Chamber of Commerce and the railroads to attract out-of-state students to the Missoula.²⁸⁹ To make the campus even more attractive, he supported Merriam's conferences for creative writers in the summers of 1930 to 1934, inviting such distinguished writers to offer master classes as Vardis Fisher, Struthers Burt, Katherine Burt, Mary Austin, Fran Ernest Hill, Wilbur Daniel Steele, Joseph Kinsey Howard, Frank Linderman, and Lew Sarrett. Merriam's success in making The Frontier and Midland the literary journal of the Northwest provided the beacon attracting these accomplished people to Montana.²⁹⁰ As another direct result, Vardis Fisher taught on campus during the 1933-1934 academic year, Sarrett served as an Associate Editor of Merriam's journal, and Linderman lectured frequently on the campus. Clapp also made certain that the Summer School catered to teachers in and out of Montana desiring coursework to enhance their teaching.

Despite the challenges students faced, enrollments remained fairly robust throughout the Depression years, typical when jobs become scarce.²⁹¹ President Clapp secured National Youth Administration and Public Works Administration (PWA) funds to support small payments to students to work in Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) projects on the campus, the precursor of work-study funding in the 1960s.²⁹² For example, in 1935, his list of FERA and PWA projects included the Journalism (\$180,000), Indian (\$30,000), and Chemistry-Pharmacy (\$250,000) Buildings, a Residence Hall and Infirmary (\$165,000), a Chemistry storeroom (\$1,500), roofing (\$3,350), painting (\$1,800), brickwork (\$1,500), gym repair (\$1,000), and a Recreational Park (\$46,650), totaling \$700,650 and many involving work-study.²⁹³ Clapp also

included surveying projects, community pageants, and forestry field work in his FERA lists. The students themselves initiated a fee of fifty cents a quarter to bring to campus outstanding lecturers, artists, and performers and cooperated with the administration and the City of Missoula to broaden the reach of their limited funds. In addition, Clapp sought ways to involve students in the effort to plan and secure grants, a fervent believer in the academic benefits of student engagement.

President Clapp had developed during the late twenties a list of needed improvements for the "Physical Plant at the State University for the Decade 1930-1940," much the same as in 1928 and undoubtedly initiated for the anticipated bond issue in 1930, and these projects figured in mostly of his federal requests.²⁹⁴ The list included Women's Health and Gymnasium, Chemistry-Pharmacy, Journalism, Large Classroom, Green House, Home Economics Practice, and Bacteriology Buildings; an additional boiler and added steam tunnels and lines for the Heating Plant; additional water mains; renovations to the Old Science and Library stacks; and funds for land acquisitions -- some already secured by notes from the University -- all funded by the state. With other funds, Clapp proposed further land acquisitions, including the payment for the Golf Course acquired with debt earlier and a Women's Athletic Field, and an auditorium large enough to accommodate the students and faculty in convocation, a student unions, and three new dormitories. The grand total amounted to \$1,815,000, \$993,000 from the state.

As one of the few sources of optimism and good feelings during this period of financial turmoil, the State University aggressively undertook to construct new facilities, beautify the campus, and repair and renovate the older facilities with the assistance of federal grants and loans.

President F. D. Roosevelt's program of public works provided grants and loans for community and municipal projects of various kinds.²⁹⁵ Clapp revised his list of projects endlessly to fit program criteria after the court invalidated the bonding on a technicality and another source of funding became imminently available. In contrast to his colleague at the State College who moved slowly to secure federal funds, President Clapp explored every seeming possibility with the assistance of students and Forestry Dean Thomas C. Spaulding who managed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds for relief work in Missoula County.²⁹⁶

By early 1932, Clapp had five self-liquidating projects in the planning stages, all with student involvement, and he intended to proceed with the first two: A men's residence hall, a Student Union Building (SUB), a facility to house three fraternities and another for three sororities, and an Infirmary with fifty beds.²⁹⁷ The SUB had surfaced years earlier and garnered increasing support during the twenties. The University needed the men's residence hall for incoming freshmen men, planned for 125 men located adjacent to South Hall, but Clapp dropped the fraternity and sorority houses because of opposition within the Missoula community.²⁹⁸

These projects required state authorization of both the specific proposals and the plan for repayment of the associated federal loans.²⁹⁹ As it turned out, the State University relied on several sources of funds as collateral, including user fees, student building fees, and land grant revenue, the latter after the state Supreme Court overruled the earlier prohibition on that use of land grant revenue.³⁰⁰ In 1932, the state Supreme Court also upheld a 1929 statute allowing the State Board of Education to construct residence halls on campus on conditions of 1) no commitment of state funds and 2) no impact on title to the land.³⁰¹ On the basis of several

test cases, University Council J. C. Garlington assured Clapp's successor, George Finlay Simmons, in 1936 that the state emergency legislation and the reversal of the decision concerning the use of land grant revenue arguably reinforced the State Board's authority to borrow and pledge revenue to construct both academic and other needed University facilities. To expedite the process, Clapp requested assistance from his former Secretary and future University President Carl McFarland, then serving in the U.S. Department of Justice.³⁰² The construction of the first SUB on the Missoula campus began in 1934, after prolonged but nonetheless fruitful negotiations.

As early as 1913, the Kaimin had featured a news story urging the construction of a student union to provide space for student activities.³⁰³ Discussions continued over the years, always futile because no funding source existed. Several people, including President and Mrs. Clapp and Professors Elrod and Jesse doggedly supported the project, and Clapp and the State Board approved a student fee of one dollar per student each quarter to build up a fund to help with the financing.³⁰⁴ Clap also suggested a larger fee at the appropriate time to assure repayment of the federal loan without fail. By 1932, Clapp with his assistants and the student committee had developed the facility plans to include a large auditorium and a large ballroom as well as space for student organizations and activities at an estimated cost of \$300,000. Built nearly as planned, the SUB became the largest building on the campus and the first of its kind funded by the federal Public Works Administration under the National Industrial Recovery Act. Clapp secured state and State Board approval of the project and the funding, with the required caveat of no state funds for construction or repayment of the loan. Clapp personally presented the request in Washington, D.C.

As usual with federal projects, it took far more time than anyone expected to complete the negotiations and turn the first shovel of dirt. The PWA required statutory action by the state and approval by the State Board of Education as well as a decision by the State Supreme Court in a friendly suit to establish the need to move forward without the usual delay to allow a possible referendum on the matter.³⁰⁵ Finally, in early 1934, the PWA authorized a \$60,000 grant and \$240,000 loan and, on July 24th, the President turned the first shovel of dirt. According to the revised financing plan, the loan amounted to \$203,000, with a grant of \$37,000 and the total cost including interest projected to 1963 estimated at \$331,500.³⁰⁶ Future earnings of the facility provided assurance of roughly \$90,000 for the SUB.

Perhaps presciently, President Clapp seized the occasion to talk directly to the students:

Although I disagree strongly with such pessimistic philosophy as that written by James Harvey Robinson, -- "Suspicion and hate are more congenial to our nature than love, for very obvious reasons in this world of rivalry and common failure" -- nevertheless, I do believe that we learn to live with one another successfully only by training and experience, which is education. And I do believe that the promotion, by providing the opportunity, of successful human relationships is one of the great tasks of education.³⁰⁷

In that spirit, he celebrated the new Student Union Building as a venue to foster "the wise use of leisure time and the improvement of man's relationship to man," the two greatest challenges of the modern era.

Unfortunately, Clapp died in May 1935 before the completion of construction and missed the dedication during Homecoming that fall. The students tentatively adopted the name "Memorial Hall" and planned to change it later to honor President Clapp. According to Merriam, however, Clapp wanted no buildings named for him.³⁰⁸ Tanya Smith suggested that the lack of a formal naming policy on campus ultimately prevented the renaming, but that had not stopped other naming proposals. In any event, the new facility remained the SUB until replaced in the 1950s by the Lodge, when the SUB became the Fine Arts Building, stirring some new controversy on campus.³⁰⁹

Nonetheless, Clapp's many initiatives, most of them continued by his successor after his death in 1935, results in a transformation of the campus. Leaving aside the FERA work-study and beautification projects, then facility additions between 1929 and 1943 included the SUB and Auditorium, Journalism Building, Fine Arts (Women's) Building, Women's Residence Hall, Chemistry-Pharmacy Building, and the Natural Science Addition. Funding included \$344,460 in federal grants, \$225,000 in a private loan, and \$556,236 in fee revenue and University funds.³¹⁰

IX

Despite the gloomy economic conditions, campus life became ever more vibrant and diverse during the Clapp years. Three major annual events competed for primacy, the Foresters', Barristers', and Military Balls, with the first requiring the most presidential attention because of the antics of the Forestry students and their guests.³¹¹ The Clapps joined in the festivities, with the President attending one year dressed as a gambler and carrying and guzzling from a flask of soda, a wonderful way to keep a close eye on things, but not necessarily the best example for students. Despite the diligent efforts of the administration, or perhaps because of

Clapp's unfortunate example, students found ways to enjoy themselves and minor incidents involving alcohol continued.

In part as an activity likely to engage students, Clapp encouraged Physics Professor G. Shallenberger to construct the first radio station on a college campus in Montana. KUOM took to the airwaves on Charter Day in 1925, powered by 500 watts.³¹² By 1926, it included coverage of the weather, fire conditions, athletic events, and classical music concerts. Future University President Carl McFarland directed the weekly educational programs for KUOM and involved other students and faculty members. According to various reports, people praised the reception and the programs from as far away as Alaska, Florida, all along the West Coast, and New York City.

The Kaimin continued its vigorous voice for students, reporting campus events and celebrating their value to the students. Student editor Jack Moriarity warred with the Missoulain during 1923-1924 because of its editorial stance against the University. His campaign greatly increased the circulation of the Kaimin, and Mary Brennan Clapp noted that he cleared his editorials with President Clapp to assure he had timely and correct information.³¹³ She also primly condemned a number of fugitive student publications, such as the Press Club's Incinerator and Aber Day Campus Rakings as typically "in need of expurgation." She conceded that the latter "was really funny," but too often lapsed into "'naughty boy and girl gossip." Apparently the President's occasional reprimand had only a temporary effect at best.

Mary Brennan Clapp also recounted many of President Clapp's efforts to maintain good relations with the students. He chose his assistants from among the students and entrusted

them with important work.³¹⁴ He also encouraged other administrators to employ students and give them real task, and he involved student leaders on various committees, such as the SUB Executive Committee. With the new gymnasium built in 1922, intramural athletics became not only possible but very popular, with over a thousand students participating annually in the 1920s, compared to less than 200 earlier. To meet student needs, Clapp expanded the Health Service and sought to include counseling, financed with a modest student fee and made possible by cooperation with the Missoula hospitals and doctors; appointed the very experienced Harriet Rankin Sedman, sister of Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, as Dean of Women to enhance the quality and responsiveness of the professional services; personally welcomed students at the beginning of each year; maintained an open door for students, faculty, and staff; and involved student leaders in all public convocations. To protect places for current students in the face of the ever increasing numbers of new freshmen, Clapp introduced advanced registration in 1922. At the same time, he insisted upon student responsibility for their actions, good and bad, with fair hearings and equitable sanctions for those accused of violating the rules, but typically involving sanctions informed by the assumption that the recipients of the discipline intended to amend their ways.

Adding to the activities on campus, Clapp authorized the remodeling of Simpkins Hall, the former SATC facility of WW I, into the first Little Theatre in Montana and the largest in the Northwest.³¹⁵ Drama had its first tentative start during the Craig years, and the opening of the Little Theatre fostered a blossoming under the direction of Professor Carl Glick.³¹⁶ The Little Theatre also became the home of the student Masquers' productions until new space became available in the SUB in 1935. The Theatre opened with three performances of Porter Emerson

Browne's 1920 play "The Bad Man" with every seat sold. The new facility also featured the first cooperative Drama and Music project with the presentation of Gilbert and Sullivan's "H.M.S. Pinafore" in 1927. Over the next few years, such theatrical luminaries as Alexander Dean (Yale), John Mason Brown (New York), Barnard Hewitt (Illinois), Lennox Robinson (Abby Theater, Dublin), Maurice Brown (Chicago), and Ellen Van Volkenburg (Chicago) graced the stage with performances or lectures. The State University's Little Theatre also hosted the first production in English of Leonid Andreyev's "He Who Gets Slapped," with Maurice Brown and Ellen Van Valkenburg in the leading roles. In a very real way, the Little Theatre brought cultural variety and intellectual excitement to Missoula.

Intercollegiate athletics achieved some successes as well, especially in track and field with two members on the NCAA Honor Roll, and the University maintained its membership in the Pacific Coast Conference (PAC).³¹⁷ Baseball lost its allure, largely because of the weather conditions and timing, and the University abandoned it. Football had several coaches, Bernie Bierman (more successful at Minnesota), J. W. Stewart, Earl (Click) Clark, Frank Milburn (who cleaned house at Clapp's directive), Bernie Oakes, and Doug Fessenden, but had few successes against PAC rivals. On the other hand, during the Clapp years, the Grizzlies bested the Bobcats eight times, tied once, and lost only twice, with the games played in Butte after 1923. Interestingly, the Executive Council intervened and decided to move the game to Butte to avoid the vandalism and related problems in Bozeman and Missoula.³¹⁸ Fans and students traveled by special trains from Bozeman and Missoula, with the Deans of Men and Women riding shotgun. Notable players included Ted Inman, Russ Sweet, "Wild Bill" Kelly -- perhaps the best football

player in Montana history to that time who played professional football before his untimely death in 1926 -- and Milton Popovich from Butte, another star.

In the mid-thirties, the Conference suspended the State University from football competition because of inadequate budgets, crowds, and facilities and some allegations about a "slush fund" to support the players maintained by downtown boosters.³¹⁹ Clapp denied the allegations, but recognized the funding and facility problems. In 1935, a group of Helena alumni adopted a resolution and sent it to President Clapp urging the elimination of all major sports at the Montana State University because of cost and lack of competitiveness, statements described by Alex B. Cunningham, for Athletics, as an inaccurate and not reflective of alumni sentiment.³²⁰ The petition went nowhere, as the program continued to attract supporters.

President George Finlay Simmons, Clapp's Successor, succeeded in reversing the Conference suspension for the 1940 and 1941 seasons.³²¹ During most of the period, the Faculty Athletics Committee and Associated Students Athletic Board oversaw the program managed in Health and Physical Education by a graduate student manager and the coaches.³²² Until his health failed, Clapp, Speer, and the coaches collaborated in assuring that the program respected NCAA and PAC rules. Plans for adequate facilities lay dormant through the lean years of the Depression and WW II.

The 1936-1937 Intercollegiate Athletics budgets revealed a great deal about the magnitude and success of the programs.³²³ Football, basketball, and track, respectively, had incomes of \$25,846, \$5,500, and \$4, 639, and expenditures of \$25,847, \$5,452, and \$4,571, with an overall

positive balance. The budgets did not include grants-in-aid or operation and maintenance of facilities, but these distributed costs accrued seventy percent to football, fifteen percent to basketball, and fifteen percent to track. Although unstated, the subsidies undoubtedly exceeded the reported expenditures by a significant margin. Student Athletic Fee revenue amounted to \$12,200, with \$4,300 to football, \$4,000 to basketball, and \$3,800 to track. Gate receipts and guarantees totaled \$26,540, with \$22,350 from football, \$4,015 from basketball, and \$175 from track.

President Simmons commented that friends -- especially Missoula businesses -- alumni, and students helped with the challenge of maintaining "an athletic program which must be largely self-supporting in a sparsely populated state unable to furnish large crowds or build the large athletic budgets under which our competitors operate."³²⁴ The list of identified expenses totaled \$35,870, with identified income of \$12,200 from student fee revenue and \$26,540 from gate receipts and guarantees for a total of \$38,740, leaving a positive balance of \$2,870 to help with the unidentified expenses. During these years, salary expenditures for Athletics accounted for just under five percent of total University salaries.³²⁵ While the number of programs and magnitudes of the expenditures have changed over the years, as have the sizes of crowds, quality of facilities, and donations from friends and alumni, the challenge remains very much the same after three-quarters of a century.³²⁶

Twelve credits of Physical Education and Military Drill became and remained a graduation requirement for male students in 1917, with females required to complete six credits of Physical Education.³²⁷ The military drill consisted of roughly five hours a week for two years,

instructing about 200 students at a time. In 1922, the State University and State College faculties voted to discontinue ROTC, initiated in 1919, but Clapp held the recommendation pending promised changes in the program by the War Department. He and the faculty refused to recognize military drill as collegiate level work.³²⁸ Accordingly, he declined to appoint a Director of the Program until it included more than drill. He also took pains to explain to the War Department that the Kaimin misstated his position, since he had no objection to a ROTC program that consisted predominately of academic work with some drill.³²⁹

Within a month, the War Department acquiesced and approved a recommendation to devote "maximum effort on theoretical classroom instruction, . . . [including] only such practice drill . . . as gives real promise," to arrange a schedule that corresponded with the regular University course schedule, and to require the Director of the Program to consult with a University "Military Advisory Committee."³³⁰ In 1922, Clapp appointed the Committee of three faculty members, agreed to department status for ROTC and the provision of appropriate space and some matching funds for operations, and accepted the War Department's two nominees as Director and Assistant Director.³³¹ The President committed the faculty to assure welcome and support to make the program work.

Over the years, the ROTC requirement generated only passing concern until the decade of the thirties. In 1933, Clapp had a series of exchanges with various external groups seeking either voluntary ROTC or exemptions for conscientious objectors. The Commission on World Peace urged consideration for the beliefs and scruples of Methodists as well as Quakers.³³² At the State University, Clapp replied, only the faculty had the authority to provide exemptions and

had done so across the board for veterans, but the policy allowed others to qualify only on very strict terms. Before elaborating, Clapp offered his personal opinion that anyone educated at the public expense had an obligation to serve and three hours a week hardly seemed to him as onerous. Further, "I cannot conceive that it can be considered militaristic or anti-pacific . . . [to require a] slight acquaintance . . . with military history and . . . methods of warfare," most likely a deterrence to war. Moreover, he thought the incidental side effects of mandatory ROTC admirable, i.e., "self-discipline, gentlemanly conduct, . . . recognition of obligation of the citizen to his national and community duty," and the like. The President sounded quite unenthusiastic about exemptions.

Clapp explained that University policy, approved by the faculty, allowed exemption only to students, aside from veterans, who took an oath affirming objection to all war based in conscience. Objection to a particular war failed the test, and did mere rhetoric. Each applicant succeeded or failed on the merits of his case. However, Clapp added that he personally counseled every applicant that he considered it an error in judgment to seek exemption.

World peace became possible only if people stood ready and willing to fight to maintain it; he thought "personal liberty" merited risking one's life. To refuse to fight "under any condition" invited abuse and war. The President left little room for doubt or argument. He had demanded collegiate level work to justify the ROTC requirement, and he intended to enforce the requirement, subject to University policy.

In pursuit of his support for ROTC, Clapp sent letters to the Montana delegation in 1934 opposing as highly "unjust and unfair" the petition of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges

asking Congress to allocate PWA funds to build armories only on member campuses.³³³ He urged support for every institution hosting a ROTC program, not a select few. Senator John Erickson immediately agreed and pledged to seek PWA funds for a State University armory. He understood that the War Department had requested \$22,000,000 for seventy armories on college campuses. Clapp immediately secured State Board approval of his plan to provide the land, maintain the armory, and make it available during emergencies for federal purposes.³³⁴ The Secretary of War ultimately assured Clapp of his support for nondiscriminatory assistance for all ROTC programs on an equal basis. In anticipation of a grant for the State University, Clapp worked with an architect on the design of an armory, but President Roosevelt rejected all "earmarking" of PWA funds and ended the project.³³⁵

After Clapp's death in 1935, the Student Committee for Voluntary ROTC (seven students) published "An Open Letter to the Faculty" in the Kaimin reviewing the arguments for and against mandatory ROTC. They pointed out that most military experts agreed about the lower costs and increased efficiency of voluntary ROTC.³³⁶ The letter mistakenly cited Clapp as opposed to "military training," unaware that he opposed "military drill," not "military training" with an academic component. The students claimed that on two earlier occasions during the twenties efforts similar to theirs came close to succeeding, especially the one in 1922. They did not mention that Clapp opposed the effort in 1922 once the War Department altered the curriculum. In a response designed to demonstrate that MSU's status as a land-grant institution required military training, the Acting Professor reviewed the federal land grant which resulted in an endowment of \$494,938 in 1939, with \$22,000 annually to support the institution.³³⁷ President Simmons ignored the land grant argument and appointed a

committee, consisting only of supporters, which, according to Louise J. Armsby, the President's Secretary, never filed a report.³³⁸ However, Simmons responded to Montana Adjutant General John W. Mahan that "We are very pleased to have the endorsement you sent us on the continuation in its present form of our ROTC program."³³⁹ That ended the opposition to mandatory ROTC with war looming in Europe. To date in 1938, the State University ROTC program had commissioned 146 officers for the country's citizen army.

During the twenties and thirties, Clapp explored a variety of initiatives and programs to link alumni and the public in general to the University. In that regard, however, he thought it unbecoming and fruitless for a President to travel around the state "selling" the University, although he assigned that obligation to the Chancellor. As Merriam observed, Clapp believed good work spoke for itself and boasting only incited criticism.³⁴⁰ Identifying and associating outstanding people with the University struck Clapp as an excellent means of gaining meaningful and lasting recognition. To that end, he orchestrated a renewal of the process of selecting distinguished people for honorary degrees awarded during Commencement or on other appropriate occasions. He welcomed recommendations from any source. Final approval, however, required the endorsement of the faculty, President, and State Board, and the procedures required strict confidentiality to prevent misunderstandings and injured feelings in the event of rejections.

During Commencement in 1925, the State University awarded the first honorary degree since 1913 to Charles M. "Charlie" Russell, over his personal objections.³⁴¹ According to Mary Brennan Clapp, a participant in and recorder of the ceremony, criticism across the state

reflected the view of Walter Prescott Webb that Montanans idolized Russell and exaggerated the quality of his art. She responded that "Montanans do not wish to idealize and exaggerate the work," but fervently intended to preserve it. Russell's humility, even embarrassment, at this recognition squashed the opposition.

Between 1925 and 1935, the State University awarded eight honorary doctorates to Montanans who had earned distinction and provided role models for young people. The list included Frank Bird Linderman (writer and ethnologist), John Hurst Durston (journalist), Frank E. Bonner (forester), James M. Hamilton (educator and former President of the State College), Emil A. Starz (pharmacist), Guy E. Sheridan (metallurgist), and Harold C. Urey (chemist). Only C. H. McLeod, Missoula Mercantile, declined to accept an honorary degree "for the reason that I cannot bring myself to believe that I have earned recognition of this character."³⁴² Clapp and the faculty based the honor to McLeod on his consistent efforts to develop western Montana and Montana higher education. Given McLeod's warm support for the University, his refusal did not deflect from Clapp's unstated objective of merit by association.

Class reunions also contributed to institutional well being by keeping the alumni connected with the University. Initially established in 1919 but interrupted during the twenties because of transportation challenges and the absence of communication linkages with the alumni, Homecoming gave way for a time to reunions in conjunction with the annual Grizzly-Bobcat game.³⁴³ In 1932, several articles reviewed the history of reunions, with the number increasing during the twenties. A photograph taken from east of Main Hall shows the original Dornblazer Stadium and a few buildings, with the Oval very prominent. The 1932 reunion

occurred in Missoula after the annual football contest, with others at various locations in other years: 1914 after the annual game; 1915, after the Syracuse game; 1919, after the Washington State game; 1921, after the North Dakota State game; 1922 through 1926, joint reunions with MSC after the annual game; and 1928, after the Washington game. The press coverage provided corroboration for Clapp's strategy.

As another source of prestige through association, Clapp pursued institutional distinction by attracting not only students from other states but also international exchange students. The first international student, Alex Stepanzoff, arrived in 1924, on an athletic scholarship through the Rhodes Scholarship at Clapp's invitation.³⁴⁴ Stepanzoff, with four other Russian students, founded the International Student Club that year, an organization that grew slowly and took different forms over the years.³⁴⁵ Stepanzoff earned a bachelor's degree from the State University in 1927, a Ph.D. in Banking and Finance from Columbia University (1939), and then returned to reside in Missoula until his death. He served for many years as the Missoula Band Director, manager of the Bon Ton Bakery (financed by his father-in-law), a member of the University's Local Executive Board, and received an honorary doctorate from The University of Montana in 1995. However, international students at Montana, as at other institutions, did not increase dramatically in numbers until after WW II and the advent of programs promoting student exchange, including the Fulbright Programs for U. S. students and scholars and the International Student Exchange Program.³⁴⁶

With the encouragement and the direct assistance of Professor H. G. Merriam and others, Clapp had a great deal more success in the annual competition for Rhodes Scholarships.³⁴⁷

Candidates for the Rhodes Scholarship competed as Montana residents against other candidates from their states of residence in Rhodes Scholarship Districts in the United States, wherever they attended college. A Rhodes Scholarship carried a small stipend and huge prestige. The initial success of the State University in the Rhodes competition with George Barnes (1904, Divinity) and James R. Thomas (1907, Geology) ended the University awards until 1919, with the competition suspended during WW I.

H. G. Merriam, a Rhodes Scholar himself before WW I, became Secretary of the Montana Rhodes Scholar Committee in 1919 when he joined the State University faculty. Later, he served as a member of the District Committee with its headquarters in Spokane, Washington. Without question, Merriam provided the impetus for a Rhodes revival at the State University. In a variety of different roles, he remained the driving force behind the very successful University campaign to graduate Rhodes Scholars even after his retirement in 1954.³⁴⁸ James E. "Burly" Miller assumed leadership of the State University Rhodes Committee in 1919, succeeded over the years by equally energetic and committed faculty members.

President Clapp also took a very active role in the Rhodes selection process on campus and in the state, District, and across the country.³⁴⁹ Between 1919 and 1962, the State University had the enviable record of graduating twenty-seven successful candidates in the national competition, five of them during the Clapp years. During those years, the State College also had two successful graduates and eight of the winners did not attend a Montana public institution. Success in the Rhodes competition reflected the dedication and talent of the

winning candidates rather than the status of the institution, but no one has ever over-estimated the benefit accruing to the institutions from which the winners graduated.

XI

The death of Charles H. Clapp ended an era of harmony and achievement at the State University despite the difficult times. Much of the credit for the good relationships among students, faculty, and administration rightly went to Clapp himself. While minor incidents occurred, such as the legislative investigation of the Alumni Challenge Athletic Field Corporation in 1934, none of them escalated because of the President's forthcoming responses. Merriam characterized him aptly as a "modest man" who inspired the students and faculty to join him in the work of building a strong university.³⁵⁰ Both the faculty and students sensed his awareness of and commitment to their welfare and that he worked diligently to provide an environment supportive of their aspirations. A lingering and recurrent affliction with enteritis and bacillary dysentery, perhaps contacted during his summer treks into the wilderness to conduct geological studies, ultimately claimed his life just before completing his fourteenth year in the presidency.³⁵¹

During the last year of his presidency, much of which he spent in the hospital, he attempted to administer the University from his sick bed. Predictably, a significant amount of the necessary administrative work either fell between the cracks or into other less capable hands. Perhaps of even greater importance, during this period, with no vice president to take the reins, the Budget and Policy Committee and its Chairman began to act as the executive of the campus. Professor Scheuch had the title of vice president but no authority unless specifically delegated

by the President.³⁵² H. H. Swain, Executive Secretary of the State Board, also lacked decisional authority and served primarily as a liaison between the Board and the Committee, conveying budget and other materials to the Board and relaying directives to the Chairman of the Committee.³⁵³

This unfortunate interlude sharpened the faculty perception of decisional rather than advisory authority on the campus. Moreover, the brief period of a vacuum in executive leadership stirred the interest and ambition of some long-term faculty members. Professor J. P. Rowe, Chairman of the Budget and Policy Committee, proposed himself as Interim President for the duration of an indefinite leave of absence for Clapp, and, that failing, suggested an executive triumvirate of himself, Vice President Scheuch, and Dean R. H. Jesse to administer the University.³⁵⁴ The Board rejected both proposals and advised Scheuch to exercise more authority as Vice President, but with no definite guidance. Named Acting President when Clapp died, Scheuch shrewdly appointed five senior Professors and two long-time Deans to the committee to advise the State Board on the search for a new President, explaining later that he deliberately included "most of those who either wanted to become president or felt themselves entitled to the job."³⁵⁵ Whatever Scheuch's motives and the aspirations of the senior faculty members, these developments spelled trouble for whomever took the helm.

Those who knew Clapp immediately liked and admired him.³⁵⁶ He surrounded himself with a few people devoted to him and who served him and the institution well: Louise J. Armsby, sister of Judge William Jameson and an alumna who worked several years in the Registrar's Office before becoming Clapp's Secretary in 1933 and continued in that role for five Presidents

and four Acting Presidents until 1965;³⁵⁷ future Judge William Jameson and future Presidents Carl McFarland and Robert Pantzer all served while undergraduates as his executive assistant; Thomas G. Swearingen began as Campus Engineer for Clapp and served even longer than Armsby; and J. B. Speer, who left in frustration when Duniway departed for Wyoming, pursued an advanced degree, and returned at Clapp's invitation to assume a host of roles, from Registrar to Business Manager to Controller, making his most significant contribution with his untiring effort to acquire land for the University.

Upon Clapp's death, the irascible McFarland spoke of his "blessed memory." As Merriam remembered, the students praised his "amiability which won him a place in the hearts of thousands of students he had known since 1921, a remarkably keen foresight and the principles of toleration, freedom and eager friendship in abundance."³⁵⁸ According to Merriam, the faculty welcomed his tolerance and fairness which "lightened their responsibilities and made consultation with him friendly. His courage was heartening. His leadership carried them in continuous and loyal endeavor." One contemporary wrote poetically of Clapp shortly after his death:

He was a man great in mind, spirit, and feeling,
To adventure in science, metaphysics, or art,
So that he went far and past desolate places,
And found an anchorage storms could not destroy.³⁵⁹

F. C. Scheuch spoke with reverence and piety on the occasion of Clapp's death: "His death takes from us one who was outstanding as an educator, the greatest loss to the State and its University. A man of great leadership."³⁶⁰ Even those words failed to convey his admiration and affection for the longest serving president to date, "A sympathetic and loyal friend, and

honest scholar, and whose work for the University will ever be remembered." Out of concern for Clapp's family -- spouse and seven children -- and the lack of a retirement system for the University, Scheuch and J. B. Speer sought to extend Clapp's salary beyond the legal limit of 1 July 1935.³⁶¹ However, Executive Secretary H. H. Swain refused to go beyond 1 September, acknowledging, however, the possibility of a challenge to even that extension.³⁶²

Scheuch and the faculty then developed an appropriate tribute to Clapp with the establishment of fee waivers for the Clapp children to assure their access to higher education.³⁶³ The State Board denied their request because of the bad precedent; too long and too indefinite. Instead, without consulting the State Board, Swain proposed an instructor position for Mrs. Clapp in the Department of English and some other "local arrangements." Under the arrangements, Scheuch committed the State University to "take care" of the Clapp children as they sought admission to the University, and he promptly issued the contract to Mrs. Clapp, continued until the mid-1950s.³⁶⁴ Interestingly enough, in 1935 President Clapp made a similar local arrangement for the daughter and spouse of Professor Morton J. Elrod when Elrod suffered a paralytic stroke a year earlier.³⁶⁵

The Missoulian commemorated radical reforms Clapp initiated in 1930, even if never fully implemented.³⁶⁶ The State University students adopted a resolution indicating appreciation for his student-centered administration:

We will never be able to express the depth of our regret in the loss of President Clapp.

In his passing, we lost a man who was always fighting for the best interests of this

university. We appreciate, better than any one, his untiring efforts to make this school

a better place. He was an educator of marked ability. But more than that, he was a staunch, warm-hearted friend upon whom we could ever depend to forgive and prevent our mistakes. The results of his work and the influence of his kindly care will always be with us.

But former President Edward O. Sisson made perhaps the most appropriate, encompassing, and certainly the most prescient comment when Clapp accepted the presidency in 1921, borrowing from founding President Oscar John Craig: "It is a safe prophecy that under President Clapp's guidance 'the University will prosper.' The greatness of its new possibilities will be matched by the capacity of the new executive." ³⁶⁷

PREFACE

¹ Morton J. Elrod, "Many Changes in the City Are Told by Elrod," Missoulian (29 January 1922), pp. 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14; and Merriam, History, p. 182, on Craig's epigram, with slightly different wording. For Joseph M. Dixon's comment on a "Harvard in Missoula," "Governor Pledges Support in Eliminating Friction Between State's Colleges," Missoulian (13 January 1914), pp. 1, 10, MJE, S5, B26, F17.

² K. Ross Toole, Montana: Uncommon Land (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959), pp. 243-44.

³ See "Trump's lies unprecedented for modern candidate," Missoulian (12 September 2016), p. A3.

⁴ David Brooks, The Road to Character (New York: Random House, 2015), passim.

⁵ Robert E. Knoll, Prairie University: A History of the University of Nebraska (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), pp. 13-15, for the use of the term "Frontier" to refer to the formative years. Also George M. Dennison, Montana's Pioneer Naturalist: Morton J. Elrod (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press), "Introduction and ch. 1.

⁶ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, chs. 2-5.

⁷ H.G. Merriam, The University of Montana: A History (Missoula: University of Montana Press, 1970), chs. IX-XIII.

⁸ This history will provide the first comprehensive coverage of this period. For some discussion, see George M. Dennison, "Higher Education in Montana, 1950-1993," Montana Magazine of Western History 44 (#2; Spring, 1994): pp. 65-72; George M. Dennison, "Financing Public Higher Education in Montana, 1990-2006: Unfulfilled Responsibilities, Funding Shortfalls, and Shifting Burdens," The Montana Professor 17 (# 2; Spring 2007): pp. 2-13; and George M. Dennison, "Public Higher Education in Montana, 1893 to 2008," forthcoming as a chapter in Rick & Suzie Graetz, This is Montana, II, copy in author's possession.

⁹ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, passim.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ See the Mary Brennan Clapp Papers for brief biography at <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv28048>. Also Mary Brennan Clapp, "Narrative of Montana State University, 1893-1935," 1958, "Preface" and "Acknowledgements," typescript copies in The K. Ross Toole Archives, The Maureen and Mansfield Library, The University of Montana, and author's possession. Also various letters and memoranda concerning the "Narrative" from 1950 to the early 1960s, all commending the valuable information it contains but concerned about revision and editing; esp. Frank C. Abbott to Dr. George F. Weisel, 29 November 1963; Jack Ryan to Dr. Abbott, 14 October 1963; Frank C. Abbott to President Newburn, 11 June, 28 September, and 2 October 1962; President Newburn to Frank C. Abbott, 20 October 1962; President H. K. Newburn, "Memo For the Files," 12 January 1960; LJA (Lucille J. Armsby) to President Newburn, 16 August 1960; and Lucille J. Armsby, "Re: Montana State University History," 13 August 1958, with attachments, all RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"Archives - University- History of (Mrs. Mary B. Clapp)." Clapp produced a final draft in 1958 but withdrew it after receiving harsh objections, as see Mrs. C. H. Clapp to Dr. Abbott, 26 June 1962, in the referenced file. The draft re-surfaced in the 1990s when her descendants inquired about publication and placed a copy in The K. Ross Toole Archives and another in the author's possession. The manuscript remains unpublished.

¹² On Merriam, see the brief biography in H. G. Merriam Papers, 1890-1980," at <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv78663>.

¹³ Norman Taylor, Director of Research, "Foreword," Merriam, History, p. v.

¹⁴ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. 3. Also President Robert T. Pantzer to Thomas Collins, Foundation Director, 29 July 1970, instructions to print Merriam's book; various letters from Pantzer to legislators, former Presidents, friends, etc., with copies of Merriam's book; and Tom Collins, Foundation Director, to Cal Murphy, Business Manager, 23 November 1970, Merriam's book cost \$3,821.45, including a \$1,500 stipend for Merriam; President R. T. Pantzer to Frank C. Clapp, 30 December 1970, enclosing a copy of Merriam's book, the only history in existence, but mentioned Mary Brennan Clapp's earlier but abortive effort, wishing "I had been on the scene to try to correct that," although he made no effort to rescue Clapp's manuscript, all RG1, PO, S15, B196, F"1970-1971-Foundation (general)."

¹⁵ Merriam, History, passim. Also, for the contract and for Pantzer's recommendations to give credit to the Foundation as the source of information, seeing "no reason to make such mention" of Mary Brennan Clapp, doubting any problems with defamation of character (which Clapp had encountered), and suggesting K. Ross Toole to do the "Foreword," President Robert T. Pantzer to Dr. H. G. Merriam, 9 January 1968 and 16 October 1969, RG30, HR, F"Merriam, Harold G." And President Robert T. Pantzer to Representative Norris Nichols, 4 January 1971, enclosing a copy of the Merriam book, "basically correct," RG1, PO, S15, B196, F"1970-1971 President Pantzer Legislature."

¹⁶ H. G. Merriam to President Edward O. Sisson, 17 August 1919, RG30, HR, F"Merriam, H. G."

¹⁷ George F. Simmons, "Envy and Hatred In A Small Western University: The Life and Letters of Finlay Simmons (1895-1955), Part 19 A-B: 1935-1939," Part19B, p. 166, written to vindicate his father's administration, copies in The K. Ross Toole Archives, Mike and Mansfield Library, The University of Montana, and author's possession.

¹⁸ Merriam, History, p. xi, on Freeman.

¹⁹ Morton J. Elrod, "Many Changes in the City Are Told by Elrod," Missoulian (29 January 1922), pp. 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14; and Merriam, History, p. 182, on Craig's epigram, with slightly different wording. For controversy caused by the designation of Craig as the "founding President," see Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I, p. 67.

INTRODUCTION

¹ Various issues of the Weekly Missoulian, (January-February 1893), RJan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894, esp. "The Merry War," (11 January 1893), and "The University," (25 January 1893).

² "Thanks, Gentlemen," Weekly Missoulian (8 February 1893), RJan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894.

³ "Everything Goes in Our State Legislature Yesterday . . . And Missoula Will Get the State University on Today's Ballot," "Afternoon Session," "Dillon's Demand," "Legislative Tips," "Montana's Legislators Whetting the Cheese Knife," "Same Old Thing," and "Local Mention," Weekly Missoulian, (9-10, 13, 17, 19, and 22 February 1893), RJan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894; and "An Act to Establish, Locate, Maintain, and Govern The University of the State of Montana," 17 February 1893, as quoted by Merriam, History, pp. 183-185.

⁴ Michael P. Malone, Battle for Butte: Mining and Politics on the Northern Frontier, 1864-1906 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981), ch. 5. Also Toole, Uncommon Land, chs. 5, 7, and 9.

⁵ "In the Senate," (5 January 1893), Weekly Missoulian, 4Jan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894.

⁶ "The University Club," (11 January 1893), "The University" and "Points for Consolidation," (25 January 1893), "The State Institutions," (12 January 1893), "Practical Results Wanted," "The Bill Passes," and "The Bunching Plan," (1 February 1893), "Rah for the 'Varsity,'" (31 January 1893), Weekly Missoulian, RJan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894.

⁷ Roger L. Williams, The Origins of Federal Support for Higher Education: George W. Atherton and the Land-Grant College Movement (College Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), chs. 1-2.

⁸ Ibid, p. 51, quoting Gilman in 1867.

⁹ The argument resonated well into the twentieth-first century.

¹⁰ See "The State Institutions," Weekly Missoulian (12 January 1893), RJan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894.

¹¹ See "Points for Consolidation," (25 January 1893), Weekly Missoulian, RJan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894.

¹² For an analysis of the dominant trends, see Williams, Origins of Federal Support, pp. 41-42.

¹³ See "Scotch'd the Job," and "The University Club," (11 January 1893), Weekly Missoulian, RJan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894. See also James M. Hamilton, "Early History of the University of Montana," Charter Day Address, 17 February 1925, esp. p. 9, 13-14, and 18; and "First Movement For The Establishment of The University of Montana As Told By E. E. Hershey to Paul C. Phillips," (no date, but probably 1930s), both RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"ARCHIVES, History." And see William Giltner, "Montana State University," 15 February 1939, esp. 1-5; Norma Beatty, "Montana University's Birth Saw Big Debate, Lobbying," Kaimin (8 April 1957), pp. 3, 5 (excerpt); and Fred G. Scheuch, "University's Start Was Very Modest," Missoulian, Souvenir Edition (20 July 1922), *passim*, esp. 10-11, all RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

¹⁴ See Merriam, History, p. 2, ft. 1, citing E. E. Hershey; and Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. I, pp. 12-13.

¹⁵ See "A Helena Scheme," Weekly Missoulian, (11 January 1893), R Jan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894.

¹⁶ See Charles Helmick to Morton J. Elrod, 8 January 1913, MJE, S5, B26, F16.

¹⁷ See A. L. Stone, "An Address Delivered On The University of Montana Charter Day," 1914, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Charter Day -- Addresses, 1912, 1914, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921." Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. I, pp. 12-13, noted that Hershey gave little credit to Matts, whom he called "a fine orator but very lazy." Stone stated Matts refused to allow him to reveal all that really happened.

¹⁸ See "The University Club," (11 January 1893), Weekly Missoulian, RJan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894.

¹⁹ Malone, Battle for Butte, pp. 92-97.

²⁰ See Stone, "Charter Day," 1914, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Charter Day -- Addresses, 1912, 1914, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921."

²¹ See "Governor Pledges Support in Eliminating Friction Between State's Colleges," Missoulian (13 January 1914), pp. 1, 10; and Sam V. Stewart, "Declaration," Missoulian (25 May 1914), both MJE, S5, B26, F17. See also Paris Gibson, "Governor's Letter Should be Studied," Missoulian (1 June 1914), p. 3, MJE, S5, B26, F7.

²² Malone, Battle for Butte, pp. 99-105.

²³ See Stone, "Charter Day," 1914, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Charter Day -- Addresses, 1912, 1914, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921."

²⁴ See William A. Clark, at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_A._Clark. Also Malone, Battle for Butte, ch. 6; and Toole, Uncommon Land, chs. 7-9.

²⁵ Keith Edgerton, "William Clark, the Cooper King," The Montana Professor 24 (#1; Spring 2014), at <http://mtprof.msun.edu>.

²⁶ "An Act to Establish, Locate, Maintain, and Govern The University of the State of Montana," 17 February 1893, Merriam, History, pp. 183-185.

²⁷ Knoll, Prairie University, ch. 1, and Williams, Origins of Federal Support, ch. 2-5.

²⁸ For the original Charters, see Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code: Part I. I. Federal Statutes, Rulings, Regulations and Instructions II. State Constitutional Provisions III. State Statutes," The University of Montana Bulletin (General Series; Number Ten; June 1919), pp. 190 and "Index," at pp. 91, 93, and 101, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code."

²⁹ See Williams, Origins of Federal Support, pp. 49-53 and Ch. 3.

³⁰ The Charters for the other three had similar provisions.

³¹ Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code," The University of Montana Bulletin (General Series; Number Ten; June 1919), pp. 190 and "Index," at pp. 91, 93, and 101, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code," for the three distinctive charters. Also Williams, Origins of Federal Support, chs. 2-3.

³² "Governor Pledges Support in Eliminating Friction Between States' Colleges," Missoulian (13 January 1914), pp. 1, 10, MJE, S5, B26, F17, for Dixon's comments; and "Joseph M. Dixon," at http://www.google.com/search?q=joseph+m.+dixon&sourceid=ie7&rls=com.microsoft:en-US&ie=utf8&oe=utf8&rlz=117GGIH_en.

³³ "Splendid Progress at the State University Emphasized by Commencement and Its Events," Missoulian (5 June 1908), pp. 3, 8, R39.

³⁴ Walter J. Greenleaf, US Office of Education, "The Land-Grant College as It Functions To-Day," School and Society, 41 (29 June 1935), pp. 855-859, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Land-Grant Colleges;" and Williams, Origins of Federal Support, ch. 7.

³⁵ For the land grant, Fred G. Scheuch, "University's Start Was Very Modest," Missoulian, Souvenir Edition (20 July 1922), pp. 9-10; for a detailed description of the sales, "The State University, Missoula. General Statement - Buildings, Contents, Insurance, Land Grant, Report first Building Commission, Statement of Expense first Building Commission," 4 April 1916, Table No. 11 in Appendix, indicating 28,062.25 acres sold by 1915 out of the total land

grant of 46,557.78 acres and providing location of sales, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational;" and Oscar J. Craig, President's Report, 1897, p. 18-19, UnPub, S2, Box 1895-1912.

³⁶ J. R. Toole to Dr. Oscar John Craig, 19 June 1902, marked "(PERSONAL)," RG1, PO, S4, B168, F"Correspondence Received - Dr. O. J. Craig, about 1896 -1907"

³⁷ Oscar John Craig, President's Report, 1907, pp. 5-7, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912, noting an Attorney General opinion disallowing use of land-grant funds, including accrued interest, to pay interest on bonds. Also Clyde A. Duniway, President's Report, 1908, pp. 2-8, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and "General Statement," 4 April 1916, p. 2, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

³⁸ For the reversal of the restriction on the use of land-grant income, see State ex rel. Blume, Plaintiff, v. State Board of Education et al., Defendants, (1934), 34 Pac. (2nd) 515, RG1, PO, S15, B 191, F"Land Grant Income." Also J. C. Garlington, University Counsel, to President Geo. Finlay Simmons, "Test Cases on University Buildings," 16 October 1936, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1941: Physical Plant."

³⁹ "General Statement," 4 April 1916, p. 2, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

⁴⁰ Nathaniel Craighill to Clyde A. Duniway, July 1908, CAD, MSS 735, R4. Duniway requested comments from the faculty. On Duniway, Merriam, History, Ch. II; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III.

⁴¹ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. 1, on Craig's ouster, claimed as "retirement."

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid; Merriam, History, ch. II; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III.

⁴⁴ Merriam, History, chs. II-IV, VII, VIII, and X; Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II-VI; and Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. 1.

⁴⁵ For the discussion of a "graveyard for presidents," a phrase used first by Edward O. Sisson, Missoulian (15-27 January 1940), various press excerpts, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"State Board Hearing, 1940."

⁴⁶ Merriam, History, chs. VI and IX; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII.

⁴⁷ See Harry R. Lewis, Excellence Without A Soul: How A Great University Forgot Education (New York: Public Affairs, 2006), "Introduction" and Chs.1-2. For a much more instrumentalist conception focused on higher education as a "parastate" in the development of the American national state as an intermediating institution within a polity suspicious of centralization, see Christopher P. Loss, Between Citizens and the State: The Politics of American Higher Education in the 20th Century (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012), esp. "Introduction." Most commentators stress the role of "buffering institutions" -- i.e., voluntary associations -- protecting the citizen from direct state control. whereas Loss stressed the development of "mediating institutions" to reconcile a public suspicious of centralization of power to the emerging American national state.

⁴⁸ Morrill Land-Grant Acts," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morrill_Land-Grant_Acts. See also David J. Staley, "Democratizing American Higher Education: The Legacy of the Morrill Land Grant Act," Origins: Current Events in Historical Perspective 6 (#4; January 2013), at <http://origins.osu.edu/article/democratizing-american-higher-education-legacy-morrill-land-grant-act>.

⁴⁹ Williams, Origins of Federal Support, "Preface" and chs. 1-2.

⁵⁰ Ibid; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I. For an instrumentalist conception of higher education as a "parastate" within the American national state as an intermediating institution within a polity suspicious of centralization, Loss, Between Citizens and the State, esp. "Introduction."

⁵¹ Alexandra Usher, Center on Education Policy, "Public Schools and the Original Land Grant Programs," at <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED518388>.

⁵² See Morrill Land-Grant Acts," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morrill_Land-Grant_Acts; and Williams, Origins of Federal Support, Ch. 1.

⁵³ Ibid.; "Pacific Railroad Acts," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pacific_Railroad_Acts; and Homestead Act," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homestead_Acts. See also George M. Dennison, "THE SALVATION OF THE MIDDLE CLASS: And – Oh, By the Way – The Key to America's Future," Field Notes (The University of Montana, Spring 2012), pp. 3-5, 26-29, at <http://issuu.com/caitlyn.walsh/docs/umfieldnotesspring2012>.

⁵⁴ Robert J. Gordon, The Rise and Fall of American Growth: The U.S. Standard of Living Since the Civil War (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016), p. 261.

⁵⁵ James Willard Hurst, Law and the Conditions of Freedom in the Nineteenth-Century United States (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1956), passim.

⁵⁶ The Morrill Act of 1862, at <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsl&fileName=012/llsl012.db&recNum=534>.

⁵⁷ L. M. Brandjord, Commissioner of State Lands and Investments, to President C. H. Clapp, 15 November 1929; and S. M. Stockslayer, Commissioner of the General land Office, "list of lands selected for the Territory of Montana, for University purposes," under the act of 18 February 1881, 8 April 1889; Lou Forsell, "MSU Land Grants," stamped 2 March 1962; and President Carl McFarland to Louis Forsell, 29 March 1954, sending copies of statutory references to land grants, with attachments, all RG1, S7, B97, F"Land Grants, Federal."

⁵⁸ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I, pp. 6-7; and Forsell, "MSU Land Grants," 1962; and McFarland to Forsell, 29 March 1954, citing the act of 22 February 1889, the enabling act that vested grants for a university, agricultural college, school of mines, normal school, and others, both RG1, S7, B97, F"Land Grants, Federal." See also Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon to Members of Legislature, (no date but 1924), RG1, PO, S19, B52, F"Duplication Prior to 1944), for the 1881 Enabling Act granting seventy-two sections for a university, and the 1889 Enabling Act granting 100,000 acres for a school of mines, 100,000 acres for a normal school, and 140,000 acres for an agricultural college.

⁵⁹ See "Historically Black colleges and universities," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historically_black_colleges_and_universities.

⁶⁰ Williams, Origins of Federal Support, Ch. 4-5; also Knoll, Prairie University, p. 21 and "Hatch Act of 1887," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hatch_Act_of_1887.

⁶¹ Williams, Origins of Federal Support, p. 51, quoting Gilman in 1867, and Chs. 2-3.

⁶² Robert J. Sternberg, Editor, The Modern Land-Grant University (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2014), passim.; and Malcom Moos, The Post-Land Grant University: The University of Maryland Report (College Park: The University of Maryland, 1981), passim. In the 1930s, Walter J. Greenleaf identified the University of

Minnesota as the model, "The Land-Grant College," School and Society, 41 (29 June 1935), pp. 855-859, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Land-Grant Colleges."

⁶³ John F. Stover, American Railroads (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), Ch. IV-VI.

⁶⁴ Gordon, Rise and Fall of American Growth, p. 311.

⁶⁵ Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order: 1977-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), passim.; and Michael P. Malone, James J. Hill: Empire Builder of the Northwest (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), passim.

⁶⁶ For background, Fred A. Shannon, The Farmer's Last Frontier: Agriculture, 1860-1897 (New York, Evanston, & London: Harper & Row, 1945), passim.; Edward Chase Kirkland, Industry Comes of Age: Business, Labor and Public Policy, 1860-1897 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), passim.; and Hurst, Law and the Conditions of Freedom in the Nineteenth-Century United States, passim. Also Thomas Piketty, Capital in the Twenty-First Century (Cambridge & London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014), passim, esp. pp. 347-353.

⁶⁷ On Joseph Schumpeter's concept of creative destruction, see "Creative destruction, " at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative_destruction; and, for an early example, Stanley I. Kutler, Privilege and Creative Destruction: The Charles River Bridge Case (Philadelphia, New York, and Toronto: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1971), passim.

⁶⁸ For discussion of the Kuznets's cycle of development tracing an inverted U curve, see Branko Milanovic, The Haves and the Have-Nots: A Brief and Idiosyncratic History of Global Inequality (New York: Basic Books, 2011), pp. 8-9, 83-91, and passim.; and Branko Milanovic, Global Inequality: A New Approach for the Age of Globalism (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016), ch. 2. Also Piketty, Capital in the Twenty-First Century, passim, esp. pp. 347-353.

⁶⁹ Michael P. Malone & Richard B. Roeder, Montana: A History of Two Centuries (Seattle & London: University of Washington Press, 1988), ch. IX-XII; Wiebe, Search for Order, chs. 5-9; Arnon Gutfeld, Montana's Agony: Years of War and Hysteria, 1917-1921 (Gainesville, Fla.: University Presses of Florida, 1979), passim., esp. "Introduction;" and Toole, Uncommon Land, chs. V, VII-XI.

⁷⁰ Thomas C. Leonard, Illiberal Reformers: Race, Eugenics & American Economics in the Progressive Era (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016), Part II.

⁷¹ James MacGregor Burns, The Vineyard of Liberty (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982), pp. 501-511.

⁷² Rush Welter, The Mind of American, 1820-1860 (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1975), ch. XI.

⁷³ As quoted by Burns, Vineyard of Liberty, p. 502; also Rush Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1962, p. 62, for the quotation, and passim. In the post-war period after 1945, the details changed again but the dichotomy of purposes remained, as see Loss, Citizens and the State, p. 93: "Military leaders looked to education as an instrument to create the soldiers the army wanted to have, while soldiers gravitated toward education because it offered a pathway to becoming the citizens they most wanted to be." As Loss concluded, "Though they had different ideas about the chief benefits of higher education, by the postwar period the state and its subjects agreed education was central to American citizenship." Thus, higher education emerged as a critically important "parastate" mediating between the federal state and the citizens, much as the state governments for the most part earlier.

⁷⁴ Larry Faulkner, "The Social Compact of Higher Education and Its Public," at <http://www.educause.edu/research-and-publications/books/tower-and-cloud/social-compact-higher-education-and-its-public>. Very similar conceptions, with differences in detail, separated those who thought of higher education as an intermediating institution capable of sustaining order within society and those who thought in terms of personal growth and development, as see Loss, Between Citizens and State, "Introduction," and passim.

⁷⁵ For the altered perspective, Knoll, Prairie University, Ch. 1; Williams, Origins of Federal Support, ch. 1 and passim.; Loss, Between Citizens and State, "Introduction," and passim., and Daniel Mark Fogel and Elizabeth Malson-Huddle, Precipice or Crossroads (Albany: SUNY Press, 2012), passim. For the reinvented purpose in modern form, see George M. Dennison, Editor, Innovative Higher Education, Special Issue, 35 (#2; April 2010), pp. 75-125, with essays by President Robert H. Bruininks (Minnesota), President Graham Spanier (Penn State), Chancellor William E. Kirwan (Maryland University System), and President Steven B. Sample (University of Southern California). Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I, for a discussion of the Michigan experience as the state-chartered college of agriculture became the State Agricultural College under the terms of the Morrill Act and, much later, Michigan State University.

⁷⁶ Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America, p. 62; and Loss, Citizens and the State, p. 93.

⁷⁷ Lewis, Education Without a Soul, passim.; and Knoll, Prairie University, ch. 2, dealing with the culture war in Nebraska during the late nineteenth century. For the modern cultural debate, Derek Bok, Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), passim.; and Peter Charles Hoffer, Past Imperfect: Facts, Fictions, Fraud--American History from Bancroft and Parkman to Ambrose, Bellesiles, Ellis, and Goodwin (New York: Public Affairs, 2004), passim.

⁷⁸ Knoll, Prairie University, "Preface," for prominent themes during various periods; and Milanovic, Haves and Have Nots, pp. 83-91.

⁷⁹ Thomas D. Snyder, 120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, January 1993), passim., esp. pp. 30, 63-68, and 75-80, for the following data. Also Gordon, Rise and Fall of American Growth, 282-85, 510-14.

⁸⁰ Morton J. Elrod, "The American University," (no date but about 1916), MJE, S3, B4, F9.

⁸¹ For modern agreement, Louis Menand, The Marketplace of Ideas (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2010), chs. 1-2; Earl J. McGrath and Charles H. Russell, Are Liberal Arts Colleges Becoming Professional Schools (New York: Institute of Higher Education, 1958), passim.; and Earl J. McGrath, The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education (New York: Institute of Higher Education, 1959), passim.

⁸² Lewis, Education Without a Soul, ch. 1.

⁸³ Morton J. Elrod, The College, Past and Present (Bloomington. Ill.: University Press, 1899), passim.; and Elrod, "The American University," (no date but about 1916), MJE, SIII, B4, F9.

⁸⁴ Albert Borgmann, "The Headaches and Pleasures of General Education," The Montana Professor, at <http://mtprof.msun.edu/Spr2003/Borg.html>.

⁸⁵ Menand, Marketplace of Ideas, passim.

⁸⁶ Malone & Roeder, Montana, ch. X-XII and XV; and "Montana," at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Montana>. The following discussion draws on Dennison, Montana Naturalist, ch. 1.

⁸⁷ Toole, Uncommon Land, chs. I-VII.

⁸⁸ Hurst, Law and the Conditions of Freedom in the Nineteenth-Century United States, *passim*.

⁸⁹ Malone & Roeder, Montana, ch. VIII; and Toole, Uncommon Land, ch. VI.

⁹⁰ Morton J. Elrod, "George Bird Grinnell," (no date but probably 1928-1929), handwritten and typescript (57 pages), MJE, S6, B16, F4-5; and Morton J. Elrod, handwritten notes on Grinnell's 18 articles in Forest and Stream, MJE, S4, B16, F6-7. On the Grinnell comment about Indian starvation, Joseph Kinsey Howard, Montana: High, Wide, and Handsome (Reprint Ed.; Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), pp. 155-156; and Gerald A. Diettert, Grinnell's Glacier: George Bird Grinnell and Glacier National Park (Missoula: Mountain Press Publishing Company, 1992), esp. p. 21. Also Morton J. Elrod, handwritten notes on and a copy of George Bird Grinnell, "The Crown of the Continent," Century Magazine 62 (#76; September 1901), pp. 660-672, MJE, S6, B16, F9; "Glacier Centennial: George Bird Grinnell," Malcom's Round Table, at <http://knightofwords.wordpress.com/2010/03/28/glacier-centennial-george-bird-grinnell/>; and "George Bird Grinnell," at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Bird_Grinnell.

⁹¹ Dawes Act at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dawes_Act; and Burton Smith, "The Politics of Allotment: The Flathead Reservation as a Test Case," Pacific Northwest Quarterly, 70 (#3, July 1979), pp. 130-140.

⁹² Malone & Roeder, Montana, pp. 270-271; and Toole, Uncommon Land, h. VI.

⁹³ Malone & Roeder, Montana, pp. 124-128; also Toole, Uncommon Land, ch. VII.

⁹⁴ Wiebe, The Search for Order: 1977-1920), *passim*. On the concentration of wealth, Piketty, Capital in the Twenty-First Century, esp. pp. 347-353, and *passim*.

⁹⁵ Toole, Uncommon Land, p. 211.

⁹⁶ On the emergence of reform, Leonard, Illiberal Reformers, *passim*, and esp. Part I; on monetary policy, Eric Rauchway, The Money Makers: How Roosevelt and Keynes Ended and Defeated the Depression, Defeated Fascism, and Secured a Prosperous Peace (New York: Basic Books, 2015), esp. chs. 1-3.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*; Malone & Roeder, Montana, ch. IX-XII; Wiebe, Search for Order, chs. 5-9; and Gutfeld, Montana's Agony, esp. "Introduction."

⁹⁸ Toole, Uncommon Land, chs. VI-XI.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, ch. X-XII.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, chs. VIII-X.

¹⁰¹ Gutfeld, Montana's Agony, chs. 5 and 12.

CHAPTER I: THE FORMATIVE YEARS, 1893-1916

¹ Morton J. Elrod, "Montana State Board of Education Acts on Duplication of Courses," The Inter-Mountain Educator 9 (#1; September 1913), pp. 26-27; and "Engineering Department Transferred to Bozeman," Missoulian (18 July 1913), MJE, S5, B26, F17; also SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 2, 13-14 June 1913, pp. 5, 6, 7, 14; Special Meeting, 17 July 1913, pp. 23-26; and Regular Meeting, 22 December 1913, pp. 35, 38, all M418, R2.

² Jonathan R. Cole, The Great American University: Its Rise to Preeminence, Its Indispensable National Role, Why It Must Be Protected (New York: Public Affairs, 2009), passim.

³ Luke Wright, "Education Crisis on Anniversary of Others," Great Falls Tribune (9 June 1963), pp. 1, 20, RG1, PO, S2, Box 25, F"ARCHIVES, History;" Paris Gibson, Chairman, Consolidation Committee, "Consolidation Handbook," (Missoula: Consolidation Committee, no date, but 1913-1914), pp. 30; W. M. Aber, "Consolidation vs. Segregation: 'Come Let Us Reason Together,'" (Pamphlet, University of Montana, 11 February 1913), pp. 4; and "Plan for Creation of A Greater University," (no place or date, but 1913), p. 2, all RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Consolidation." Also numerous press excerpts and other materials, MJE, S5, B26, F16-19; "A Great University," Fergus County Democrat (31 December 1912), pp. 2, 10, MHS, DN; and H. A. Davee, Superintendent, to "Teachers and University Alumni of Montana," 14 October 1914, MJE, S5, B26, F16.

⁴ On the Leighton Act authorizing a Chancellor, C. S. Stewart, Secretary of State, "Certificate," of "Senate Bill No. 105," 14 March 1913, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"History of MSU." Also Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code," June 1919, pp. 141 ff., Act of 14 March 1913, RG1, PO, S6, B63, F"University Code;" and Scheuch, "University's Start Was Very Modest," Missoulian, Souvenir Edition (20 July 1922), pp. 9-12, esp. 11, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." Also, "An Active Week In The Legislature," Fergus County Democrat (4 February 1913), p. 11, MHS, DN; and Joseph M. Dixon's comment that the University lost its autonomy and became simply another "department" in the multi-campus University, "Resolutions With an Amendment," Missoulian (10 July 1915), pp. 1-4, 8, MJE, S5, B26, F17.

⁵ Merriam, History, "Appendix," the enabling act, dated 17 February 1893, pp. 183-185. The University Club members drafted the Act, as see Weekly Missoulian (14 January 1893), R Jan. 4, 1893-Dec. 26, 1894.

⁶ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 7, 11-14.

⁷ Craig, President's Report, 1902, p. 7, and 1903, p. 22, both UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; also Brandjord to Clapp, 15 November 1929, the Mt. Sentinel grant, RG1, S17, B97, FF:"Land Grants, Federal." ; and J.B. Speer, Controller, to President McCain, 9 March 1950, "Memo of Land Acquisition," RG1, S17, B96, F"Land and Property, 1950 -."

⁸ Craig, President's Report, 1905, p. 22, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; also O. J. Craig, President, to C. F. Mellen, President Northern Pacific Railroad, 24 February 1902, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Correspondence -- 1901-1908." And Scheuch, "University's Start Was Very Modest," Missoulian (20 July 1922), pp. 9-12, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

⁹ MSU, Map, (no date but after 1956), the Planetarium, RG1, S17, B97, F"Maps of Campus."; and Anonymous (Lucille J. Armsby), "Missoula Women's Club," typed list of promises or agreements relating to the building, (no date, but 1959), RG1, PO, S15, B191, F"Missoula Women's Club." On the Planetarium, see President Carl McFarland to Herbert N. Williams, 22 January, 25 September, and 3 October 1953; and MSU Order to Spitz for Planetarium with McFarland's signature for the MSU Endowment Foundation, 22 February 1954, RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"Planetarium." Also State Board of Education, "Planetarium at Montana State University," 16 March 1954; and President Carl McFarland, "Acceptance of Scheuch Planetarium," 5 June 1955, RG1, PO, S17, B 101, F"Planetarium - General."

¹⁰ Merriam, History, p. 6. President Craig announced the termination of the Prep School in 1908 over three years ending in 1911, Clapp "Narrative," ch. II, p. 57.

¹¹ Williams, Origins of Federal Support, ch. 2-5.

¹² On the merging of the prep school and Missoula high school, see Elrod, "Many Changes," Missoulian (29 January 1922), pp. 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14. Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 57; and Missoula Public High School, "Fifty years of progress at Missoula County Free High School," Golden Anniversary: Dedication Program (26 May 1957), p. 2, Kleinkopf Collection, The K. Ross Toole Archives, The Maureen and Mike Mansfield, The University of Montana.

¹³ Oscar J. Craig, President's Report, 1906, pp. 11-13, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and Oscar J. Craig, President's Report, 1907, pp. 16-23, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. Also Merriam, History, pp. x and 7; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 56-57, and ch. III, p. 23.

¹⁴For background, John C. Beard, "Morton J. Elrod and The University of Montana Biological Station," (History 598: The Trans-Mississippi West, April 1968, The University of Montana), Section I, MJE, S1, B1, F1; Elrod, "Many Changes in the City Are Told by Elrod," Missoulian (29 January 1922), pp. 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14; "A Great Strike. Motormen on All the Electric Street Cars Go Out," Weekly Missoulian (22 February 1893), RJan. 4, 1893-Dev. 26, 1894; and "Initial Run of Missoula Street Cars Proves Success and Pleases Many," Missoulian (12 May 1910), R39, an expansion of service.

¹⁵ See William D. Middleton, The Interurban Era (Milwaukee: Kalmbach Publishing Co., 1921), passim; and George W. Hilton and John F. Due, The Electric Interurban Railways in America (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960), passim.

¹⁶ Oscar John Craig, President's Report, 1902, p. 6, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

¹⁷ Clyde A. Duniway, President's Report, 1908, pp. 10-11, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and James H. Bonner, Chairman, Charles E. Mallett, William M. Aber, M. J. Elrod, and J. H. Underwood, Physical Plant Committee, to President F. C. Scheuch, 14 October 1916, in RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"General to 1933."

¹⁸ Morton J. Elrod, "Charter Day Address," 1916, MJE, S5, B26, F13. For a description of the building, Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 19 ff.

¹⁹ On the "leaflets," Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 25; and "From the faculty minutes," 7 September 1895, 18 April 1898, 7 September 1908, RG1, PO, S15, B49, F"Religion, State Support of."

²⁰ Elrod, "Charter Day Address," 1916, MJE, S5, B26, F13. See also Missoula Public High School, "Fifty years of progress," Golden Anniversary: Dedication Program (26 May 1957), p. 2, Kleinkopf Collection, concerning separation from the high school.

²¹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I, pp. 26-27.

²² Merriam, History, pp. 8-9.

²³ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 27.

²⁴ M. J. Elrod, "Memorial" for J. H. T. Ryman, February 1927, who selected the original "trees and shrubbery" and served as a "member of the Campus Development Committee . . . at the time of his death," RG1, PO, S7I, B29, F"RYMAN, J. H. T."

²⁵ "Resolutions, With an Amendment Is the Result of Craighead Meeting Influenced at Intervals by Hysteria," Missoulain (10 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

²⁶ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 38-39. See also The University of Montana, "The Program . . . at the Laying of the Corner Stone of . . . University Hall . . .," 8 June 1898, RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"University Hall."

²⁷ Stone, "An Address Delivered at the University of Montana Charter Day ," 1914, RG1, PO, S19, B167, F"Charter Day Addresses 1912, 1914, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921."

²⁸ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II.

²⁹ Merriam, History, pp. 3, 5; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I, pp. 1, 10, and 56.

³⁰ Merriam, History, pp. 183-185, for the statute.

³¹ Oscar J. Craig to Prof. M. J. Elrod, 2 November 1901, RG1, PO, S4, B168, F"Correspondence Received -- Pres. O. J. Craig, about 1897-1907 . . . (A-R)."

³² Merriam, History, p. 11.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

³⁴ Elrod, "Many Changes," Missoulain (29 January 1922), pp. 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14.

³⁵ See "gf." "Re: Old Craig Hall [Women's Building, Mathematic Physics Building, and then Mathematics Building]," 27 April 1953, J. B. Speer explained that President Duniway ("somewhat of a perfectionist") and the Local Executive Committee objected in 1912 to the placement of the old plaque provided by Massey McCullough and the Class of 1911 as "inadvisable" because Craig did not found the University, the state did; so the old plaque went into the vault until recast in 1953 eliminating that description after McFarland delayed the placement so he could study the issue, RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Planning and Construction Office."

³⁶ Judith A. Rile, "The Changing Role of the President in Higher Education," 2001, at <http://www.newfoundations.com/OrgTheory/Rile721.html>. See also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 31, 35, and ch. III, p. 6.

³⁷ Neil W. Hamilton, Academic Ethics: Problems and Materials on Professional Conduct and Shared Governance (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers, 2002), *passim*.

³⁸ William A. Aber to Clyde A. Duniway, 13 July 1908, CAD, MSS 735, R4; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, pp. 6-8.

³⁹ Letters to Bausch & Lomb, 1901-1907, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Correspondence - 1901-1908;" also O. J. Craig, President, "Recommendations," December 1899, and J. M. Hamilton and J. G. McKay, "Report of University Committee," December 1899, both RG1, PO, S5, B11, F"President - Craig, O. J. No. 4;" and Merriam, History, p. 11.

⁴⁰ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, chs. 1-2. At the time, all University appointments ran for one year unless explicitly renewed.

⁴¹ Aber to Duniway, 13 July 1908, CAD, MSS 735, R4.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ The Company built the smelter in 1903, as see Anaconda Standard, Butte Miner, Butte Inter Mountain, and Helena Independent Record, "Smoke Fumes" Scrap Book, Mss 753: Scrapbook 4 (various dates 1906-1910), *passim*.; also Donald MacMillan, "A History of the Struggle to Abate Air Pollution From Copper Smelters of the Far West, 1885-1933," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Montana, 1973), *passim*., and Smoke Wars (Helena: Montana Historical Society Press, 2000), *passim*.

⁴⁴ W. E. Harmon to Clyde A. Duniway, 19 June, 14 July, and 8 August 1908, all CAD, MSS 735, R4.

⁴⁵ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, chs. 1-2; Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, pp. 6-8; and SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 2 December 1907, p. 88; and Minutes, Special Meeting, 1 April 1908, p. 96, both M418, R2.

⁴⁶ Aber to Duniway, 13 July 1908, CAD, MSS 735, R4.

⁴⁷ J. H. T. Ryman to C. A. Duniway, 26 June, 18 July, and 10 August 1908; and Clyde A. Duniway to J. H. T. Ryman, 3 and 21 July 1908, all CAD, MSS 735, R4.

⁴⁸ See several letters from principals, superintendents, scientists, higher education faculty and staff members, and college and university presidents, including Charles C. Adams, University of Chicago, to Superintendent W. E. Harmon, 1 May 1908, MJE, S5, B27, F2.

⁴⁹ Harmon to Duniway, 14 July 1908, CAD, MSS 735, R4.

⁵⁰ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. 2.

⁵¹ Merriam, History, p. 18; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, pp. 6-8; but also Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. I-II.

⁵² A. L. Stone, "A Useful Life," Missouliau (6 March 1911), p. 4, MHS, DN.

⁵³ For the quotation, "Oscar J. Craig Summoned Unexpectedly In San Diego," Missouliau (6 March 1911), p.1; Craig brought Scheuch to Missoula with him in 1895. See also Stone, "A Useful Life," Missouliau (6 March 1911), p.4; and "University Bids Farewell to Founder and President at Funeral of Dr. Craig," Missouliau (11 March 1911), pp. 1,5, all MHS, DN.

⁵⁴ Elrod, "Many Changes," Missouliau (29 January 1922), pp. 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14; and Merriam, History, p. 182, on Craig's epigram, with slightly different wording. For controversy caused by the designation of Craig as the "founding President," see Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I, p. 67.

⁵⁶ W. E. Harmon to Clyde A. Duniway, 19 June, 14 July, and 8 August 1908; J. H. T. Ryman to C. A. Duniway, 26 June, 18 July, and 10 August 1908; and Clyde A. Duniway to J. H. T. Ryman, 3 and 21 July 1908, all CAD, MSS 735, R4.

⁵⁷ Mrs. Tyler Thompson's comments, "Resolutions, With an Amendment Is the Result of Craighead Meeting Influenced at Intervals by Hysteria," Missoulian (10 July 1915), pp. 1-4, 8, MJE, S5, B26, F17; and Miles Romney, "From An Independent Newspaper," New Northwest, (no date but September 1921), reprinted from The Western News, MJE, S5, B27, F10. On Romney, see Sam Gilluly, The Press Gang: A Century of Montana Newspapers, 1885-1985 (Great Falls: Montana Press Association, 1985), esp. pp. 70 and 97-98.

⁵⁸ O. J. Craig to Mr. Orville Bremer, 6 January 1908, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Correspondence - 1901-1908."

⁵⁹ For the discussion of a "graveyard for presidents," a phrase first articulated by Edward O. Sisson, Missoulian (15-27 January 1940), various press excerpts, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"State Board Hearing, 1940."

⁶⁰ Toole, Montana: Uncommon Land, pp. 243-44.

⁶¹ James R. Steele (apocryphal), "Hire Learning in Montana," Pacific Weekly (16 March 1936), RG1, PO, S19, B167, F"Borton-Gosman Report 1939," for the claim of Elrod's dismissal; and Merriam, History, pp. 86-87, discussing the piece with no mention of Elrod. Also Simmons, "Envy and Hatred," Part 19A, pp. 59-91.

⁶² Merriam, History, p. 23, footnote 6, citing no evidence; for repetition of the claim, Gutfeld, Montana's Agony, pp. 117-118, citing the American Federation of Teachers, "The Keeney case: big business, higher education, and organized labor, report of an investigation," 1939, at <http://www.worldcat.org/title/keeney-case-big-business-higher-education-and-organized-labor-report-of-an-investigation/oclc/13491059>; and Jim Habeck, "Can Botanists Be Bought?" Kelseya (Summer 2006), at <http://www.mtnativeplants.org/filelib/75.pdf>. Habeck later informed the author that he had relied on Merriam's footnote.

⁶³ On Craig's critical role, James M. Hamilton, "Early History of the University of Montana," Charter Day Address, 17 February 1925, esp. p. 9, 13-14, 18, (1925), RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"ARCHIVES, History." Also Giltner, "Montana State University," 15 February, 1939, esp. 1-5; and Scheuch, "University's Start Was Very Modest," Missoulian, Souvenir Edition (20 July 1922), passim., esp. 10-11, both RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

⁶⁴ J. M. Hamilton, J. W. Kleck, Oscar J. Craig, and D. W. Sanders, State Board of Education Special Committee for "a uniform plan for accredited high schools," to State Board of Education, 28 November 1897, RG1, PO, S4, B168, F"Letters Concerning Vocations" Also H. A. Hollister, High School Visitor, University of Illinois, to President Oscar J. Craig, " 14 September 1905, RG1, PO, S4, B168, F"Correspondence and Statistics Relating to Accredited High Schools -- 1905; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 17-19.

⁶⁵ Hamilton, Kleck, Craig, and Sanders, to State Board of Education, 28 November 1897; and "University of Montana. Course of Study for Accredited High Schools" (no date but after 1905), both RG1, PO, S4, B168, F"Letters Concerning Vocations . . . ;" and The University of Montana, Missoula, Montana, A Circular of Information . . . , 1895 and 1896 (Helena, Montana: The University of Montana, 1895), 24 pages of history, organization, faculty, courses, admission and graduation requirements, and calendar, RG1, PO, S4, B167, no Folder.

⁶⁶ Craig, President's Report, 1903, pp. 13-15, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912 ; and SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 6 June 1904, p. 504-508, M418, R1.

⁶⁷ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 17-18; and Merriam, History, pp. 13-14.

⁶⁸ Clapp, Narrative," ch. II, p. 63.

⁶⁹ Craig, President's Report, 1897, pp. 21-23; and Craig, President's Report, 1905, pp. 25-28, both, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

⁷⁰ "From the faculty minutes," 10 January 1898; and L. K. Williams, "The Montana State University School of Pharmacy," (no date but 1927), no pagination, both RG1, PO, S15, B37, F"Pharmacy: 1916-1932;" and Craig, President's Report, 1902, p. 19, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 35.

⁷¹ Elrod, "Department of Biology," 1901-1902, MJE, SV, B23, F6; and Morton J. Elrod, "Biological Station," Craig, President's Report, 1902, p. 47-50, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and "Timber Harvesting," at <http://www.foresthistory.org/ASPNET/Publications/region/1/flathead/chap10.htm>, on the O'Brien Mill.

⁷² Elrod, "Charter Day Address," 1916, MJE, S5, B26, F13.

⁷³ Elrod, "The American University," (no date but about 1916), MJE, S3, B4, F9.

⁷⁴ On externally administered admission tests, Rebecca Zurick, "College Admission Testing," 2007, at <http://www.nacacnet.org/media-center/standardizedtesting/documents/standardizedtestingwhitepaper.pdf>.

⁷⁵ Craig, President's Report, 1905, p. 24, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

⁷⁶ Craig, President's Report, 1900, p. 6, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

⁷⁷ Craig, President's Report, 1907, p. 24, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

⁷⁸ E. B. Craighead to H. A. Davee, State Superintendent, 19 June 1914, indicating the Board had assigned the Inspector role to the Superintendent in 1913, RG30, HR, F "Craighead, Edwin B."; and "Unification Comes Before Board Today," Missoulian (14 June 1913), p. 8, MHS, DN.

⁷⁹ Craig, President's Report, 1907, p. 19-22, 25-26, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

⁸⁰ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, p. 33.

⁸¹ A. L. Stone, "An Injustice," Missoulian (2 December 1910), p. 4, MHS, DN.

⁸² Knoll, Prairie University, pp. 6-8.

⁸³ Beard, "Morton J. Elrod," Section II, p. 5 MJE, S1, B1, F1; and Merriam, History, p. 6.

⁸⁴ RG1, PO, SIV, Box 168, F"Applications;" William R. Trowbridge, Principal, Helena High School, to Dr. Craig, 31 July 1905, RG1, P O, S4, Box 168, F"Correspondence Received - Dr. O. J. Craig, about 1896-1907 . . .;" and "Table Showing the number of graduates from Montana High Schools that enter Higher Education," (no date, but after 1899), RG1, PO, S4, Box 168, F"Letters Concerning Vocations"

⁸⁵ Craig, President's Report, 1907, p. 24-26, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. Most of the graduates earned second bachelor's degrees from the accepting institutions prior to enrolling in graduate or professional schools, a fact unmentioned in the boasts about alumni performance.

⁸⁶ In ensuing years, The University of Montana fared well in the Rhodes competition, as see State University, Missoula, Press Release, 25 September 1925; "Rhodes Scholars from Montana State University, 13 May 1950,"

listing twelve by 1950, both RG1, PO, S15, B03, F"Rhodes Scholarship." The success continued thereafter, with a total of twenty-eight by 2010, as see <http://hs.umont.edu/hs/scholarships/rhodes-scholars.php>.

⁸⁷ Craig, President's Report, 1907, p. 35, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

⁸⁸ Oscar J. Craig, President's Report, 1900, p. 26, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

⁸⁹ Craig, President's Report, 1897, pp. 18-19, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; Merriam, History, p. 8; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 28-29, 32.

⁹⁰ Scheuch, "University Start Was Very Modest," Missoulia, Souvenir Edition (20 July 1922), on Craig's contribution to the campus plan; and The Phi Beta Kappa Association of the State University of Montana, "Essential Facts For Consideration In Connection With Its Petition For a Charter In Phi Beta Kappa," (no date but 1929), esp. pp. 9-13, both RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." See also Hipolito Rafael Chacon, The Original Man: The Life and Work of Montana Architect A. J. Gibson (Missoula: The University of Montana Press, 2008), pp. 66-72; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 28-29.

⁹¹ On Gilbert's earlier work in Montana, see Patty Dean, Cass Gilbert in Big Sky Country: His Designs for the Montana Club (Helena: Drumlummon Institute. 2015), passim. Also Bonner, Chairman, to President F. C. Scheuch, 14 October 1916, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"General to 1933;" SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 3 April 1920, p. 342, M418, R2; Merriam, History, pp. 64-66; "Cass Gilbert" at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cass_Gilbert; and "The Gilbert-Carsley Plan" at <http://content.lib.umont.edu/omeka/items/show/864>; also "A History of Campus Planning," at <http://content.lib.umont.edu/omeka/exhibits/show/a-history-of-campus-planning/1893-1929/3>; Anonymous (J. B. Speer), "Proposed Land Acquisitions," 1 January 1943, pp 24, with map, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1945 Legislative Data - MSU." The Jones Plan replaced the obsolete Gilbert Plan in the 1940s, as see "Minutes," Campus Planning and Development Committee, esp. 3 January 1946 and 7 October 1947, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Campus Planning and Development." President Johns secured a Landscape Development Plan by Theodore J. Wirth in the early 1960s, as see Theodore J. Wirth to Vice President Robert T. Pantzer, 1 July 1965, RG1, S17, B96, F"Wirth, Theodore J." Also Chacon, Original Man, ch. 5.

⁹² "The Phi Beta Kappa . . . Petition," (no date but 1929), esp. pp. 9-13, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational;" and J. B. Speer, "Land Acquisitions," in "Report of the Alumni Council Meeting, 17 February 1936, RG30, F"George Finlay Simmons," for Gilbert's plan to expand one block north, one west, and one south.

⁹³ Chacon, Original Man, chs. 1-4, esp. p. 63.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, ch.5, for the following discussion.

⁹⁵ The University of Montana, "Dedication Ceremony for University Hall," 18 February 1899, RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"University Hall."

⁹⁶ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 49-51, concerning the bell, modified considerably over the years, most significantly in 1952 with the addition of the Carillon. Clapp emphasized the "strength of the Gibson tower," given the weight of the Carillon and its apparatus, on which see Betsy Holmquist, "Artifacts: The Bells! The Bells!" Montanan: The Magazine of The University of Montana, at <http://archive.umont.edu/montanaf10/Artifacts.php>. Also Cheryl Hutchinson, "Main Hall Clock Appears in 1902, Part Two of a Series on MSU History," Kaimin (15 May 1964), RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: History of MSU;" and Martin Kidston, "47 University of Montana carillon bells each have a story to tell," Missoulia (27 January 2013), at http://missoulia.com/news/state-and-regional/university-of-montana-carillon-bells-each-have-a-story-to/article_a87c0728-6904-11e2-abc9-0019bb2963f4.html. The

University administration reinforced the tower with a steel skeleton, renovated the roof, and cleaned the western façade in the first decade of the twenty-first century, as see "History of Main Hall," at <http://www.fortmissoulamuseum.org/blog/?tag=clock-tower-and-roof>.

⁹⁷ Chacon, Original Man, p. 67.

⁹⁸ Both graduates of The University of Montana (then Montana State University) subsequently recognized for their accomplishments and example for young people, the Davidsons helped to initiate a construction boom on the campus in the 1990s, "George M. Dennison, 1990-2010," at <http://www.umat.edu/president/people/pastpresidents/dennison.php>.

⁹⁹ Knoll, Prairie University, pp. 4-6.

¹⁰⁰ President E. B. Craighead, "Biennial Report . . . 1915-1917," no pagination, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929." Gibson also designed the new Missoula City Library funded by Andrew Carnegie.

¹⁰¹ Craig, President's Report, 1902, p. 6, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

¹⁰² Craig, President's Report, 1907, pp. 5-7, noting an Attorney General opinion disallowing use of land-grant funds, including accrued interest, to pay interest on bonds; and Duniway, President's Report, 1908, pp. 2-8, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. See also, "General Statement," 4 April 1916, p. 2, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." For reversal of the restriction on the use of land-grant income, see State ex rel. Blume, Plaintiff, v. State Board of Education et al., Defendants, (1934), 34 Pac. (2nd) 515, RG1, PO, S15, B 191, F"Land Grant Income." See also Garlington, University Counsel, to Simmons, "Test Cases on University Buildings," 16 October 1936, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1941: Physical Plant."

¹⁰³ "General Statement," 4 April 1916, p. 2, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

¹⁰⁴ Duniway, President's Report, 1908, pp. 2-8, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

¹⁰⁵ For the land grant, Scheuch, "University's Start Was Very Modest," Missoularian, Souvenir Edition (20 July 1922), pp. 9-10; for a detailed description of the sales, "General Statement," 4 April 1916, Table No. 11 in Appendix, indicating 28,062.25 acres sold by 1915 out of the total land grant of 46,557.78 acres and location of sales, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

¹⁰⁶ Craig, President's Report, 1907, pp. 5-7; and Duniway, President's Report, 1908, pp. 5-25, esp. 9-10, both UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

¹⁰⁷ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I, p. 14. Each of the four campuses had a Local Executive Committee.

¹⁰⁸ The University of Montana, Missoula, Montana, A Circular of Information . . . 1895 and 1896 (Helena, Mt.: The University of Montana, 1895), pp. 24, with the history, organization, list of faculty, list of courses, admission requirements, grade regulations, and calendar, RG1, PO, S4, Box 167, no Folder. Also Merriam, History, pp. vii-ix, 11, and 27-28; Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, esp. p. 14; and Malone & Roeder, Montana, pp. 274-280.

¹⁰⁹ Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code: Part I. I. Federal Statutes, Rulings, Regulations and Instructions II. State Constitutional Provisions III. State Statutes," The University of Montana Bulletin (General Series; Number Ten; June 1919), passim., and "Index," RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code."

¹¹⁰ SBE, Regular Meeting, 7 April 1919, p. 231, M418, R2.

¹¹¹ Toole to Craig, 19 June 1902, marked "(PERSONAL)," RG1, PO, S4, B168, F"Correspondence Received - Dr. O. J. Craig, about 1896 -1907"

¹¹² See Oscar John Craig, President's Report, 30 November 1897, pp. 21-23, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

¹¹³ See SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, DATE 1902, p. , M418, R1?. **CHECK THIS CITATION.**

¹¹⁴ "Teachers of State Favor Consolidation," Fergus County Democrat (31 December 1913), p.4, MHS, DN, for MSTA reaffirmation of a resolution adopted initially in 1910 favoring consolidation.

¹¹⁵ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, "The Impatient Scholar;" Merriam, History, ch. II, "*As Montana develops so does its University;*" and Elrod, "Many Changes," Missoulain (29 January 1922), pp., 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14. Also "Charles William Eliot," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_William_Eliot; "Andrew Dickson White," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andrew_Dickson_White; and David Starr Jordan, at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Starr_Jordan.

¹¹⁶ Clyde A. Duniway, open letter to listed faculty, 17 June 1908; and Clyde A. Duniway, open letter to Principals, 22 July 1908, both CAD, MSS 735, R5. Also Clyde A. Duniway to Alumni of The University of Montana, 23 July 1908, CAD, MSS 735, R4.

¹¹⁷ Nathaniel Craighill to Clyde A. Duniway, July 1908, CAD, MSS 735, R4; Clyde V. Duniway, typescript of statement (no date but Fall 1908), RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"ARCHIVES, History;" and Clyde A. Duniway, untitled typescript statement clearly intended as a press release to "the people of the state," 29 November 1909, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." Also several responses to Duniway's earlier requests, CAD, MSS 735, R4-5.

¹¹⁸ President Clyde V. Duniway to President C. H. Bowman, 2 December 1908, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"ARCHIVES, History."

¹¹⁹ C. A. Duniway, President, to President J. M. Hamilton, 2 December 1908; and J. M. Hamilton, President, to President C. A. Duniway,, 3 December 1908, both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1945 Legislative Data - University System." And C. A. Duniway, President, to President J. M. Hamilton, 13 and 25 January 1909; and J. M. Hamilton, President, to Pres. C. A. Duniway, 24 January 1909, all RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Prior to 1919, Legislative Sessions." And, see Duniway, President's Report, 1908, pp. 6-7, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

¹²⁰ See Duniway, President's Report, 1908, pp. 7-8; and Oscar J. Craig, President's Report, 1900, p. 26, on the mill levy, both UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. For the statutory language Duniway invoked, see Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code: Part I. I. Federal Statutes, Rulings, Regulations and Instructions II. State Constitutional Provisions III. State Statutes," The University of Montana Bulletin (General Series; Number Ten; June 1919), pp. 190 and "Index," at pp. 91, 93, and 101, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code." For analysis of the constitutional authority of the Board of Education, see President Charles H. Clapp, "Report on State University of Montana Requested by Senate Committee on the State University," (no date but 1925), RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1925, Legislature;" and Ernest O. Melby, "Organizing Montana's System of Higher Education, " (no date but 1944-1945), RG1, PO, S1, Box 169, F"President (Melby, E. O.)" Obviously, differing interpretations existed.

¹²¹ "Selway Bill," 1909, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Prior to 1919, Legislative Sessions."

¹²² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, p. 11, that Norris thought his reforms critical to good government; also Merriam, History, pp. 27-28; and SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 7 June 1909, pp. 121-122, 130, M418, R2.

¹²³ Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code," 1919, pp. 135-141, at 137-139, Act of 1909, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code." For insight concerning how governance of the State University actually worked, see J. B. Speer, "A Bird's-Eye View of the Organization of One University," Journal of Higher Education, 2 (#9; December 1933), pp. 461-467, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Questionnaires."

¹²⁴ In 1951, the Legislature restored fiscal responsibility to the State Board of Education because of the public uproar caused by the Examiners' reallocation of bond revenue from the 1948 referendum.

¹²⁵ See SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 7 December 1908, p. 115, , M418, R1.

¹²⁶ Clyde V. Duniway, "Selections from . . . December 1909," President's Report, 1910, pp. 33-34, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

¹²⁷ Quoted in Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, pp. 12, from an unidentified Duniway letter to Senator Joseph M. Dixon. Merriam, History, p. 27, footnotes 15-16, identified the letter Clapp quoted.

¹²⁸ Duniway, "Selections from . . . December 1909," pp. 33-34, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and Merriam, History, p. 27, footnotes 15-16, "The criticism . . . must have weighed heavily with the Board of Education when dismissal of Duniway was being considered," adding parenthetically that Duniway deleted the criticism from his report. However, the words quoted in the text appeared in Duniway's official report to the Board.

¹²⁹ "University of Montana 's Commencement Auspicious," Missoulian (11 June 1909), p.1. MHS, DN.

¹³⁰ Charles A. Kofoid, Chairman, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure: Report of the Committee of Inquiry Concerning Charges of Violation of Academic Freedom, Involving the Dismissal of the President and Three Members of the Faculty at The University of Montana," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 3-52.

¹³¹ Duniway, "Extracts from . . . June 5, 1911," President's Report, 1912, pp. 24-25, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. The total does not include fee revenue, dedicated to specific purposes.

¹³² SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 5 June 1911, pp. 178-187, M418, R2.

¹³³ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. I; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 23.

¹³⁴ Founded in 1850, Illinois Wesleyan University no longer awards doctoral degrees, as see "Illinois Wesleyan University," at <https://www.iwu.edu/aboutiwu/history.html>. On the graduate "external" degree, Henry C. Allan, Jr., Abstract of "History of the Non-Resident Degree Program at Illinois Wesleyan University, 1873-1910: A Study of a Pioneer External Degree Program in the United States," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1984), copy in author's possession. Also Morton J. Elrod, "The Butterflies of Montana," (Ph.D. Thesis, Illinois Wesleyan University, 1905), ch. 6 missing, MJE, S3, B10, F1-9, also available online in full at <https://archive.org/details/butterfliesmont00malegoog>.

¹³⁵ On teaching prep school and undergraduates in the same room, Morton J. Elrod, "Department of Biology Report," 1903, MJE, S5, B23, F 7; and Knoll, Prairie University, ch. 1.

¹³⁶ A. L. Strand, President, Montana State College, "Foreward," Bibliography of Graduate Theses, University of Montana (Works Progress Administration, Service Division, Historical Records Survey Project, Bozeman, MT., January 1942), pp. i-vii, 71, at iii, erroneously claiming that Montana State College awarded the first graduate degree, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"Degrees at all University Units (Master's);" also Morton J. Elrod, "Department of Biology," 1901-1902, MJE, S5, B23, F6; Morton J. Elrod, "Department of Biology," Craig, President's Report, 1902, pp. 44-46, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and Douglass's thesis, "The Neocene Lake Beds of Western Montana," "Numbered Publications," clipped file, March 1934, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Publications, Procedures for Distribution to State Board;" and Earl Douglass, "The Neocene lake beds of western Montana and descriptions of some new vertebrate from the Loup Fork ," (Nabu Public Domain Reprints, www.ICGtesting.com, #LVOW01s0036100915, n.d., originally Missoula: University of Montana, June 1899), passim.

¹³⁷ Richard E. Rice and George B. Kauffman, "William Draper Harkins: An Early Environmental Chemist in Montana (1900-1912)," Bulletin for the History of Chemistry 20(1997), pp. 60-67, at http://www.scs.illinois.edu/~mainzv/HIST/bulletin_open_access/num20/num20%20p60-67.pdf; and "Jesse P. Rowe," at <https://books.google.com/books?id=Q-DOAAAAMAAJ&pg=PA5&lpg=PA5&dq=1905+Faculty,+University+of+Montana&source=bl&ots=3w8QX-ftkT&sig=475gs1VlhheXJKON2Dq5HgWWCrA&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0CDgQ6AEwBGGoVChMlnrOGnv7YxwIVhZSiCh0qTg6T#v=onepage&q=1905%20Faculty%2C%20University%20of%20Montana&f=false>.

¹³⁸ See Rowe citation in the preceding note.

¹³⁹ "University Boosters' Meeting Held Under the Auspices of the Seniors," Missoulian (2 June 1910), p. 8, MHS, DN. Also "Splendid Progress at the State University Emphasized By Commencement and Its Events," Missoulian (15 June 1910), pp. 1, 8, R39.

¹⁴⁰ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. 1; also "Dixon Brings Good News," and "Establishes Weather Station to be at the University," Missoulian (21 June and 16 August 1908), pp. 1 and 12, 1, respectively, R32.

¹⁴¹ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. I.

¹⁴² Morton J. Elrod, "Eulogy," (no date but 1928 because of Kirkwood's death); and Morton J. Elrod, "Statement," (no date but 1928 because of Kirkwood's death), both MJE, S5, B28, F1; Elrod, "Department of Biology," 1901-1902, MJE, S5, B23, F6; Elrod, "Department of Biology," Craig, President's Report, 1902, pp. 44-46, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and Elrod, "The Butterflies of Montana," MJE, S3, B10, F1-9, ch. 6 missing, also available in full online at <https://archive.org/details/butterfliesmont00malegoog>. For the Squyer collection, Florida Museum of Natural History, Invertebrate Paleontology, Collector= "Squyer, Homer," at http://www.flmnh.ufl.edu/invertpaleo/search_proc.asp?collector=SQUYER,HOMER.

¹⁴³ On the valuation, Charles H. Clapp, Report to the US Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, 1930, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Bureau of Education Reports and Letters - 1916-1931." For a description of the growing collections, Morton J. Elrod, A Biological Reconnaissance in the Vicinity of Flathead Lake (Reprint Edition, Cornell University Library, Digital Collections, OH 105.M9E 48, no date), originally, Bulletin University of Montana (No. 10, Biological Series No. 3, 1902), pp. 170-176, and Plates XXVII and XXXII on shells. The museum led in time to the modern Philip L. Wright Zoological Museum.

¹⁴⁴ Elrod, "Establishment of the University of Montana Biological Station," Elrod, Biological Reconnaissance, pp. 93-96; and Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. I-III.

¹⁴⁵ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, chs. 4-5.

¹⁴⁶ Morton J. Elrod, Elrod's Guide and Book of Information of Glacier National Park (2nd Ed., Revised and Enlarged; Missoula, Mt.: Morton J. Elrod, 1930), passim.

¹⁴⁷ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, p. 42; also various documents, RG30, HR, F"Rowe, J. P."

¹⁴⁸ "J. E. Kirkwood Papers, 1906-1928," with a brief biography, at <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv87213>. Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 76.

¹⁴⁹ Rice and Kauffman, "William Draper Harkins: An Early Environmental Chemist in Montana (1900-1912)," Bulletin for the History of Chemistry 20(1997), pp. 60-67, at http://www.scs.illinois.edu/~mainzv/HIST/bulletin_open_access/num20/num20%20p60-67.pdf.

¹⁵⁰ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. I, p. 30; and "School [Art] History," at <http://www.umn.edu/art/history>.

¹⁵¹ On the concept and function of social capital, see Robert D. Putnam, Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community (New York *et al.*: Simon & Schuster, 2000), esp. ch. 1 and passim.

¹⁵² RG1, PO, S4, Box 168, F"Applications;" William R. Trowbridge, Principal, Helena High School, to Dr. Craig, 31 July 1905, RG1, PO, S4, Box 168, F"Correspondence Received - Dr. O. J. Craig, about 1896-1907 . . . ;" and "Table Showing the number of graduates from Montana High Schools that enter Higher Education," (no date, but after 1899), RG1, PO, S4, Box 168, F"Letters Concerning Vocations"

¹⁵³ J. W. Streit, President of The University of Montana Alumni Association, and J. B. Speer, Secretary, "To Alumni and Students of The University of Montana," 17 August 1909, RG1, PO, S5, B11, F"Alumni General, 1909-44." Actually, Duniway merely accelerated Craig's plan to terminate the prep school.

¹⁵⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, pp. 23 ff.; Merriam, History, ch. II.

¹⁵⁵ Duniway, "Certain Sections," 1909 Annual Report, President's Report, 1910, pp. 36-37, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and "President Duniway's Annual University Report Shows the Institution To Be In Fine Condition," Missoulian (11 December 1911), p. 5, MHS, DN.

¹⁵⁶ Clyde A. Duniway to President E. A. Bryan, WSC, 8 October 1908, RG1, PO, S15, B26, "F"ARCHIVES: Duniway Inauguration."

¹⁵⁷ Duniway's comments in "President Duniway Makes Response to the State Board," Missoulian (15 January 1912), p. 1, 10, MHS, DN.

¹⁵⁸ Merriam, History, ch. II; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III. Also George H. Greenwood to Dr. C. A. Duniway, 15 November 1908; and President C. A. Duniway to George W. Greenwood, 27 November 1908, the secrecy mandate unnecessary and disallowed him, as President, from working with the society, both RG1, PO, S5, B67, F"Class of 1904."

¹⁵⁹ Duniway, "Certain Sections," 1909 Report, President's Report, 1910, pp. 38-39, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.

¹⁶⁰ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 52.

¹⁶¹ Excerpt from the "Executive Committee" Minutes, 29 March 1930, RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"Education: 1946-1959;" "Report to the President of the University, Covering growth from 1910 to 1915," (no date but 1918

because of internal reference to School of Education authorization by State Board in June 1918); chart listing dates of establishment of various Divisions, Departments, and Schools, (no date but 1935-1936); and "SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AT STATE UNIVERSITY," (penciled date of 1930), all RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945." Also "Dates of Opening of Schools (From Catalogs), 17 January 1936, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

¹⁶² Morton J. Elrod, "Department of Biology Report," 27 November 1910, MJE, S5, B23, F6. Also Morton J. Elrod, "Department of Biology," Duniway, President's Report, 1910, pp. 50-53; and Duniway, President's Report, 1910, pp. 1-3, 7, both UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. Also Elrod, "Eulogy," (no date but 1928); and Elrod, "Statement," (no date but 1928), both MJE, S5, B28, F1. And Merriam, History, pp. 24, 34. Also Walt Nelson, "The History of the Forestry School," (no date but 1926-1927); Dorr Skeels, "Memorandum for President Craighead," 10 October 1914; and T. C. Spaulding, "Forestry Education in Montana," (no date but early 1920s), all RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"Forestry - School of, 1914-1934."

¹⁶³ Duniway, President's Report, 1910, p. 7, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and "President Duniway's Annual University Report," Missoulian (11 December 1911), p. 5, MHS, DN.

¹⁶⁴ "Pinchot-Ballinger Controversy," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pinchot%E2%80%93Ballinger_controversy.

¹⁶⁵ "Dates of Opening Schools (From Catalogs)," 17 January 1936, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

¹⁶⁶ Duniway, President's Report, 1910, p.9, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p.40.

¹⁶⁷ Merriam, History, pp. 183-185 for the Charter with specific mention of Schools of Law and Medicine.

¹⁶⁸ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, pp. 18-23, 55-59; Merriam, History, pp. 25-30; and Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. II. Also Clyde A. Duniway to Henry S. Pritchett, President, Carnegie Foundation, 30 November 1912, CAD, MSS 735, R5. For background, see H. L. Clayberg to C. A. Duniway, 18 September 1909; C. A. Duniway, President, "To the Lawyers of the State of Montana," 4 September 1909; Clyde A. Duniway to Professor Nathan Abbott, 3 April 1909; Joseph M. Dixon to Clyde A. Duniway, 7 April 1909; H. L. Clayberg to Clyde A. Duniway, 1 June 1909; Clyde A. Duniway, "To the Faculty," February 1911, "Excerpt from Faculty Minutes, Vol. 3, Page 67, February 24, 1911," a three-year program for Law students requiring two years of college level work for admission, a requirement considered absurd by H. L. Clayberg; and Danta C. Hanson, "History of the Montana Law School," 25 May 1927, all RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Law School, 1909-1938."

¹⁶⁹ Various letters of 1910-1911 from Duniway to Dixon, Mrs. W. W. Dixon to Dixon or Duniway, and Dixon to Duniway or Mrs. Dixon, and related documents, including University of Montana Bulletin (State University Series, Number 225), "the School of Law: Dixon Memorial Number With Announcements for 1919-20" (no date but 1919), all RG1, PO, S15, F"Law School -- Dixon Endowment." Also "Law Library for State School," Missoulian (6 January 1911), p.1; and "Glorious Celebration By Montana University," Missoulian (18 February 1911), pp. 1,3, both MHS, DN.

¹⁷⁰ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 5 June 1911, pp. 178-189; Special Meeting, 31 July-1 August 1911, pp. 190-193; and Regular Meeting 4 December 1911, pp. 194-199, all M418, R2. Also Merriam, History, pp. 26-28; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. III, pp. 19-22.

¹⁷¹ "Board Deadlocked in Helena," Missoulian (1 August 1911), p.1; and "Law School Faculty Named," Missoulian (2 August 1911), p. 1, both MHS, DN.

¹⁷² "The Law School, "Missoulian (3 August 1911), p. 4, MHS, DN. Stone thought Duniway's success assured that the University did not become the dumping ground for "played-out politicians."

¹⁷³ John A. Tressler, Malta, to President C. A. Duniway, 13 September 1908; and H. L. Clayberg to President C. A. Duniway, 13 September 1908, both RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Law School, 1909-1938."

¹⁷⁴ Duniway to Pritchett, 30 November 1912; Duniway to O'Shea, 2 February 1912; David Starr Jordan, President, Stanford, to Clyde A. Duniway, 22 January 1912, indicating he had sent Duniway's explanation to the editor of Science for publication; Clyde A. Duniway to W. E. Harmon, 26 April 1912; Clyde A. Duniway to President F. P. Keppel, Columbia, 24 January 1912; Arthur O. Lovejoy, AAUP, to Clyde A. Duniway, 2 February 1912, all CAD, MSS 735, R4; and Clyde A. Duniway to A. Lawrence Lowell, President, Harvard, 19 December 1911, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁷⁵ Duniway to Pritchett, 20 November 1912; and Clyde V. Duniway to Charles H. Hall, with a handwritten note indicating not sent to avoid further controversy, both CAD, MSS 735, R5. Also SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 31 July-1 August 1911, pp. 190-193, M418, R2.

¹⁷⁶ Kofoed, Chairman, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 8-9, quoting Duniway's letter to the Committee.

¹⁷⁷ "Educational Board Tells Story of Duniway Affair," Missoulian (14 January 1912), p. 9; "President Duniway Makes Responses to the State Board," Missoulian, pp. 1, 10; "H. G. Pickett Tells How Dr. Duniway Was Probed," Missoulian (17 January 1912), p. 1; and "Vague and Intangible," Missoulian (18 January 1912), p. 4, noting that the State Board offered no real grounds for nonrenewal except unanimity, all MHS, DN.

¹⁷⁸ Anonymous, "Review of Duniway's performance, 1908-1911, and what occurred late that year," (no date, but late 1911 or early 1912), with a handwritten note at the top identifying "Aber" as the author, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁷⁹ "State Board Reaffirms Previous Action as to President Duniway," Missoulian (2 April 1912), pp. 1, 7, R46.

¹⁸⁰ "Special Report University Committee," SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 4 December 1912, p. 199, M418, R2. But see also Anonymous, "Review of Duniway's performance, 1908-1911, and what occurred late that year," (no date, but late 1911 or early 1912), with a handwritten note at the top identifying "Aber" as the author, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁸¹ Duniway to Pritchett, 30 November 1912, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁸² W. E. Harmon, Secretary, Executive Session of the Board, to President C. A. Duniway, 5 December 1911, RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forestry and Conservation Experiment Station -- through 1955." Also the Duniway letter quoted by Kofoed, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 8-9, that some Board members informed Duniway that the discussion of his contract took no more than twenty minutes and became unanimous when the vote for nonrenewal prevailed, making further effort futile.

¹⁸³ "Dr. Duniway Tells Faculty of State Board's Action," Missoulian (8 December 1911), p. 1, 8, MHS, DN; and "From the Faculty Minutes of December 7, 1954," for Duniway's comments, RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forestry and Conservation Experiment Station -- through 1955." Also Edwin B. Craighead to Mr. Henry S. Pritchett, President, Carnegie Foundation, 10 January 1913, that "the board . . . had notified Mr. Duniway, time and again, that they didn't consider his administration a success," denying that just a few disgruntled dissenters brought about

Duniway's demise, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B." Craighead's interest in securing admission to the Carnegie Foundation for the State University induced him to put the best face on these developments.

¹⁸⁴ Duniway to O'Shea, 2 February 1912, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁸⁵ "Educational Board Tells Story of Duniway Affair," Missoulian (14 January 1912), p.9, MHS, DN.

¹⁸⁶ Duniway to Pritchett, 30 November 1912, quoting Hall, CAD, MSS 735, R5; Merriam, History, pp. 29-30, quoting Hall's statements; and also C. H. Hall's explanation that Governor Norris had charged the University Committee, with Hall as the Chairman, to conduct the review and denying any personal hostility toward Duniway, "State Board Reaffirms Previous Action as to President Duniway," Missoulian (2 April 1912), pp. 1,7, R36. For E. B. Craighead's description of Hall as "a high-toned gentleman" who had "never interfered with the President and the University in the slightest degree," Edwin B. Craighead to Mr. Henry Pritchett, Carnegie Foundation, 10 January 1913, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B."

¹⁸⁷ Merriam, History, p. 30, footnote 19. He cited no evidence.

¹⁸⁸ Kofoid, Chairman, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 3-52.

¹⁸⁹ Merriam, History, p. 30, quoting letters to George Greenwood of the Alumni Association.

¹⁹⁰ Max Farrand, Yale, to Clyde A. Duniway, 20 December 1911, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁹¹ Jordan to Duniway, 22 January 1912, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁹² Paris Gibson to Clyde A. Duniway, 30 March 1912, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁹³ "State Board Reaffirms Previous Action as to President Duniway," Missoulian (2 April 1912), pp. 1,7, R36.

¹⁹⁴ Clyde A. Duniway, open letter to principals, 25 March 1912, asking them to solicit student opinion and send the results to him and the Board; also Senior Class, Helena High School to Clyde A. Duniway, 26 March 1912; and William A. Aber and L. C. Plant to Clyde A. Duniway, (no date, but early 1912), letter from the faculty expressing appreciation for fine service; and a few other supporting letters, all CAD, MSS 735, R5.

¹⁹⁵ Duniway letter quoted by Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 8-9, that some Board members informed Duniway that the discussion of his contract took no more than twenty minutes and became unanimous when the vote for nonrenewal prevailed, making further effort futile, a pragmatic excuse focused on protecting the Board from as much criticism as possible.

¹⁹⁶ Merriam, History, p. 24. Merriam did not arrive on campus until 1919, seven years after Duniway departed.

¹⁹⁷ "From the Faculty Minutes of June 6, 1912," RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forest and Conservation Experiment Station - Through 1955."

¹⁹⁸ Clapp, "Narrative, ch. V, p. 1.

¹⁹⁹ Clyde A. Duniway to W. E. Harmon, 26 April and 1 May 1912, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

-
- ²⁰⁰ W. E. Harmon to C. A. Duniway, 1 and 5 May 1912, CAD, MSS 735, R5.
- ²⁰¹ "The Duniway Spirit," Missoulian (7 June 1912), MJE, SV, B27, F1.
- ²⁰² "Both Inspiration and Opportunity For Betterment of the University," Missoulian (6 June 1912), MJE, SV, B27, F1.
- ²⁰³ See Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch.21.
- ²⁰⁴ Duniway, President's Report, 1912, pp. 14-19, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.
- ²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-21.
- ²⁰⁶ For agreement that accommodation of the status quo mattered, and that the time for change had already passed, Hamilton to Duniway, 24 January 1909, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Prior to 1919, Legislative Sessions;" Hamilton, "Early History of the University of Montana," Charter Day Address, 17 February 1925, esp. pp.6-8, RG1, P, S2, B25, F"ARCHIVES, History;" and Merriam, History, pp. 38-39, footnote 25.
- ²⁰⁷ Duniway, President's Report, 1912, pp. 19-21, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912.
- ²⁰⁸ See Dennison, "Public Higher Education in Montana, 1893 to 2008," forthcoming as a chapter in Rick & Suzie Graetz, This is Montana, II, copy in author's possession, on the distribution of campuses as a foregone conclusion.
- ²⁰⁹ University of Montana faculty members, "Statement Regarding Salaries and Cost of Living of Professors," to C. A. Duniway, President, 1910, MJE, S5, B28, F13. See also Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. III; and Merriam, History, Ch. II, esp. pp. 20-21.
- ²¹⁰ Duniway, President's Report, 1908, pp. 14-17, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. These requests conformed with developments across the country.
- ²¹¹ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 2 December 1912, p. 225, M418, R2.
- ²¹² Excerpt, "Faculty Minutes," 8 October 1912, RG1, PO, S19, B167, F"Overlapping of Courses and Curricula -- All Units of University of Montana."
- ²¹³ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 3 June 1912, pp. 213, 216-217, M418, R2.
- ²¹⁴ J. H. Underwood, "Whose Interest Is Served," Missoulian (27 January 1913), p. 4, MHS, DN.
- ²¹⁵ A Reader of Both Sides, To the Editor, Missoulian (27 January 1913, p. 4, MHS, DN.
- ²¹⁶ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 2 December 1912, pp. 224, 230, M418, R2; and "State Board Recommends Consolidation of Schools," Missoulian (24 December 1912), pp. 1,3,6, MHS, DN.
- ²¹⁷ Merriam, History, p. 37. As discussed earlier, Hamilton had repudiated his initial support of consolidation in 1893, and in 1909 he told Duniway that the time for it had passed, as see Hamilton to Duniway, 3 December 1908, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1945 Legislative Data - University System."

²¹⁸ "State Board Recommends Consolidation of Schools," Missoulain (24 December 1912), pp. 1,3,6; and "Consolidation," Missoulain (25 December 1912), p. 4, both MHS, DN.

²¹⁹ Jules A. Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis in University Politics," Montana: The Magazine of Western History 36 (#2; Summer 1985), pp. 48-61, esp. 57. Also J. H. T. Ryman, "A Statement," Missoulain (18 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F20.

²²⁰ "Resolutions With an Amendment Is the Result of Craighead Meeting," Missoulain (10 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

²²¹ Merriam, History, p. 34. And see Gilluly, The Press Gang, esp. 40, 42-44, 49-50, 110-11, and 147-48; also A. L. Stone, Dean, to John Dexter, Referendum Campaign, 12 August 1930; and Sadie Erickson ('21), "Beginnings of State's Journalism School," Missoulain, Souvenir Edition (20 July 1922), RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"School of Journalism, 1914-1942."

²²² SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 3 June 1912, p. 205, M418, R2.

²²³ Merriam, History, p. 34.

²²⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, p. 1.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, ch. IV, p. 3.

²²⁶ "E. B. Craighead President Elect," Missoulain (19 May 1912), pp. 1, 4, MHS, DN.

²²⁷ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), p. 12, reporting a comment by Stewart.

²²⁸ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 52.

²²⁹ Merriam, History, pp. 36-37.

²³⁰ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, pp. 3-4.

²³¹ "Annual Meeting of State Teachers Auspiciously Opened in Missoula," Missoulain (27 December 1912), p. 10, MHS, DN.

²³² "Teachers of State Favor Consolidation," Fergus County Democrat (31 December 1913), p. 4, MHS, DN.

²³³ Craighead to Pritchett, 10 January 1913, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B."

²³⁴ Edwin L. Norris to Doctor E. B. Craighead, 22 January 1913, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B."

²³⁵ Edwin B. Craighead to Governor E. L. Norris, 31 January 1913, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B."

²³⁶ See the discussion in "Introduction," above.

²³⁷ Excerpt of a notice attached to Norris to Craighead, 22 January 1913, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B." On the success of the land-grants, Williams, Origins of Federal Support, ch. 1-3.

²³⁸ "Election of J. J. Walsh Week's First Business . . . Balk at Consolidation," Missoulian (13 January 1913), p. 1, MHS, DN.

²³⁹ "The University and the State," Missoulian (16 January 1913), p. 4, MHS, DN.

²⁴⁰ A Reader of Both Sides, To the Editor, Missoulian (27 January 1913, p. 4, MHS, DN.

²⁴¹ "Rough Sledding Predicted For Consolidation Scheme," Missoulian (19 January 1913), pp. 1,3; also "Opponents of Consolidation Are Kept Out of Conference in Helena: Very Rapidly Opposition Gathers," Missoulian (21 January 1913), pp. 1, 8, both MHS, DN.

²⁴² "Axe to Grind in Merger Scheme," Missoulian (19 January 1913), p. 1, 6, MHS, DN.

²⁴³ "The University," Missoulian (19 January 1913), p. 4, MHS, DN. Also "Plan is Opposed in Dillon," Missoulian (21 January 1913), pp. 1, 6, MHS, DN.

²⁴⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, p. 2, criticizing Craighead for missing that point.

²⁴⁵ "What Shall We Call It" and "Go Slowly," Missoulian (20 and 19 January 1913, respectively), pp. 4 and 4, respectively, MHS, DN.

²⁴⁶ J. H. T. Ryman to Clyde A. Duniway, 18 January 1913, CAD, MSS 735, R5.

²⁴⁷ See Craighead to Norris, 31 January 1913, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B." For discussion of the hostility between Craighead and Dixon and Ryman, see Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 48-61.

²⁴⁸ "Consolidation Scheme Meets Defeat in Helena: Reactionaries Win Out And Will Make Use of Steering Committee," Missoulian (22 June 1913), p. 1, MHS, DN.

²⁴⁹ "An Active Week In The Legislature," Fergus County Democrat (4 February 1913), p. 11, MHS, DN.

²⁵⁰ C. S. Stewart, Secretary of State, "Certificate," certified copy of "Senate Bill No. 105, Being Chapter 92 of the Laws of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana," 14 March 1913, adopted on the last day of the Session in 1913 and signed by Governor Sam V. Stewart, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"History of MSU." Also Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code," June 1919, at pp. 141 ff., Act of 14 March 1913, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code." And Wright, "Education Crisis on Anniversary of Others," Great Falls Tribune (9 June 1963), pp. 1, 20, RG1, PO, S2, Box 25, F"ARCHIVES, History;" also Morton J. Elrod, "Montana State Board of Education Acts on Duplication of Courses," The Inter-Mountain Educator 9 (#1; September 1913), pp. 26-27. Chancellor M. A. Brannon credited Dr. J. H. Durston, Editor of the Butte Post, for the Chancellor plan incorporated in the Leighton Act, as see Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon to Members of Legislature; and Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon, "Higher Education in Montana," (no date but December 1924), both RG1, PO, S19, B52, F"Duplication Prior to 1944."

²⁵¹ Quoted under "Same Agitation," Missoulian (25 January 1913), p. 4, MHS, DN. Also "Senate Kills That Plan for Good," Missoulian (7 February 1913), p. 1, MHS, DN, final demise of the consolidation bill, with the Leighton Act moved toward final passage.

²⁵² "Consolidation Bill Meets Death In The Senate," Missoulian (31 January 1913), pp. 1,5, MHS, DN.

-
- ²⁵³ Craighead to Norris, 31 January 1913, RG30, HR, F“Craighead, Edwin B.”
- ²⁵⁴ On these funds, Williams, Origins of Federal Support, chs. 4-5. Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, p. 3.
- ²⁵⁵ "University Appropriation Introduced In Legislature," Missoulian (2 March 1912), pp. 1,6, MHS, DN.
- ²⁵⁶ "Varsity Fund is Pared Down," Missoulian (4 March 1913), pp. 1, 9, MFS, DN.
- ²⁵⁷ Merriam, History, p. 36.
- ²⁵⁸ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 12 April 1913, pp. 1-2, M418, R2.
- ²⁵⁹ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 57, on the reconfiguration, noting the obvious intent to block Craighead.
- ²⁶⁰ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 13-14 June 1913, pp. 13-14, M418, R2. Also "Unification Comes Before Board Today," Missoulian (14 June 1913), p. 8; and "Craighead and His Faculty Re-Elected By State Board," Missoulian (15 June 1913), pp. 1, 8, both MHS, DN.
- ²⁶¹ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 17 July 1913, pp. 23-26, M418, R2. Also Morton J. Elrod, "Montana State Board of Education Acts on Duplication of Courses," The Inter-Mountain Educator, 9 (#1; September 1913), pp. 26-27, "Engineering Department Transferred to Bozeman," Missoulian (19 July 1913), pp. 1,3, MHS, DN.
- ²⁶² On the futile effort to attain this controversial goal in the late nineteenth century for the land-grant colleges across the country, Williams, Origins of Federal Support, passim, and the discussion in "Introduction," above.
- ²⁶³ Elrod, "Montana State Board of Education Acts On Duplication of Courses," Inter-Mountain Educator, 9(#1; September 1913), pp. 26-27.
- ²⁶⁴ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 17 July 1913, pp. 23-26, M418, R2.
- ²⁶⁵ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 23 December 1913, pp. 27-39, M418, R2.
- ²⁶⁶ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 1 June 1914, pp. 42-43, 57-59, M418, R2; and "New Building at Varsity Soon," Missoulian (2 June 1914), p. 1, MHS, DN.
- ²⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁸ The initial proposal applied only to the University and the College and provided full pay for the year. After discussion, the Board extended it to Mines and the Normal School but at half-pay.
- ²⁶⁹ Morton J. Elrod, "Consolidation of the State Institutions," The Inter-Mountain Educator, 9 (#9; May 1914), pp. 29-30.
- ²⁷⁰ Kofoed, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917),p. 12-13, quoting a letter from Stewart.
- ²⁷¹ MJE, SV, B26,F18, containing handbills, letters, and articles for and against consolidation. Also Consolidation Committee, Consolidation Handbook (Missoula, Mt., Consolidation Committee, no date but 1914), pp. 30 (printed by the Missoulian Publishing Company), Paris Gibson, Chairman, insisting that consolidation saved about \$2

million annually; E. B. Craighead, President, to Miss Gertrude Buckhous, Librarian and alumna, 28 August 1914; and a mass of documents relating to the campaign, all RG1, PO S4, B167, F"Consolidation." Also Morton J. Elrod, form letter to members of the Horticulture Society, 22 October 1914, urging support for consolidation; Morton J. Elrod to M. B. Hampton, Warm Springs, 29 October 1914, a form letter with slides containing facts in support of consolidation, both MJE, S5, B26, F16. Also Mary Stewart (no relation to Governor Stewart), Dean of Women, to President E. B. Craighead, 17 October 1914, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B."

²⁷² Morton J. Elrod, "Consolidation and Woman Suffrage," The Inter-Mountain Educator, 10 (#4; November 1914), p. 24, that "the journal came into the hands of the present management" about a year earlier; Morton J. Elrod to Melvin A. Brannon, 11 March 1928, for details concerning his original acceptance of the responsibility for the Educator at Craighead's insistence and the agreement with the MSTA for seventy-five cents of the dues of each member as the price for a subscription, MJE, S3, B6, F9.

²⁷³ Superintendent of Public Instruction H. A. Davee, press release, 3 August 1914; and H. A. Davee, Superintendent, to Teachers and University Alumni of Montana," 14 October 1914, both MJE, S15, B26, F16. Also Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. I.

²⁷⁴ "Governor Pledges Support in Eliminating Friction Between State's Colleges," Missoulian (13 January 1914), pp. 1, 10, for the Dixon and Stewart comments, MJE, S5, B26, F17. Also Karlin, Dixon of Montana, Vol. I, passim., on Dixon with little on consolidation but confirmation of the hostility between Dixon and Craighead; and Karlin, "Progressive Politics in Montana," Burlingame and Toole, History of Montana, vol. II, ch. XI, pp. 247-280, at 262 ff.; Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 48-61, for a detailed discussion of Dixon's efforts to defeat consolidation after considerable wavering. While Karlin mentioned Dixon's speech, he implied that Dixon supported consolidation of the four institutions into two institutions rather than one -- i.e., the Harvard in Missoula and Cornell in Bozeman suggestion he made during this meeting. Ultimately, Dixon opposed consolidation, as his comments indicated.

²⁷⁵ Also Governor S. V. Stewart, "Governor Stewart Answers Letter of an Opponent of Consolidation," responding to James P. Reid, former President of the College from 1894 to 1904, who had favored consolidation in 1893 but not after the siting of the institutions because of "breach of faith" and likely tax increases; and Governor S. V. Stewart to J. P. Reid, 15 and 13 June 1914, respectively, both Anaconda Standard (15 June 1914), MJE, S15, B26, F17.

²⁷⁶ Governor Sam V. Stewart, "Declaration," Missoulian (25 May 1914), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

²⁷⁷ Stewart borrowed this argument from former College President James P. Reid, as see "Governor Stewart Answers Letter of Opponent of Consolidation," and Stewart to J. P. Reid, 13 June 1914, both Anaconda Standard (15 June 1914), MJE, S15, B26, F17.

²⁷⁸ Paris Gibson, former state Senator from Great Fall and Chairman of the Consolidation Committee, denied the Governor's claims, especially about the fit between institutions and communities, "Governor's Letter Should be Studied," Missoulian (1 June 1914), p. 3, MJE, S5, B26, F7.

²⁷⁹ "Governor Stewart Answers Letter of an Opponent of Consolidation," Anaconda Standard (15 June 1914), MJE, S15, B26, F17.

²⁸⁰ Stewart to Reid, Anaconda Standard (13 June 1914), MJE, S15, B26, F17.

²⁸¹ W. M. Aber, "Professor Aber Discusses The Consolidation Plans," Missoulian (28 May 1914), MJE, S15, B26, F17.

²⁸² Elrod, "Consolidation of Montana's State Institutions," and "Editorial," The Inter-Mountain Educator, 9 (#10; June 1914), pp. 18-21, 24-25; and also M. J. Elrod, Paul C. Phillips, and James L. Pope to President Edward O. Sisson, 1 July 1919, for the Committee's heated repudiation of the Chancellor's subsequent attempt to revise the 1914 resolution, RG1, PO, S6, B82, F"Service Committee."

²⁸³ Elrod, "Consolidation of the State Institutions," The Inter-Mountain Educator, 9 (#9; May 1914), pp. 29-30.

²⁸⁴ Morton J. Elrod, "Consolidation of State Institutions," The Inter-Mountain Educator, 10 (#1; September 1914), pp. 25-26.

²⁸⁵ See E. B. Craighead, President, to Miss Gertrude Buckhous, 28 August 1914, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Consolidation;" and Mary Stewart (no relation to Governor Stewart), Dean of Women, to President E. B. Craighead, 17 October 1914, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B."

²⁸⁶ Edwin B. Craighead, "Craighead to Hamilton," 30 October 1914, Missouliau (2 November 1914), MJE, S15, B26, F17.

²⁸⁷ J. M. Hamilton, "Hamilton to Craighead," 31 October 1914, Missouliau (2 November 1914), MJE, S15, B26, F17.

²⁸⁸ "The Official State Canvass Is Finished," Missouliau (10 December 1914), p. 1, 36,991 for and 44,275 against, MHS, DN; and Elrod, "Consolidation and Woman Suffrage," The Inter-Mountain Educator 10 (#4; November 1914), p. 24. For an analysis of the votes, with only three counties in favor -- Missoula, Rosebud, and Valley -- see Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 54.

²⁸⁹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, pp. 6-7.

²⁹⁰ Morton J. Elrod, handwritten piece on the fate of the initiative, (no date but November 1914), MJE, S5, B26, F19.

²⁹¹ "Should Adopt Amendment," Butte Miner (8 November 1914); and "A Word About Consolidation," Missouliau (27 November 1914), both MJE, S5, B26, F17.

²⁹² "Chancellor Is To Be Named For Schools," Missouliau (8 December 1914), p. 4, MHS, DN.

²⁹³ "Dr. E. B. Craighead Presents His Report," Missouliau (8 December 1914), p. 7, MHS, DN.

²⁹⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, pp. 16-17, for Professor, Dean, and Vice President R. H. Jesse's comment that Craighead and Stone finessed the issue of Department versus School and Dean versus Director or Chairman by simply labeling the new entities Schools and the administrators Deans. The Chancellor later discovered the omission of Board approval when drafting the University Code that listed the Schools, Departments, and Deans and Chairmen and secured Board retroactive approval.

²⁹⁵ SBE, Regular Meeting, 7 December 1914, pp. 59-64, M418, R2.

²⁹⁶ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 54.

²⁹⁷ SBE, Minutes, Adjourned Regular Meeting, 8 January 1915, pp. 65-68. M418, R2.

²⁹⁸ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 54-56; and Merriam, History, p. 38.

²⁹⁹ As quoted by Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 56.

³⁰⁰ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 55-6. Karlin viewed the outcome as a pyrrhic victory since he agreed with the AAUP Committee and Elrod that consolidation alone had the potential to establish workable governance and end the wasteful competition among the institutions; also Merriam, History, pp. 37-38, 41-42.

³⁰¹ See "Rumor of Craighead's Possible Retirement," Anaconda Standard (31 May 1914), MJE, SV, B26, F17.

³⁰² "Some Interesting Sidelights in Recent Meeting's Record Shows Craighead had Notice," Missoulian (10 July 1915), reporting on a meeting in the President's Office on 5 July 1915, MJE, S5, B26, F17.

³⁰³ "Resolutions, With an Amendment Is the Result of Craighead Meeting Influenced at Intervals by Hysteria," Missoulian (10 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

³⁰⁴ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 56-57, citing the Helena Independent (7 June 1915).

³⁰⁵ J. H. T. Ryman, "A Statement," Missoulian (18 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F20.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁷ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), *passim*.

³⁰⁸ J. H. T. Ryman to Morton J. Elrod, 30 July 1917, MJE, S2, B2, F3

³⁰⁹ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 7 June 1915, M418, R2. Board members Hall, Davee, John Dietrich of Helena, and J. D. Largent of Great Falls dissented.

³¹⁰ As quoted in Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 57.

³¹¹ E. B. Craighead to students, 25 June 1915, Missoulian (26 June 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F20.

³¹² "Some Interesting Sidelights," Missoulian (10 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

³¹³ "Resolutions," Missoulian (10 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

³¹⁴ "Some Interesting Sidelights," Missoulian (10 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

³¹⁵ "Resolutions," Missoulian (10 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

³¹⁶ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), p. 8, citing the cases of Craighead and Duniway as evidence of the Board's lack of "the proper sense of the ordinary courtesies and amenities."

³¹⁷ "Resolutions," Missoulian (10 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17.

³¹⁸ "The Craighead Meeting," Missoulian (10 September 1915, MJE, S15, B26, F17. Also numerous excerpts in the Missoulian on 10 September 1915 focused on the "Missoula mess," from the Great Falls Tribune, Helena Independent, Yellowstone Journal, Miles City Star, Bozeman Chronicle, Townsend Star, Livingston Enterprise,

Carbon County Journal, Butte Miner, Stevensville Tribune, and others, all critical of the public meeting and the attacks on Dixon and others, generally agreeing that Craighead got what he deserved.

³¹⁹Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 59-60, who mistakenly stated that the Board had merely placed the three on leaves of absence. At a later date, the Board altered the nonrenewal of the contracts to leaves of absence. Also "Through Personal Revenge Professors Are Dismissed," Missoulian (9 July 1915), MJE, S5, B26, F17; and Merriam, History, p. 42. Also SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 7 June 1915, pp. 73-92, M418, R2.

³²⁰ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis" p.56, on the Ryman's infatuation.

³²¹ Merriam, History, p. 24, footnote 10, with nothing about the infatuation but describing Mary Stewart as "a modish woman of attractive personality and decisive in mind and action. Her independence later brought on unpleasant rumors." And Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 56. For a copy of Ryman's will, A. N. Whitlock to J. B. Speer, Registrar, 29 December 1927, with Ryman's statement in the will: "That no error shall occur, Mary Stewart is the Mary Stewart, former Dean of Women, University of Montana," with the directive to put the identified funds into bonds with the yield paid to her semi-annually for life, RG1, PO, S5, B67, "F"Ryman Scholarship." Also Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. V, pp. 12-14, for a detailed discussion of the Ryman gift.

³²² Merriam, History, p. 42-43; and Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 59-61, who also mentioned the vehement opposition to Craighead by Professor J. A. Underwood, who wrote to the AAUP complaining bitterly about Craighead's actions. However, Craighead perhaps did not know of Underwood's outright opposition.

³²³ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V, pp. 8-10.

³²⁴ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), p. 28; and Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 48-61, who attributed the nonrenewals to C. H. Hall's effort to get revenge.

³²⁵ American Association of University Professors, "APPENDIX 1: 1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," at <http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/A6520A9D-0A9A-47B3-B550-C006B5B224E7/0/1915Declaration.pdf>; and Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors III (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 3-52. Also Hamilton, Academic Ethics, passim.

³²⁶ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 11 October 1915, pp. 95-97, M418, R2. Also Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 59-61.

³²⁷ Scheuch, "Data Concerning the State University," 1916, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational," listing Reynolds, Boton, and Stewart leaves with note "Did not return."

³²⁸ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 11 October 1915, pp. 93-97, M418, R2. Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. p. 2. On Elliott, Frank K. Burrin, Edward Charles Elliott, Educator (Lafayette: Purdue University Studies, 1970), chs. I, III.

³²⁹ Burrin, Elliott, pp. 53-55.

³³⁰ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 11 October 1915, pp. 93-95, M418, R2.

³³¹ Burrin, Elliott, 56-57. Interestingly, Elliott would otherwise have helped to review the Montana case.

³³² Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 34-38, quoting two letters from the Governor dated 27 October 1915 and 1 April 1916.

³³³ Ibid., pp. 35-38, citing letters from the Governor, two of the affected faculty members, and the Chancellor. However, the two faculty members received notice that the Board's new "system" of appointments did not apply to them because the nonrenewal and leave decisions preceded the adoption of the new "system," although neither the Board nor the Chancellor specifically verified that statement.

³³⁴ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 39-40.

³³⁵ Ibid., quoting a letter from Elliott. And SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 28 April 1916, pp. 114-115, M418, R2.

³³⁶ See Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 36-39.

³³⁷ Ibid.; and Merriam, History, p. 42.

³³⁸ Burrin, Elliott, pp. 60-61.

³³⁹ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 5-12, 33.

³⁴⁰ Ibid, pp. 4-8.

³⁴¹ Ibid, p. 9.

³⁴² Emphasis supplied.

³⁴³ Ibid, pp. 10-11.

³⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 16.

³⁴⁵ Ibid, pp. 24-28.

³⁴⁶ "Resolutions, With an Amendment Is Result of Craighead Meeting Influenced at Intervals by Hysteria," Missoulain (10 July 1915), pp. 1-4, 8, MJE, S5, B26, F17.

³⁴⁷ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 18-24.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 29-32. And see Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," pp. 56-57, esp. p. 56, footnote 36, citation to Professor J. H. Underwood's letter to the AAUP Committee on Academic Freedom attacking Craighead for lowering standards and as "the stereotype of an arrogant, dictatorial administrator."

³⁴⁹ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), pp. 42-44..

³⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 40.

³⁵¹ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), p. 41.

³⁵² "Academic Freedom," at <http://www.aaup.org/our-programs/academic-freedom/censure-list>.

³⁵³ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V, pp. 8-10. Bolton went to Temple and Reynolds to the University of Colorado. Stewart held a number of positions over the years.

³⁵⁴ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 61.

³⁵⁵ Clapp, "Narrative, ch. V, pp. 11-13. See also Anonymous (probably F. C. Scheuch,) to Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 8 November 1915, RG1, PO, S7, B29, F"RYMAN, J. H. T."

³⁵⁶ Edwin B. Craighead, "To the Editor," (no date, but September 1915), typescript sent to the Missoulian and other papers, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B." Craighead paid all costs for the letter, since the University refused to do so for lack of authority, Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V, p. 3. For Craighead as a visionary educational leader, see Giltner, "Montana State University," 15 February 1939, esp. pp. 5-6, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational;" a view shared by future President Simmons, as see President G. F. Simmons to Barclay Craighead, 13 March 1939, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B."

³⁵⁷ See Merriam, History, p. 44. who mistakenly identified South rather than North Dakota.

³⁵⁸ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, p. 32.

³⁵⁹ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 61; and Toole, Uncommon Land, ch. X.

³⁶⁰ Elrod, "Many Changes," pp. 1, 5, MJE, S3, B7, F14.

³⁶¹ Karlin, "Conflict and Crisis," p. 61.

³⁶² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, pp. 33, "Consolidation is good business;" and ch. V, pp. 28, "Dressed in a little brief authority."

³⁶³ Ibid., ch. IV, pp. 1, 33; and see also "Claude Debussy," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Claude_Debussy.

³⁶⁴ Mrs. C. H. Clapp to Dr. Abbott, 26 June 1962; Katherine Craighead to Mrs. Lucille Armsby, 1 July 1958, quoting her brother; Lucille M. Armsby, "Re: Montana State University History," 13 August 1958; and various other letters detailing the development of the project and Clapp's decision not to publish, all RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: University -- History of (Mrs. Mary B. Clapp)." The following emphasis in original.

³⁶⁵ H. G. Merriam to Mr. Melby, 26 November 1944, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Campus Planning and Development Committee, 1941-51."

³⁶⁶ Merriam, History, ch. III, esp. p. 33.

³⁶⁷ The Phi Beta Kappa Association of the State University of Montana, "Essential Facts For Consideration In Connection With Its Petition For a Charter In Phi Beta Kappa," (no date but 1929), esp. p. 4, RG1, PO S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

³⁶⁸ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, pp. 18 ff.; Merriam, History, ch. III, passim.; and "Lubrecht Experimental Forestry: History," at <http://www.cfc.umt.edu/lubrecht/about/history.php>.

³⁶⁹ "Dates of Opening of Schools (From Catalogs), 17 January 1936, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Information." Also E. B. Craighead, President, "Annual Report of the President, 1 June 1913), no pagination, RG1, PO, S5, B11, F"President's Reports, 1913-1915;" E. B. Craighead, President, "To the State Board of Education," (no date but late 1914 or 1915), RG1, PO, S5, B11, F"President -- Reports, 1913-1915," Folder 2, title in penciled notes, "1912-1914, Biennial Report," no pagination; "Biennial Report of President E. B. Craighead . . . Dec. 1913 - Dec. 1914," no pagination, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929; and E. B. Craighead, "Annual Report of the President," 25 November 1915, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929."

³⁷⁰ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, pp. 16-17.

³⁷¹ Merriam, History, p. 36; and President G. F. Simmons to Barclay Craighead, 13 March 1939, RG30, HR, F"Craighead, Edwin B." Also "North Central Association of Colleges and Schools," founded in 1895, at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_Central_Association_of_Colleges_and_Schools. Montana subsequently fell into the region for accreditation and became accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Schools, founded in 1917, at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Northwest_Commission_on_Colleges_and_Universities, President C. H. Clapp, "Aims and Achievements of the State University of Montana, 10 May 1932, RG30, HR, F"Addresses By C. H. Clapp."

³⁷² Edwin B. Craighead, "To the Editor," (no date but September 1915), RG30, HR, "Craighead, Edwin B."

³⁷³ Elrod, "Charter Day Address," 1916, MJE, SV, B26, F13.

³⁷⁴ Harold C. Urey to Morton J. Elrod, 21 November 1934, MJE, S2, B3, F8; also "Harold Urey," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harold_Urey.

³⁷⁵ M. J. Elrod, W. M. Aber, and Eunice J. Hebbell, "To the Faculty of the University of Montana," 13 March 1898, MJE, S5, B27, F14; "The First Milestone," Anaconda Standard (30 May 1898), MJE, S8, B37, F24; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 34, and ch. III, pp. 25-26. Also Hutchinson, "Main Hall Clock Appears in 1902, Part Two of a Series on MSU History," Kaimin (15 May 1964), RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: History of MSU."

³⁷⁶ Morton J. Elrod, "How Shall a Vacation Be Spent," Kaimin (1898), pp. 6-8, MJE, S8, B37, F24.

³⁷⁷ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V, pp. 9-10. Clapp erroneously attributed the play to John Masfield.

³⁷⁸ Giltner, "Montana State University," 15 February 1939, pp. 4-5; and F. C. Scheuch, Acting President, "Data Concerning the State University," 1916, both RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." Also "Hiram Boardman Conibear," at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hiram_Boardman_Conibear; Ellen Garvin, "And in the Beginning . . ." (Senior Practice Laboratory, School of Journalism, The State University of The University of Montana, Missoula, Montana, 18 May 1925), pp. 4-6, copy in author's possession; and J. P. Rowe, Chairman, Interscholastic Committee, to Morton J. Elrod, 23 January 1935, expressing regret caused by "the first time you have been absent from the Interscholastic Committee during its entire life," MJE, S2, B3, F9. Also Morton J. Elrod to Clyde A. Duniway, 25 June 1908, raising funds to support students in the Meet, CAD, MSS 735, R4.

³⁷⁹ "At the Montana State University," Missoulian (30 August 1908), p. 3, R32; and Merriam, History, pp.16-17.

³⁸⁰ Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. II, p. 58; and Hutchinson, "Main Hall Clock Appears," Kaimin (13 May 1964), RG1. PO, S15. B36, F"ARCHIVES. History of MSU."

³⁸¹ "At the Montana State University," Missoulian (30 August 1908), p. 3, R32.

³⁸² Merriam, History, pp. 15-18.

³⁸³ "Students Planning to Celebrate," Missoulian (3 February 1911), p. 3, MHS, DN.

³⁸⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 62; excerpts "Faculty Minutes," 15, 22 January and 5 February 1918, concerning the Student Council with Elrod as one of three elected faculty members, RG1, PO, S18, Box 21, F"Student Affairs - Student Council 1918;" "At the Montana State University," Missoulian (30 August 1908), p. 3, R32; and "Elrod, Morton J., 1863-1953," at <http://socialarchive.iath.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=elrod-morton-j-1863-1953-cr.xml>. Also Morton J. Elrod, "To the Faculty," 1 December 1927, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Campus Christmas Tree."

³⁸⁵ Hamilton, "Early History," p. 13, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"ARCHIVES, History." Also Giltner, "Montana State Univesity," 15 February 1939, pp. 3-4, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

³⁸⁶ A. L. Stone, "An Address Delivered at the University of Montana Charter Day," 1914, RG1, PO, S19, B167, F"Charter Day Addresses 1912, 1914, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921." Merriam, History, p. 43, dated Aber Day in 1916.

³⁸⁷ Quoted by Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 37-38.

³⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, ch. II, p. 61. Also Hutchinson, "Main Hall Clock," Kaimin (15 May 1964), RG1. PO, S15. B36, F"ARCHIVES. History of MSU."

³⁸⁹ On Charter or Founders' Day, Craig, President's Report, 1905, p. 25; and Duniway, President's Report, 1912, p. 15, UnPub, S2, B1895-1912. Also Hutchinson, "Main Hall Clock," for date of 1906, Kaimin (15 May 1964), RG1. PO, S15, B36, F"ARCHIVES. History of MSU."

³⁹⁰ Hutchinson, "Main Hall Clock," RG#1. PO, S15. B36, F"ARCHIVES. History of MSU."

³⁹¹ Morton J. Elrod, "First Football Team, University of Montana," (no date, but probably in the mid-to-late 1920s), MJE, S5, B27, F11; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, p. 34. Also Bob Gilluly, Editor, The Grizzly Gridiron: Football Through the Years at Montana State University (Missoula: Montana State University Press, 1960), pp. 9-12; and Mick Holien, The University of Montana Football Vault: The History of the Grizzlies (Atlanta, GA.: Whitman Publishing, LLC, 2009), chs. 1-2.

³⁹² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. II, pp. 35-36.

³⁹³ *Ibid.*

³⁹⁴ Elrod, "First Football Team, University of Montana," (no date, but mid-to-late 1920s), MJE, S5, B27, F11.

³⁹⁵ Hamilton, "Early History," p. 16-17, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"ARCHIVES, History."

³⁹⁶ Gilluly, Grizzly Gridiron, pp. 59-60.

³⁹⁷ Morton J. Elrod to Malchoir (indecipherable), 14 March 1915, weather conditions in late November for the football game between Montana and Syracuse, MJE, S2, B1, F12. Also Merriam, History, pp. 43-44, for the Syracuse tie; and Gilluly, Grizzly Gridiron, pp. 15-17.

³⁹⁸ Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. II, pp. 45-47.

³⁹⁹ "Montana State University," (no date but apparently 1919), MJE, S3, B6, F6.

⁴⁰⁰ "Report to the President of the University, Covering growth from 1910 to 1915," (no date but 1918 because of internal reference to School of Education authorization by State Board in June 1918), and other related documents urging a School, RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945." Also "Dates of Opening of Schools (From Catalogs), 17 January 1936, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." The University established the School of Education officially in 1930.

⁴⁰¹ Craig, President's Report, 1902, p. 7; Craig, President's Report, 1903, p. 22; and Craig, President's Report, 1905, p. 22, all UnPub, S2, B1895-1912; also O. J. Craig, President, to C. F. Mellen, President Northern Pacific Railroad, 24 February 1902, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Correspondence -- 1901-1908." Also Scheuch, "University's Start Was Very Modest," Missoulian, Souvenir Edition (20 July 1922), pp. 9-12, esp. 10; and "Excerpts from early annual reports," "Eighth Annual President's Report, 30 November 1902," both RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." Also Merriam, History, p. 8. Also

⁴⁰² Clapp. "Narrative," ch. III, p. 15, for designation as a federal repository by Senators Thomas Carter and Joseph Dixon in 1909; and Merriam, History, p. 23.

Chapter II: LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE, 1916-1920

¹ "Edward C. Elliott," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_C._Elliott; and Burrin, Elliott, passim., esp. ch. III.

² Schrecker, No Ivory Tower, ch. 1, esp pp. 20-23.

³ Loss, Citizens and the State, pp. 19-20.

⁴ "Melvin Amos Brannon," at https://www.beloit.edu/archives/history/presidents/melvin_brannon/. Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 68; and Charles H. Clapp, "Remarks on Centralized Systems," National Association of State Universities (November 1933), pp. 3-5, concerning Brannon's resignation in exchange for veto of a bill eliminating the Chancellor position, with an Executive Secretary replacing the Chancellor in the Executive Council, RG1; PO, S5, B6, F"National Association of State Universities, 1910-51."

⁵ Malone and Roeder, Montana, ch. XI. See also Robert H. Ferrell, American Diplomacy: A History (Rev. Ed.; New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1969), chs. 19-20; and Henry F. May, The End of American Innocence (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1959), Part IV.

⁶ Gordon, American Growth, Part I, esp. p. 61, 92-93, 127-28, 162, 168-71, 203-05, 244-46, 285-87, and 316-18.

⁷ May, End of American Innocence, Part IV.

⁸ Merriam, History, Ch. IV.

⁹ "Clarence Streit," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clarence_Streit.

¹⁰ Gilluly, Grizzly Gridiron, pp. 77-84; and Holien, Football Vault, pp. 21-25.

¹¹ Merriam, History, pp. 47-48.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 64; President C. H. Clapp to President Melvin A. Brannon, 29 December 1922, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C. H. (Dr.)." Also Clapp, "Remarks on Centralized Systems," National Association of State Universities (November 1933), pp. 6, RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"National Association of State Universities, 1910-51."

¹⁴ Clapp to Brannon, 29 December 1922, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C. H. (Dr.)."

¹⁵ President Charles H. Clapp, "The University of Montana: The Montana System of Higher Education," 29 August 1930, RG1, PO, S19, B52, F"Millage and Bond Issue Referendum, 1930."

¹⁶ As quoted in Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V, p. 13.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, ch. V, p. 4; and Merriam, History, p. 47.

¹⁸ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 4 adjourned to 22 December 1916, p. 168, M418, R2.

¹⁹ Bonner to President F. C. Scheuch, 14 October 1916, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"General to 1933."

²⁰ James H. Bonner, Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, copy to President E. O. Scheuch, 25 March 1917, RG1, S17, B96, F"Repairs and Replacements."

²¹ C. F. Farmer to President E. O. Sisson, 1 May 1918; 4 February 1919; and 10 September 1919, RG1, S17, B96, F"Repairs and Replacements."

²² E. O. Sisson, Chair, Local Executive Board, 6 March 1919; and E. O. Sisson to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 10 March, 24 March, 29 March, and 1 April 1919; and Chancellor Edward C. Elliott to President Sisson, 30 April 1919, all RG1, PO, S17, B97, F"Alumni House."

²³ See President Robert Johns to Frank Abbott, et al., 10 June 1964; LJA (Armsby), typed note, 8 July 1964; and State Board of Education, "Item 191-102," 13 July 1964, all RG1, PO, S17, B97, F"Alumni House."

²⁴ Chancellor Edward C. Elliott to President Sisson, 26 April 1920, RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Trucks, Cars and Buses."

²⁵ J. B. Speer, Businesss Manager, to J. E. Murphy, State Purchasing Agent 1 March 1927; and President G. F. Simmons to T. G. Swearingen, 21 September 1938, RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Trucks, Cars and Buses."

²⁶ T. G. Swearingen, Maintenance Engineer, to President Simmons, 3 May 1940; and W. Fitzsimmons, Clerk, State Board of Examiners, 25 February 1942, RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Trucks, Cars and Buses."

²⁷ Dean, Cass Gilbert, pp. 15-17, on George Carsley, Gilbert's assistant who subsequently established his practice in Helena; Merriam, History, pp. 64-66; and Anonymous (J. B. Speer), "Proposed Land Acquisitions," 1 January 1943, pp 24, with map, for land acquisition by the University or the Alumni Challenge Athletic Field Corporation created by President C. H. Clapp in 1923 to assist the University in land acquisition, and a discussion of land planning, beginning with Craig for the Oval, and the Cass Gilbert Plan of 1916 that "contemplated acquisition of

land on the north, west, and south sides of campus, bounded by Eddy, Arthur and Beckwith," with initial financing for the land acquisition through the bonds authorized in the election of 1920, RG1, PO, S3 B16, F"1945 Legislative Data - MSU." Speer dated the Cass Gilbert Plan in 1916, the "History of Planning" in 1917.

²⁸ "Natural Science Building," RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"Natural Science Building."

²⁹ Various materials on the initiative campaign of 1920 for a dedicated levy of a mill and one-half to support maintenance and operations and a bonding bill to construct and repair the facilities in the Bonner committee report of 1916, including the completion of the Natural Science Building and the new Library, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Funds Campaign, 1920 - Advertisements."

³⁰ "Industrial Workers of the World," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_Workers_of_the_World. Also Toole, Uncommon Land, ch. X.

³¹ Malone and Roeder, Montana, pp. 199-215.

³² Burton K. Wheeler, with Paul F. Healy, Yankee From the West (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962), ch. Seven, esp. pp. 139-142.

³³ Work, Darkest Before Dawn, passim.; Gutfeld, Montana's Agony, passim.; and Astrid Honoria Sisson, "Edward Octavius Sisson, May 24 1869 - - January 24, 1949," (15 June 1950), passim., RG1, PO, S2, B169, F"President-Sisson, Edward O. (1917-21)."

³⁴ Malone and Roeder, Montana, pp. 212-214.

³⁵ "Espionage Act of 1917," in http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Espionage_Act_of_1917; and "Sedition Act of 1918," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sedition_Act_of_1918. Also "Sedition Act of 1918," at <http://find.galegroup.com/gic/infomark.do?&contentSet=EBKS&idigest=fb720fd31d9036c1ed2d1f3a0500fcc2&type=retrieve&tabID=T0011&prodId=GIC&docId=CX2687500077&source=gale&userGroupName=itsbtrial&version=1.0>, for the Montana source.

³⁶ "The Montana Sedition Project," at <http://www.seditionproject.net/>.

³⁷ Merriam, History, p. 48.

³⁸ "Proposal for Adjustment of Work For Students Registered in the Discontinued German Classes," effective 23 April 1918, "in accordance with the order of the State Defense Council;" and various letters, including F. C. Scheuch, Chairman of the Special Committee, to President E. O. Sisson, (no date but May-June 1918), reporting on arrangements for students affected by the discontinuance, all RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"CURR. Elimination of German - World War I."

³⁹ Owen Nelson, President of the University of Wyoming, to President E. O. Sisson, 31 May 1918, RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"CURR. Elimination of German - World War I."

⁴⁰ Unknown (probably Sisson) , "German," (no date but early 1918, referring to an article in the Modern Language Journal, vol. II, (#2, February 1918), RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"CURR. Elimination of German - World War I."

⁴¹ Chancellor E. C. Elliott, "Administrative Memorandum No. 95," 22 April 1918; and Gertrude Buckhous, Librarian, to President E. O. Sisson, 13 May 1918, implementing the removal of books in German, both RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"CURR. Elimination of German - World War I."

⁴² Fletcher B. Holmes to Dr. Richard B. Jesse, 17 May 1918; and Chancellor E. C. Elliott to President E. O. Sisson, 16 July 1918, both RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"CURR. Elimination of German - World War I."

⁴³ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 4 and 25 April 1921, pp. 20, 56, M418, R2.

⁴⁴ Edward C. Elliott to President E. O. Sisson, 8 April 1920; "The University of Montana, State Board of Education, University Act No. 1432, Chancellor's Calendar, April 1920, Relative To: Instruction in German at the State University," amended to include the other three campuses, both RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"CURR. Elimination of German - World War I."

⁴⁵ President Charles H. Clapp to Professor F. C. Scheuch, 3 October 1921, RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"CURR. Elimination of German - World War I."

⁴⁶ Curricular change forms in April 1923 from the Department for approval of courses on German language and literature, RG1, PO, S15, B 35, F"Languages, 1920-1955."

⁴⁷ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 78.

⁴⁸ "American Expeditionary Force to Siberia," concerning Wilson's attitude, at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Expeditionary_Force_Siberia; Malone and Roeder, Montana, Ch. 12; Gutman, Montana's Agony, *passim*.; Work, Darkest Before Dawn, 2005, *passim*., and "Red Scare," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red_Scare. See also Loss, Citizens and the State, pp. 33-34.

⁴⁹ Dean A. N. Whitlock to E. O. Sisson, 18 February and 8 March 1918, and several others during 1918, RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Law School, 1909-1938;" and Sisson, "President's Annual Statement, Commencement Day, 18 June, 1919, RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

⁵⁰ Merriam, History, p. 51.

⁵¹ "Announcement of a Nurses' Preparatory Course," Office of the Chancellor, September 1917; and H. H. Swain to President E. O. Sisson, 24 September 1917, both RG1, PO, S15, B38, F"Nurses Training Course."

⁵² M. J. Elrod, *et al.*, to Chancellor Elliott, 6 June 1918, RG1, PO, S15, B38, F"Nurses Training Course."

⁵³ Margaret Hughes, Director, Department of Public Health, to President E. O. Sisson, 28 February 1919, with related documents, RG1, PO, S15, B38, F"Nurse Training Course."

⁵⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 13-1; and Merriam, History, p. 57.

⁵⁵ Burrin, Elliott, pp. 66-67; and Clapp, "Narrative," CVI, pp. 15 ff.

⁵⁶ J. H. Wigmore, "The Students' Army Training Corps," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, 8 (#7; November 1922), pp. 60-62, at http://www.jstor.org/stable/40217179?seq=3#page_scan_tab_contents.

⁵⁷ Loss, Citizens and the State, Ch. 2, esp. p. 19.

⁵⁸ Merriam, History, p. 52; and Giltner, "Montana State University," 15 February 1939, p. 6, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." Documents concerning the SATC fill a large box of folders, RG1, PO, S3, B18.

⁵⁹ "University of Montana Men Who Died during the World War or as a Result of the War," penciled date of 28 May 1930, listing twenty-one persons; and "Roll of Honor, World War I," 27 June 1953, listing thirty-one people, including five SATC cadets; and other listings and notes, RG1, PO S15, B26, F"Roll of Honor - World War I."

⁶⁰ See Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, pp. 20 ff.

⁶¹ Various materials, RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"R.O.T.C., 1933-1935;" and RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"ROTC-Effort to Make Voluntary: 1938."

⁶² "M. J. Elrod," (no date but 1950s), referring to John Avenue, subsequently eliminated from the campus as a roadway, MJE, S1, B1, F1-1. Also Maintenance Engineer, "Property Map, Montana State University," 24 January 1947, RG1, S7, B97, F"Maps of Campus."

⁶³ Ibid; also Business Manager to Mrs. Lawrence Maloney, 8 December 1925, "Professor Elrod is assisting in looking after proper name plates for memorial trees;" and M. J. Elrod to A. L. Stone, 28 June 1926, funds for name plates, both RG1, PO, SIII, B18, F"President's Office, 1921, No. 1."

⁶⁴ SBE "Minutes," Regular Meeting, 2 September 1919, p. 303, M418, R2. Also Edward C. Elliott, Chancellor, to President F. C. Scheuch, 28 February 1920, name change for the field; Annabelle Lee Desmond, "Dornblazer Field -- Its Evolution. Part 1, Paul Dornblazer. Part II, Dornblazer Field," (Problems in Journalism, Autumn Quarters, 1926- 1927); President C. H. Clapp to H. M. Weir, 22 December 1927; Richard B. Millin to President C. H. Clapp, 2 April 1935, the details of Dornblazer's death; Lucille J. Armsby to Mrs. W. C. Henderson, 27 March 1947, Fletcher Henderson to The President, 7 April 1947, Mrs. W. C. Henderson to Mr. McCain, 19 April 1947, and President James A. McCain to Mrs. W. C. Henderson, 11 and 28 April 1947, all concerning a photograph of Dornblazer; and Montana State University, "Paul Logan Dornblazer: Football," plaque commemorating Dornblazer in 1956, all RG1, PO, S17, B97, F"Dornblazer Field." Also "Paul Logan Dornblazer," Gilluly, Grizzly Gridiron, p. 21.

⁶⁵ Giltner, "Montana State University," 15 February 1939, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." Merriam, History, p. 52; Melvin Lord, "Men's Dormitories at the University of Montana," 1927, RG1, PO, S15, B19, "F"Residence Hall - General to 1927;" and "Re: Buildings Acquired for Students Army Training Corps in World War I, 2 January 1953, RG1, S17, B96, F"Temporary & Wooden Buildings." Although providing some of the financing, the federal government took no ownership of the buildings.

⁶⁶ "1918 flu pandemic," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1918_flu_pandemic.

⁶⁷ Merriam, History, p. 52; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 18-20; and Sisson, "President's Annual Statement, Commencement Day," 18 June, 1919, RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

⁶⁸ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI; Merriam, History, ch. V; and Astrid Sisson, "Sisson," passim., RG1, PO, S2, B169, F"President- Sisson, Edward O. (1917-21)." Also "Copy of Contract Between State Board of Education and Edward O. Sisson," 18 September 1917; Sisson, "Inaugural," September 1917; President E. O. Sisson to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 26 April 1920; and E. O. Sisson, "Some Aims for the State University," (No date but 1918-1919), all RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

⁶⁹ Merriam, History, p. 58-59, once again criticism with faint praise.

⁷⁰ Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. VI, p. 47.

⁷¹ Clapp to Brennan, 29 December 1922, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C. H. (Dr.)."

⁷² Merriam, History, p. 56.

⁷³ Ibid, pp. 50-51; Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 8-10; and Astrid Sisson, "Sisson," pp. 16-17, RG1, PO, S2, B169, F"President- Sisson, Edward O. (1917-21)." Both Merriam and Clapp drew on Sisson's account.

⁷⁴ President E. O. Sisson, "State University of Montana: A Crisis and an Opportunity in the History of the University," (no date but probably 1917), RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

⁷⁵ Quoted by Astrid Sisson, "Sisson," p. 17, RG1, PO, S2, B169, F"President- Sisson, Edward O. (1917-21),"obviously the Anaconda Copper Company.

⁷⁶ Edward O. Sisson, "Inaugural," (no date but 1917), RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

⁷⁷ For the headline, Merriam, History, p. 50-51.

⁷⁸ President Edward O. Sisson, "An Open Letter Concerning the State University of Montana," reprinted from Missoulian (17 January 1921), RG1, PO, S19, B169, F"President - Letters." See also Astrid Sisson, "Sisson," pp. 19-21, RG1, PO, S2, B169, F"President- Sisson, Edward O. (1917-21)."

⁷⁹ Edward O. Sisson, "President's Annual Statement, Commencement Day, 18 June, 1919, RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

⁸⁰ See Loss, Citizens and State, ch. 2, esp. p. 27, concerning the development of these crude tests and the psychological bureaucratization of the Army for the effective adaptation and use of the recruit, late applied the students in the colleges and universities. Loss argued that educational administrators in the 1920s adapted the Army and business psychological tools for the most effective development of the student.

⁸¹ E. O. Sisson, "Some Aims for the State University," (no date but 1919), RG30, HR, F"Sisson, Edward O."

⁸² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 30-31, on the "Welfare Committee." For shared governance, see Hamilton, , Academic Ethics, passim.

⁸³ Excerpt "From the Faculty Minutes of January 15, 1918: Welfare Committee," RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918."

⁸⁴ Excerpts "From the Faculty Minutes, November 26, 1918," and "From the Faculty Minutes, March 11, 1919," RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918."

⁸⁵ Excerpt "From the Faculty Minutes of January 15, 1918: Welfare Committee;" also Sisson to Thornleer, 13 February 1918, both RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918."

⁸⁶ E. O. Sisson, President, to The Welfare Committee, 20 March 1918, RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918."

⁸⁷ Sisson to Thornleer, 13 February 1918, RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918."

⁸⁸ Sisson, "Welfare Committee," 1918, RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918."

⁸⁹ Excerpt "From the Faculty Minutes of November 26, 1918," RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918."

⁹⁰ Unknown (undoubtedly Sisson), "Welfare Committee," handwritten title, one typed sheet with the date of "Feb. 1918" in the margin, explaining that Sisson and the Chancellor "favored a system by which the Faculty should share the responsibility and the authority of directing the University," and that the Chancellor appointed a "committee of this Faculty" to advise on such a system, but that since implementing the new system for the entire University required time, Sisson created the Welfare Committee to advise him on State University personnel matters, RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918." Elliott never called for a multi-campus faculty advisory committee and one did not emerge until the 1950s at the faculty initiative but with little administrative support.

⁹¹ Burrin, Elliott, pp. 61-66, esp. 64.

⁹² Elrod, "Consolidation of the State Institutions," The Inter-Mountain Educator, 9 (#9; May 1914), pp. 29-30.

⁹³ Morton J. Elrod to Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 13 January 1916, MJE, S2, B2, F1.

⁹⁴ Burrin, Elliott, p. 65.

⁹⁵ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 11 October 1915, pp. 93-95, M418, R2.

⁹⁶ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V, pp. 16-18; SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 22 December 1913, p. 35, 38, M418, R2, for the mandated review of course and program proposals; and Edward C. Elliott, Chancellor, to The Presidents, "Memorandum," #145, 8 March 1920, "From the Faculty Minutes of March 9, 1920," mandating procedural change to prevent "irregular, indefinite and unsupported" proposals for "new courses of instruction" and for organization or modification of curriculum, and requiring approval by the separate faculties and Presidents; and several other memoranda and minutes concerning transferability of credits and the documentary requirements for all courses and programs, RG1, PO, S7, B6, F"Curriculum General to 1942."

⁹⁷ "Request of Chancellor's Office for Reports," 20 September 1917, RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

⁹⁸ "Executive Council Proceedings - Helena, XXIV, Coordination of Courses," 3 December 1920, RG1, PO, S7, B6, F"Curriculum General to 1942."

⁹⁹ "Request of Chancellor's Office for Reports," 20 September 1917, RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

¹⁰⁰ Freeman Daughters, Chair, et al., Committee on Student Advisers, to Edward C. Elliott, Chancellor, "Report of the Committee on Student Advisers," 23 December 1916, RG1, PO, S5, B59, F"Academic Advising."

¹⁰¹ "Proposed Rule Concerning Student Advisers," (no date but early 1920s), RG1, PO, S5, B59, F"Academic Advising."

¹⁰² Lucille J. Armsby to President McFarland, 5 April 1951, RG1, PO, S19, B52, F"Duplication - 1945-50." Without this clearinghouse function, before long no one knew what existed where and with what authority.

¹⁰³ SBE, "Minutes," Regular Meeting, June 1918, pp. 59-154, M418, R2.

¹⁰⁴ Burrin, Elliott, pp. 62-63.

¹⁰⁵ E. O. Sisson, "Copy to Chancellor," 6 April 1921, RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

¹⁰⁶ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 22 January 1917, p. 173, M418, R2.

¹⁰⁷ "No Lobbying For College Funds Now," Missoulian (9 December 1914), p. 5, MHS, DN.

¹⁰⁸ The Executive Council, University of Montana, "Statement of Organization and Regulations," (no date but May 1958), a proposal by the Council submitted for approval by the State Board to formalize the Council, Section B, concerning Elliott's establishment in 1916 of the Executive Council consisting of the campus Presidents and four others -- two each from the State University and the State College -- to advise him, with a handwritten note stating "Not Approved," RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"Executive Council Manual." Nonetheless, the Executive Council functioned to advise the Chancellor from 1916 until well after the abolition of the Chancellor's Office. This 1958 proposal sought to place the Council on a secure foundation to advise the State Board of Education functioning as the University Board of Regents. Also Clapp, "Remarks on Centralized Systems," November 1933, RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"National Association of State Universities, 1910-31;" and Clapp to Brannon, 29 December 1922, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C. H. (Dr.)."

¹⁰⁹ Merriam, History, p. 63, fn. 6.

¹¹⁰ Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code . . .," The University of Montana Bulletin (General Series; Number Ten; June 1919), pp. 190 and "Index," plus a brief supplement with a few more state statutes published in 1922; and "Executive Council Proceedings," 25-26 March 1921, noting Board approval of the "plan" for the Code in 1918, indicating that the draft of Part II, sent to the campuses for review, represented the beginning of the compilation of the "acts of the State Board of Education and of the State Board of Examiners, administrative memoranda of the Chancellor, regulations of the several faculties, and constitutions of student organizations," both RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code." Also Edward C. Elliott, "Administrative Memorandum No. 180, Relating To: The University Code," 20 October 1921, pp. 66 (typescript), RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Univ Code (First Draft of Part I);" and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V, pp. 20-21, on the Code that included "all the laws that had to do with the units of the University of Montana, the State Board of Education, and the chancellor plan, from the original land grant year to the year 1922," and the acts and regulations for the University. For a modern effort to update the Code, Gordon B. Castle, Academic Dean, to President Carl McFarland, 1 August 1951, including Report of the Committee on Codification of Rules of the University, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Committee to Codify the Rules & Regulations of the University."

¹¹¹ E. O. Sisson to J. J. Thornleer, Secretary to the Faculty, University of Arizona, 13 February 1918, reporting that Professor N. J. Lennes served as the chairman of the faculty committee appointed by Elliott, RG1, PO, S5, B23, F"Welfare Committee, 1918." Also Edward O. Sisson, "Inaugural Address," (no date but September 1917), noting Elliott's recognition as a "national authority on educational administration" with "advanced and liberal views" toward "development in the direction of democracy," RG30, HR, F"Edward O. Sisson."

¹¹² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V-VII; Merriam, History, ch. IV-VI; and Astrid Honoria Sisson, "Edward Octavius Sisson, May 24 1869 - - January 24, 1949," (15 June 1950), passim., concerning Sisson's respect for Elliott because of his consultative and democratic approach, RG1, PO, S2, B169, F"President- Sisson, Edward O. (1917-21)"

¹¹³ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, June 1918, pp. 145-147, M418, R2. For the policies concerning appointments, tenure of office, and the Committee on Service, Edward C. Elliott, "Administrative Memorandum No. 180, Relating

To: The University Code," 20 October 1921, pp. 66 (typescript), RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Univ Code (First Draft of Part I)."

¹¹⁴ "No. 7814 . . . The State of Montana, *Ex rel.*, Philip O. Keeney vs. Roy E Ayers, *et al.*," 17 June 1939, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Admin., Simmons etc."

¹¹⁵ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, June 1918, pp. 145-146, M418, R2; Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. VI, pp. 30-32; and Frederick S. Deibler, "Committee on Academic Freedom: Statement on the Case of Professor Louis Levine of the University of Montana," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors. Reports of Actions on Carnegie Foundation Proposals; University of Montana; Bethany College; List of Committees (Boston: AAUP, March 1919), pp. 13-25, at p. 19, on the Committee and the process, MJE, S3, B4, F4.

¹¹⁶ Office of the Chancellor, "Administrative Memorandum No. 100," 29 June 1918, referencing "Regulations in Regard to Tenure . . .," Un. Act #673 (22 June 1918), RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"Salaries, 1918-1944." Also Elliott, "Administrative Memorandum No. 180," 1921, pp. 66 (typescript), RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Univ Code (First Draft of Part I)."

¹¹⁷ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 1 June 1914, p. 57, M418, R2.

¹¹⁸ Kofoid, "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 3 (#5, Part II; May 1917), p. 15.

¹¹⁹ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 22 January 1917, p. 173, M418, R2. In recent years, critics used the term "gag rule" to refer to efforts by the Board of Regents -- successor to the State Board of Education -- to restrict communication with members of the legislature or the Governor and staff.

¹²⁰ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 4 and 15 June 1917, p. 185, M418, R2. Also excerpt SBE Minutes, 4 June 1917; and "State Board of Education - Document No. 3," RG30, HR, F"Rowe, J. P."

¹²¹ *Ibid.*; the motion instructed the Chancellor to consult, develop, and "present" the regulations to the Board and the campuses.

¹²² "University Act No. 514, Chancellor's Calendar -E, December 1917," in response to the Board resolution of 15 June 1917, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"Investigations and Censure Prior to 1936." For subsequent restatement of the regulation concerning "outside employment," see Elliott, "Administrative Memorandum No. 180, Relating to: The University Code," 20 October 1921, explaining that Part II consisted of "all the regulations now in force for the internal administration of the institutions," compiled from "minutes of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Examiners and of administrative memoranda, . . . [and] the minutes of the several faculties," with various sections, one for the Executive Council and one on outside "work of any nature" which required "approval of the president," RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Univ Code (First Draft of Part I)." On the "University Code," developed and promulgated by Chancellor Elliott, see Clapp, "Narrative," ch. V, pp. 20-21, including "all the laws that had to do with the units of the University of Montana, the State Board of Education, and the chancellor plan, from the original land grant year to the year 1922," and the acts and regulations for the University. For the Code, Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code . . .," The University of Montana Bulletin (General Series; Number Ten; June 1919), pp. 190 and "Index," plus a brief supplement with a few more state statutes published in 1922; also see "Executive Council Proceedings," 25-26 March 1921, noting Board approval of the "plan" for the Code in 1918, indicating that the draft of Part II, sent to the campuses for review, represented the beginning of the compilation of the "acts of the State Board of Education and of the State Board of Examiners, administrative memoranda of

the Chancellor, regulations of the several faculties, and constitutions of student organizations," both RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code."

¹²³ Exchanges among N. J. Lennes, L. Levine, F. Daughters, E. C. Elliott, J. M. Underwood, and E. O Sisson, summer and fall of 1918, RG30, HR, F"Lennes."

¹²⁴ Various materials related to the Levine case, including Professor Elrod's handwritten draft of the Service Committee report and a copy of the AAUP Bulletin reporting the case, MJE, S5, B28, F3; also Arnon Gutfeld, "The Levine Affair: A Case Study in Academic Freedom," Pacific Historical Review 39 (#1; February 1970), pp, 19-37; Joseph Kinsey Howard, Montana: High, Wide, and Handsome (Reprint. Ed.; Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), ch. XXIII, "'A Russian Jew Named Levine . . .';" and RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹²⁵ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, p. 19.

¹²⁶ Ibid, pp. 24-36; Merriam, History, pp. 54-55; and Gutfeld, "Levine Affair," passim.

¹²⁷ Louis Levine to President E. O. Sisson, 1 April 1918, the topics and focus; and Louis Levine to Morton J. Elrod, Chairman, Service Committee, 21 February 1919, the sequence of events, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹²⁸ Gutfeld, "Levine Affair," pp. 19-23.

¹²⁹ Ibid; and Edward C. Elliott to President E. O. Sisson, 8 April 1918, RG30 HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹³⁰ Astrid Sisson, "Sisson," p.18, quoting Sisson, RG1, PO, S2, B169, F"President- Sisson, Edward O. (1917-21);" also Gutfeld, "Levine Affair," pp. 25-26, the "uneasy" time created by war hysteria and the resurgence of farmer-labor political agitation.

¹³¹ Gutfeld, "Levine Affair," pp. 26-27.

¹³² SBE Minutes, Regular Meeting, (**GET PRECISE DATES**) December 1918, M418, R2; and Gutfeld, "Levine Affairs," p. 28.

¹³³ See Merriam, History, p. 183, for the section of the University Charter on sectarian or partisan teaching.

¹³⁴ E. O. Sisson to Chancellor Elliott, 6 December 1918, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis." However, Sisson later changed his view, and identified a serious problem in Levine's monograph of working "backward from a desired answer. That is what was the matter with Levine's solution of Mine Taxation;" the comment appeared in a letter opposing a "labor College" at the State University with a "narrow curriculum," inadequate staffing, and approached "from a sentimental or even practical basis," without the "technical expertise," President E. O. Simmons to Professor H. G. Merriam, 11 November 1921, RG30, HR, F"Merriam, H. G."

¹³⁵ Louis Levine to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 4 February 1919, the sequence of events leading to specific agreement; and Levine to Elrod, 21 February 1919, both RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹³⁶ Edward C. Elliott to Louis Levine, 29 January 1919, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹³⁷ Morton J. Elrod, Paul C. Phillips, and Walter J. Pope, "Findings of the Committee on Service . . .," 1 April 1919, p. 6, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹³⁸ Elliott to Levine, 29 January 1919, emphasis supplied; F. S. Deibler to President E. O. Sisson, 23 March 1919, that Elliott "told Levine not to do a thing" but Levine "did it" despite the instruction; and Levine to Elrod, 21 February 1919, that Elliott did not contend "that his new policy gave him the right to forbid me to publish my monograph privately," denying insubordination, all RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹³⁹ Merriam, History, p. 54-55; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, p. 24.

¹⁴⁰ Levine to Elrod, 21 February 1919; Levine to Elliott, 4 February 1919, and Deibler to Sisson, 23 March 1919, all RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹⁴¹ Gutfeld, "Levine Affair," p. 30; Louis Levine, The Taxation of Mines in Montana (Reprint Ed.; Boulder: University of Colorado BiblioLife, n.d.), passim., originally published in 1919; and Jules Alexander Karlin, Joseph M. Dixon of Montana (Missoula, MT: University of Montana, 1974), vols. I-II, esp. vol. II, chs. 3-11.

¹⁴² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 23-36; Merriam, History, pp. 54-55; also Sisson, "Sisson," ch. IV, no mention of a possible resignation and good terms with Elliott despite disagreement, RG1, PO, S2, B169, F"President- Sisson, Edward O. (1917-21)."

¹⁴³ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 29-30.

¹⁴⁴ E. O. Sisson to Dr. Elliott, 9 February 1919, RG30, HR, F "Levine, Louis."

¹⁴⁵ Gutfeld, "Levine Case," p. 31; and Elrod, *et al.*, "Findings of the Committee on Service . . .," 1 April 1919, p. 6, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹⁴⁶ Deibler, "Case of Levine," p. 20, 1919, listing the Committee members, MJE, S5, B28, F3; and Gutfeld, "The Levine Affair," pp. 30-31, in error, that President Sisson appointed all three members.

¹⁴⁷ Morton J. Elrod, handwritten draft of the Committee Report in the Louis Levine case, (no date but February – April 1919, MJE, S5, B28, F3. Elrod erred, as consultation had occurred.

¹⁴⁸ Minutes, "regular monthly meeting of the faculty," 11 February 1919, marked "Confidential. For members of the faculty only," purportedly about the "report of findings of the Service Committee" on the "suspension of Dr. Levine," MJE, S5, B27, F3. However, the discussion focused on procedures and possible findings, not the actual report, although perhaps affecting the report not completed and submitted until April.

¹⁴⁹ For the basis of Lennes' concern, see the earlier discussion and President E. O. Sisson to Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 21 April 1921, RG30, HR, F"Lennes, N. J."

¹⁵⁰ See "Would Relieve 'U' Suspicion," Missoulian (15 February 1919); J. H. Underwood to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 23 July 1918; and J. H. Underwood to Mr. Elliott, 16 June 1918, all RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"1919, 1923 Investigations by Senate Committee." The letters refuted the charges against Underwood, Levine, and the Department, although Underwood speculated that "any defense will be time wasted if the attacks are personal or partisan."

¹⁵¹ Underwood to Elliott, 16 June 1918, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"1919, 1923 Investigations by Senate Committee."

¹⁵² Edward O. Sisson, President, to Hon. J. W. Anderson, Chairman, Senate Committee on Education, 24 February 1919, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"1919, 1923 Investigations by Senate Committee." Several other letters and memoranda relate to the charges and the investigation.

¹⁵³Office of the Chancellor, "Report of the Senate Committee on Education on the Teaching of Socialism in the University of Montana, March 1919," University of Montana Bulletin (General Series; No. Nine; April 1919), RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"1919, 1923 Investigations by Senate Committee."

¹⁵⁴ Morton J. Elrod, "Montana Professor Suspended," The Inter-Mountain Educator 14 (#6; February 1919), pp. 24-26.

¹⁵⁵ Deibler to Sisson, 23 March 1919, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹⁵⁶ Elrod, *et al.*, "Findings of the Committee on Service . . .," 1 April 1919, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁸ See *ibid*; and Deibler, "Case of Levine," pp. 20-25, 1919, MJE, SV, B28, F3.

¹⁵⁹ See "Abbott Lawrence Lowell," at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abbott_Lawrence_Lowell.

¹⁶⁰ Elrod, handwritten draft, 1919, MJE, S5, B28, F3.

¹⁶¹ Morton J. Elrod, "Dr. Louis Levine Reinstated," The Inter-Mountain Educator 14 (#8; April 1919), pp. 41-42.

¹⁶² SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 7 April 1919, at p. 250, M418, R2 and Edward C. Elliott to President E. O. Sisson, 10 April 1919, the Board "approved" the "action of the Chancellor in suspending" Levine and reinstated Levine and restored his "salary for the period of suspension," RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis." Also Merriam, History, p. 55, a confused statement that the Board "approved the action of the Chancellor in the reinstatement," implying that the Chancellor reinstated Levine, an action not allowed by the policy.

¹⁶³ J H. Underwood to President of the University, 5 March 1919, RG30, HR, F""Levine, Louis," for the amendment.

¹⁶⁴ See Morton J. Elrod, "Dr. Louis Levine Reinstated," The Inter-Mountain Educator 14 (#8; April 1919), pp. 41-42; and see SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 7 April 1919, at p. 250, M418, R2.

¹⁶⁵ Edward O. Sisson, President, to Editor, New Republic, 22 February 1919, marked "not for publication" and objecting to the tone and thrust of the New Republic report, and specifically defending the Chancellor "for good faith and earnest purpose," RG30, HR, F "Levine, Louis."

¹⁶⁶ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 33-34.

¹⁶⁷ Toole, Uncommon Land, p. 221, that "Levine was fired;" and Howard, Montana: High, Wide, and Handsome, ch. XXIII.

¹⁶⁸ Deibler, "Case of Levine," pp. 13-15, 1919, , MJE, S5, B28, F3.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p. 25; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 23-36.

¹⁷⁰ See Gutfeld, "Levine Affair," pp 36-37; and Jules Alexander Karlin, "Progressive Politics in Montana," Merrill G. Burlingame and K. Ross Toole, A History of Montana (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., Inc., 1957), vol. II, ch. XI, pp. 247-80, at 262 ff.; Karlin, Dixon of Montana, vol. II, ch. 3-11; and Toole, Uncommon Land, ch. X.

¹⁷¹ Malone & Roeder, Montana, pp. 220-22.

¹⁷² Edward O. Sisson to Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 29 September 1919; Louis Levine to President E. O. Sisson, 1 October 1919; and Edward O. Sisson to Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 4 October 1919, all RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹⁷³ E. C. Elliott to E. O. Sisson, 10 October 1919; and E. O. Sisson to Louis Levine, 13 October 1919, both RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹⁷⁴ For example, E. O. Sisson to Professor Jane I. Newell, Wellesley College, 18 March 1921, RG30, HR, F "Levine, Louis."

¹⁷⁵ Excerpts from the Congressional Record, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹⁷⁶ Merriam, History, p. 55; and Gutfeld, "Levine Affair," p. 37.

¹⁷⁷ Stephen Duggan, Director, Institute of International Education, to President George Finlay Simmons, 30 October 1938, RG30, HR, "Levine, Louis,"; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, p. 35

¹⁷⁸ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting , 7 April 1919, p. 250, M418, R2.

¹⁷⁹ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 4 and 25 April 1921, pp. 50-53, M418, R2; and Morton J. Elrod, "Findings of the Committee on Service of the Montana State University In the Case of Arthur Fisher," 13 September 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F6. For the Elrod amendment, minutes of the "regular faculty," 11 February 1919, MJE, S5, B27, F3.

¹⁸⁰ "Office of the Chancellor Memorandum, 10 April 1919," RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"Investigations and Censure Prior to 1936."

¹⁸¹ E. O. Sisson to Dr. H. H. Swain, Executive Secretary, 12 April 1919, RG30, HR, F"Levine, Louis."

¹⁸² M. J. Elrod, Paul C. Phillips, and Walter L. Pope to President Edward O. Sisson, 1 July 1919, RG1, PO, S6, B82, F"Service Committee."

¹⁸³ "Office of the Chancellor Memorandum, 10 April 1919," RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"Investigations and Censure Prior to 1936."

¹⁸⁴ N. J. Lennes to Max Cederbaum, 16 December 1918, and several related documents, RG30, HR, F"Lennes, N. J."

¹⁸⁵ Sisson to Elliott, 21 April 1921, RG30, HR, F"Lennes, N. J."

¹⁸⁶ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 7 April 1919, p. 252, M418, R2.

¹⁸⁷ For the Lennes amendment, see "Minutes of the "regular faculty," 11 February 1919, MJE, S5, B27, F3.

¹⁸⁸ For the survey results, E. O. Sisson to the Service Committee, Professor Elrod, Chairman, 20 May 1919; and Morton J. Elrod, Chairman, Paul C. Phillips, and Walter L. Pope, Committee on Service, to President E. O. Sisson, 3 July 1919, both RG1, PO, S5, B47, "F"Tenure." And Office of the Chancellor, "Administrative Memorandum No. 100," 29 June 1918, referencing "Regulations in Regard to Tenure . . .," Un. Act #673 (22 June 1918), RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"Salaries, 1918-1944."

¹⁸⁹ Recent attacks on academic tenure have made a similar argument. Also President George Finlay Simmons, "Regarding teachers to be discharged," National Association of State Universities, November 1938, "faculty members will not testify against each other," thus a dismissal cannot prevail, RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"Nat'l Ass'n of State Un, 1910-1951."

¹⁹⁰ C. H. Clapp to Morton J. Elrod, 10 August 1921, allegations against Arthur Fisher, Professor of Law, MJE, S5, B27, F8. Also Stearns, "Fisher," passim. And Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, p. 32; Merriam, History, pp. 66-67, minimal discussion. Burrin, Elliott, no discussion at all.

¹⁹¹ Work, Darkest Before Dawn, passim.; Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp. 6 ff. and 90-100; Merriam, History, ch. V; Gutfeld, "Levine Affair," pp. 25-26; Stearns, "Fisher," esp. 11-25; and "Palmer Raids," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Palmer_Raids.

¹⁹² Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 7-17; and Elrod, "Findings of the Committee . . . In the Case of Arthur Fisher," 13 September 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F6.

¹⁹³ Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 7-17; and "Prof. Fisher Dismissed From University," Missoulain (18 September 1921), headline error, MJE, S5, B7, F10.

¹⁹⁴ Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 58-59.

¹⁹⁵ Miles Romney, "From An Independent Newspaper," New Northwest, (no date but September 1921), reprinted from The Western News (Hamilton weekly), MJE, S5, B27, F10. Also various statements and related documents, RG30, HR, F"Staff: Fisher, Arthur" and "Arthur Fisher"(2 separate Folders).

¹⁹⁶ Arthur Fisher to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 6 September 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F8.

¹⁹⁷ Arthur Fisher to Miss May Trumper, State Superintendent of Schools and Secretary to the State Board of Education, 1 September 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F8. Fisher took the oath prescribed by the state Constitution.

¹⁹⁸ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, p. 32; and Stearns, "Fisher," esp. 40, 42-46, on Fisher's involvement with the paper.

¹⁹⁹ Elrod, "Findings of the Committee," 13 September 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F6; Edward C. Elliott, "Memorandum re American Legion Charges Against Arthur Fisher," 1921, passim., RG30, HR, F"Arthur Fisher."; and Stearns, "Fisher," pp. esp. pp. 14-26, 48.

²⁰⁰ Elliott, "Memorandum," 1921, esp. pp. 3-4, RG30, HR, F"Arthur Fisher."; and Stearns, "Fisher," esp. pp. 14-25.

²⁰¹ Stearns, "Fisher," passim.

²⁰² *Ibid*, at 41-46.

²⁰³ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 11 July 1921, p. 75, M418, R2. And numerous documents concerning the Legion charges and other issues, RG30, HR, F"Staff: Fisher, Arthur" and F"Arthur Fisher;" and Stearns, "Fisher," passim.

²⁰⁴ Arthur Fisher to Committee on Service, 3 August 1921, including various documents concerning the case, MJE, S5, B27, F4; and Clapp to Elrod, 10 August 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F8. Also Merriam, History, p. 67, that the Board simply filed the resolutions offered by the Montana Newspaper Association supporting the Legion Executive

Committee and the resolutions of the Montana Trades and Labor Council and the World War I Veterans and ordered the investigation by the Chancellor and the President using the Service Committee.

²⁰⁵ Arthur Fisher to President Charles H. Clapp, 28 July 1921, RG30, HR, F"Staff: Fisher, Arthur."

²⁰⁶ Clapp to Elrod, 10 August 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F8.

²⁰⁷ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. IV, p. 32.

²⁰⁸ M. J. Elrod to President Clapp, 31 August 1921, RG30, HR, F"Staff: Fisher, Arthur."

²⁰⁹ C. H. Clapp to Morton J. Elrod, 2 September 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F8.

²¹⁰ Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 68-76, citing Clapp to Fisher, 14 September 1921, not in the Fisher, Elrod, or President's Office files.

²¹¹ Morton J. Elrod to Arthur Fisher, 25 August 1921, with "best regards" to Fisher's family, MJE, S5, B27, F4.

²¹² Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, passim.

²¹³ Elrod to Fisher, 25 August 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F4; and Arthur Fisher to Mr. and Mrs. Elrod, 17 August 1921, leaving "205 So. Fifth in perfect shape;" if Mrs. Elrod "finds any of my things in her way," "dump" them; hoped the Committee was not burdensome; with "Best wishes to 'Mother Elrod' and Mary et al," MJE, S55, B27, F8. The Elrod family typically spent the summers at the Biological Station. Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 13-14, made no comment about the relationship.

²¹⁴ Elrod to Fisher, 25 August 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F4.

²¹⁵ Elrod, "Findings of the Committee," 13 September 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F6. Also Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 78-90; and F. S. Deibler, "Report on the University of Montana," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 10 (#3; March 1924), pp. 154-162.

²¹⁶ Office of the Chancellor, "Administrative Memorandum No. 100," 29 June 1918, RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"Salaries, 1918-1944;" for the amendment concerning 15 April, SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 4 and 25 April 1921, pp. 50-53, M418, R2. Also Merriam, History, p. 67, the erroneous statements that Fisher had a three-year contract and that the Legion Post in Missoula filed the charges against Fisher.

²¹⁷ Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 27-29, 37-39, 55, 91-93, agreed, arguing the administrators trumped up this charge at the last moment; but see Elliott, "Memorandum," 1921, p. 4, RG30, HR, F"Arthur Fisher." Also Clapp to Fisher, 14 September 1921, concerning partisan activities, cited in Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 68-76; and C. W. Leaphart and C. H. Clapp to Montana State Board of Education, 16 September 1921, on Fisher's relationship with the partisan paper, RG30, HR, F"Arthur Fisher."

²¹⁸ Note the similarity to President Sisson's "Open Letter," Missoulian (17 January 1921), RG1; PO, S19, B169, F"President - Letters."

²¹⁹ Leaphart and Clapp to State Board of Education, 16 September 1921, RG30, HR, F"Arthur Fisher."

²²⁰ Stearns, "Fisher," passim., and esp. 93-94.

²²¹ C. W. Leaphart, Dean, to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 8 July 1921; and Danta C. Hanson, "History of the Montana Law School," 23 May 1927, on the "problem method" based on the Langdell case method, used for years in the School of Law at the State University, both RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Law School, 1909-1938."

²²² C. W. Leaphart to the Service Committee, 10 September 1921, MJE, S5, B27, F5. In response to the survey, H. G. Merriam thought Fisher a good but tough teacher and urged his retention.

²²³ Leaphart and Clapp to State Board of Education, 16 September 1921, RG30, HR, F"Arthur Fisher."

²²⁴ A. Atkinson, President, Montana State College, to President C. H. Clapp, 10 September 1921, RG#30, HR, F"Staff: Fisher, Arthur."

²²⁵ See Elliott, "Memorandum," 1921, RG30, HR, F"Arthur Fisher." Also Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 90-96, praise for the analysis, but criticizing Elliott's conception of academic freedom.

²²⁶ Elliott, "Memorandum," 1921, at pp. 1-2, RG30, HR, F"Arthur Fisher."

²²⁷ Note that Memorandum No. 100 required presidential approval of off-campus employment, as see Office of the Chancellor, "Administrative Memorandum No. 100," 29 June 1918, RG#1, PO, S5, B47, F"Salaries, 1918-1944." No evidence exists to show whether Fisher ever asked President Sisson to approve the outside employment on a part-time basis. He made no such request of Clapp who obviously saw a conflict with his campus responsibilities.

²²⁸ The Chancellor's second resolution ran parallel to but exceeded in stringency the sanctions proposed by Clapp and Leaphart. No administrator recommended disrupting Fisher's existing contract.

²²⁹ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 17 September 1921, pp. 103-116, at 111-112, M418, R2. Fisher did not have tenure or a tenure-track contract.

²³⁰ Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 95-96.

²³¹ See "Prof. Fisher Dismissed From University," Missoulian (18 September 1921), despite the headline, the Board did not dismiss Fisher, MJE, S5, B7, F10.

²³² "Prof. Fisher Dismissed From University," Missoulian (19 September 1921), inaccurate headline, MJE, S5, B7, F10.

²³³ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 4 and 25 April 1921, pp. 50-53, M418, R2. Years later, Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. IV, p. 32, recognized that the Board simply allowed Fisher's contract to expire, after notifying him of that intention in 1921. She also stated, however, that Fisher, as editor of the New Northwest, failed to devote appropriate attention to his teaching, and that the Board did not renew his contract in 1921. In fact, Fisher, as one of several directors and partial owners, never served as editor; and the Board ultimately refused to renew his contract in 1922 but notified him of that outcome in 1921.

²³⁴ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 19 December 1921, p. 127, M418, R2.

²³⁵ "The Case of Arthur Fisher," Missoulian (20 September 1921), MJE, S5, B7, F10.

²³⁶ Romney, "From an Independent Newspaper," 1921, MJE, S5, B7, F10. Also "Miles Romney," at <http://boards.ancestry.com/surnames.romney/13/mb.ashx>. He apparently forgot or never knew about the Elrod case in 1908.

²³⁷ By analogy, Romney claimed for his "victims" exemption from the self-inflicted burden falling on the citizen who engaged in civil disobedience, thereby draining away the moral significance of the act itself. For discussion, see David Brooks, The Road to Character (New York: Random House, 2015), esp. ch. 6; Alexander M. Bickel, The New Age of Political Reform: The Electoral College, the Convention, and the Party System (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1968), passim; Alexander M. Bickel, The Morality of Consent (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975), passim; and Alexander Bickel, The Supreme Court and the Idea of Progress (New York, Evanston, & London: Harper & Row, 1970), passim.

²³⁸ Stearns, "Fisher," pp. 102-104.

²³⁹ Ibid., p. 98.

²⁴⁰ Morton J. Elrod, "Professor Fisher," The Inter-Mountain Educator 17(#2; October 1921), pp. 73-74.

²⁴¹ Deibler, "Report on the University of Montana," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 10 (#3; March 1924), pp. 160-161, included a copy.

²⁴² Stearns, "Fisher," p. 97-98.

²⁴³ See Deibler, "Report on the University of Montana," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 10 (#3; March 1924), pp. 154-162.

²⁴⁴ Emphasis supplied.

²⁴⁵ Stearns "Fisher," p. 99, quoting C. H. Clapp to A. W. Vernon, AAUP, 5 July 1923.

²⁴⁶ C. H. Clapp, President, to Professor John Hollen, University of Texas, 13 February 1930, RG1, PO S5, B47, F"Tenure."

²⁴⁷ See "Connick v. Meyers," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Connick_v._Myers#cite_note-McAuliffe_case-14.

²⁴⁸ Emphasis supplied.

²⁴⁹ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, Ch. II.

²⁵⁰ Merriam, History, p. x.

²⁵¹ Stearns, "Fisher," p. 101-104.

²⁵² Office of the Chancellor, "Administrative Memorandum No. 100," 29 June 1918, RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"Salaries, 1918-1944;" and Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code," 1919, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code."

²⁵³ But see the discussion below in Chapter 4 of "No. 7814 . . . The State of Montana, *Ex rel.*, Philip O. Keeney vs. Roy E. Ayers, *et al.*," 17 June 1939, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Admin., Simmons etc." In this case, an AAUP Committee

recognized the discretionary authority of the Board, but also required notice of the nature of the term contract to the faculty member.

²⁵⁴ Again, for a special exception, see "No. 7814 . . . The State of Montana, *Ex rel.*, Philip O. Keeney vs. Roy E. Ayers, *et al.*," 17 June 1939, RG1, PO, SIV, B167, F"Admin., Simmons etc.," turning on a technical point of contract language; and, for the AAUP discussion of that case, Professors W. T. Laprade, Harry F. Clements, and Charles McKinley, "Academic Freedom and Tenure," *AAUP Bulletin* 24 (#4; April 1938), pp. 321-348, at 329-331, conceding the institutional prerogative but requiring notice.

²⁵⁵ *Sweezy v. New Hampshire*, 334 *US* 234 (1957), at 263, emphasis supplied.

²⁵⁶ Stearns, "Fisher," pp. iii-v.

²⁵⁷ Alexander Bickel, *The Supreme Court and the Idea of Progress* (New York, Evanston, & London: Harper & Row, 1970), *passim*, esp. p. 13, citing his predecessors L. B. Namier and E. H. Carr.

²⁵⁸ M. J. Elrod to President Clapp, 4 November 1921, and President Clapp to M. J. Elrod, 4 November 1921, both RG1, PO, S4, B82, F"Service Committee."

²⁵⁹ Ellen Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (New York & London: Oxford University Press, 1986), *passim*.

²⁶⁰ William Joseph Austin, Jr., "Academic Freedom: Checks and Balances," and "Academic Freedom Checks and Balances Part II: Does the Individual Teacher Have Rights?" *Newsletters: Education Law* (North Carolina Bar Association, 4 June 2010 and 22 November 2010, respectively), at <http://educationlaw.ncbar.org/newsletters/education-law-may-2010/academicfreedom>, and <http://educationlaw.ncbar.org/newsletters/educationlawnov2010/academicfreedom>, respectively; Joan, DeFattore, "Defending Academic Freedom in the Age of Garcetti," *aaup* (January-February 2011), at <http://www.aaup.org/article/defending-academic-freedom-age-garcetti>; and Donald A. Downs, "The University of Wisconsin Counters Garcetti v. Ceballos," *aaup*, at <http://www.aaup.org/get-involved/issue-campaigns/speak-speak-out-protect-faculty-voice/how-and-success-stories/wisconsin>.

²⁶¹ Merriam, *History*, pp. 57-58.

²⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 49, fn. 1; and 60, fn. 1.

²⁶³ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VI, pp., 35 ff.

²⁶⁴ Gilluly, *Grizzly Gridiron*, pp. 81-82.

²⁶⁵ Morton J. Elrod, "The Heritage of Youth," 1928, with photographs, MJE, S3, B5, F16; also Toole, *Uncommon Land*, chs. XI-XII. For corroboration, see Gordon, *American Growth*, Part I, covering 1870 to 1940.

²⁶⁶ E. O. Sisson, "State University of Montana: A crisis and an Opportunity in the History of the University," 1919, RG30, HR, "Sisson, Edward O."

²⁶⁷ Hutchinson, "Main Hall Clock," *Kaimin* (15 May 1964), RG1. PO, S15. B36, F"ARCHIVES. History of MSU."

²⁶⁸ Merriam, *History*, pp. 52-53; Gilluly, *Grizzly Gridiron*, pp. 82-85; and Holien, *Grizzly Vault*, pp. 25-28.

²⁶⁹ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 3 April 1920, p. 342, M418, R2.

²⁷⁰ Burrin, Elliott, pp. 71-76. Levine provided assistance, as mentioned earlier.

²⁷¹ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 12 December 1919, pp. 331-332, M418, R2. Also W. F. Brewer, "If it's for the Schools, Everybody's for it," (no date but 1920), campaign pamphlet warning about the possible need to limit enrolments, with copies of the initiatives, RG1, PO, S4, B168, (file identifier missing). Also various materials, including charts on the miniscule portion of the state tax dollar allocated to higher education, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Funds Campaign, 1920 - Advertisements."

²⁷² Burrin, Elliott, pp. 73-74.

²⁷³ Memoranda of Lennes, Brewer, Sisson, and Elliot, March 1919 to March 1920, all RG30, HR, F"Lennes, N. J."

²⁷⁴ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 6 December 1920, pp. 1-4, M418, R2; and Office of the Chancellor, "The University Code," pp. 210-213, both initiatives proclaimed in effect on 6 December 1920, RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"University Code." Also Burrin, Elliott, p. 74; Gutfield, "Levine Affair," pp. 36-37; Karlin, "Progressive Politics in Montana," Burlingame and Toole, A History of Montana, vol. II, ch. XI, pp. 247-280, at 262 ff.; and Karlin, Joseph M. Dixon, vols. I-II, passim., esp. vol. II, ch. 3-11.

²⁷⁵ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 6 December 1920, p. 387, M418, R2.

²⁷⁶ In an exception to the decade rule, the mill levy vote occurred in 1948 and increased the amount to six mills because of the enrollment pressure of returning WW II veterans.

²⁷⁷ Edward C. Elliott, "The Future of the University: Charter Day - State University," 18 February 1921; and Edward C. Elliott to Dean A. L. Stone, 7 March 1921, both RG1, PO S4, B167, F"Charter Day - Addresses, 1912, 1914, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921."

²⁷⁸ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, ch. III.

²⁷⁹ M. J. Elrod, "Charter Day -- Information, For Members of the Faculty and Students," 18 February 1921, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Charter Day - Informational."

²⁸⁰ Simpler but very similar programs, "To the Members of the Faculty," 15 February 1927, and "Proceedings of the Charter Day Committee . . .," 17 February 1928, both RG1, PO, S4 B167, F"Charter Day - Informational."

²⁸¹ Elliott, "Future of the University," RG1, PO S4, B167, F"Charter Day - Addresses, 1912, 1914, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921."

²⁸² "Soldiers Memorial," Edward C. Elliott, to President Clapp, 21 April 1922; J. E. Kirkwood, Member of the Committee on Campus Development, to President C. H. Clapp, 17 April 1922, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Campus Development, 1922-44."

²⁸³ Sisson to Elliott, 21 April 1921, RG30, HR, F"Lennes, N. J."

²⁸⁴ Professor N. J. Lennes to President Sisson, 22, 23, 24 April 1921, RG30, HR, F"Lennes, N. J."

²⁸⁵ N.J. Lennes, Leave Proposal, 5 May 1921; and N. J. Lennes to Dr. C. H. Clapp, 9 June 1922, with copies of work, both RG30, HR, F"Lennes, N. J."

²⁸⁶ President C. H. Clapp to Dr. N. J. Lennes, 22 June 1922, RG30, HR, F"Lennes, N. J."

²⁸⁷ "Conference in President Simmons' Office," 8 July 1939, RG31, S19, B167, F"Borton-Gosman Report, 1939."

²⁸⁸ See the discussion in the chapter 4 below.

²⁸⁹ C. W. Leaphart, Acting President, to Profesor N. J. Lennes, 6 April 1944; Mary Brennan Clapp to Lucille (J. Arsmby), 17 September 1957, with attachment, RG30, HR, F"Lennes."

CHAPTER III: THE MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITY, 1920-1935

¹ See "Melvin Amos Brannon," at https://www.beloit.edu/archives/history/presidents/melvin_brannon/.

² Clapp, "The University of Montana: The Montana System of Higher Education," 29 August 1930, RG1, PO, S19, B52, F"Millage and Bond Issue Referendum 1930."

³ "Chapter 28," 16 February 1935, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"!935 Legislative Budgets & Data;" and H. H. Swain, Executive Secretary, to President C. H. Clapp, 25 March 1935, names less confusing -- Montana State University, Montana State College, Montana School of Mines, Montana State Normal School, Eastern Montana State Normal School, and Northern Montana College, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"ARCHIVES, History,"

⁴ Malone & Roeder, Montana, chs. XII-XIII; and Toole, Uncommon Land, chs. X-XI.

⁵ Michael P. Malone, James J. Hill: Empire Builder of the Northwest (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), passim, esp. chs. 7-8.

⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 261-262.

⁷ See "Montana," at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Montana>.

⁸ Malone & Roeder, Montana, pp. 217-218.

⁹ *Ibid*, pp. 219.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, ch. 12; and Gordon, Rise and Fall of American Growth, Part I and ch. 16. "The Great Leap Forward From the 1920s to the 1950s"

¹¹ Fred Freidell, Franklin D. Roosevelt: Launching the New Deal (Boston & Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1973), passim; Frank Freidell, Franklin D. Roosevelt: Rendezvous with Destiny (Boston& Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), passim; and Ira Katznelson, Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time (New York & London: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2013), passim.

¹² See Katznelson, Fear Itself, ch. 7.

¹³ See Rauchway, Money Makers, chs. 2-6.

¹⁴ See Katznelson, Fear Itself, ch. 12.

¹⁵ Malone & Roeder, Montana, Ch. XIII; and Rauchway, Money Makers, chs. 6-9.

¹⁶ President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M.A. Brennan, 2 November 1932; T. C. Spaulding, Dean, and PWA Coordinator in Montana, "Memorandum to President Scheuch," 12 June 1935; President C. H. Clapp, "State University of Montana Fact-Funding Projects," 1935; and Petition to implement SB 144 to construct a Journalism Building with federal assistance, (no date but 1935); and President C. H. Clapp, "State University of Montana FERA and PWA Projects," RG1, S17, B96, F"Building Program." See also George M. Dennison, "Student Loans and Access to Higher Education," at The Montana Professor 23.1, Fall 2012 <<http://mtprof.msun.edu>>. The print edition does not include end notes (retained on the host server).

¹⁷ Loss, Citizens and the State, chs. 2-3, esp. pp. 86-87.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5, 79, and 87.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, ch. 2-3.

²⁰ See Edward S. Corwin, Court Over Constitution (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938), ch. 3.

²¹ See Robert A. Caro, The Years of Lyndon Baines Johnson: The Path to Power (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982), ch 19, and esp. p. 340. The first volume of four on Johnson.

²² For a brief biography, see Charles H. Clapp Papers, at <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv81237>. Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII; and Merriam, History, ch. VI.

²³ The "Chancellor's Calendar" identified all items on the Board agenda; for Elliott's influence, see State Board of Education, "Legislative Memorandum of Financial Estimates for the Biennial Period 1919-1921, The University of Montana," 30 January 1919, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1919, 1923, 1924, Legislative Material."

²⁴ SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, June 1918, p. 154, M418, R2.

²⁵ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 12 December 1919, pp. 327-330, M418, R2. Also University Faculty, "To the President of the State University of Montana, the Chancellor of the University of Montana, and the State Board of Education of the State of Montana, 1919;" Shirley J. Coon, Secretary of the Faculty, to E.O. Sisson, 17 November 1919; F. C. Scheuch, Chair, G. Buckhous, P. W. Graff, F. Daughters, and M. J. Simes, Faculty Committee, to President E. O. Sisson and Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 8 July 1920 (copy to Board of Education members), the increases and the criteria for performance evaluation; also proposed agreement between the "President and the Faculty," State University, (no date but 1920); and "University of Montana, State University, Salary Rates and Averages, Full Time Faculty Staff (December 1920)"; also H.H. Swain, Executive Secretary to the Board, to E. O. Sisson, President, 22 December 1920; and various documents on 1921 increases, all RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"Salaries, 1918-1944."

²⁶ Excerpts, Executive Council "Minutes," 20 August 1920 and 25-26 March 1921, all RG1, PO, S5, B88, F"Salary Rates, Faculty."

²⁷ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 12 December 1919, pp. 327-330, and SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 3 April 1920, p. 342, M418, R2.

²⁸ SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 4 and 25 April 1921, pp. 5-27 and 28-63, M418, R2.

²⁹ Excerpts, Executive Council, "Minutes," 20 August and 3 December 1920, 25-26 March 1921, all RG1, PO, S5, B88, F"Salary Rates, Faculty,"

³⁰ Ibid, pp. 5-27 and 28-63, esp. pp. 10-11, 21, 27-43, 63, M418, R2.

³¹ President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 16 January 1928, RG1, PO, S17, B100, F"Mathematics Physics Building."

³² State Board of Education, "Item 3734," 5 April 1926, \$40,000 for the remodeling, RG1, PO, S17, B100, F"Mathematics Physics Building."

³³ W. E. Henry, Librarian, University of Washington, to President E. O. Sisson, 4 March 1919; Floor Plan of Library, 1919; President E. O. Sisson to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 4 November 1919; Lucia Haley, temporary replacement for Librarian G. Buckhaus, 15 and 27 November 1920; Chancellor Edward C. Elliott to President E. O. Sisson, 10 January 1921; W. E. Henry, Librarian, University of Washington, to President E. O. Sisson, 15 January 1921; Chancellor Edward C. Elliott to Chandler Cohagen, 31 March 1921; President E. O. Sisson to Chandler Cohagen, 10 August 1921; and T. G. Swearingen, Maintenance Engineer, to State Purchasing Agent, 8 December 1922 (three different letters), RG1, PO, S17, B100, F"Library Original Building."

³⁴ See especially Haley to Sisson, 15 and 27 November 1920; Henry to Sisson, 15 January 1921; Sisson to Elliott, 10 August 1921; and Swearingen, "Library, Montana State University, 1921," 1946, all RG1, PO, S17, B100, F"Library Original Building."

³⁵ E. O. Sisson to Chancellor Elliott and President Clapp, 3 May 1921, "Re: Supplementary Bond Issue Appropriated for Books and Apparatus," RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-1936;" and Swearingen to State Purchasing Agent, 8 December 1922 (three separate letters), RG1, PO, S17, B100, F"Library Original Building."

³⁶ T. G. Swearingen, "Library, Montana State University, 1921," RG1, PO, S17, B100, F"Library Original Building."

³⁷ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 52; and Merriam, History, p. 65.

³⁸ Minie Smith, "Montana's School of Forestry: Highlights of 100 Years," p. 13, at <http://www.cfc.umt.edu/Files/MontanasschoolofForestry.pdf>; and Forestry Faculty Women's Club, "Forestry Building," October 1935, initialed by Louise J. Armsby, RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"School - Forestry, 1914-1934."

³⁹ T. G. Swearingen, Maintenance Engineer, to President Clapp, 26 July 1922; and T. G. Swearingen to President Clapp, 12 August 1922, RG1, PO, S17, B95, "F Sewer System."

⁴⁰ See the discussion in chapter 4 below.

⁴¹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch VII, pp. 65-66.

⁴² Merriam, History, pp. 64-66; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 45 ff. Also Theodore Jacobs, "The Alumni Athletic Field Corporation," "Report of the Alumni Council Meeting," 17 February 1936, RG30, HR, F"George Finlay Simmons;" Charles H. Clapp, Tribute to George R. Shepard (1921), President of the Alumni Challenge Athletic Field Corporation, Chair of the Greater University Alumni Committee on Refinancing, (no date but after 1928), RG30, HR, F"Pres. Clapp: Statement of Opinions; Statements for Publication;" J. B. Speer, Business Manager (Approved

by President C. H. Clapp, 21 June 1933), "The Alumni Corporation: Explanatory Statement," 1933; and J. B. Speer, Business Manager, to President George Finlay Simmons, 12 March 1936, both RG1, S17, B97, F"Golf Course."

⁴³ Merriam, History, pp. 55, 63, property values in the state slipped badly in 1922, affecting the mill levy.

⁴⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 65; and Merriam, History, p. 65. Also Melvin Lord, "Men's Dormitories at The University of Montana," 1927;" and Hulda Miller Fields, "The Women's Dormitory System of The State University of Montana, As Developed From 1903 to 1927," 5 April 1927. both RG1, SXV, B19, F"Residence Halls - General to 1927." Also State University of Montana, "Charter Day, February 17th, 1927; Corbin Hall Floor Plan, 1951; T. G. Swearingen to President Carl McFarland, 20 June 1955; L. H. Kotschevar to Dr. McFarland, 17 June 1955; and State Board of Education "Item 15515," 11 July 1955, all RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"Corbin Hall -- General;" and State Board of Education, "Item 15213," 13 September 1954, RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"Corbin Hall Extension, 1956-7."

⁴⁵ M. S. Burke, Minutes of the Residence Hall Meeting, 15 July 1925, RG1, PO, SXVII, F"Corbin Hall -- Construction and Financing of Original Building."

⁴⁶ L. A. Foot, Attorney General to Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon, 17 December 1925; President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 5 October and 23 December 1925; and Chancellor M. A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 30 December 1925, all RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"Corbin Hall -- Construction and Financing of Original Building."

⁴⁷ President C. H. Clapp to Charles T. Stewart, Secretary to the Board of Examiners, 31 March 1926; Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 3 April 1926; and President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 19 April 1926, RG1, PO, SXVII, B101, F"Corbin Hall -- Construction and Financing of Original Building."

⁴⁸ Arnold H. Olsen, Attorney General, to Chancellor George A. Selke, 27 October 1950, RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"Craig Hall (Orig.) Architect's Contracts."

⁴⁹ President Charles H. Clapp, "Physical Plant at the State University for the Decade 1930-1940," (no date but 1929 or 1930), RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program." A list for 1928 included most of these projects as well.

⁵⁰ Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon to the Presidents, 11 November 1930; also "Herrin, Plaintiff, v. Erickson, Governor, et al., Defendants," 6 July 1931, 2 Pac (2nd) 296), both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1931 Legislative Budget Request."

⁵¹ Freidel, Rendezvous with Destiny, Chs.9-11.; and Katznelson, Fear Itself, Chs. 6-7.

⁵² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 100-101, 119-122; and Merriam, History, pp. 66-67; "University Center: History," at <http://www.umt.edu/uc/about-us/History/default.php>; and Tonya N. Smith, "Celebrating Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: The History of the Student Union at The University of Montana Since 1935," (2011, The University of Montana, Missoula, Montana, unpublished), esp. p. 16, typescript copy in author's possession.

⁵³ State ex rel. Blume, Plaintiff, v. State Board of Education et al., Defendants, (1934), 34 Pac. (2nd) 515, RG1, PO, S15, B 191, F"Land Grant Income;" and "No. 7546 -- State of Montana, in the Supreme Court, March Term 1936. State ex rel. F. W. Wilson, Relator, vs State Board of Education et al., Respondents, 8 March 1936, sustaining the Journalism Building authorization using land grant funds, RG1, PO, S17, B100, F"Journalism Building." Most of the cases during the period involved friendly suits seeking to vindicate the use of non-state funds, including the land grant funds.

⁵⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 115; and see T. C. Spaulding to T. G. Swearingen, 4 November 1932, 4 November 1932; and T. C. Spaulding to President C. H. Clapp, 16 November 1932; T. G. Swearingen, "Proposed Work From R.F.C. Funds," 24 January 1933, all RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"General to 1933." Also various memoranda and letters during the mid- to-late 1930s on such projects, RG1, PO, S6, B542, F"Campus Development, 1922-44." Also T. C. Spaulding, Dean, to Dr. Ernest O. Melby, 4 December 1941, discussing the reliance on federal funds during the 1930s, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Campus Planning and Development Committee, 1941-1951." Also President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 2 November 1932; Clapp, "State University of Montana FERA and PWA Projects, (no date but 1935); and T. C. Spaulding, Dean, "Memorandum to President Scheuch," 12 June 1935, all RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program."

⁵⁵ Philip R. Barber vs. State Board of Education et al., 9 July 1932, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union." Clapp and Brannon considered the ruling board enough to sustain leasing fraternity-sorority houses. The Attorney General disagreed, as see below. Also J. C. Garlington, University Counsel, to President Geo. Finlay Simmons, "Test Cases on University Buildings," 16 October 1936, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1941: Physical Plant."

⁵⁶ President C. H. Clapp to Carl R. McFarland, Department of Justice, 23 October 1933, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union Application for Loan and Grant."

⁵⁷ President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 2 November 1932, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union Application for Loan and Grant."

⁵⁸ President C. H. Clapp to President Alfred Atkinson, 29 July 1933, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Montana State College, 1925-1945." Concerning the issue of fraternities and sororities on land leased on campus, see untitled and undated resolution from the Local Executive Board urging the State Board of Education to authorize a lease to the Alumni Chapter of Kappa Kappa Gamma Fraternity, (probably 1926 or 1927);" also several related documents in the same file, esp. C. W. Leaphart, Dean, School of Law, to Dr. C. H. Clapp, President, 17 May 1928," arguing the "educational purpose" of fraternities and sororities on leased land on campus allowing better "supervision and control;" Melvin A. Brannon, Chancellor, to President C. H. Clapp, 2 July 1928; President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 13 October 1928; Howard Toole to C. H. Clapp, 20 January 1929, agreeing on legality but suggesting authorizing legislation, 20 January 1928; Melvin A. Brannon, Chancellor, to President C. H. Clapp, 29 and 31 January 1929, initially requesting a draft of legislation as Toole suggested but retracting the request when Clapp argued for inherent Board authority; J. B. Speer, Business Manager, to H. H. Connell, The College Survey, 23 December 1931, thought all fraternities and sororities wanted to lease land; and Arnold H. Olsen, Attorney General, to Chancellor Geo. A. Selke, 11 October 1950; and Geo. A. Selke, Chancellor, to Presidents, 13 October 1950, sending Olson's citation of Report and Official Opinion of A. Harney, Attorney General, (no date but 1929 or 1930), denying the authority of the State Board or Board of Examiners to "permit the erection upon the campus of a residence hall by a Greek Letter sorority to be used . . . as a chapter house," and that "private buildings may not be built upon the university campus," with Olsen's agreement that public property "cannot be used" for "private purposes" only of a "social nature," all RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Montana State College, 1925-1945." The issue had resurfaced in the 1950s. However, see the discussion below of the Women's Center on campus.

⁵⁹ Smith, "Celebrating Yesterday," pp. 9-22, for the details.

⁶⁰ J. B. Speer, typed statement of revenue to support the SUB project, 31 October 1932; and J. B. Speer, Business Manager, to Harry M. McConnell, The College Survey, 14 December 1931, both RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union Application for Loan and Grant."

⁶¹ Dean C. W. Leaphart, School of Law, to Governor John W. Bonner, 24 December 1941, discussing "State ex Rel. Veeder Relator v State Board of Ed. 97 M. 121," which upheld the use of the Student Union Fee revenue for

construction of the Student Union, with no mention of the Building Fee, and warning against other than incidental use of the facility for instruction, RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"President's House." Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 120.

⁶² See Acting President Frederick C. Scheuch to C. B. Shephard, Supervisor, Public Works Administration, 1 August 1935, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"S. Union Loan Agreement & Retirement of Bonds."

⁶³ President C. H. Clapp, Speech at Student Union Building ground-breaking, 1934, RG30, HR, F"Addresses by C. H. Clapp." For discussion of the college personnel perspective reflected in Clapp's views, see Loss, Citizens and the State, Ch. 2.

⁶⁴ Merriam, History, p. 66, fn. 18. Nonetheless, President Robert T. Pantzer proposed to name a new science building for Clapp in the 1970s, and a plate inside the building indicates that name. However, the name did not change officially until 2004 with the members of the Clapp family attending the belated dedication.

⁶⁵ Smith, "Celebrating Yesterday," pp. 18, 38.

⁶⁶ Clapp, "Narrative," ch.VII, p. 122; President C. H. Clapp, "State University Fact-Finding Projects," 1935, RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program;" Loss, Between Citizens and the State, Part I; and Dennison, "Student Loans and Access to Higher Education," The Montana Professor 23 (#1, Fall 2012), at www.google.com/#q=The+Montana+Professor.

⁶⁷ President C. H. Clapp, "State University of Montana FERA and PWA Projects," (no date but 1935), RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program.

⁶⁸ Montana State University, "Buildings Erected 1929-1943," (no date but 1943-1944), RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program."

⁶⁹ Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1922, p. 1, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929; also SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, 3 April 1920, p. 343; and SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 4 and 25 April 1921, p. 45-48, M418, R2.

⁷⁰ SBE, Regular Meeting, 3 April 1920, p. 343; and SBE, Minutes, Special Meeting, 4 and 25 April 1921, p. 45-48, M418, E2. And Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 21.

⁷¹ Clapp, President's Report, 1922, p. 1, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929.

⁷² Merriam, History, pp. 56-57; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 30 ff.

⁷³ See Loss, Citizens and the State, ch. 2.

⁷⁴ Morton J. Elrod, "Charter Day Address," 1916, MJE, S5, B26, F13; and Morton J. Elrod, "The American University," (no date but after 1916), MJE, S3, B4, F9.

⁷⁵ H. G. Merriam to President E. O. Sisson 8 March and 8 March (second letter) 1921, RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"English 1917-1939."

⁷⁶ N. J. Lennes to President E. O. Sisson, 26 March 1921, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Budget and Policy to 1936."

⁷⁷ Merriam, History, pp. 56-59; Also H. G. Merriam, "Memorial," 6 March 1921, with a page missing; H. G. Merriam to CHC, 18 February 1933, handwritten note urging another memorial in 1933; and Edward C. Elliott, Chancellor, to President C. H. Clapp, 16 July 1921, Memorial attached, all RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"CURR. Curriculum Revision, 1933," for first two and F"CURR. Curriculum General to 1942," for the last.

⁷⁸ This emphasis reappeared in Merriam's History.

⁷⁹ H. G. Merriam, Chairman, English Department, to President Clapp, 10 December 1921, RG1, PO, S7, B14, F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1919-1925." Also H. G. Merriam to Clapp,, 10 December 1921, RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"Curr. Curriculum General to 1942," for a somewhat different formulation.

⁸⁰ Merriam, History, p. 58, quoting Jesse's comment in 1920.

⁸¹ J. H. Underwood to President Clapp, 21 October 1921, RG1, PO, S5, B6, "F"CURR. Curriculum General to 1942."

⁸² H. G. Merriam to President C. H. Clapp, 10 December 1921, RG1, PO, SV, B6, "F"CURR. Curriculum General to 1942."

⁸³ Elliott to Clapp, 16 July 1921, RG1, PO, S5, B6, F""CURR. Curriculum Revision, 1933."

⁸⁴ Alfred Atkinson, President, to Presidents C. H. Clapp, George Craven, and S. E. Davis, 6 May 1922, RG1, PO, S5, B6, "F"CURR. Curriculum General to 1942."

⁸⁵ President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 12 December 1924, RG1, PO, S5, B6, "F"CURR. Curriculum General to 1942."

⁸⁶ C. H. Clapp, President, to Curriculum Committee, 28 November 1921, RG1, PO, SV, B6, "F"CURR. Curriculum General to 1942."

⁸⁷ Charles H. Clapp, "Inaugural Address," (12 June) 1922, RG30, HR, F"Addresses By C. H. Clapp;" and Clapp, "Narrative, ch. VII, p. 21.

⁸⁸ For a similar critique, Morton J. Elrod, The College, Past and Present (Bloomington. Ill.: University Press, 1899), esp. pp. 23-26; and Morton J. Elrod, "The American University," (no date but after 1916), MJE, SIII, B4, F9. More recent critiques by subsequent academic reformers sounded a similar theme, as Harry R. Lewis, Excellence Without A Soul: How A Great University Forgot Education (New York: Public Affairs, 2006), passim;. Louis Menand, The Marketplace of Ideas (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2010), chs. 1-3; Earl J. McGrath, The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education (New York: Institute of Higher Education, 1959), passim; and Earl J. McGrath and Charles H. Russell, Are Liberal Arts Colleges Becoming Professional Schools (New York: Institute of Higher Education, 1958), passim.

⁸⁹ For a similar emphasis on extra-curricular involvement among higher educators as a means to engagement, see Loss, Citizens and the State, pp. 48-49.

⁹⁰ Thomas Carlyle, On Heroes, Hero Worship, and the Heroic in History, (1840) at <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1091/1091-h/1091-h.htm>

⁹¹ Melvin A. Brennan, Chancellor, to President C. H. Clapp, 9 December 1924; and Clapp to Brannon, 12 December 1924, both RG1, PO, SV, B6, "F"CURR. Curriculum General to 1942."

⁹² C. H. Clapp to Dean C. S. Boucher, University of Chicago, 24 December 1931, "new Chicago plan;" C. H. Clapp to John H. MacCracken, American Council on Education, 8 June 1932, reforms on "divisional plans, departmental groupings, and curriculum revisions," RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"Curr. , Curriculum Revision, 1933." On the reforms, see Loss, Citizens and the State, ch. 2.

⁹³ Curriculum Committee Minutes, 1921-1935, RG1, PO, S7, B14, F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1919-1925," and F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1928-1954," on Clapp's academic leadership. Also Merriam, History, pp. 60-82, a participant's recollections.

⁹⁴ G. B. Castle, Chair, Montana State University Budget and Policy Committee, 12 February 1945, the establishment of the Committee, attached to E. G. Marble, "Minutes," Faculty Meeting, 25 January 1945, RG1, PO, SVI, B42, F"Faculty Minutes, 1940 - Aug. 1946;" also various documents, including "Excerpts from Faculty Minutes Pertaining to Budget and Policy Committee," 12 April 1921 through 11 March 1936, with annual reports and minutes of Committee meetings during that period, RG1, PO, SVI, B42, F"Budget and Policy to 1936."

⁹⁵ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 30-32.

⁹⁶ J. B. Speer, "A Bird's Eye View of the Organization of One University," Journal of Higher Education 4 (#2; December 1933), pp. 461-467, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Questionnaires."

⁹⁷ G. Finlay Simmons, "Conference in President Simmons' Office," 8 July 1939, p. 54, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Borton-Gossman Report, 1939." Locked in a desperate fight to save his presidency when he made the remark, Simmons had little respect for committees.

⁹⁸ Merriam, History, pp. 56-59.

⁹⁹ President C. H. Clapp to President Alfred Atkinson, 10 March 1926, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Budget and Policy to 1936."

¹⁰⁰ Budget and Policy Committee, Minutes, 10 October 1922, unanimous approval of Clapp's proposal in 1922 to authorize "one man committees" and mid-level administrators to handle routine administrative work; also Lennes to Sisson, 26 March 1921, recommending that approach, both RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Budget and Policy to 1936); and Merriam, History, p. 68, fn. 20.

¹⁰¹ Clapp to Atkinson, 10 March 1926, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Budget and Policy to 1936."

¹⁰² Morton J. Elrod, Chairman, Minutes, Committee on Budget and Policy, 30 March 1933; and various documents, specifically "Excerpts from Faculty Minutes Pertaining to Budget and Policy Committee," 12 April 1921 through 11 March 1936, with annual reports and minutes of Committee meetings all RG1, PO, SVI, B42, F"Budget and Policy to 1936."

¹⁰³ On national developments, Katznelson, Fear Itself, ch. 7.

¹⁰⁴ George F. Simmons, 1936-1941, at <http://www.umt.edu/president/people/pastpresidents/simmons.php>; see also various documents in RG1, PO, S19, B167, F"Borton-Gosman Report 1939."

¹⁰⁵ "Conference in President Simmons' Office," 8 July 1939, pp. 20-21, 54, RG1, PO, S19, B167, F"Borton-Gosman Report 1939."

¹⁰⁶ Merriam, History, p. 91, cited with relish.

¹⁰⁷ Harold Tascher to President G. Finlay Simmons, 8 January 1940, "A Functional Deficiency at Montana State University," RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Budget & Policy Committee, 1936-1941."

¹⁰⁸ E. F. Freeman, Secretary, Minutes of the Budget and Policy Committee, 24 April 1941, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Budget & Policy Committee, 1936-41."

¹⁰⁹ Merriam, History, pp. 60-61.

¹¹⁰ Morton J. Elrod, "The Committee on Service Report," various years, Clapp, President's Report, 1921-1934, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929 and B1929-1934.

¹¹¹ Clapp, President's Report, 1922, p. 1, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929.

¹¹² President Charles H. Clapp, "Program for Decade 1928-1938 for the State University of Montana," (no date but 1927 or 1928), RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C. H. -- Development."

¹¹³ On the administrative refocusing, see Loss, Citizens and the State, ch. 2.

¹¹⁴ See the discussion earlier of campus facilities development.

¹¹⁵ Edward C. Elliott to President E. O. Sisson, 20 August 1917; Franklin O. Smith to Dr. E. O. Sisson, 24 July 1917; E. O. Sisson to C. H. Clapp, 16 May 1921; and C. H. Clapp to E. O. Sisson, Reed College, 16 September 1921, all RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945."

¹¹⁶ J. H. Underwood to the President, 6 May 1921, RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945."

¹¹⁷ H. E. Stone, Dean of Men, West Virginia University, to C. H. Clapp, 3 February 1923, RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945." For similar courses and experiences focused on orientation and adjustment to college and the advent of the American College Personnel Association, see Loss, Citizens and the State, pp. 34-44.

¹¹⁸ Curriculum Committee Minutes, 7 June 1923, RG1, PO, SVII, B14, F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1919-1925."

¹¹⁹ "From the Faculty Minutes of February 19, 1924;" documents relating to "The Montana School of Religion," 1924; William L. Young, "Our Faculty Chairmen on the Place of Religious Education in Our University," 8 February 1926; and D. Foster, Director, American Association on Religion, "Memo on University of Montana," 7 October 1927, including letters relating to the effort to raise the funds for the School led by Clapp and Atkinson, all RG1, PO, S15, B19, F"Religion, Affiliated School of, 1924-1929;" and Charles H. Clapp, "The School of Religion," President Report, 1932, p. 82, UnPub, S2, B1929-1934. Also Merriam, History, p. 70.

¹²⁰ See "School of Education at State University," penciled date of 1930, RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945."

¹²¹ C. H. Clapp to Dr. H. H. Swain, Executive Secretary, 18 August 1933, RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"School -- Music, 1918-1950. See also Merriam, History, pp. 76-81.

¹²² Merriam, History, pp. 76, 181.

¹²³ "Cooperative Teacher Training Plan, State University of Montana and Missoula County School District No. 1," (no date but 1920); Ira B. Fee, Superintendent, Missoula Public Schools, to Dr. E. O. Sisson, 2 June 1920; and E. O. Sisson to Mr. Ira B. Fee, 7 June 1920, all RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945."

¹²⁴ "Report to the President of the University, Covering growth from 1910 to 1915," (no date but 1915 or 1916), and other related documents urging a School; F. Daughters, Chair of the Department of Education, to President E. O. Sisson, 16 December 1920; E. O. Sisson to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 5 March 1921; and E. C. Elliott to E. O. Sisson, 7 March 1921, all RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945."

¹²⁵ C. H. Clapp, President, to President S. E. Davis, State Normal School, 4 October 1927; Professor Freeman Daughters, Chair of the Department of Education, 10 November 1928; and various letters on the topic of upgrading the new normal schools at Dillon and Billings, all RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"State Normal College, 1922-44."

¹²⁶ Malone & Roeder, Montana, p. 277.

¹²⁷ Chancellor M. A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 7 November 1928; and President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 7 November 1928, RG1, PO, SIII, B16, F"1929, Legislative Material."

¹²⁸ Daughters to Clapp, 10 November 1928, RG#1, PO, SV, B47, F"State Normal College, 1922-44."

¹²⁹ Office of the Chancellor, "Administrative Memorandum No. 180. Relating To: The University Code," pp. 61, (no date, but 1922), at p. 59, for Board authorization of the State College to grant a "university certificate of qualification to teach" with eighteen required credits for majors in Vocational Education concentrating in Agricultural Education, Home Economics Education, and Trade and Industry Education, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Administrative Memo 180, First Draft of Part II of Univ. Code." President Carl McFarland argued in 1951 that this beginning led inexorably to full majors and graduate programs in Education at the State College, as see Carl McFarland, President, "Duplication Among Institutions of Montana System of Higher Education," 19 August 1951, RG1, PO, S1, B169, F"President (McFarland, Carl)." In the 1920s, the State Board approved State University preparation of Home Economics teachers as well, thus increasing the duplication.

¹³⁰ Edward C. Elliott, Chancellor, to President E. O. Sisson, 12 and 14 November 1917; President E. O. Sisson to Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 14 November 1917, urging limits on the State College and involvement of the State University; and several memoranda during the following years seeking equal allocations for the State University, esp. President E. O. Sisson to Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 23 September and 4 October 1919, and Revised Budget Smith Hughes Teacher Training, 1919, with \$4,553 to State College and \$2,000 to State University, RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Home Economics - Smith Hughes" and F"Correspondence Courses in Agriculture and Home Economics."

¹³¹ Requests for new courses in Vocational Education approved by the Board for the State University in 1923 and 1930, RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education Through 1945." Disputes about duplication emerged in full force in the 1930s, President George Finlay Simmons to H. H. Swain, Executive Secretary, 28 June 1938, and to Miss Lelia Massey, 28 June 1938, for restoration of Smith-Hughes funding, RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Home Economics-Smith Hughes." Also Emma H. Briscoe, The Montana Home Economics Association, 1920-1978 (Missoula: Montana Home Economics Association, 1978), pp. 2-6.

¹³² President R. R. Renne to President James A. McCain, 7 March 1946, that the State College had offered undergraduate teaching majors in the sciences and mathematics "for years," RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Montana State College 1946-51."

¹³³ President C. H. Clapp to President S. E. Davis, 4 October 1927, RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"State Normal College, 1922-44."

¹³⁴ President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 7 November 1928, RG1, PO, SIII, B16, F"1929, Legislative Material."

¹³⁵ President C. H. Clapp to President S. E. Davis, 4 October 1927, RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"State Normal College, 1922-44."

¹³⁶ President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 7 November 1928; and Chancellor M. A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 7 November 1928, both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1929, Legislative Material."

¹³⁷ President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 17 February 1929, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1929, Legislative Material."

¹³⁸ Melvin A. Brannon, Chancellor, to C. H. Clapp, 27 March 1930, RG1, PO S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945."

¹³⁹ Excerpt from the "Executive Committee" Minutes, 29 March 1930, Clapp's report that the Board had authorized a School of Education in June 1918, now scheduled for "the opening of the next academic year," RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"Education: 1946-1959;" and, for the quotation, "School of Education at State University," penciled date of 1930, RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945."

¹⁴⁰ "Dates of Opening of Schools (From Catalogs)," 17 January 1936; also Chart listing dates of establishment of Divisions, Departments, and Schools, (no date but 1935-1936), all RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." And "Report to the President of The University," (no date but 1915), and related documents indicating Board authorization in 1918, RG1, PO, S15, B31, F"Education: Through 1945."

¹⁴¹ Unknown, "The Scholastic Record of the Class Entering the State University in 1923," (no date but probably 1925-1926); F. O. Smith to President C. H. Clapp, 9 June 1926, with a copy of the report attached; L. G. and T. G. Thurston to President C. H. Clapp, 1 April 1931, report on State University freshmen using the ACE Psychological Examination (35,000 students nationally), State University ranked 45 with a median score of 141.43, penciled note "This looks good;" other reports on ACE Aptitude Test, Otis Test, and B-2 Test, and related documents, all RG1, PO, S15, B38, F"Psychology." Generally, see Loss, Citizens and the State, ch. 2.

¹⁴² For example, Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1925, p. 7, on the medical program, UnPub, S2, B1912-1925, 1921-1929.

¹⁴³ Morton J. Elrod, "Department of Biology," (undated but probably 1916), MJE, S5, B23, F6; and Morton J. Elrod, to Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, 18 December 1916, MJE, S5, B23, F6.

¹⁴⁴ "State University of Montana, Missoula: PRE-MEDICAL COURSE," (no date but 1918)," RG1, PO, S15, B37, F"Pre-Medic: 1919-1954." Emphasis supplied.

¹⁴⁵ Merriam, History, p. 184, the State University Charter's reference to "Law or Medical Departments."

¹⁴⁶ For the decision in the 1970s, see <http://WWW.montana.edu/wwwwami/>.

¹⁴⁷ Dean S. J. Coon to President C. H. Clapp, 4 March 1924; and President C. H. Clapp to Dean S. J. Coon, 15 March 1924, both RG1, PO, S15, B30, F"Business Administration, Through 1938." Also Merriam, History, pp. 76-81, for agreement with Elrod and Clapp.

¹⁴⁸ See Clara M. Main, Librarian, to C. H. Clapp, 22 September 1921; C. H. Clapp to Miss Clara Main, 26 September 1921; Mrs. Henry E. Garber, Jr., Librarian, to C. H. Clapp, 8 October 1921; C. H. Clapp to Mrs. Henry E. Garber, Jr., 14 October 1921; and Mrs. Henry E. Garber, Jr., to C. H. Clapp, 20 October 1921, all RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁴⁹ M. G. Buckhous, Librarian, to President C. H. Clapp, 25 October 1928; C. H. Clapp, President, to the Carnegie Corporation, (no date, but 1929); and C. H. Clapp, President, to M. A. Brannon, Chancellor, 18 April 1929, all RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁵⁰ "Referendum Measure No. 33" and "Referendum Measure No. 34," 4 November 1930, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Referendum Measures." The state Supreme Court ruled the bonding referendum unconstitutional on a technicality, as see Ernest O. Melby, President, to Members State Board of Education, 12 June 1943; and "Proposed Land Acquisitions . . . List of Properties," January 1943, mentioning that the ruling prevented the University from acquiring adjacent properties, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1943: Data Used In Attempt To Secure Land For University From Legislature."

¹⁵¹ Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. VII, p. 97.

¹⁵² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 52; and Merriam, History, p. 65.

¹⁵³ "State University Library Staff Manual, " 1927, pp. 22, RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁵⁴ "Fine Relics and Important Records of State's and Region's Early Days Newly Housed in U Treasure Room," Rocky Mountain Husbandman (20 August 1936), copy in author's possession, thanks to *Emeritus* Professor James R. Habeck. Celebrating the expanded "Treasure Room" in the new Journalism Building, but noting the old space, "a little, musty room on the top floor of the library, where the smell of mothballs is heavy on the air and the space is inadequate for the proper house of works whose value increases daily. Here are the Gibson and Lewis Indian collections, valuable old books and historical papers and various odds and ends of historical interest which have been donated or bought by the school." Mrs. Nettie C. Lewis donated the John Elsworth Indian relic collection that included some one hundred articles -- Sitting Bull's shirt and leggings, Chief Plenty Coups's war bonnet, Jim Bridger's rifle, Louis Riel's knife; Franklin Rutherford donated the Gibson relic collection. The University museum also held Stanley Martineau's statue of Lewis and Clark and several thousand volumes.

¹⁵⁵ See Rhea Marna Johnson, et al., to the President and Faculty, 15 January 1919; and President E. O. Sisson to Rhea M. Johnson, 23 January 1919, both RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-1936."

¹⁵⁶ Lucia Haley, Acting Librarian, (no addressee but President Sisson), (no date, but after March 1921), RG1, PO, S15, B36, F."

¹⁵⁷ Sisson to Elliott and Clapp, 31 May 1921, "Re: Supplementary Bond Issue appropriated for Books and Apparatus," RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁵⁸ President C. H. Clapp to J. B. Speer, Business Manager, 5 June 1924, RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁵⁹ C. H. Clapp, President, to President A. G. Crane, University of Wyoming, 23 February 1926, RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶⁰ A. G. Crane to C. H. Clapp, 26 June 1926, RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶¹ G. Buckhaus, Librarian, to C. H. Clapp, 3 March 1926, RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶² A. G. Crane to President C. H. Clapp, 4 August 1926, with chart, RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶³ State University of Montana Library Committee, "General Needs of the Library," (no date but 1928); "Report of the Library Committee on conditions in the State University Library," 23 April 1928; "Report of the Library Committee on Research Material," 27 April 1928; and "Comparative Statement of Expenditures for Periodicals, Binding and Books, Years 1927-1928, 1928-1929, 1929-1930 to March 21st," (no date but 1930), all RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶⁴ C. H. Clapp to M. A. Brannon, 18 April 1929; and C. H. Clapp to Carnegie Corporation, (no date but April 1929), all RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶⁵ F. O. Smith, Chairman of the Department of Psychology, to President C. H. Clapp, 5 June 1931, RG#1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶⁶ Lucille J. Armsby to George F. Simmons, 23 November 1963, George F. Simmons, "Envy and Hatred In A Small Western University: The Life and Letters of Finlay Simmons (1895-1955), Part 19, A-B: 1935-1939," Part A, pp. 63-68, at 64.

¹⁶⁷ J. B. Speer, Business Manager, to President Geo. Finlay Simmons, 30 January 1936, with chart, RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶⁸ Philip O. Keeney, Librarian, to President George Finlay Simmons, 3 March 1936; and Philip O. Keeney, Librarian, to President Charles H. Clapp, 20 November 1933, both RG1, PO, S15, B36, F"Library, 1918-36."

¹⁶⁹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 97-98.

¹⁷⁰ See Simmons, "Envy and Hatred," Part A, pp. 86-87, 115-128, esp. 117.

¹⁷¹ As quoted in Simmons, " Envy and Hatred," Part A, p. 87. See also W. T. Laprade, Harry F. Clements, and Charles McKinley, " Academic Freedom and Tenure," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, 24 (#4; April 1938), pp. 321-348, esp. 329-334, for discussion of the notes, whether dated 1935 or 1934, and whether prospective or retrospective of a conference informing Keeney of the annual contracts and the consequences, at http://www.jstor.org/stable/40219440?seq=28#page_thumbnails_tab_contents.

¹⁷² See Simmons, Part A, pp. 86-87. The younger Simmons had access to his father's letters and memoranda and discussed the specific details with Louise J. Armsby, Clapp's and Simmons' s Secretary, Armsby to Simmons, 23 November 1963, Simmons, "Envy and Hatred" Part A, p. 64. The elder Simmons also talked with former Acting President Scheuch about Clapp's actions concerning Keeney and recorded his findings.

¹⁷³ Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1923, pp. 1—13, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929.

¹⁷⁴ RG1, PO, SII, B25, F"!919,1923 Investigations by Senate Committee."

¹⁷⁵ President C. H. Clapp, typescript review of budget issues for 1923-1925, (no date but late 1922 or early 1923), RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1925, Legislature."

¹⁷⁶ Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, chs. II- III.

¹⁷⁷ President C. H. Clapp, "Statement Concerning Income of State University of Montana during the fiscal year, 1923-1924," 14 October 1924, RG1, PO S7, B14, F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1919-1925."

¹⁷⁸ Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 14 and 23 February 1925, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1925 Legislature."

¹⁷⁹ "Extract from House Bill No. 400," effective 1 July 1923, and several related documents, memoranda, and letters, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1919, 1923, 1924, Legislative Material."

¹⁸⁰ Clapp, "Statement Concerning Income, " 14 October 1924, RG1, PO S7, B14, F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1919-1925." And "Interpretation of Statutes," legal opinion, (no date, but after 1923); and Anonymous to President C. H. Clapp, "Re: Mills Tax Measure," (no date, but about 1925-1926), citing Executive Council Minutes of 20 November 1919 defining the Experiment Station and Extension Service as federal entities and not integral parts of the State College, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"State College of Agri. 1913-1915."

¹⁸¹ Melvin A. Brannon, Chancellor to President C. H. Clapp, 4 June 1925; excerpts from Executive Council Minutes, 5 December 1925, 19 February 1926, 27 March 1926, all RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1919, 1923, 1924, Legislative Material." See also typescript of State Supreme Court confirming decision, *ex rel* Frances D. Jones vs. The State Board of Examiners, 20 February 1926, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1919, 1923, 1924, Legislative Material."

¹⁸² President C. H. Clapp, "Report on State University of Montana Requested by Senate Committee on the State University," (no date but 1925-1926); also Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 16 and 23 February 1925, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1925, Legislature."

¹⁸³ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 72; and see Ernest O. Melby, "Organizing Montana's System of Higher Education," (no date but 1944-1945), RG1, PO, S1, B169, F"President (Melby, E.O.);" and various newspaper excerpts, RG1, PO, S4, B16, F"1945, Bills and Clippings, Affecting University."

¹⁸⁴ Chancellor M. A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 2 February 1927, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1927 Legislature."

¹⁸⁵ C. H. Clapp to William J. Jameson, Jr., 20 February 1929; and William J. Jameson, Jr., to C. H. Clapp, 21 February 1929, both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1929, Legislative Material."

¹⁸⁶ Excerpts from the University Executive Council Minutes, 17 February 1926, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1927 Legislature." Also President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon 20 February 1929; and Chancellor M. A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 21 February 1929, both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1929, Legislative Material." And "Montana Educational Survey," 1929, pp. 3, lower taxes relative to other states in the region and roughly a third of the support for higher education those states provided, while enrolments increased by 110 percent, state support rose by only seventy-seven percent, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Leg. 1929, Montana Education Survey." Also Chancellor M. A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 17 October 1930, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1931 Legislative Budget Request;" and "Referendum Measure No. 33" and "Referendum Measure No. 34," 1930, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Referendum Measures."

¹⁸⁷ "Referendum Votes, 1920, 1930," (no date but after November 1930), RG1, PO, S19, B52, F"Millage and Bond Issue Referendum, 1930."

¹⁸⁸ Chancellor Melvin A. Brannon to the Presidents, 11 November 1930; also "Herrin, Plaintiff, v. Erickson, Governor, et al., Defendants," 6 July 1931, 2 Pac (2nd) 296), both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1931 Legislative Budget Request."

¹⁸⁹ Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1925, pp. 1-17, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929.

¹⁹⁰ C. W. Leaphart, Dean, School of Law, to Dr. C. H. Clapp, President, 17 May 1928; "Student Housing Plan Considered: Would Group Fraternities and Sororities in Residence Halls," Missoulian (7 January 1932), p.5; and Arnold H. Olson, Attorney General to Chancellor Geo. A. Selke, 11 October 1950, citing an Attorney General opinion, vol. 13, p.71, denying the legality of leasing houses on campus land to fraternities and sororities, and several related letters and reports, all RG1, PO, S15, B49, F"Fraternities on Campus."

¹⁹¹ C. W. Leaphart, Dean, School of Law, to Professor M. C. Burlingame, 17 March 1953, and several other letters and reports in the folder, RG1, PO, S5, B67, F"Fraternity Housing." Also President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 2 November 1932, RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program;" President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 2 November 1932, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union Application for Loan and Grant;" and President C. H. Clapp to President Alfred Atkinson, 29 July 1933, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Montana State College, 1925-1945."

¹⁹² Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1929, pp. 7-10, 34, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929; also Charles H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 4 October 1925, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"State Board Investigation, 1926;" and Alex Blewett, "A Survey of Higher Learning at Montana State University, Missoula," July 1936, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

¹⁹³ J. B. Speer, Business Manager, (approved by President C. H. Clapp, 21 June 1933), "The Alumni Corporation: Explanatory Statement,": 1933, RG1, PO, S17, B97, F"Golf Course;"and Charles H. Clapp, tribute to George R. Shepard (1921), President of the Alumni Challenge Athletic Field Corporation, Chair of the Greater University of Montana Alumni Committee on Refinancing, (no date but after 1928), RG30, HR, F"Pres. Clapp: Statements of Opinions; Statements for Publication."

¹⁹⁴ Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1928, pp. 1-2, UnPub, S2, Box 1912-1915, 1921-1929; and Anonymous (J. B. Speer), " Missoula, Proposed Land Acquisitions," 12 February 1943, p. 14, for the Country Club acquisition with a loan of \$12,000 initially from the Missoula Mercantile and then from Student Reserve Funds, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1945 Legislative Data - MSU;" also Ernest O. Melby, President, to Members State Board of Education, 12 January 1943; and "Proposed Land Acquisitions . . . List of Properties," January 1943, all RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1943: Data Used to Attempt to Secure Land For University From Legislature," requesting \$56,038.84 owed to the Alumni Challenge Corporation. See also Merriam, History, pp. 64-65; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 91-92, 98-100. Acquired properties included the athletic field, golf course, Forestry Nursery land, East John Street land, Harkins lots, Westly tract, and lots on University Avenue in the Hammond Block, among others. The loan from student reserves ultimately led to a disputed claim of an ASMSU legal ownership interest in the golf course, actually a lien, loan, or mortgage subsequently paid back by the University.

¹⁹⁵ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 91-92

¹⁹⁶ Senate Committee "Report," January 1934, RG1, PO, S2, B25, F"Investigations and Censure Prior to 1936." Merriam, History, p. 66, erroneously dated this investigation and report in 1925.

¹⁹⁷ See Edmund T. Fritz to Attorney General R. V. Bottomly, 6 December 1948, the "legal title to the land . . . is in Alumni Challenge Athletic Field Corporation, which by reason of reincorporation is now University Development Corporation," with "no exception to the title," describing the Corporation as a non-profit entity "with the sole purpose of acquiring and holding title to the lands for the benefit of the University" which in this instance had given "the students a mortgage and note to secure the investment;" the Attorney General accepted the title for the State of Montana to benefit Montana State University; and President James A. McCain to James Mueller, President ASMSU, 27 December 1948, "By this memorandum, I wish to assure the Associated Students . . . that upon the termination of the Golf Course Housing Project, it is my intention to use this property for student activities in accordance with the official policy of your organization. Furthermore, I *hope* [emphasis supplied] that future administrations of the University will be guided by this memorandum in any use made of the Golf Course site," GR1, PO, S17, B90, F"Golf Course." These documents admit of no doubt about the University's clear legal title to the land.

¹⁹⁸ Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1927, p. 9, UnPub, S2, B1912-1915, 1921-1929; also Nelson, "The History of the Forestry School," (no date but 1926-1927), no pagination, RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"Forestry - School of, 1914-1934."

¹⁹⁹ Dorr Skeels to The Chancellor, 13 October 1919, "Description of Fort Missoula Timber Reserve," (no date but 1919); Edward C. Elliott to President E. O. Sisson, 21 October 1919; President Sisson to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 7 November 1919; Senator H. L. Meyers to Dr. E. C. Elliott, 10 and 23 December 1919; T. C. Spaulding to Dr. C. H. Clapp, 31 December 1923; Representative Scott Leavitt to Professor T. C. Spaulding, 11 and 26 December 1923; T. C. Spaulding to Representative Scott Leavitt, 18 December 1923, and "H.R. 4907," 17 January 1924, RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forestry Reserve."

²⁰⁰ E. A. Sherman, Acting Forester, to District Forester, 24 October 1924; and Business Manager (J. B. Speer) to Dean T. C. Spaulding, 21 July 1922, both RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forestry Reserve." Also John M. Evans to Mayor W. H. Beacom, 2 April 1932; W. H. Beacom to John M. Evans, 25 March 1932, both RG1, PO S15, B32, F"Forestry, School of, 1914-1934."

²⁰¹ Spaulding to Clapp, 31 December 1923, RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forestry Reserve."

²⁰² T. C. Spaulding to Dr. Clapp, 28 December 1927; J. R. Hobbins to Dr. C. H. Clapp, 19 December 1927, and C. H. Clapp to J. R. Hobbins, 8 December 1927; "A.C.M. Land" and "Land of Blackfoot Land and Development Co." (no date but 1927), all RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"Forestry - School of, 1914-1934."

²⁰³ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 66-67; T. C. Spaulding to Dr. Clapp, (no date but April 1927); Dorr Skeels to T. C. Spaulding, Dean, 9 February 1927; Fred Morrell, District Forester, to T. C. Spaulding, Dean, 3 November 1926; T. C. Spaulding to C. H. Clapp, 27 December 1926; C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 10 January 1927; "Resolution relative to forestry cooperative project between State of Montana and Federal Government according to provisions set forth in the Clarke-McNary Act," (no date but April 1927); "Agreement for the Cooperative Distribution of Forest Planting Stock . . .," signed by Melvin A. Brannon, Chancellor, Rutledge Parker, State Forester, and R. W. Dunlap, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, 13 June 1927; C. H. Clapp to T. C. Spaulding, 15 April 1927; and Chancellor M. A. Brannon to Fred Morrell, 14 April 1927, all RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forestry - Nursery."

²⁰⁴ Dorr Skeels to C. H. Clapp, President, 5 May 1942, and attachments; and "Nursery, Robertson," (no date but late 1930s because of internal reference), typescript of a press release providing a brief overview of the nursery and its work, both RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forestry - Nursery." Several other letters relate to ongoing disputes with private nursery owners and the Extension Service

²⁰⁵ J. H. Ramskill, Assistant Dean of Forestry and Director, to Joseph E. Parker, State Administrator, WPA, 4 May 1940, RG1, PO, S15, B33, F"Forestry - Nursery." Also President Geo. Finlay Simmons to Governor Sam C. Ford, 31 August 1941, comprehensive report on his term, 9 December 1935 to 31 August 1941, pp. 32, esp. p. 15, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Five-Year Report (8-31-41)."

²⁰⁶ Phi Beta Kappa Association, "Petition," (no date but 1929), passim, esp. p. 16, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational," for the following quotations.

²⁰⁷ The low number of doctorates resulted from the Board policy of allowing only junior appointments to replace resignations or retirements.

²⁰⁸ Simmons to Governor Sam C. Ford, 31 August 1941, comprehensive report on his term, 9 December 1935 to 31 August 1941, p. 25, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Five-Year Report (8-31-41)." Also Merriam, History, p. 70, that "some departments and schools needed additional staff," undoubtedly accurate but vastly understated.

²⁰⁹ "University Millage Fund," 1933, discussing the annual shortfalls during 1931-1933, with overdue warrants in excess of \$240,000, and expenditures for FY1933 exceeding revenue by \$448,550, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Legislature, 1933, Millage Data." For a thorough analysis of the impact of the Depression on the six public institutions (with the statistical work done by Dr. Roland Renne, future President of Montana State College) which confirmed Clapp's analyses, see Fred Bennion, Executive Secretary, Montana Taxpayers' Association, Higher Education in Montana (Helena, Montana: Montana Taxpayers' Association, December 1938), pp. 106, passim., RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Reports on Higher Education."

²¹⁰ For example, Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1932, p. 7, UnPub, S2, Box 1929-1934. Also Merriam, History, pp. 60-82, who experienced the difficulties and participated in Clapp's reform efforts.

²¹¹ Brannon, "Higher Education in Montana," RG12, PO, S19, B52, F"Duplication Prior to 1944."

²¹² On the Meiji Period in Japan, see Marcus B. Jansen, Editor, The Emergence of Meiji Japan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), passim.

²¹³ C. H. Clapp, "Montana Educational Survey," 1929, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Leg. 1929, Montana Educational Survey;" and C.H. Clapp, "Educational Statistical Survey: Comparing Higher Education in Montana With That in Eleven Other Northwest and Rocky Mountain States," 22 September 1928, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C. H. -- Educational Statistical Survey." See also C. H. Clapp, "The Financing of the University," 7 January 1929, a radio talk stressing the need for the mill levy renewal, RG30, HR, F"Addresses by C. H. Clapp."

²¹⁴ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII., p. 88.

²¹⁵ President Charles H. Clapp to Fred Bennion, Secretary, Taxpayers' Association, 10 November 1934, RG1, PO, S19, B167, F"Taxpayers' Association."

²¹⁶ On this issue, see Katznelson, Fear Itself, passim.

²¹⁷ Fred Bennion, Executive Secretary, Montana Taxpayers' Association, Higher Education in Montana (Helena: Montana Taxpayers Association, December 1938), passim, esp. pp. 1-7, 46-48, 51--56, 70-71, and 82-91, with Professor R. R. Renne, Head of Economics and Sociology at the State College, responsible for the statistical analyses, RG1, PO, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Reports on Higher Education in Montana."

²¹⁸ For his conclusions, see *ibid*, pp. 92-108.

²¹⁹ Alex Blewett, "A Survey of Higher Learning at Montana State University, Missoula," July 1936, RG1, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational."

²²⁰ Clapp, "Remarks on Centralized Systems, National Association of State Universities (November 1933), RG1, PO S5, B6, F"National Association of State Universities, 1910-51;" and C. H. Clapp to President Melvin A. Brannon, 29 December 1922, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C. H. (Dr.)," on efforts to persuade him to become Chancellor. He refused because he regretted the time taken from his research even to serve as President.

²²¹ Shirley J. Coon, Secretary, Minutes, Committee on Budget and University Policy, 10 October 1922, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Budget and Policy to 1936."

²²² Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 66-70. Also Shirley J. Coon, Secretary, Minutes, Committee on Budget and University Policy, 10 October 1922, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Budget and Policy to 1936."

²²³ Brannon to Clapp, 4 June 1925; excerpts from Executive Council Minutes, 5 December 1925, 19 February 1926, 27 March 1926, all RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1919, 1923, 1924, Legislative Material." Also typescript of State Supreme Court decision, *ex rel* Frances D. Jones vs. The State Board of Examiners, 20 February 1926, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1919, 1923, 1924, Legislative Material." And Chancellor M. A. Brannon to Howard Toole, 24 September 1929, successfully opposing a Public Service Commission effort to force the State College to conduct oil tests without reimbursement of costs, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Montana State College, 1925-1945." Also Charles H. Clapp to M. A. Brannon, 26 February 1929; Chancellor M. A. Brannon to President Alfred A. Atkinson, 22 February 1929, killing a bill to restrict faculty members solely to teaching, both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1929, Legislative Material."

²²⁴ "Senate Bill No. 3; H. H. Swain to President C. H. Clapp, 16 June 1931; supplementary information about other states, all RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1931 Legislative Budget Requests."

²²⁵ C. H. Clapp to M. E. Brannon, 21 January 1931; Representative Oakley E. Coffee to President C. H. Clapp, 3 February 1931; and Chancellor M. A. Brannon to President C. H. Clapp, 17 October 1930, all RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1931 Legislative Budget Requests."

²²⁶ President C. H. Clapp to President E. C. Elliott, 18 March 1931, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C. H. (Dr.)."

²²⁷ *Ibid*.

²²⁸ "University Millage Fund," 1933; and H. H. Swain to C. H. Clapp, 30 October 1933, both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Legislature, 1933, Millage Data."

²²⁹ M. A. Brannon to President G. H. Vande Bogart, Northern Montana College, 27 December 1932; and C. H. Clapp to M. A. Brannon, 8 February 1933, both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Legislature, 1933, Millage Data."

²³⁰ Chancellor M. A. Brannon to Presidents, 13 February 1933; and "Senate Bill No. 1," 1933, both RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"Legislature, 1933, Millage Data." On Brannon's departure, see James D. Graham, Minority Report," 22 July 1944, in Ernest E. Melby, "Report of the Montana Commission on Higher Education With Recommendations of the State Board of Education," 26 September 1944, RG1, PO, S19, B52, F"Duplication -- Melby Attempts to Change Unit Functions, 1944-5."

²³¹ See John E. Erickson (Montana Politician), at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_E._Erickson_\(Montana_politician\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_E._Erickson_(Montana_politician))

²³² H. H. Swain to President Charles H. Clapp, 2 August 1934, with attached chart, RG1, PO, SIII, B16, F"1935 Legislative Budget Data."

²³³ President Charles H. Clapp to President Alfred Atkinson, 13 June 1933, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Montana State College, 1925-1945."

²³⁴ Alfred A. Atkinson, President to President C. H. Clapp, 15 November 1934, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1935 Legislative Budget Data."

²³⁵ Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1933, p. 4, UnPub, S2 B1929-1934; Charles H. Clapp, President's Report, 1934, p. 4, UnPub, S2, B1929-1934; also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 32 ff.; and "Excerpt From the Faculty Minutes of the Meeting of May 8, 1934," RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"Curr., Curriculum Revision, 1933." For Clapp's description of the State University and its programs on the eve of radical change, see President Charles H. Clapp, "Aims and Achievements of the State University of Montana," 10 May 1932, HG30, HR, F"Addresses by C. H. Clapp."

²³⁶ Clapp, "Aims and Achievements," 10 May 1932, HG30, HR, F"Addresses by C. H. Clapp."

²³⁷ Curriculum Committee Minutes, 9 December 1930, requiring the approval by a large majority of the faculty, RG1, PO S7, B14, F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1928-1954." Also, Merriam, History, pp. 60-82, a participant.

²³⁸ C. H. Clapp, President, to Department Chairmen, 17 April 1933, "Curricular Revision" attached, RG1, PO, S15, B30, F"Biological Sciences, Division of;" C. H. Clapp, President, To the Members of the Faculty, 31 May 1933, "Curriculum Revision" attached, RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Humanities, Division of;" and C. H. Clapp, President, To the Members of the Faculty, 31 May 1933, RG1, PO, S15, B39, F"Social Sciences, Division of."

²³⁹ Curriculum Committee Minutes, 9 December 1930, RG1, PO S7, B14, F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1928-1954."

²⁴⁰ For similar reforms at the University of Chicago and elsewhere, including the division into junior and senior colleges, see Loss, Citizens and the State, pp. 44-45.

²⁴¹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 31-32 Also Clapp to Department Chairmen, 17 April 1933, "Curricular Revision" attached, RG1, PO, S15, B30, F"Biological Sciences, Division of;" Clapp to the Members of the Faculty, 31 May 1933, RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Humanities, Division of;" and Clapp to the Members of the Faculty, 31 May 1933, RG1, PO, S15, B39, F"Social Sciences, Division of."

²⁴² Curriculum Committee Minutes, 9 December 1930, RG1, PO SVII, B14, F"Minutes, Curriculum Committee, 1928-1954." For brief discussion, Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, pp. 162-65.

²⁴³ See Clapp, "Aims and Achievements," 10 May 1932, HG30, HR, F"Addresses by C. H. Clapp." For this perspective, see Loss, Citizens and the State, ch. 2.

²⁴⁴ Merriam, History, p. 72, "the faculty was not ready for such a change."

²⁴⁵ Morton J. Elrod, "Division of Biological Sciences," p. 19, the new Biological Sciences interdisciplinary core course, Clapp, President's Report, 1934, UnPub, SII, B1929-1934; and Morton J. Elrod, "Introduction to Biological Science, 1933," RG1, PO, SVIII, B6, F"Survey Courses."

²⁴⁶ "Excerpt From the Faculty Minutes of the Meeting of May 8, 1934," RG1, PO, S5, B6, F"Curr., Curricular Revision, 1933."

²⁴⁷ Ibid. The restriction revealed the Arts and Sciences opposition to freshmen and sophomore students enrolling directly in the professional schools.

²⁴⁸ Clapp to Department Chairmen, 17 April 1933, "Curriculum Revision" attached, RG1, PO, S15, B30, F"Biological Sciences, Division of." Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 35, for the statement that some unknown person wrote the limerick in response to Clapp's proposed reforms. Whether Clapp wrote it remains uncertain, but he included it in his memoranda to the various Chairs and Deans and obviously delighted in its dry humor.

²⁴⁹ H. H. Swain to R. L. Collins, Oregon, 25 July 1934, RG1, PO, SV, B47, F"Salaries, 1918-1944."

²⁵⁰ C. H. Clapp, President, to President S. E. Davis, Normal College, 24 March 1933, RG1, PO, S5, B47, F"Salaries, 1918-1944."

²⁵¹ Select Committee on University Finances, "Report," 14 February 1935, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1935 Legislative Budget Data."

²⁵² Elrod, "Introduction to Biological Science, 1933," in RG1, PO S8, B6, F"Survey Courses."

²⁵³ Paul C. Phillips and Harry Turney-High to President Clapp, 18 April 1934; and C. H. Clapp to Phillips and Turney-High, 8 May 1934, both RG1, PO, S15, B39, F"Social Sciences, Division of."

²⁵⁴ On teaching languages, see "Excerpt from a Letter Written to Professor B. E. Thomas by President Clapp," 22 March 1932, and several additional letters on the language issue, all RG1, PO, S15, B35, F"Languages. 1920-55."

²⁵⁵ Merriam, History, p. 70, for the optimistic comment that support for graduate teaching assistants allowed graduate programs to grow.

²⁵⁶ M. J. Elrod to President Clapp, 28 July 1931, RG1, PO, S15, B38, F"Pre-Nursing and Nursing Through 1957;" and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 57-58.

²⁵⁷ Merriam, History, p. 92. Also Clapp, President Report, 1933, p. 1; and Clapp, President's Report, 1934, pp. 1-3, 5, UnPub, S2, B1929-1934.

²⁵⁸ State University of Montana, report with note by C.H.C., 9 October 1934; E. K. Badgley to Durwood Howes, (no date, but December 1934), in response to a request for outstanding male alumni; and J. E. Miller, Dean of Men, to Durwood Howes, (no date by December 1934), in response to a request for outstanding female alumni; all RG1, S5, B11, F"Alumni - General, 1909-1944;" also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, passim.

²⁵⁹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, passim., esp. p. 73.

²⁶⁰ Simmons to Ford, 31 August 1941, p. 25, RG1, PO, S4, B167, F"Five-Year Report (8-31-41)."

²⁶¹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 80-81.

²⁶² *Ibid.*, ch. VII, p. 76.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*, ch. VII, pp. 59-62.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, ch. VII, pp. 86-88. For references, see also "Salishan Languages," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Salishan_languages.

²⁶⁵ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 75-76; also "The . . . Register of the University of Montana, Missoula," at <https://books.google.com/books?id=Q-DOAAAAMAAJ&pg=PA14&lpg=PA14&dq=Professor+Paul+Chrisler+Phillips,+University+of+Montana&source=bl&ots=3w9V239PnV&sig=D6KEacYaP4WooKcxWiMSCc1IRhI&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjDsZzK8qLLAhUO9mMKHfdHCF0Q6AEIMjAE#v=onepage&q=Professor%20Paul%20Chrisler%20Phillips%2C%20University%20of%20Montana&f=false>.

²⁶⁶ For a brief biographical sketch providing the following details, except as otherwise noted, see H. G. Merriam Papers, 1890-1980," at <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv78663>. A definitive biography does not exist, although certainly needed.

²⁶⁷ H. G. Merriam to President E. O. Sisson, 17 August 1919, RG30, HR, F"Merriam, H.G."

²⁶⁸ President E. O. Sisson to Professor H. G. Merriam, 5 April 1920 and 1 September 1921, for the salary of \$3,800, not quite the promised level, but Merriam remained nonetheless.

²⁶⁹ See discussion above.

²⁷⁰ See Course Request taught by H. G. Merriam, two credits, fall, winter, and spring, for "Students with genuine literary ability" to provide an "outlet for their expression, limited to four or five students at any one time, 1 October 1919; and another "Teaching of English" for elementary as well as secondary teacher candidates, of which Sisson informed the Chancellor in the event of complaint from the Normal School; H. G. Merriam to Mr. Sisson, 2 February 1921; President Sisson to Professor H. G. Merriam, 4 February 1921; and President E. O. Sisson to Chancellor E. C. Elliott, 14 February 1921, all RG1, PO, S15, B 32, F"English 1917-1939."

²⁷¹ On this effort, see Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 59-62. The State University provided \$250 for postage and the use of Department equipment to mimeograph the Notes.

²⁷² See L(ucille)JA(rmsby), handwritten note on press release, "June Edition of Magazine Will Be Last. Dr. Merriam Announces Frontier and Midland To Be Suspended," 1 June 1939, RG1, HR, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier." See also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 105.

²⁷³ H. G. Merriam to President C. H. Clapp, 22 November 1922, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier."

²⁷⁴ H. G. Merriam, Chairman, English, to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, The University of Montana, RG30, HR, F"Merriam, H. G."

²⁷⁵ Merriam, *History*, pp. 66-67; also President C. H. Clapp to Professor H. G. Merriam, 9 April 1925, RG30, HR, F"Merriam, H. G."

²⁷⁶ President C. H. Clapp to H. G. Merriam, 4 May 1926; Melvin Brannon, Chancellor, to President Charles H. Clapp, 4 May 1926; and President Charles H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 6 May 1926; and H. G. Merriam to President C. H. Clapp, 9 June 1926, all RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"English 1917-1939."

²⁷⁷ For the agreement see C. H. Clapp to the U. S. Patent Office, 15 December 1928; also unidentified but H. W. Whicker to Joe McDowell, "Analyses," (no date but 1936-1937), confirming that the "storm" in 1926 resulted in passing the journal "into private ownership of Mr. Merriam," both RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier."

²⁷⁸ Brannon, to Clapp, 4 and May 1926, both RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"English 1917-1939."

²⁷⁹ H. G. Merriam to President C. H. Clapp, 18 May 1926, RG30, HR, F"Merriam, H. G. "

²⁸⁰ Merriam to Clapp, 9 June 1926. Also J. B. Speer, Business Manager, to President Simmons, 14 October 1936; Dean C. W. Leaphart, Law School, to J. B. Speer, Business Manager, 9 December 1936, subsidy legal; and H.G. Merriam to President Simmons, 15 September 1936, varying amounts annually to pay for copies to exchange with other universities, H.G. Merriam to President Simmons, all RG1, PO, S15, B32, F"English 1917-1939."

²⁸¹ See, for example, F. P. Francis to President Simmons, 29 December 1938, with attached but incomplete backlog inventory numbers, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier."

²⁸² H. G. Merriam to President G. Finlay Simmons, 17 November 1937, RG1, HR, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier."

²⁸³ Armsby, handwritten note on press release, "June Edition of Magazine Will Be Last. Dr. Merriam Announces Frontier and Midland To Be Suspended," 1 June 1939, RG1, HR, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier."

²⁸⁴ See E. E. Nelson, Passenger Traffic Manager, NP, to H. G. Merriam, 12 February 1937, RG30, HR, F"Merriam, H. G. "

²⁸⁵ See the discussion in Chapter 4 in Volume 2 of this study.

²⁸⁶ State Board of Education, "Resolution," 14 April 196, Billings Meeting, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier;" G.

F.(inlay) S.(immons), President, to L.(ucille J. A.(rmsby), 22 October 1937,

²⁸⁷ H.G. Merriam to President G. F. Simmons, 30 January 1936, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier;" H. G. Merriam to President Simmons, 15 September 1936;" G. F.(inlay) S.(immons), President, to L.(ucille J. A.(rmsby), 22 October 1937, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Frontier."

²⁸⁸ Merriam, History, pp. 68-70.

²⁸⁹ C. H. Clapp, "Summer Session, 1925;" "Summer Session, 1926;" "Summer Session, 1927;" "Summer Session, 1934," esp C. H. Clapp to Dean Theo. W. H. Iron, Missouri, 29 October 1934, all RG1, PO, S7, B7, F"Summer Session 1925;" F"Summer Session, 1926;" "Summer Session ,1927;" and "Summer Session, 1934," respectively.

²⁹⁰ Merriam, History, pp. 70-75.

²⁹¹ Blewett, "A Survey of Higher Learning at Montana State University, Missoula," July 1936, RG1, S15, B26, F"ARCHIVES: Informational." Nationally, enrolments declined during `1933 to 1935 and then began to increase again until WW II.

²⁹² Clapp, "Narrative," ch.VII, p. 122; President C. H. Clapp, "State University Fact-Finding Projects," 1935, RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program;" Christopher P. Loss, Between Citizens and the State: The Politics of American Higher Education in the 20th Century (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012), Part I; and George Dennison, "Student Loans and Access to Higher Education," The Montana Professor 23 (#1, Fall 2012), at www.google.com/#q=The+Montana+Professor.

²⁹³ President C. H. Clapp, "State University of Montana FERA and PWA Projects," (no date but 1935), RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program.

²⁹⁴ President Charles H. Clapp, "Physical Plant at the State University for the Decade 1930-1940," (no date but 1929 or 1930), RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program."

²⁹⁵ Freidel, Rendezvous with Destiny, Chs.9-11.; and Katznelson, Fear Itself, Chs. 6-7.

²⁹⁶ Clap, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 115; and see T. C. Spaulding to T. G. Swearingen, 4 November 1932, 4 November 1932; and T. C. Spaulding to President C. H. Clapp, 16 November 1932; T. G. Swearingen, "Proposed Work From R.F.C. Funds," 24 January 1933, all RG1, PO, S4, B63, F"General to 1933." Also various memoranda and letters during the mid- to-late 1930s on such projects, RG1, PO, S6, B542, F"Campus Development, 1922-44." Also T. C. Spaulding, Dean, to Dr. Ernest O. Melby, 4 December 1941, discussing the reliance on federal funds during the 1930s, RG1, PO, S6, B42, F"Campus Planning and Development Committee, 1941-1951." Also President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 2 November 1932; Clapp, "State University of Montana FERA and PWA Projects, (no date but 1935); and T. C. Spaulding, Dean, "Memorandum to President Scheuch," 12 June 1935, all RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program."

²⁹⁷ President C. H. Clapp to Chancellor M. A. Brannon, 2 November 1932, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union Application for Loan and Grant."

²⁹⁸ President C. H. Clapp to President Alfred Atkinson, 29 July 1933, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Montana State College, 1925-1945."

²⁹⁹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 100-101, 119-122; and Merriam, History, pp. 66-67; "University Center: History," at <http://www.umt.edu/uc/about-us/History/default.php>; and Tonya N. Smith, "Celebrating Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: The History of the Student Union at The University of Montana Since 1935," (2011, The University of Montana, Missoula, Montana, unpublished), esp. p. 16, typescript copy in author's possession.

³⁰⁰ State ex rel. Blume, Plaintiff, v. State Board of Education et al., Defendants, (1934), 34 Pac. (2nd) 515, RG1, PO, S15, B 191, F"Land Grant Income;" and "No. 7546 -- State of Montana, in the Supreme Court, March Term 1936. State ex rel. F. W. Wilson, Relator, vs State Board of Education et al., Respondents, 8 March 1936, sustaining the Journalism Building authorization using land grant funds, RG1, PO, S17, B100, F"Journalism Building." Most of the cases during the period involved friendly suits seeking to vindicate the use of non-state funds, including the land grant funds.

³⁰¹ Philip R. Barber vs. State Board of Education et al., 9 July 1932, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union." Clapp and Brannon considered the ruling board enough to sustain leasing fraternity-sorority houses. The Attorney General disagreed. Also J. C. Garlington, University Counsel, to President Geo. Finlay Simmons, "Test Cases on University Buildings," 16 October 1936, RG1, PO, S3, B16, F"1941: Physical Plant."

³⁰² President C. H. Clapp to Carl R. McFarland, Department of Justice, 23 October 1933, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union Application for Loan and Grant."

³⁰³ Smith, "Celebrating Yesterday, " pp. 9-22, for the details.

³⁰⁴ J. B. Speer, typed statement of revenue to support the SUB project, 31 October 1932; and J. B. Speer, Business Manager, to Harry M. McConnell, The College Survey, 14 December 1931, both RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"Student Union Application for Loan and Grant."

³⁰⁵ Dean C. W. Leaphart, School of Law, to Governor John W. Bonner, 24 December 1941, discussing "State ex Rel. Veeder Relator v State Board of Ed. 97 M. 121," which upheld the use of the Student Union Fee revenue for construction of the Student Union, with no mention of the Building Fee, and warning against other than incidental use of the facility for instruction, RG1, PO, S17, B101, F"President's House." Also Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 120.

³⁰⁶ See Acting President Frederick C. Scheuch to C. B. Shephard, Supervisor, Public Works Administration, 1 August 1935, RG1, PO, S18, B21, F"S. Union Loan Agreement & Retirement of Bonds."

³⁰⁷ President C. H. Clapp, Speech at Student Union Building ground-breaking, 1934, RG30, HR, F"Addresses by C. H. Clapp."

³⁰⁸ Merriam, History, p. 66, fn. 18. Nonetheless, President Robert T. Pantzer proposed to name a new science building for Clapp in the 1970s, and a plate inside the building indicates that name. However, the name did not change officially until 2004 with the members of the Clapp family attending the belated dedication.

³⁰⁹ Smith, "Celebrating Yesterday," pp. 18, 38.

³¹⁰ Montana State University, "Buildings Erected 1929-1943," (no date but 1943-1944), RG1, PO, S17, B96, F"Building Program."

³¹¹ See Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 116-117.

³¹² See *Ibid.*, ch. VII, pp. 56-57.

³¹³ See *ibid.*, ch. VII, pp. 96-97.

³¹⁴ See *ibid.*, ch. VII, *passim*.

³¹⁵ See *Ibid.*, ch. VII, handwritten interleaf between pages 90 and 91.

³¹⁶ See Merriam, History, p. 73.

³¹⁷ See *Ibid.*, p. 75; Clapp, Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 92-93; Gilluly, Grizzly Gridiron, pp. 82-105; and Holien, Grizzly Vault, pp. 25-36.

³¹⁸ See Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, handwritten interleaf between pages 40 and 41. See also President Charles H. Clapp to Acting President F. B. Linfield, 8 November 1927, RG1, PO, SXIX, B46, F"Montana State College, 1925-1945. See also Holien, Grizzly Vault, p. 48, the first game in Butte in 1928 and the last in 1949.

³¹⁹ See Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 92-93; and Merriam, History, p. 75.

³²⁰ See Alex B. Cunningham to President C. H. Clapp, 27 February 1935, RG1, PO, SXV, B 34, F"Health & Physical Education, Athletics - 1935-1959."

³²¹ See Simmons to Ford, 31 August 1941, RG1, PO, SIV, B167, F"Five-Year Report (8-31-41)," p. 23.

³²² See Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 93.

³²³ See Montana State University, Missoula, Athletic Board Budget, 1936-37, RG1, PO, SXV, B 34, F"Health & Physical Education, Athletics - 1935-1959."

³²⁴ See Simmons to Ford, 31 August 1941, p. 23, RG1, PO, SIV, B167, F"Five-Year Report (8-31-41)."

³²⁵ See K. K. Badgley, "Memo: RE: Salaries and Wages . . .," 23 November 1943, RG1, PO, SXV, B 34, F"Health & Physical Education, Athletics - 1935-1959."

³²⁶ See former football Coach Don Read, "Leadership Paved Montana's Way," Holien, Grizzly Vault, p. 4.

³²⁷ "From the Faculty Minutes of December 6th, 1917: Requirements for graduation; Physical Education & Military Drill," RG1, PO, SXV, B38, F"ROTC: 1917-1921."

³²⁸ See C.H. Clapp to Col. M. N. Falls, HQ 9th Corps Area, San Francisco, 15 April 1922, RG1, PO, SXV, B38, F"ROTC: 1917-1921."

³²⁹ See C. H. Clapp to General C. S. Fransworth, War Department, 15 April 1922, RG1, PO, SXV, B38, F"ROTC: 1917-1921."

³³⁰ Chas M. Walton, Capt. & Professor of M. S. & T., to President C. H. Clapp, 1 May 1922; and C. H. Clapp to Captain Charles M. Walton, 3 May 1922, RG1, PO, SXV, B38, F"ROTC: 1917-1921."

³³¹ See Jas. J. K. Partello, Col., to Dr. Edward C. Elliott, 7 April 1922; and C. H. Clapp to Major H. L. Jordan, 9th Corps HQ, 17 October 1922, both RG#1, PO, SXV, B38, F"ROTC: 1917-1921."

³³² See Ernest F. Tittle, Secretary-Treasurer, Commission on World Peace, to President Charles H. Clapp, 22 November 1933; Charles H. Clapp, President, to Reverend Ernest F. Tittle, 6 December 1933, both RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"R.O.T.C., 1933-1935."

³³³ See C. H. Clapp, President to Representative Roy Ayers, Senators B. K. Wheeler , and Secretary of War George H. Dern, 27 February 1934; President C. H. Clapp to Senator John E. Erickson, 2 February 1934; and Senator John E. Erickson to President C. H. Clapp, 31 March 1934, all RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"R.O.T.C., 1933-1934."

³³⁴ See C. H. Clapp to Senator B. K. Wheeler, 24 March 1934; and George H. Dern to C. H. Clapp, 19 March 1934, both RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"R.O.T.C., 1933-1934."

³³⁵ See President C. H. Clapp, to E. P. Astle, Assistant Secretary to the Governor, 5 June 1934, RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"R.O.T.C., 1933-1934."

³³⁶ See Student Committee for Voluntary ROTC, "An Open Letter to the Faculty," stamped 25 May 1938, RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"ROTC - Effort to Make Voluntary: 1938."

³³⁷ Major R. M. Caulkins, Acting Professor of Military Science and Training, to HQ ROTC, 15 June 1939, both RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"ROTC - Effort to Make Voluntary: 1938."

³³⁸ President Geo. Finlay Simmons to M. Mansfield, R.A. Diettert, A. S. Merrill, E. L. Freeman, T.C. Spaulding, W. E. Schreiber, and Major George B. Morris, 23 May 1938; and handwritten note by Lucille J. Arsmby, dated 11 June 1940, "No report ever made,"

³³⁹ See President Geo. Finlay Simmons to John W. Mahan, Adj. Gen., Mont., 18 November 1938; and Geo. B. Morris, Major Infantry, MSU, Stanford, Member of the Committee, "Memo to the Committee," 8 June 1938, both RG1, PO, SXV, B39, F"ROTC - Effort to Make Voluntary: 1938."

³⁴⁰ See Merriam History, pp. 67-68.

³⁴¹ See Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 75-76.

³⁴² See C. H. McLeod to Dr. Clapp, 11 April 1930, RG1, PO, SXI, B74, F"Honorary Degrees - Voted by Faculty but not Conferred,"

³⁴³ See various memos and newspaper clippings, etc., for "first alumni . . . reunion" on 4-6 June 1932, RG1, PO, SV, B11, F"Reunion 1932."

³⁴⁴ See Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 54-55. See also "Stepanoff, Jo," Stepanzoff, Alexander," Stepanzoff, Alexander and Joswephine," Jo Rainbolt, Compiler, Missoula Valley History (Dallas, Texas: Curtis Media Corporation, 1991), pp. 503-05.

³⁴⁵ See "University of Montana," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Montana.

³⁴⁶ On these programs see, "Fulbright U. S. Student Program," at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Montana; "Fulbright Scholar Program," at <http://www.cies.org/program/fulbright-international-education-administrators-seminars>; and "ISEP: International Student Exchange Program," at <https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=isep%20exchange>.

³⁴⁷ See H. G. Merriam, "Who Have Been Montana's Rhodes Scholars?" 6 June 1962, RG1, PO, S15, B93, F"Rhodes Scholarship." See also Clapp, "Narrative," Ch. VII, p. 119.

³⁴⁸ On Merriam, see the biographical note in "H. G. Merriam, 1890-1980, at <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv78663>. Among others, Professor Maxine Van de Wetering carried on Merriam's work with success.

³⁴⁹ See several letters from and to Clapp and other documents, esp. President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore, to Chancellor Clapp, 1 September 1926; J. R. Thomas, Secretary, Rhodes Committee, to President Clapp, 2 October 1929, designating Clapp as Chairman of the Montana Committee; C. H. Clapp, President, to Representative John W. Evans, 14 December 1929; and C. H. Clapp, President, to President Frank Aydelotte, 19 December 1930, all RG1, PO, S15, B93, F"Rhodes Scholarship."

³⁵⁰ Merriam, History, pp. 67-70.

³⁵¹ President C. H. Clapp to President L. B. McMullen, Eastern Montana Normal School, 19 November 1934, RG1, PO, S19, B46, F"Eastern Montana Normal School 1927-1948."

³⁵² See SBE, Minutes, Regular Meeting, June 1918, p. 134, M418, R2, concerning the appointment on an annual basis of a vice president to assist the President as directed.

³⁵³ See, for example, J. P. Rowe, Chairman, "The Budget and Policy Committee," 9 February 1935; and J. P. Rowe, Chairman, "Budget and Policy Committee," 13-14 March 1935, salary listing for 1935-1936, both RG1, PO, S4, B42, F"Budget & Policy to 1936;" and H. H. Swain, Executive Secretary to the Board of Education, to Professor J. P. Rowe, 22 April 1935, RG1, PO, SIV, B42, F"Budget & Policy Committee, 1936-41," on behalf of the State Board, denying certain salaries.

³⁵⁴ See Simmons, "Envy and Hatred, Part B, pp. 191-192; and Armsby to Simmons, 23 November 1963, in Part A, p. 63.

³⁵⁵ Simmons, "Envy and Hatred, Part A, p. 24, citing his father's report of a conversation with Scheuch.

³⁵⁶ See Merriam, History, pp.68- 69, 82; and Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, pp. 118, 127-128. See also Simmons, "Envy and Hatred, " Part A, pp. 58-60.

³⁵⁷ Unknown, "Lucille Jameson Armsby, " (no date but 1965), RH30, HR, F"ARMSBY, Lucille Jameson," tribute on her retirement and record; in 1961 she had the title of Assistant Professor, which began in 1938-1939, duties described by Acting President Leaphart as "administrative," not "clerical," and with "full faculty standing;" transcript attached, showing BA in History with Honors, all to assure her inclusion under TRS for retirement.

³⁵⁸ See Merriam, History, p. 82.

³⁵⁹ Clapp, "Narrative," ch. VII, p. 128, penciled note with no name mentioned, suggesting she wrote it.

³⁶⁰ See F.C. Scheuch, statement on Clapp's death, (no date but May 1935), RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C.H. (Dr.)."

³⁶¹ F. C. Scheuch to Mrs. Clapp, 5 July 1935, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C.H. (Dr.)."

³⁶² H.H. Swain, Executive Secretary, to J. B. Speer, 23 May 1935, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C.H. (Dr.)."

³⁶³ F. C. Scheuch, Acting President, to Dr. H. H. Swain, 10 June 1935, and attachments, RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C.H. (Dr.)." For the Clapp children, see Charles H. Clapp Papers, at <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv81237>; and any Alumni Directory.

³⁶⁴ See Mary Brennan Clapp Papers for brief biography at <http://archiveswest.orbiscascade.org/ark:/80444/xv28048>.

³⁶⁵ See Dennison, Pioneer Naturalist, pp. 166-71.

³⁶⁶ "Dr. C. H. Clapp Devoted Efforts Toward School," Missoulian (9 and 11 May 1935); and Kaimin (10 May 1935), RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C.H. (Dr.)."

³⁶⁷ "Interview with President Edward O. Sisson," (no date but 1921), RG30, HR, F"Clapp, C.H. (Dr.)."