

4101
V. 112
-atg-11111


A SOUTHERN INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITY:
A SOCIOLOGICAL INQUIRY

By Tracy Harrington

200 8 1 30A

A Senior Thesis
Submitted for Honors
to the
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Washington and Lee University

May, 1965



FOR
DR. JAMES G. LEYBURN
WITH
SINCERE APPRECIATION

This thesis could not have been written without the generous assistance of numerous men, whose long-standing associations with Washington and Lee have rendered them invaluable in such a study as the present one. Especially, the author's gratitude is extended to Dr. Ollinger Crenshaw, the university historian; Dean Emeritus Frank J. Gilliam; and Mr. Henry Coleman, university librarian.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. Introduction	1
2. Personnel and Government	14
3. Admissions and Scholarships	43
4. Courses and Degrees	52
5. The Student Body	67
6. Extracurricular Activities	84
7. Southernism, Community, and Intellectuality	95
8. Appendices	
9. Footnotes	
10. Bibliography	

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The immediate purpose of this thesis is to make a sociological analysis of Washington and Lee University as a Southern intellectual community during the first three decades of the present century.

It is not here suggested that Washington and Lee was a "typical" Southern institution of higher learning - if any such typical college or university existed. It identified itself with the South, however, and in many ways was, wherever it was known, regarded as Southern. It was located in Virginia, that commonwealth which more than any other, because of its antiquity, heritage, and leadership represented to Southerners and Northerners alike "the" South. It bore the name of two Virginians - and if Washington was the father of his whole country, Lee was the great Southerner. For five years the institution had been under the presidency of Robert E. Lee, and for another twenty-five under that of his son, George Washington Custis Lee. The student body was drawn chiefly from the South, over 90% being from that area in 1900.

The institution thus justifies the appellation of Southern. It shared the attitudes and preoccupations of literate Southerners, as will be seen, but it also shared the external conditions general throughout the whole Southern area at the time. There is no need to rehearse here the statistics on economics and industry, on poverty and illiteracy, on public health, transportation, rates of growth, or any other of the indices that show how far the South lagged behind the other regions of the nation. If there were impediments to progress in the other institutions of the South, its institutions of higher learning would also feel them. And so they did.

The key words for sociological analysis are the three qualifying terms applied to Washington and Lee in the title of this study. The problem to be studied involves community, intellectuality, and Southernism at the university from 1900 to 1930. These three terms must be carefully defined before stating the hypotheses to be examined in relation to all three.

By community shall be meant a group, mutually inclusive, having two primary characteristics:

1. Within it the individual can have most of the experiences and conduct most of the activities that are important to him.

2. It is bound together by a shared sense of belonging and by the feeling among its members that the group defines for them their distinctive identity.¹

Those persons comprising a community feel a sense of belongingness, a sense of rapport with their fellow members. The fact of community presupposes a reason for its existence; that is, it presumes that there is some centrality of purpose or meaning, some consensus as to ends and generally as to means. Community often includes locale, as it does in the case at hand; it need not do so, however, but rather need only define the group identity.² The crucial point is found in the query, "What does the community stand for?" It is essentially a matter of identity - the identity of individual members of the group expressed in the general terms of community values or spirit.

Intellectuality is a little more difficult to define. Any definition or set of definitions would be unsatisfactory to some degree, and would inevitably be assailable. The high degree of subjectivity present in the task of defining such a term as intellectuality precludes universality of acceptance of definition. The attempt has not been made, therefore, to arrive at a definition that would be universally acceptable. On the contrary, a single source has been

purposely used, and the definition of intellectuality has been based on that of Richard Hofstadter in Anti-Intellectualism in America.³ In the pages that follow, then, "intellectuality" shall mean essentially that quality defined in the following paragraphs - gleaned for the most part from Hofstadter's book.

Intellectuality has to do with a quality of mentality, and is, as Hofstadter has said, "the critical, creative, and contemplative side of mind."⁴ The intellectual regards knowing as an end in itself, thrills with ideas for their own sake. Intellectuality is contrasted with professionalism in that the former seeks knowledge for the joy of knowing while the latter seeks knowledge as a device of practical application. Intellectuality is not, then, essentially the acquisition of facts for technical application; it is, rather, learning for the pleasure of learning.⁵ Again to quote Hofstadter, intellectuality "implies a special sense of the ultimate value in existence of the act of comprehension."⁶ Basic to intellectuality is this delight in thoughtful activity. The meaning of intellectual life lies not in acquiring neat collections of truths, but in the speculation ~~of~~^{on} unknowns, in the exploration of new uncertainties.

There must be independent commitment to

ideas for intellectuality to exist, but a severely restricting commitment to a special or narrow idea or ideology precludes intellectuality and spawns fanaticism.

When one's concern for ideas, no matter how dedicated and sincere, reduces them to the service of some central limited preconception or some wholly external end, intellect gets swallowed by fanaticism.⁷

The non-manipulative nature of true intellectuality has been mentioned. A side to intellectuality exists, however, which involves application.⁸ The commitment of the intellectual necessarily entails devotion - in the West, at any rate - to such values as reason and justice. To turn a final time to Hofstadter:

. . . it is also true that intellectuals are properly more responsive to such values than others; and it is the historic glory of the intellectual class of the West in modern times that, of all the classes which could be called in any sense privileged, it has shown the largest and most consistent concern for the well-being of the classes which lie below it in the social scale. Behind the intellectual's feeling of commitment is the belief that in some measure the world should be made responsive to his capacity for rationality, his passion for justice and order: out of this conviction arises much of his value to mankind. . .⁹

The final term to be defined is that of Southernism, which has to do largely with a general and self-conscious philosophy of thought and action. Perhaps it is advisable to point

out first what is not meant by Southernism; it is not, as the word is used here, intended to mean "the Southern Way of Life." It does not mean simply the culture of the South. Rather it designates a mental attitude which grew up during and after Reconstruction, and which flowered in the early part of the twentieth century. Southernism, as the term will be used here, emerged after the devastation of the Civil War. Fundamental to this philosophy born of defeat was a pre-occupation with and idealization of the Past.¹⁰ More than any other region of the United States the South lived with (and to some extent still lives with) an acute awareness of its by-gone culture. This pre-occupation took the form of intense romanticizing, and a picture emerged of an idyllic ante-bellum age when all was sunshine and magnolias.¹¹ Southernism was concerned with a deep sense of personal honor, with a polished and highly complex institutionalized social life, and with the cultivation of the Ideal Gentleman as epitomized by Robert E. Lee.¹² A "polished and complex social life" means, simply, that there was a proclivity for and evidence of abundant activities and organizations of a purely "social" nature.

Southernism also included a profound sense of difference from and opposition to the rest

of American culture. Progress - in education, economics, or whatever - was held in mannerly contempt if its birthplace was extra-Southern.¹³

The defeated South clothed itself in the sackcloth of the Lost Cause. It built a psychological Chinese Wall separating the two parts of the old nation. Memory of the War became the wedge of separation in ways of thinking and living.¹⁴

These, then, are the three crucial phenomena to be confronted: community, intellectuality, and Southernism. Their interrelations and interdependencies form the basis for the central theme of this investigation. The cardinal hypotheses to be examined are these:

1. Whether the cult of Southernism, to the degree that it existed at Washington and Lee, had a positive or negative effect on intellectuality in the university during the first thirty years of the century.
2. Whether community existed at Washington and Lee, and, if it did, whether the community that did exist amounted to the institutionalization of Southernism.
3. Whether intellectuality existed at Washington and Lee during the period under discussion.

These hypotheses may be restated more succinctly, as follows:

1. The cult of Southernism had either a positive or negative effect on intellectuality.
2. Community was the expression of the cult of Southernism.
3. Intellectuality tended to vary inversely with the cult of Southernism and the sense of community.

In the present case, this paper would to

In the broadest sense, this paper seeks to discover how specific factors or phenomena encourage or discourage intellectuality in the academic setting. With this in mind, various aspects of the Washington and Lee University such as the formal structure, the student body, and extracurricular life will be examined. In each of the following five chapters, a specified facet of the university will be investigated. At the conclusion of each chapter, observable emphases or trends, based on the empirical evidence presented, will be pointed out and their significance in the context of this paper will be suggested.

The guiding inquiry throughout this analysis will be as follows: How did the various components of the university reflect, support, or oppose the attitudes of Southernism, intellectuality, and community?

Five purely descriptive chapters follow. Each of these chapters deals with a particular aspect of the university: personnel* and government, admissions and scholarships, courses and degrees, the student body, and extracurricular

* By personnel will be meant the administration, board of trustees, and faculty. The student body is not included in that classification.

activities. After an examination of the empirical conditions prevailing in each of these areas, the trends or emphases which emerge from the analysis will be summarized and related to the three qualifying terms applied to Washington and Lee in the title of this study.

Chapter Seven will call together all of the "trends" which have been ascertained throughout the paper. At that point, an attempt will be made to discover to what degree Southernism, intellectuality, and community existed in the university from 1900 to 1930.

The final chapter will also deal with the interrelationships of the three attitudes under discussion, and will further seek to reveal what parallel trends prevailed among the three.

The Sociology of Knowledge

The branch of sociology in which the present investigation falls is that of "the sociology of knowledge." This special field, with its somewhat ambiguous title, emerged in the second quarter of the present century.¹⁵ The German sociologist Karl Mannheim first formulated the subdiscipline, giving it the name of Wissensoziologie. Before his time many studies had been made which now might be labelled as researches in the sociology of knowledge; but as a modern area of scholarship, both field of inquiry and designation were born

in Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia.¹⁶

What Mannheim perceived was that ideas and attitudes affect social behavior and institutions, and are in turn affected by behavior and institutions. If this be so, then this "knowledge", these products of mind, must be sociological data, and must therefore be investigated by the sociologist.

Religious beliefs had decisive effects upon economic and political life from the Middle Ages on through the Reformation and the century of religious wars. Utopian ideals have produced social revolutions and fundamental reforms. Attitudes toward slavery, nationalism, race, socialism, sex, social class, and many other issues have profoundly influenced not only historical events but also the durable institutions all societies regard as fundamental to their well-being. Conversely, these institutions, in the setting of their time and place, affect ideas and attitudes. That New England and the South took different views of slavery in pre-Civil War days is an example of the interplay between social conditions and ideas.

To call such pervasive ideas and attitudes as have been named "knowledge," as Mannheim has done, may be semantically inexact. Among present-day sociologists, however, the rubric of "the sociology of knowledge" has become conventionally

accepted. Robert K. Merton, in his Social Theory and Social Structure,¹⁷ suggests that the true subject-matter of the discipline is what he calls "mental productions."¹⁸ He suggests that the sociologist should study group structure, "historical situation," power structure, and social processes (such as competition and conflict) - all of them aspects of the sociology of knowledge. He adds that underlying these "existential social bases" are cultural bases, such as values, ethos, climate of opinion, and "culture mentality."¹⁹

The sociological orientation of the present inquiry rests directly upon Merton's suggestion that spheres of moral beliefs, ideologies, ideas, social norms, philosophy, and similar mental productions are topics for sociological analysis. These are all "mental productions," in his terminology. He emphasizes several aspects of these mental productions: "their selection (foci of attention), level of abstraction, presuppositions, conceptual content, models of verification, and objectives of intellectual activity."²⁰

The mental productions under study here are intellectuality, Southernism, and community. They will be analyzed according to some of the social and cultural bases mentioned above, such as group structure, social processes, ethos and

values. Consideration will be given to the pre-suppositions, content, and foci of attention found in intellectuality, Southernism, and community at Washington and Lee from 1900 to 1930.

Mannheim has distinguished two aspects of the sociology of knowledge: theory and research. The present study lies in the latter realm, which Mannheim called "historical-sociological research which seeks to trace the forms the relationship between knowledge and existence has taken in the intellectual development of mankind."²¹

Research in the sociology of knowledge differs in one important aspect from most other current sociological investigation: its results cannot be tabulated for statistical manipulation or assembled for use in computing machines. In an age of quantification this limitation would seem to be a disadvantage. The materials of the sociology of knowledge, however, patently consist of ideas and attitudes - that is, of subjective rather than objective phenomena. What people think and believe and feel is, as Mannheim and his followers ~~make~~ abundantly clear, of sociological importance; the problem is how to present empirically materials that are, of their nature, subjective. Of the methods available to the present investigator, the case-study method has seemed the most feasible, all the more since it makes possible the examination

of change in attitudes and sentiments during a period of thirty years.

Materials for the case-study are contained in catalogues, official statements of policy, records compiled by registrars, year-books, student publications, and books written during or about the period. The investigation was inestimably assisted by information derived from persons connected with the university during part of the period, and by materials collected by the university historian.

The assembled facts, while interesting in themselves, are all directed toward the one sociological goal of examining the interplay of attitudes upon a functioning institution during three decades of its life. Specifically, the sociological goal of this study is to answer the question posed on page eight: How did the various components of the university reflect, support, or oppose the attitudes designated as Southernism, intellectuality, and community?

CHAPTER TWO

PERSONNEL AND GOVERNMENT

The year 1900 brought the death of William Wilson, former Postmaster-General of the United States and President of Washington and Lee since 1897.¹ Wilson took over management of the university when the school was deficient in almost every way. The student body was dismally small, the financial situation was poor, and the curriculum was a Victorian anachronism.² By 1900, however, Wilson was able to make a number of improvements. In that year, the faculty, though small, was adequate for the size of the student body and the modest curriculum. Of the total twenty-two teachers at Washington and Lee, eleven held doctoral degrees; and, for the most part, these degrees were distributed throughout the sciences and the humanities. Each of the major sciences (biology, chemistry, physics, and geology) boasted a Ph.D. instructor, as did Latin, Greek, history, economics and political science, and modern languages.³ Two particularly good men had been added to the faculty by Wilson. These were Dr. Walter Stevens, in physics, who came from Rensselaer²; and Dr. H. Parker Willis, in economics, from the University of Chicago.⁴

It had been Wilson's objective to make Washington and Lee "the most prominent Southern university;"⁵ although his short four-year term did not permit the realization of this goal, Wilson left the school in a better condition than it had enjoyed since Lee's time.⁶ As has been noted, he left a small but adequate faculty. Because of his nation-wide renown, he brought Washington and Lee to the attention of influential outsiders whose contributions helped replenish the school's faltering finances. One such man was Herbert Welch of Philadelphia, a journalist who undertook to raise \$100,000 for the general endowment of Washington and Lee. After Wilson's death in 1901, Welch's plan merged with that of Harry St. George Tucker to endow the chair of economics Wilson had established.⁷ By the Spring of 1901, the fund had grown to \$65,000, and included such contributors as Booker T. Washington, Grover Cleveland, and Harvard University.⁸ With a gift of \$1,000 from Isidor Straus, Wilson started what was to become the commerce library.⁹ Professor Willis, mentioned earlier, occupied the endowed chair of economics that Wilson established.¹⁰

At the end of Wilson's regime, the bureaucracy of the school was minimal. The government of the university was handled almost wholly by the president. Students were freely permitted to visit his office, and he personally administered discipline,

excused absences, counseled in academic matters, and performed functions now usually assigned to a dean. All professors reported to the president regularly, informing him of the standing and deportment of each student. Only the president was permitted to grant leaves of absence from the university or from class, and it was he who was responsible for admission of students.¹¹ With a parttime secretary, President Wilson took care of virtually all of the business of the university.¹² He was, therefore, closely and directly involved in the life of Washington and Lee.

A careful watch was kept by Wilson over each student, and though every boy in attendance had a faculty adviser, it was the president who "admonished and counseled students."¹³ Personal letters were written by Wilson to the students' parents, informing them of their sons' academic standing and personal situation.¹⁴

In addition to weekly assemblies at which the president or his guest spoke,¹⁵ there were regular religious services held in the chapel which, as the 1900 catalogue stated, "The students are expected to attend in addition to the church of their choice."¹⁶

When Wilson died, Harry St. George Tucker (a faculty member and nominally "dean" of the university), served as temporary president until Dr. George H. Denny entered the office in June, 1901.¹⁷

Arch.
378.2

HARRINGTON¹⁷

Denny inherited, as has been pointed out, a university greatly dependent on its president for direction. He had definite ideas about what that direction should be, and during his ten years as Washington and Lee's president he did much to put the school on the path he had chosen. His credentials were respectable. In addition to the Ph.D. degree, he held four honorary doctorates - from Furman, the University of South Carolina, Tulane University, and Washington College in Maryland.¹⁸ All, significantly, were from colleges in Southern or border states.

Denny's central concern and major emphasis as president lay in finances and enrollment, and those were the areas in which his major accomplishments were made.¹⁹ He believed that Washington and Lee should seek to produce "The Christian Gentleman;"²⁰ and in his inaugural address, he condemned the deification of intellectual culture, permeating his speech with religious overtones while asserting that the college must remain Christian.²¹

Almost as soon as he took office, Denny tackled the problem of finances. In the first eight years of his term he was responsible for an increase of \$250,000 in the school's valid assets; the liquidation of a \$21,700 floating debt; and the construction of a \$30,000 dormitory, a \$36,611 science building, a \$55,000 library (aided by

Carnegie funds), and a \$20,000 heating plant.²² In addition, Denny, with Welch, managed to raise the remaining \$26,000 of the Wilson fund by late 1902.²³

The achievements of Dr. Denny in financial matters were paralleled in his other major field of interest, that of enrollment. At the end of his first year as president, the number of students climbed by forty, to reach a total of 278 - the largest enrollment since 1870.²⁴ In 1904, enrollment was 308; in 1907, it was 418. In the following year, 480 students were in attendance, and by 1911 617 persons were enrolled in the university.²⁵ At the end of his administration, Denny had built enrollment up to 700 students - tripling the number in a decade.²⁶

The Denny decade was not marked by equal strides in faculty personnel, however. When Dr. Denny entered the presidency, twenty-two teachers had served approximately 200 students. In 1905, the same number administered to 335 students.²⁷ The number of qualified teachers (qualified on the basis of being a college graduate) had crept to thirty-one by 1910, while the student body had soared to 597.²⁸ Thus nine more teachers than in 1900 taught nearly three times as many students ten years later. The university, in the latter days of the Denny population explosion, was grossly overcrowded and the faculty thoroughly overworked.²⁹

The only way, in fact, that the school continued to function was through the use of student (undergraduate) teaching assistants.³⁰ Hence in 1905, seven Washington and Lee student undergraduates were teaching courses, and in 1910 the number grew to ten.³¹ This practice evidently continued throughout the thirty year period under discussion, though in later years "student assistants" ordinarily were laboratory and library workers rather than classroom instructors.³² The fact of student teachers aside, Washington and Lee 1900-1911 boasted a faculty possessing more than adequate degree requirements.³³ In 1905 there were twelve doctorates and two masters among the faculty of twenty-two, and this number remained stable throughout Denny's regime.³⁴

The zeal with which Denny applied himself to the enrollment problem had extramural consequences. In 1905, Denny had been appointed to the governing board of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.³⁵ He began almost immediately working to have Washington and Lee admitted to the Carnegie Foundation's list of "approved" colleges and universities, which was both highly prestigious in academic circles and which carried with it a tacit understanding of potential reward.³⁶ The Foundation finally acted on Denny's application, and in 1909 rejected the school on the basis of "administrative

policies and practice."³⁷ Washington and Lee was not finally admitted to the Carnegie Foundation list until 1921.³⁶

At the time that Washington and Lee was rejected, the president of the organization wrote Denny a letter elaborating on the primary reason that Carnegie had refused Washington and Lee. The letter said that the Foundation was dissatisfied with its failure to find evidence of stated entrance requirements of eleven units for 1908-09, and fourteen units for 1909-10. No registration system, to indicate the basis upon which students were admitted, was found to exist. (Comparable institutions ordinarily had such systems). The president of the Carnegie Foundation recommended that "registration and admission be regulated on some exact basis."³⁹

According to the organization's investigation, of 133 students admitted during the 1908-09 year to the college and school of engineering, only 107 had graduated from any type of high school. Furthermore, a considerable number of law students had not graduated from high school. Washington and Lee, the Carnegie investigations discovered, admitted students from high schools unacceptable at the University of Virginia; and although the Washington and Lee catalogue mentioned a list of accredited high schools from which applicants had to come, no such list could be found. Virtually no definite entrance requirements, the

Carnegie Foundation concluded, were enforced. Too many students, the letter said, had been admitted in recent years - far more than could be effectively educated.⁴⁰

The general tenor of university regulations changed little under the Denny administration. Absences continued to be regulated personally by the president, though by 1910 it was possible for a student to miss class with the professor's permission.⁴¹ Daily religious services continued to be held in the Lee Chapel, although the catalogue no longer specified enforced attendance.⁴²

As in Wilson's day, the president continued to function as disciplinarian and adviser to individual students.⁴³ Apparently, he was especially attentive to the needs of the student body. He prided himself on knowing the first names of all students, and spent a great deal of time writing personal letters to parents analyzing their sons' lives at college.⁴⁴

The bureaucracy of the university increased during Denny's term of office. By 1905, ten faculty committees had appeared - where none existed in 1900.⁴⁵ For the most part, these dealt with the awarding of medals, regulation of the library, buildings and grounds maintenance, and religious and physical culture.⁴⁶ Another sign of the increased bureaucracy was the implementation of the decanal

system. Although a "Dean of the College" had been mentioned as early as 1900, it was not until 1906 that this became a functioning office. In 1908, a new deanship, dean of the university, was created.⁴⁷

An area that has thus far been neglected but merits attention at this point is that of the Board of Trustees governing the university. Even though Denny and Wilson before him were almost solely responsible for intramural decisions, they were in turn responsible to the Board. It was the trustees who hired and fired the president, and it was the Board that could invoke or revoke at will any policy it chose. It is, therefore, helpful to see what kind of men composed this body. The same fifteen men sat on the Board from before the turn of the century to the end of Denny's administration. Of these, twelve were Virginians, and only one (a Missourian) was from outside the Old South. Four were Presbyterian ministers, and six, including the attorney-general of Virginia, were attorneys. All but two were members of the Presbyterian Church.⁴⁸

The religious affiliation of the trustees has been brought out for a specific purpose. While denominationalism ceased to be an issue by the end of the decade of Denny's presidency, it was very much an issue in the early years of the century. Washington and Lee, perhaps because of its location in a Presbyterian community, was predominantly

Presbyterian throughout the nineteenth century. No large number of non-Presbyterians had been permitted either on the faculty or the Board even in the days of Robert E. Lee's presidency (1865-1870).⁴⁹ When Wilson (a Baptist) first visited Washington and Lee in 1896, he commented on the school's being predominantly Presbyterian despite its assertions of non-sectarianism. In 1897, there was but one non-Presbyterian faculty member and only two non-Presbyterian trustees.⁵⁰

The question of denominationalism burst into the open after the Wilson regime. In 1901, a battle took place over the picking of a successor to Wilson; it was the Presbyterians against the non-denominationalists.⁵¹ A man at the time being considered for the presidency was rejected by the board because he was not a Presbyterian.⁵² This brought on a wave of protests from Methodist, Baptist, and Episcopalian spokesmen who denounced Washington and Lee's "sectarian policy."⁵³

In 1901, four of the trustees voted to make a clergyman president of the university; though the measure failed to pass, two years later a resolution was put before the Board which would make explicit the Board's policy of keeping a clear Presbyterian majority on it. The resolution, however, was not called to a vote.⁵⁴

Throughout the controversy of Calvinist con-

trol, the official student body newspaper, the Ring-tum Phi, consistently opposed the idea of Presbyterian dominance. A few days before the Board met in September, 1901, to elect a president, the paper warned against election of a Presbyterian minister.⁵⁵ The editorial affirmed the policy of non-sectarianism, and admitted ruefully that there was some basis for the charges of Presbyterian domination in the university. Therefore, the student writer reasoned, it behooved the Board to demonstrate non-sectarianism by electing someone other than a clergyman.⁵⁶ During the heat of the argument, The Central Presbyterian (a publication of the Southern Presbyterian Church) suggested that Washington and Lee become "the" Presbyterian university.⁵⁷ An outcry of protest from the students greeted this suggestion, and the Ring-tum Phi denounced the idea vigorously.⁵⁸

After Denny's election, the argument lost its fire, and with the exception of an occasional outburst, the accusation of denominationalism ceased to be a live issue. It was finally and officially resolved in 1906 at the time that Washington and Lee applied for membership in the Carnegie Foundation. The Foundation insisted that the board of trustees go on record as explicitly non-sectarian, not applying any denominational tests in choosing trustees, faculty, or students. The Board issued such a

statement in June, 1906.⁵⁹ Although the number of Presbyterians affiliated with the university either as personnel or students continued to be high, the issue of sectarianism as such was officially resolved; this did not mean, however, that the university was not explicitly Christian. Every president and every trustee repeatedly asserted that while Washington and Lee was not Presbyterian, it was decidedly Christian and would remain so.⁶⁰

Denny left in 1911 to assume the presidency of the University of Alabama. After an interim of a year, Dr. Henry Louis Smith came to the Washington and Lee executive office in July, 1912.⁶¹ Smith, president of Davidson College in North Carolina, was a native of North Carolina, the son of a Presbyterian minister, and a doctor of philosophy in physics from the University of Virginia.⁶²

Like his predecessor, Smith had a clear-cut idea about his goals at Washington and Lee. He did not share Denny's concern for large enrollment and finances, but was, rather, interested in education as preparation for life. Smith was a practical man, and as he unfolded his plans for Washington and Lee he chose to stress applied learning and the sciences. The core of his educational program consisted of administrative emphasis on engineering, commerce, and journalism.⁶³ He openly frowned on learning for learning's sake, declaring that "the bane of our

present educational system is the professional pedagogue's belief that the chief end of man is study, and therefore the chief end of study is to prepare for future study."⁶⁴

Smith's concern for improving the quality of Washington and Lee students was made apparent in his inaugural address when he described the undergraduate's life as "a unique combination of social loafing, childish frivolity, degrading dissipation, and strenuous athletics; when homeopathic doses of intellectual discipline (were) administered by discouraged physicians to unwilling patients when more important activities allow."⁶⁵

Indeed, he sought to improve the student body; but he wanted to improve it along particular lines. His opening address pledged a course of training which would "develop the well-rounded citizen instead of the goody-goody, the mollycoddle, the textbook grind, or the childish loafer."⁶⁶ In campaigning for a better student body, he wrote letters to top high schools and preparatory schools throughout the South, asking for the names of their best students so that he might personally urge each boy to attend Washington and Lee. Furthermore, he asked that the principals and headmasters of these schools, in rating their boys, "rank moral character, social influence and leadership, and physical skill and prowess as of equal value with

with scholarship."⁶⁷

Although Smith "in a general way. . . did not advocate learning for learning's sake, and . . . did nothing to promote the humanities in the curriculum,"⁶⁸ he devoted himself conscientiously to improving the quality and reputation of Washington and Lee. A superb orator, he traveled and lectured widely - even representing the governor of Virginia at a British meeting. Thus he did much to spread the name of the university.⁶⁹ He propagated his educational ideas and programs through promotional literature,⁷⁰ and almost immediately upon assuming office instituted an "automatic rule" whereby students falling below a specified level of scholastic attainment automatically severed their connection with the university.⁷¹ This was the first time that minimum academic standards had been set up.⁷²

One of Smith's first acts of administration was the enforcement of the number of minimum entrance requirements.⁷³ He pledged himself to eliminate the unfit among the students, and to choose carefully those permitted to enroll.⁷⁴ When he assumed office, the grossly overcrowded school had 700 students. For the 1913-14 academic session, Smith's efforts reduced the figure to 450, where he indicated it would be kept until facilities and faculty could accommodate more students.⁷⁵

The personnel of Washington and Lee underwent significant change during the years 1913 to 1930. Perhaps the least change of all occurred on the Board of Trustees, and even there a noticeable alteration took place. When Smith took office in 1912, ten of the fifteen trustees were Virginians, two were West Virginians, and one each hailed from Missouri, Maryland, and Tennessee. Thus all were either Southern or border state residents. The number of Virginians on the Board fell to eight in 1915, and stayed there for the remainder of the period under study. Though Southerners continued to make up the majority of the Board membership, by 1930 the actual picture had changed somewhat. At that time, nine Southerners sat on the Board, with eight from Virginia and one from North Carolina; border state residents were two, a West Virginian and a Missourian. Three trustees could validly be called non-Southern residents - two of them New Yorkers and one from Ohio.⁷⁷ Therefore, whereas in 1913 two-thirds of the Board members were Southerners, only a little over half were Southerners by 1930.

Changes in the faculty 1913-1930 are rather more apparent. Smith began his regime with 46 teachers (19 student assistants among them), thirteen of whom had doctorates and five of whom had

master's degrees.⁷⁸ By the end of the 1920's, the "faculty" had climbed to eighty, with twenty-two student assistants (most of whom were laboratory assistants and library workers rather than teachers). Hence, if the student assistants are subtracted, the number of degree-holding faculty members went from twenty-seven in 1913 to fifty-eight in 1930, more than doubling the number of qualified instructors.⁷⁹ Furthermore, the percentage of graduate degrees among the faculty grew considerably. Again discounting student assistants, eighteen faculty members had graduate degrees in 1913.⁸⁰ In 1930, fifty-two faculty members held doctoral or master's degrees.⁸¹ Stated more simply, this means that in the seventeen-year span of Smith's term, the percentage of faculty men with graduate degrees went from 66% to 93%. Finally, the student-teacher ratio changed from 25:1 in 1913 to 15:1 in 1930.

The bureaucratic structure of government at Washington and Lee likewise underwent considerable alteration during the seventeen-year Smith regime. The first marked evidence of the change appeared in the university catalogue of 1913. Formerly, the president was solely responsible for counseling, discipline, and granting of absences; beginning in 1913, the official university policy changed. "The

discipline of the university is administered by the president, the dean and the faculty; the dean and the president occupy offices to which students have access. All cases of irregularity receive the attention of one or both of these offices."⁸² The increased responsibilities given the dean were apparent in the absence policy, as well; the president no longer dealt with leaves of absence, and after 1913 only the dean could excuse a student from either class or the university.⁸³

When Smith took office ten standing faculty committees existed.⁸⁴ By 1930 the number doubled. A committee existed for everything from public functions to freshmen to vocational guidance to music and drama.⁸⁵ Smith had in 1915 added a registration committee of five professors, thereby yielding a task formerly performed solely by the president and his secretary.⁸⁶

The number of purely bureaucratic personnel increased tremendously. When Smith became president, there were no more than five such employees connected with the university.⁸⁷ By 1924 there were fourteen, among them an official university registrar and an official university treasurer.⁸⁸ The number reached twenty by 1930.⁸⁹ In 1915, the president and two deans comprised the administration (deans were of the university and the school of applied

sciences).⁹⁰ By 1930, the university had grown up

sciences).⁹⁰ By 1930 the administration was made up of nine persons: the president, the dean of the university, the assistant dean of the university, the dean of the commerce school, the dean of the school of applied sciences, the treasurer, registrar, university physician, assistant university physician, and the university librarian.⁹¹

Regulations governing classroom attendance remained fairly stringent throughout Smith's administration. Until the early 1920's, the students absent from class were required to bring written explanations to professors at the first meeting of class following an absence. Instructors were required then, as now, to make daily reports of absences to the dean's office.⁹² By 1925, however, a standardized policy of permitting three absences per course per semester had been instituted.⁹³ In the 1928-29 term, the university's policy regarding attendance was renovated with apparently two objectives in mind: to discipline the academically deficient student and to reward the academically accomplished student. The dean's list system was instituted in that year. Students with grade averages of "B" or better were permitted unlimited absences from class. For freshmen (first-year students), students whose grades were below a "C" average, and students who had missed more than the allotted number of classes in the previous semester, no absences were permitted.

The body of students who were neither on the dean's list nor in one of the above categories received as many absences as there were class meetings per week - ordinarily three.⁹⁴

Smith's "automatic rule" (discussed earlier) began in 1913 as a rather lenient cut-off point. In order to sever automatically his connection with the university, a student had to fail to pass at least half his courses; and even then he was eligible for readmission the following term at the dean's and president's discretion.⁹⁵ Slowly the automatic rule became stricter. By 1920, the student had to make above grade "E" in one course,⁹⁶ and by 1924 he had to pass nominally two courses with grade "D" or better.⁹⁷ Under the general revision taking place in the year 1928-29 (see chapter on courses and degrees), the automatic rule was made still more rigorous. A student was required to pass with grade "D" three courses; if he failed to pass (that is, made a grade of "F") in as many as two courses he severed his connection with the university.⁹⁸ No relationship seemed to exist between the rigor of the automatic rule and the number of students who came under its jurisdiction. From its establishment in 1913 through 1930, approximately five to six percent of the students annually were affected by it.⁹⁹

Mention was made earlier of President Smith's devotion to technical and vocational education. Detailed consideration to the rise of the commerce school and to the development of the school of applied sciences will be given in the chapter on courses and degrees. A few remarks are pertinent now, however, to indicate in a general way how this practical emphasis was manifested in the structure of the university. When Smith became president, the commerce school (begun in 1905) was hardly more than a department of the university. No degree was offered, though a certificate was given upon the completion of a minimum of two year's study. Within the school of commerce, three subjects were taught: four semesters in economics, ten semesters in commerce, and six semesters in political science.¹⁰⁰ Four hundred dollars were spent annually on volumes for the commerce school.¹⁰¹ By 1930 the course offerings had changed radically: nine semesters were offered in economics, eight semesters in commerce, and fifteen semesters in political science. In addition, nine semesters in business administration and nine in accounting and statistics had been added. Thus the curriculum had grown 150% under Smith's leadership.¹⁰² Furthermore, the annual allocation of funds for the development of the school of commerce library had exactly doubled.¹⁰³

A similar situation prevailed in the school of applied sciences. As a matter of fact, no such division of the university existed before Smith. It was he who, in the first year of his administration, revamped the old engineering school, called his new creation the school of applied sciences, and began offering the bachelor of science degree in general science, civil engineering, and chemistry.¹⁰⁴ In 1915 the science school offered fifteen courses: eight semesters of chemistry, four of civil engineering, and one each in electricity, engineering physics, and engineering astronomy.¹⁰⁵ The university catalogue of 1930 specified fifty-nine semesters in applied sciences: nineteen in civil engineering, eighteen in electrical engineering, and twenty-two in chemistry.¹⁰⁶ Thus the science curriculum expanded by nearly 300% in seventeen years.

The observations which emerge from the preceding discussion are as follows:

1. Increasing bureaucratic complexity. That this did in fact occur is aptly demonstrated by the emergence and growth of faculty committees, by the rise of deanships, and by the concurrent increase in administrative personnel such as secretaries, librarians, and laboratory assistants. Three interrelated results of this increased bureaucratic complexity are observable. First, a decentralization

of authority accompanied the development of the bureaucratic structure of the university. In the early years of the century, the president was counselor, admissions officer, recruiter, dean, and public relations man. As the years passed, more and more of his duties and powers were assumed by other bodies: the deans, faculty committees, and even university regulations (as in the case of absences from classroom attendance). A corollary of the trend toward decentralized authority is the concomitant formalization of the university structure. Before 1913 admissions, absences, and student disciplinary problems were handled informally by the university president. In the last seventeen years of the thirty-year period, however, rules and regulations explicitly stated in the catalogues governed these matters. Channels were established through which specific matters passed; the faculty committee on vocational guidance helped the student find a job, the library committee bought books, and the dean handled disciplinary problems. Together with the decentralization of power, the increasingly formalized university structure led to a third phenomenon, that of standardization. Particularly in such matters as absences and admissions did this standardization show itself; to a greater and greater degree, class attendance and entrance to the university were depersonalized and based on explicit university

regulations spelled out in the catalogue.

2. Prevailing paternalism. The practice of frequent personal letters to students' parents illustrates this paternalism. It is further illustrated by the university attitude toward attendance; until the middle of the Smith administration, students were required to present written notes explaining absences. Even after that time, a close watch was kept to assure the students' regular presence in the classroom. At no time during the period under discussion was absence left up to the student; the school continued to claim responsibility for attendance. That the university considered itself the protector of the students' morals is indicated by the following quotation which appeared in the catalogues up to and including 1930:

It is. . . the duty of the authorities to eliminate those who are injuring the scholarship or moral standing of the institution. Such personal habits as drinking, gambling, licentiousness, etc., are contagious, and harmful to the student body.

3. Improved faculty. It is manifestly impossible to adjudge the quality of a teaching faculty of a half century past. It is, however, possible to assess certain empirical data and from those data predict with a high degree of probability the likelihood that a relatively better faculty existed. And such is the case at hand. The vastly improved faculty-student ratio, the

decline of the number of undergraduate instructors, and increased percentages of graduate-degree holders indicate that the faculty of 1930 was potentially more qualified and better able to teach than the faculty of ten, twenty, or thirty years earlier. It is not suggested that the faculty was, in fact, "better;" rather, it is suggested that the structure of the 1930 university was more likely to house a faculty of greater effectiveness.

4. Decline of denominationalism. Presbyterianism continued to claim an exceptionally large number of affiliates in the Washington and Lee community. It is, however, a safe observation to make that after 1906 there was no question as to the university's official position. The statement issued at the time of the Carnegie Foundation application affirmed a non-sectarian policy, which was never seriously challenged again. More will be said in the chapter on the student body in regard to denominationalism; it is sufficient at this point to say that the possibility of Presbyterian control declined steadily during the first three decades of the present century. While non-sectarianism was affirmed, the Christian faith was equally supported. Denny had declared the purpose of the university to be training of the "Christian gentleman," and after him, Smith continued to re-assert the peculiarly Christian nature of the university. There was,

then, a definite Christian orientation at Washington and Lee.

5. Regionalism on the Board. Throughout the thirty years of this study, the Board of Trustees remained predominantly Southern, and even more predominantly Virginian, in its makeup. In the last years a slight trend of extra-regionalism occurred. Of the six men who were appointed as university trustees after 1912, three were from the North (two from New York and one from Ohio) and one was from the border state of West Virginia. Thus while the fact of regionalism existed, a slight trend away from regionalism is apparent.

6. Emergence of academic rewards and penalties. For the most part, academic rewards were slight in the structure of the university. The institution of dean's list privileges did, however, constitute a beginning tendency to reward scholarly accomplishment in the 1920's. On the other hand, the establishment of the automatic rule and its increasing austerity represent an effort to penalize academic inefficiency or deficiency. Furthermore, the limitation of absences on the basis of unsatisfactory grades constituted another incentive to the students to meet at least a minimum standard of academic responsibility.

7. The Gentleman Ethos. Both Denny and Smith stressed the development of the well-rounded

person, accomplished in all aspects of life: scholarship, morality, athletics, and social amenities. Both presidents chided the bookworm who in intellectual greed forsook the other equally important elements of what they would have termed a fully developed personality. An integral part of the tendency is throughout the period a stress on gentlemanliness; the gentleman was well-rounded, and was equally adept at Homer, football, or a dance figure. Denny's comment on the purpose of Washington and Lee, as well as Smith's qualifications for the "best" candidates for admission, substantiate the existence of an "ethos of gentlemanliness."

8. Professionalism and vocationalism. The rise of the school of commerce and the expansion of the school of applied sciences indicate a definite trend toward "preparatory education," or an emphasis on practical education - education directed toward the goal of qualifying students for careers. This was a stated aim of Smith, and one which was manifestly implemented in the curricular developments of his era. A broader trend and an element which prevailed throughout the thirty years is suggested here. Practicality of purpose revealed itself as a major emphasis during the period; one way was in the stress of Smith on vocational training; a second and more obvious way was in the concern of Denny with finances and enrollment, to the almost total

disregard of scholarship.

It will be recalled that the objective of this study is to illuminate three states of mind designated as Southernism, community, and intellectuality. The purpose, therefore, of this summary statement of "trends" has been to show what elements of the university "Personnel and Government" bear directly on the three mental phenomena under discussion.

In the case of Southernism, two of the preceding emphases are immediately relevant. The fact of regionalism on the Board indicates that those men who were the ultimate governors of university policy were overwhelmingly Southern, and therefore more likely to be in support of the cult of Southernism. Likewise, official expression and affirmation of the "Gentleman Ethos" is indicative of Southernism, in that this stress on gentlemanliness was an integral part of Southernism as it has been defined.

The "Gentleman Ethos" bears as well on the question of community. In this ethos lay a set of norms and values potentially functioning as the expression of a sense of community. It provided an "identity" to which the members of the group could look for the articulation of their own sense of belongingness. Whether this was in fact the case will be discussed later. Another factor which

bears on community is that of declining denominationalism. Special attention will be paid this matter in the chapter on the student body; it is sufficient here to point out that the prevalence of Protestant Christianity provided a source of rapport, and thus community.

All of the "trends," it could be argued, affect intellectuality. The most notable ones, however, follow. Increasing bureaucratic complexity enabled standard procedures to be implemented and limited the interplay of personalities in the functioning of the university. Prevailing paternalism suggests limited freedom or lack of responsibility on the part of students, or both - and freedom and responsibility are intimately connected with intellectuality. The improved faculty meant simply that the students were provided with a better qualified body of instructors and hence that the life chances of intellectuality were greater. Academic rewards and penalties are the first concrete "facts" of an intellectual emphasis in the university. Professionalism and vocationalism, while they do not deny intellectuality, are trends which suggest that pure pursuit of "ideas for ideas' sake" was not an emphasis in the university. The "Gentleman Ethos," in that it stressed versatility of interests over sheer intellectual commitment, is related to the question

of intellectuality and will be explored later in that context.

A full discussion of the trends noted herein will be reserved for the concluding chapter. It is only necessary at this point to remind the reader of the three key sociological terms and to suggest briefly how the trends are related to them; this has hopefully been accomplished by the foregoing paragraphs.

CHAPTER THREE

ADMISSIONS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

This chapter deals, as did the preceding one, with the formal structure of the university. Two aspects of this structure will be discussed in the following pages: standards of admission and university scholarships.

Admission Requirements

Entrance prerequisites in 1900 were not very specific. A candidate for admissions had to be sixteen years of age - but even that requirement could be waived by special faculty or presidential action. A thorough background in eighteenth and nineteenth century literature, United States history and geography, and algebra and geometry were required for admission. The catalogue also stipulated that the entering student must have a reading knowledge of Latin and Greek.

Requirements could be fulfilled in either of two ways: by a certificate from an "approved" school (a list of which schools ostensibly was kept by the university), or by examination in the particular course involved. In actuality, all that was necessary was that the president present the faculty with a statement indicating that the entrance re-

with a statement indicating that the entrance requirements had been fulfilled.¹

Little change occurred in the entrance regulations by 1905, although one could now enter without Latin or Greek. (Admission to the law school was especially vague, the only requirement being "a good English background" with a year in the college recommended.) English and algebraic mathematics continued to be required by the university, and a third subject for entrance credit could be chosen from Latin, Greek, history, science, French or German. Two units in each - mathematics, English, and the elective - were nominally required.²

In Denny's sixth year as president, he increased the number of required units for entrance from six to eleven, and in 1908 raised the number to fourteen units - the standard set by the Carnegie Foundation.³ Six of the fourteen units were specified and eight were elective within certain boundaries. The specified ones were as follows: three in English, two in mathematics, and one in United States history. The elective entry units could be in any courses deemed "acceptable" by the president.⁴

Certain of the requirements mentioned in the early catalogues remained the same throughout the period. These included the age prerequisite of sixteen years and admission by either special examination or a diploma from an approved school.⁵

Furthermore, during all of the years under discussion, advanced standing was available.⁶ For most of the time period such advanced standing could be gained by either special examination or "at the discretion of a professor."⁷ In 1923, the discretionary clause was omitted from the university catalogue.⁸

The requirements as stated in official university publications actually changed little under the two presidents. There was, nevertheless, apparently a radical change in application and enforcement of entrance regulations.⁹ Reference has already been made in Chapter Two to the findings of the Carnegie Foundation and its observation that entrance standards were not observed. It was supposedly common for Dr. Denny, in his zeal for larger enrollment, to admit students whose qualifications did not begin to approach the officially required ones.

The catalogue of the university continued to specify fourteen units for entrance until 1924, at which time the number was raised to fifteen. Those required included three units in English, two and one half in mathematics, one in history, and two in a foreign language. The remaining six and one half could be freely elected from science, language, history, or mathematics.¹⁰ These same requirements remained through 1930.¹¹

Fees and Scholarships

A Washington and Lee student entering school in 1900 paid fifty dollars in tuition and fees.¹² In 1930, he paid five times as much, or \$250.¹³ The enormous increase in tuition and fees was accompanied by an equal increase in the number and kinds of scholarships offered.

In 1900, the scholarships that the university offered were of four types: a. exemptions of fees to ministerial students and the sons of ministers; b. scholarships endowed by benefactors, of which there were eight; c. university departmental scholarships of thirty dollars each, of which there were nine; and d. the Howard Houston graduate fellowships which paid for two years of graduate study at the university.¹⁴

By 1915, at which time the tuition had doubled since 1900, the number of scholarships offered had approximately tripled. Three new classifications of awards had been created. In addition to ministerial exemptions, endowed scholarships, and departmental scholarships, the university in 1915 had six law scholarships and a student loan fund of \$12,000. So-called "school scholarships," financing a year's study to any graduate of a high school or preparatory school, had been instituted. While the Howard Houston fellowship remained the same, three new departmental scholarships and a new endowed scholarship had been

added.¹⁵

In the next decade tuition doubled¹⁶ and the amount of scholarship aid doubled as well. The 1925 catalogue listed eight kinds of financial assistance available. Ministerial exemptions, the Houston graduate fellowship, the school scholarships, and the university student aid fund remained as they had been in 1915. Four additional endowed scholarships were listed, five new departmental ones had been added, and four endowed loan funds had been created. Furthermore, each alumni chapter was granted a scholarship of full tuition for a student nominated by the chapter.¹⁷

The five years that followed brought a tuition increase of one-fourth,¹⁸ the establishment of another endowed loan fund, four more endowed scholarships, and two added departmental scholarships.¹⁹ Thus the growth during this period was considerably greater in the area of awards than in that of tuition and fees.

The students holding particular endowed or departmental scholarships were not listed in the catalogue before 1913.²⁰ In the remaining seventeen years, however, the scholarship holders were listed; and an examination of them on the basis of residence proves revealing. In 1913, of nine endowed scholarships that existed, all went to Southern students (seven contained stipulations requiring Southern

residence).²¹ The same was true of the eleven departmental scholarships.²²

Two years later, seven of nine endowed scholarships were held by Southerners, as were ten of twelve departmental scholarships. The distribution continued to be largely Southern, as the following chart indicates:

	Number of Endowed	Number Southern	Number of Departmental	Number Southern
1920	9	8	12	11
1924	10	6	17	14
1930	13	9	18	12

It appears from this that although a slight decrease in the percentage of Southern scholarship holders existed in 1930, no trend was noticeable; and, furthermore, by far the greatest number of scholarship holders continued to be Southern students.

Five observations emerge from the preceding discussion:

1. Rising entrance standards. Before the days of Dr. Smith's presidency, a big gap evidently existed between official and unofficial policies of admission. With Smith's ascendancy, the catalogue requirements were strictly enforced and their rigor gradually increased. The fact of rising entrance standards can be stated another way, as the

standardization and formalization of university policy.

2. Broadening of requirements. In the early years, course requirements for admission - though few - were carefully spelled out; as time passed, the number of electives increased.

3. Provision for exceptional students. Throughout the thirty-year period, students were eligible for exemption on the basis of special examinations. Although this was used (by Dr. Denny) as a means of skirting entrance requirements, it existed - theoretically, at least - as a structural provision for the exceptionally well-prepared student.

4. Increasing financial aid. Concurrent with the rising tuition of the university was a rise in the amount of financial aid available; during the 1920's, the relative increase in aid outstripped the increase in fees.

5. Regionalism in awards. The two most numerous kinds of scholarships - endowed and departmental - continued to be held for the most part by Southern students. The high percentage of Southerners having endowed scholarships can largely be explained by resident requirements in the endowments. The same is not true of departmental scholarships, however, in which the percentage of Southerners was similarly high. Moreover, the very fact that endowments stipulated Southern residence

is an indication of regionalism.

The fact of regionalism in awards would appear, in an indirect but nevertheless significant way, to affect the question of Southernism. In the first place, that so many awards were held by Southerners indicates either that the student body had in it a large number of Southerners or that Southerners were given scholarship preferences. In either case, the cult of Southernism is given support. In the instance of endowed awards, the very fact that Southern residence was stipulated suggests that a significant proportion of the people who gave the school money were either Southern or were men who expressed an interest in the education of Southern students at Washington and Lee.

The other four "trends" just noted bear on intellectuality. Both rising entrance standards and the broadening of requirements are evidence of a desire on the part of the university to raise the academic qualifications of the students; at the same time, more rigorous entrance standards would tend to make the student body more qualified and thereby improve the probability of intellectuality. The provision for exceptional students, in theory at least, served as a recognition of and reward for intellectual achievement. The proportional increase in financial aid made it more possible for students

to enroll on the basis of intellectual potential rather than on the basis of family wealth. It also showed a growing tendency of the university to enable intellectually capable but financially unable students to attend Washington and Lee.

CHAPTER FOUR

COURSES AND DEGREES

This chapter deals primarily with two purely structural facets of Washington and Lee University 1900-1930. These are the courses offered and the stipulated degree requirements that obtained throughout the period. It is not possible to ascertain the quality of courses taught, nor is it possible to ascertain the stringency with which degree requirements were enforced. It is, therefore, the function of this chapter merely to describe the prevailing circumstances with the hope of establishing visible signs of emphasis and interests which guided the university authorities during the first three decades of the twentieth century.

Four fairly distinct divisions of the university existed. These were the college, the school of engineering (which became the school of applied sciences), the law school, and the school of commerce. Time and space do not allow thorough examination of each, nor is such an examination necessary for the purposes of this paper. The law school has been omitted altogether. The commerce and applied science schools will be touched on briefly, particularly in the section on courses, as will the school of journalism. For the most part, the following

remarks will focus on the college - the main division of the university, insofar as percentage of enrollment is concerned. The reasons for this focus are three: first, it is the division of the university in which most of the students, most of the time, were matriculated; second, the college serves as a better case-study due to the fact that it is general, broad, and largely non-specialized, whereas the commerce, science, and law schools are restricted to highly specialized areas of concentration; and third, since some limitation is necessary in the context of this study, the college (for the two reasons just stated) serves as the best possible division of the university on which to concentrate.

Courses 1900-1930

The curriculum of Washington and Lee in 1900 included, nominally, twelve "departments" or subject-divisions, and fifty course offerings in these twelve departments. An equal number - five - of departments existed in the humanities (languages, history, and philosophy) and the sciences (mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and geology). Three courses were offered in social sciences and the physical education department gave training in health and hygiene. Twenty-seven of the fifty courses were in the realm of the humanities. The

remaining twenty-three were in the sciences (which included a department of civil engineering, offering four courses).

Significantly, Latin and Greek were separate departments and between them made up ten of the fifty courses offered - or one-fifth of the curriculum. French and German were the only two modern languages taught, and together with English were a single department.¹

Slight change in the curriculum occurred by 1905, perhaps the most notable being the establishment of a department of English and the doubling of the course offerings in that area. A year of Spanish had been added in the modern languages, and the social science courses had grown from three to seven - three of which were seminars, according to the catalogue. Fifty-four courses were now offered, and the balance of course offerings in the sciences and the humanities remained about as it had been in 1900.²

Throughout the remainder of the Denny administration, little change occurred in the humanities and the sciences. The birth of the school of commerce in 1905 marked the beginning of expansive curricular development in the area of the social sciences. The department of philosophy had become, in 1910, the department of philosophy and Bible study.³

A change in the balance of the curriculum came in the first years of the Smith administration. By 1915, Washington and Lee offered seventy-three courses in the college, commerce school, and school of applied sciences. Whereas ten years earlier the number of courses in the humanities approximately equalled the number in the sciences and commerce, in 1915 forty of the total seventy-three courses lay outside the humanities.⁴

The curricular changes occurring between 1915 and 1920 were characterized by steady growth and by a continuing trend toward emphasis on the non-humanities. Washington and Lee offered 101 courses in 1920, fifty-eight of which were in the areas of mathematics and science, commerce, and applied sciences.⁵ As of 1913 the old school of engineering had become the school of applied sciences. The most apparent growth took place in this division of the university, which gave degrees in engineering, general science, and chemistry.⁶ In 1915 seven courses had been taught in the school of applied sciences;⁷ in 1920, there were twenty-three courses in engineering and chemistry.⁸ The school of commerce had changed little, adding two courses to its curriculum during the five years after 1915.⁹ Although major changes took place outside the humanities, some innovation was made in the area of languages and history. French and Spanish had been joined together

in a newly created department of Romance languages, and a second year of Spanish had appeared. The number of history courses taught in 1920 had grown to twelve, an addition of five since 1915. Three of the twelve were courses having to do with the Southern United States and the Civil War. Languages continued to receive emphasis in the curriculum; four years each of Latin, Greek, and German were taught. The only other significant alteration of the curriculum was the institution of a pre-medical course of study leading to the bachelor of arts degree.¹⁰

After 1920, the curriculum grew explosively. By 1924 there were 149 courses in the university - a growth of nearly fifty percent in four years. The commerce school grew by nearly 100%, offering thirty-two courses in 1924 (four in economics, five in business administration, seven in commerce, eight in accounting and statistics, eight in the political and social sciences). The school of applied sciences saw a 65% increase in its curriculum, moving from twenty-three to thirty-five courses. Two new subject areas appeared in 1924: psychology (three courses) and education (six courses). The humanities grew, too, adding nine new courses since 1920; but there was no doubt as to the increasing importance given technical and scientific areas in the curriculum. Of the forty-eight

new courses instituted since 1920, thirty-seven lay outside the humanities. Language continued to dominate the liberal arts. Ten courses were given in the Romance languages, eight in Greek and Latin, and four in German. The balance of the humanities versus scientific and vocational education had shifted radically by 1924; two-thirds of the curriculum was now composed of courses outside the humanities.¹¹

The next six years saw scant change in the relative percentages of technical, non-technical, and liberal arts courses in the curriculum. Humanities comprised a little less than one-third of the course offerings. Sheer growth, rather than change in the makeup of the curriculum, was the keynote. In 1930, 231 courses were offered: forty-three in the commerce school, forty-six in the school of applied sciences, thirty-six in the pure sciences and mathematics, seventy-eight in the humanities, fourteen in education and psychology, and twelve in journalism.¹² The biggest innovation during the last six years of the thirty-year period was in the re-establishment of the school of journalism, originally begun by Robert E. Lee. For some years, President Smith had worked to institute a Lee Memorial School of Journalism, and in 1925 the school was inaugurated.¹³

A 350% increase took place in the number of courses offered between 1900 and 1930. The balance

of the earlier years, in which slightly over half the courses had been in the humanities, had undergone a significant reversal, with just over two-thirds of the 1930 curriculum being outside the humanities.

Course Requirements and Degrees*

Throughout the period 1900 to 1930, the university catalogue specified that four years were ordinarily needed to complete the requirements for a bachelor's degree, other than in law. The catalogues further specified that a minimum of fifteen hours of class work a week must be undertaken, with a maximum of eighteen hours. Despite the other innovations that took place, these two stipulations remained the same.¹⁴

During the early years of the century, the university awarded the following degrees: bachelor of arts, of science, and of law; master of arts and of science; doctor of philosophy; and the civil engineering degree. The M.S. and M.A., the Ph.D., and the C.E. were graduate degrees;¹⁵ the existence of these graduate degrees justified the appellation

* Although other degrees awarded will be mentioned, the body of the discussion on degree requirements will be concentrated on the prerequisites for the bachelor of arts.

of "university" applied to Washington and Lee.

Degree requirements were computed on the basis of "points," a specified number of points designating the number of hours a class met per week per year. Prior to the 1920's, classroom hours were calculated on a yearly rather than a semester basis; that is to say, a student's course load of fifteen hours from September to June would tally up to sixty hours (or points) at the end of four years. In the 1920's the point system was calculated on a semester basis; thus a student's total accumulation of points would appear to be double that of the student in 1900 who took the same number of hours.¹⁶

For the purposes of course distribution, the university used a "group system" whereby all courses were divided into three categories: languages, mathematics, and natural science, and English and social sciences. This system continued to be used throughout the thirty-year period, with some alteration toward the end.¹⁷

In 1900, the requirements for an **A.B.** (bachelor of arts) degree consisted of sixty-six points, forty-two of which were specified. Sixteen points had to be earned in the language group and in the science group, as well as ten in English and the social sciences. The remaining twenty-four points could be chosen at will by the student. A graduating thesis was also required of each senior student, and each

student was required to accumulate at least twelve points in a single subject area, thus acquiring a "certificate."¹⁸

Little change in the requirements for a bachelor's degree occurred until the late 1920's. In 1910, the graduating thesis had been eliminated and slight readjustments were made in the number of points necessary in each group.¹⁹ In 1923, a statement appeared indicating that a certain grade average was to be required for graduation - that a student must pass half his courses directed toward his degree with a grade of "C". This was the first time that the university catalogue noted such a stipulation.²⁰

During the 1928-29 academic year, the curriculum was revised and the first major change since 1898 in requirements for the bachelor of arts degree was made.²¹ In the process of the revision, the group system was altered and a fourth category created. Group I remained foreign languages and literature; group II was restricted to English and philosophy; group III became the social sciences, history, accounting, business administration, and commerce; and group IV was the pure sciences and mathematics. Under the new system, an A.B. candidate had to complete a minimum of twelve hours in group I, eighteen hours in group II, eighteen hours in group III, and twenty hours in group IV. This cut in half the

language requirement, doubled the social and applied sciences requirement, and left the English and pure science requirements approximately the same as they had been.²²

Certificates in concentrated areas of work were replaced by majors; each A.B. candidate had to complete (and pass with a grade of "C") eighteen hours in one subject to attain a "major" field for graduation.²³

Before the 1928-29 revision, the catalogue listed no specified freshman courses. At the time of the revisions, however, the freshman year curriculum was devised, and its courses prescribed for every entering man. This curriculum included English, a foreign language, mathematics, a semester each of two sciences, and physical education.²⁴ (A two-year requirement of physical education had been incorporated into the college in 1913.)²⁵ Throughout the period of this study, entering students could exempt courses by special examination or by evidence of previous completion on the high school level. Earlier (until 1915) a student could be given advanced standing at the discretion of a professor.²⁶ Later, however, written examinations or credentials were necessary.²⁷

Candidates for the graduate degrees of M.A. and M.S. had to fulfill all the requirements for

the bachelor's degree, or present such a degree from another institution "acceptable to Washington and Lee."²⁸ The university further required a master's thesis, twenty-four quality points on the graduate level, and the attainment of five certificates.²⁹ For the doctor of philosophy degree, a student must have been a graduate of Washington and Lee; he must have had done two years of graduate work above the master's or three above the bachelor's degree.³⁰ Throughout the period, the requirements for the master's degree changed little,³¹ while the Ph.D. was discontinued after 1913.³²

The stated aim of the school of applied sciences was career preparation, and throughout the thirty-year span under consideration its requirements were set with that aim in mind.³³ The degree requirements for a bachelor of science degree in chemistry and civil or electrical engineering were severely limiting. The only courses outside of mathematics or science that a candidate for an engineering degree was allowed to take were a year of English, two years of language, and a year of social science or commerce.³⁴ The chemistry student was permitted a year of English, two years of German or French, two electives, and a year of economics.³⁵ The bachelor of science degree was given after the successful completion of 124 hours, of which the above courses were a part.³⁶

The Commerce School awarded the bachelor of science degree upon the completion of 124 hours, thirty-six of which had to be in English, history, and languages. In addition, a graduating thesis was required.³⁷ Just as in the school of applied sciences, the stated aim of the university's commerce division was career preparation:

1. To give thorough preparatory training suitable for the needs of those who expect to become lawyers.
2. To prepare those who expect to enter business careers, especially in such fields as banking, foreign or domestic commerce, journalism, or the public service.³⁸

Most of the trends or emphases discernible in the foregoing pages are obvious ones. Four appear to be of particular relevance in this context.

1. Curricular growth. This is probably the most self-evident of the trends occurring in the early years of the twentieth century at Washington and Lee. It need only be reiterated that the number of courses increased by over 350%; phenomenal growth characterized the curriculum from 1900 to 1930.

2. Increasing professionalism. Four phenomena serve to illustrate the steady tendency toward practical education: first, the continuous expansion of the school of commerce and applied sciences division of the university; second, the emergence of education courses in the 1920's, apparently providing training

for teachers; third, the rebirth of the school of journalism; fourth and finally, the persistent decline in the number of the purely "cultural" or liberal arts courses as compared to the scientific, technical, and professional courses.

3. Breadth versus narrowness. A curious dichotomy existed between the college and the rest of the undergraduate university. While the trend in the school as a whole was toward increasing professionalism and specialization, within the college breadth and the ideal of a "liberal education" persisted. The group system and the wide distribution of requirements suffice to indicate the college's dedication to an extensive education. Its aims stood in direct contrast to those of the commerce and applied science schools. A comparison is revealing:

The college is intended to offer to the student an opportunity to secure such general culture as may tend to develop him into a useful citizen without preparing him for any special profession; to broaden his views and arouse an intelligent interest in all that is best in modern civilization. Intellectual discipline is sought, not merely through a few channels whose value has been established by centuries of testing, but equally through others that have been opened up by modern scholarship, and whose value has been proved equal to that of any agencies employed in the past.³⁹

This quotation appeared in every university

catalogue after 1915; and it suggests a marked departure from those aims of specific career preparation in the Commerce School and School of Applied Sciences.

4. Regionalism. A minor but nevertheless significant point indicates a sentiment of regionalism in the university. This is the fact that through most of the period studied, one-fourth (three out of twelve) of the history courses taught at Washington and Lee had to do with the South and the Civil War.

Of the four trends just noted, three bear directly on intellectuality. Curricular growth and expansion provides for increased academic opportunity and demonstrates a rising concern of the university for improving the state of intellectuality in the school. The tendency toward professionalism has been mentioned in an earlier chapter as a factor limiting devotion to ideas for their own sake and therefore negatively affecting intellectuality. This professionalism seemed, however, to be countered in the college division of the university, where the ideals of sheer intellectuality continued to be named as positive objectives.

Regionalism reflected in the abundance of Southern history courses in the curriculum is obviously an index of emphasis placed on the "South,"

and hence it is an indicator of Southernism as that term has been defined.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE STUDENT BODY

In a span of thirty-one years from 1899 to 1930, the Washington and Lee student body grew from 157 men to 901 men, or an increase of nearly 500%.¹ During the same period of time, the percentage of students dwelling in Southern or border states declined from 94.3% in 1899 to 69.1% in 1930, or a 25% decrease in the relative number of Southern or border state residents.² A similar decrease in the number of students residing in Virginia took place. In 1899, 54.8% of the students were in-state residents. By 1930, the percentage had declined to 21.1 percent. The decrease in percentage of Southerners was not a steady or consistent one, however; as late as 1920, over 90% of the student body were still Southern or border state residents, with only 8.8% of the students listing extra-Southern addresses.³

Thus, while there was a 25% decline in regional residence during the whole thirty-year period, in the first twenty years the decline was barely 3% as compared to over 22% in the last ten years.⁴

For the most part, the decrease in the number of Virginians operated in a pattern opposite from

that of Southern students as a whole. By 1920, the number of students who were in-state residents had decreased by 22.1 percent;⁵ hence the ten years between 1920 and 1930 saw a decrease in Virginians of only 11.6 percent.⁶

The conclusions drawn in the foregoing paragraphs are perhaps confusing. The following chart lucidly demonstrates the facts of geographic distribution among the student body:

<u>Residential Region</u>	<u>Yearly Percentages of Students</u>			
	<u>1905</u>	<u>1913</u>	<u>1920</u>	<u>1930</u>
Southern & Border States	95.2%	93.2%	91.2%	69.1%
Western States	1.5%	1.4%	.9%	2.6%
Northern States	3.0%	4.3%	7.4%	27.7%
Foreign	.3%	1.1%	.3%	.6%
Virginia	52.7%	43.8%	32.7%	21.1%

Data on the religious affiliation of the student body are unfortunately not available prior to 1917. After that year, however, statistics suggest that Washington and Lee's student body was almost wholly Christian, and predominantly Protestant.⁷ Although a decrease in the percentage of Christians and of Protestants did take place, neither ever went below 90 percent. In 1917, 98% of the student body reporting religious affiliation was Christian, and 97% was Protestant.⁸ Thirteen years later, in 1930, 93% of the student body was Christian and 90% was Protestant.⁹

Although a slight decline occurred, the percentage

of Presbyterian students during the thirteen-year period remained at approximately one-third.¹⁰ The President's report of 1917 indicates that the current student body was 36% Presbyterian,¹¹ while in 1930 the percentage had dropped slightly to 30 percent.¹² Throughout the period for which figures are available, the Presbyterian and Methodist denominations together claimed over half the student body as members. In 1917, 62% of the students were either Presbyterian or Methodist, and in 1930 53% were affiliates of one or the other of these two churches.¹³

An examination of student enrollment in the various divisions of the university proves revealing. In 1905, of the total enrollment of 332, 56% of the students were in the college, while 27% were engineering school students and 17% were in the law school. (At this time and until 1920, the school of commerce enrollment was included in the college.)¹⁴ No transitional trend whatsoever occurred in the college enrollment during the period 1900 to 1930.¹⁵ The first year that the commerce school enrollment was listed separately - 1920 - the college claimed 43% of the student body;¹⁶ but by the end of the decade in 1930 the percentage in the college had risen to 57%, more in fact than it had been in the beginning of the century.¹⁷ In 1905, 27% of the student body was enrolled in the school of engineering.¹⁸ This

number steadily decreased until, by 1930, only 7% of the students were studying applied sciences.¹⁹ The commerce school enrollment, in the years that it was given, increased only slightly, from 19% in 1920 to 23% in 1930.²⁰ Thus, despite the administrative emphasis and curricular growth of technical training in the university, there was not a concomitant shift of interest on the part of students.

The official student newspaper at Washington and Lee remained, throughout the period under discussion, a semi-weekly called the Ring-tum Phi.²¹ In every academic year and under thirty different editorships, three-fourths of the articles in the paper dealt with athletics or social events.²² In the early years especially, reports or announcements of lectures or musical programs were rare. Through approximately 1915, however, a great deal of attention was given to debating and oratorical events. In each of the newspapers before that year, an average of two articles per issue were devoted to one or the other of these topics.²³

Two features that continued to appear through the 1920's in the columns of the Ring-tum Phi were notices and news items from other schools and social announcements of people and events in the town of Lexington.²⁴ Although both features were less in

evidence after 1925,²⁵ until that time each edition carried approximately a half-page of social notices and a quarter-page of news items from other campuses.²⁶

The 1925-26 Ring-tum Phi was typical. In that year, of sixty editions of six pages long, an average of twelve to fifteen news stories appeared in each edition. Only sixteen stories were printed announcing or reporting on lectures in the town and university (not including a number of athletic and religious speeches); twenty-six articles appeared about musical or dramatic activity in the university, and ten were printed on debating or oratorical events. The remainder of the news stories were concerned with social or athletic affairs.²⁷

The editorial pages of the Ring-tum Phi from 1900 to 1930 show a consistency similar to that of the news items during those years. Several major themes recurred on the editorial pages, the most relevant of which follow.

In the volume of the newspaper appearing in 1901-02, no fewer than eleven editorials were written concerning the value of traditions.²⁸ On October 5, 1901, congratulatory remarks to the new university president indicated that "to him is committed the duty and privilege of upholding and perpetuating the memories that cluster around the name of Robert E. Lee."²⁹ Three weeks later, one editorial contained

praise for the college literary magazine for returning to a cover "distinctive and hallowed by age," and a few paragraphs further on bemoaned the passing of old Virginia life.³⁰ Several weeks later, the literary magazine came under fire for mentioning political opinions. The basis of the paper's criticism was that since its inception thirty-three years before, the magazine had not expressed political views - and now, against all tradition, it did so.³¹

In eliciting support for the university, another editor a decade later based his argument on the fact that Washington and Lee men had always supported the administration. "Let us stand by the traditions of our college and falter not in our support of the administration in every college activity."³² An editorial of January 28, 1913, mentioned that Washington and Lee was unique for two reasons: its namesakes and its democratic spirit. The explanation for the democratic spirit, the editorial asserted, was the great tradition of the school - which must never be neglected:

May the day never come when our traditions are lost sight of in the death whirl of commercialism. May the day never come when the snob and the formalities of vain and egotistical plutocrats stamp out the spirits of our heroes. If such a day ever comes, let the walls of our halls of learning crumble and fall and be buried in the dust of their ignominious destruction; for their usefulness to the development of mankind is at an end.³³

A year later, the students - and the newspaper-- protested a women's suffrage movement in the town of Lexington, commenting thus:

. . . we harbor a deep personal affection for this, the home of the great guiding spirits of the Lost Cause, and dislike, above all things, to see it made the center of an agitation so out of harmony with the spirit of the place, and so fraught with danger - unintended though it is - to that chivalric regard for women which has been proverbial of the men of the South and of Virginia.³⁴

In 1918, a controversy was sparked on the campus by the emergence of a freshman secret society. The cause of the concern was that no such society had previously existed in the university.³⁵ The current Ring-tum Phi soundly denounced the freshmen:

The scheme of social honors here was settled upon long before these members of the class of 1921 had dreamed of Washington and Lee. Do these freshmen realize the step they are taking, or are they anarchists by disposition, wanting to overturn and reverse the system of government in vogue since Adam first caned Abel?³⁶

The freshman society was subsequently disbanded, after a committee of sophomores "impressed upon the freshmen the value of the standing social system."³⁷

An editorial of the early 1920's reviewed the wide range of courses available in the university, and praised the fact that men of differing tastes could study at Washington and Lee; however,

the editorial pointed out, the students' primary responsibility was adherence to the school's traditional values:

Whatever his line may be, the student should always bear in mind the aims and ideals of the founders of this historic institution, and his ever-present duty to live up to them.³⁸

In 1925-26, seven editorials appeared at various times in the year which remarked on the value of the "speaking tradition" - long-standing custom of greeting on the campus. One of these editorials indicated that "an evil has sprung up" in that the "habit begun in 1870 of greeting everyone with a 'Hi, Gentlemen,' has been perverted by some into a 'Hi, Gents.'" This was not the tradition, the editorial insisted, and reminded the student body that the longer greeting was the traditional one.³⁹

A second theme which continued to recur during the thirty-year span from 1900 to 1930 had to do with the exemplary Washington and Lee student. Again and again, editors wrote on the values most highly prized in the student body. In general, the characteristics which the editors emphasized involved well-roundedness and honor, as personified in General Lee. Southern good citizenship was stressed, as the following editorial comment indicates:

We think that the peculiar function of Washington and Lee is to make them (the students) men who are worthy to be examples of right living in the South.⁴⁰

The "Washington and Lee Man" was the subject of innumerable editorials, and each of them usually emphasized the qualities of versatility, loyalty, congeniality, and honor. The one-sided scholar was condemned as lacking in the characteristics which the university held in highest regard.

The peculiar mark of Washington and Lee is spirit - a spirit of wholeness, and dedication to the University. Loyalty is the keynote of the Washington and Lee spirit: the W&L man must do his part in upholding the traditions of Washington and Lee - the traditions set forth by the lives of the men whose names she bears and has exemplified over a century of progress.

If the student is a mere grind he will become a storage room for booklore and bear no more resemblance to a Washington and Lee man than if he had taken a correspondence course.⁴¹

The ideal of honor was concretely expressed in the system of unproctored examinations and automatic permanent expulsion for a student who lied, cheated, or stole. It was more than simply a regulation, however, for (in the minds of the students, at least) the Washington and Lee Honor System was the embodiment of the best of the university's inheritance from the past. Editorials, such as the one from which the following quotation

is taken, occurred regularly between 1900 and 1930.

To speak of the Honor System at Washington and Lee is to mention something which is a veritable religion to her sons. Long traditions of Southern chivalry, pride and honor have steadily raised the place of this principle on our campus until today it is undoubtedly the most vital feature of the spirit of Washington and Lee.

We will not be considered Pharisaic when we thank God that Washington and Lee men have that spirit of honor so engraved in the very recesses of their souls that there can be no room on the campus for a man who does not do his duty to his conscience and to his school, breaking this ideal of honor either in letter or in spirit.⁴²

Many of those qualities attributed to the ideal student were connected in some way with the South. References to Southern chivalry, history, and the like have already occurred in the foregoing quotations. Honor, too, was identified with the South:

For be it to the glory of Washington and Lee that her prized traditions are kept ever bright and quickened with the fire of eternal youth.

The man from a northern university cannot understand how an examination can be held without a professor in the room . . . but to the Washington and Lee man, it seems as natural as eating.⁴³

Southern hospitality and friendliness were as much a part of the Washington and Lee Ideal as was honor. Editorials throughout the period expressed this ideal of friendliness, which had its

practical embodiment in the "speaking tradition" referred to earlier. An editor of the mid-twenties aptly expressed the prevailing campus sentiment:

Washington and Lee is known throughout the South for its ever-ready spirit of genuine hospitality. It is with a feeling of pride that each member of the student body can point to this institution as representative of the true Southern friendliness which is so characteristic of our campus.⁴⁴

Two editorials - written twenty-five years apart - exemplified the campus preoccupation with regionalism. The first of the following excerpts is taken from an editorial written early in the Denny administration; the second is the viewpoint of an editor of the late 1920's:

We recognize that the mission of Washington and Lee is to educate the young men of the Southland, but also to expose them to other worlds without making them unfilial to their mother section.⁴⁵

*

*

Again they come. . . to the little university nestled here among the hills, from which radiate the noble spirit of Washington and the Southern leadership and culture of our warrior, scholar, and educator, Robert E. Lee. Therefore, we welcome you to this shrine of the South. . .⁴⁶

The presence of intramural controversy is conspicuously missing from the pages of the Ring-tum Phi before the first World War. As a matter of fact, a careful examination of the volumes during those years brings forth only one example of a clash of ideas on the campus; the condemnation,

already mentioned, of the magazine editor for political expression.⁴⁷ Beginning in 1918, however, diversity of opinion among the students began to reveal itself. That year saw three major student controversies reported in the Ring-tum Phi. One of these was the starting of a freshman secret society, discussed earlier in the current chapter.⁴⁸ A debate ensued for several weeks concerning the merits of the system of fraternity membership selection; the paper supported change of the system, and the student body appeared to be half for and half against an innovation.⁴⁹ The other major conflict which occurred in 1918-19 also had to do with social fraternities. This time it took the form of protest against the practice of "hazing" new members. Although the paper supported the fraternities, a large number of students wrote letters to the newspaper condemning the treatment of freshmen.⁵⁰ The following school year the argument was continued, and a letter covering half the editorial page protested "wholesale beating" of the freshman class.⁵¹

In 1920, an editorial appeared praising the tradition of speaking and cautioning against its abuse on the campus.⁵² This was the first of an increasing number of commentaries in the 1920's on apparent neglect of the university traditions.⁵³

On November 7, 1925, the paper printed its fifth editorial of the fall on the weakening of the speaking custom.⁵⁴ An editorial of October, 1928, explicitly condemned neglect of the speaking tradition by upperclassmen, and in the same issue printed two letters lamenting the demise of the custom of greeting.⁵⁵

Eight "trends" emerge from the foregoing pages which apparently characterized the student body during the years 1900 to 1930.

1. Growth in numbers and geographical diversity. That the student body increased 500%, and that the percentage of Southerners decreased 25% is evidence of this growth.

2. Dominance of Protestant Christianity. It is safe to assume that the first sixteen years, for which there are no figures, were not radically different from the last thirteen. Although a slight decrease did occur, the student body remained over 90% Christian and Protestant, and over 50% Presbyterian and Methodist.

3. Liberal arts interest. The largest percentage of students continued to matriculate in the college; the official university emphasis on technical and vocational training caused no shift to the schools of applied science and commerce.

(The remaining "trends" are based on evidence garnered from the student publications, most notably the newspaper. Such evidence, it could be argued, is not sufficient to derive trends from it. Several facts must therefore be cited to justify the use of newspaper articles as data. In the first place, the excerpts which appear here are typical ones rather than isolated examples; ^{two} ~~three~~ or three times as many quotations could have been offered, had space permitted. Furthermore, the sentiments expressed in these quotations invariably received support rather than disagreement in student letters. The editorial comments demonstrate recurring themes, expressed year after year by thirty different editors. These editors were elected by popular vote of the student body, and would, therefore, be unlikely to hold attitudes contrary to student consensus; wherever any evidence of student disagreement occurred, it has been noted.)

4. Athletic-Social orientation. The dearth of news stories in other areas and the almost total commitment to athletics and social events in the college newspaper would indicate that these were the dominant interests of the student body.

5. Traditionalism. A consciousness of the past and the historic roots of the university pre-occupied students throughout the era. Attitudes

toward specific issues and institutions were often shaped by their historical context.

6. Regionalism. Despite the gradual rise of geographic diversity in the student body, an identification with the South and its culture continued to prevail. This identification took concrete form in the regard for the Honor System and the speaking tradition, which were considered manifestations of Southern cultural norms.

7. Ethos of Gentlemanliness. Washington and Lee's student body held a rather well-articulated viewpoint of what the ideal student should be - he was a gentleman, and his attributes were threefold: a high degree of personal honor, hospitality and friendliness, and versatility of interests and accomplishments. Once again, the highly prized traditions of the Honor System and the speaking custom were practical and structural embodiments of the ethos of the gentleman.

8. ^{FROM} Consensus to controversy. In the early years, almost no diversity of opinion existed concerning the aims and institutions of the university. After World War I, however, increasing evidence of conflict appeared; traditions began to be neglected, and the strong campus consensus which had existed was weakening.

Nearly all of the foregoing "trends" or "emphases" are intimately connected with both Southernism and community. In the case of numerical growth and geographic diversity, the decline in the proportion of Southern students would indicate a negative influence on the cult of Southernism. Similarly, as the student body became more diverse, the sense of community as the expression of Southernism would be impaired. The sheer growth in numbers would also threaten community; the smaller a group, the more likely it is that a sense of belongingness and mutual identity will exist.

The prevailing evidence of traditionalism, of an athletic-social orientation, and of the "Gentleman Ethos" all are indicators of the cult of Southernism, on the one hand, and of community on the other. Each of these phenomena ^{is} ~~are~~ attributes of Southernism, as defined in Chapter One. Furthermore, the degree to which they were accepted as agreed-upon truths indicates that they were the essence of whatever spirit of community existed.

The factor of regionalism bears directly on Southernism and indirectly on community. So long as the university student body was almost wholly Southern, a vital impetus was given to the cult of Southernism. Moreover, regionalism served

as a basis for rapport and thus community. With its decline, then, both community and Southernism were likely to be weakened.

Two trends bear especially on community. The dominance, throughout the era, of Protestant Christianity among the students stands as another source of community. The increasing evidence, after the first World War, of conflict points to a weakening of the old sense of community. Consensus is vital to the maintenance of community; when consensus decreases, community - to the degree that it depends on those factors on which consensus is lost - is threatened.

The students' liberal arts interest, especially as it withstood the stress on professionalism, is a factor amenable to intellectuality as it has been defined; for it promotes the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge, a crucial consideration in the matter of intellectuality.

CHAPTER SIX

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

In this chapter on the extracurricular activities of the university, the main concern will be description of the existential situation: the nature and kind of organizations, the relative strength of the various types of organizations, and any general shifts in interest that the extracurricular life might reveal.

The most noticeable feature of extracurricular activity at Washington and Lee is that there were so very many clubs and organizations. Two factors, not immediately relevant in this study, were in large part responsible for the magnitude of extracurricular organization. Washington and Lee is in the town of Lexington, Virginia. Even today, the student body criticizes the smallness of the town and its isolation. Before the prevalence of the automobile, however, Lexington's smallness was infinitely more apparent. Students could not leave the town on weekends, and thus had to improvise for entertainment; hence they turned to clubs and university-connected functions for diversion. Smallness and isolation of the town did, then, create a need for extracurricular activities that might have been answered otherwise in a larger or more accessible city.

Throughout the early part of the century,

athletics were especially popular, the school having intercollegiate baseball, football, rowing, basketball, track, and gymnastic teams. During the whole thirty-year period, these sports activities were highly developed and thoroughly supported by the students. Often, as many as half to three-fourths of the student body would travel fifty to sixty miles for an athletic contest. Intramural sports were popular, too, and almost every conceivable kind of athletics was played intramurally.¹

Dancing remained one of the major extracurricular pastimes of the university. Almost every campus organization had its dances and balls, in addition to the three or four school-wide figures held annually.² A Methodist minister, cautioning youths of his denomination against attending Washington and Lee, said in 1903 that "The Final Ball is quite as much an event as the delivering of diplomas, and the Presidency of the Final Ball is familiarly spoken of as one of the highest honors of the University."³ The school became known throughout the South for its Fancy Dress Ball, an annual affair which began in 1907.⁴

Before discussing the proportion of student organizations in various interest-areas, it is helpful to cite at length the clubs which existed. The year 1920 was a typical one; the yearbook of that school

session listed thirty-seven student associations. Not included, of course, are the athletic teams, customary dances, and informal organizations which existed:

Social Fraternities (18)

Phi Kappa Psi	Beta Theta Pi
Kappa Alpha	Alpha Tau Omega
Sigma Chi	Sigma Alpha Epsilon
Phi Gamma Delta	Kappa Sigma
Sigma Nu	Phi Delta Theta
Pi Kappa Alpha	Phi Kappa Sigma
Delta Tau Delta	Sigma Phi Epsilon
Alpha Chi Rho	Zeta Beta Tau
Pi Kappa Phi	Sigma Delta Kappa

Social Clubs (6)

Square and Compass (Masons)
 "13" Club
 Pi Alpha Nu
 Sigma Society
 White Friars
 Cotillion Club

Honorary Societies (4)

Phi Beta Kappa
 Delta Sigma Rho (debate)
 Sigma Upsilon (literary)
 Omicron Delta Kappa (leadership)

Literary, Scholastic, Musical, Dramatic

Glee Club
 Orchestra
 Troubadours (dramatic and musical)
 Mandolin Club
 Literary Society

Publications

Ring-tum Phi (newspaper)
Calyx (yearbook)

Religious

YMCA

Governmental

Executive Committee

The social fraternity dominated student life in extracurricular affairs. In 1900, thirteen Greek letter social fraternities had chapters at the university, and claimed among them 60% of the student body as members.⁵ By 1930, twenty such organizations graced the campus with 68½% of the student body as members.⁶

Literary, academic, and musical organizations were also dominant in the extracurricular structure. The debating societies and the musical-dramatic clubs comprised the greatest number of these organizations. In 1900, 24% of the student body was active in these areas;⁷ in 1930, 32% of the students held memberships in literary, academic, debating or dramatic-musical organizations.⁸

There is no doubt, however, of the dominance of purely social organizations in the college. At the beginning of the century, sixteen of a total of twenty-two organizations were social.⁹ Ten years later, thirty-six out of fifty were social.¹⁰ 1920 saw all but thirteen of the campus's thirty-seven organizations as social clubs.¹¹ In 1930, the school had fifty-one extracurricular organizations - twenty-nine of which were social.¹² Thus throughout the

thirty-year span, over 50% of the school organizations were social in nature. Some decline in percentage did take place, however; whereas 72% of the extra-curricular associations were social ones in 1900, 57% were social clubs in 1930.

One of the most significant innovations occurring in the 1920's was the increase in subject-area clubs. Earlier, the literary-academic classification had been made up of debating and musical groups for the most part.¹³ By 1920, no more than four clubs existed whose memberships were based on interest in a particular academic discipline.¹⁴ The picture changed radically in the ensuing five years. Seven such voluntary associations claimed a total membership of 114 men in 1925.¹⁵

An organization which played an extremely active role in extracurricular life was the Young Men's Christian Association - the YMCA. Through the first two decades of the century, the club employed a general secretary who held a college degree. Weekly religious meetings were held, Bible study classes were conducted, and a student handbook was published annually.¹⁶ Membership was comprised of students belonging to evangelical Christian denominations.¹⁷ As late as 1915, the university catalogue officially commended the YMCA, urging students to join it.¹⁸ In 1914, the Y brought religious

leader John R. Mott to the campus in April for two days of religious services. In addition to giving Mott's visit the greatest possible coverage in four editions, the Ring-tum Phi called it "one of the two greatest events of the academic year."¹⁹ After 1920, the relative popularity and activity of the YMCA waned considerably, and one editor of the paper was prompted to note the organization's decline from former days.²⁰

The student body of Washington and Lee began early in the century to manifest a high degree of political interest, both on the national and intramural levels. An institution born in 1908 became a regular quadrennial feature at the university. This was a "mock convention," held in the years of the national election for the presidency. The plan of the convention was extremely well-articulated, and closely approximated current conditions in the major political party which was out of office.²¹ The first such convention was held on May 4, 1908; in preparation, the students published a weekly newspaper, The Democrat, devoted to discussion of Democratic candidates and issues.²² The election year activities became a prominent extracurricular facet of Washington and Lee life; the students ordinarily spent the entire school year organizing and formulating plans for the conventions.²³

Political activity on the campus level was especially prominent in the years after 1914.²⁴ The political structure of the student body was decidedly oligarchical in nature. One body of a dozen students (called the Executive Committee) handled all matters involving student government. This committee was judicial in that it was responsible for interpreting and applying the Honor System; it was legislative, in that it created other subordinate committees and established regulations governing student elections; and it was executive, in that it carried out the judicial and legislative resolutions the committee made. Even though democratically elected, the Executive Committee was all-powerful in student government.²⁵ A university yearbook of the period chose to criticize the school's political structure, and printed a biting satire of the Executive Committee as "omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent."²⁶

The primary responsibility of the Executive Committee was administering the Honor System. Before 1920, the system had never been spelled out; it had simply been understood by the student body to embrace "the code of the gentleman."²⁷ Because of student misunderstanding arising ~~in the~~ late ~~1910s~~ ^{in the second} decade, however,²⁸ the committee found it necessary to codify the Honor System. In March of 1920, the limits of the system were carefully described to include four

areas where lying, cheating, and stealing would be interpreted as honor offenses. These four areas were academics (course work), removal of books from the library, general theft, and failure to report an offense.²⁹

Various honorary fraternities appeared on the Washington and Lee campus. The first of these was a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, national brotherhood honoring scholastic achievement. This came in 1911.³⁰ Three years later, members of the student body founded what was to become a national collegiate fraternity of leadership, Omicron Delta Kappa. "From its inception, election to membership in ODK became a coveted honor among undergraduates, many if not most of whom regarded it as infinitely more desirable than election to Phi Beta Kappa."³¹ The birth and continued prominence of Omicron Delta Kappa is significant. The prime prerequisite for membership was outstanding achievement in some aspect of extracurricular life; to be tapped for ODK was considered the highest possible campus honor, rewarding as it did the versatile man of extra-scholastic accomplishments.

Two other honorary societies of note came to the campus. The first of these was Delta Sigma Rho, national forensic fraternity, established at Washington and Lee late in the 1910's. Sigma Upsilon, an honorary

literary fraternity, appeared at the university in 1920.³²

The various aspects of extracurricular life discussed above suggest several trends or emphases, six of which are particularly pertinent here.

1. Abundance of extracurricular organizations.

Washington and Lee, 1900-1930, was characterized by a high degree of extracurricular activity. The informal structure of student life was thoroughly and intensely articulated through a wealth of clubs and voluntary associations.

2. Dominance of social-athletic interests.

Throughout the thirty-year span, the student body's proclivity for extra-academic and extra-scholarly activities was pronounced. A great deal of attention to and affinity for purely social endeavors such as dancing was in evidence. The strength of the social fraternity, the superabundance of balls and danced figures and the devotion to athletics demonstrate this.

3. Emerging academic interests. The rise of subject-area associations in the 1920's suggests a shift to scholarly activity not apparent in the extracurricular framework during the first two decades.

4. Declining consensus. The need for codification of the student Honor System in 1920 points

to a lessening of consensus as to what, exactly, honor meant. Before that time, the system was defined as "the code of the gentleman." Apparently everyone understood that phrase in approximately the same way. As the years passed, however, misinterpretations of the concept of honor necessitated precise and explicit elaboration of the Honor System's jurisdiction.

5. Political awareness and interests. The creation and continuance of the "Mock Convention," and the popularity of that institution among the students indicates a propensity for politics and a consequent familiarity - quadrennially, at least - with national issues of government.

6. Declining religiosity. In the early years of the century, the YMCA had been one of the most active and popular campus organizations. After 1920, its membership and scope radically diminished, and no new religious organization rose in its place. This points, it would seem, to a lessening concern among the students for campus religious activity.

It is here, in the area of extracurricular life, that Washington and Lee's sense of community is most apparent. What kind of community prevailed is demonstrated in the "emphases" just noted. It was

a community which was highly developed and well-articulated in a profuseness of organizations. It was a community whose chief interests were athletics, dancing, and social life, coupled with a regard for oratory and politics. In short, it was a community that emphasized in its organizations all of the elements of Southernism.

This community of Southernism began, apparently, to change after the World War. Religiosity - exemplified in the popularity of the YMCA - declined. Academic interests gained ground, evidence perhaps of an increase in intellectuality. The consensus that had prevailed began to decline, and the "honor of the gentleman" had to be defined concretely for the first time.

For the most part, however, the community remained as the expression of the "Gentleman Ethos." Congeniality, versatility, mannerliness, forensic prowess were the cherished values. It was, to summarize, a community whose highest honor - the key of Omicron Delta Kappa - rewarded the exemplary gentleman.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOUTHERNISM, COMMUNITY, AND INTELLECTUALITY

Southernism

The phenomenon of "Southernism" has been herein defined as a mental attitude involving a preoccupation with and an idealization of the past; fundamental to this attitude was a romanticized concept of the pre-Civil War South. Moreover, Southernism was concerned with a deep sense of personal honor, with a polished and highly complex institutionalized social life, and with the cultivation of the Ideal Gentleman as epitomized by Robert E. Lee.

Attention has been paid throughout this study to the prevalence of regionalism and the consciousness of the past that existed at Washington and Lee; likewise, the ideal of the Southern gentleman has been described as an integral part of the ethos that existed in the university. These ideas of regionalism, traditionalism, and gentlemanliness were intimately connected with a regard for and attitude toward Robert E. Lee.

Before William L. Wilson accepted the presidency of Washington and Lee, he paid a visit to the campus; although he admired Robert E. Lee, Wilson issued

a severe criticism of the presence of "Lee worship" on the campus. He indicated at the time that "the interests of a great institution could not be made subordinate to the personality of one man."¹

Presidents Denny and Smith did not view with Wilson's concern the esteem in which Lee was held. On the anniversary of Lee's birthday in 1907, President Denny addressed the gala gathering,² and in his speech he said:

No one who ever reads aright the history of this institution will ever undertake to question the fact that the life and service of Robert E. Lee is its largest asset, its richest tradition, and its noblest meaning.³

Out of the Centennial celebration in 1907, a Robert E. Lee movement grew up, the objectives of which were renovation of the Lee Chapel and establishment of an endowed Lee chair of American history.⁴ The movement died after a few years,⁵ to be revitalized by Smith in the form of a Lee Memorial School of Journalism.⁶

That the best of Washington and Lee had to do with Lee was expressed repeatedly by student editors of the newspaper. The 1904 Ring-tum Phi indicated that "the tenet par excellence of Washington and Lee is the reality of the Southern ideal, with Lee as exponent."⁷ The regard the students felt for Lee often became hero worship, as the following excerpt from a 1912 editorial

on Lee indicates:

The nobleness of his being stands out in burnished glory above the commercial spirit of our times.

Let us strive harder and harder to live up to the noble ideals he bequeathed us. Let us make him the object of our hero worship.

With a campus hallowed by the dust of the Great Chieftain, how can we help but go forth from our alma mater inspired to live for the highest ideals in true American citizenship?⁸

The following year, the editor of the college newspaper commented on the birthday of Lee, January 19th.

Of all the days of the year, January 19 is the one most sacred to the Southerner. By the ceremonies of this day, we burn the incense of true love to the spirit of honor, to the spirit of duty.⁹

The Lee Chapel, which had served as the General's office and after his death as his mausoleum, was locked during certain hours. In October, 1917, the paper criticized this policy on the basis of the Chapel's value as a landmark:

. . . Containing as it does the tomb of Robert E. Lee, (it) is without a doubt the leading landmark which Lexington can offer to visitors, and one of the most revered spots throughout the Southland. Every person who enters the Chapel and visits the last resting place of the Great General, leaves with a new feeling of honor for Washington and Lee University.¹⁰

The same intensity of feeling continued to be manifested by the students. An editorial appearing in 1918 amply demonstrates this:

He is more than a memory, for his spirit is the living spirit of Washington and Lee: his life serves as an example to thousands of young men who have come to study at his shrine. His name and his career make our University what it is today. . . . The life and character of Lee form for this university traditions which are undoubtedly its most sacred possessions. . . . The South's greatest hero and the country's finest citizen lies buried here. Men of W&L, let us not forget our traditions, the living spirit of our University. Take time to visit the tomb of Lee and learn from his face.¹¹

Or, as another editorial phrased it:

The Great Leader of the Southland lies buried in the University chapel, and it is the honor of his name and the tradition of his influence which form the greatest intangible assets of our institution today.¹²

Campus expression of the Lee "mystique" was not confined to the Ring-tum Phi. On several occasions, the university yearbook, the Calyx, ran tributes to Lee that had been written by students. The edition of 1920 had in it a student poem on the spirit of the school's second father, an excerpt of which follows:

Of the spirit that would mold us,
Till we like an army move
To the hills of high achievement,
Through the power of his love
Till his fame that is but budding
Shall be spread from sea to sea,
And the world shall come to worship
At the resting place of Lee.¹³

The Calyx of 1930 carried an epilogue tribute to Lee, the concluding stanza of which conveyed the attitude of hero worship which surrounded the general:

With grand humility he came
 And found his calm Mt. Vernon here,
 While the world's paeans crowned his name
 With praise he did not turn to hear.
 LEE!¹⁴

In the years immediately following his presidency, a custom of guarding Lee's tomb had prevailed. Each student had spent a day keeping the vigil, so that there was always a person at the burial site. In 1926, the newspaper started a campaign to reinstitute this tradition.¹⁵ A number of editorials and letters from students and alumni appeared, advocating the rebirth of the tradition. Although the custom was never revived, the tomb-watchers movement continued through 1928.¹⁶ One of the editorials favoring the tradition spoke of its value in maintaining Washington and Lee's identity as a Southern university:

Were this custom re-established, it would do much to bring our impressionable youth under the uplifting influence and stainless traditions of General Lee - it would mean that Washington and Lee would have another distinctive tradition of her own to travel wherever her name goes, and help brand her as a school of the Old South, appreciative of its traditions and worshipful of its memories.¹⁷

The key argument in favor of tomb-watching, however, was that it would help Lee's spirit to permeate the student body to a greater degree:

Such a custom can have only one result - that of bringing each man into more intimate contact with the living spirit of General Lee and thus help mold him into a better Washington and Lee man. . .¹⁸

Presidents of the university, as well as the students and alumni, continued to regard Lee's person as stainless and perfect; they furthermore tended to view the personal effect of Lee on the university as its most valuable asset and discriminating characteristic. At Washington and Lee, the Civil War general exemplified everything most highly prized and desirable.

The "Gentleman Ethos," propagated and encouraged by the college administrators and idealized by the student body, has been examined. The elements of this ethos were the very characteristics attributed to Robert E. Lee: a cordial and friendly mannerliness, a well-articulated and rigid sense of honor, and versatility of interests and accomplishments. These qualities were concretely manifested at Washington and Lee in the Honor System, the speaking tradition, and the emphasis on well-roundedness as opposed to the one-sided academic "grind."

The traditions of the school, its heritage from Lee and former generations, somehow were considered to have ultimate worth. If a practice or habit was traditional, that fact justified its existence and precluded its alteration. References to the Old South abound; chivalry and Southern honor were constantly recalled as the greatest attributes of character to which one could strive.

A "highly complex and institutionalized social life" has been mentioned as a basic element of the cult of Southernism. Washington and Lee certainly displayed this trait. The emphasis on dancing and athletic activity and the preponderance of social organizations existed throughout the period.

An attitude of "difference" and a consciousness of superior identity was also a component of Southernism. The evidence of this sense of difference was revealed, first of all, in the sentiments surrounding the Honor System. The student body, at least, repeatedly expressed the belief that honor - and its implementation in the system - could exist only in the South and among Southerners. Lee's spirit, it was thought, gave birth to the Washington and Lee culture. The traditions of the university, hallowed by identification of them with Lee, coupled with the idea of Lee's still-prevailing spirit to give the school a consciousness of "difference."

Washington and Lee was profoundly and distinctly different from all other institutions, by virtue of the personality of Lee. This man's personality had become the essential characteristic of the school's spirit and had found concrete embodiment in the school's institutions. Because this personality was the noblest, the finest, the most ideal, it followed that Washington and Lee's difference was translated as superiority.

On the basis of the foregoing pages, it can be seen that the cult of Southernism existed at Washington and Lee; and, further, that it existed on an extremely high level of articulation. The elements of Southernism were enumerated at the beginning of this discussion:

- a preoccupation with and idealization of the past;
- a romanticized concept of the Old South;
- a deep concern with a sense of personal honor;
- a highly complex and polished institutionalized social life;
- a cultivation of the Ideal Gentleman as epitomized by Robert E. Lee;
- a sense of difference and superior identity.

Each of these facets of Southernism ~~have~~^{has} been demonstrated to exist at Washington and Lee. A pertinent comment by the Ring-tum Phi, quoted earlier, bears repeating:

Again they come. . . to the little university nestled here among the hills, from which radiate the noble spirit of Washington and the Southern leadership

and culture of our warrior,
scholar, and educator, Robert E. Lee.
Therefore, we welcome you to this
shrine of the South.^{19*}

Community

"Community" has been defined for the purposes of this paper as a mutually inclusive group, "bound together by a shared sense of belonging" and by the feeling among the members that the group defines for them their distinctive identity. A quality of totality characterizes the true community; that is, the individual can "have most of the experiences and conduct most of the activities important to him" within the framework of the community. The idea of community involves, essentially, a matter of identity - the identity of the individual members expressed in the general terms of the community value or spirit.**

The case study investigation reveals that community existed at Washington and Lee throughout

* Italics added.

** For the purposes of this paper, the sense of community discussed refers to the nature of that phenomenon among the ~~the~~ ^{are} student body. Data from the current investigation ~~is~~ ^{are} not sufficient to extend the "community" to include the administration and the faculty; further study might well permit such an extension.

the thirty-year span. Until World War I that community amounted to the embodiment of the cult of Southernism. After the war, the community underwent a perceptible change, the elements of which change are to be summarized here:

decline in the percentage of Southern
students
lessening religiosity
emphasis on "practical" education
decline in consensus
codification of the Honor System
dispersion of the community due to the
rise of the automobile

To say, however, that the community perceptibly changed does not mean necessarily that it declined. What seems to have occurred is rather a subtle shift in the fundamental spirit of the community from the cult of Southernism to the cult of the gentleman. The following discussion demonstrates this alteration in the nature of the community.

It would hardly be possible for the cult of Southernism to define the identity of non-Southerners. The first point to be made, therefore, is that throughout the period under study, residents of the South were overwhelmingly dominant among the student body. A steady decline took place, nevertheless, in the percentage of Southerners, which would suggest an increasing inability of Southernism to fuse its values and presuppositions with those of the university. For the greater portion of the period, however,

Southern regionalism was predominant - as borne out by the number of Southerners on the board of trustees, the percentage of Southern scholarships and scholarship holders, and the dominance of Southern students. The fact of regional imbalance does not prove or disprove community, to be sure; it does, however, serve as a prerequisite to the community's having been the institutionalization of Southernism.

What does suggest community is consensus. Throughout the thirty-year span, both the student body and the administration ~~was~~^{were} largely in agreement on the aims and objectives of Washington and Lee, the purposes of education and the relationship of Washington and Lee to those purposes. The ideals of traditionalism, Old South glorification, honor, conviviality, and versatility - the cult of Southernism - remained largely unchallenged before the World War. The qualities of mind and temperament identified with Lee and thus with Washington and Lee were agreed-upon truths, accepted and affirmed without question. Only in the 1920's did incidents of breakdown in the consensus begin to occur; while the same cultural values and standards were expounded, increasing references arose to the neglect of tradition on the part of the students. The codification of the Honor System indicated that the "code of the Southern gentleman" was no longer interpreted with

the same universality of opinion that had previously existed.

Washington and Lee University was and continued to be an almost thoroughly Protestant, Christian college. Moreover, a large majority of the students - over half - were Presbyterians and Methodists. Thus an ethno-religious factor existed, potentially serving as one means of rapport and hence community. Decline in percentages came here, as well, although the most significant lessening was not in numerical percentages of church members but rather in attention to and interest in religious activities (exemplified by the decline of the YMCA). This might well have been a part of the national "materialism" prevalent in the 1920's, of which declining religiosity was a feature.

Basic to the cult of Southernism was a kind of romanticized idealism, which held in antipathy purely practical or materialistic objectives. The 1920's saw the emphasis on "practical" education gain force on the Washington and Lee campus, and hence another factor came into play which tended to weaken the community as the expression of Southernism. This growth of "practicality" might well have been a reflection of the materialistic values of the twenties, which were nationwide years of departure from old norms of idealism. The

national trend toward materialism was almost sure to ramify in colleges and universities; and this was very likely an influence on the campus of Washington and Lee. Whatever the reasons, the increase in practicality was bound to weaken Southernism in the university.

The stress on purely social organizations has been mentioned in connection with the cult of Southernism. The number of social clubs, dances, and sporting events were, on the one hand, an expression of general interest - they would not have existed had there not been desire for the activities involved. On the other hand, such organizations, in the amount that they were found at Washington and Lee, enabled the students to articulate and express these interests. In other words, the structure of the extracurricular life had been fashioned out of keen social and athletic proclivities. The fact of the structure's existence provided a framework within which, both formally and informally, the student could have most of the social experiences and participate in most of the athletic events important to him.

Prior to the World War, automobiles - particularly in the South - were rare. At Washington and Lee, the only means of transportation were time-consuming and troublesome. The university

was, therefore, largely isolated from the outside world. The mere fact of this isolation served as a reinforcement of community. Students, virtually stranded in the town at weekends, turned to each other and to the many extracurricular organizations for diversion. The popularity of debating societies and of the YMCA was due in part, at least, to the fact that students had nothing else to do on Saturday evenings. With the rise of the automobile, however, students were able for the first time to leave Lexington on weekends and travel to neighboring cities. These weekend travels served to weaken the community of Southernism in two ways. In the first place, isolation had tended to cement close ties among the students and with the loss of isolation came a consequent weakening of those ties. In the second place, isolation had provided an impetus to the growth of a highly organized intramural social life; when it became possible for students to leave Lexington, one of the chief reasons for many of the social organizations was gone.

For at least the first two decades of the period 1900 to 1930 Washington and Lee, indeed, was a community. Campus-wide consensus existed on what the values were; there was an identity of the school and its inhabitants with the ideals of Southernism, and no significant challenges were offered to

those ideals. Out of this identity came a sense of difference and uniqueness, which enhanced the feeling of belongingness that prevailed. The students and the administration accepted the same norms of behavior and the same hierarchy of values. The social system of the university - highly organized and well-expressed - enabled the student body to enjoy most of the activities and experiences necessary to the fulfillment of needs.

After the World War, and progressively in the 1920's, the community of Southernism was weakened. Conflict attacked consensus. It was necessary to define terms heretofore accepted by universal agreement, and to admonish the students against abuses of the traditions for so long unquestioned. Regionalism declined considerably, providing a potential dysfunction to the extant community. Religiosity, too, declined, and another source of rapport and consensus was thus impaired.

Community existed, then, at least through the first two decades of the century, as characteristically and identifiably Southern. It was, further, not only Southern (as witnessed by regionalism), but was also an expression of the cult of Southernism. With the decline of Southernism, however, the sense of community grew more inclusive, beginning to weaken in its restrictive "Southern" elements, while holding

to the same basic values of conviviality, versatility, mannerliness, and honor. In short, it was the "ethos of the gentleman" to which the members of the community began to adhere, in which they found their individual identities mutually expressed, in which lay the source of belongingness, and in the context of which they were able to conduct most of the experiences important to them.

Intellectuality

Intellectuality has been defined as "the critical, creative, and contemplative side of mind." The intellectual thrills with ideas for their own sake, and learns for the pleasure of learning. Intellectuality is thus contrasted with professionalism in that the former seeks knowledge for the joy of knowing while the latter seeks knowledge for a device of practical application. Finally, an independent commitment to ideas must exist in order for intellectuality to exist.*

In an attempt to measure intellectuality in

* As in the case of community, the discussion of intellectuality deals primarily with the nature of that attitude among the student body. Further research is necessary for conclusive observations on the state of intellectuality on the faculty or administration.

the academy, the central question to be answered is this: What indices of scholarly or intellectual concern existed, and contrariwise, what indices of non-scholarly or anti-intellectual concern were apparent?

Factual indicators of intellectuality grew more numerous as the years passed at Washington and Lee. In 1911, a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa was established, thus suggesting that there was at least a desire to reward scholastic achievement and hence intellectual endeavor.

Admission to the Carnegie Institute's list of approved colleges and universities, in 1921, demonstrated that the school had achieved a measure of respectability in academic and scholarly circles. Between 1900 and 1930, the number of doctorates on the faculty doubled, while the proportion of well-known faculty scholars likewise increased, providing another indicator of the relative growth of intellectuality at Washington and Lee. The rise, particularly after the World War, in the number and diversity of scholarly and aesthetic student organizations is similarly indicative of an increase in intellectuality.

Such phenomena as the establishment of Phi Beta Kappa and admission to the Carnegie list are self-evident facts, which speak for themselves as indices of intellectuality. Other factors of equal

significance are perhaps not so self-evident, but nevertheless merit considerable attention in an attempt to demonstrate intellectuality in the university.

In the formal structure of Washington and Lee, a number of trends or emphases have been examined which are detrimental to genuine intellectuality. The prevalence throughout the period of practicality of purpose is one of these. Education had to be for something; it could not be education for the sake of learning. The most pointed illustration of this practicality is the growth of professional and vocational emphasis in the curriculum, as in the schools of commerce and applied science. Both administrations stressed professional and vocational preparation, and the fact of this stress on professionalism directly conflicts with the definition of intellectuality as "the seeking of knowledge for the joy of knowing rather than as a device for practical application."

The paternalism of the university - as manifested in the absence regulations, for example - is indicative of a lack of responsibility on the part of the students or a lack of faith placed in them on the part of the school, or both. At any rate, freedom and responsibility - two apparent prerequisites for intellectuality - were limited

by the university. The school continued to regard itself as the guardian of morals and the watchdog of student behavior.

Structurally, then, a number of factors operated negatively on a climate conducive to intellectuality - especially professionalism, vocationalism, and paternalism. At the same time the formal structure of the university manifested evidence of intellectual concern in increasing amounts.

A major trend in the college was curricular growth and expansion from 1900 to 1930. While much of this growth took place in the technical fields, the humanities and liberal arts enjoyed a broadening and intensifying evolution in the curriculum. The increasing amount of financial aid provided a structural inducement to intellectuality, as well, in that it made possible the enrollment of intellectually qualified but financially incapacitated students. To an increasing degree, students were able to enroll on the basis of ability rather than wealth.

Certainly the improvement in the faculty could be noted as a trend beneficial to intellectuality; so long as the teaching staff was overworked and underqualified, intellectuality was impaired. The chances for intellectuality would be greater, it would seem, the more qualified the faculty and the lower the student-faculty ratio.

The increasing bureaucracy of the university, noted in Chapter Two, does not immediately appear to bear on intellectuality. A closer consideration, however, indicates that it does. Admittedly, the formal structure of the university does not finally prove or disprove intellectuality. It can, on the other hand, provide either safeguards or hazards to the development and maintenance of an intellectual culture.

In the case of bureaucracy, the trend toward standardization and formalization of university regulations assumes, in the first place, that universal standards will be used in admissions, absences, and degree requirements. This means that policies would be explicitly stated, and could therefore be improved upon or analyzed with ease. In the early years of Washington and Lee, the lack of bureaucracy resulted in a discrepancy between what was and what appeared to be. Standards could be - and were - waived at the will of the president; and because there were no structurally explicit statements preventing this, it would have been impossible to alter the situation. Thus the development of the bureaucracy helped to avoid the laxity and irregularity prevalent in the early years, and, in so doing, provided a structural component amenable to the development of intellectuality.

When there is a lack of formalization and

standardization, and therefore a lack of decentralized authority, personality differences come into play. It is possible for students to be adjudged not on the basis of intellectual acumen or qualifications, but rather on the basis of such factors as family connections or background, personal demeanor or influence. While structural rigidity does not absolutely prevent judgment on these bases, it does limit them considerably. And to the extent that considerations of personality are avoided, the possibility of purely intellectual criteria of judgment is improved.

There is another face to the issue of personality affecting intellectuality. When power is decentralized and authority is divided, the chances are less that administrative sentiments detrimental to scholarship and intellectuality can prevail. As in the case of the Denny presidency, centralized and unspecified authority can be used to commendable - but nonetheless anti-intellectual - ends. Certainly the influence of personal appeal can never be wholly eliminated from the university; but its scope and potency can be limited by bureaucratic articulation. This happened at Washington and Lee, and hence became a structural safeguard of intellectual integrity.

Two additional structural phenomena must be mentioned as positive factors in the existence of

intellectuality. The first of these is the emergence, late in the period, of academic rewards and penalties. The "automatic rule" with its increasing austerity indicated that academic lethargy or ineptitude would not be supported by the university. Likewise, the establishment of dean's list privileges served to reward the scholar and accept him as a responsible agent. Although neither of these in themselves induced intellectuality, both were evidence of official regard for and support of scholarly endeavor.

The final structural innovation conducive to intellectuality is that of rising entrance standards. Not only were the existing prerequisites for admission enforced; gradually the number of requirements was raised, thus demanding better qualified and more intellectually capable students.

Two observations emerge from the foregoing discussion:

First, the empirical "facts" of intellectuality grew more numerous from 1900 to 1930. These indices of intellectuality deserve repeating:

1. The establishment of Phi Beta Kappa
2. Admission to the Carnegie Institute
3. Proportional increase in the number of Ph.D.'s on the faculty
4. Rise in number and diversity of scholarly and aesthetic student organizations

Secondly, concurrent with the increase in evidence of intellectuality was a development of

trends conducive to intellectuality:

1. Curricular growth and expansion
2. Increasing financial aid
3. Maturation of organizational bureaucracy
4. Emergence of academic rewards and penalties
5. Rising entrance standards
6. Quantitative as well as qualitative improvement of the faculty

Taken together, these two observations lend strong support to the contention that intellectuality did, in fact, exist at Washington and Lee in increasing amounts. Not only did the indices of intellectuality become more numerous, but also the concern for intellectuality became more apparent in the structure of the university. To be sure, phenomena dysfunctional to intellectuality existed throughout the period. Professionalism and paternalism, particularly, have been cited as negative influences.

But the issue is not whether intellectuality existed absolutely; it is, rather, whether any evidence of intellectuality did exist, and whether such evidence indicated a trend toward greater or lesser intellectuality. On this basis, it can be said that intellectuality at Washington and Lee became more evident and that concern for and encouragement of intellectuality likewise became more evident.

* * *

The fundamental premise of the sociology of knowledge is that there is an interplay between ideas and attitudes, on the one hand, and institutions on the other, and that this interplay is of such importance that it may prove crucial to the persistence and well-being of society. Our whole investigation has consisted of an analysis of three important "ideas and attitudes"; but the "institution" has simply been taken for granted. In this final chapter it may well be worthwhile to turn for a moment to consider the institution itself, Washington and Lee University.

Sociologists have given almost as many definitions to their characteristic term "institution" as anthropologists have given to their fundamental focus of attention, "culture" - and Kroeber and Kluckhohn in 1952 uncovered more than one hundred and sixty different statements of what "culture" meant to various anthropologists.²⁰ Some sociologists regard institutions as merely conventions surrounding some social interest; others look upon them as being essentially organizations of social interrelationships; still others define institutions in terms of mankind's universal concerns (as when they speak of the economic institution of a whole society).

Malinowski, in his posthumous A Scientific Theory of Culture,²¹ develops a theory of institutions which bears directly upon the sociology of knowledge and which offers considerable illuminations in the summation of the findings of this essay. He begins his definition of an institution with a particularly significant assertion: an institution, he says, is "an agreement on a set of traditional values for which human beings come together."²² This is to say that in the background of every institution is a consensus among the participants; they share a set of convictions, attitudes, ideals, presuppositions. Without these there would be no reason for the institution. Conversely, the more convincingly they are held, the stronger the esprit de corps within the institution.

No statement could be a clearer recognition of the underlying tenet of all sociologists of knowledge. No statement could more aptly describe the importance of exploring the "agreement on a set of traditional values" in understanding the institution known as Washington and Lee. This paper has investigated three "traditional values" and has raised questions about their power and influence during thirty years of university life.

Malinowski, continuing his definition of an institution, says that "it also implies that these

human beings stand in definite relation to one another and to a specific physical part of their environment, natural and artificial."²³ This, of course, is valid (and obvious). We have not concerned ourselves here with the social structure of the university, with its physical plant, with its relationship to the town of Lexington, nor with its routines.

One term to which Malinowski gives especial emphasis in his analysis of institutions is "Charter." Critics have objected to his term and to his somewhat idiosyncratic definition of it. Despite this, his conception of the "Charter" of an institution (whether we call it by that or by some other name) is especially apt for our purposes. A charter, he says, is "the traditionally established values, programs, and principles of organized behavior."²⁴ Again he is emphasizing the mental components of every institution.

Calling an institution "the definite isolate in the concrete cultural reality" Malinowski then gives a full account of how an institution functions:

Under the charter of their purpose or traditional mandate, obeying the specific norms of their association, working through the material apparatus which they manipulate, human beings act together and thus satisfy some of their desires, while also producing an impression on their environment.²⁵

This analysis he sums up in a diagram, decidedly useful for our purposes. It begins with "Charter" and ends with that concept whose development by Malinowski gave its name to the Functional School of sociology. His diagram is as follows:²⁶



The four interior terms of this diagram - personnel, norms, material apparatus, and activities - are so easily apprehended by anyone who is acquainted with Washington and Lee University that they need no comment here. The "Charter" of the university, however, and its relation to "function," must be considered.

Using "charter" in the Malinowskian sense, Southernism was demonstrably an outstanding feature of the university's "charter" in 1900. Was it so in 1930? The finding of this study is that, though still strong, Southernism had by the later date begun perceptibly to diminish, yielding gradually to what we have called "the ethos of the gentleman."

Still pursuing the subject of Southernism, can it be asserted that it was not only an element

of the university's "charter," but also one of its "functions," in the sense that administration and students had its inculcation in the new generations of students as a conscious purpose? Apparently, Southernism was, indeed, viewed as a conscious "function" of the university by administrators and students alike. Both expressed the desire for the versatile, mannerly, and convivial student - essential components of Southernism. Presidents as well as student editors proclaimed "education of the Southern gentleman" as one of the school's purposes. Preservation of traditions and adherence to the values of the Old South were repeatedly emphasized, and inculcation of the ideals associated with Robert E. Lee was ever-present as an explicit purpose of the university.

The second important attitude examined throughout this essay, namely, community, was also a part of the "charter" of Washington and Lee. One makes this assertion in somewhat dogmatic fashion, since probably every residential college in the country looks upon itself as a community, in some sense. This is to say that American institutions of higher learning consistently regard themselves as separate and recognizable communities, held together because of common interest in the educational "function," and thereby developing at least some measure of

esprit de corps. It has been a part of the purpose of our investigation to see whether "community" at Washington and Lee increased or diminished between 1900 and 1930, and whether, if it fluctuated, it did so in relationship to two other attitudes, Southernism and intellectuality. This question will be presently discussed in summary.

Finally, by the very nature of the fact that the university was an institution of learning, it might be assumed that intellectuality, our third subject of investigation, would be a dominant part of the institution's "charter". The facts, however, do not confirm this assumption. On the contrary, in the early years of the present century it seems difficult to discover any clear agreement on intellectuality as one of the "set of traditional values for which human beings come together" at Washington and Lee. This is certainly not to suggest that no individuals on the faculty and in the student body cherished the ideal of sheer intellectuality, but merely to assert that until 1918 it had not been enunciated in any form that would impress a detached observer of the campus scene. If, however, there began to be increasing signs of intellectuality as Washington and Lee moved toward 1930, our question is whether that growth is related to concurrent changes in "Southernism" and in "community."

Our summary task, therefore, is to explore the interrelationships among the three foci of study. We must consider three pairs of possible relationships - those among

Southernism and community
Southernism and intellectuality
Community and intellectuality

In each pair do we find that the two increase together in intensity, diminish together, or change in opposite direction?

Southernism and Community

Southernism appeared to have experienced a decline after the World War; at the same time, the nature of the community began to change.

Throughout the thirty-year span, strong evidence of Southernism persisted: the Old South continued to be romanticized, the Lee "mystique" was manifested in administrative and student pronouncements, and the past took precedence over the future. After the war, however, the cult of Southernism lost its pervasive dominance. Traditions were not so universally obeyed, adoration of Lee was less apparent, and the culture of the Old South was referred to more infrequently. In other words, while the values and norms of Southernism continued to be expressed, they were no longer either as vigorous or as explicitly Southern as they had been.

The sense of community extant before the World War also began to undergo change after 1918. A decline in the number of Southern students, a decline in religiosity, the need for codification of traditions are a few of the factors involved in the apparent alteration of community.

It has been indicated that, prior to 1918, community was indeed the institutionalization of Southernism; it follows that with a decline in Southernism, community, as it had existed, would be weakened. And so it was.

What appeared to have happened is this: The community began to undergo a transition from an expression purely of the cult of Southernism to an expression of what may be called the "Gentleman Ethos." To be sure, there is a thin line of difference between the two; a characteristic element of Southernism was the ethos of the gentleman. Admittedly, many of the students probably considered gentlemanliness and Southernism as one and the same. The point is, however, that Southernism could not provide "community" for non-Southerners, whereas the code of the gentleman could.

The essential qualities of the "Gentleman Ethos" - versatility, mannerliness, honor, and conviviality - witnessed no decline, but rather continued to express the vitality of the community.

The loss of consensus and the disintegration of the old community had to do with elements which were definitively Southern - adoration of Lee, idealization of the past, and a sense of unique Southern identity.

No inference is made here of causality; rather, the observation is put forth that as a gradual decline occurred in Southernism, a change took place in the sense of community. Whereas during the first two decades of the century group identity found its expression in the cult of Southernism, after that time the community zeitgeist increasingly began to be identified with the "Gentleman Ethos."

Southernism and Intellectuality

As the cult of Southernism declined, both the "facts" of intellectuality and the trends conducive to intellectuality became more pronounced. Once again, it is not the purpose of this paper to establish causal relationships among the attitudes under examination. That task must be reserved for future study. All that can be said, on the basis of the collected data, is that as one phenomenon grew stronger or weaker, a similar - or dissimilar - pattern occurred in the other phenomena.

In the case of Southernism and intellectuality, a reverse trend is apparent. Whether it be causal

or simply coincidental, the gradual decline in Southernism after World War I paralleled a gradual increase in intellectuality. The 1920's saw a weakening of tradition, a lessening of the preoccupation with Old South culture, and a decreasing proportion of Southern students. Concurrently, intellectuality began to be encouraged and the evidences of intellectuality became more abundant. The curriculum gained in breadth, the faculty grew in numbers and in quality, and student organizations which were based on some aspect of intellectuality multiplied.

Community and Intellectuality

With the change in community from a purely "Southern" orientation to an expression of the "Gentleman Ethos," an increase occurred in intellectuality. The 1920's, especially, witnessed both the alteration of the old community and the growth of intellectuality. So long as the community continued to be the embodiment of Southernism, slight evidence of intellectuality existed. Forward strides in intellectuality were made simultaneously with the change in the community.

The three qualities of mind designated as intellectuality, Southernism, and community have

been individually analyzed in this study. The precise nature of each, and the relative strength or weakness of each has been delineated through the technique of the case-study method, and in terms of the assumptions of the sociology of knowledge. It has been neither feasible nor possible to investigate all of the factors bearing on intellectuality, Southernism, and community as they existed at Washington and Lee from 1900 to 1930.

The possibility of noting any causal relationships that might have existed among the three does, therefore, lie beyond the scope of this thesis. What has been attempted is the dissection of three phenomena of mind on the basis of the social setting in which they existed, and the observation of any parallel trends that might have obtained among them. Hopefully, this undertaking will lead to further study in which more insight might be gained into the nature of intellectuality, Southernism, and community in the academic environment.

APPENDICES

Appendix One

Student Geographic Distribution

1899

<u>Region</u>	<u>Percent of Residents</u>
Southern	94.3%
Western	2.5%
Northern	3.2%
Foreign	0.0%
Virginian	54.8%

1905

Southern	95.2%
Western	1.5%
Northern	3.0%
Foreign	.3%
Virginian	52.7%

1910

Southern	92.5%
Western	1.9%
Northern	5.2%
Foreign	0.0%
Virginian	45.7%

1913

Southern	93.2%
Western	1.4%
Northern	4.3%
Foreign	1.1%
Virginian	43.8%

1920

Southern	91.2%
Western	.9%
Northern	7.4%
Foreign	.3%
Virginian	32.7%

1924

Southern	83.7%
Western	3.1%
Northern	12.1%
Foreign	1.1%
Virginian	28.8%

1930

<u>Region</u>	<u>Percent of Residents</u>
Southern	69.1%
Western	2.6%
Northern	27.7%
Foreign	.6%
Virginian	21.1%

Appendix Two

Religious Distribution

<u>1917:</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Christians	98%
Presbyterians	36%
Jewish	2%
Methodists	26%
Protestants	97%
<u>1920:</u>	
Christians	98%
Presbyterians	31%
Jewish	2%
Methodists	28%
Protestants	96%
<u>1925:</u>	
Christians	93%
Presbyterians	33%
Jewish	7%
Methodists	15%
Protestants	91%
<u>1930:</u>	
Christians	93%
Presbyterians	30%
Jewish	7%
Methodists	23%
Protestants	90%

Appendix Three

Enrollment by Divisions

	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>1905:</u>	
college	56%
engineering	27%
law	17%
<u>1913:</u>	
college	54%
science	13%
law	23%
<u>1915:</u>	
college	58%
science	10%
law	22%
<u>1920:</u>	
college	43%
commerce	19%
science	10%
law	18%
<u>1930:</u>	
college	57%
commerce	23%
science	7%
law	13%

FOOTNOTES

Chapter One

1. Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology (Evanston, Ill., 1958), p. 25.
2. Ibid., p. 27.
3. (New York, 1963).
4. Ibid., p. 25.
5. Ibid., p. 27.
6. Ibid., p. 26.
7. Ibid., p. 29.
8. Ibid., p. 28.
9. Ibid., p. 29.
10. Louis D. Rubin, Jr., "An Image of the South," The Lasting South, eds. Louis D. Rubin, Jr., and James Jackson Kilpatrick (Chicago, 1957), p. 1.
11. Richard Barksdale Harwell, "The Confederate Heritage," Rubin and Kilpatrick, p. 16.
12. Rubin, "Image of the South," pp. 6-7.
13. Harwell, "The Confederate South," p. 18.
14. Ibid., p. 17.
15. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Ill., 1949), p. 217.
16. (New York, 1963).
17. Merton, op. cit.
18. Ibid., p. 221.
19. Ibid., p. 221.
20. Ibid., p. 221.
21. Mannheim, op. cit., p. 264.

Chapter Two

1. Ollinger Grenshaw, A History of Washington and Lee University (unpublished manuscript), Chapter 19, p. 1.

2. Ibid., p. 18.

3. Washington and Lee University Catalogue (Lexington, Va., 1900), pp. 7-11.

4. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 19, p. 45.

5. Ibid., p. 13.

6. Ibid., p. 46.

7. Ibid., Chapter 20, p. 2.

8. Ibid., p. 6.

9. Ibid., Chapter 19, p. 41.

10. Ibid., p. 39.

11. Catalogue, 1900, p. 83.

12. Ibid., p. 83.

13. Ibid., p. 83.

14. Ibid., p. 84.

15. Ibid., p. 85.

16. Ibid., p. 85.

17. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 20, p. 16.

18. Ibid., Chapter 21, p. 4.

19. Ibid., Chapter 20, p. 19.

20. Ibid., Chapter 21, p. 2.

21. Ibid., p. 19.

22. Ibid., p. 19.

23. Ibid., Chapter 20, p. 27.

24. Ibid., Chapter 21, p. 12.

25. Ibid., p. 13ff.

26. Ibid., Chapter 22, p. 9.

27. Catalogue, 1905, pp. 8ff.
28. Catalogue, 1910, pp. 11ff.
29. Grenshaw, op.cit., Chapter 21, p. 29.
30. Ibid., p. 16.
31. Catalogue, 1905, p. 9; Catalogue, 1910,
p. 12.
32. Ibid., 1915, 1920, 1924, 1929.
33. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 21, p. 32.
34. Catalogue, 1905, p. 9; 1910, p. 10; 1912, p. 13.
35. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 21, p. 8.
36. Ibid., Chapter 22, p. 23.
37. Ibid., p. 23.
38. Ibid., Chapter 20, p. 44.
39. Ibid., Chapter 21, p. 26.
40. Ibid., p. 27.
41. Catalogue, 1910, p. 67.
42. Ibid., 1905, p. 55.
43. Ibid., 1910, p. 59.
44. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 21, p. 30.
45. Catalogue, 1905, p. 12.
46. Ibid., 1910, p. 13.
47. Ibid., p. 10.
48. Catalogue, 1905, p. 8.
49. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 19, p. 42.
50. Ibid., p. 42.
51. Ibid., Chapter 20, p. 15.
52. Ibid., Chapter 19, p. 17.
53. Ibid., Chapter 20, p. 34.

54. Ibid., p. 46.
55. Ibid., p. 18.
56. Ring-tum Phi, vol. V, no. 2 (1901).
57. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 20, p. 20.
58. Ring-tum Phi, vol. V., no. 3 (1901).
59. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 20, p. 43.
60. Ibid., p. 45.
61. Ibid., p. 56.
62. Ibid., Chapter 22, p. 1.
63. Ibid., p. 87.
64. Ibid., p. 7.
65. Ibid., p. 6.
66. Ring-tum Phi, vol. XVI, no. 1 (1912).
67. Ibid., vol. XVII, no. 3 (1913).
68. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 22, p. 11.
69. Ibid., p. 14.
70. Ibid., p. 10.
71. Catalogue, 1913, p. 66.
72. Ibid., 1900, p. 59; 1910, p. 62.
73. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 22, p. 9.
74. Ibid., p. 8.
75. Ibid., p. 9.
76. Catalogue, 1913, p. 11.
77. Ibid., 1930, p. 14.
78. Ibid., 1913, p. 12.
79. Ibid., 1930, pp. 15-16.
80. Ibid., 1913, pp. 11-15.
81. Ibid., 1930, pp. 14-16.
82. Ibid., 1913, p. 63.

83. Ibid., 1913, p. 64; 1920, p. 75; 1930, p.88.
84. Ibid., 1913, p. 15.
85. Ibid., 1930, p. 19.
86. Ibid., 1915, p. 14.
87. Ibid., 1913, p. 6.
88. Ibid., 1924, p. 8.
89. Ibid., 1930, p. 10.
90. Ibid., 1915, p. 10.
91. Ibid., 1930, p. 9.
92. Ibid., 1920, p. 73.
93. Ibid., 1925, p. 78.
94. Ring-tum Phi, vol. XXXII, no. 8 (1928).
95. Catalogue, 1913, p. 66.
96. Ibid., 1920, p. 73.
97. Ibid., 1924, p. 71.
98. Ibid., 1930, p. 78.
99. Ibid., 1913, p. 66; 1920, p. 73.
100. Ibid., 1910, pp. 109ff.
101. Ibid., p. 110.
102. Ibid., 1930, pp. 167ff.
103. Ibid., 1920, p. 137.
104. Ibid., p. 139.
105. Ibid., 1915, pp 125ff.
106. Ibid., 1930, pp 184ff.
107. Ibid., 1915, p. 72.

Chapter Three

1. Catalogue, 1899, pp. 27ff.
2. Ibid., 1905, pp. 41ff.

3. Crenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 21, p. 18.
4. Catalogue, 1910, pp. 45ff.
5. Ibid., 1930, pp. 51ff.
6. Ibid., 1900, p. 30; 1930, p. 52.
7. Ibid., 1920, p. 42.
8. Crenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 22, p. 9.
9. Personal interview.
10. Catalogue, 1924, p. 48.
11. Ibid., 1930, p. 51.
12. Ibid., 1899, p. 94.
13. Ibid., 1930, p. 55.
14. Ibid., 1899, p. 94.
15. Ibid., 1915, p. 60.
16. Ibid., 1925, p. 49.
17. Ibid., pp. 56-63.
18. Ibid., 1930, p. 55.
19. Ibid., pp. 66-68.
20. Ibid., 1900, 1912.
21. Ibid., 1913, p. 171.
22. Ibid., p. 172.

Chapter Four

1. Catalogue, 1899, pp. 41-65.
2. Ibid., 1905, pp. 76-99.
3. Ibid., 1910, pp. 81 ff.
4. Ibid., 1915, pp. 87ff.
5. Ibid., 1920, pp 97ff.
6. Ibid., p. 144.

7. Ibid., 1915, pp. 125ff.
8. Ibid., 1920, p. 144.
9. Ibid., pp. 128ff.
10. Ibid., pp 97ff.
11. Ibid., 1924, pp 93ff.
12. Ibid., 1930, pp. 106ff
13. Ring-tum Phi, vol. XXIX, no. 1 (1925).
14. Catalogues 1900, 1910, 1930.
15. Ibid., 1900, pp. 38-39.
16. Ibid., 1910, p. 53.
17. Ibid., 1905, p. 61.
18. Ibid., 1900, p. 37.
19. Ibid., 1910, p. 53.
20. Ibid., 1924, p. 91.
21. Ring-tum Phi, vol. XXXII, no. 57 (1929).
22. Catalogue, 1930, pp. 97-98.
23. Ibid., p. 98.
24. Ibid., p. 96.
25. Ibid., 1913, p. 60.
26. Ibid., 1910, p. 109.
27. Ibid., 1920, p. 123.
28. Ibid., 1910, p. 57.
29. Ibid., p. 57.
30. Ibid., p. 57.
31. Ibid., 1920, p. 96; 1930, p. 98.
32. Ibid., 1915, p. 70.
33. Ibid., 1920, p. 139.
34. Ibid., 1924, pp. 156ff.
35. Ibid., p. 172.

36. Ibid., p. 164.
37. Ibid., p. 140.
38. Ibid., 1915, p. 87.

Chapter Five

1. Catalogue, 1899, p. 101; 1930, p. 260.
2. See Appendix One
3. Catalogue, 1920, p. 200.
4. See Appendix One
5. Catalogue, 1920, p. 200.
6. Ibid., 1930, p. 260.
7. See Appendix Two.
8. Henry Louis Smith, "President's Report," Washington and Lee University (Lexington, Va., 1917), p. 22.
9. Henry Louis Smith, "President's Report," Washington and Lee University (Lexington, Va., 1929), p. 22.
10. See Appendix Two.
11. Smith, "President's Report," (1917), p. 22.
12. Smith, "President's Report," (1929), p. 22.
13. See Appendix Two.
14. Catalogue, 1905, p. 180.
15. See Appendix Three.
16. Catalogue, 1920, p. 200.
17. See Appendix Three
18. Catalogue, 1905, p. 180.
19. Catalogue, 1930, p. 260.
20. See Appendix Three
21. Ring-tum Phi, vols. III-XXXII.

22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., vols. III-XVIII.
24. Ibid., vols. III-XXXII.
25. Ibid., vol. XXIX.
26. Ibid., vols. III-XXVIII.
27. Ibid., vol. XXIX, nos. 1-60.
28. Ibid., vol. V.
29. Ibid., V, 3 (1901), 2.
30. Ibid., V, 6 (1901), 2.
31. Ibid., V, 10, (1901), 2.
32. Ibid., XVI, 1 (1912), 2.
33. Ibid., XVI, 14 (1913), 2.
34. Ibid., XVII, 16 (1914), 2.
35. Ibid., XXI, 19 (1918), 2.
36. Ibid., XXI, 19 (1918), 2.
37. Ibid., XXI, 20 (1918), 2.
38. Ibid., XXIX, 1 (1925), 2.
39. Ibid., XXIX, 14 (1925), 2.
40. Ibid., V, 18 (1902), 2.
41. Ibid., XXI, 2 (1917), 2.
42. Ibid., XXI, 23 (1918), 2.
43. Ibid., XXII, 14 (1919), 2.
44. Ibid., XXIX, 50 (1926), 2.
45. Ibid., V, 11 (1901), 2.
46. Ibid., XXIX, 1 (1925), 2.
47. Ibid., V, 10 (1901), 2.
48. Ibid., XXI, 19 (1918), 2.
49. Ibid., XXI, 15-20 (1918).

50. Ibid., XXI, 20 (1918), 2.
51. Ibid., XXII, 1 (1919), 2.
52. Ibid., XXIII, 13 (1920), 2.
53. Ibid., vols. XXIII-XXXII.
54. Ibid., XXIX, 14 (1925), 2.
55. Ibid., XXXII, 11 (1928), 2.

Chapter Six

1. Ring-tum Phi, XIV, 7 (1910), 7.
22. Crenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 22, p. 47.
3. Ibid., Chapter 20, p. 35.
4. Ibid., Chapter 22, p. 47.
5. Washington and Lee University Student Body, The Calyx (Lexington, Va., 1900).
6. Ibid., 1930.
7. Ibid., 1900.
8. Ibid., 1930.
9. Ibid., 1900.
10. Ibid., 1910.
11. Ibid., 1920.
12. Ibid., 1930.
13. Ibid., 1900, 1910, 1915.
14. Ibid., 1920.
15. Ibid., 1925.
16. Catalogue, 1910, p. 60.
17. Ibid., 1913, p. 161.
18. Ibid., 1915, p. 175.
19. Ring-tum Phi, XII, 25 (1914), 1.
20. Ibid., XXXII, 31 (1929), 2.
21. Crenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 22, p. 39.

22. Ibid., p. 40.
23. Ring-tum Phi, vol. XIV.
24. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 22, p. 43.
25. Ring-tum Phi, XVII, 17 (1916), 2.
26. The Calyx, 1914.
27. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 22, p. 43.
28. Ring-tum Phi, vols. XX-XXII.
29. Ibid., XXIII, 20 (1920), 1.
30. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 21, p. 20.
31. Ibid., Chapter 22, pp. 45-46.
32. Catalogue, 1924, p. 91.

Chapter Seven

1. Grenshaw, op. cit., Chapter 19, p. 17.
2. Ibid., Chapter 21, p. 33.
3. Ibid., p. 35.
4. Ibid., p. 44.
5. Ibid., p. 47.
6. Ibid., Chapter 22, p. 10.
7. Ring-tum Phi, VII, 14 (1904), 2.
8. Ibid., XVI, 5 (1912), 2.
9. Ibid., XVI, 13 (1913), 2.
10. Ibid., XXI, 4 (1917), 2.
11. Ibid., XXI, 14 (1918), 2.
12. Ibid., XXI, 22 (1918), 2.
13. The Calyx, 1920, p. 226.
14. Ibid., 1930, epilogue.
15. Ring-tum Phi, XXIX, 44 (1926), 2.

16. Ibid., XXXII, 16 (1928), 2.

17. Ibid., XXIX, 48 (1926), 2.

18. Ibid., XXIX, 52 (1926), 2.

19. Ibid., XXIX, 1 (1925), 2.

20. A. L. Kroeber and C. Kluckhohn, Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions (Cambridge, 1952).

21. Bronislaw Malinowski, A Scientific Theory of Culture (Chapel Hill, 1944).

22. Ibid., p. 39.

23. Ibid., p. 39.

24. Ibid., p. 140.

25. Ibid., p. 39.

26. Ibid., p. 53.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I. Washington and Lee University Publications

Smith, Henry Louis. President's Reports.
Lexington, Va., 1917-1930.

Student Body of Washington and Lee University.
The Ring-tum Phi. Lexington, Va., vols.
III-XXXII.

_____. The Calyx.
Lexington, Va., 1900-1930.

Washington and Lee University. Catalogues.
Lexington, Va., 1899-1930.

II. Books

Avary, Myrta Lockett. Dixie After the War.
New York, 1906.

Broom, Leonard, and Philip Selznick. Sociology.
Evanston, Ill., 1960.

Carter, Holding. Southern Legacy. Baton
Rouge, 1950.

Commager, Henry Steele. The American Mind.
New Haven, 1950.

Crenshaw, Ollinger. History of Washington and
Lee University. unpublished manuscript.

Eaton, Clement. The Mind of the Old South.
Baton Rouge, 1964.

Heatwole, Cornelius J. A History of Education
in Virginia. New York, 1916.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in
American Life. New York, 1963.

_____, and Wilson Smith, eds.
American Higher Education. (2 vols.)
Chicago, 1963.

Kelly, Robert Lincoln. The American College
and the Social Order. New York, 1940.

- Kendrick, Benjamin Burks, and Alex M. Arnett. The South Looks at its Past. Chapel Hill, 1935.
- Knight, Edgar W. Twenty Centuries of Education. Boston, 1940.
- Kroeber, A. L. and C. Kluckhohn. Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. Cambridge, 1952.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. A Scientific Theory of Culture. Chapel Hill, 1944.
- Mannheim, Karl. Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge. New York, 1952.
- _____. Ideology and Utopia, trans. Louis Wirth and Edward Shils. New York, 1936.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill., 1949.
- McGill, Ralph. The South and the Southerner. Boston, 1959.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Ill., 1951.
- Rubin, Louis D., Jr., and James Jackson Kilpatrick, eds. The Lasting South. Chicago, 1957.
- Sugrue, Thomas. Stranger in the Earth. New York, 1948.
- Van Doren, Mark. Liberal Education. New York, 1943.