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Preface

University presidents are not masters of all they survey; they may never have been. Certainly during the last one hundred years governance in a university has become a shared responsibility; so has management, because universities are large and complex institutions encompassing a variety of disciplinary studies, research institutes, centers for the study of particular topics – particularly those that cut across traditional fields of study, and entrepreneurial educational ventures.

Universities are not homogeneous institutions. Those charged with the responsibility for leading them, including Boards of Regents or Trustees, are beset by various constituencies each passionately seeking support for an agenda – and all their agendas are important. Ideas deserving support far exceed any institution’s financial capability to finance them; there’s more good to do than an institution’s leaders can afford to do.

Presidents of universities make judgments every day about the nature of education and the needs of society. Those judgments are colored by their own visions and by institutional capability; each action a president takes or fails to take reveals a philosophy of governance and education.

So university presidents, called on to do more for every fragmented constituency – faculty, staff, students, alumni, friends of the institution – spend most of their time choosing among competing good ideas, thereby making several people or groups unhappy each time one person or group is made happy. Equity becomes an argument as if it were not incumbent to consider merit. The art of treating unequal things unequally is not widely appreciated.

Universities have always demanded and derided leadership. President Marvin, the worthy subject of this history, was a man of strong beliefs who governed at a time when presidents had more
control of the wonderful variety of university life than they do now. Understanding his presidency in the light of particular controversies he provoked as well as those he resolved, and understanding how he coped with the changing temper of his times as our nation moved from the Depression to the Cold War will prove instructive to anyone interested in the art and the history of leadership in higher education in America.

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg
President, The George Washington University
August 2004
Introduction

On the afternoon of May 5, 1970, the largest protest ever held by George Washington University students crippled the administration and became the defining moment of student activism on the campus. Earlier that day, four students were killed at Kent State University after a bloody encounter with the Ohio National Guard during a demonstration to protest the United States’ role in the Vietnam War.

Over 1,000 students attended a memorial service and rededication ceremony in the heart of Washington, DC to rename the University Center, the student center on campus, the Kent State Memorial Center. The service followed a silent procession around campus that was estimated to include 800 students, according to Kent Ashworth, a writer for the *GW Hatchet*, the student newspaper of the university.

Exactly one year and one week prior to these demonstrations, former George Washington University President Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin passed away, signaling the close of a long, tumultuous era in the history of the George Washington University. In the third of a century that Marvin was president he doubled the student body size, tripled the faculty size, and increased the endowment ninefold. He physically expanded the campus as well; over fifteen of George Washington’s most familiar buildings were built between the beginning of his tenure in 1927 and his retirement in 1959.

Marvin is also remembered, however, for his explicit support of segregation, his conservative political and religious beliefs, and his almost dictatorial control over student life. Much friction developed between Marvin and more liberal elements of the campus community, fostering resentment and division that boiled over several times during his administration, and even after his 1969 death.
Marvin's widow, Dorothy Betts Marvin, donated the sum of one million dollars to the university for the rededication of the University Center, known to many students as the Kent State Memorial Center, in the honor of her late husband. The dedication of the Cloyd Heck Marvin Center coincided with the sesquicentennial anniversary celebration of GW—commemorating the 150 years from the school's founding in 1821 to 1971.

The ceremony was originally to take place in the Center Theater, to be rededicated to Dorothy Betts Marvin in honor of her gift to the university, adjacent to the University Center. However, to accommodate larger numbers of students, the ceremony was moved to Lisner Auditorium, across the street.

Lisner Auditorium opened twenty-five years before, in 1946, marking a turning point in GW history: it was here that the painful desegregation of the university began, when, on the theater's opening night, Hollywood actress Ingrid Bergman was discouraged to find she would have to play before a segregated audience and launched a protest that made headlines around the nation. Although Lisner would be desegregated later that year, it was not until 1954 that the rest of campus followed suit; nonetheless, the students never forgot her courageous stand against the policy of segregation, which Marvin continuously defended as “traditional” in the District of Columbia. The irony of honoring Marvin in a place symbolic of the struggle against segregation was not lost on many students.

Mrs. Marvin supported the change of locale as well, commenting: “I am glad this gathering is in Lisner Auditorium, for it was Mr. Lisner who first recognized my husband's plans for a great urban university.”

At five o'clock in the afternoon on February 15, 1971, the dedication ceremony began, with invited guests, donors, and alumni seated in the lower level, and students seated in the upper level.

Then-President Lloyd H. Elliott was greeted by applause from those seated on the lower floor, while the students above hissed, according to Hatchet reporter Dick Polman. He listed Marvin's achievements as president, and concluded: “Marvin combined
vision with will, patience with tenacity. It is fitting that the Center should be named the Cloyd Heck Marvin Center.”

Applause erupted from the lower level, but three-fourths of the students seated in the upper level rose and walked out of the auditorium with clenched fists in the air, Polman wrote in a front-page article in the next issue of the Hatchet. One student shouted angrily, “it’s the Kent State Student Center, and you know it!” The audience below continued applauding despite the commotion, and the ceremony continued.

That morning, the GW Hatchet had come out with a special issue for the 150th anniversary of the university. A front page editorial by the newspaper staff read: we “have to conclude that the name Cloyd Heck Marvin will insult many users of this Center, especially the black students whose parents were not allowed to attend GW.”

In that issue, the Hatchet also printed a letter from a “group of ‘frustrated’ students,” who wrote: “GW has decided to memorialize its racist heritage” by immortalizing Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin. “We do not want a university dedicated to producing ‘the man in the gray flannel suit,’” the students wrote. “We have no intention of standing idly by while GW attempts to make the seventies a return of the fifties.”

This was perhaps the most enduring criticism of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin’s educational philosophy, that he was a proponent of “assembly-line” education that did little more than produce government functionaries and corporate bureaucrats. He was a principled man who championed efficiency over creativity, with constant concern about cost cutting and money saving. GW during his term sacrificed much to achieve his goals. A great deal of evidence is available to support the assertion that throughout his terms of office as a university administrator, Marvin privileged the hard sciences at the expense of the liberal arts. This philosophy had its devout critics, including one professor of English who, in 1940, sacrificed her career to launch a revolution against his administration. It nearly succeeded.

But in his dedication to this philosophy, Marvin made George Washington great. He came to the University at a time when it
amounted to little more than three buildings and a few townhouses. When he left, the University spanned more than a dozen city blocks, with an internationally renowned medical center and law school and an enviable endowment.

Marvin's term in office at GW is remembered as much for his heavy-handed policies as it is for the rapid expansion of the university, the development of a renowned research institution, the construction of the dream that dated back to George Washington's will and the first United States President's desire for a national university in the District of Columbia.

Many alumni and students who attended GW during the Marvin years will attest to his censorship of the student press, his disregard for the civil liberties of students and secure tenure and academic freedom for the faculty, his zealous anti-communist efforts, and his support of segregation. These aspects of his legacy, as well as the construction in bricks and mortar of a great university, contribute to the myth of the longest-serving and most renowned president in the history of The George Washington University. He built and destroyed; he mended and divided; he left a complicated legacy for his successors.

He was the greatest thing to happen to this prominent university, and the worst.

When Marvin became president of the University of Arizona Tucson in 1922, he was then 33 years old, the youngest university president in the nation. He was far ahead of his time; while students at other schools were still being taught Greek and Latin, Marvin encouraged business, economics, and accounting. He was called a progressive educator, a vigorous leader.

But by the time he retired in 1959, on the opening of a new era, he was a rather elderly man, considered by those below him to have a philosophy that was archaic, anachronistic, obsolete, best left behind in an earlier time. He still championed his same old philosophy at a time when the theory of educating students in the liberal arts tradition was becoming more popular. Instead of educating students to be efficient, productive members of society in a one-size fits all formula, the concept of educating students to be well-rounded in the arts as well as the sciences had replaced
the assembly-line educational philosophy of which the “man in the gray flannel suit” had become a powerful symbol.

The question remains: how could he have done so much good for the University, and yet be remembered as a villain by later generations? Certainly, no other single individual has influenced the University more, for good or ill.

The purpose of this work is not to render judgment upon Dr. Marvin or his legacy; the goal is simply to find the truth and to tell the story so that future generations may benefit from it. The past is prologue. This work is meant to be respectful of Dr. Marvin, to be thoughtful of his dream.

Revisionist history is quick to erase pages from history books rather than come to an understanding with the demons of the past. In response to the suggestion that The George Washington University remove Dr. Marvin’s name from the Marvin Center, GW President Stephen Joel Trachtenberg said, “we should repudiate bad behavior not by taking names off buildings,” but rather by “the example we set for those who follow us.”

Certainly, there are aspects of our contemporary society that will seem inappropriate, even reprehensible, to the generations who will follow in our footsteps. Studying those who preceded us will reveal an understanding not only of the social norms that we refute today, but an insight into the character and motives of our forefathers.

As President Trachtenberg so correctly pointed out, “we must learn from the past; we must be students of the past.”
Notes on Introduction:
7. Ibid.
1. The Arizona Years

E.E. Ellinwood, the President of the Board of Regents of the University of Arizona, called the board to order on the afternoon of July 17, 1926 to resolve a crisis that had brought first the University, and then the entire state government, to its knees in the spring of 1926. They were to vote on the impeachment charges brought against Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin, the President of the University of Arizona.

The charges were shocking, but Marvin’s critics were confident that they would be sustained and that Marvin would be forced out of office. It was alleged that he “had broken down the morale of the University of Arizona thru his habitual lying, thru gross disloyalty to his associates on the Faculty, thru the discrediting to the extent of seriously damaging their professional reputation members of the faculty who have displeased him, thru losing the confidence of the students and of many people in the community and State, and so weakening the influence of the University.”

The battle lines had already been drawn among the eight regents; three, Theodora Marsh, Charles M. Layton, and Roy Kilpatrick, were firmly anti-Marvin. Four, including Ellinwood, Secretary Cleve Van Dyke, John H. Campbell, and John J. Corrigan were entrenched on the pro-Marvin side. A renegade, Charles O. Case, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, was unaligned.

This proved to be a difficult situation for Arizona Governor George W.P. Hunt, who was to cast a vote in the event of a tie. “The Marvin Affair,” as it had come to be called, was now a hot-button campaign issue, and Hunt was running for a sixth term in November. First, however, he had to win a difficult primary challenge on September 6 from E.E. Ellinwood himself, the President of the Board.
Ellinwood was outspoken in his support of Marvin; he made a campaign pledge to keep Marvin as President of the University if elected, and if Hunt fired him before that, to rehire him. Hunt at first attempted to make a truce until after the election, but finally decided, privately at first, against Marvin, confiding in a colleague that he would give Marvin the boot if reelected. 3

Ellinwood wasn't the only member of the Board to have had political conflicts with Hunt; John H. Campbell, a prominent lawyer and one of the last Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of Arizona prior to statehood in 1912, had represented Thomas E. Campbell in the contested gubernatorial election of 1916 against George W.P. Hunt. Campbell won in Maricopa County Superior Court, but the decision was reversed in the Arizona Supreme Court, and Hunt was seated for a third term. 4

At this meeting of the Regents, however, Hunt was conspicuously absent, called to Prescott, Arizona on “urgent business,” according to the Tucson Daily Independent. Hunt had requested that the meeting adjourn until a later date when he could be present. 5

Marvin's supporters on the Board of Regents forced a vote on whether or not to sustain the charges of impeachment against Marvin, despite the faraway protests of the governor. Regent Charles Layton motioned to adjourn the meeting to comply with Hunt's request; Regent Case seconded the motion.

The vote was 4 to 4, defeating the motion. Case had joined Regents Marsh, Layton, and Kilpatrick against the “pro-Marvin” side.

Following the vote on the superseding motion, the question of whether or not to sustain the charges of impeachment against Marvin followed quickly, the Independent reported.

Hunt did not have to worry about casting the tie-breaking vote at a later meeting; Regent Charles Case switched sides, joining Ellinwood, Van Dyke, Campbell, and Corrigan in exonerating Marvin of the impeachment charges. The vote had been 5 to 3.

At 10:55, Regent Ellinwood announced formally, “The charges are not sustained.” John Campbell quickly left the room to congratulate Marvin, who had been nervously pacing in a
nearby room.

The regents then voted on a proposal by Van Dyke for the Board to suspend the faculty constitution and assume full governing power of the university. The faculty constitution had been one of the major points of contention between Marvin and his opponents, as faculty members at Arizona had comprehensive rights of faculty tenure and promotion. The vote was in favor of Van Dyke's proposal, 5 to 3, the Citizen reported. The result was now the Board of Regents could fire any staff member of the University of Arizona at will, including the President, regardless of tenure.

Later that night, Van Dyke gave a statement to the press, indicating "there has been an attitude on the part of the faculty to run the university, and this has not been satisfactory." The Independent condemned the vote, saying, "the Marvin adherents on the board then swiftly slashed at the university constitution, ripping out the provision therein providing for a faculty committee and placing the institution in absolute control of themselves." The regents had voted "to emasculate the state university as an education entity and to render it a political catspaw."

The article ended with a warning: "Every member of the faculty at present who is in disfavor with the autocratic president will be summarily and brazenly fired, it is said, being replaced by men who will kowtow to Marvin and the political ring in whose hands the fate of Arizona's greatest education institution lies at present."

One other important vote was taken at the meeting: a unanimous vote to reappoint all faculty for the coming school year, excepting eight that the board could not agree on. The vote on those eight were to be held until a later meeting in which Governor Hunt could be in attendance. One of those eight was Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin; another was his archrival, Frank C. Lockwood, a disaffected faculty member who led the crusade against Marvin's administration.

Governor Hunt could not ignore the crisis any longer. The election was only a month away. Although his mind was firmly
made up, could he take the political risk of making such a controversial move as firing Marvin?

It was not supposed to end this way, and the road to this point was long and complex. The seventh President of the University of Arizona, Dr. Rufus Behnhard von KleinSmid left in April 1921 to become President of the University of Southern California, initiating a long search for his successor. The Verde Copper News spoke highly of von KleinSmid: “Those of us who have been in the state as long as ten years will remember that the university was more or less of a joke until the appointment of Dr. Von KleinSmid as president. That eminent educator put the institution well up toward the head of the list of really effective state universities…”

Von KleinSmid had “found a small college and built a great university,” according to the Citizen. “The history of the institution must always be written with a considered realization that he gave it its impetus towards greatness.” Von KleinSmid’s tremendously successful administration, from the doubling of the faculty size to the quintupling of the student body size, left very large shoes to fill for his successor.

For the first year after von KleinSmid’s reluctant resignation, three deans of the university were in charge of administrative affairs: Francis Cummins Lockwood, the dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences, Gordon M. Butler, the dean of the School of Mines, and D.M. Working, the dean of the College of Agriculture. Later, the regents designated Dr. Frank C. Lockwood as acting president on April 22, 1922.

Frank Lockwood was tall, dignified, and scholarly, notes Arizona historian Mary Huntington Abbott. He was a firm administrator both of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences, the largest of the U of A Tucson schools, and as acting president. The latter role was one that he did not give up easily when the regents would choose the next president, and, according to some sources, Lockwood remained disgruntled, feeling he was entitled to the presidency himself. The result would be a bitter power struggle between Lockwood and the new president.
After a year and a half of searching for von KleinSmid's successor as university president, University Regent Dwight B. Heard, the publisher of the *Arizona Republican*, found Dr. Marvin through a mutual friend. Marvin was invited to Arizona, and five days later he accepted the position and moved to Tucson. On September 1, 1922, Marvin became the eighth president of the University of Arizona by a vote of the Board of Regents, and the youngest university president in the country.\(^\text{12}\)

According to *The Wildcat*, the student newspaper, Marvin "looked more like excellent material for Coach McKale's football squad than a college president."\(^\text{13}\)

"From newsboy to university president at the age of 33 is the remarkable record achieved by Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin," the dean of the Southern Branch of the University of California, wrote the *Los Angeles Times* at the time Marvin ascended to the University of Arizona presidency. "The election of a business man to the presidency of a university is, in itself, an event worthy of record; but the election of a business man and education leader thirty three years old was unheard of until the regents of that western institution, after a search lasting for nine months, announced Dr. Marvin as their choice for the office."\(^\text{14}\)

Born on August 22, 1889 in Findley, Ohio, Marvin moved with his family to Riverside, California during the spring of his final semester of high school. The following autumn, 1909, Marvin matriculated at Leland Stanford University with the intention of pursuing a legal career. According to *The Pittsburgh Dispatch*, "even before his entrance into the university, the young man had made his first venture into the business world--not in the accustomed fashion of the youthful heroes of fiction as a newsboy, but as a clerk in a grocery store and an apprentice in a machine shop."\(^\text{15}\)

During his freshman year at Stanford, Marvin worked as a night operator for the American Bell Telephone Company. He worked there throughout his undergraduate years at Stanford, advancing into increasingly important positions by the time he graduated in 1914. Having altered his course of study, he graduated with a bachelor's degree in business administration and
In 1915, when Marvin was twenty-six years old, he was appointed as a special member of the City Efficiency Commission of Los Angeles. That spring, he received his master’s degree from the University of Southern California in business administration. When, the following year, Marvin became a Thayer Fellow at Harvard University, he moved to Cambridge, Massachusetts. “In these new surroundings he developed a thirst for a new kind of knowledge,” wrote the Dispatch. He continued his studies in economics and business administration, but increasingly his attention focused on a new field of study: education.\(^{16}\)

“It was not education as it is ordinarily conceived which fascinated him and which led him to specialize in this subject while at Harvard, but education as a means of increasing production, or improving the efficiency of men.” In order to lead men, he had to be able to teach them.

In Marvin’s own words:

Before the Civil War period, industry consisted of a multiplicity of hand operations. Each man in every factory was acquainted with the entire process of manufacturing the article upon which he was engaged. If he was a gunsmith, he shaped the stock, bored the barrel, and constructed the lock. Mass production was unthought of, besides being an impossibility under such a system.

But with the industrial revolution came the development of machine processes. Gradually the scope of each worker’s activities became circumscribed; each man was occupied with only a small detail in the manufacture of any article. None of the workmen could be familiar with all the details of the process. Each man became only a cog in the machine, and the age of specialization had arrived.

We are now living in this age of specialization. We see the system at its height. Further specialization, without greater intellectual training, is
a practical impossibility.

Realizing this, I attempted to analyze the situation to find where the next great field for advancement lay. Science had displaced the old processes. And the new processes established tend to be about as efficient as possible with the present personnel. How was greater efficiency to be achieved?

The only field which had not been probed to its depth, I decided, was the education of the workers. Specialization and machinery were artificial aids to production. The greatest improvement would come through natural means—through education, which would make every worker inherently more capable, and hence more efficient.

Accordingly, having reached this decision, I set out to fit myself to give them this education. I realized that one man cannot impart ideas to large groups of men unless one has some knowledge of the science of education, and for this reason I specialized in this subject during my first two years at Harvard. 17

What could be called the Marvin Doctrine is concerned with "commercial education," as Marvin wrote in his 1922 book, *Commercial Education in Secondary Schools*. This philosophy holds that education for purposes of teaching students the ways of business, trade, and commerce, is something quite different from narrow vocational training. It is one thing to teach railroad workers to be more productive at their jobs, for example, by using a new tool, machine, or process. It is quite another to teach a railroad worker how to be a more productive member of society.

"A democracy cannot exist unless its members are productive; it cannot be permanently stable unless there be a just distribution of that which is produced, nor will efficient production or equitable distribution avail, unless there be a wisdom in consumption," Marvin wrote. 18 A more productive society, according to Marvin, is dependent on three fundamental tenets:
more efficient production, more just distribution, and wiser consumption. The most important of these, as indicated above, is the latter.

The growth of business courses and training in the field of commerce was a relatively new phenomenon. Most courses were offered in private colleges, although private corporations and public colleges and universities had recently undertaken education of business students. The development of commercial education in public schooling became more urgent as the numbers of students enrolled began to swell. In 1890, Marvin notes, 68% of all students were enrolled in public schools, which comprised 60% of the total number of schools. By 1918, 91% of students were enrolled in public schools, and 87% of schools were public.

Business classes were not comprehensive enough in response to the increased necessity and demand for a business curriculum. While many schools taught commercial arithmetic, bookkeeping, business law, and typewriting, comparatively few taught banking, foreign trade, window display, stenography, or advertising—these latter fields being more recent, though not less important, developments in the field of business and commerce.

Marvin’s recommendations call for a more unified curriculum for full-time students, and particular recommendations for evening, part-time, and high school courses, as well as two-year college curricula guidelines. He emphasized training should start earlier and be updated to reflect the modern post-war business reality and opening of a larger window of world trade.

The Marvin Doctrine was, at its heart, a fusion between business and education, and this philosophy would guide Marvin’s career as university dean and president for over forty years. 19

In 1917, after two years of graduate work at Harvard, Marvin received his Master’s Degree in education. With the declaration of war on Germany in April of that year and with his degree completed that spring, Marvin enlisted in the army in June. He was assigned at first to the second Presidio training camp, and after two months, he was given a captain’s commission and stationed in Portland, Oregon.

His Portland assignment was immense: he was placed in
charge of the Spruce Production Division. Spruce, as a light hardwood, was the material from which the first planes in the fledgling aviation division were made. When Marvin took over supervision of the office, he had two assistants and could obtain only 50,000 feet of spruce each month, hardly enough to satisfy the tremendous needs of the military.

When he left six months later, the organization had grown to 286 persons and occupied the entire floor of one of Portland's largest office buildings. The amount of spruce being furnished increased from 50,000 feet per month, to over one million feet per day in that time period.

In July 1918, Marvin was sent to the officers' training camp at the Vancouver Barracks in Washington State, and became a captain in the aviation division. Before he was sent overseas, however, in November the Armistice was signed and the fighting came to a halt. He married in 1917, to Dorothy Ellen Betts, to whom he was to remain married for the next fifty-two years.20

Returning to Harvard, he studied through the winter term of 1918 to 1919 and received his doctorate of philosophy that spring. While in New England, Marvin served for several firms as an advisor; upon receiving his degree, he declined the offers to work for these firms permanently, choosing instead to return to Los Angeles. Expecting to enter business, he instead became a professor of economics and business administration at the Southern Branch of the University of California. A few months later, he was appointed dean of the Southern Branch.21

During the 1920 and 1921 summer terms, Marvin taught business administration at Columbia University.22 In 1921, Marvin was appointed by the State of California Board of Education as chairman of a committee for the reorganization of teachers' training curricula for the Teachers' College. The Board also appointed him a specialist in commercial education. The result of his investigations was a set of curricula for normal classes and evening classes for the College that stood "as a model for the reorganization and simplification of teachers' curricula," wrote the Dispatch. The Board promptly approved his recommendations.

His success had not escaped notice of the Board of Regents
of the University of Arizona. The regents were "easily persuaded" to elect Marvin president after seeing his record as dean at the University of California. He was offered the job the morning after his interview. Although sacrifices were made in his decision to leave his promising business career in California and move to Tucson, Marvin promptly accepted the job, with some conditions, namely that he have free rein in reorganizing the academic and institutional structures. The regents promptly agreed and ratified his contract.  

At his inauguration, on April 23 and 24, 1923, the Los Angeles California Times announced: "Long and careful preparation for the inaugural has been made by the faculty and student committees. In Tucson today are gathered representatives of scores of colleges and learned bodies, while the State of Arizona and its cities have official representation."

Although the "Marvin Doctrine" would have its many virulent and dedicated critics over the next forty years, Marvin never strayed from it, developing his philosophy in a great number of books and speeches that he would give over the years. "Education is nothing but experience," he told the Providence Tribune in 1922. "The training which teaches the student thoughts and doesn't teach him to think is futile.

"We in the West are free to make of education an experience and to apply it practically to our lives. Eastern colleges are handicapped and hidebound by tradition, as we are not. That is why I have refused professorships in two of the largest Eastern schools.

"It is what a man does that his personality finds expression. Classical education often teaches him what he should do, without in any way teaching him how to do it. The man with the purely academic training is much like the man who possesses a beautiful musical instrument and doesn't know how to play it."  

Such a radical philosophy would, of course, make waves when instituted in practice. While Latin, Greek, and classical studies were emphasized in many university curricula at this time, Marvin sought instead a new, innovative approach: to teach students to be independent and well rounded, and teach them to
think critically. It was this trademark of the Marvin administration
at the University of Arizona and the George Washington University
that would so distinguish him from his peers in the years to come.

According to Douglas D. Martin, the newspapers at the time
felt that university growth would be “brought about by applying
President Marvin’s policy of ‘blending the collegiate atmosphere in
the clear air of business efficiency.’”

“The University of Arizona’s regents believed Marvin had
precisely the vigor, education, and experience required to
administer the school and he was eager to do it,” Abbott wrote.
Marvin had ambitious plans to improve the academic quality of the
school by expanding the curricula and raising the standards of the
faculty. He sought a “bigger and better” student body as a result
of higher admissions standards.

The physical infrastructure of the school was antiquated and
deteriorating: the streets were unlit, there was no fire protection,
and the athletic facilities had been outgrown. To get money for
these plans, Marvin took two major steps: first, he sought to
petition the state legislature for funds and began a massive
publicity campaign to draw interest in the university’s expansion;
second, he consolidated control of the university in the office of the
president. Marvin proved quickly that he was adept at
accomplishing both these goals.

The former goal, he realized, was achieved by going to the
people. He quickly became accessible and spoke at clubs and
meetings around Arizona, especially veterans, miners, and
farmers, receiving a reputation for being an effective lobbyist. The
regents supported his plans for better alumni relations by creating
the office of alumni secretary and urging formation of alumni clubs
nationwide.

The members of the state legislature did not overlook the
growing public interest in the university: 19,000 residents attended
free university-sponsored lectures, the faculty size reached 135,
and the student body size reached 1766. Appropriations to the
university sailed smoothly through the House and Senate.

Although encountering faculty opposition, Marvin sought to
reduce the number of university departments from forty-nine to
twenty-eight, although most would undergo a change in name only. Ten departments were consolidated into the College of Agriculture; mining, engineering, metallurgy, and ore dressing were grouped under the College of Mining. All social sciences were placed under the auspices of the Department of Economics.

To the newspapers, he cited five reasons for the changes: "First, to make for more efficient administrative channels; second, to avoid duplication of work; third, to strengthen the morale of the personnel of the departments; fourth, to create a better academic standing; fifth, to make for a better promotion scheme." Not all approved of the reorganization scheme; the College of Agriculture was hardest hit, and several of the faculty there would later stand against Marvin.

Marvin ruffled feathers among the faculty elsewhere. He asked eleven teachers to resign, including six professors, to make room for a number of more prestigious scholars, all with the blessing of the Board of Regents. The businesslike firing of eleven teachers caused many to think of him as an insatiable youngster obsessed with efficiency who lacked respect for others.

Frank Lockwood, later to become Marvin’s most outspoken critic, wrote:

Within three or four weeks after Dr. Marvin's arrival, I found that he was bent upon dismissing or demoting able men and women of high reputation and long tenure. I was grieved, especially, by his ruthless methods. He asked my advice concerning Dr. A.E. Vinson and Dean J.J. Thornber [of the College of Agriculture], though they were not in my college. I told him that Dr. Vinson had been here about nineteen years, and had done notable work as a scientist. He said, he had decided he must go.... He said Thornber was not fit to be a Dean, and asked if I did not think he should be dropped. I replied that we had appointed him only six months ago, and that
it would break his heart if he were dropped.

Indeed, to be fair, whenever a new president takes office, some readjustment of faculty and departmental organization is inevitable. However, gradually, many of the faculty at the University of Arizona grew to distrust Marvin.

Nonetheless, his contributions to the school can hardly be overestimated. He raised funds for the university in innovative ways. In February 1925, Marvin proposed the establishment of a state military institute at the university, and this idea eventually became the School of Military Science and Tactics, again with the support of the Regents. A new men’s gymnasium was completed in July 1926 at a cost of $166,207; the basement of the new facility was reserved for the new School of Military Science.

The School was a benefit to the university in many ways. It was highly praised around Arizona and offered students a new and exciting field of study. The State of Arizona contributed 10,000 acres of state land for the School; the university began to draw income from the sale and rental of this land. By the time the School of Military Science opened, the university had already earned some $45,000. As Mary Huntington Abbott notes, Marvin appropriately invested this money to build and equip an armory.

The new men’s gymnasium was large enough to house three basketball courts, a dance floor, and room for organization meetings. Another campus building, Herring Hall, was renovated into a gymnasium for female students. The School of Music moved into a renovated home in Apache Hall. The Steward Observatory dedication was combined with Marvin’s inauguration ceremony in April 1923. The dedication closed with a formal reception at the Masonic temple, which The Star called one of the most brilliant occasions Tucson had ever seen. The observatory would enliven astronomy classes.

Fire protection was brought to campus by the connection of the university’s water system to the water system of the city of Tucson. Forty-four ornamental lighting fixtures were installed above the newly paved streets. A network of tunnels running underneath the university carried steam, water, and gas lines,
electric cables, telephone and telegraph wires, and a fire alarm system.33

The curricula were expanded under Marvin as well. Opportunities were offered for students in the College of Mines and Engineering to work over the summer at nearby mining companies, affording students practical experience in addition to classroom study. A College of Law was started, with Samuel Marks Fegely appointed as Dean in 1925. No longer were extracurricular activities neglected either; archaeological field trips, horseback riding, and play performances were offered to students, among a number of other activities.

One of Marvin's more notable accomplishments was the establishment of a new library. The regents debated the possibility of an addition onto the old library, but had given up the idea and petitioned the Legislature for a grant. They received $190,000, and ground was broken at an elaborate ceremony on January 17, 1924. The structure was completed that May, at a final cost of $450,000, and remains one of the most attractive public buildings in Arizona. It was designed to shelve 300,000 books, and provided students with an outdoor and an indoor reading room.34

The Regents felt that the university had progressed a great deal under Marvin's expansion plan, and the Association of American Universities was asked to send a representative to reappraise the institution for the first time since 1916, when the school was rated a Class Four institution. The Association undertook an investigation headed by Dean David Robertson, and, after making a careful survey, in October 1924 Robertson wired congratulations on the admission of Arizona to the list of accredited institutions. Rated a Class A institution, the campus celebrated; Marvin declared a holiday, the Wildcat put out an extra edition with the headline: "University Recognized," and the event, it has been said, gave a great boost in morale to the students and faculty.35

Marvin was not a cause of the friction between the Board of Regents and Governor Hunt; he was simply a victim of the back-
and-forth, the politicking and partisanship, caught on the wrong side of the battle lines at the wrong time.

Governor Hunt was the State of Arizona’s first governor, a Democrat, elected in 1912, the year Arizona acquired statehood. He was reelected in 1914, but the very close election of 1916 brought in Thomas E. Campbell, a Republican, before the Arizona Supreme Court invalidated the election results and ruled the contested case in favor of Hunt. Campbell was forced out as governor after several months in the position, and Hunt was seated for a third term.

Hunt was a Democrat, the leader of the last Territorial Legislature in 1909 and head of the constitutional convention that wrote the state’s new constitution. In the document, he laid down mandates that were written into law: the eight-hour workday, a child labor law, an arbitration board for labor disputes, adequate mine inspection, and the initiative, referendum, and recall, among others, according to Douglas Martin.

Also a strong supporter of the public school system, Hunt appealed to the Legislature in 1913 and again in 1915, taking up the university’s cause. “In the scheme of modern government, the state university is becoming an institution fraught with great possibilities. Encouragement of higher education among the young men and women of a state is one of the worthiest objects to which we can bend our energies. Arizona especially, because of her vast mining industry, has an exceptional opportunity for the upbuilding of a superb school of mines in connection with the state university,” Hunt told the Legislature in 1915.

The Legislature quickly passed his proposal for a College of Mines, appropriating $75,000 towards its construction. Hunt appealed for more dormitories, and the Legislature responded with funds to build two dorm structures. Governor Hunt was also supportive of the institution’s efforts in giving free lecture courses throughout the state, taught by some of the most prominent university faculty.

In 1918, Thomas Campbell won the governorship by a wide margin, and was reelected in 1920. That year, President Woodrow Wilson appointed Hunt ambassador to Siam, but Hunt
returned and was reelected governor in the November elections of 1922. He took office the first day of January 1923, when Marvin's administration was already several months old.

The University of Arizona Regents serve for eight years, are appointed by the governor, and approved by the legislature. Their terms are staggered, so that no governor can appoint a majority of the Board in only one term. In 1923, when Hunt took office, he found a Board full of appointees of Governor Campbell.

Less than two weeks after he took office, John Campbell, the Chancellor of the Board and Regents L.D. Ricketts, E.W. Hudson, and E.W. Wells received letters from Governor Hunt requesting their resignations. Regent James Compton, a Governor Campbell appointee, had resigned when Campbell left office. The terms of Regents Mose Drachman, Dwight Heard, and Timothy Riordan were to expire in April.

Correspondence between Governor Hunt and the regents, obtained from the John H. Campbell papers of the Arizona Historical Society, gives an insight into the dispute. On January 12, 1923, twelve days after taking office, Hunt sent letters to the four regents with a very short request: “After considerable reflection I have decided to request your resignation from the Board of Regents of the University of Arizona effective at my pleasure.”

The four regents refused to resign, causing a political controversy that had opponents of Governor Hunt arguing that Hunt was trying to politicize the Board, a non-political body. In a response to Governor Hunt, John H. Campbell defended the current system and refused to resign:

I am unable to accede to your request [to resign]. The legislature some years ago enacted the legislation under which I hold my appointment. My understanding of the purpose of the legislature is that a continuing board should be appointed to conduct the affairs of the University, the terms of two of the members to expire each two years. The terms are for eight years. This leaves six members who have
knowledge of the affairs and policies of the university and with the Governor and Superintendent of Public Instruction, who are ex-officio members, four new members may be added in each two year period. My understanding also is that this legislation was enacted upon the recommendation of the United States Bureau of Education. The legislature also may have had before it the experience of other states. My information is that out of forty-one education institutions whose governing boards are appointed by the Governor, in only five are the members of the boards removable at the pleasure of the Governor.

For the members to resign merely upon the request of the Governor sets a precedent which will defeat the purpose of the legislature. It would tend to put the University back into politics.38

Campbell's arguments, that the Board was a "continuing board" that should not be interfered with by the partisan leanings of the Governor, quickly found supporters among the other members of the Board.

Hunt responded sternly to John Campbell's refusal to resign. Hunt argued that when he left office in 1918, Thomas Campbell, then taking office as governor, requested the resignations of all of Hunt's appointees, and six of the eight resigned. The result was, when Hunt returned to office, a Board of Regents united, more or less, against him. Hunt, however, made his feelings towards John Campbell very clear in the letter: "However, the bitter partisanship manifested by you on previous occasions toward my administration does not leave me confident that I would receive your whole-hearted cooperation."39

Campbell denied this; "I have taken very little active part in partisan politics," he insisted. "You confuse my partisanship in certain law suits in which I have been counsel with active partisanship in party politics. I am of course a partisanship in any law suit in which I am engaged, but when that law suit is disposed
of my partisanship is ended." He concluded that although he had voted against Hunt, "the fact that you vote a different political ticket" should not prevent giving him "whole-hearted cooperation in the administration of the affairs of the University."  

Regent Lewis D. Ricketts had a similar correspondence with Hunt; Hunt demanded his resignation and Ricketts refused. A letter from Ricketts to Chancellor Campbell affirms the solidarity between the four remaining regents: "I do not see how we can possibly take any other stand than we have, and I believe we should all stand by our decision, but if we can in any way avoid friction and keep out personal feeling in the controversy I think it most desirable."  

Regent Estmer W. Hudson did not hide his resentment from Hunt at the request for his resignation. "If the Legislature in deference to your wishes or in its wisdom shall see fit to change the law, the situation will be entirely different, but at the present time, I see no reason why I should resign. In fact, I think there is every reason why I should not do so because my resignation, under these circumstances, would be tantamount to my becoming an accessory to the violation of the plain Statute of this State, so that this question becomes one of principal [sic.] and for this reason and this reason alone, I must decline to comply with your request."  

Hunt had succeeded at nothing except solidifying the opposition of the Board. The most immediate battle occurred that May when Hunt had John H. Campbell removed as Chancellor of the Board.  

Regent E.E. Ellinwood, a new appointee of Governor Hunt, appeared to be the governor's choice to replace Campbell. John Campbell confided in Judge Edmund W. Wells, the fourth remaining regent appointed by Thomas Campbell to the Board, his outrage at Hunt's intention to oust him as Chancellor of the Board. "It is proposed to elect Ellinwood to the position," Campbell wrote. "He suggested that I step aside in the interests of harmony. I clearly stated to him my position...that I do not think that the Board of Regents of the University is a political board. I do not think that the Governor has any right, as a member of that board, to dictate
who shall and who shall not be chancellor." Campbell, however, praised Ellinwood’s abilities, and wrote: “I have such a high regard for Ellinwood personally that I would gladly step aside that he might be chancellor were it not for the principal [sic.] involved.”

On May 31, 1923, Campbell received a telegram while he was on a business trip in Mexico telling him that Ellinwood had become the new Chancellor of the Board. On June 5, Campbell received a letter from former regent Dwight B. Heard. Heard wrote: “I believe the time has come for the Governor to understand that the Statutes of Arizona must be respected, and not subject to his individual prejudices or whims. The sooner this issue is made clear, the better, in my opinion, will it be for the State.”

The battle lines were very clearly drawn; these controversies were the prologue to the final battle between Hunt and the regents that would bring the collapse of a University administration and that would leave an enduring tension among Arizonans that would take many years to dissipate.

Marvin’s actions of consolidating power in the office of the president caused many to resent his personal control of the university administration. Under President von KleinSmid, the faculty was given a stake in the governing of the university through an appointed administrative committee and an elected judicial committee, a system that had been formalized in the 1921 faculty constitution.

The faculty constitution, historian Mary Huntington Abbott notes, was strongly protective of faculty members’ tenure, providing that teachers who were not to be reappointed must be given adequate warning. Professors were to be notified by November first of the previous year, assistant and associate professors by January first, and instructors by March first if they were not to be reappointed for the following year. On October 16, a little more than a month after taking office, Marvin called together a meeting of the administration to scrutinize the faculty and cut those who were no longer needed by the university. By this method, the “businesslike firing of eleven teachers,” though swift and, according to some, ruthless, Marvin was able to meet
the deadline.

Two of those who had been fired decided to appeal their case to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). A.E. Vinson, the professor of agricultural chemistry, and DeRosette Thomas, the professor of home economics asked for an investigation into their dismissals. In May 1924, Professor G.P. Adams of the University of California spent a week at the University of Arizona gathering information and interviewing teachers. In the AAUP report, published in November 1924, Marvin received much credit for his quick action in order to raise academic standards and fire of inadequate teachers.

The report affirmed Professor Thomas's dismissal, and likewise, found the evidence supporting Vinson's firing substantial. "He had been criticized by officials of the Department of Agriculture for slow progress of research reports. President von KleinSmid had scolded him for a poor attitude, no production and a reluctance to publish promised research," Abbott explained. However, the AAUP reported that the dismissal was not seen as warranted by a majority of Vinson's colleagues. The report concluded: "to have lost these services at the cost of so much bitterness" was "a serious blunder." The report, though agreeing with Marvin's decision, had reservations about his methods. He "had left the campus in a state of serious unrest and rife with rumor."46

The committee had also commented on the worthwhile accomplishments of the Marvin administration, such as the raising of the salary scale, the granting of sabbatical leave without the loss of salary increases, and the employment of some new professors of high repute, wrote Douglas Martin.47

According to a December press release of the AAUP, many of Vinson's colleagues believed that the copper interests of Arizona were to blame for his dismissal. Vinson had provided testimony in a suit arising from allegations that smelter fumes damaged agricultural crops, an accusation adverse to mining interests. The press release quotes the AAUP report, saying: "a university should be slow to dismiss any professor when that dismissal may be even remotely attributed to outside, pernicious
influence, and should prefer to retain a mediocre professor rather
than to give the appearance of molesting academic independence
and freedom.

The AAUP was chiefly concerned with the dismissals of
Thomas and Vinson, and the resignation of Professor Charles A.
Turrell of the Spanish Department. Thomas’s dismissal and
Turrell’s resignation came after long terms of service and were
caused by the sudden appointment of new department heads and
the reorganization of departments. The press release quotes the
report: “President Marvin’s decision, taken after a very short term
in office, was untactful and ill-advised, and ... it is largely
responsible for the disquiet and disaffection at present prevailing
among the faculty.” In regards to Vinson’s dismissal, the AAUP
felt that the flimsy charges against Vinson “were not sufficient to
offset his long and honorable period of service to the institution
and the state.”

The tense situation grew, when, on January 7, 1926, a
meeting of the deans ended with Lockwood alone standing up to
Marvin, as dean after dean praised the president for the progress
of the previous year. “In matters of honor,” Lockwood told Marvin,
“I cannot yield my convictions.” Lockwood refused to resign,
saying if Marvin wanted to oust him, he would have to dismiss him.

The deluge came several months later when the Rev. Ernest
Collard Tuthill, at the time forty-eight years old, persuaded the
Tucson Ministerial Association to investigate “morale” at the
university. When no results came out of the investigation by
spring, Tuthill attended a regents’ meeting on May 3, 1926 and
formally lodged charges against President Marvin, claiming Marvin
“has broken down the morale of the University of Arizona” through
his lies, his deceit, and his manipulation. The regents agreed to
begin an investigation of this and other complaints on May 11.

Many complaints were lodged against Marvin in a three-day
hearing by the Board of Regents which commenced on the
eleventh of May, some of the complaints more frivolous than
others.

One written testimony by one Paul W. Loucks, class of 1924,
claimed “three leading Faculty members of the University of
Arizona personally told me that they had practically no voice in matters concerning their work." Loucks sought a change in the required curriculum for Horticulture majors in the College of Agriculture to include a course of Advanced Plant Breeding. He claims that the chairman of the Curriculum Committee directed him to Marvin, who directed him back to the Curriculum Committee. Marvin initially refused to alter the curriculum. Loucks argued, "A man who specializes in a certain field of work, should know what is the best for students who wish to major in his line of work."\(^{50}\)

Similar charges, though appearing trivial, were attempting to prove that Marvin had violated the sacrosanct "laissez-faire" policy of the previous administrations, letting faculty members make important decisions about their own courses. When Marvin violated this unwritten rule, he was accused of meddling, of interfering in the business of those who knew better. Later in his career, he would meet the same charges from the faculty of the George Washington University.

In early April, Governor Hunt and other regents received a telegram from the major organized labor leaders in Arizona urging an "immediate and thorough investigation of the morale of University and Marvin’s responsibility therefor [sic.], to be held before the full board." The leaders of the Arizona State Federation of Labor, the Painters Local #596, the Tucson Building Trades Council, the American Federation of Labor, the carpenter’s union, and the bricklayer’s union had all signed the telegram. The example shows how, eventually, the investigation divided the citizens of Arizona.\(^{51}\)

One group of citizens were not divided in support of Dr. Marvin; all of the major newspapers were in favor of retaining Dr. Marvin as president of the University, with the exception of one, the short-lived Tucson Independent, a tabloid that appeared in the summer of 1926 and carried testimony in front-page stories from August to September, and, it is rumored, partially-owned by Lockwood. The other papers, including the Citizen, which ran a story a day, the Daily Star, Tucson's morning paper owned by Ralph Ellinwood, the son of Regent President E.E. Ellinwood, and
the *Arizona Republican*, owned by former University regent Dwight Heard, were supportive of Marvin’s position, and critical of Hunt’s. “The newspapers of the state were loud in their support of Marvin. There are huge volumes of scrapbooks covering the period in the University’s special collections and the clippings show that the editorial comment was unanimously pro-Marvin,” wrote Douglas Martin. “From the *Verde Copper News* and the *Miami Silver Belt News* to Bisbee and Douglas, the press was united.”

The *Citizen* had even gone so far as to nickname Lockwood “the Mad Dean,” saying: “During the long continued agitation the shadow of the ‘Mad Dean’ has lurked in the background, sinister and brooding.”

The transcripts published in the short-lived *Independent* as well as historian Mary Huntington Abbott’s research, published in 1982, give a comprehensive account of the three-day hearing of the Board of Regents.

At nine o’clock on the morning of Tuesday, May 11, hearings commenced in the president’s office, which was then situated in the agriculture building. Dr. Lockwood and the Rev. Mr. Tuthill represented the complainants; the administration designated as its advocates Dean Butler of the College of Mines and Dean John O. Creager of the College of Education. Members of the press, barred from the meeting, stood close to the door, their eavesdropping made easy by Tuthill’s booming voice. The outer room was full of witnesses: twenty-one faculty members from the Agriculture Department, two clergymen, twelve townsfolk, and twenty-five students....

For three days, the Board of Regents heard accusations against Marvin, many accusing him of lying, reckless judgment in the firing and hiring of faculty and in the reorganization of departments, and making the faculty fearful of job insecurity. The
charges ranged from Marvin's serving of tequila at a party during prohibition to more substantial charges of Marvin reneging on promises to job seekers that he would find them employment at the university. Marvin once claimed to have saved the university $40,000 in the reorganization of the departments; his critics claimed that the reorganization was in name only and that no money was saved.

Written testimony as well was presented to the regents, in addition to the oral testimony presented at the hearing. Such testimony was presented by J.H. Brown, the head of the Department of Agriculture, one of two departments in the College of Agriculture. On the reorganization of the departments, Brown wrote that Marvin was sincere in believing that the results were successful; similar plans were made in a number of various other colleges and universities across the nation. Marvin's goals were to eliminate "red tape," more closely supervise classroom instruction, and secure closer cooperation among the departments, all of which were facilitated by the cutting and merging of departments. However, Brown noted, "I have learned that the first and most important condition necessary for efficient work is a contented faculty. The form of organization is a secondary matter."

"The present tendency in the government of universities and colleges is toward democracy," Brown added, achieved through faculty committees and a constitution, and through student government. Marvin had, in one way or another, tampered with all of these, making his critics wary of his motives. "In small colleges and normal schools and secondary schools there may still remain some of the old monarchical system, but in the larger colleges and universities it has all but passed away. No president of a large university can properly function if he attempts to attend to minute details any more than a governor of a state or the president of a nation."54

Brown's criticism goes to the heart of the dispute between Marvin and his critics. As the Secretary of the Board of Regents, Cleve Van Dyke, noted, Marvin sought to make the University of Arizona a school that operated as a large business, open to
accepting public funds, growing wherever possible, and responsive to the desires of taxpayers. His critics, on the other hand, sought a school with a more democratic form of government, run by committees of faculty members, operating on student tuition, and cautious in campus expansion and building construction. Similar disputes had raged through college campuses nationwide, and certainly this was not the last time Marvin heard criticism that his control over a university administration was too tight, too dictatorial.

Perhaps as a prologue to later decades, an interesting footnote must be added. Although early school records do not include racial classifications, Marvin encountered almost no opposition when he formally instituted the segregation of classes. The first black graduate on record, Elgie Mike Batteau, received her bachelor's degree in 1935. Although she enrolled at the University of Arizona about five years after the conclusion of Marvin's presidency, the example serves to illustrate an important part of the long-term legacy of the Marvin administration.

While attending the university, Batteau was not permitted to live in the university dormitories or to eat at its lunch counters. In a 1991 interview with Nathan Gammage, three years before her death in 1994, Batteau recounted a particularly painful incident where she and another student wanted to buy a soda, but the attendant refused to serve them. When the manager came over, he said that for them, he charged five dollars per soda. For other students, he charged fifty cents. Batteau said she would pay for the soda no matter what the cost, and afterwards contacted her dean about the incident.55

Marvin's defense began June 1, 1926. A variety of Tucson businessmen, student leaders, and pro-Marvin faculty members testified on Marvin's behalf. Dean Gordon M. Butler of the College of Mines refuted the charges and spoke highly of Marvin: "I know him, respect him, and love him. Before the Ministerial Association made their charges, we never had better morale." Many of the others who were called upon to testify, including Butler, made note of Lockwood's history of obstructionism.
The second day, Dean Samuel Marks Fegly of the College of Law testified that the charges had not damaged Marvin's reputation as much as they had damaged the reputation of the University, “at whose heart the envenomed arrow has been striking.” At 9 p.m. on Saturday, June 5, the hearings ended and the meeting adjourned. Governor Hunt was not in attendance, and asked that no decisions be made until he had reviewed the transcripts. He was in no hurry to wade into politically divisive waters.

Regent President Ellinwood called a board meeting on July 17, 1926, the date when the board would decide the charges lodged against Marvin. Hunt was not in attendance, and asked them to postpone the meeting. The board declined to do so, and voted 5 to 3 to dismiss the charges against Marvin, 5 to 3 to suspend the faculty constitution and assume direct control of the university, and voted unanimously to reappoint all faculty except for eight, whose fates would be decided at a subsequent meeting. Those eight included Dr. Lockwood, President Marvin, five anti-Marvin faculty members, and one pro-Marvin faculty member, Coach J.F. McKale.

Hunt finally agreed to attend an August 7 meeting of the board to determine the fate of these eight. Not yet openly opposed to Marvin, Hunt had already decided that he must go. At the meeting, Hunt asked each of the eight, one by one, whether they would be willing to work together and settle the matter. Marvin, his supporter, and one of Lockwood’s, agreed that they could. Lockwood and the other four refused, and were granted sabbatical leave by the board. It seemed, as Mary Huntington Abbott wrote, “a semblance of peace was restored.”

On September 6, 1926, Governor Hunt soundly defeated Ellinwood in the Democratic gubernatorial primary, by a 2 to 1 margin of 39,000 votes cast. Hunt no longer had to conceal his animosity towards Marvin. He vowed to appoint two regents hostile to Marvin when two vacancies opened in January, so that a majority of the Board would be opposed to Marvin’s policies.56

The climax came on the afternoon of January 19, 1927.
Immediately following the appointment of Frank J. Crider to the Board, and the reappointment of Regent Theodora Marsh, Marvin and his supporters felt that they no longer had a voice on the Board. President Marvin, Regent President E.E. Ellinwood, Regent Secretary Cleve Van Dyke, and Regents John H. Campbell and John J. Corrigan submitted their resignations. Several deans at the University, including Anna Pearl Cooper, the Dean of Women, and Elmer Lacy Shirrell, the Dean of Men, followed them. Also, Frank Mann Life, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, who in July 1926 had been appointed to fill the position held by Lockwood, resigned as well. Lockwood was reappointed to his old position. Anna Pearl Cooper would follow Marvin to the George Washington University.57

“Recent changes in the personnel of the board of regents of the University of Arizona obviously establish a board which will be unsympathetic to the plans of the administration which I feel are vital and which render tenable the position of any president who accepts seriously the responsibilities of his position,” Marvin said, regarding his resignation.

Ellinwood said of his resignation: “You are aware that the discord and dissension which exists among some of the members of the board is real and irreconcilable.” He added, “A house divided against itself cannot stand.”57 The Arizona Daily Star praised Marvin’s accomplishments and stated that the University was now “a storm-torn ship at sea minus a pilot.”58

Marvin’s contributions to the University of Arizona are impressive: Between 1922 when he took office, and his 1927 resignation, the faculty had increased in number from 116 to 137, the student body had increased from 1,456 to 1,843, books in the library increased from 43,223 to 61,493, and the number of buildings increased from 21 to 23, plus the renovations of several others. These were impressive statistics for such a brief term of office.

The Board of Regents appointed Dr. Byron Cummings acting president with an advisory committee of various other faculty members. In September 1927, Cummings was formally made president, a position he held until the appointment of Dr. Homer
LeRoy Shantz in July 1928.⁵⁹

“The Marvin Affair,” as it had come to be called, left a community divided; labor leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, government officials, University faculty and students, and the daily newspapers had chosen sides, and were left with the bitterness that such a division within a small community left behind.

Within several months, Marvin would be appointed President of the George Washington University in Washington, DC, a position he would serve with distinction for the next third of a century.

“In my opinion he was a most dangerous man and we are better rid of such an octopus who would probably have brought ruin upon our university,” wrote Governor Hunt.

“You know him as well as I do, and I am afraid if he follows the same tactics in Washington that he did in Arizona, they will rue the day of his appointment.”⁶⁰
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2. The Early Years

The character of the George Washington University differed markedly from its counterpart in tertiary education in Tucson. The distinction was between urban and rural, between old money and new, and, not insignificantly, between private education and public. The George Washington University was humbler than Arizona in its origins, the brainchild of a devout Baptist missionary, Luther Rice.

Though it was blessed by its location and the great personalities who made appearances at its ceremonies, donated much needed funds, and expressed sincere faith in the University's future, it would be nearly a century before the survival of Columbian College, as it was then called, was guaranteed. Many times in that first hundred years the University nearly met its demise, by war, scandal, bankruptcy, depression, and mismanagement of funds. At one point, in the first decade of the twentieth century, the University was forced to sell its downtown properties and continue classes in a row of rented townhouses.

The Columbian College, from its inception in 1821 to 1873 when it became the Columbian University, became the George Washington University in 1904 after an intense lobbying effort by the George Washington Memorial Association to fulfill the first president's last will upon his death the vision of a great national university in the heart of the capital. Thus, the George Washington University was born, or more accurately, born again, from the noble but antiquated dream of the Columbian University.

It was a renaissance in more ways than simply a change of title. The charter, approved by Congress in 1821 was altered in 1904 to eschew the University's informal Baptist affiliation. This affiliation had become formal in 1898 with the hope of securing more funds from various Baptist societies and conventions. The gamble unfortunately did not pay off and the financial health of the
University continued its downward trend from disastrous to catastrophic. In 1904, the University began a new, nonsectarian future, with a new name and a new charter. Even now, however, the survival of the University was tenuous, and the financial situation was particularly precarious and growing more so.

The long and expansive presidential administrations of the innovative and dedicated George W. Samson (1859-1871) and the intelligent and scholarly James C. Welling (1871-1894) left an enduring and indelible mark upon GW. Those successes, however, were almost completely reversed under the short, tragic administrations of the Rev. Benaiah Whitman (1895-1900) and Charles W. Needham (1902-1910). Rightly known as the "dark ages" of GW history, Whitman and Needham saw income dry up and expenses escalate.

The situation deteriorated until 1910, when Rear Admiral Charles Stockton became the president of GW. Stockton, then 65 years old, commanded the *U.S.S. Kentucky* for the Union Navy during the Civil War. The expert on international law and former president of the Naval War College became president at a crucial time in the University's history. Widely credited with saving GW from ruin, Stockton did his best to cut expenses to the bone. He sold the university property at 15th and H Streets and moved the classrooms to rented residences, cut faculty salaries, raised tuition, served without compensation, and managed to balance the budget. As Historian Elmer Louis Kayser writes, "As the years of President Stockton's administration passed, anyone looking for the dramatic or the spectacular would have found instead the plain, the steady, and the prosaic. Therein was the president's greatness." 1

Stockton is responsible for the purchase of the property in Foggy Bottom that would, to this day, be the home of the George Washington University. From this seed, the University would expand in every direction under later administrations. With the end of World War One in sight, Stockton finally retired at age 73. His replacement was William Miller Collier, who served for three short years before being appointed Ambassador to Chile in 1921, the year of the University's centennial.
Collier (1918-1921) and his successor, William Mather Lewis (1923-1927), the tenth and eleventh presidents of the University, served short, but important terms, as they completed Stockton's goal of financially guaranteeing the survival of the University. The University was stable, well respected, and positioned for expansive and rapid growth. The 1927 election of Cloyd Heck Marvin, then only 38 years old, would achieve just that, but at a price.

The University of Arizona's history was just as traumatic as that of the George Washington University, but for a different reason. Where the Washington, DC university was hampered by a continuous lack of funds, the Tucson, Arizona university was hampered by a lack of students, and until the statehood of the territory, in 1912, no graduation class ever exceeded ten students. The first 17 years of Arizona's existence, beginning with the first class to enter in 1891, had classes composed mostly of high school students, since Arizona had few high schools prior to statehood. By the time Marvin took the reins at Arizona, the University had expanded very rapidly under his predecessor, Rufus Bernhard von KleinSmid, and the total number of students by 1922 had reached over 1400.\footnote{2}

Marvin left Arizona in January 1927, and took office at George Washington on August 1, 1927 after a unanimous vote by the Board of Trustees. Although probably the most qualified candidate ever elected to the presidency of GW to that time in terms of experience and education, he was not widely known among the Trustees. Kayser wrote that there were two deciding factors in Marvin's election: one, a group of faculty members chosen to represent the entire faculty favored the election of Marvin over another candidate; second, Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, provided a recommendation on his behalf.\footnote{3}

The Trustees immediately began searching for candidates after William Mather Lewis tendered his resignation. Lewis, who became president of Lafayette College for the next 18 years (1927-1945), is remembered, as Kayser notes, as "a speaker of
great ability and charm,” who was “able to carry the message of the institution far and wide.” Part of Lewis’s success at GW was a result of his ability; part, no doubt, was a result of his extensive connections in the business community. At Lewis’s inauguration, the beginning of his short, four-year term, delegates of 161 American and foreign colleges and universities were present, as well as a number of representatives of professional societies, religious congregations and organizations, and the federal government. The delegate of Yale University, for example, one of the renowned persons present at the inauguration, was William Howard Taft, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court and former U.S. President.

The period of George Washington University’s history beginning with President Stockton and ending with the Lewis administration marks an enormously successful growth spurt and reorganization after it had been so close to the brink of disaster. The university seemed poised for a tremendous expansion, in concrete as well as in prestige, if only it could have a president who was firm, innovative, and dedicated. Cloyd Heck Marvin was exactly that person.

On March 1, 1927, less than six weeks after Marvin’s inglorious resignation from the presidency at U of A, William Mather Lewis tendered his resignation as president of the George Washington University to the Board of Trustees, effective September 1, 1927. The Board commissioned a Special Committee on the Selection of the President, which issued its report on June 6.

At 2:30 p.m. on June 6, 1927, in Corcoran Hall, then only three years old, the Special Committee recommended to the Board of Trustees two names: Dr. Elliot H. Goodwin and Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin. On June 10, a Friday, the Board met to discuss the qualifications of the two candidates.5

On Monday, June 13, 1927, they voted. It appears from the minutes of the Board of Trustees that a recommendation by then-Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover in praise of Marvin proved to be the deciding factor.
[Trustee] Judge Parker was recognized by the chair and made a statement in high regard to his conversation over the long-distance telephone with Secretary Hoover. ... Judge Parker reported that Secretary Hoover spoke in high terms of commendation in regard to Dr. Marvin. Judge Parker further reported that he had a three-hour interview with Dr. Marvin and that he was convinced that Dr. Marvin is a man peculiarly well fitted for the position of President of the George Washington University.

Judge Parker then yielded the floor to [Trustee] Aspinwall who moved that the secretary be instructed to cast the unanimous vote of the Board of Trustees for Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin for President of George Washington University. This motion was seconded by [Trustee] Hertle and was unanimously carried. Thereupon the secretary cast the unanimous vote of the Board of Trustees for Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin as President of George Washington University and the presiding officer [Chairman Larner] declared Dr. Marvin duly elected. The election was declared to be effective September 1, 1927.

... Dr. Marvin arrived at this point in the proceedings and Chairman Larner formally notified him that the Board of Trustees had unanimously elected him to be President of George Washington University. Dr. Marvin in his acceptance set forth in brief his vision for the future of the University, his general policies and the need for active and sympathetic cooperation on the part of the Board of Trustees, the faculty, and student body.6

Less than six months after his departure from the University of Arizona, Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin, then thirty-eight years old, became president of the George Washington University.
Dr. Elmer Louis Kayser, who came to GW as a student in 1914 and later as professor, dean, Secretary of the University, and historian until his death in 1985, recounts the early Marvin years in an oral history interview. Kayser's long period of service at George Washington makes him one of the most influential men in the school's history, leaving a legacy of leadership, scholarship, and dedication.

According to Kayser, in the spring of 1927, the Board of Trustees had two nominees for the office of president, one of whom was not accepted because of opposition among the faculty. The other had tentatively accepted and even spent a week at GW “going over details and that sort of thing.” He was, at the time, one of the most respected people in the field of higher education, Henry Suzzallo, the President of the University of Washington, Seattle.

A preeminent education theorist and administrator, Suzzallo, not unlike Marvin, had a very difficult time with the state legislature, since the University of Washington, like Arizona, receives both funds and direction from the legislature. The friction reached a climax when Suzzallo simply resigned. The Board of Trustees immediately got in touch with him and persuaded him to come to GW for a week.

Kayser admits, “I was tremendously impressed because he knew the educational process so well that you could start a thing and he could finish it for you. He would know exactly where it was going and what the possibilities were.”

Suzzallo, however, was elected President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. He was forced to turn down the presidency of GW in what Kayser believed to be one of the greatest missed opportunities in GW’s history.

The timing had left the university in a state of crisis because the 1926-1927 school year was ending and summer vacation was beginning, and still no president had been chosen.

The events of Arizona came into the picture, however, as the Marvin administration came to a close in Tucson. Kayser commented on Marvin’s brief U of A administration: “The reason, I think, why Marvin had had all that trouble was, in the first place, he
was young, willful and inexperienced. They had been used to the charming, easy ways of Dr. Rufus von [KleinSmid]. When Marvin came—spit-and-polish, sort of a meticulous, self-willed individual—I've always felt that the contrast was too much for the University of Arizona to take."

It so happened that one of the members of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Charles Ribor Mann, was particularly well connected. A war veteran, Dr. Mann had been one of the founders and the director of the American Council on Education. Kayser described the Council as a sort of "employment bureau for out-of-work college presidents," because the Council is composed largely of current and former college administrators. Through this organization, Mann met Dr. Marvin.

Mann persuaded the Trustees to give Marvin an interview, and the former U of A president traveled to Washington, DC. The Board elected him immediately, without going through the usual preliminaries. Part of the motivation was that Dean Howard Hodgkins had been acting president three times now: after President Stockton retired, after President Collier was appointed to an ambassadorship, and after President Lewis resigned, and was, by this time, an old man. The Trustees wanted a president before the start of the 1927-1928 academic year. They searched, and they found Cloyd Heck Marvin.

Kayser briefly mentions the other nominee, Elliot Goodwin, but does not mention Goodwin by name. He was opposed by a faculty committee, who felt Goodwin was "an administrator of a most arbitrary mood; a perfect czar, whose main asset it was thought by many, was an honored name." Although the faculty ended up with a czar—one without an honored name—"they also got a man of a great deal of ability. In the other case they would not have. Marvin was a man of amazing ability and the Marvin who came here was not the Marvin who left here, a generation later. Men change. Some become more flexible, and some become intensely inflexible."

"None of us knew him at all because he was an utter unknown in the East here," Kayser recalled, noting that only the Journal of the American Association of University Professors had
provided any significant reference whatsoever to Marvin's previous administration—and the AAUP had been extremely critical of him.

Kayser and the old Dean Hodgkins went to congratulate Marvin on his election. After the initial first meeting, Dean Hodgkins, the acting president, told Kayser, “I think he looks young enough to be trained.” To Kayser, that represented the appraisal of the oldest and wisest mind that the University had.

But Marvin was too determined a man to be trained by others; “that colt had never been broken,” Kayser surmised. He also had a way of “rearranging facts,” an old criticism of Marvin stated in more eloquent words.

One of the most insightful anecdotes that Kayser provides about Marvin’s early years at GW concerns Marvin’s decision to repaint the high walls of his office, then in an old house where Strong Hall stands today, on the corner of 21st and G Streets. With the scaffolding and long ladders, it took most of the summer of 1927 to repaint.

Well, he began. He’d lay on one coat. It wouldn’t suit him. He’d lay on another coat. He’d lay on another coat. And when the coats got to be rather heavy—winter weight overcoat, I should think—he then began to describe it as “stippled.” Well, he continued to lay on and stipple and ripple and dipple, and suddenly there emerged a most extraordinary synthetic color which, reduced to its most conservative terms, produced the general tone and general shade of what came to be known as “Marvin Green.” As time marched on, all the interiors came to be painted in Marvin Green, which he actually had mixed up specially and labeled and was commercially available as Marvin Green because we used so much. Anyway, that gives you a picture of the man.

Kayser recalled “Marvin Green” with intense affection. “I am very fond of it, and always hope I have at least one room of it around me as long as I live, for this reason: while it’s long since
been forgotten, he built this thing up by a strange amalgam of colors, one on top of another. And it is peculiarly free of clashes with almost any color, and therefore it was an ideal color. It's neither too warm nor too cold."

Marvin rejected, fairly early in his administration, the plan of his predecessors to limit the University to one city block, drawing up his own plans to expand as much as possible. He rather disliked the old red brick buildings with white trim, a very traditional New England type of architecture. But Marvin was a “Buckeye who had gone West and lived his life bemoaning the fact that he was not a native son of the Golden West, but doing everything he could to appear that way.”

Although the plan to develop the university within Square 108, a single city block, was originally constructed by Marvin’s predecessors and had been implemented with a great deal of forethought, Marvin thought it was “too restrictive” and could hinder the development of a university then poised for greater expansion.

Marvin, supported by large donations from Mrs. Henry Alvah Strong and the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, was able to build Strong Hall, an all-female dorm hall, and the Hall of Government, respectively. The first residence hall, funded by a wealthy woman whose husband made money in both mining and in Kodak cameras, was the first major building to be constructed outside of the Square, at the corner of G and 20th Streets. The second building was funded from a million dollar grant from the Freemasons, concerned that Georgetown’s School of Foreign Service was the only training for the foreign service officers of the State Department. The fact that a Catholic institution could have so much sway over American foreign policy was intolerable to the Freemasons.

Marvin’s reorganization of the departments was meant to streamline curricula and prevent duplication. The Department of Political Science, for example, taught a course called “Europe Since 1915,” a comparable class to another taught in the History Department. This was a very “statesmanlike” thing to do, Kayser recalled; “the curriculum was clogged with that sort of thing.”
Marvin divided all of the departments up into “divisions,” of which there were four; each division had a special committee formed who would organize the departments in a more logical manner than had previously been the case. Kayser served on one of those committees, and helped clean up that which the departments never would have agreed upon independently. As Kayser noted, Marvin was able to get many otherwise unpopular initiatives passed because he was on his “honeymoon.”

In 1928 and 1929, Kayser went on a full year sabbatical leave, during which time the position he held, Secretary of the University, was abolished. He had academic tenure and “could not be disposed of,” as he put it, so he was given a rather unique position that was created solely for him, the dean of the Division of University Students, the administrative unit comprised of non-degree seeking students at George Washington. While “administrative efforts were made progressively to hamper it,” Kayser recalled, by the time he retired, long after Marvin’s retirement, the Division was the largest academic unit of the University.7

Amid the great fanfare of Marvin’s election to the presidency, he unveiled plans calling for rapid expansion of the university and the reorganization of the departments, much as he had done in his first year in office at Arizona. Like his previous administration, Marvin would encounter a great deal of faculty opposition to his efforts at reorganization during his early years.

Not all were pleased with the new president. Perhaps the most interesting, and critical, account of Marvin’s first years as president was that of Evelyn Jones Kirmse. A dedicated critic of Marvin’s style, Kirmse was an assistant to the registrar, secretary to the dean of women, assistant dean of women, and editor of the course catalogue over the course of five years, from 1924 to 1929. In 1929, Kirmse left the George Washington University for a position, ironically, at the University of Arizona, where she became dean of women and assistant professor of education until 1942, and holding a variety of other positions at U.A. into the 1980s.

When she arrived in Tucson in 1929, Kirmse quickly learned
that “the ashes from the fire of discord surrounding Marvin were still hot—that remnants of division existed still within both town and gown.” For many years to come, the residents of Tucson still talked about the incident that had awakened a sleepy western town, an incident that had divided the state in the most bitter partisan battle of Arizona in the twenties.

The fact that Marvin served more than thirty years as president of the George Washington University was claimed as evidence among his proponents back in Arizona that Marvin was an able administrator who had been misjudged and unfairly maligned by partisans who would stop at nothing to ruin him. Kirmse refutes this argument, claiming that, although Marvin served GW with distinction for a third of a century, he nonetheless failed to learn his lesson after his bitter Arizona experience.

“A private institution,” Kirmse argues, “[the] George Washington University is governed by a self-perpetuating board of trustees; the board’s only democratic input in Marvin’s time being the periodic election by the alumni of their own representative. The institution owes no responsibility to the general public nor to any governmental unit.” She continues, “Marvin himself legally owed allegiance only to the trustees.”

By drawing the distinction between the composition of the Board of Regents at the University of Arizona and the Board of Trustees at the George Washington University, Kirmse underscores the major difference between the two Marvin administrations: one was accountable to the public, since the regents were appointed by the governor and ratified by the legislature, and the other was accountable only to itself, and was very much an exclusive club.

“Regents appointed by the governor recognize responsibility to the people of the state,” Kirmse said in a 1984 interview. If questions arise over the wisdom of a particular president’s policies, an outlet exists for the redress of grievances in the Arizona model. At GW, as the Marvin years will inevitably illustrate, Dr. Marvin retained nearly absolute, personal control over all of the university’s functions, because only the trustees had the authority to second-guess the president, an action seldom
Marvin claimed the Arizona debacle was simply about politics, and not about the feasibility of his policies or public discontent with his administration. Certainly, Kirmse argues, the incident was "more than lightly tinged by political considerations." Chairman Ellinwood and Governor Hunt, Kirmse noted, were bitter political enemies in the years before the gubernatorial election of 1926. At Arizona's 1910 Constitutional Convention, Ellinwood refused to sign the proposed constitution carrying Hunt's stamp of progressivism. Ellinwood was, above all, a lawyer representing mining interests, and Hunt was a mortal enemy of the mining industry.

"Although politics might well have influenced both Hunt and Ellinwood in their reactions to Marvin, Marvin's own questionable actions set the stage for the confrontation. They came to light because in Arizona his victims, unlike those in Washington, had an outlet for official complaint," Kirmse said, affirming the notion that in Washington, Marvin was almost entirely insulated from accountability. As his later years would show, the only way, it seemed, for the student body to protest the actions of the administration successfully was to mobilize and publicly demonstrate.

The waves of student strikes that crippled the George Washington University administration in the 1960s may have been, at least indirectly, the result of years of what was construed as repression under Marvin—years of censorship of the student press, seemingly arbitrary changes in personnel, prohibitions on liberal activist groups and liberal student protests, alleged restrictions on the enrollment of Jewish students, and a variety of other policies that are very questionable in hindsight. In Kirmse's opinion, this "repression" occurred because there were no checks and balances on the presidential authority at GW.

She takes a strong stand: "Marvin's own attitude and administrative practices—not Arizona politics—engendered the situation, the most traumatic in the history of the University of Arizona." Those who testified against Marvin in Tucson were of the highest reputation and stuck to the absolute truth without
regard to bias.

When Marvin succeeded Lewis at GW, faculty gossip spread that he had given the name of Herbert Hoover, Coolidge’s Secretary of Commerce with ties to Stanford University, as a principal reference. “It was reported later that Hoover, when asked about Marvin, had replied he had never heard of him. Marvin habitually referred to his Harvard doctorate in business administration—but not to the fact that his thesis dealt not with...administration, but with teaching business subjects in high school,” Kirmse notes, skeptical.

“Marvin arrived at George Washington University in the middle of the summer of 1927 to face a nervous faculty. All at George Washington University, familiar with Marvin’s record, were skeptical of the trustees’ choice,” she firmly states. Their fears were soon justified, she adds, because immediately Marvin began instituting abrupt and arbitrary administrative and academic changes, much as he had done at Arizona in 1922.

Linda Jane Kincannon, the assistant registrar, was the first victim. According to Kirmse, Kincannon, a veteran of seven years, possessed “a strong professional attitude [and] was operating to the complete satisfaction of all concerned in handling admissions, evaluations for degrees, general record keeping, and all other matters then the responsibility of college registrars.” Shortly after taking office, Marvin apparently announced to her, without warning and without securing an evaluation of her performance, that he was appointing a new registrar and she would be demoted. The position went to a male faculty member with no experience.

According to the University Hatchet, the student newspaper, Kincannon resigned in March 1929, to take a new position at Columbia University. “I have only the greatest love for George Washington and its faculty and students,” Kincannon told the paper; “but despite my interest in the University, I felt that I must accept the greater opportunity offered to me.”

A Hatchet editorial proclaimed: “We, as the student body, regret the loss of Miss Kincannon and feel that a place will be empty in the hearts of the students of George Washington which will remain unfilled. No doubt of Miss Kincannon’s success in her
future work can be entertained and we hope that she will enjoy her new position as much as the University appreciates her service and friendship in the past.”

In addition to forcing staff members out of their positions, Marvin also brought some professors with him from Arizona who had aligned on his side during the controversy and who left their positions at the same time he did. One of them, his secretary, Myrna Sedgewick, displaced the incumbent secretary who was shifted to another department; Sedgewick received a “much higher salary.”

Even Kirmse agrees that a rearrangement of the staff often accompanies a change in the executive, particularly for secretaries to the president in whom he must have a great deal of loyalty. However, the case of Anna Pearl Cooper, Kirmse argues, was much more serious an offense.

The dean of women at Arizona, Cooper sided openly with Marvin, and, as one might expect, her contract with the university had not been renewed either as dean or as assistant professor of English.

At the time, Anna L. Rose was the dean of women at GW. According to Kirmse, she was pursuing doctoral studies in education and psychology at Columbia University. She was never comfortable with Marvin, as he was always nitpicking and harassing her. She asked permission to leave, believing that her career at GW offered little, and she accepted a position at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The Hatchet wrote, in her support, “the University is losing one who has done much to further everything connected with the women students of the college.” Adding, “[an] alumna of GW, she has taken a deep interest in the University and her resignation will be personally regretted by the many who have learned to know and admire her.”

Marvin immediately asked the trustees to approve Anna Pearl Cooper as Anna Rose’s replacement as dean of women. For once, a backlash occurred against Marvin among the trustees: the alumna trustee (alumni are permitted to elect a representative on the board of trustees), Jessie Fant Evans, the only woman on the
board, persuaded her colleagues that Cooper, at age 55, was too old to begin a new position in a new environment. Evans believed, essentially, that Dean Rose was being forced out.

Evans was herself an important and influential character in the history of the George Washington University. Viewed as a notable link between the Board of Trustees, the alumni, the faculty, and the students, her experience as teacher, women's advocate, journalist, and civic leader gave the Board an alternative viewpoint. She secured frequent and generous contributions from female alumnae, was dedicated and thoughtful in her work, and even when her son, a George Washington student, was killed in an automobile accident at age 22, she did not lose her vision, serving as an alumni Trustee, a charter Trustee, and finally as an honorary Trustee.

Marvin did not give up. He ordered Professor Dewitt Clinton Croissant, head of the English Department, to assign Cooper to teach drama. Croissant protested, because Cooper was not academically qualified to become an associate professor. Dr. Croissant believed that Dr. Robert Bolwell, an acknowledged drama scholar, fulfilled all the needs of his small department. Marvin suggested Bolwell teach American Literature, a class Croissant himself taught.

"Miss Cooper's background in no way matched the qualifications of these men, removed from their assignments to provide a berth for her. Nevertheless, Dr. Marvin's orders held, and a reorganization of the department followed," Kirmse said.¹⁴

It must be added that much of Kirmse's criticisms of Anna Pearl Cooper may be unfair. Cooper had tremendous educational experience in her career, according to the Hatchet. She was head of the English department and dean of women at Occidental College, professor of English and dean of women at Beloit College, professor of English and dean of women at the University of Arizona; she had taught at the University of Chicago, had done graduate work at Columbia University and the University of Chicago, and had graduated from Colorado College and Stanford University. She was also a member of the Shakespeare Club of America and the Modern Language Association.
Her specialties were the Elizabethan and Victorian periods; sure enough, she was teaching Elizabethan and Renaissance literature when the spring term of 1930 began. The Hatchet confirms that Bolwell began teaching the American Literature courses.15

Evelyn Jones Kirmse was moved from her position as assistant dean of women to editor of the catalogue of courses. Ostensibly a two-week job, it took her six months. Department heads, Kirmse said, submitted a copy of the courses in their departments to be included in the catalogue. However, the copies were not returned to the department heads after Marvin made his extensive changes. He changed course numbers, sequences, and content descriptions. In Kirmse's words:

I recall two instances vividly. Professor Lowell Ragatz offered a course in European History, which he had entitled "Europe Since 1815." I was present in Marvin's office when Ragatz was called in and told to change the title to "Europe Since Waterloo"—seemingly an insignificant change. But Ragatz was livid, insisting rightly that Dr. Marvin was not teaching the course, had no idea of its content, and was moreover usurping the instructor's academic freedom.

A second fracas which I also witnessed concerned copy for the College of Medicine. Marvin rewrote much of it, sent it to the printer and [when it arrived], he summoned the Dean and Registrar of the Medical School and two other medical faculty members. So agitated did the elderly dean become when he saw what had been done with his catalogue material, I feared he would succumb to apoplexy. A stormy session resulted in few changes, because the dean held his ground.

Kirmse also alleges in her interview that Marvin played games with the truth. She cites "two examples among many." In 58 .
the late 1920s, the George Washington University was not fully accredited by the American Association of University Women. Dr. Marvin assured Kirmse that the A.A.U.W. would accredit GW soon, as he had personally been successful in accomplishing such accreditation in Arizona, and would do likewise in Washington. When Kirmse began her work in Arizona, however, one of the first items on President Shantz’s agenda was to secure accreditation to the A.A.U.W., because the University of Arizona had not yet been accredited.

She further claims that, despite the efforts of Professor Croissant and other individuals to secure an endowment from the Freemasons to establish the School of Government long before Marvin arrived, the circumstances of which will be described in detail below, he took full credit for the donation. There is evidence in the papers of GW President William Mather Lewis, Marvin’s predecessor, that the Mason donation was on its way before Marvin ever came to GW.

Marvin abolished the office of dean of women when Dean Rose left, and, in its place, created an appointed position that no longer had the rank and influence of deanship. Kirmse felt that, as assistant dean of women, there was no longer a place for her at the George Washington University in her field. She began looking for another job, and Professor Croissant is the one who directed her to Arizona.

She concludes her interview with a final, scathing view of Marvin:

I applied and was appointed Dean of Women here [University of Arizona] in 1929. By then most of my colleagues at George Washington University were disgruntled with the new regime. Hardly a department had not been upset in some fashion by Marvin’s manipulations, his carelessness with the truth, his arbitrary attitude and his disregard for academic courtesy. They were delighted in the irony of my leaving for Arizona—of all places!

The first years of Marvin’s regime almost
completely destroyed what confidence and hope the George Washington University staff had in him. But as time passed, obviously, he administered with less friction, while using his authority to win many critics to his support. He found friends to raise salaries for all; he scattered promotions among the opposition; he courted those elements beyond the University [that] could best serve his personal goals—and gains.

But even so, if Marvin repeated at George Washington University the attitudes leading to his downfall at Arizona, why did he last? Simply because in such a different situation, with no responsibility to the public, he could manipulate successfully—even his trustees. He could and did court sources of power and prestige. He found himself in a situation ready made for growth in enrollment. The institution had for years maintained a class schedule making it possible for employees of the federal government to carry degree programs identical with those of full-time day students, and the number of such students enrolling swelled. He was able to mollify faculty with pay increases, and to find endowment funds. At retirement he left the institution a better University than he had found it in 1927, yet those who suffered under his leadership until their own retirement, even while recognizing his accomplishments, never respected him nor trusted him.16

At the George Washington University, Evelyn Jones Kirmse was assistant to the Registrar (1923-1924), secretary to the Dean of Women (1924-1925), Assistant Dean of Women (1925-1928), and Catalogue Editor (1928-1929).

At the University of Arizona, she was Dean of Women and Assistant Professor of Education (1929-1942), member of the Arizona Board of Regents (1951-1959), Lecturer in English (1960-1973), and Assistant to the President as Historian (1973-1984).
With Charles Lindbergh's flight from Washington, DC to New York City dominating the front page of The Washington Daily News, Cloyd Heck Marvin's election to the presidency of George Washington was tucked away on the bottom corner of the front page. “In my opinion the function of a university is to provide the proper educational environment for its students,” Dr. Marvin said. “Its faculty should be such as to insure that environment, freed from anything that would lead to the contrary.

“This is my ideal for George Washington, as for all universities.” Building that university became his primary goal.

Within a few months, and with a little help from friends, Marvin began the long expansion of the University in the Nation's Capitol. Not long after Marvin took over as president in September 1927, the wheels began spinning as support for the University came from a unique and enthusiastic source: the Freemasons.

The relationship between Dr. Marvin and the Freemasons reached fruition during his presidency at the George Washington University, but by no means did it begin there. Marvin's defenders at the University of Arizona included many freemasons, especially Gordon M. Butler, the dean of the College of Mines and Engineering and the director of the Arizona Bureau of Mines.

Butler considered himself a “confidant and intimate friend” of Marvin's, writing to Harry A. Drachman, the Deputy of the Supreme Council in Arizona, that “in no case was the opposition to him due to a credible motive, and the reasons for this opposition were in most instances despicable.”

Butler wrote that he attended every session of the impeachment hearings, concluding that the whole thing was “a farce, and that not a single charge was proven by the opposition.” He praised Marvin for not permitting the institution “to be made a part of the Governor's political machine.” Marvin's enemies who sought to ruin the University of Arizona succeeded only in dividing the community. The Tucson Ministerial Association, the organization that instigated the investigations of Marvin, was itself divided; the Baptist Church, the largest Protestant congregation in
Tucson, was not a member, and the second largest congregation, the Presbyterian church, withdrew after the Association’s attempt to drive Marvin out of office. The Congregational Church, the third in size, refused to join the Association’s prosecution, and succumbed to a shrinking congregation as people left the church.

The wounds were deep, and they had not healed. About a hundred witnesses appeared on Marvin’s behalf during the impeachment trials, Butler wrote, and not more than half a dozen appeared against him. While this is no doubt an exaggeration, Butler insists that the community was firmly on Marvin’s side. Marvin “did more for the institution in the short time that he was here than all the other Presidents have ever accomplished, and placed it among the highest ranking American Universities.”

Marvin’s enemies, his “persecutors,” were still harassing Marvin even at his new position at George Washington. Butler alleged that disgruntled Arizonans had attempted to prevent his attaining a membership at the Cosmos Club in Washington.

“Dr. Marvin is a wonderful man of tremendous energy and ability. I know that he is the soul of honor, and George Washington University is extremely fortunate in having him as its President. That institution will undoubtedly go far under him,” Butler concluded.

Harry Drachman received the letter from Butler on February 8, 1928, the same day that he in turn wrote one to John H. Cowles, the Sovereign Grand Commander of the Supreme Council of the Thirty-Third and Last Degree of the Southern Jurisdiction of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, headquartered in Washington, DC. Drachman was the highest Mason in Arizona and a member of the Supreme Council, and, like Butler, a staunch pro-Marvin supporter.

Both Drachman and Butler were attempting to persuade Cowles not to give the reports of the controversy in Arizona any credence, and to continue to have full faith in Marvin’s five-month old presidency at George Washington. Cowles had recently heard of Marvin’s difficult administration in Tucson and had read several unfavorable articles about the youthful president in the newspapers. Drachman cited Butler’s letter several times, even
plagiarizing some paragraphs, referring especially to Butler’s assertions that the hearing was a disgraceful and unfounded personal attack on Marvin’s presidency.\textsuperscript{19}

The truth was that Cowles had a greater plan for George Washington University, and knew that Marvin would be very supportive. He had earlier told Drachman the plan was “absolutely confidential.”\textsuperscript{20}

The Masons had become specifically interested in the need for a properly trained foreign service. The only university that formally offered such training was Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service. Cowles and others were aroused that such an important part of the training of future diplomats was offered through a church-related institution, namely a Catholic university in the Jesuit tradition.\textsuperscript{21}

In a written letter to Drachman, Cowles described his intentions in this way: “The responsibility rests largely from the fact that such a school [of foreign service] is sadly needed here in Washington, as there is only one in United States of the same nature that I know of and that is the one at Georgetown University that is conducted by the Jesuits.”\textsuperscript{22}

This plan was in the works before the George Washington University had ever heard the name Cloyd Heck Marvin. Professor DeWitt Clinton Croissant of the Department of English was a leading figure in stimulating the interest of the Masons in assisting the establishment of the new school, a prominent Mason himself.

In 1898, the Department of Comparative Jurisprudence and Diplomacy opened. The school combined degrees in law and degrees in diplomacy. Although the school was hampered by the lack of adequate funds almost from its opening, it remained immensely popular among students and was held in high importance by the university administration under Presidents Whitman and Needham. The school was “a marked financial drain on the whole institution,” Kayser writes.

The school was changed to the Department of Politics and Diplomacy in 1905, and the law courses were reassigned to the law school. Two years later the school was abridged and became
the College of Political Sciences, assigned to the Department of Arts and Sciences. In 1910, the school did not survive the reorganization of the institution, hampered as it was by lack of funds.\footnote{23}

This was the background to the Masons' decision to assist GW financially with the building of a School of Foreign Service. The Education Foundation run by the Masons was so confident in the ability to raise funds for the new school, that in September 1926, their official publication announced the likely opening of a School of Foreign Service in the George Washington University.

The foundation was not able to raise the massive funds for the building of the new school, but brought the attention of the greater Masonic community around the country. A year later, Marvin's young administration received a stunning donation: a one million dollar gift to the George Washington University from the Supreme Council of the Southern Jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, with John Henry Cowles as Sovereign Grand Commander.\footnote{24} The Board of Trustees approved the gift on December 28, 1927. This generous gift made possible the School of Government, established the following year.

The gift had one curious condition, however: the gift would revert if the University ever became a sectarian school, like Georgetown. The irony of this is that GW was founded by prominent Baptists and carried an informal, and later a formal, Baptist affiliation through most of the first century of its existence.

Although modern Masonry is neither anti-Catholic nor xenophobic, the Freemasons in this era were widely seen as both; the Catholic Church discouraged its members from joining. In fact, the GW Masonic Club handbook warned that the "Roman Catholic Church, with impressive zeal, is endeavoring to increase the facilities for higher education in the District of Columbia."\footnote{25}

The front page of The Evening Star heralded the donation, announcing that new courses in the School of Government would begin in the autumn of 1928. "The money will become available at once," the paper reported. "Not only is this gift the largest ever received by George Washington, but it is among the largest ever made to a local educational institution."\footnote{26}
The *University Hatchet*, the student newspaper, ran the headline: “Million Is Given to G.W.” Not even Marvin’s election to the presidency elicited such a large headline. Most appropriately, the donation was made in the honor of “George Washington, the Mason,” inducted into the organization in 1751. An editorial accompanied the announcement. “A cool million. It is a lot of money,” the editors asserted. “It is almost beyond the power of one unaccustomed to wealth to conceive. And it is a very large sum for any institution to receive, especially in one lump.

“After well over one hundred years, the will of George Washington is at last fulfilled, and the bequest paid.”

The Masons would have a continuing impact on many activities at George Washington during the Marvin era and beyond. Later in 1928, the National League of Masonic Clubs endowed two chairs in the School of Government, the chair of International Affairs and the chair of Accounting. “These endowments are due largely to the yeoman service of Lynn H. Troutman, Past President of the National League of Masonic Clubs and Professor DeWitt Croissant of this University,” *The Hatchet* reported. “George Washington University is the sole college in the United States to be thus endowed, and similar endowments for G.W.U. alone are planned for the future.”

From 1927 until the mid-1980s, the Grand Commander of the Scottish Rite of Freemasons served on the Board of Trustees of The George Washington University. Cowles was the first to hold the position. The Freemasons have also sponsored scholarships to GW students, including the Scottish Rite Fellowships and the Wolcott Fellowships.

With the tremendous prestige brought to the University with the Masonic donation and the establishment of the School of Government, Marvin achieved celebrity status in the eyes of many. He operated with a legitimacy that few of his predecessors had, as the University, at one time in the most dire of financial straits, was now on firm financial footing. Even the Great Depression, the greatest effects of which would be felt worldwide in the next three or four years, could not erase that legitimacy as Marvin continued to enjoy a more secure financial situation than many other college
presidents nationwide. However, slowly, that legitimacy began to
disappear in the eyes of many, picked away a tiny piece at a time,
but not because of economic difficulties. Marvin's heavy-handed
administrative policies were the culprit, and they left a long list of
victims in their wake.
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3. The Turbulent Decade
The Marvin administration during the 1930s

For the majority of the George Washington University community, campus life was quiet and sleepy, like a giant animal hibernating through the winter. Sports and student organizations dominated campus politics, and university life revolved solely around fraternities and sororities. The majority of the student body was employed and only attended late-afternoon classes, and many commuted from home. Campus life may have disappeared altogether at the University had the fraternity system not been so strong; the Greek letter societies kept social activities alive, and most of the leadership for student publications and athletics came from the fraternities and sororities. Once in a while, a group of students might petition for a redress of grievances, but never before had students demanded accountability from the administration, protested in large numbers, or taken up causes, banners, or ideologies.

On history’s calendar, the eve of spring had arrived, and the University would be shaken from its peaceful slumber by a shocking scandal that spiraled out of control as students, faculty, and alumni confronted the administration in what was, perhaps, the most significant event in the University’s history. On this date was born a revolution, one that would evolve into the great student activist movements of later decades idolized by history and still influential today.

Like other revolutions in history, this one did not arise overnight. For almost two decades, a new breed of students slowly came into existence. They were a minority, to be sure, but over time their ranks grew, composed of students who valued campus life so much that they were willing to risk everything, even their own educations, to make their voices heard. No longer did students come to GW with the intention of simply getting a degree.
At universities around the country, students began challenging the established norms of the elite and the powerful, the autocratic rulers who ran higher education. It was an experiment in democracy, a challenge to the long-held belief that one should defer judgment to a higher authority. It was a mortal threat to the Marvin Doctrine, the promise of efficiency and "assembly-line" education.

The low rumblings of student dissent were heard in the mid-1920s when a student published the campus newspaper *Sour Grapes*. Appearing on December 12, 1923, the paper espoused conspiracy theories among the faculty and criticized student politicians, fraternity life, most student activities, and the educational system in general. The same student wrote *The Lash* three years later, targeting GW President William Mather Lewis. "Caesar has his Brutus, Charles Stuart his Cromwell, George the Third his Washington, Harding his liquor, and Lewis his Lash." The paper was a form of protest, well written and full of irony, sarcasm, and humor in the numerous attacks on the university establishment. But the ideas espoused in the two papers had not yet reached their time, and the pleas for student revolt only attracted a handful of followers.

The long-established publications began to grow bolder; *The University Hatchet*, in existence since 1904, began investigating stories instead of simply reporting on them. What used to be a simple newsletter of campus events, speakers, personnel changes, alumni news, and sports events slowly began to take up causes, writing meaningful editorials and advocating for the student body as a whole. From time to time the *Hatchet* supported a new activity or program on behalf of the student body, even, at times, overstepping its bounds. In 1933, President Cloyd Heck Marvin found an article in *The Hatchet Literary Supplement* immoral, and the *Supplement* never appeared again.

Indeed, Marvin's ascendancy to the office of president at GW ruffled feathers among faculty members who resented his heavy-handed policies. Dozens of professors from a wide array of departments filed appeals with the American Association of University Professors, the same organization that investigated
complaints against the Marvin administration at the University of Arizona. The AAUP investigates violations of faculty tenure, that is, if a teacher is dismissed in violation of contract, and academic freedom, if a teacher is fired or targeted because of his or her political beliefs or the content that he or she teaches in the classroom. The AAUP blacklists universities, and occasionally censures universities for repeated violations.

The professors alleged that Marvin had mishandled the truth, misled his colleagues, or outright lied. Many had their careers ruined for very minor reasons, if any reason was given. The Great Depression, to Marvin’s credit, had little effect on the University, and Marvin always prided himself on never having to cut teachers’ salaries as so many other universities had done. In such economic desperation as the country was in, it is perhaps a credit to Marvin that operations continued so smoothly; a swift application of the Marvin Doctrine, advantaging the hard sciences, law, business courses, economics, and similar fields at the disadvantage of the arts, literature, English, history, and other fields, made the University more “efficient,” more “business-like,” to use Marvin’s catch phrases. While other universities were forced to contract during the Depression, GW was expanding at the most rapid rate in its history.

This progress, of course, created dissent, and not only among the faculty who found that job security was difficult to come by. Students and alumni, too, felt aggrieved by Marvin’s heavy-handed actions. As their favorite professors were dismissed and forced to leave George Washington, they began to fight back. Many began carrying liberal ideologies, which were confronted with Marvin’s open hostility. An entire generation of alumni refused to later give support to the University, left as they were with such bittersweet memories of their college education. Under the banner of “anti-communism,” Marvin suppressed student protests, publications, and political activities.

Once, just once, this almost changed. A revolution against Marvin, fomenting throughout the 1930s, had reached the end of its fuse. As the University community, and indeed many in the outside community, began to rally around a liberal professor of
English whose job was lost for arbitrary reasons, Marvin felt much as an emperor feels when his empire is in revolt. Once, just once, was Marvin's tight grip on the University threatened as students, faculty members, and alumni joined forces to blast him from power. Never again would Marvin hold the same legitimacy in the eyes of his students as he held prior to the spring of 1940. The mask had slipped off, and had the Second World War not intervened, Marvin's regime may very well have fallen.

She was nearly forgotten from the University's history, but the legacy of Assistant Professor of English Martha Gibbon's fight against the administration remains a turning point in GW history. According to Elmer Kayser, she was "a woman of deep convictions and liberal views. Highly articulate and dynamic in appeal, she was held in high regard by many students and by many of her colleagues," who would stand with her when the time came.² The University had come of age, had exorcised its demons, and had grown stronger. The spring of 1940 was the most significant of a generation, for a great revolution began against the powerful Cloyd Heck Marvin. The turbulent 1930s, when the king and his subjects were continuously at war with one another, were merely a prologue to the tidal wave that nearly swept the king from power. This is that story.

The Purges of 1932

As the heat of the Great Depression intensified, many schools nationwide began reorganizations of departments and faculty in order to prevent duplicity and therefore save money. At George Washington, the administration followed suit. In 1932, Marvin began a reorganization that dramatically impacted the School of Medicine and included the reduction or elimination of other departments, including the Department of Anthropology.

In the Medical School, the 1931-32 reorganization terminated the employment of more than seventy professors and instructors, most part-time, in a manner that was widely perceived to be unacceptable to most of the men. Many had served in their
positions for more than twenty years, much longer than Marvin
had served in his, and the former professors and instructors were
extremely bitter at Marvin and at the University. One later
threatened court action and received a settlement outside of court.

Indeed, some of the reason for the reorganization rested with
the statistics. The maximum income that could be raised by
student tuition was $120,000, while maintenance of the Medical
School and its faculty required at least $150,000.\(^3\)

The reorganization coincided with the appointment of a new
dean. William C. Borden, the dean of the Medical School, had
served in his position since 1909, under five University presidents.
In 1931, Earl B. McKinley became dean of the Medical School,
though his short administration would not last the rest of the
decade.

One of the men whose career came to an end in 1932 was
Oscar B. Hunter, a professor of Bacteriology and Pathology who
had been both Assistant Dean and Acting Dean of the Medical
School during the brief interim between Dean Borden and Dean
McKinley. Hunter signed his name at the top of a formal appeal to
the American Association of University Professors to investigate
the dismissals. Hunter, in particular, had found the administrative
duties too overwhelming and distracting from his work in his
professorship. He continued as a professor for some months prior
to his resignation.

"As a member of the [American Association of University
Professors], I have to respectfully request that an investigation of
this reorganization be made," wrote Professor Hunter. His name
was followed by the signatures of eighteen men who had lost their
jobs and decided to formally appeal their cases to the AAUP. "In
making this request I am supported by a large number of the
members of the Faculty and Alumni who, for obvious reasons,
wish their names [withheld]," Hunter added. Among those
eighteen was the executive officer of the Department of
Physiology, Leslie H. French.\(^4\)

But that was not all Marvin did. He abolished the Department
of Physiology; he demoted the executive officer of the Department
of Chemistry; he divided the Department of Bacteriology and
Pathology into two, despite protests of the professors involved; he revoked the Emeritus Professorship of a retiring professor who had almost thirty years of service to the University; he demoted and transferred the secretary to the Medical School dean, Anna Sellner, who had served for 23 years; he forced the resignation of the Superintendent of the Hospital; he appointed a dean (McKinley) without the approval of the Medical School faculty; and he terminated the appointments of seven full professors, ten clinical professors, two associate professors, one assistant professor, four clinical associate professors, two lecturers, and forty-three instructors and clinical instructors.  

The dismissed professors made it very clear that they did not object to the reorganization of the Medical School; they promised to drop the formal request for an AAUP investigation should the Board of Trustees launch an investigation of their own.

“I am aware, of course, that the University is privileged to act in whatsoever manner it sees fit,” Dr. French, the head of the Department of Physiology, wrote in an appeal to the Board of Trustees. “I wish to file...vigorous protest concerning the treatment accorded me,” he wrote. In the Ordinances for the School of Medicine, a document possessed by all members of the faculty and staff, it was stated: “The tenure of office of Professors and Associate Professors shall be indeterminate.” French added, “an ordinance prepared by one whose record includes the abrupt dismissal of university professors elsewhere, means little.” Nevertheless, French insisted that the sudden termination of his employment as well as the appointments of the entire teaching staff of the Department of Physiology and a score of respected members of the Faculty was decidedly irregular. The Trustees, of course, refused to intervene in the bulk of Marvin’s reorganization.  

French was persistent, however, and his words give an insight into the climate of the Medical School. “Until the advent of the present dean of the School of Medicine my relations with the University had always been cordial, friendly, frictionless, enthusiastic. To my knowledge my ability as a student, teacher, departmental administrator and clinician had never been
questioned during my twelve years' association with the school of medicine." French told the Trustees how he had received no compensation for professional services for patients in the Hospital. He told the Trustees how he had been offered sabbatical leave, but then told that he would not be able to return to George Washington afterwards. He told the Trustees how he had been excluded from faculty meetings, how he had never been informed of the appointment of his successor until he read about it in the press, how he was verbally informed by his dean that he should cancel classes as soon as possible, and how he was informed twelve hours in advance by telephone that a newly hired professor will take over his class in Physiology for the remainder of the school year. Officers of the administration were circulating derogatory statements concerning his personal integrity and professional ability. Literally, within a matter of days, the young professor had lost not only his appointment on the Medical School staff, but also his administrative position as department head. 

The Medical School was not the only area of the University affected by Marvin's reorganization. The Department of Anthropology, in the Columbian School of Arts and Sciences, was the next victim. Although with only two professors teaching four courses the department was fairly small, it had been in existence for almost forty years, since 1893. It would not reappear again until the 1965-66 school year, well after the conclusion of Marvin's term in office.

Dr. Truman Michelson, the executive officer of the Department and professor of Ethnology, taught three of the four classes, including Ethnology, Advanced Ethnology, and a Seminar in Ethnology. The purpose of the classes was to investigate ethnicity and race, the history of culture, and folklore, with Michelson's specialty being in the field of Native American societies. Caroline Benedict Carroll, a lecturer, taught the fourth course, on Archaeology.

Professor Michelson came to George Washington in 1917, and was appointed department head in the fall of 1927. His appointment was terminated in the spring of 1932. A part-time professor, the bulk of Michelson's work and salary came from his
appointment at the Bureau of American Ethnology in the Smithsonian Institution. Marvin had been trying to reduce the dependence of the University on part-time men, and in accordance with this, he reduced many professors and assistant professors to lower ranks. Michelson, at first, was not so impacted, as he was important to the University as a research professor as well as a teaching one. This changed abruptly, however.

Serving on the faculties of the Columbian College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (not yet affiliated with the Columbian College, which was an undergraduate body), and the School of Government, Michelson was one of the most senior professors in each body in terms of experience, and felt that he “was exploited by the University and dropped when it suited their pleasure.” He told the AAUP that when his appointment was terminated “there were no uniform rules for appointment, advancement, censure, demotion or dismissal.”

Michelson recounts his termination in detail. He had been late for a meeting of the deans and department heads, and later learned that prior to his arrival Marvin had discussed the abolition of the Anthropology Department, but said that it was “undecided.” Several of Michelson’s powerful friends lobbied Marvin to retain the department, and Marvin held an angry meeting with Michelson, informing him that he had decided to abolish the Department in response. Those friends came from the American Association for the Advancement of Science and most anthropological associations around the country. Marvin’s crassness and unprofessional demeanor particularly incensed Michelson.\(^7\)

Michelson was one of the most renowned experts on Native American societies in the country and had written dozens of books and scholarly works, and had done field research among the Cree, Fox, Ojibwa, Cheyenne, and Sarcee Indians, among many others. He had taught courses at George Washington on American Indian languages, and much of his work on the transcription of spoken languages, writings on the role of women in Native American society, and recordings of American Indian folklore remain authoritative texts to the present day. His work helped preserve dozens of endangered languages while he was a member of the
American Council of Learned Societies Committee on Native American Languages.

Although the AAUP did not prosecute his case, the senior members of the Association seriously considered an investigation. One of them wrote: “I feel that George Washington University has been living a shoe-string existence a very long time and it really should settle down and adopt the standards of tenure of a good educational institution.” Speaking of Marvin as if he were a wayward child, the AAUP member noted that the principles for which the Association has fought for many years do not seem to be taken seriously by many colleges “if, on the pleas of finances, men of ability can be treated as Michelson has been treated by George Washington.”

Elmer Louis Kayser describes many of the financial troubles that Marvin went through in these years. “He had to work with the modest sums which his predecessors had been able by their parsimony to accumulate through low overhead, meager faculty salaries, and careful administration.” Marvin’s ascendancy to the presidency practically coincided with the beginning of the Great Depression. “His early administration had to face the ups and downs as the economy struggled to its feet, only to be upset again by the prospect of foreign war and then by war itself,” Kayser wrote. “It was his proud boast, demonstrated by fact, that at no time in his administration were salaries cut and that he was able to keep intact for the purposes of development the extraordinary income that came to the University.” Despite the unrest among the faculty, one of the most rapid building phases in the University’s history was about to begin.

Dissent in the Department of Classical Languages

Dr. Lester K. Born came to George Washington as assistant professor in September 1934. With degrees from the University of California and the University of Chicago, Dr. Born was charged with teaching the entire schedule of the Department of Classical Languages, build up the department, and establish a more
satisfactory relationship between the Department and the public. Previously, Born had taught at Ohio State (at a salary of $3000 per year) and at Case Western Reserve University ($3800 per year).\textsuperscript{11}

His predecessor, Charles S. Smith, taught at the University continuously for over thirty years. During much of that time, Smith was the only member of the severely under-funded Department. Although he was liked personally, many undergraduates found him rather uninteresting and he lacked the candor to promote the department outside of GW. In 1932, he went on sabbatical leave, returned to teach one more year in 1933-34, and was retired at the minimum age after that year.

President Marvin appointed Lester Born in Fall 1934, while the Dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences was out of town, at a salary of $2190 per year. The University opened the next week, on September 15. All members of the administration, Born felt, were personally cordial and professionally agreeable. “There was every outward evidence that they seriously wanted me to succeed in the task set to me, namely, the rehabilitation of the moribund department,” Born wrote to the AAUP.

Not long afterwards, according to a student source years later, Born found that little academic preparation had been made. He soon realized the entire Department had to be reorganized. “Despite a first year teaching load of 16 hours, Dr. Born, before the year closed, had revised the offerings of the department. He had begun to make himself and his work known in the University,” the student wrote. While numbers of students enrolled in the Greek or Latin courses remained low throughout his tenure, in his brief two years at GW the number increased from 19 students per semester to 31 students per semester. Unlike many universities nationwide, GW did not have a Greek or Latin requirement for its graduates. This had been the case for many years.

Hampered by a library that had many valuable old books, but few works of modern Latin and Greek study, reference material for research in the classical languages was sparse, and often unclassified and in poor condition. Dr. Born made a recommendation to the administration that the library acquire several essential Greek and Latin texts. Along with other
recommendations Born made, including tuition scholarships for students in the Department, the appointment of a part-time professor, and suggestions for content in the summer sessions, were either refused or never replied to.\textsuperscript{12}

In March 1935, he recommended to President Marvin that the University preempt the nation in the celebration of the 2,000th anniversary of the birth of Horace. In November, many months later, he was informed the idea was impractical, which made it impossible to secure help from other sources. Nonetheless, Dr. Born was called upon to give the principal address before the Italy-American Society on December 9, 1935 on "Horace, A Birthday Prophecy," that won him wide praise and considerable congratulation. He was invited to appear at the Georgetown University celebration, he contributed articles to the local press, and spoke over a University Radio Program.\textsuperscript{13}

In the 1935-36 school year, the Librarian, upon advice of the Dean of the Columbian College (so he stated verbally), refused to order the books that Born had ordered on the Departmental budget and specifically stated that the money would be given to another department. No written word of this was ever received, Born stated, but the Department lost its budget, which meant that the syllabus prepared for the lecture course could not be mimeographed.

On December 18, 1935, President Marvin verbally stated that the Board of Trustees had questioned the expenditures of the Classics Department. The rules of tenure held that Born required a promotion and a raise in salary for the next year, but Marvin insisted that he could not afford it. Born recalled, "there had been no criticism of my work except that I was very exacting and tended to be dull. No instances were offered in support of these last comments. I was advised to seek another place at once."

On January 16, 1936, Born received a letter from Marvin stating that his appointment could not be renewed. Several days later, Born requested that Marvin put the statements he had made in December in writing. Marvin refused, and also ordered the destruction of the letter of January 16 "because up to that time there was no written record of my case, and such a record might
later be used to my disadvantage," Born wrote. “I refused to allow the destruction of the letter. In my presence the president dictated, in obvious ill-humor, a letter covering my points." The letter was not immediately delivered, but several days later Born received a different one, not the one composed in his presence, but containing the same substance.

The letter included the following points: “the appropriate committees of the Board of Trustees feel that it would be ill-advised to advance, at this time, the expenditures of the Classical Language Department.” Marvin wrote in the letter “we appreciated your scholarship and wanted to back it as far as was possible to do so. I believe I also mentioned my appreciation of your public contracts, which have been rather good.” Lukewarm criticism aside, Marvin concluded the letter by insisting that Classical Languages was not a program that the University cared to expand at this time."

After leaving GW, Dr. Born published “A Translation of Erasmus’ Education of a Christian Prince,” with an introduction on ancient and medieval political thought, from Columbia University Press. Of this work, Dr. Preserved Smith, a distinguished Medieval scholar, said, “Nothing so well oriented, so penetrating, and so sound has been written about Erasmus’ political theory as what Professor Born has given us.” In the Historical Bulletin of January 1937, Brian A. McGrath said, “this edition of Erasmus is to be recommended for its careful editing and scholarly research evident throughout. It is a needed addition to the works on Erasmus, and to the history of political thought.”

In 1936, the world prepared for the anniversary of the birth of Erasmus, and Dr. Born was placed on the Washington Erasmus Committee, eventually to become its chairman. He arranged an exhibit at the Library of Congress from July 12 to November 18, 1936, and gave a brief address at a Washington Cathedral ceremony. He also negotiated several national and international radio broadcasts on Erasmus. In April 1937, Born published the “Social Program of Desiderious Erasmus” in the Journal of Social Philosophy for April 1937.

“Frankly, as we review the monumental effort of Dr. Born, we
are at a loss to explain why or how the University could afford to let him go. To be sure, he was known as a ‘Stiff teacher’ but no one begrudged doing Dr. Born’s assignments. He was known as a thorough and efficient instructor, thoroughly human, and eminently just in all his dealings,” wrote a group of disgruntled students.

The students derided President Marvin for his “business-like methods.” “Nothing is maintained in The University very long unless it makes money. Can it be assumed that because the registration of George Washington University is composed largely of part time students desiring courses in accounting, economics, etc., that the University (a University in the Nation’s Capital) is soft-pedalling the study of the sources of culture[?]”

It was not the last time this charge would be lodged against Marvin.

Friction in the Department of English

Dr. John Elson, an instructor of English, also recalled bitter experiences with Dr. Marvin. Elson served briefly in his position from his appointment in June 1933 to his dismissal in the spring of 1936. For those three years, Dr. Elson received numerous mixed signals from the administration, and suffered tremendous betrayal at the hands of the administration.

Elson received his appointment at George Washington upon the recommendation of Dr. Joseph Q. Adams, Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington. Adams, in turn, made his recommendation at the request of Dr. DeWitt C. Croissant, head of the English Department at GW. Croissant asked Adams to recommend a professor of Shakespeare, a class formerly taught by the elderly William Allen Wilbur, the long-time provost of the University and former dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences.

“In conversations with Dr. Adams...both Dr. Croissant and President Cloyd Heck Marvin of the university laid emphasis on the institution’s need of a man with scholarly training and
reputation, qualified to develop research in the Elizabethan field," Elson wrote to the AAUP. "Dr. Adams heartily recommended me as such a man."

When his service began, however, he found he was to teach three classes instead of two, all freshman and sophomore classes. Marvin considered Elson a "promising research man" and wished him to have a light schedule. Elson was later able to find part-time work at the Folger Library and the Library of Congress. He encountered difficulties in his teaching, however: "I found the courses formulated and outlined on principles very different from those I had been accustomed to follow in my former teaching service at Cornell University." Elson ventured to moderately and courteously criticize such principles at some English Department staff meetings.

After a year of teaching, Elson received an enthusiastic recommendation for reappointment. Later in the spring, Executive Officer Croissant submitted a plan for an English major program, and asked for opinions from the other faculty members. Elson did not hesitate to criticize the plan as "mechanical and deficient on the cultural side." Although he heard nothing from Croissant on the matter, he was aware that Croissant expressed resentment of the criticism of other faculty members.

"Though after this I suspected something of a rift between the department head and myself, I was reassured by his asking me to take over a semester course in Elizabethan drama, my specialty," in the fall of 1934. Elson preferred to read excerpts from the plays aloud in class, but Dr. Croissant felt this was a waste of time. Elson inconspicuously held informal readings outside of class to "make the study more alive."

Small student criticisms found their way back to Elson; Croissant heard from students that Elson did not make eye contact or speak distinctly to students, but Croissant felt that the problem was simply beginner's stage fright.

In December 1934, Dr. Croissant held a meeting with Elson to discuss some of the criticism. "Your teaching is not getting across to students," Croissant told Elson. "They have been complaining about it, and the president is so dissatisfied with your
work that he feels that we cannot keep you after another year.” No students had complained to Croissant, but President Marvin, Dean Henry G. Doyle of the Columbian College, and other professors of the Department had received complaints.

Two days later, Elson went to visit Dean Doyle. Doyle said he had received no student complaints, and believed the students liked Dr. Elson personally. “My own feeling is that my relations with students at George Washington were almost invariably friendly,” Elson wrote. Aside from the usual disagreements in class, he had encountered no great obstacles. “Always, however, order and attention have prevailed in my classes; and my students have been responsive and cordial.”

Throughout the school year, Elson had been making plans for graduate courses and research in Elizabethan literature. He wrote a paper detailing the remarkable facilities for Elizabethan research in Washington, but Croissant was unenthusiastic about the idea, feeling that the University could not afford the undertaking. Later, Croissant informed Elson that he would not be reappointed after his third year. “He said he vainly urged President Marvin to keep me on the staff,” Elson recalled.

In March 1935, Elson finally held a meeting with Dr. Marvin. “The president then received me in a cold and rigorous manner. He denied at the outset that he had initiated the move for my dismissal, insisting that the initial recommendation came from Dr. Croissant, but saying that he and Dean Doyle had ‘concurred’ in it.” Several days later, President Marvin held a meeting with Dr. Elson, Dean Doyle, and Professor Croissant. Marvin explained to Elson that it was his “negative philosophy on life” that contributed to his dismissal, not student complaints alone. The president blamed Dr. Croissant for Elson’s dismissal.

Later, Elson was told from his colleagues in the English Department that Dr. Croissant had not only fought hard to keep him on the staff, but had even threatened to resign from his chairmanship of the English Department in order to keep Elson from being dismissed.

Soon after the meeting, Elson received a research grant from the American Council of Learned Societies. The official attitude of
the University did not change after the grant. Elson was permitted one more academic school year to find another job. “My last year at George Washington was a happy one so far as my class work was concerned; happy also in my contacts with the faculty, excepting only the department head and president, whose obstinate wrongheadedness, as I saw it, kept me under a feeling of tension and anxiety.”

Elson told his story to a professor at Cornell University, where Elson used to teach. The professor was so disturbed by Marvin’s treatment of Elson that he wrote to another George Washington faculty member, also a friend of his, expressing shock and disapproval. Marvin found out about this latter correspondence, and was greatly alarmed, as the Cornell professor was a national officer in an honorary fraternity then seeking recognition on GW’s campus. President Marvin wrote a letter to the Cornell professor, Elson recalled. “This letter misrepresented the president’s dealings with me in every conceivable manner.”

Elson cited a particularly distressing quotation from Marvin’s letter: “The boy [Elson was 35 years old] has been thoroughly scared about himself. He has been going to a psychiatrist and constantly talks to himself in psychological terms that to me seem untoward.” The letter continued in this vein, Elson recalled, “trying to represent me as in utter psychological instability,” when in fact he had never been so productive and well-balanced in his life.

“The experience at George Washington, terrible as it was, has had much educational value,” Elson concluded. “But I do not see that credit for this is due the men who seem to have almost conspired together to wreck a young teacher’s career.”

Reflecting on the reasons for his dismissal, Elson believed he was only appointed a member of the faculty in order to satisfy Dr. Joseph Adams of the Folger Library, who received a part-time appointment to the staff at the same time as Elson. The president of the University successfully manipulated the executive officer of the English Department, convincing Croissant that Elson was a poor professor. Marvin “was motivated solely by expediency and, beyond the allowance of an extra year for me to find employment, by no considerations of justice or humanity,” Elson finished.17.
Dr. John Elson would be appointed to the University of Tennessee, a school that, in the late 1930s, was having great difficulty with faculty-administration relations. In 1939, Tennessee was under AAUP investigation, causing Elson much resentment toward the Association because, after all, he had "simply found George Washington a hell and Tennessee, comparatively speaking, a heaven," he wrote to Ralph Himstead, the Secretary of the AAUP. "I feel competent to assert that on the whole, George Washington was a bad school to work in and Tennessee is a good one. Can you blame me for being incensed when the good school is held up to national disapproval while the bad school is let alone?" The Association's willingness to investigate Tennessee and its reluctance to investigate George Washington constituted a "deplorable injustice."

The rise and fall of the Division of Library Science

"The alumni and students in the Division of Library Science are stunned and do not know what to do or think," Professor Elizabeth Adams Lathrop wrote to the AAUP on November 1, 1936 exasperatedly recounting the demise of the Division. "Professor Schmidt, the Director of the Division, is carrying on with a very retrenched curriculum. He too feels at sea. As for the fate of the Division, nobody knows, but many people are much concerned."18

The Division, though it existed from 1897 to 1904, was newly reorganized in 1928 as an independent academic unit of the school, separate from the other colleges and departments. For the next twelve years, the Division lived a precarious yet hopeful existence before its disorganization in 1940.

One of the paramount criticisms of Marvin's administration was his tendency to favor hard sciences, engineering, economics, business, law, and political science courses over dramatics and art, humanities, classics, literature, and other so-called "soft" subjects. His definition of efficiency, of industrialized "assembly-line" education, of technological curricula, made him only a
lukewarm supporter of experimental academic initiatives, like the
development of a Library Science program, which did not fit this
narrowly defined construct of higher education. This was the
Marvin Doctrine in full-force.

The Division was the brainchild of one man, Alfred F. W.
Schmidt, an ancient librarian with a “very, very, very, very soft”
voice according to Elmer Louis Kayser, fondling remembering that
“during the years when he was Director of the Division of Library
Science and accordingly had to present candidates for degrees at
Commencement... it used to be a constant source of annoyance to
President Marvin, who made him go through dress rehearsals in
order to speak loudly enough so that everybody could hear.” He
was a short, slightly built man with a large beard. A professor of
German, Schmidt was also a collector of rare books for his own
personal library.

He came to GW in the early 1900s, before the University had
moved to its present location in Foggy Bottom, as a teacher in
German. He was also a chief classifier at the Library of Congress
where he formulated the scheme for classification of books and
documents in the social sciences. When the University suffered
its major financial crisis in 1910, his salary was curtailed, and he
accepted a part-time appointment at Howard University.
Beginning in 1912, Schmidt presided as librarian over the initially
small GW library in the old Lisner Auditorium, then the St. Rose’s
Industrial School purchased by the University that year. His library
consisted of a single room on the first floor, and books were piled
on shelves all the way to the ceiling.

“And even that considerable amount of shelf space was
woefully inadequate,” Kayser recalled. “That one little poor man
had to take care of classification, cataloging, acquisition with in the
best times, only help from a few part-time individuals that he was
able to inveigle into helping him.” After a day of working at the
Library of Congress, he retreated into his little cubicle where a
devoted student brought him a package of graham crackers and a
carton of milk for his evening meal. His teaching schedule began
afterwards.

Upon arrival at GW, Marvin was “not exactly impressed” with
Professor Schmidt's work as librarian, so Marvin made him the Director of the Division of Library Science, “called upon to set up a curriculum for training librarians, to administer the Division and to give a major part of the teaching.” Marvin was inclined to be critical of Schmidt, seeing the elderly librarian as lacking “vim, vigor, vitality,” which to Marvin were essential. Schmidt was never particularly popular among the students, but a number of students became devout disciples of his, believing him to be a deeply inspiring scholar.

“So that is the Professor Schmidt I knew,” Kayser concluded. “I might summarize by describing him as a rather unique person in appearance, as a fine scholar with a broad humanistic background, as a very thoroughgoing teacher but with absolutely no grasp of the foibles of the college undergraduate who would take advantage of him by knowing that whatever he said in class, it would be followed by a very gracious “Thank you, thank you.”

While the Division was still in infancy, Elizabeth Lathrop began her six-year career at GW. She confessed in her AAUP appeal that she had never heard of GW until she received a telegram from Dr. Marvin in June 1929 while she was librarian of the public library in Oshkosh, Wisconsin. Marvin stated in the telegram that the American Library Association had recommended her, and he asked if she would be interested in an assistant professorship in Library Science. Excited by the opportunity, she readily accepted.

“I came to the Division of Library Science in George Washington University in September 1929, with a great enthusiasm to help build up a first-class library school. For six years, including four summer sessions, I worked early and late, teaching several different subjects, two of which required ‘laboratory periods,’” she wrote. In addition to her teaching activities, she befriended several leading librarians to secure their interest in the school, she coordinated the student club of library science students and all social activities of the Division, and she selected, cared for, and filed all books and materials used in her teaching. With donations from alumni, students, and friends, she collected about 2,000 books to use as practice material for her
cataloguing classes.

In the 1930 to 1931 school year, she was appointed Acting Executive Officer of the Division while Schmidt was in Europe. In addition to her teaching and research, she also carried administrative duties. "For that work I received no extra salary nor even a 'thank you' from President Marvin."

In June 1935, she opened an exhibit displaying the work of the Division. Although it was held for a week, President Marvin never stopped by to show his interest or approval. Lathrop believed that the Division of Library Science was dying of neglect, with little sanction or support from the administration. "From the expressions of librarians all over the city as well as from hosts of students, I know I have been a very successful teacher of library science," she explained.

Nonetheless, early in the fall of 1935, President Marvin called her to his office to discuss her "place in the University staff." Lathrop was shocked, and attempted to schedule an appointment but was unable to get in touch with Marvin's secretary. In the first week of November, she received a call from Marvin's secretary, who asked if Lathrop could come to Marvin's office immediately. Lathrop went, and when she arrived, Marvin explained "he had been considering for a long time the Division of Library Science and was uncertain whether or not to cut it off entirely in June or to offer only a few courses in Columbian College." He told her that he had no money to accredit the school due to the Depression, and Marvin wanted her to know "long enough ahead to lay plans." He then told her that there was no criticism of her work, and that it was only a matter of finances.

She heard nothing from the President's Office until January 1936 when she received a letter from Marvin. "My dear Miss Lathrop," he began.

Following our December conversation, I am writing this note to tell you that it is going to be impossible for the University to renew your contract for this coming year.

It is with regret that I have to advise you of this
decision, for you have been a loyal fine person on our staff.

I want to take this opportunity of thanking you for what you have contributed to the University.

Yours sincerely,
Cloyd H. Marvin, President

"In the meantime, I was so unsettled that my year was a nightmare," Lathrop wrote. "When a person of my age has been six years in a position in which she knows she has made good, she naturally expects some security of position." Lathrop began to search for another position, and not a single one opened up. Libraries, publishers, and literary organizations want young people who will accept a small salary. She was working on a part-time piece of bibliographic work, but it did not produce a full-time salary for her. When the fall 1936 staff was announced, the list did not include Elizabeth Lathrop. Her AAUP appeal was added to a growing pile of other professors that met their end under Marvin in the 1930s.20

In the fall of 1938, the Division underwent a reorganization, and a letter from President Marvin to the Library Science Alumni Association hailed the importance of "training prospective librarians and ... providing additional professional instruction for the personnel of libraries in Washington," and announced the opening of the new Lisner Library, with a capacity of 200,000 volumes. Marvin announced that Lester A. Smith, the Alumni Secretary of the University with an M.A. in Library Science, would serve as Executive Officer, replacing the retired Alfred Schmidt. Miss Belknap Severance, head cataloguer of the United States Patent Office, and Miss Adelaide Hasse, a bibliographer at the Works Progress Administration, taught courses in cataloguing and public documents. Enlarged classroom space was secured on the fourth floor of the new Hall of Government.21

It is curious that Marvin attempted to reorganize the Division with new faculty this late in the game. With neither Schmidt nor Lathrop, two devoted faculty members, to support the new
Division, it is clear that the reorganization accomplished little. Within fewer than two academic years, the Division ceased to exist. It was formally abolished in 1941.

Kayser recalled the reasons why the Division of Library Science was terminated.

I think all of us realized that the Division of Library Science was something that would begin and end with Schmidt. President Marvin was never particularly interested in developing it and that was due in large measure to the fact that President Marvin had on him certain immediate needs for the support of what might be considered major branches of the University in order to retain their accreditation. That established a priority. Now here was a new, utterly new venture, you see. It obviously had no accreditation. It tried but was so far, far removed from the standard requirements for an accredited library that it was virtually doomed.

The fact that Catholic University had a well-established library school that could meet the demands of the city more adequately contributed to the Division's demise. Regardless, however, many faculty and alumni were resentful toward Marvin, for though it was a time of severe financial restraint and a depressed economy, the President was cutting programs and professors, an action that always produces enemies who feel that a certain program should not have been cut or reduced. But did the Division die a natural death? Lathrop's and Kayser's statements indicate that the Division died of neglect, because President Marvin did not want to divert funds away from "more important" areas of the University, especially the Business School, the Columbian College, and the Medical and Law Schools.
Professor J. Orin Powers came to GW in 1925 as an assistant professor in Education, immediately after receiving his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. During the summer sessions of the next several academic years, he taught at Pennsylvania State, Northwestern, and West Virginia Universities; he was also a frequent contributor to several professional educational periodicals. In 1927, the year Marvin came to George Washington, Powers was made an associate professor.

In 1930, Powers held a conference with President Marvin and his executive officer, William Cullen French, then one of three professors who formed the executive committee of the School of Education, and the two men questioned his ability to assume a position "of leadership" among the teachers of the District of Columbia. The absurdity of this allegation was proven two weeks later when Powers was elected president of the Educational Association of the District of Columbia, a position he held for two years before becoming a member of the Executive Committee of the Association.

At the beginning of the fall semester of 1933, several students apparently complained of the type of examinations Professor Powers was giving, and President Marvin demanded that Powers be removed from that particular course. The course was instead assigned to Professor William John Cooper upon Cooper's release as United States Commissioner of Education, a political appointment in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration. By the following academic year, almost all of his courses had been assigned to Professor Cooper, and Powers was assigned to some research projects.

In January 1935, Powers, then in his tenth year, held a meeting with Secretary Ralph Himstead of the AAUP, fearful that Marvin was trying to force him out of his position. That year, his salary had been reduced to $3,000, cut by $500 that year and $300 the year before. Powers had heard rumors that his executive officer, William Cullen French, had been asked by President Marvin to cut Powers out of the catalogue of courses for
the following year. President Marvin offered Powers a leave of absence for a year on full salary if he would agree to leave George Washington at the end of that time. Powers refused, seeing no reason to "enter into a dishonorable agreement."

"[Powers] asserts that there are other members of the faculty who are apparently slated for dismissal. [He] is actively seeking a new position, but of course, it is difficult to find one," according to an internal memorandum of the AAUP.22

In March 1936, Powers attained a position as a regional director of the National Youth administration. The job was temporary, not more than three months, if that long, so he did not bother to inform President Marvin of the new employment. On March 18, Powers was called into President Marvin's office. Marvin was livid. "According to Professor Powers, President Marvin told him that he would be unable to find a man in the country who could condone his unethical conduct in accepting the position without consulting President Marvin." Marvin gave Powers until 11:30 the next morning to choose between the following alternatives:

1. Put the case before a committee of five, two chosen by President Marvin, two by Professor Powers, and the fifth by the committee, all chosen from University staff, or

2. President Marvin would recommend to the Trustees that Professor Powers be placed on leave for the rest of the year, with no change in salary, but would not be reappointed next year.23

It is unknown which of the two options he chose, though in September 1936 he was entirely deprived of his teaching duties and had his salary cut to $1800. He was told he was free to do as he pleased as a "research professor," and he was put officially on leave. On October 1, 1936, Dr. Powers resigned because he was unable to live on the salary that the University provided for him. Forcing a professor to resign by cutting his or her salary is a clear
violation of academic tenure.

Powers later found a job in the Office of Education in the Department of the Interior. He was also a member of Phi Delta Kappa, the professional education fraternity. Other sources seem to indicate that Powers was actually very popular among his students and had a commendable list of community service activities.

Several students wrote to the AAUP in 1937 detailing the Powers case. "We are at a loss to explain Pres. Marvin's tactless and unjust relations with Dr. Powers. Dr. Powers has shown himself kind and restrained in the face of such treatment. We feel justice has been denied him. [His] case is another instance that, we feel, warrants investigation."

Powers was not the only professor in the Department of Education to be dismissed by President Marvin. Professor Cooper soon followed. Cooper came to George Washington by special contract between President Suzzallo of the University of Washington and President Marvin. Marvin agreed to put Cooper on the faculty if Suzzallo agreed to pay Cooper's salary. Professor Cooper began his teaching career at George Washington, but Suzzallo died without fulfilling his part of the agreement. At the end of his two-year appointment, President Marvin released Dr. Cooper under such embarrassing circumstances that his close associates believed that "he left Washington a broken man with no interest in living because his associates no longer placed any confidence in him. It is safe to say that President Marvin hastened the death of Professor Cooper by his tactless and unjustifiable conduct of this affair." To critics of Dr. Marvin's style, the president was no longer merely callous and uncaring; he had become a murderer.24

It is worth noting the difficulty of piecing together these two incidents since no testimony from either of the two professors can be found. Only a paper trail of correspondence among AAUP officials remains to give details of the incidents, a paper trail that is, most certainly, quite biased. It can be inferred from the documents that do exist, however, that Dr. Powers in particular was deliberately reluctant to leave a paper trail that included
AAUP Secretary Ralph Himstead had on numerous occasions been forced to visit George Washington University professors at their homes because those professors refused to come to the AAUP office.

The crisis in the Department of Public Speaking

The controversial administrative policies of Marvin affected other branches of the University as well; those professors involved in campus dramatics alleged that not only had Marvin neglected dramatics, as he had done to library science, but that he was consciously and willingly undermining the theatre and dramatics divisions of the University.

"It is my sincere belief that Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin is totally unfit to be connected in any way with any educational institution," wrote Constance Connor Brown, professor in the Public Speaking Department. "I should like to make formal request that The American Association of University Professors investigate his administration at the George Washington University."

Constance Connor Brown received her Masters in Dramatic Art and Literature at Cornell University. She graduated from Wheaton College and spent two years as a professional actress in both Washington and New York. She also translated German plays, spending time in Europe with the Public Speaking Department at Cornell. For three years, she was a member of the Executive Council of the Drama Guild of Washington. After her time at GW, she taught public speaking briefly at the University of Maryland before opening her own school.

She had come to GW in the fall of 1931, hired as an associate professor in the Department of Public Speaking to teach a course in play production at a salary of $350. The course had been taught previously by a Mr. J. Milnor Dorey, whom Marvin dismissed because there was "no demand for his class." Yet, upon Professor Brown's arrival at GW that September, 35 students registered in her course.

In addition to her academic work, she was put in charge of
the Cue and Curtain Club, an extracurricular organization that put on two plays a year. The Cue and Curtain Club received a University stipend of $350, one hundred dollars of which went to Professor Brown as salary. The remaining $150 was divided between the two shows: $75 a show. “Since the rent of our theatre alone cost $75 a night, it was necessary to make the admissions to the plays cover the remaining cost of production—i.e., royalty, scenery, costumes, etc,” Brown recalled.

She concentrated her efforts in making the play an artistic success, assured by a group of students that the sale of seats was in competent student hands. The press and audience were delighted by the production. The business aspects of the play, however, the advertising, ticket sale, and publicity, were not well managed, and the production used most of its allotted budget.

“But my students did such good work, their enthusiasm and spirit of cooperation was so splendid, that I felt that they should be allowed to put on another play that year if I could arrange it for them,” Brown wrote.

That year happened to be the two hundredth anniversary of George Washington’s birth, and Cloyd Heck Marvin was the head of the District of Columbia Bicentennial Commission. To commemorate the year, Brown decided that a production of The Contrast by Royall Tyler, the first American melodrama, would be appropriate for the occasion. She therefore approached Dr. Marvin’s chief assistant on the Commission, Dr. George Havenner. Havenner was one of Professor Brown’s father’s assistants in the United States Bureau of Efficiency, and Marvin was particularly eager to have Brown’s father release Dr. Havenner for a job on the Commission. It was at this time Constance Connor Brown was appointed to the University staff.

“Though, at the time, neither my father nor I connected the two circumstances, I now believe that Dr. Marvin’s need of Dr. Havenner’s assistance on the Bicentennial Commission accounts for Mr. Dorey’s sudden dismissal and my appointment to fill his place,” she surmised, alluding to scandal on the part of President Marvin.

The Bicentennial Commission gave valuable help in
connection with the play’s publicity and advertising, and *The Contrast* was a phenomenal success both artistically and financially. Professor Brown was reappointed for the following academic year at a salary of $500.

In the meantime, however, she became very concerned for the permanent success and financial security of the Cue and Curtain Club. "I began to realize that, while it is difficult to sell tickets for any single event during a busy Washington winter, Washington is a good subscription town." She suggested to the administration that Cue and Curtain tickets go on a seasonal subscription basis, as is common among the major professional theater productions around the city. In the back of her mind, she had foreseen a University Theatre that could rival those of any major institution in the country. Permission, however, to sell ticket subscriptions was not granted.

With the help of the Columbian Women, the association of female graduates of the University, she was able to pay expenses for the first production. The second play, however, ran over budget, and the season closed with a deficit. Again she pleaded for tickets to go on a subscription basis, and this time permission was granted.

The Cue and Curtain Club was not, notably, the only dramatic organization on campus. An older organization called the Troubadours existed, and every year produced an original musical comedy. Professor Brown was anxious that no rivalry should exist between the two organizations, and because their work was so different, she saw no occasion for any.

At the beginning of her second year of teaching, however, the Troubadours were having difficulties with President Marvin. Dr. Robert Bolwell, the faculty advisor of the Troubadours, resigned from his post, and Marvin suggested that his successor come from the Department of Public Speaking. The department head called on Professor Brown to fill the post, but she asked to be excused for two reasons. "Firstly, because I felt that I had all I could manage in looking after the Cue and Curtain Club; and, secondly, because I felt that the success of a Faculty Advisor is conditioned largely by his acceptability to the group which he is to advise." Her
relations with the Troubadours had been entirely friendly, she recalled; they made her an honorary member of a dramatic fraternity that they started in their ranks, the students in this organization assisted with technical assistance in the Cue and Curtain plays, and many students were members of both organizations.

“But I happened to know that their choice of a Faculty Advisor was Professor Harold Harding, another member of the Public Speaking Department. I therefore asked that my name be withdrawn from consideration.” This was done, but the matter of appointing a new faculty advisor was held up on President Marvin’s desk for months, thereby retarding all plans for the Troubadours’ annual production. As time went on, a great deal of resentment grew among members of the Troubadours, who, not understanding her situation, believed that Professor Brown was trying to usurp the position they wanted to give to Professor Harding. After a long delay, as tensions grew among members of the dramatics organizations, President Marvin finally approved Professor Harding as faculty advisor of the Troubadours. “Could Dr. Marvin’s purpose in delaying Professor Harding’s appointment have been to cause dissention between Troubadours and Cue and Curtain and give strength to the suspicion among the students that I was trying to ‘gain control’ of Troubadours?” Professor Brown rhetorically asked.

This sounds like a preposterous allegation against Marvin, but Brown quickly followed it up with evidence that may support her claim. “In addition to Troubadours and Cue and Curtain there was started during my first year at the University a third dramatic organization called The Drama Appreciation Group. This was founded for the purpose of reading and studying plays, attending theatres in student groups, and arranging for talks by dramatic critics.” The faculty advisor for the Drama Appreciation Group, Mrs. Vinnie G. Barrows, the Director of Women’s Personnel Guidance (the position was formerly the Dean of Women), discussed the project with Brown at its inception. Professor Brown attended its first meeting, and one of her students was elected its first president.
"I was considerably surprised, however, upon my return to the campus in the fall of my third year, to find the Drama Appreciation Group preparing to embark upon a schedule of play production." This was possible due to a donation from Mrs. Theodore Tiller, the mother of one of Brown's former students. Professor Brown considered Theodore Tiller, Jr. to be a talented youth, "but somewhat undisciplined--an opinion which other faculty members share." His work with both the Troubadours and Cue and Curtain had been unreliable, so his mother set out to make a place for him in the Drama Appreciation Group. Mrs. Tiller persuaded Mrs. Abram Lisner, a long time patron and benefactor of the University, to make a $100 donation to University Dramatics for the Drama Appreciation Group. The Lisner family would make several major donations to the University for a library, a classroom building, and the famed Lisner Auditorium.

"This came just at a time when, the University having finally acceded to Cue and Curtain's request for permission to launch a subscription season, the Cue and Curtain Club was exerting all its efforts to raise funds for forthcoming productions." Since the Club had a significant record of creditable achievement over the past two years, it seemed an unfriendly gesture that Marvin should accept the donation for a rival production company. "It was felt that Marvin was selling out the Cue and Curtain Club for a paltry $100." 27

The day the Drama Appreciation Group's play was to be produced, an article appeared in The Washington Daily News commending the production: "Out of the turmoil of the dramatic situation at G.W. has arisen a group which has everything--talent, enthusiasm, money, and best of all, the support of President Cloyd Heck Marvin."

The next day, President Marvin called a meeting of the officers of Cue and Curtain, the Troubadours, and the Drama Appreciation Group, at which he denied any responsibility for the article. (He did not, however, deny his acceptance of Mrs. Lisner's gift). Mrs. Tiller also denied all knowledge of the source of the article, but a student officer privately ascertained through a former GW student who worked on the Washington Daily News that Mrs.
Tiller brought the copy in herself.

In addition, publicity in the Hatchet soon after the Cue and Curtain Club began rehearsals made the situation more disturbing. A front-page article stated that President Marvin was dissatisfied with both the Troubadours and the Cue and Curtain Club. He made two charges against the Troubadours and one against Cue and Curtain. Against the Troubadours, he alleged:

1. They had not made money.
2. They had not produced musical comedy books of sufficiently high literary standard to be worthy of University support.

Against Cue and Curtain, Marvin only alleged that it had not made money. There was no criticism either of their choice of plays, or of their standard or means of production.

The article was copied in the city newspapers, which made the Cue and Curtain's goal of securing a sound financial basis even more difficult. Responses to circulars soliciting subscriptions for the season immediately began to fall off. Instead of receiving from six to ten checks a day, they were reduced to receiving only one or two. When prospective buyers were approached, they would ask whether Cue and Curtain would even produce this year, for they had heard that Marvin did not approve of the organization. “And so the whole situation had to be carefully explained in each such case and the person assured that the Club would produce as advertised, but that the financial support of its patrons was more than ever necessary to the organization.”

Difficulties were further aggravated by a ruling of the administration whereby students and faculty members were to be admitted to plays at half price. Even if every show was sold out, the play would still run a deficit of $82, compounded to $246 per year as Cue and Curtain was now sponsoring three plays each academic year.

Professor Brown says she was therefore dismayed to find that the Club was within two weeks of their first production with every indication that they would not be able to rent the theatre they
had counted on. She immediately wrote a letter to the head of the Public Speaking Department summing up the situation, and made one shocking and severe conclusion.

Unless she was assured of financial security, she felt she must resign. She did not feel it was right to continue running up deficits for the University. She sent a copy of the letter to President Marvin, and was summoned to his office the next day. It was immediately obvious that he was rather annoyed.

That evening, Constance Connor Brown became ill and was in bed for several days. Marvin therefore called upon her house and asked to speak with her father, who went to the President's Office the next day, where he found Marvin in conference with Mrs. Jesse Fant Evans, the alumni-elected trustee of the University. "Mrs. Evans' presence on this occasion was apparently accidental, but I could not help but wonder whether it had been arranged because Mrs. Evans was one of the backers of the Drama Appreciation Group."

Both Evans and Marvin were resentful toward Professor Brown because she had forced the situation. Trustee Evans stated that she felt that it was not necessary for Cue and Curtain to make a financial success, or even an artistic one; its purpose was simply to give plays involving large numbers of students and to put them on in the easiest, quickest possible way. Evans ignored the fact that the Drama Appreciation Group was unpopular among the students, in spite of free admission, and their plays were poorly cast and poorly attended. "The Drama Appreciation Group died a natural death before the end of the academic year--or as soon as it had exhausted Mrs. Lisner's $100," Professor Brown recalled.

The main purpose of the meeting was to decide the fate of the Cue and Curtain subscription fund for the immediate future. Brown's father, representing the ill Professor Brown by proxy, made two suggestions. First, Marvin should write a letter to The Hatchet commending the Cue and Curtain Club, and secondly, he should include in that letter a suggestion that the Club postpone its play by two weeks so that it may be easier to complete the business transactions prior to the play's opening. These
suggestions were accepted. The newspaper printed the letter, and the play was postponed for two weeks.

“The upshot of the matter was that we sold out both houses for the play and sold standing room besides. The resulting publicity was gratifying. Among the letters we received was one from Dr. Joseph Quincy Adams, Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, who wrote that the production was one of the best amateur performances he had ever seen,” Brown wrote, proudly.

The second and third productions that year were very successful as well, and Brown not only made up her deficit, but also ran a surplus of $150 with an additional $150 worth of scenery and equipment. Delighted, Professor Brown went to see Marvin to make a final report of the artistic and financial success of the Cue and Curtain Club. Before she was even permitted to make her case, President Marvin informed her that her services would not be required next year because the Board of Trustees had decided to discontinue all work in dramatics because a shrinkage in the student population “made it mandatory that certain courses be discontinued.” There is no evidence of Marvin’s claim.

It was rather pointless for Professor Brown to make her case, pointing out that she had earned for the University more money than it had paid her. Marvin told her merely that the Board had made its decision and that there would be no supervised dramatic activities at the University. He also told her that there was no criticism of her in any way, and that her work had been entirely satisfactory.

“I have since been told by Mr. Harry Cassell Davis, Secretary of the Board of Trustees, that President Marvin read my name at a meeting of the Board on a list of faculty members who had ‘resigned.’ Mr. Davis said that he regretted it very much, but that he had made no comment at the time because it was represented that I had resigned!” This was one of Marvin’s signature tactics, alleged by numerous faculty members over the course of his reign: he told the Board of Trustees that they had resigned when in fact he dismissed them. This is a clear violation of faculty tenure and
the Faculty Code that protected the rights of faculty members.

On June 4, 1934, she received a letter from President Marvin in which he said: "It is with regret that the Board of Trustees accepts your resignation at the close of this academic year." She promptly returned his letter insisting that she had, in fact, not resigned. To this letter, she never received a response. A student petition on her behalf was also ignored.

After she left GW in 1934, Constance Connor Brown founded the Studio of Theatre Arts, a school that taught theatre technique and style to students. In forming an alliance with the Washington Civic Theatre, the president of the theatre contacted Marvin to inquire about Professor Brown's work. He was told that her record was impeccable and her work was very satisfactory, but that her parents had been so meddlesome that the University was forced to terminate her service.

She could not believe this allegation; her parents had never attended a single class or rehearsal of hers. The family was, however, rather well-connected, and advertised the Cue and Curtain Club in various circles that resulted in bringing many important people in official Washington to the University plays. "My family has been prominent in Washington for almost thirty years and we have therefore a great many friends and acquaintances here. It did not occur to me that such friends as we might make for the University would be unwelcome," she wrote. Further research sheds no light on the reasons why Professor Constance Connor Brown was dismissed.

"Recently it has been brought to my attention that the resentment against Dr. Marvin's administrative tactics, which was obvious even in my time, has been growing until it seems to have approached a crisis," she told the AAUP. "I feel confident in my own mind that a drastic reform must be brought about if the morale of the whole university is not to be destroyed."²⁸

Internal memoranda among the executive officers of the AAUP indicate that her appeal was read and considered. "I still do not think we have an issue sufficiently sharp to justify an investigation," according to one AAUP officer.²⁸ The AAUP again decided to wait.
She was not the only member of the Public Speaking Department to complain to the AAUP about Marvin’s disastrous administrative policies.

Assistant Professor Harold F. Harding of the Department of Public Speaking, the faculty advisor of the Troubadours and a colleague of Professor Brown, sent a letter to the AAUP the day before Professor Brown penned her lengthy appeal. He wrote: “If there is any possibility that the AAUP is about to conduct an investigation of the administration and faculty relations at George Washington University I want to submit my views on the conditions there as I see them. In my judgment there is sufficient evidence at hand for the Association to act and I hope it will act at once. If matters are allowed to wait until Fall, valuable time will be lost. For this reason I prefer to await your word before sending my letter.” His AAUP appeal cannot be tracked down; it is possible that he never did send it. Nonetheless, the fact that his letter and Constance Brown’s appeal are dated one day apart may mean that there was some planning on the part of the two professors.

A third professor of Public Speaking, Assistant Professor H.G. Roberts, sent a letter to the AAUP the week prior. The situation had become intolerable, Roberts wrote.

“Many galling things have taken place since I came to the university in 1930, but, until the last few weeks, I have felt that silence was the best policy in the interest of the faculty and of the university,” Roberts wrote. However, with the tenth anniversary of Marvin’s presidency at GW being celebrated, rather suspicious faculty intimidation experiences were witnessed. “It is common belief on the campus that failure to purchase a ticket and to attend the dinner will be certain to bring about reprisals on the part of the administration. I am convinced that this fear is justified.”

The director of Women’s Personnel Guidance had told Roberts that she had been advised by another member of the administration that a certain faculty wife, a personal friend of the Director, was “one of the wives who had better be seen at the dinner.”

In early April, rumors broke out among the faculty that faculty members would be asked to sign a “servile testimonial lauding the
President of the University," according to Roberts. On April 24, 1937, he received a notice inviting him to sign such a testimonial. His first reaction was, of course, to refuse. After talking it over with several other faculty members, however, and having been indirectly advised by a member of the Board of Trustees that it was "wiser to sign," he dutifully signed his name.

"I am writing this letter to you as Secretary of the [AAUP] that it may be on record that I do not subscribe to the fawning sentiments of the testimonial, that my only reason for signing was my honest conviction that failure to sign would endanger my position as a member of the faculty, and, finally, to protest against such intimidation of the faculty on the part of the President of the University," Roberts bitterly wrote.31

It was clear that the Department of Public Speaking was in full revolt against the administration. Meanwhile, however, an even greater scandal was exploding at the University, one that would elicit student and alumni protests and leave an intense bitterness in the mouths of many.

**Controversy returns to the Medical School**

"I feel that the Medical School and University authorities have acted in an unwarranted, arbitrary and unjust manner toward me," Dr. James Defandorf wrote to the AAUP in the summer of 1938. A graduate of DC schools and Wesleyan University in Connecticut, Defandorf was also a veteran of the First World War where he served in the Army Medical Corps, sanitation division.

In September 1920, Defandorf was appointed Associate Professor in Pharmacology in the School of Medicine at George Washington. He taught a number of Pharmacology and Biochemistry courses for the next two years until the two departments were divided in 1922, and Biochemistry was united with Physiology. In 1925, when Pharmacology was made a separate department, he became a member.

From 1920 to 1932, during his appointment as associate professor, he had little time for research since the classes were
large and the departmental staff fluctuated between one and three. "For the better half of one year," Defandorf wrote, "I alone carried all the didactic and laboratory work" for several of his courses. "In addition to my academic duties, I also acted as assistant evaluator of premedical credentials for many years, work which demanded an enormous amount of time."

With the appointment of Dean McKinley in 1931, a reorganization of the Medical School followed, which led to a resignation or termination of many members of the faculty. At the beginning of the reorganization, he was relieved of the credential evaluation work, but within a few days, this work was reassigned to him, "making it practically impossible for me to do research work" that year, Defandorf recalled.

He registered at American University graduate school the following year to work on his advanced degree. All classes were scheduled before 9 a.m. or after 5 p.m. In addition, he continued his Ph.D. thesis research under the direction of the department head of the Pharmacology Department. "During the second year of graduate work, my rank was reduced to that of instructor and my pay cut from $3200 to $2400, an additional hardship which I felt I could bear for a year, and which I naturally expected would be removed when I received the Ph.D. degree." When he received his degree in 1934, he was not only not promoted, but he received a pay cut for an additional $200, lowering his salary to $2200.

After receiving his degree, Defandorf asked Dean McKinley if it would be possible for him to get sabbatical leave for further postgraduate work outside of Washington; McKinley refused since Defandorf had already received his Ph.D. "It was manifestly impossible for me to do further work at my own expense and support my family on the meager salary I received," he wrote. Then, suddenly, in Fall 1936, he was notified that he would not be reappointed for the 1937-38 school year, though no reason was ever given.

Defandorf promptly appealed his case to the Board of Trustees. In a letter to the Trustees, he wrote that he had been a member of the staff for seventeen years, performing more than his
share of duties in the courses of the Departments of Pharmacology, Physiology, and Biochemistry at various times. He felt that with his Ph.D. and extensive published research, he had more than met the requirements for promotion, or at least permanent tenure and a higher salary, yet none had been offered.

“Apart from academic duties, it has been my impression that the University favors the participation of its members in civic or national matters, and in assuming certain duties and responsibilities therewith,” Defandorf wrote. He had been in the Army reserves since 1925, and in 1937 held the rank of Major in the Sanitary Reserve Corps of the Medical Department and held a rank equivalent to Lt. Colonel.

I do not believe I have ever failed to carry out orders, or refused to do so, in my university work. I do not see how my loyalty can be questioned, even under such discouraging circumstances. Judgment by others of my ability might differ; I feel that I am capable of performing my duties satisfactorily and conscientiously. I do not believe that any defense of my character is necessary.

I understand that my rank for years as assistant and associate professor entitles me to certain privileges of tenure, a matter which I do not wish to press. ...

I have been actively engaged for some time in attempting to secure a new position, and am active in that search at present. I feel that a temporary appointment at least, or sabbatical leave at a satisfactory salary should be tendered me until I am able to secure a suitable position, an attempt which is rendered the more difficult by the fact that I have suffered a reduction in rank after all these years. The problem is complicated by the fact that I have a family to support and children to educate, and that it would be very difficult and costly for me to leave this city where I own my home, and of which I am a
Defandorf sent a copy of the letter to President Marvin, who asked for an immediate meeting with the aggrieved professor. Marvin offered to reappoint Defandorf as instructor for an additional year with the understanding that Defandorf resign after that time. The president gave no reasons why the professor would be forced to resign. Because of this arrangement, the letter to the Trustees was never presented to the Board.

Marvin wrote an additional letter, “explaining” the rank and tenure system in the Medical School. Until about 1929, the Medical School had no established rank and tenure system at all; professors were reappointed yearly by contract with the dean of the School. In 1929, the tenure of professors in the Medical School were adjusted in line with the tenure and rank of professors in the other colleges, taking into consideration length of service, workload, and quality, with the result that many professors, including Defandorf, were demoted. “This paragraph explains nothing to my satisfaction,” Defandorf later wrote in response to Marvin’s comments on the tenure issue.

Dr. Defandorf penned one final letter to Marvin, pleading for one last review of his case. Outlining his case in detail again, he insisted that he had been a loyal and dependable employee of the University. He also indicated that he had no other job prospects lined up, a problem, no doubt, faced by the other former Medical School personnel who lost their jobs during the Great Depression. He received only a cordial notice of acceptance of his final letter from President Marvin.

Defandorf concluded his appeal to the AAUP: “I have sincerely endeavored to find out why I am being ‘railroaded,’ with no success, as can be seen from this correspondence, except that my department and school administration ‘do not recommend me for reappointment.’” But his Department head, George B. Roth, insists that he fought on Defandorf’s behalf, and even the dean of the Medical School told Defandorf that he had nothing against him. President Marvin, however, said that the action comes not from his office, but from the Medical School administration, an obvious
contradiction.

"I believe it is nothing but a continuation of the practice of removing all of those who were on the faculty when the new administration was appointed, and that no charges have been brought against me because there are none to bring. I have no desire to remain in the School under such circumstances, but I feel that my rights have been violated and my future jeopardized by the treatment I have received," Defandorf finished. 35

But Defandorf was not the only Pharmacology professor to be shown the door in the mid-1930s. George M. Hocking, a professor of Pharmacology and Pharmacognosy in the College of Pharmacy (separate from the Medical School during Marvin's administration), met with a very similar fate.

Hocking was accepted an instructor in the School of Pharmacy in October 1933 when he was only about twenty-four years old. At the time, he was working toward his Ph.D. and was aided by a scholarship at the University of Florida. He expected to receive the degree the following spring or summer, but he interrupted his graduate work at the University of Florida to accept the position at George Washington "solely on account of my need for a larger salary," he wrote to the AAUP.

Hired at half salary, Hocking received a written understanding that he would be reemployed at the full salary for an instructorship the following year if his service was satisfactory. "The impression was strongly given to me that they really intended to stand by their word and do this," Hocking recalled.

There was proof that indeed he was found satisfactory; the dean of the School of Pharmacy expressed complete satisfaction with his services on several occasions. "In May 1934, he read to me a letter which he had written and sent to the President of the University. In this he stated his unqualified approval of my continuance in my position there, and strongly recommended that I be raised to the regular salary for that position." When Hocking left George Washington for the summer, the dean told him that the promotion was settled and Hocking would return in the fall at full salary.

He was surprised then to learn at the end of the summer that
the dean had found it "impossible to increase the amount of my salary for the coming year over what it had been the previous year," and had asked him nonetheless to return to the University under the circumstances and continue teaching at half-salary, in a part-time, rather than full-time, position. "Since it was only a few weeks before school opened, it was out of the question for me to seek another position at that late date, so that I could do nothing but accept."

During the second school year, Hocking was permitted to do outside work in addition to his teaching duties. As far as he knew from feedback from his dean, he discharged his duties in a completely satisfactory way. In April 1935, the dean informed Hocking that Marvin felt he "was not satisfied" in his present position, and therefore requested Hocking's resignation, which the young instructor granted.

"Of course, it was true that I was not satisfied with my salary or with the quality of my teaching during the second year, since I was compelled to spend so much time outside the circle of my duties," Hocking wrote. Nevertheless, he was satisfied in his position since the fractional pay was for a part-time position.

"I have no doubt whatsoever (from my personal knowledge of the situation at George Washington) that the request for my resignation originated with the President. I have been unable to find the true motive for the action, but I am almost sure that it was a matter of economy," as the University was then launching an extensive building program. "I know that I had the friendship and respect of the majority of the students," Hocking concluded.36

George Hocking became a registered pharmacist soon after leaving George Washington. He taught at Ohio Northern University, University of Buffalo, University of New Mexico, and at Auburn University where he taught for 35 years as professor of Pharmacognosy. His extensive publications in the field of herbal remedies, organic health, and natural methods of healing are still staples to anyone knowledgable in the field; his last publication was a revision of his Dictionary of Natural Products, published at age 90. He died in 2001 at age 93.
A. Curtis Wilgus first taught in the George Washington University's History Department in the summer of 1927, and again in 1930. Professor Samuel Flagg Bemis, the department head, told Wilgus that there were no opportunities for a permanent professor in Latin American history at the time. However, later in the summer of 1930, Dr. Marvin offered Wilgus a job as associate professor of Hispanic American history without notifying Bemis of the appointment.

Professor Bemis “knew nothing about my appointment, and was greatly surprised, and he appeared angry and indignant that President Marvin had appointed me to the history staff without consulting him,” Wilgus later wrote in a 1936 appeal to the AAUP. This put Wilgus in an awkward position relative to his department head, and several of the other History Department professors criticized Marvin’s handling of the appointment and directed that criticism at Wilgus.

In February 1932, Marvin again called Wilgus to his office and made the history professor the acting dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (under Dean Doyle) in place of another professor who was not to find out about the appointment until the following June. “President Marvin asked me to keep my appointment confidential,” Wilgus wrote. In line with his new administrative duty, however, Wilgus was listed for only nine hours of teaching during the following academic year. “When I told Professor Bemis this he threatened to resign from the University, and said he would do so if economic conditions permitted. He appeared exceedingly angry, thinking apparently that I had ‘put something over’ on him.” The next day, however, Bemis approached Wilgus and told him to “forget the whole episode” and to mention nothing about how he had acted.

As acting dean of Columbian College, Wilgus was placed in an extremely awkward position, for he was the administrative superior of Bemis in the College, but his inferior in the History Department. This situation led to numerous disagreements
between the two men, disagreements that President Marvin eventually noticed. Bemis was also a very prominent scholar, having won the Pulitzer Prize in 1927 for his book on *Pinckney's Treaty*.

In 1933, President Marvin reappointed Wilgus Chairman of Columbian College, and later the Director of the Center of Inter-American Studies, which was created partly at Wilgus's suggestion. "This further promotion led Professor Bemis to become not only unfriendly, but critical of me and sarcastic at my expense as well," Wilgus wrote.

In the fall of 1934, Professor Bemis finally left George Washington for Yale University, and his replacement as chair of the History Department was Professor Lowell Ragatz. "Professor Ragatz and I had attended school together at the University of Wisconsin, and I had considered him a good friend. I was, therefore, happy that he had been appointed to the position, for it was what he deserved," recalled Professor Wilgus. "I did know, of course, that he had resented keenly my appointment as Associate Professor to the regular staff in the fall of 1930," as Ragatz had been on the staff since 1924 and was still an assistant professor (one rank lower than an associate professor) and therefore received a lower salary. In fact, when Wilgus's appointment was made public, Ragatz planned to resign because of the unfair treatment for which he felt President Marvin had been responsible.

Ragatz had, as well, resented Wilgus's appointment as chairman of Columbian College and as director of the Center of Inter-American Studies. "The result was a breach between us which I could see growing wider despite everything I might do to prevent it." Since Professor Ragatz had been an understudy of Samuel Bemis for many years, he held Bemis's views with regard to Wilgus's appointments. "The result was that from the fall of 1934 onwards Professor Ragatz seems to have planned and carried out a careful campaign to undermine me and my work in the eyes of President Marvin and in the eyes of the students of the History Department." Dr. Marvin had even told Wilgus that Professor Ragatz had reported that he was a poor teacher who
had no standing among the faculty or among scholars in the United States.

After hearing similar complaints from both Professor Bemis and Professor Ragatz, Marvin naturally began to have doubts about Wilgus's work. In 1935, Ragatz had made up a teaching schedule for the 1935 summer session excluding Wilgus; Marvin approved this despite the president's earlier promise that Wilgus work during the summer sessions. Wilgus left to teach at the University of Missouri.

During the summer Wilgus was away, Professor Ragatz apparently told several professors and President Marvin that Wilgus's classes were falling off in numbers, that Wilgus was not a popular teacher, and that he ought to stop teaching Hispanic-American History and take over United States History. Ragatz wrote a letter to Dean Doyle of the Columbian College suggesting that Wilgus teach fifteen hours of classes—three more hours than the department maximum and six more hours than the majority of the other members of the department had. Marvin approved this recommendation, though no students registered in one of Wilgus's classes, the history of Spain and Portugal, which Ragatz forced Wilgus to teach.

"President Marvin told me that Professor Ragatz had said that my teaching was poor, that I had no standing among my colleagues in my field, and that the faculty was unfriendly to me. Marvin even claimed that Wilgus "could not get along with people." As Wilgus wrote to the AAUP: "I mention these things to show how jealous and pettiness within the history department caused not only embarrassment and ill feeling but immediate unfortunate results for the victim of this feeling."

During the month of December 1935, the Center of Inter-American Studies and the Carnegie Institution sponsored an exhibit of Peruvian textiles and art objects owned by a prominent Washington, DC socialite. As Director of the Center, and with Dr. Marvin's approval, Wilgus made, some weeks in advance, all arrangements for the exhibit, and planned to have the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution at an opening reception.
About ten days before the opening of the exhibit, and after all arrangements had been completed, President Marvin began to interfere, questioning whether the exhibit was even worth holding or whether the articles were worthwhile (though Smithsonian officials declared it an extraordinary collection). "Finally, two days before the exhibit, the President called me to his office and before his secretary told me that I had gone about the arrangements for the exhibit 'ass backwards.'"

Professor Wilgus told the AAUP that he believed that President Marvin deliberately upset his arrangements for the exhibit so that he had fodder with which to criticize Wilgus's work. This was the second exhibit of its kind that Wilgus had arranged; the first was an exhibit of Guatemalan textiles about two years before. The first exhibit had gone so smoothly that the Director-General of the Pan-American Union had complimented Wilgus on his work.

On Christmas Eve 1935, President Marvin called Wilgus to his office and said that the Center of Inter-American Studies had failed and that Wilgus was to blame due to his personality and to the criticism and opposition of the faculty. Dr. Marvin told Wilgus to see if he could find an opening at another university. "I asked for specific criticisms against me, and he said that I was not dignified enough to be Director of the Center because I did not wear a hat!"

Wilgus did start looking for a job, asking friends and colleagues if they knew of any vacancies. Apparently some of those friends wrote to Dr. Marvin protesting the treatment, and Marvin decided to keep Wilgus on the staff and as director of the Center for another year.

During the summer of 1936, Wilgus planned to host the fifth annual Seminar Conference on Hispanic-American Affairs, which he had originally started in conjunction with the Center. The Seminar, however, had aroused the opposition of many of the faculty members for reasons that are somewhat difficult to understand; many thought that too much money was spent, that it focused too much on historical and not contemporary issues, and various other complaints.
Professor Wilgus had invited four prominent professors to come to George Washington to teach for the summer of 1936. But Dean Robert Bolwell of the Summer Sessions opposed holding the conference because of the amount of money spent and because Wilgus’s topic for the Seminar, “South American Dictators,” he was afraid, would hardly inspire large turnout.

In December 1935, Marvin entered the fray, calling together the members of the departments of history, political science, and economics to discuss the question of the Seminar Conference and whether it should be held as a for-credit class during the summer sessions or as a non-credit class during the regular academic year, or whether it should even be continued at all. The general opinion of the faculty members was that the Conference should be held during the school year and should be open to the public, two suggestions that Wilgus adamantly opposed.

Marvin decided to appoint a committee with Dean Bolwell as chair, along with six faculty members, including Wilgus, to decide the question of when, if at all, to hold the Seminar Conference. The committee voted to place the Conference in the academic year for no academic credit. Wilgus was the only one to vote against these recommendations; the report was submitted directly to the President.

Wilgus made a final plea to Dr. Marvin to save the Seminar Conference, but his letters were ignored. “When it became apparent that the Seminar Conference would not be offered, I communicated with the lecturers, stating the facts of the case and saying that I would try to do whatever I could to salvage the Seminar Conference, especially in view of the fact that two of the speakers had turned down summer school positions in order to lecture at the George Washington University,” Wilgus recalled. Although no contracts had been signed, Wilgus felt he was not only bound to save the Seminar, but that he was bound to save the men embarrassment or financial loss as well.

So, Professor Wilgus did the only thing he felt he could do: he communicated with the administration at American University in Washington, DC to see if they would permit the conference to continue there. Upon hearing about these plans, Marvin called
Wilgus into his office along with Dean Bolwell and Dean Doyle of the Columbian College, and dictated a letter in their presence to each of the Seminar Conference speakers that Wilgus had lined up for the summer, stating that the Seminar Conference would be held as originally planned. At the same time, it was agreed that the Conference would be the last one of its kind. Later, Wilgus heard from a colleague that Marvin had said that the University had been “sold out” to American by a faculty member—referring to Wilgus.

Just before the Conference was set to begin in the summer of 1936, Wilgus had drinks with a friend, GW Professor George Howland Cox, who taught a course on current Latin American problems. After four cocktails, Cox told Wilgus that Marvin had offered him the directorship of the Center of Inter-American Studies beginning September 1. Cox possessed no academic degree, though he served for six years in Central America with the United Fruit Company and was a weekly correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor.

On April 1, Marvin told Wilgus that he should find a job at another institution because there was such opposition to him at the University and in the History Department, though no specific criticisms could be proffered to Wilgus.

Later that month, Cox told Wilgus confidentially that he was Wilgus’s replacement for the directorship of the Center so that he could use his influence at the State Department to get President Marvin appointed a member of the United States delegation to the Buenos Aires Peace Conference. Cox also said that he felt Marvin chose him for directorship because Cox had recently willed half his estate to the Center. “Furthermore, Cox said that he believed that as soon as President Marvin had gotten what he wanted from him that he would throw Mr. Cox out of the Directorship,” Wilgus recalled, noting that Mr. Cox thought of the appointment to be a “great joke.”

In May, as school was letting out, Cox told Wilgus “President Marvin was moving heaven and earth to obtain an appointment on the United States delegation to the Peace Conference, and that because he had headed the United States delegation to the Pan
American Scientific Conference in Mexico in the fall of 1935 he had had his appetite whetted for greater honors," wrote Wilgus. Cox told him further that President Marvin had entertained the Honorable Sumner Welles, the former ambassador to Cuba and prominent Latin American scholar, and he was "working on" Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

The director of university publicity phoned Wilgus in mid-May saying that Marvin had told her to announce in the city and campus newspapers that Mr. Cox had been appointed the new director of the Center and that Wilgus had resigned to do research. Sure enough, several days later, an article appeared in The University Hatchet announcing the change.

"Dr. A. Curtis Wilgus, associate professor of Hispanic-American History in the University, who has served as director of the Center since its founding three years ago, is relinquishing his administrative work to devote full time to research, writing, and teaching," the paper wrote. Little is mentioned about Cox except that he is a newspaper correspondent who lived in Latin America for several years.37

At the end of May, Wilgus received a letter from President Marvin stating, "in accordance with our last conversation I am not recommending you for the directorship of the Center of Inter-American Studies for this year," and thanking him for his services. The same day Wilgus’s secretary told him that Cox had told her she could only remain as Cox’s secretary into the new school year if she refused to communicate with Wilgus. The other members of the History Department had not been notified of the change, and one, Dr. James Robertson, a colleague and good friend of Professor Wilgus, resigned in protest and wrote Marvin a very bitter parting letter.

Wilgus later found out that his salary for the following year had been reduced, and that Cox was only teaching three credit hours during the school year and receiving a salary of $1500—five times more than the other part-time professors who only taught one course. He received another $900 salary for the directorship of the Center—Wilgus had received only an extra $200.
The following September, after the Seminar had been a dud, with only twelve students enrolled (while Wilgus was teaching during the summer at another University), Cox discussed his position as director of the Center with Wilgus. The Center had been allotted more money than he was able to spend, “and he asked me if I thought it would be proper to spend some of it on entertainment and travel!” Cox spent money on publications that the Center was already receiving and he spent postage needlessly to send books to South America instead of using the Smithsonian’s international book exchange service. “I mention these instances because they show the absurdity of the President’s dictum that I should not be consulted in matters regarding the Center,” recalled Wilgus.

“It may be evident from the foregoing statements that the President of the George Washington University is guilty of constant insincerity, frequent double-dealing, tactless and unfair treatment, numerous inconsistencies, recurring spells of grandiose ambition, and occasional exaggeration and prevarication,” concluded Wilgus. These were not new criticisms of President Marvin; they had dogged the President for almost fifteen years. Marvin allowed himself to be influenced by three powerful deans: Doyle (Columbian College of Arts and Sciences), Bolwell (Summer Sessions), and Kayser (non-degree seeking students), each of whom considered himself to be a vice-president of the University. It was extremely difficult for another faculty member or administrative officer to gain access to this “inner circle.”

The following case that must be analyzed, however, that of Dr. Marvin Herrick, shows that even a professor who had the written support of four deans—Doyle, Bolwell, and Kayser included—could not manage to prevent the termination of an employee whom Dr. Marvin had made up his mind to fire.

The Marvin Herrick Affair

The student body was beginning to organize, to agitate, to protest. And the students, for the first time, wrapped themselves
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up in a case of faculty tenure, the case of Dr. Marvin T. Herrick, an
associate professor of English whose dismissal created waves
among the students and faculty. It was an insightful prologue to
future events.

"President Marvin has just notified me that my contract will
not be renewed after its expiration this coming June," Dr. Marvin T.
Herrick wrote in earnest to Ralph Himstead, the Secretary of the
American Association of University Professors (AAUP), in January
1937. "[He] is violating no terms of contract. I came here with the
understanding that I was on a two-year probationary status," and
the two years end in June 1937. "Therefore I have no legal
complaint," Herrick confessed.

There were a number of irregularities in his case, however.
In April 1935, Marvin offered an associate professorship to Dr.
Herrick, with the intention that Herrick would "help build up the
[English] department." Since coming to the university, Herrick
explained, he had worked hard to strengthen the sophomore
courses in English literature, to establish a course on the history of
literary criticism for more advanced students, and to restore a
Shakespeare class to the curriculum. "I sincerely believe that you
will find no complaints about my academic work during the past
year and a half. President Marvin has admitted to me that he has
no cause for dissatisfaction there."

When Herrick came to George Washington in April 1935, he
was "well aware of the published report on Pres. Marvin's
irregularities at the University of Arizona," and was "somewhat
hesitant about working under him." Herrick explained to Marvin
that he was concerned about academic freedom and faculty
tenure, having just been embroiled in a scandal at the University of
Pittsburgh, then under legal investigation by the State legislature
and condemned by the AAUP. "President Marvin assured me, in
detail, that GWU had a definite policy of freedom of speech for
both faculty and students and that it supported those standards of
tenure commonly accepted by the better colleges and
universities," Herrick wrote. With the verbal assurances Marvin
provided, Herrick accepted the position at George Washington.

Marvin explained to Herrick that all new members of the
faculty, above the rank of instructor, came on a two-year probationary period, which Herrick accepted. "I have since learned from a member of the Board of Trustees that this two-year verbal contact was solely of Pres. Marvin's own making, that, so far as he knew, no member of the Board was even aware of the existence of this two-year probationary period," Herrick told Secretary Himstead, referring to a conversation he had with Trustee Alfred Henry Lawson.

Herrick found he was to teach 5 classes his first semester, Literary Criticism, two sections of English Literature, and two sections of freshman composition, with a total of 240 students. He remembered Marvin's request, however, that he should try to engage himself in community life by performing lectures, participating in dramatics, and otherwise becoming involved in community and university projects outside of the classroom. In June 1936, after several months of working with the local Drama Guild, he was elected a director, in an effort to comply with the request.

That year, however, a tiny incident put him on Marvin's bad side, so to speak. A second-semester senior in one of his classes refused to purchase the required textbook and prepare assignments for class. Insisting that he needed to graduate, the student threatened to go to Dr. Marvin if he failed. At Herrick's request, the student went to Dr. Marvin before he failed; to Herrick's horror, Marvin sided with the student, insisting that books were expensive, and that a student should not be disadvantaged for not buying a textbook for a class.

The student persisted in refusing to take part in the class, according to Herrick's account of the incident, and he was forced to flunk the student. The student went to Herrick's office with "a long story of how he had finally seen the light," asking for another chance at passing the class. Herrick agreed to change the student's grade from "F" to "conditional" if he made up the class the following semester. "The student kept his word. He bought a book, took a real part in the recitations, got a 75 on his make-up and an 84 on his final examination, and was graduated."

The above incident seemed trivial to Herrick, but after a
conversation with Mrs. Jessie Fant Evans, a trustee of the university elected by the alumni committee, he realized that it might well be the reason why Dr. Marvin turned against him.

Disagreements ensued between Dr. Marvin and Dr. Herrick with Marvin's insistence that Herrick do more to "popularize" the English Department off-campus. Herrick responded that he was teaching a full load of classes, and "a teacher's first duty was to his classes." Marvin told Herrick that regardless of Herrick's experience and the work he did for the Department, the situation was clear-cut; either Herrick must do more "popularizing," or he must look for another job. The Marvin Doctrine, sacrificing academic quality for "economy," was being applied full-force and was about to claim another victim.

On January 21, 1937, Herrick was informed that his reappointment had been denied. Dean Doyle of the Columbian College brought him the news, and the two men met Marvin for a meeting two weeks later. Joining them was Dean William Crane Johnstone of the Junior College, and Professor DeWitt C. Croissant, the head of the Department of English. At the meeting, Marvin asked Herrick to submit a letter of resignation; Dean Doyle protested that Herrick could hardly resign since he had not been reappointed. Herrick told Marvin the next month that he could write no such letter; he insisted he had fulfilled his obligations to Marvin and to the George Washington University. In addition to a strong class in literary criticism, a 35-student class in Shakespeare, and nearly 200 in the sophomore English course, Herrick had also organized the Literary Club on campus and had the support of every member of the English Department. "The general attitude, so far as I could judge, both on and off campus, was that Pres. Marvin's decision was unfair and unwise," Herrick wrote.

President Marvin and Dean Doyle called another conference, this one concerning a petition that was circulating on campus, sponsored by a senior named Davis Harding, a student in Herrick's Shakespeare class. Herrick admitted to knowing about the petition, his attention brought to it by a colleague. President Marvin asked why Herrick had done nothing to suppress the
petition. "Pres. Marvin and Dean Doyle both tried to impress upon Davis Harding and me the gravity of our offense, of our disloyalty to the university. Both Harding and I refused to be impressed." Herrick insisted that the petition in no way showed disloyalty to the university, that it was an "honest effort" on the part of the students to express their dissatisfaction with the administration, and moreover, that the right of students to free speech and petition was absolute and protected the actions in question.

The President insisted that Harding and Herrick were causing irreparable damage to the university by committing such an act. "Both Harding and I replied that we were prepared to take the risk of incurring his displeasure," Herrick later wrote. Dean Doyle and Marvin accused them of "breaking faith with them." Doyle told Herrick that he had been for him one hundred percent, but now he was just as much against him; Doyle went so far as to repudiate any recommendation he had ever made on behalf of Herrick. The two administrators went on to say that instead of giving Herrick a recommendation, they would say that Herrick was an "unscrupulous, unethical man who did not belong in any university."

The student press championed both Herrick's cause and the circulating petition. The Hatchet wrote on March 23, 1937: "Present and former students of Dr. Marvin T. Herrick have paid him tribute by the wholesale signing of a petition outlining their feelings concerning his abilities as a scholar and teacher and asking that the Board of Trustees reconsider its decision not to renew his contract, which terminates this year." An accompanying story reported that 171 students had signed the petition, and Davis Harding read the petition to the student council. A copy was sent to the American Association of University Professors. The petition read:

It is now common knowledge that Dr. Herrick's contract at the University expires this June and for reasons of economy will not be renewed. Out of admiration for Dr. Herrick as a teacher, and out of affectionate concern for the future of the University
itself, we urge a reconsideration of the decision of the administration.

We feel that economy may better be practised elsewhere than on a distinguished teacher whose fine scholarship is recognized and appreciated, not only by the students of George Washington University, who have had the good fortune to study under him, but by the leaders in his own field. We have studied under him. We can testify to the inspiration of his contact. We have benefitted from his stimulating class-room methods and from his exact and minute scholarship. And, as a man, we have liked him. In the short period of two years, he has become a significant part of the life of the University. We cannot let him go without protest.\footnote{41}

When the administration ignored the petition that the students of Herrick's English classes presented, and worse, chided Herrick about it, the students took a revolutionary step. They took the petition to the university community at-large. The students collected 700 signatures and had established an ad-hoc Committee for the Retention of Dr. Herrick. The petition read: "It is the student who is the loser in this case, and therefore, we, as students, feel justified in doing all that we may properly do to bring about the retention of Dr. Herrick." A Hatchet article reported that Marvin addressed the Student Council on March 18, 1937, saying that Herrick was an excellent professor.\footnote{42}

A Washington Post article on March 19, 1937, carried an account of an open student meeting at which Marvin refused the 171-signature student petition.\footnote{43}

Herrick recounts how a reporter from the Washington Daily News contacted him. The reporter had recently held an interview with Dr. Marvin in which Marvin insisted that Herrick's dismissal had gone through the regular channels and that it had the approval of the English Department. "Is that true? Did your department recommend your dismissal?" the reporter asked.\footnote{44} Herrick replied: "It did not, unless my colleagues have been lying
to me, and I do not believe they have. The chairman of the Department did not recommend it either." The reporter responded, "I thought not. That's why I did not print the conversation between Marvin and me." According to Herrick, Marvin called up the *Washington Daily News*, and asked the managing editor not to print anything about the "Herrick case." The *News* slyly responded by running a story the next day.

On March 24, 1937, Marvin held another meeting, at which he attempted to convince Herrick that his case had been dealt with judiciously, involving the normal procedures. Herrick refused to believe it; he recounts the conversation:

*President Marvin:* Who hired you?
*Dr. Herrick:* You did.
*M: Who recommended you?
*Herrick:* Professor Croissant
*M: Exactly, and you are going out the same way.
*Herrick:* Do you mean to tell me that Professor Croissant recommended my dismissal?
*M: How could it be otherwise?
*Herrick:* I do not believe it. If Prof. Croissant has ever given any consent to this move, then you have been putting pressure on him.

President Marvin called Croissant, and asked him to come to the president's office.

*M: Professor Herrick does not believe, Professor Croissant, that you have agreed to his dismissal.
Professor Croissant: I have always opposed letting Mr. Herrick go, and I still oppose it. I have never been consulted about the matter since last fall.

Marvin called Dean Doyle of the Columbian College, and asked him to come to the president's office.

*M: Dean Doyle, Professor Croissant says that
he has never recommended Professor Herrick's dismissal. Is that true?

Dean Doyle: Well, not in writing.

Croissant: No, nor verbally either.

Doyle: Well, we assumed you agreed.

Croissant: I have never been consulted since our conference of last fall. I opposed letting Professor Herrick go then, and I still oppose it. I still think that the move is unwise. I have always had the highest regard for Professor Herrick, and I still have. The only thing you can say is that I have not fought the final decision.

There was nothing for President Marvin or Dean Doyle to say after Croissant's last declaration, Herrick wrote.

"Even now I am not sure of just why Pres. Marvin has refused to renew my contract," Herrick concluded to Secretary Himstead of the AAUP. "I cannot believe that this failure to put popularizing first is the sole, or even the real, reason for my dismissal. Too many of my colleagues and too many friends in Washington, who know Pres. Marvin and his methods, have assured me that the real reason must lie elsewhere." Trustee Evans, a close friend of President Marvin, had told Herrick that Marvin was "excessively temperamental, a victim of whims, that he often turned suddenly upon a man and tried to force him out of the university." Mrs. Evans cited specific examples of men Marvin had once tried to fire and later rewarded with promotions, including Dean Doyle.

"I sincerely believe that Pres. Marvin alone is responsible for my dismissal. I have the absolute assurance of Professor Croissant, executive officer of the Department of English, that he has always supported me." Herrick also had the support of four deans: Dean Robert W. Bolwell of the Summer Sessions, Dean Elmer Louis Kayser of the adult education and non-degree programs, Dean Johnstone of the Junior College, and, at least initially, Dean Doyle of the Columbian College. Although proper academic procedures of the university hold that both department heads and deans have votes in whether or not a professor should
be retained, Herrick believed these procedures were violated. The rank of associate professorship supposedly came with “permanent tenure,” as President Marvin told Herrick when he was first hired.

“To the best of my knowledge, President Cloyd Heck Marvin has been exercising despotic, unethical powers over the faculty and undergraduates of the George Washington University,” wrote Dr. Herrick to Secretary Himstead.45 “His lying, his shifty evasions, his use of brutal intimidation have so antagonized members of the university that the undergraduate leaders have already broken out into open rebellion and the faculty is in secret rebellion.” No member of the faculty has any job security, Herrick said, warning that professors can be hired and fired virtually at the will of the president. President Marvin has scattered all opposition. These charges were not new, and Herrick would certainly not be the last to charge them against Marvin.46

“In my opinion, the university is in an unhealthy state. President Marvin, I believe, is a martinet, a veritable dictator. I believe that he wants the reputation of upholding academic standards, but is unwilling to pay the price. President Marvin, if I read the signs aright, does not have the confidence of his faculty or of the better students.”

Herrick made one last, ominous warning: “The day may come when the rebellion, which surely exists in the minds and feelings of many faculty members and students, may break out into the open.”47

Less than three years after Herrick left the George Washington University, a rebellion did break out into the open; a revolution against President Marvin had begun.

Student body politics and dissent in the 1930s

But other events were to intervene in the meantime. Dissent did not only arise among the faculty in the 1930s. The student body as well was becoming aware of University politics and was demanding a voice. The university newspaper, which celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary in 1929, was one source of opposition
to President Marvin. Student government proved to be another. As other student organizations formed, including student publications and left-leaning political groups, they were met with a hostile administration that did not sympathize with their goals and even attempted to manipulate them.

The rise of student government on the campus of the George Washington University marked another milestone passed in the mid-1930s. In January 1935, the year Professor Herrick came to campus, a group of students began to plan what became the George Washington Union, the body of student government that would, many years later, form the foundation for the present Student Association, along with the Student Council, which also began in the mid-1930s.

“What is the George Washington Union?” The Hatchet asked. The paper quoted Article II of the Union's Constitution. “The purpose of the union shall be two-fold: (1) to enable the students of the University to gain a political and economic point of view which will have been arrived at by independent thinking, and (2) to provide an organization which will give the students of the University practical experience in politics and parliamentary procedure.”

Half the delegates in the Union were elected from 10 districts of the United States, and half elected at-large, but all were, of course, members of the GW student body (this was changed to elect the delegates by proportional representation). Those delegates discussed the national policies of the United States “in a manner which reflects fairly all aspects of university opinion on these questions.” The students would learn political procedure, including the organization of political parties, parliamentary procedure, and group leadership. A committee worked throughout the spring and summer of 1935 writing a constitution for the Union and planning its organization. The University and city press hailed its development.

The move had the “fullest official sanction,” Dr. Elmer Louis Kayser writes. Students supported various ideologies, which were represented by 101 delegates in the Union, and they debated political questions. In the first election, held on November 15,
1935, the Center won 55 seats, the Left won 24, and the Right won 22. There were 1,465 votes cast.

Each party held a political convention early in the school year to declare its position on current issues. On October 15 and 16, the general election days, students voted on automatic voting machines. As soon as results were in, 101 seats were assigned to parties by proportional representation. The students also chose a president. Those students who are not seated in the Union still participate through party caucuses for the determination of policy and instruction of delegates.

Although the administration was supportive, in principle, of efforts to increase student input in administrative decisions, including student government initiatives, the administration and the Board of Trustees were steadfastly opposed to permitting student groups from George Washington to affiliate with national organizations. On many college campuses today, it is not uncommon to see a university chapter of a political party or an advocacy or special interest group; for many decades at George Washington, however, this was strictly forbidden. Unlike previous cases where students clashed with the university over faculty relations, immersing themselves in questions of faculty tenure and due process, some students began chafing over the question of civil liberties, the right to free expression and association in particular.

The immediate question was over the infamous Rule 6 of the Board of Trustees. Rule 6 held that "no student clubs or societies (except social fraternities, sororities, scholastic honor societies, religious or professional clubs or societies) organized as a branch or affiliate of a non-George Washington University organization will be recognized by the Student Life Committee," the body charged with permitting student groups to operate on campus.

The Hatchet summed up the rule succinctly: "In other words, students here cannot join with students of other colleges and universities in discussion of their common problems or do anything about them." Although the rule was referred to once in a while when a new student group sought recognition, it was not until 1937 that the rule sparked protest; that year, the George
Washington Union sought to affiliate itself with the American Student Union, a nationwide organization that aligned various student governments in a large lobbying group of sorts, much as the American Association of University Professors oversaw faculty relations nationwide and lobbied on behalf of professors when the situation warranted. The Hatchet called the American Student Union "a progressive national student federation concerned with political and social problems affecting every student in the country."\(^{51}\)

Earlier in the decade, a liberal movement among the student body was quietly snuffed out. On November 6, 1934, a Hatchet article reported that the Liberal Club, an organization that espoused progressive politics, was holding a rally the following Monday, one of about 150 such rallies held nationwide to protest war and Fascism. Six nationwide organizations, several that were later branded as "communist," called for the rallies across the country: the Student League for Industrial Democracy, National Students' League, Student Councils of the YMCA and YWCA, the Committee on Militarism and Education, and the International Students' Service. Other GW campus organizations, including the International Students Society, the Methodist Club, and the International Relations Club supported the Liberal Club in the holding of a rally at George Washington.

Several nationally prominent liberal activists planned to speak at the rally, held on Armistice Day, November 11. Many of the student liberals were concerned with the role played by the munitions manufacturers in fomenting war and promoting ill feeling among nations, according to The Hatchet.\(^{52}\)

The rally sparked protests from other organizations in the District of Columbia, including the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Military Order of the World War. The DAR decried "student un-Americanism." In an open letter to President Marvin, James E. Van Zandt of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, declared that the holding of an anti-war rally is "plainly un-American and absolutely devoid of common sense and patriotic decency. It is inconceivable for me as commander-in-chief of America's largest group of overseas
fighting men to think that a meeting of this nature announced in
the press would be tolerated in American institutions." 53.

In the wake of this protest, Marvin did something very out of
character: he refused to break up the rally. “The function of the
university is to search for truth, this means freedom of thought,
freedom of speech, and, incidentally so far as the University is
concerned, freedom of the press,” Marvin said in a statement,
upholding the Liberal Club’s right to hold the rally, but noting the
University gave it no official sanction because the University does
not give sanction "to any set of opinions on any subject." 54.

 Hecklers at the rally made the event chaotic. The speakers
gave short, disjointed speeches before students interrupted them,
shouting “Hurrah for Hitler” and “Hurrah for Huey Long.” Students
stood about laughing and joking, unsympathetic to the cause. The
student newspaper reported: “There were no torchlights because
the fire department would not allow them; there were no veterans
of foreign wars to break up the meeting because President Marvin
had previously ‘pacified’ their delegation over the telephone. One
half dozen policemen were on hand, but they had a big laugh,
too.” 55

Editorials following the incident appeared in The Hatchet
appreciating Marvin’s support of the freedom of speech, but
condemning the Liberal Club’s actions. Many students felt that the
Liberal Club, in vowing not to fight in any war under any
circumstances, had become too radical. Others felt that the Club
should at least have been permitted to present its views.

“What elicits the pride of the entire student body is the fact
that our President, not necessarily agreeing, stood for the practice
of what might have been a petty theory, the theory of the students’
privilege of unrestricted discussion,” wrote Hatchet columnist
Verna Volz. “We want him to know that we appreciate that stand,
and we want him to hear our heartfelt hurrahs for his
act.” 56.

Other actions of President Marvin, however, reduced his
credibility as a defender of the civil liberties of students. Several
weeks after the controversy, the David Carliner incident occurred.

David Carliner, a high school student in the District of
Columbia, was perhaps the most prominent advocate of student
liberalism in the local high schools. He was suspended from his high school for attempting to incite a strike after the school cancelled the football season following an uproar at a football game, The Hatchet reported. He was reinstated after his suspension and he graduated in January 1935 when he applied to George Washington. He was denied admission.

Although Marvin insisted that he was not denied admission for his personal beliefs, The Hatchet wrote that the "[basis] for denying admission to Carliner was an unfavorable report of a moral nature, submitted by his high school principal." The report included a survey of Carliner's behavior after his reinstatement but before his graduation.

The admissions letter sent to Carliner specifically stated that denial was not based on his "political or economic beliefs," but rumors soon became rampant that he was denied admission for his "avowed Communistic views," according to the paper.

The National Student League, with which Carliner was associated, prepared several hundred liberal activists throughout the city to be signed and sent to President Marvin. The form letter alleged inconsistency in Marvin's sanctioning of a peace demonstration by the Liberal Club when opponents tried to stop it, only to be followed by the denial of admission to David Carliner.

The admissions letter to Carliner stated that if he waited a year to "demonstrate his good intentions," he would be admitted in the usual manner.57

Civil liberties on campus became the subject of a meeting of the Liberal Club on February 12. The Carliner case was discussed. The Liberal Club denied participating in the publication of "The Index," which was passed out on campus the previous Friday. Distributed by the League for Industrial Democracy, the flyer criticized the administration for rejecting Carliner.58

Carliner was not, to be sure, the only student in such a position. A year later, in March 1936, Marvin received a letter from Gabriel R. Mason, the principal of the Abraham Lincoln High School in Brooklyn, New York. "Last April [1935]," Mason wrote, "a number of New York City high school students, who participated in so-called peace strikes, were grossly disobedient, boldly defiant,
and flagrantly disrespectful of constituted authority." The students refused to respect codes of conduct specifically made by the principal in the event of protests. On each of the students' school records, a notation was made explaining that the student was guilty "of a serious breach of discipline" in disobeying the orders of the principal.

Mason wanted to know if George Washington was interested in character records as well as records of scholarship. He offered to send Marvin a list of all students who had participated in the "disorderly" peace protests. 59

Marvin, in his reply to Mason's letter, insisted the point was moot. "If an institution gives a student graduation...knowing him to be 'guilty of a serious breach of discipline,'" Marvin wrote, "then I think the school is as guilty as the student." 60

Mason was, indeed, a strong opponent of the peace protests, but not all who corresponded with Marvin were. Edmund Chaffee, the editor of The Presbyterian Tribune in New York City, wrote a cordial but bitter letter to President Marvin. "There are just two points that I would like to make," Chaffee wrote. "The first is that students are entitled to make an effective protest against their manslaughter. Surely when one is defending his life, he cannot be bound by too many regulations." War loomed in Europe and in the Far East, and millions worldwide were anxious with fear.

"Second, would you take precisely the same attitude toward a Republic group or, say, the R.O.T.C. that you take toward these students?" Chaffee asked, rhetorically. 61

The Teachers Union of the City of New York also condemned the actions of administrators nationwide in the face of the protests, noting that participating students were severely penalized with a notation attached to their college applications, "indicating that the student was deficient in loyalty and obedience." Some students were denied admission while others were forced to make retractions.

"Progressive education demands that students' participation in the solution of current problems be encouraged," wrote Union President Charles J. Hendley. "Repressive measures practised by certain New York principals have shaken the confidence of many
of these students. They have suddenly become aware of a gap between democracy in theory and democracy in practice.\textsuperscript{62}

“I do not see how we can support students who, having signed up to abide by the laws of any University, see fit to take it into their hands, at the pronouncement of some outside body, to violate the integrity of the contract which they have signed as a member of the institution,” Marvin responded.\textsuperscript{63}

The peace protests in question took place nationwide in March 1935. At George Washington, liberal fervor again became apparent as a strike committee formed to advocate GW participation in a nationwide Strike Against War and Fascism to be held on April 12 at 11 a.m. The previous year’s strike called 25,000 students out of class at universities around the country. The 1935 protest against the United States’ preparation for war was advocated by the National Council of Methodist Youth, the American Youth Congress, the Inter-Seminary Movement, the Student League for Industrial Democracy, and the National Student League. Local strike committees were also formed at American University and Howard University in the District of Columbia.\textsuperscript{64}

As the strike date neared, the students enlisted official support from the U.S. Senate Munitions Investigating Committee. U.S. Senator Homer Bone of Washington made a special statement to \textit{The Hatchet}: “Certainly anything which constitutes as grave a challenge to civilization as war should invoke the active interest of students as well as all of our citizens who value our social institutions.” The American Legion registered official opposition, saying that the strike was “communistic in its inception, direction, and control.”

The chairman of the D.C. Central strike committee refuted the Legion’s arguments, insisting that progressive, liberal students, not by communists, sponsored the strike. “We want to carry on a peaceful strike in Washington,” said chairman Jean Scott, “and we are opposed to any violent action by any organization to break up the strike.”\textsuperscript{65}

As late as April 9, \textit{The Hatchet} reported that the GW Strike Committee had made no definite plans about the exact location of
the strike. The administration of the University refused to grant permission to the strike committee to use University facilities in conducting the demonstration. President Marvin, however, insisted that no students would be punished save for the usual class-cutting rule. The chairman of the GW Strike Committee, Harvey Thirloway, reported that leaflets with the exact time and place of the strike would be printed on flyers and distributed around campus later that week.

American University students planned a University-sponsored rally against war at 10 a.m. followed by a march at 11. Howard University expected 100% turnout for the walkout. At the University of California at Berkeley, 13 students were jailed for distributing flyers advertising the strike. It was expected that the City College of New York would be forced to close. The University of Pennsylvania had decided to cancel classes.

As the strike date neared, the Anti-Strike League, organized by a small group of students trying to prevent the proposed strike, denounced the strike as a “Communistically incited demonstration to weaken the morale and defenses of the United States,” in a statement to the student newspaper. The statement, written by E.Z. Buck, George R. Brown, and William M. Backus, the Anti-Strike League “has acquired proof that the strike was called by a body at which a union of Socialists and Communists were dominant.” The League “wishes to protest the ungentlemanly procedure engaged in by the supporters of the strike.”

The bulletin board in front of Corcoran Hall, the students alleged, contained a poster denouncing the “sinister Communist backing” of the strike, which was stolen the previous Friday evening. The bulletin board was in a locked glass case when it was broken into, confirming the League’s belief that the strike supporters were unruly and complicit in the destruction of University property.

The American Legion had vowed to prevent the strike “by any means necessary,” supported by the National Women’s Patriotic Council and the Sons of the American Revolution. Senator James Hamilton Lewis of Illinois said, “I think it unfortunate that students should be called upon to strike for anything. I believe that strikes
are bad methods for gaining to any end.”

One of the strongest opponents of the strike was John Bracken, the chairman of the Center Party in the student union. He presented documentary evidence that the sponsoring organizations were either left-wing radical groups or non-existent. The American Youth Congress denied backing the strike, insisting that a tiny minority of “Communists” is behind the strike. One organizer, Viola Ilma, insisted that the strikers “are misusing the name of the Congress which officially knows nothing of the strike.” The National Council of Methodist Youth also stated that they had not sanctioned the strike. “We do not approve” of the strike, the Council wrote in a telegram to Bracken. No record could be found of any organization with the title “Inter-Seminary Movement,” Bracken reported.

The other two organizations sponsoring the strike, the National Student League and the Student League for Industrial Democracy, were Communist and Socialist in nature, respectively, according to Bracken.

Charles Kiefer, a member of the strike committee and prominent student activist at GW, said that it was “distinctly unfortunate that the rumor is being whispered that the student strike is being backed by ‘Moscow Gold.’ The rumor is false, and I earnestly hope that the student body will not be lulled into any false sense of security or inertia by this intimidation.”

On April 10, the George Washington Union debated the proposed strike, with Thirloway and Kiefer of the Left Party upholding the strike, and Bracken and Union chairman Ted Pierson, both of the Center Party, opposing the strike. Professor Henry G. Roberts of the Public Speaking Department moderated the debate. A crowd of more than 200 jammed Stockton Hall to hear the discussion. Bracken argued that the strike “was all destruction and no construction.” A public forum after the debate permitted students to ask questions of the four debaters. One of the student organizations that had endorsed the strike, the Wesley Club, withdrew support.

“Rain failed to dampen the spirits of some 600 curiosity seekers and strikers against war Friday when the scheduled
demonstrations held without University sanction went off," The Hatchet reported the following week. U.S. Representative Maury Maverick of Texas was scheduled to speak at the rally, but withdrew after Marvin announced that the University did not sanction the meeting and the congressman could not be afforded an official University welcome. Former Congresswoman Jeanette Rankin of Montana, the first female elected to the legislative branch of the U.S. government and opponent of U.S. entry into the First World War, did speak to the students. Members of the Anti-Strike League, led by student C.T.R. Bohannan, drove around the University square several times in an old automobile carrying a large American flag.68

Marvin’s prohibition of the 1935 peace strikes brought criticism from the floor of the United States House of Representatives. Congressman Fred H. Hildebrandt of South Dakota believed it was “encouraging to see young men and young women in our colleges show their opposition to mass murder. It is especially encouraging to find such large numbers of them refusing to be hypnotized and intoxicated by war slogans, propaganda of munitions makers, and the glare and glitter of military uniforms and ceremonies.” Hildebrandt also quoted a letter sent by his colleague Representative Fred J. Sisson of New York to President Marvin:

I think, however, it is very regrettable that in these times when so much is being attempted in the nature of repression and suppression of free speech...that the head of a great university should align himself with the Army and Navy lobby here in Washington, the munitions and armament makers, the Shearers, and other provocateurs of war, and what is even worse than that, should deny the right of free discussion upon those vital questions.69

Prior to the 1936 strike the following year, much debate erupted among members of the student body. The Patriotic Action Committee of George Washington University distributed a circular
calling the strike an “un-American attempt to copy the
demonstrations of Lenin Square.” The sponsoring organizations
were communist or socialist in orientation, E.Z. Buck and C.T.R.
Bohannan wrote for the Committee, in an attempt to rally the
conservative students on campus. “Don’t support a Communist
Strike!” another circular read. Elmer Kayser recounted the 1936
strike in his book Bricks Without Straw: The Evolution of the
George Washington University. On the day of the strike, April 12,
1936, demonstrations pro and con threatened to erupt across the
campus. Marvin took the initiative by persuading all factions to
join in a Peace Convocation on Monday, April 6. Three sessions
were held: a general session at 11:10 a.m. and two afternoon
sessions at 5:45 p.m., one in Stockton Hall and one in Corcoran
Hall. All classes falling within the hours of the Convocation
sessions were cancelled. At each session two distinguished
speakers were heard and a student panel of five carried on the
discussion. “All shades of opinion were represented in the list of
speakers and in the student panels,” Kayser wrote. The Hatchet
editorialized: “Its success is sung by its proponents and admitted
by its opponents.... Such was the success of the Convocation that
all shades and grades of pacifists and militarists had their innings
during the day's course.” In short, Marvin fought speech with
speech, and not with censorship. This would change dramatically
in the next year.

In addition to the editorial praising the Peace Convocation,
the April 7 issue of The Hatchet also contained a memorable
column, one by James Haley, the editor-in-chief the previous year.
“To the everlasting credit of President Marvin may it be said that
The Hatchet has in the past enjoyed greater ‘freedom’ than
perhaps any other major college newspaper in the country,” Haley
wrote, commending the President’s endorsement of the Peace
Convocation. Many other newspapers nationwide voiced envy
that the University did not exercise overt control over the
newspaper or censorship of its content; a faculty member did not
have to review copies or proofs before publication, as was the
case at many other universities.

However, Haley wrote, prior to the publication of the last
issue of the newspaper, Editor-in-Chief Eleanor Heller received a
demand from an unnamed dean:

Your orders are that you stand ready and at my
command to do as I direct in this matter whatever
inconvenience or trouble it might cause you
personally or any member of your staff, whatever the
expense involved, and regardless of how much time
you might lose from class or work, even if it means
holding up the paper one or two or three days and
necessitates your staff working every night in the
week. 72.

The demand almost certainly came from Dean Elmer Louis
Kayser of the Division of University Students, the non-degree
seeking students enrolled at George Washington. Haley decried
the obvious attempt to manipulate the staff of the newspaper so
that they reported a certain way on the Peace Convocation. Haley
wrote in a column that the undignified dean did not deserve the
post that he had, and he only held his place at the University for
three reasons: "(1) To draw a monthly paycheck. (2) To help his
personal friends among the students at the expense of other
students whom he dislikes, and (3) to achieve by acclamation the
title of 'The George Washington Clown.'" 73.

"At all events, President Marvin, a proven friend of the
students and the student press, would have handled it more
tactfully," Haley wrote. Needless to say, Dean Kayser did not
appreciate the personal attack on him.

In a letter to President Marvin, Dean Kayser wrote: "I regret
that it is necessary to call to your attention as a matter of personal
privilege the following article appearing in today's Hatchet." Kayser attached the editorial to the letter. 74.

James Haley's roommate, Student Union chairman Ted
Pierson, wrote a letter to President Marvin detailing the incident.
Dean Kayser appeared before the Peace Convocation Committee,
a group of students whose job it was to plan the event. Invited to
the meeting were Editor-in-Chief Heller and James Haley. Dean
Kayser asked Miss Heller if the paper could hold the issue for a day so that the Peace Convocation, covered the day before the paper’s publication, so that the staff would be able to cover the event. Kayser insisted that it was under President Marvin’s orders. Miss Heller “tried to explain the inconvenience and expense of such an order” of delaying publication “and that she thought such a move was impossible,” Pierson recalled. Dean Kayser was insistent. “They wrangled for about fifteen minutes during which time the Dean definitely stated that he did not care about the expense, that he did not care how many classes Miss Heller had to miss, how much work she had to miss, how late she had to stay up at night to carry out the order, that she was to accept or reject the same, without more.” Miss Heller finally conceded. She left the meeting with Haley.

Immediately after they left the room, the committee members, including Charles Kiefer, shook Dean Kayser’s hand and a former Hatchet staff member remarked, “They have been asking for it for a long time.” “With the exception of myself and the possible exception of Dean Johnstone the members of the Committee seemed vengefully elated at Dean Kayser’s conduct of the whole affair. Dean Kayser also remarked that he really thought it was unnecessary to hold up the Hatchet, but that he would not let the editors know it,” said Pierson.

The members of the Strike Committee were very critical of Haley’s and Heller’s editorial positions regarding the Peace Convocation, though specific charges are not known. Political disputes divided the newspaper staff, at least in part between those who favored the strike and those who did not. Several members of the Committee had publicly expressed criticism of Heller and Haley in the past.

“As for my part I thought the whole quarrel was disgraceful, and hold Miss Heller and Dean Kayser equally to blame. Miss Heller was very indiscreet and disrespectful in first ignoring Dean Kayser’s order and the dean at least equalled her thoughtless conduct in trying to ‘put her in her place.’” Pierson insisted that both sides should be prosecuted to the same extent.}

On April 16, the Student Council voted ten to six to endorse
removing Haley from all participation in extracurricular activities. The Council resolved that “we deplore and condemn the action of the University Hatchet in the printing of the column ‘Flying Chips’ by James W. Haley which appeared in the last issue of that paper, for we believe that the attack on an able, self-sacrificing and well-beloved member of our University Faculty which was contained in that column was both contemptible and cowardly.” A letter to President Marvin was signed Ruth G. Brewer, Secretary of the Student Council.76.

On April 21, Haley’s column, “Flying Chips,” again appeared. He wrote at the very end of his column: “Realizing that I have misused this column in the past by making personal attacks upon individuals, I hereby apologize for any injury or embarrassment caused the University or persons so attacked.”

A staff editorial accompanied it, saying: “It is the privilege of the college journalist in editorial material to express his own ideas and feelings and the sentiment of the student body without restrictions other than those considered to be within the scope of the purposes and requisites of the paper.” The article, signed not by Eleanor Heller, but by associate editor William Cheatham, defended the paper’s prerogative to print its own editorial content.

A letter to the editor from President Cloyd Heck Marvin also appeared on the page. President Marvin did not support the paper’s stance that it had the absolute right to publish its own editorial content. He began by explaining that the freedom of the press was not absolute. “It is the right freely to examine, freely to set forth, and freely to comment upon whatever is of general concern to the membership of the community,” Marvin wrote. “As with everything of great value, its possession carries high responsibilities. It is not license to pry, to misrepresent, to attack in petty spirit, to be personally vituperative. Hence, freedom of the press ought to be placed only in the keeping of those endowed with balanced judgment, fine integrity, and the highest motives.”77.

Kayser was still not pleased, and in a letter to Marvin that day encouraged disciplinary action for Heller and Haley, and advocated that Haley make an apology and a retraction, and Heller make an apology for the misuse of space in the paper.
“There is no retraction, and the apology is definitely subordinated in the set-up of the page,” he noted, looking at the April 21 issue, and “There is no apology from the responsible editor. What is given is a circumlocutory editorial signed by an associate.”

He ended the letter on a bitter note, insisting to Marvin that he was humiliated for simply carrying out the President’s orders: “As one who was attacked because he was discharging an onerous and difficult task assigned to him by the President I cannot feel that amends have been made in the best possible manner.”

James Haley and Eleanor Heller, the editors-in-chief for 1935 and 1936, respectively, married and raised two daughters and a son. Residing in Arlington, Virginia, Heller received a law degree and worked in Haley’s law firm. In 1970, it was reported that they had two grandchildren.

In 1937, the Chairman of the United Strike Peace Committee, Helen Morton, a GW student, wrote a letter to Marvin requesting that the University sponsor the peace strike as it had done the previous year. “Last year some 500,000 students [nationwide] participated. We anticipate, in view of the wider sponsorship this year, an even larger number. It is to be hoped that universities will have a united demonstration of faculties and administrations as well as student bodies. It would be a demonstration that the American university world is united on behalf of peace.

Marvin not only refused the strike sponsorship, but he banned the peace strikes altogether. He wrote to The Hatchet “belligerent and inappropriate action is neither educational nor effective. It breeds opposition and counter demonstration by those who resent the tactics though they may be sincerely enthusiastic for the cause.” What made the situation worse for Marvin was that the Marvin Herrick protests were in full force; petitions were circulating around campus calling for Herrick’s retention as a professor of English.

The strikers pressed ahead with their plans, however. Numerous letters to the editor filled the Hatchet pages. The editorial staff wrote an article that, while not endorsing the strikers’ position, nonetheless questioned Marvin’s refusal to sponsor the peace strike as he had done the previous year. The 1936 Peace
Convocation had provided an educational opportunity quite apart from textbooks and classrooms, the editors explained. The University had, indeed, missed an excellent chance for a peaceful, educational experience. A small faction of students felt that peace convocations did little good. They may be right, but the University should not make that judgment for the students.

On Thursday, April 22, about 300 students abandoned classes and defied Marvin's orders not to strike. Several congressmen spoke to the students; Representatives Henry Teigan and John Coffee addressed a morning audience of about 150 at the Union Methodist Church. "It seems beyond belief," Teigan said in regard to Dr. Marvin's attitude, "that a man occupying his position should take a stand that indirectly at least is one on behalf of warmongers." Coffee said, "Dr. Marvin's action seems to me like a clear-cut case of abridgement of the right of academic freedom." Representative Jean T. Bernard also spoke, The Hatchet reported, as did the incoming Hatchet editor-in-chief Howard Ennes, who admonished the paper for failing to stand up to Marvin. Under his watch, the paper would not let Marvin get away with such violations of student freedom.

Several anti-strikers were invited to speak also. A.C. Johnson of the Anti-Strike Committee said that he felt like a solitary rose among jagged thorns. "I belong to a military organization and am proud of it. Serving under Uncle Sam's flag is a great honor to me." One student held a placard saying: "Dr. Marvin—The Constitution Gives Us the Right to Assemble—Do You?"

The Courier of Prescott, Arizona, ran an article about the peace strike. Marvin was governing George Washington with efficiency and dignity, the paper wrote. "These same qualities he managed to endow the University of Arizona with while he was at the head of the institution."

One of the more clever circulars on campus criticized not only Marvin's handling of the peace strike, but his denial of the use of any campus facilities for the campus activists:

DIED: ACADEMIC FREEDOM—Passed away,
April 22, from a fatal blow struck below the belt by a reactionary administration. Never having enjoyed the best of health, the final vicious onslaught proved too much for its delicate constitution.

The final illness set in last November when seven hundred students petitioned for a meeting in connection with a peace mobilization and were denied permission to hold it. The official excuse was that national propagandist organizations of all 57 varieties could not be permitted to contaminate the virginal minds of the student body.

A relapse set in, occasioned by the administration’s forbidding the rising temperature of those anti-war students to manifest itself in a strike in solidarity with fellow-students from schools throughout the country on this date. Those students who approached the powerful virus…on this question were threatened with expulsion from the university should the strike be held.

It is in deep mourning, therefore, that we bereave the passing of our freedom. It is survived by a handful of liberals and radicals, a group of intellectually honest centrists, and those conservatives who came to know the beauty of the recently deceased. Interment will be held in the offices of the Board of Trustees and memorial services in the chapel of the [Daughters of the American Revolution] and in the Hearst editorial rooms.

Another casualty had been left in Marvin’s wake, the students insisted: the right to peaceably assemble. Student interest in the peace strike had reached its zenith. The 1938 peace strike was smaller in scope, attracting only 100 students in defiance of Marvin’s prohibitions. Like other years, the rallies were held in a local church on campus, and a mixture of Congressmen, veterans, and student leaders spoke before the gathered students.
The student newspaper, growing bolder, condemned Marvin's invocation of the infamous Rule 6, which prohibited campus groups, including those advocating the peace strike, from allying with national organizations. "The right of the Administration of the University to limit the activities of either the strike or the anti-strike committees cannot at this time be questioned, as it has been definitely established that so long as we have Rule No. 6 we must accept such decisions," the staff wrote. "It is plain, of course, that we should not have such a rule, and it might be better for students to organize with whatever strength can be mustered and work consistently to get it out of the way before they lose all of their strength butting up against the present stone-wall barrier of Rule No. 6."86

The 1937-1938 school year was a particularly strong one for The Hatchet, because during this time the paper had grown more vocal in its opposition to President Marvin. At one point, the paper, in a front-page editorial on January 4, 1938, crossed the line. A battle between Marvin and the staff was imminent.

The offending editorial was printed across the front page, entitled: "Can George Washington Become a "Genuine Fortress of Democracy?" The editorial pointed out three areas of conflict between the student body and President Marvin. The first was methods of extra-curricular organization, whereby Marvin invoked Rule 6 to stamp out liberal dissent on campus. The second, in the wake of the Marvin Herrick affair that divided the student body, was the unsatisfactory relations with the faculty at George Washington. And third was the consistent denial of the civil liberties of students.

"Before it becomes possible to meet successfully the questions of organization of extra-curricular life and faculty relations, the haze surrounding civil liberties of students must be cleared away," the editors, led by Editor-in-Chief Howard Ennes, wrote. "At this University, as all over the nation, youth seem to be awakening to the role it is destined to play a few years hence; the collegiate atmosphere throughout the nation is being punctuated by discussions—and action—on current social, economic, and political affairs affecting the young people."87
month, a slight reorganization occurred; Ennes resigned as editor-in-chief, and Winfield Rankin replaced him. Frank Ford Burnet, a member of the senior staff of the newspaper, was elected an associate editor. 88

Before Ennes resigned, however, he made a final stab at Rule 6: “The common sense thing to do would be to repeal ‘Rule 6’, the obnoxiousness of which cannot be mitigated by any plea of expediency or protection.” 89 Students had enough intelligence, Ennes and the editors believed, to avoid being swayed by communist propaganda, the supposed reason why Rule 6 was established in the first place.

The damage had already been done. The Board of Editors met later that spring to elect a new editor-in-chief; they chose Associate Editor Frank Ford Burnet. President Marvin, believing Burnet to be too critical of the administration, held a hearing behind closed doors, and dumped the entire Board of Editors, including Burnet. He chose six members of the senior staff as replacements. One of the replacements, Murray Berdick, later said: “The paper and students were forbidden to comment” on the incident. “No more than a handful of students ever heard about the whole thing.” 90

The Hatchet had fought the administration head on, and they had lost.

The students were not only questioning the administration’s actions on civil liberties and Rule 6. They were also protesting on behalf of the faculty. In May 1937, a group of students appealed directly to the American Association of University Professors for an investigation. The nine students, including the student body president and vice-president and the Hatchet editor-in-chief, among others, compiled a confidential memorandum detailing a number of Marvin’s faults over the previous decade. The thirty-page brief was signed by Charles Kiefer, the director of the 1937 Protest Against War and Fascism; Davis Harding, the student who spearheaded the Herrick petition drive; Ross Pope, the student body president; Howard Ennes, the editor-in-chief of The University Hatchet; two members of the Right Party, the
conservative wing of the Student Union, two student journalists, and one former student body president. 

"As representative students of The George Washington University we feel that the concept of a 'university located in the capital of the Nation' has fallen far short of realization," the students wrote. Dr. Marvin, they emphasized, was the cause of that failure. Divided between their loyalties to the University and their loyalties to the head of the University, the students explained, they had no other choice than to make such an appeal. They didn't love Caesar less; they loved Rome more.

"We have seen a faculty cowed by economic pressure and personal intimidation. We see the futures of our classmates conditioned in narrowness and their idealism stifled. We see the utter failure of the University to recognize its responsibilities to the community." The students were well aware of how such a report, if leaked, could jeopardize their status in the University, but the gravity of the charges involved demanded a student response. They were afraid for themselves; "But we are more afraid for the future of The University if conditions which now exist are allowed to continue."

Citing cases of academic freedom, faculty tenure, and administrative relations, the students also reported Marvin's obstacles to the institution of student government, the cancellation of the peace strike, Marvin's unfavorable depictions in the local press, and, of course, Marvin's failed record of leadership at the University of Arizona. "We submit these facts to the American Association of University Professors as the highest tribunal of academic opinion," the students wrote in exasperation. "We feel that conditions at The George Washington University merit the most serious consideration."

Several of the faculty tenure cases mentioned in the brief were themselves subjects of AAUP appeals in the past. The cases of Dr. Alva Curtis Wilgus, Dr. Lester Born, Dr. J. Orin Powers, Dr. John Elson, and, of course, Dr. Marvin T. Herrick, were all mentioned in detail in the brief. The circumstances of the death of William John Cooper, the former Commissioner of Education, were also mentioned. Anna Rose, the dean of women,
and two other professors, one of diplomatic history, Dr. Samuel Flagg Bemis, and one of economics, Dr. A.J. Johnson, also lost their positions due to personal conflicts with President Marvin.

"We have an excellent faculty—one that any university could well be proud," the students proclaimed. "We have a group of scholars honestly devoted to research, to fine teaching, and to helping the student understand the world in which he lives.

“But our faculty is subjected to the domination of, and fear of, President Marvin. They fear salary reductions, loss of privileges, demotions, and the loss of their jobs.” Faculty committees are ignored, and faculty-student relationships are looked upon with suspicion. Professors may make no suggestions for changes of policy, for these are often interpreted as personal criticism of the president. “We know that President Marvin maintains a file on every faculty instructor for purposes of intimidation.”

Matters of faculty relations were not the only problems facing the University. Community relations suffered as well. The local press very rarely printed anything favorable about the University. Marvin has attempted, in the past, to exert influence on city editors and to have journalists fired who had “misconstrued” his remarks. It is very difficult to erase an unfavorable impression, the students wrote.

Real student government at GW is unheard of. Marvin had a great deal of influence on the writing of the Student Council constitution. President Marvin did all he could to delay the establishment of the Student Union, which was concerned with matters of national political importance (the Student Council addressed school-related questions). Dr. Marvin had been asked to speak at the inaugural session of the Union, but after finding out that Fr. Edmund Walsh, the rector of Georgetown University, Marvin found an excuse not to go. Deans Doyle and Kayser offered to speak in Marvin’s place, but they later refused after consulting the President.

The student newspaper was manipulated constantly in order to “get the person in the editor’s chair who will reflect President Marvin’s viewpoint. Ask Howard Ennes the real reason why he was suspended from all activities for over three months.” Marvin
has placed petty dress code restrictions and curfews and other similar regulations on the girls living in Strong Hall, the all-female dorm hall on campus (and, at that time, the only dorm hall on campus). Numerous petty restrictions have been placed on the delegation of funds from the Student Council activity fee; there has never been accountability to the students.

Marvin was antagonistic to student ideas and ideals; he refused to cooperate with student leaders and alienates himself from the student body. “No atmosphere of education haunts our halls, no enthusiasm, little scholarship. College education at The George Washington University is so little advanced in effectiveness that if the whole system were run through a meat grinder hardly any loss of vitality would be observed.” George Washington was not nourishing a socially desirable life in most of its students. “To doubt that the charge is true is not enough. That the charge is even conceivable and tenable is an indictment of the administration headed by Cloyd Heck Marvin.”

The students demanded an investigation into the University in order to prove what they believe to be true: that there must be serious and drastic changes in the administrative policy of the University if it is to survive. They ended with a bitter conclusion:

It is our belief from a study of the material outlined in the preceding pages that Cloyd Heck Marvin has outlived his usefulness at The George Washington University. It may have been necessary at the outset of his term of office to use ruthless and questionable methods in making the University a going concern. But after ten years, those methods should be part of the early history of the administration, not the entire technique of present management of the University.92

From the correspondence among the officers of the AAUP, it is clear they handled the brief with utmost seriousness. William Laprade, a member of the AAUP secretariat, wrote to AAUP Secretary Ralph Himstead: “The situation revealed in the
documents you sent seems to me to be serious and disturbing. The petition of the students would perhaps more appropriately have been addressed to the Board of Trustees. However, if that Board elected as President a man retired from Arizona under circumstances attending the leaving of President Marvin, I suppose there would be little hope in that quarter. I agree that before beginning an investigation, we should await a case clearly violating the letter as well as the spirit of the law. Thus far we do not seem to have it. If publicity is to have its maximum effect, there ought to be no doubt in the case inspiring our entrance. Another general condemnation of President Marvin might do as much harm as good.” Herrick’s petition, in particular, presented the AAUP with a clear violation of faculty tenure, but only insofar as trial appointments can only be terminated in conference with the deans and departments concerned, and there is evidence that no such conference occurred. But the AAUP wanted to base an investigation on something stronger than a mere technicality.93

Himstead told Laprade that several times during the past year ten or twelve professors from the faculty had been in to see him to discuss conditions at the University. Several insisted that Himstead meet them at their homes because they felt it was not safe for them to be seen going to the AAUP office. Some wrote lengthy statements concerning the faculty relations under the Marvin administration; others merely talked with him informally. “In this latter class was a dean of one of the colleges for whom I have considerable respect.”

He continued: “So far, Dr. Marvin has apparently not technically violated our tenure rules. In the main, the men who have been dismissed have been professors who were brought to the institution on short-term appointments. In our files, however, there is a case of a professor who was, by shrewd manipulation on Dr. Marvin’s part, induced to sign a resignation. Sooner or later, I think we shall have to investigate the situation at George Washington University.”94

One consequence of the looming AAUP investigation into the Marvin administration involved the granting of a charter to George Washington from Phi Beta Kappa, the honors fraternity. The
Committee on Qualifications and the Phi Beta Kappa Senate had unanimously recommended the granting of the charter. However, a letter from the secretary of the fraternity mentioned certain criticisms of the administration and added: "I understand that one of the charges would come within the province of the American Association of University Professors."95

Laprade wrote in later correspondence that while he had nothing to do with the Phi Beta Kappa charter, he would not grant the charter if he did have anything to do with it.96 The Phi Beta Kappa charter was approved in September, however, since the AAUP investigation never took place. In February 1938, the Phi Beta Kappa chapter was installed.

1937 was the year Marvin celebrated his tenth anniversary of coming to George Washington. In those ten years, the number of faculty members increased 74%, from 77 to 134. Enrollment had increased 21%, from 7,020 to 8,528. The number of classrooms increased 35%, from 60 to 81. The number of degrees rose from 565 to 641 and the number of student organizations almost doubled from 66 to 123. The number of buildings increased from 21 to 26. The endowment increased an enormous 222%, from $800,000 to almost $2.6 million.

On the eve of revolution, Marvin had achieved considerable progress on paper.97
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4. An Intolerable Injustice
The Legacy of the Martha Gibbon Affair

"My dear President Marvin," Assistant Professor Martha Gibbon wrote to Cloyd Heck Marvin on March 6, 1940, "This is my resignation, effective at the close of the present semester. It is written in the conviction that I have met with great injustice at the George Washington University, and with the knowledge that I can hope for no better treatment in the future under your Administration." The long years of agitation and frustration with Dr. Marvin had finally ended; she had reached the end of her rope. Immediately after her resignation, Professor Gibbon formally appealed her case to the American Association of University Professors. In her introduction she wrote:

If you have any awareness of the atmosphere at George Washington--of the almost unbelievable sense of insecurity, distrust, and fear among the faculty, and of the realization among faculty members that nothing counts but the capricious personal favor of the President, these facts will have significance for you. You will understand that my resignation is not a foolishly emotional step nor even an unnecessary one. President Marvin, I predict, will take refuge in the assertion that it is both.

"Miss Gibbon," as she was referred to in the metropolitan newspapers and by all of her students, came to the George Washington University in the fall of 1929 from four years at the Minnesota State Teacher's College in Moorhead, Minnesota. While in Moorhead, she helped with the student newspaper, was a member of the Athletic Board of Control, which governed campus athletics, and became one of two faculty members of the Student
Senate. “It appears that for the short time she was here, she was involved with many things,” writes Korella Selzler of Minnesota State University Moorhead. 3

With a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Master of Arts degree in English from the University of Wisconsin, Miss Gibbon began her teaching career at the Teacher’s College in the fall of 1925. In the fall of 1929, on leave from the Teacher’s College, Miss Gibbon became an instructor in English. When her contract came from Moorhead in the spring of 1930, Miss Gibbon submitted her resignation and refused the contract, which would have given her $2350 per year, one hundred dollars less than she was making at George Washington in 1940, after “ten years more of hard and successful work.” She was given permanent tenure on the staff of the George Washington University Department of English, along with a $400 salary increase, raising her salary from $1800 during her leave to $2200 as a permanent faculty member.

In the spring of 1933, she was promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor. Called into a conference with Dr. Marvin, he praised her work at George Washington. “He made very cordial comments on my teaching and on my value to the university,” she wrote. Marvin asked her, in what she characterizes as a “most friendly and interested tone” what she planned to do in the future. She replied that she intended to get a Ph.D. Marvin questioned this; “Do you think you will be a better teacher as Dr. Gibbon than as Miss Gibbon?” She assured him that she did not think so, adding that she felt she could be of greatest service to the university if she took courses that related to the subjects she was teaching rather than courses that pertained to the Ph.D. However, she was concerned that there was “a sort of compulsion about the Ph.D.,” and that she should therefore try to attain one. “With a magnificent gesture of scorn for the Ph.D. superstition, he said to me, ‘No pressure will ever be brought upon you to get the Ph.D., and it will not stand in the way of your progress here,’” she recounted in her AAUP appeal.

Assured of the president’s support, Miss Gibbon studied at Chicago University and at the University of Wisconsin every summer that she was not teaching at George Washington. Her
courses related, primarily, to the subjects and style of her teaching, especially of her teaching of Composition in the Junior College, the same subject her colleague Dr. Marvin Herrick would teach during his time at the university.

“You will know without my saying so that I have no written word from President Marvin to support my own account of this conversation with him regarding the Ph.D. He may deny it,” she confessed to AAUP Secretary Ralph Himstead. “In that case it is a matter of my word against his, and my one advantage over him lies in the fact that I do not have a reputation for untruthfulness.”

With the height of the Great Depression, university presidents around the country were cutting costs by reducing salaries, firing teachers, and dropping courses. To Marvin’s credit, he managed to survive the Depression without doing any of those, even increasing salaries and improving faculty tenure. Miss Gibbon confessed, “I got no salary increase with my advance in rank” to Assistant Professor. “For several years my salary remained where it was, an instructor’s salary. I was not unhappy over this; I assumed that the University was not in a position to give me more money, and it did not seem to me a matter of principal importance.”

But others were receiving raises out of line with hers. In the spring of 1937, she learned in a conversation with Mr. George Winchester Stone, the head of the Department of English, that he had received a $700 increase in salary with his change in rank to the Assistant Professorship the previous year. “I began to feel disturbed about my own place in the scheme of things,” Miss Gibbon wrote, and she went to discuss the matter with Dean William C. Johnstone of the Junior College.

She explained to the dean that she had growing anxiety over her position and felt as though she should resign. He replied that he had been concerned over the inadequacy of her salary; Dean Doyle of the Columbian College felt it was inadequate as well. They both thought very highly of her as a person and as a teacher, and, together, they would make the strongest possible recommendation to Dr. Marvin for a substantial increase in salary in line with other promotions made in the Department.
A few weeks after the conversation with her dean, Miss Gibbon was reappointed with a fifty-dollar salary increase, the only raise she received since 1930 when her salary was fixed at $2200. She immediately wrote to President Marvin, saying,

I have been increasingly puzzled over the matter of my relationship to the University, and I have decided at last to turn to you for information regarding it. Why have I been kept for years on an instructor's salary, while holding the rank of Assistant Professor? And why am I now, after making my dissatisfaction known to the Dean of my College, offered the menial increase of fifty dollars for the coming year? When I got my change in rank several years ago, I got no change in salary. I thought, of course, that since times were difficult, no increases were being given, and that I would surely be considered at once when such increases were resumed. Then I began to hear of colleague after colleague whose salary had been increased. The one case which caused me particular concern was that of a member of my own department, who was advanced seven hundred dollars last year. Although he has been in the University exactly half as long as I, and although he has held the rank of Assistant Professor only one-fourth as long as I, he has been getting a salary this year which is two hundred dollars more than mine.

I have regarded you highly and too affectionately all these years to believe that this is a matter of mere caprice and injustice. But I do not understand it. I should be very grateful for a direct statement from you concerning it.  

She was called to the President's office within twenty-four hours. "He was extraordinarily gracious and cordial, and refused to accept the resignation which I was prepared to hand him." She recounts her conversation with Dr. Marvin:
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Miss Gibbon: This looks to me like the handwriting on the wall. I want you to tell me straightforwardly whether or not I should get my credentials together and look for another position.

Marvin: Of course not. I should hate very much for you to do that. I regard you as an excellent teacher, and I don't want to lose you.

Gibbon: Then what is the explanation of my lack of progress?

Marvin: Well, you know, we haven't given many salary increases.

Gibbon: I have heard of a number of them--two hundred dollars, three hundred, five hundred, seven hundred. You know, these things get around. We tell each other these things.

Marvin: Well, those people were getting their Ph.D.'s.

Gibbon: You told me that I needn't get my Ph.D. and that it would not stand in the way of my progress.

Marvin: Oh, yes, oh, yes, that's true--but you see, we've done very well not to cut salaries here.

Gibbon: If you had had to cut my salary in half, I would have worked for you willingly and loyally. I am not objecting to my salary, but to the unjust differences that are shown in our salaries.

Marvin: Well, you see, you are a Composition teacher, and we haven't quite settled the matter of where the Composition teacher belongs, and what scheme of advancement we must use there. But it will all come out all right. It will all be taken care of.

She reminded him that she was not just a composition teacher; she was also a literature teacher and had taught literature since her first year at George Washington. Although she came to the university to teach composition, Dr. Bolwell (Dean of the Summer Sessions) fell ill and passed the Survey of Literature course onto Miss Gibbon. "If my contract as a Composition
teacher has been violated in any way, it has not been violated by me," she stressed. She had regularly taught sections of Sophomore Literature, Freshman English, and Sophomore Composition, along with two semesters of Romantic Literature and three semesters and two summer sessions of Victorian Literature over the course of seven years.

A few days later, according to Professor Gibbon, she was again called to Marvin's office. He told her that he had persuaded the trustees to increase her salary by a hundred dollars instead of by fifty dollars. A year later, she received another raise of fifty dollars, bringing her total salary to $2450.

The 1939-1940 school year was Martha Gibbon’s seventh year as Assistant Professor. The Faculty Code, written in 1937, states: "If an Assistant Professor is not promoted by the time he has served as Assistant Professor for seven years, he will be notified in writing prior to the beginning of the last semester covered by the contract, that his appointment will not be renewed." "This, clearly, was the crucial year for me," Gibbon believed. She was the only member of the English Department faculty of which she knew who received no raise for spring 1940. She had also been the only assistant or associate professor omitted from conferences held by Marvin to discuss the future of the English Department.

Her omission from the meeting was all the more glaring because it occurred just after Anna Pearl Cooper, the acting head of the Department of English while Professor Stone was absent, had made a recommendation on behalf of Professor Gibbon to President Marvin. Professor Cooper was so adamant that after writing the President, she saw him in person about it, expressing to him her belief that Miss Gibbon was one of the best teachers in the University. Cooper left disturbed that she could not elicit a single word of praise from Marvin about Professor Gibbon.

However, the Faculty Code was not retroactive, and Gibbon’s seven-year period of guaranteed tenure did not begin with her appointment in 1933, but with the passage of the Code in 1937. Thus, she would have been safe in her position until 1944.
However, she was almost certain that when 1944 came around, she would not be reappointed anyway.

Again, she visited Dean Johnstone of the Junior College at the beginning of the spring semester of 1940. He told her that both he and Dean Doyle had done everything they could, and both visited the President one additional time to express to him their high regard for her. “He did not believe, he said, that I was in immediate danger of dismissal, but he felt convinced that my progress at George Washington would be very slow,” Gibbon wrote.

In the course of the conversation, she informed her dean that she had decided to resign. He gave her his support in whatever decision she made. One more time, Dean Johnstone, as well as Mr. Stone, the head of the Department of English, visited Marvin. On March 6, Mr. Stone went to see Marvin; he went to Professor Gibbon almost immediately afterwards to tell her the results. “He was agitated, and, as he said, ‘ashamed.’ He is wrong, of course, in blaming himself, and I tried to console him with that assurance,” she wrote. During the meeting, both he and Dean Johnstone told the President that she was one of the best teachers at the University. They urged her promotion, but Dr. Marvin refused on the grounds that she did not have a Ph.D. Mr. Stone then asked whether Professor Gibbon could be assured tenure even if she worked to get her Ph.D., circumventing the obstacle that appeared to be blocking her from promotion. To the surprise of the two men, Marvin told them that Miss Gibbon would not be reappointed even if she had a Ph.D.

Again Mr. Stone, in earnest and desperation, urged the President to reconsider, citing her 11 years of dedicated and successful service to the University and her “exceptionally high quality” of teaching. Again President Marvin refused to relinquish. “That may be,” he told Mr. Stone. “But administratively speaking, she is not the type of person that we want permanently on the staff.”

It was clear to Mr. Stone that Miss Gibbon’s case was a hopeless one, and he told her this. Professor Gibbon asked Stone what the phrase “administratively speaking” meant, but Stone said
he didn't know. It was Mr. Stone's conviction that Gibbon would be dismissed since President Marvin would not give her tenure whether she had a Ph.D. or not. Stone recommended that Gibbon resign immediately, "to gain whatever advantage my resignation might give me in an utterly hopeless situation, and to avoid certain dismissal at the end of another three years or so at the latest," she later recalled.

At Mr. Stone's suggestion, Marvin agreed to give Miss Gibbon a sabbatical leave for the next school year, with the understanding that she did not have to serve the two years of required service to the University upon her return. Marvin clearly did not want her back on the staff, and was counting on her refusing the suggestion, or at least on refusing to serve the two years upon return. She refused any such arrangement, and wrote Marvin her letter of resignation as soon as Mr. Stone had left her office.

Like Dr. Herrick before her, Martha Gibbon had aroused the support of her colleagues against the President, and like Dr. Herrick, she found that it made no difference. Although she had rallied the support of three deans, one department head, and one acting department head, Miss Gibbon's case was still lost.

"If my case proves anything at all," she wrote, "it proves that all the Deans and department heads here at George Washington are mere cogs, like the rest of us. Democratic procedure in our university is a pantomime and farce; this is a one-man institution, and that one man is a ruthless tyrant."

On the tenth of April 1940, General Secretary Ralph Himstead addressed a letter to Marvin asking for his view of the events surrounding the Martha Gibbon controversy. Himstead expressed to Marvin that the organization had received a great number of complaints from students, faculty, alumni, and others at George Washington, but that he was solely concerned with the complaint of Professor Gibbon. "This letter is to ask you to give us such information as you feel will contribute to our understanding of the facts," Himstead wrote to Marvin. He continued:
"While the national officers of the Association have no desire to interfere in the purely internal affairs of The George Washington University or any other institution of higher learning, we are, in accordance with the philosophy of the Association, definitely interested in the conditions affecting academic tenure in all institutions of higher learning. We believe that satisfactory tenure conditions are essential to academic freedom and that, without academic freedom, it is not possible to achieve the desired degree of objectivity in scholarship."

Marvin replied to the letter on the 14th of April, detailing his account of the Martha Gibbon affair, including a number of details of which Professor Gibbon would not have been aware. He defended his position: never had Miss Gibbon received notice that “her services were to be terminated.” Neither her deans nor the executive officers of her department had made any such recommendation. “As President of The George Washington University I have never forwarded a recommendation concerning personnel to the Board of Trustees without full consultation with all responsible college officers,” Marvin wrote. Without the approval of her deans or the executive officer concerned, only the Educational Relations Committee of the Board of Trustees had the authority to fire her. The President has no such authority.

The 1937 Faculty Code, Marvin reiterated, was not retroactive. Chapter 13 included the statement that “No part of these regulations as published is retroactive.” Miss Gibbon was thus safe in her position until the 1943 to 1944 school year, and the new code made mandatory a review of her position. At that time, one of three decisions would be made: Miss Gibbon would not be reappointed, whereupon she would be notified in advance; her tenure could be extended in accordance with the clause that provides “exceptional cases wherein the period of Assistant Professorship may be extended;” or she may be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor. In order to receive this promotion, she would have to have a Ph.D. degree or its equivalent, as well
as secure recommendations from appropriate college officers.

Miss Gibbon was brought to the University to teach composition, the equivalent of freshman and sophomore English writing and grammar courses. She had also taught some work in literature. She did not need to have a Ph.D. to receive permanent tenure in order to teach composition; she could substitute the Ph.D. requirement with the publication of a work of creative writing. Teaching literature, however, required a Ph.D. Other professors had received permanent tenure in the field of composition without a Ph.D., but they were relegated to teaching composition only.

Furthermore, in June 1937, Professor Croissant wrote in a confidential report to President Marvin that "Miss Gibbon is a problem. Is successful in teaching composition but wants to teach literature. Her field in literature is the Romantic Movement and the Nineteenth Century, periods now satisfactorily handled by Smith and Shepard. She will probably go on for her Ph.D., and when she gets it will become more of a problem then ever." His 1938 report confirmed the same situation.8

Other facts would soon come to light that would lead many to question what, in truth, Marvin's motives were. Miss Gibbon's progressive liberal political views were most certainly woven into the tapestry; how much they figured into Marvin's final decision requires a critical look at the circumstances regarding her resignation.

On Monday, March 11, 1940, the Washington Post launched the battle of the press with front-page headline "Martha Gibbon Resigns Position at G.W. University." The Post wrote in a brief article, "Miss Martha Gibbon, assistant professor of English at George Washington University, has resigned, President Cloyd Heck Marvin said last night.

"The resignation will be acted on at a meeting of the board of trustees Thursday, Marvin said."9

The next day, the Post followed up with an article entitled, "G.W.U. Students Indignant at Miss Gibbon's Departure." Dissent among the student body had spread rapidly, the Post reported.
"At a conference with editors of the Hatchet, in which her resignation was discussed, [Marvin] said it was 'not a dismissal,' but Miss Gibbon had resigned of her own will."\textsuperscript{10}

The \textit{Washington Daily News} picked up the story the next day, Wednesday, March 13, 1940. The AAUP "may investigate the case of Martha Gibbon, resigned George Washington University assistant professor, which has roused indignation among G.W. students and alumni," the \textit{Daily News} reported.

The article quoted Gibbon's statement to the AAUP: "It is my conviction that that Dr. Marvin's presidency is increasingly bad for the institution and that it is my social duty to offer you whatever assistance I can in bringing those in authority to an awareness of this truth."

Secretary Himstead of the AAUP said that her appeal had arrived, according to the article, but he could not say what may be done after it receives consideration. The officers of the AAUP were themselves divided over whether or not her case merited an investigation, correspondence between the officers shows. The Association normally investigates dismissals, in the event a teacher is fired for unjust reasons; never before had a resignation case been pursued.

Insightfully, the article quoted Dr. Marvin: "I do not know anything at all about the case. All I know is that Miss Gibbon turned in her resignation.

"I have not talked with her. She seems to be interested in talking with newspaper people. I have nothing to say," he said.\textsuperscript{11}

The \textit{Washington Evening Star} became embroiled in the debate on Thursday, March 14. "George Washington University's Board of Trustees today was to consider the resignation of Miss Martha Gibbon, assistant professor of English," the \textit{Star} reported. "Dr. Marvin declined to comment on the case, but Miss Gibbon placed it before the American Association of University Professors 'at the request of one of your members' in a detailed statement of her relations with the institution. Some members of the student body are aroused over the incident, it was reported."\textsuperscript{12}

More than 500 students have signed petitions asking for a public investigation of the Gibbon case, the \textit{Washington Daily
News reported earlier that day, noting that her recent resignation "has created a campus furor."

"The petitions are being circulated by students and many more signatures are expected before tonight's scheduled meeting of the university's board of trustees," the News wrote. "Students also called on members of the board, asking that Miss Gibbon's side of the case be heard."

The Student Committee on the Gibbon Case was formed immediately after the resignation was announced. The secretary of the student committee, Helen Dillon, recounted a conversation two had with Jessie Fant Evans, a member of the Board of Trustees, the only woman and the only member elected by the alumni, on March 13.

Mrs. Evans: Well, Marvin says that she is a radical. Do you think that is true?
First student: She is a liberal, but I wouldn't say she is a radical.
Mrs. Evans: Marvin says that she is a communist. He says she has a Red Card.
Two students together: That certainly isn't true; we are sure.
Second student: Mrs. Evans, do you think that Miss Gibbon's alleged radical views could be the reason that President Marvin doesn't want to keep her?
Mrs. Evans: Well, I don't know, that may be a factor.

Helen Dillon concluded in a letter to General Secretary Himstead, "[t]here certainly is more to this case than appears on the surface."

The same day, Associate Professor Anna Pearl Cooper, the acting head of the Department of English during the previous semester, released a statement on the recommendation she had made during her time as department head. Accompanying the statement was a personal note to Miss Gibbon: "Upon consideration, it seemed best to me to write a statement of my
relation to your case dated after your resignation as evidence that my attitude in the matter is unchanged."

Professor Cooper wrote in the recommendation that she had, indeed, made the recommendation to the administration that Miss Gibbon be promoted to an associate professorship with permanent tenure. "I hope that her undoubted value to the university as a teacher of exceptional ability might be regarded as of sufficient weight to justify this promotion without regard to the formal technical requirement of the Ph.D. degree," Miss Cooper wrote, referring to the exception in the Faculty Code allowing a promotion without a Ph.D. in special cases. "As her colleague and friend, I deeply regret the severing of her relation to the university."15

On the evening of March 14, 1940, the Board of Trustees, including Mrs. Evans, met to discuss the Gibbon controversy. "The resignation of Miss Martha Gibbon, Assistant Professor of English, was presented," according to the Board of Trustees minutes. "Letters from Miss Gibbon's students were presented and also a petition signed by some of her present and former students, asking that the Board give full consideration to Miss Gibbon's case and expressing the hope that she might be retained on the staff." The Board also received a copy of her appeal to the AAUP. "Two or three members of the Board stated that certain students had asked to talk with them concerning Miss Gibbon and in one instance [that of Mrs. Evans] had been received."

The resignation itself was addressed at the meeting. The minutes continue,

The chairman of the Committee on Education Policy, to whom the entire matter had been referred, read Miss Gibbon's resignation. He stated that her resignation was voluntary, that she could have continued at the University for at least four years, and that she had been offered sabbatical leave for 1940-41, which she had declined. Inasmuch as Miss Gibbon had never sought a hearing with the Board in reference to any grievances she might have had and her resignation as voluntarily presented, and in light

165
of the action that Miss Gibbon had taken in this case, the committee recommended that the Board confirm the acceptance of the resignation.

[Action: the Board unanimously confirms resignation]

The Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Robert V. Fleming, read a letter written by Assistant Professor George Winchester Stone, the head of the Department of English, a copy of which Miss Gibbon had included in her AAUP appeal. "In my eight years of association with Miss Gibbon as a teacher at the George Washington University I have been impressed with her ability as a teacher, and have recommended that she be made a permanent member of our department." Stone believed that her chief assets were her ability to stimulate interest in a subject, her enthusiasm for the subject matter, her careful preparation for class, and her conscientious responsibility to her students. "Her value to the University as a teacher to me is obvious."

Stone was outwardly critical of Marvin’s stance. "The administration, it seems, has a policy of promotions which requires its teachers to present either the doctor’s degree or what it considers to be its equivalent. I have asked the Administration whether or not Miss Gibbon would be assured promotion and permanent tenure if she presented the doctor’s degree." Marvin refused to make any guarantees.

Miss Gibbon, Stone noted, was assured tenure until 1944, when she would either be promoted or dismissed. "In face of the uncertainty of the future here she has decided to take the initiative and resign now. I have concurred with her in this decision and have advised her to leave now for whatever advantage there might be to herself, because I feel strongly that her future here is not secure and that this is the time to make the break."

He ended with a crushing indictment of the administration: "I, personally, am ashamed to feel that so good a teacher can have been carried so long, and that now she has to face this future of insecurity."

Chairman Fleming said that Stone’s letter disturbed him very
much because it implied that the deans and department heads were refusing to support an action taken by the President at the recommendation of the Trustees. This the deans and department heads cannot do. The actions of the President and the Trustees “should be consistently supported” by the faculty members. The Chairman then asked for authority to appoint a special committee of the Board “to consider all phases of the matter in connection with Miss Gibbon’s resignation.”\(^17\) By a vote of the Board, the committee was established.

The Star reported the next day that the Trustees had confirmed Miss Gibbon’s resignation, in light of the fact that she had never attempted to make an appeal to the Board.\(^18\)

Professor Gibbon did not know that she had the right to appeal her case to the Board of Trustees until the Board itself criticized her for not doing so. On March 19, she promptly wrote a letter to Chairman Fleming, appealing her case to the Board. “I have learned from the newspapers that I have the right to appeal my case to the Board of Trustees,” she wrote. “The Faculty Code states that a member whose service is directly terminated by the Administration does have the right to appeal, but it makes no mention of the rights of those who are driven, as I was, by intolerable injustice, to resignation.”

Gibbon noted that the Trustees are distinguished men and women who have little personal contact with the faculty. “Your knowledge of us comes from the President, and it is what he wants you to know about us,” Gibbon wrote, not the first to imply that Marvin was capable of manipulating the Trustees. “You see the physical and financial side of George Washington life, and it is good. But the significant life of a great University is its academic life, and I appeal my case to you as a symbol that the academic life at George Washington, under the administration of President Marvin, is not good, and that it deserves the attention of those in authority over the University.”\(^19\)

Miss Gibbon released a bitter letter to the Trustees on April 1. She explained that the Board had not replied to her request for an appeal, nor did they send her a copy of the report of the special investigating committee that affirmed Dr. Marvin’s refusal to
promote her, according to an article in the *Daily News*. The report contained negative reviews of Miss Gibbon’s work by her superior administrators. Miss Gibbon wrote to the Trustees that she had “more than fulfilled any technical requirement. A copy of my full report to the American Association of University Professors was sent to each member of the Board and it reached you individually, before the meeting at which you disposed of my case so neatly.” She questioned why her request for an appeal had not been acted upon: “when it was pointed out to me that I should make a formal plea to the board, I hastened to do so.”

More than three weeks later, despite the appeal made above, the Chairman of the Board wrote to Miss Gibbon alleging that she had never made an appeal to the Board, “either prior to or subsequent to your voluntary resignation.” The Chairman added that she would have been given a hearing if she had asked for one, and that she could still ask for one, provided the Board approves. There is no evidence that such a request ever appeared before the Board, even though Miss Gibbon and her supporters had been lobbying the Board for weeks. Against her wishes, Miss Gibbon was never offered a hearing. Ostensibly the reason was that the Board did not consider appeals from professors who had resigned of their own accord, only accepting appeals from professors who had been unjustly dismissed. The Chairman’s offer of an appeal, however, was forwarded to Dr. Marvin, who remained steadfastly opposed to the prospect of Miss Gibbon being afforded an appeal. While this does not prove manipulation of the Trustees by Marvin, it shows that the Trustees held Marvin’s opinions in high regard.

The debate over whether or not the AAUP should conduct an inquiry into the Marvin administration divided the organization’s leaders. Many felt that the fact that Professor Gibbon had resigned—instead of being dismissed—precluded any inquiry, since her resignation had been seen as voluntary. The AAUP investigated alleged violations of faculty tenure or academic freedom. Martha Gibbon was secure in her position until 1944, though it was clear that she would probably not be reappointed.
and she would have to take her career elsewhere; technically, it appears no violation of the rules of faculty tenure had occurred. The AAUP may have been able to make a case on academic freedom, alleging that Professor Gibbon had been targeted for her liberal political views, but little concrete evidence of this had come to light even though Dr. Marvin’s fervent anti-communism was well known. To wade into such politically volatile territory required a very egregious action on the part of Marvin; in short, though Marvin had acted unjustly and perhaps unwisely, he had not acted illegally.

On the day of the Trustees’ decision, AAUP General Secretary Himstead wrote to his colleague William Laprade about the Gibbon controversy. The complaint from Miss Gibbon “would seem to indicate that faculty-administration relations at that institution are still unsatisfactory and that President Marvin has not changed greatly since the publication of the Association’s investigation of his administration at the University of Arizona in 1926. President Marvin has great skill in disposing of teachers who do not meet with his favor without actually violating any technical rules of tenure.”

According to the Daily News, the AAUP appointed three university professors, one from Harvard, one from Duke, and one from Northwestern, who, together with General Secretary Himstead, would review the Gibbon complaint and decide whether or not it merited an investigation. A committee of twenty, including the four men and 16 other faculty members, would have the final decision.

However the AAUP Secretariat felt in private about the grievances constantly perpetuated by Marvin against the GW faculty, in public the AAUP was much more restrained. They were opposed to Miss Gibbon and the students going to the local press for publicity, and reporters were constantly hounding Secretary Himstead as a result. In numerous articles, the AAUP noted that they do not take sides in controversies in which they were not investigating. Miss Gibbon’s appeal was going through the usual channels and a committee would decide what action, if any, to take. In the meantime, it was not the place of the AAUP to make
predictions. As Himstead succinctly wrote to a colleague: “Although pressed to do so by the reporters, I have made no comments on what I thought to be the merits of the complaints” because, Himstead argues, “The Association has not investigated these recent charges against President Marvin and hence I am not in a position to make such comments.”

Laprade wrote: “It seems to me that we shall have to have a very good case on the surface before tackling this institution in view of the Association’s investigation of President Marvin’s administration at another place (The University of Arizona). Had not Miss Gibbon resigned, we may have used her case, but I doubt the wisdom of doing so under the circumstances.”

Another of Himstead’s colleagues, F.S. Diebler, felt that Professor Gibbon’s political views figured prominently into her treatment at the hands of the administration. “The cumulative impression that the correspondence makes on me is that Miss Gibbon’s alleged radical views are the primary cause of President Marvin’s attitude.” As in the many earlier appeals to the AAUP, the Association felt that they needed a crisp, clean-cut case before they again confronted Marvin for the second time in his career. But they also knew that they might as well wait forever.

For several weeks, the debate in the AAUP ranks continued.

On Tuesday, March 19, the Hatchet came out with an outraged, but muted, front-page article on the controversy. “Miss Gibbon Resigns From Staff In Protest,” the headline read, accompanied by an article that announced the formation of a student committee. “Immediately after the publication of Miss Gibbon’s resignation a Student Committee was formed and issued a petition signed by 555 students who had studied under Miss Gibbon, or ‘who have come to know something of the superior quality of her personality, character and ability through association on the campus.’” The signatures had been collected between Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday evening of the previous week, the twelfth and thirteenth of March, and were presented to the Board of Trustees at the Thursday meeting. According to the Student Committee on the Gibbon Case, the signatures
represented only a small portion of the students who desired an investigation into this and other controversies aroused by Marvin.  

Marvin's manipulation of the Hatchet Board of Editors the previous year had a large effect on how the case was presented in the student press. Under the headline "Explanation Wanted," a staff editorial conceded that it was with the "deepest regret" that Miss Gibbon would be leaving at the end of the semester. "Even more unfortunate is the clouded atmosphere under which she has felt called upon to resign." Miss Gibbon had come forward with a complaint, the editorial noted, but the administration has said nothing. It would seem only fair, the paper argued, if Marvin were to give his side of the circumstances that placed Miss Gibbon's career in jeopardy.

The Hatchet expressed surprising restraint on the matter, with perhaps a less critical editorial than would have been written in earlier years. "Before taking sides in this case, other than to express regret at the departure of a much-loved teacher, The Hatchet awaits an Administrative statement. Hasty judgment and hasty action are unwise," the paper wrote.

The Washington Daily News ran an article about The Hatchet's editorial the next day. "George Washington University's student publication, The Hatchet, this week asks editorially for a statement from President Cloyd Heck Marvin about the resignation of Asst. Prof. Martha Gibbon, which has stirred up a continuing dispute among students and alumni," the Daily News wrote, quoting portions of the Hatchet editorial.

At the beginning of April, after the Trustees had released the report on the Gibbon the previous week, the Hatchet followed up its editorial with another, entitled "Explanation Received." An article in the paper detailed the contents of the report, written by the special committee established by the Trustees, that reviewed, year by year, the annual reports of the English Department head, as well as special reports by Professor Stone, the current department head, Deans Johnstone and Doyle, and President Marvin.

The report of the Board of Trustees confirmed that the
University's treatment of Professor Gibbon had violated no statute. Specifically, the report found:

1. Under the date of March 6, 1940, Miss Gibbon voluntarily submitted her written resignation as Assistant Professor of English in the George Washington University.

2. If at any time prior to said resignation, Miss Gibbon felt that she had a grievance, she did not see fit of the right to avail herself of the right to appeal as provided in the [Faculty Code]... nor did she make any attempt to call the attention of the Board of Trustees to what she terms in her letter of March 19 "intolerable injustice."

3. Under the faculty code Miss Gibbon was secure in her position as Assistant Professor until 1944 at least, and Executive Officer Stone and Dean Johnstone advised her of this fact.

4. The committee finds that Miss Gibbon was advised that she would be recommended for sabbatical leave for the academic year 1940-41....

5. A careful review of the annual reports and statements submitted definitely establishes that Miss Gibbon has never been received for promotion to associate professorship by the deans of her colleges.

6. The committee finds that contrary to statements made by Miss Gibbon, the procedure with respect to faculty personnel gives due regard to the recommendations of the executive officers and deans concerned. ... No deviation from the normal procedure had occurred with respect to Miss Gibbon during her term of service to the University.

"In view of all these facts the committee finds that there is no
basis nor foundation for the statements made by Miss Gibbon as to unfair treatment," the committee concluded, releasing the report to the press after the Trustees meeting on March 28, 1940.\(^\text{30}\)

Marvin's manipulation of the student press was complete. A Hatchet editorial proclaimed: "At this point The Hatchet finds it necessary to make a very difficult decision," the editors proclaimed. "The press traditionally has, and should have, the right and the duty to express its opinions on matters of public importance."

The editorial noted that the editors had personally reviewed a number of documents released by the Trustees, in order to verify Miss Gibbon's claims. "Yet in the present case The Hatchet is unable to say that one side or other is in the right. It has had access to much more information than is available to any single student, and as a result of that is convinced, in the view of the many individuals and happenings involved, that neither it nor any other group of students--and probably no one else--will ever be in possession of all of the facts in the case, and thus competent to judge."\(^\text{31}\)

However, the fact that the committee of Trustees failed to call Miss Gibbon herself as a witness was suspect, according to the editors. The Trustees overlooked the person whose case was under discussion.

Later that week, Martha Gibbon demanded to see the documents that the Hatchet editors had seen, accompanied by her lawyer. In a letter to President Marvin dated April 6, she wrote: "You have shown these documents to the Hatchet staff as evidence that I have been treated justly. I feel no hesitation in claiming a right in this matter equal to that of the students. And surely no one is more in need of such evidence than I."\(^\text{32}\)

The following week, however, her frustration had turned to anger. "I have received from your office an evasive and noncommittal reply to my request for the right to see the reports in your files concerning me," she wrote to Marvin on April 11. "I realize, as do others who are interested in my case, that you have been at liberty to do what you wanted to these reports, to destroy or fabricate to meet the needs of the moment. All of this would, I
believe, come out in a properly conducted investigation."

Her closing was bitter. "I am repeating my original request now for the sake of the record which I have filed with the Office of the American Association of University Professors. I want it unmistakably known that I have asked--not once, but twice--for permission to read, in the presence of my attorney, the reports concerning me that you have already shown to students."33.

Miss Gibbon at last resigned herself to her fate, that an unsympathetic and distant administration had no interest in her situation. To the Trustees she wrote: "Like you, I too have disposed of my case now, once and for all. I knew from the beginning, of course, that Dr. Marvin had broken no law but the law of decency and justice. It was naive of me to assume that, for the good of the university, you would be concerned with my case."34. But the scandal had not yet spiraled out of control; for that, intense alumni and student pressure would be applied to the Marvin administration in the coming weeks. The protests against Marvin, however, began to change; it soon became clear that the Gibbon controversy was only the spark that caused a rebellion against the administration.

On March 24, 1940, The Washington Post printed a staff editorial entitled "Smoke Without Fire." A large quantity of smoke, the Post wrote, does not necessarily indicate a serious fire. The exploitation of the Gibbon case by Marvin's enemies to embarrass the administration is not to be confused with the reality that anything is vitally wrong at the university.

The editorial asserted that no violation of faculty tenure or academic freedom was immediately apparent in Professor Gibbon's complaint. "She has resigned, of her own free will, because she has not been accorded a promotion from an assistant to an associate professorship," the Post staff wrote. "Perhaps that is unfortunate. But it is certainly not a matter of grave public moment, nor even one over which the American Association of University Professors need be concerned."35.

Miss Gibbon is a teacher of talent, but she had failed to secure an advanced degree or publish the fruits of her research,
the two criteria for promotion. "Perhaps these standards are always somewhat arbitrary. But certainly there is no secret about them and it is impossible to see how the university administration is to be blamed for the failure of a teacher to make the required grade."

The Post dubbed the whole Gibbon controversy a “teapot tempest,” a large uproar over an insignificant matter. The rhetoric of the protest surrounding Gibbon’s resignation, the Post correctly noted, was becoming less a matter of Miss Gibbon’s academic career, and more a matter of opposition to Dr. Marvin himself. The paper warned, “a very small episode at George Washington is being consciously utilized to focus criticism against President Cloyd Heck Marvin. If that is so, he is wise to refuse comment on the Gibbon case.” The editorial ended with an insightful and far-reaching conclusion. “For perhaps it is not this incident which is causing the disturbance, but wider antagonisms aroused by Dr. Marvin’s vigorous and progressive leadership.”

The editorial was particularly shocking because Washington journalists had been critical of Dr. Marvin for many years. The Post, the Star, and the Daily News each continued to run student and alumni letters of protest in the editorial pages throughout the month of March and the first weeks in April.

“Your rather outworn metaphor about the tempest in the teapot requires some analysis. There is never a tempest in the teapot, you know, when the tea is brewing properly,” Martha Gibbon wrote in a pointed and bitter response to the Post editorial. Her case, she affirmed, was only one in a long series of cases presented to the AAUP.

Miss Gibbon criticized the editorial’s assertions that she had failed to achieve the criteria for promotion, namely that she failed to get an advanced degree or publish her research. But, she reminded the newspaper, “our faculty code states no such formal technical requirement for promotion and tenure” and numerous other faculty members have been given promotion and tenure without fulfilling the same requirements.

Faculty members are afraid to speak out against Marvin’s constant injustices inflicted on their colleagues because their
careers and livelihoods are in danger. Calling again for an investigation into Marvin's abuses of power, Miss Gibbon believed that the faculty would speak out "in surprising numbers" against Marvin's reign of terror.  

It is necessary to analyze what is, perhaps, the underlying reason for Dr. Marvin's refusal to promote Martha Gibbon to an associate professorship, namely, that she had communist sympathies. This claim is substantiated by a number of sources, including the conversation with Trustee Jessie Fant Evans, mentioned above. Two letters from students printed in The Washington Post give insights into the question of Professor Gibbon's political views.

Lee C. Patton, a former student in Miss Gibbon's class, wrote that he had no flaws with her teaching style or ability, "but I and a number of my friends do object to her social views. During the Spanish [Civil] War Miss Gibbon had the audacity to put on her required reading list in her classes the radical magazines the Nation and the New Republic. She also took the liberty of stressing her sympathy for the Red government of Madrid. A number of us, finding her views too objectionable after a time, lodged a protest with Dr. Marvin."  

Marvin's anti-communist credentials had been affirmed numerous times; although democracy and communism fought on the same side in the Spanish Civil War against fascism, they were diametrically opposed in the United States. The contradiction between Marvin's support of democracy as an alternative to communism, and his disregard of civil liberties and democratic governance at the university was not lost on many students. Another letter, in response to Patton's letter to the editor, by a former student identified only as C.G., noted that "although I disagreed with many of her ideas, I came out of her classes with the knowledge that my mind had been stimulated, that English courses could be made interesting, alive, vital." Faculty and student relations had been at this low point before, according to C.G., with the dismissal of Dr. Herrick. How could Marvin claim to be a defender of democracy while acting not unlike a petty...
"Yes, Mr. Correspondent Patton, Miss Gibbon did ‘stress her sympathy for the Red government of Spain,’" C.G. wrote in response to Patton’s letter. "As a believer in democracy, she had no other alternative. History has already shown how democracy took a beating when Spain fell.

"The issue in Miss Gibbon’s case is not simply a technical matter of Ph.D. degrees. It is the fundamental question of democracy on the campus of an important educational institution."

More insightfully, correspondence of Secretary Himstead of the AAUP indicates that two professors, “both department heads, Hansen and Van Evera, came to see me.” Ira Hansen was the head of the Department of Zoology and B.D. Van Evera was the head of the Department of Chemistry. They had a copy of Marvin’s statement to the Board of Trustees concerning the resignation, but refused to let Himstead read it himself, and the two men offered to read it aloud to Himstead. Himstead declined, nothing that no official inquiry into the controversy had been approved.

"In the course of our conversation," Himstead later wrote to a colleague, “they said that Professor Gibbon is a Communist and was a member of the League for Peace and Democracy, which, as you will recall, was condemned recently by the Dies Committee." In 1938, United States Representative Martin Dies became leader of the House Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, known simply as the Dies Committee. Dies was an outspoken critic of the New Deal and President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Committee cited certain organizations for being “communist fronts,” including the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was composed of large numbers of disparate groups, including communist elements, socialist and pacifist elements, and even the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Although the League began falling apart by the end of the 1930s, it remained vigorous and vocal.

“I asked them whether they thought that was one of the reasons why President Marvin had indicated that ‘administratively
speaking' she was not the kind of person he wished to retain on the faculty of the University," Himstead wrote. "They stated that they thought it was a factor in the situation, but they wished it understood that they were speaking 'off the record.'" 41

In 1954, the *Saturday Evening Post* published an article on Marvin's leadership at the George Washington University, paying special attention to his anti-communist efforts. "He has waged a long-enduring and, he believes, successful battle against communist infiltration of his student body and faculty," the *Evening Post* wrote of him, at the height of the Cold War hysteria that so indelibly marked the 1950s. "GW's location and close working relationship with the Federal Government have made it a primary target for commie colonization."

The *Saturday Evening Post* continued,

> During the '30s, because of his refusal to permit formation on campus of the so-called Liberal Club—only a few college presidents in the country outlawed the organization—he was widely excoriated by left-wingers as a dangerous reactionary. Great pressure was applied to blast him loose from his job. What Marvin knew and couldn't reveal publicly at the time was that a well-organized cell of 17 pro-communist students was operating on campus and that at least one faculty member was involved in it. By playing his cards cautiously and quietly, Marvin was able to break up and rout the organization within a single school term.42

The article gave no indication as to who the faculty members or students in question were.

Himstead was exasperated from the publicity surrounding the Gibbon controversy and Marvin's refusal to cooperate with the AAUP. "So much for the George Washington situation," he wrote to a colleague. "I have had to give this troubled place altogether too much attention during the past four years. I really do have other work to do."43
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But the controversy was far from over.

The Martha Gibbon Affair was significant in the history of the George Washington University because of the intense student and alumni protests that erupted against Dr. Marvin. The Student Committee on the Gibbon Case and the Alumni Committee for Investigation of Conditions at George Washington University were formed immediately after her resignation, and through a variety of methods—writing letters to the four major D.C. newspapers, demanding an AAUP investigation, holding rallies and meetings, signing petitions, and conducting their own investigations—the two committees succeeded in turning student opinion against the administration and publicly embarrassing Marvin.

Protest from alumni on behalf of Martha Gibbon was particularly intense; whether spurred to action by personal loyalties to the professor or by personal grievances against Dr. Marvin, dozens of alumni made a stand on behalf of Miss Gibbon. Charles Coltman of the class of 1936 was chairman of the Alumni Committee, a self-constituted group of nine alumni, including Davis Harding who led the petition drive some years earlier. The committee urged a “full, open, and free investigation,” according to The Washington Post. “We are firmly convinced that a grave injustice has been done to an extraordinarily excellent teacher,” the former students wrote.

In late March 1940, a bizarre incident occurred that gave many an eerie feeling that the GW administration was somehow engineering a cover-up. An alumnus of George Washington discovered vandalism at the Library of Congress, a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment. The alumnus was a supporter of Martha Gibbon and doing research on Marvin’s administration in Arizona. The vandalism reportedly involved the Library’s reference copy of a bulletin of the American Association of University Professors covering the AAUP investigation of Dr. Marvin’s administration at the University of Arizona. According to The Washington Daily News, four pages had been removed with a sharp blade, leaving a cut hardly noticeable to the average reader. The Library was not the sole source of the bulletin; it was readily
Prominently displayed signs in the Library reference and reading rooms notify the public that "Any person who shall steal, deface, injure, mutilate, tear, or destroy any book or newspaper, property of the United States, shall be held guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $10 or imprisonment of not less than one month, or both, for every such offense." The action does not indicate any foul play on the part of President Marvin, according to the News, and a crony or even an enemy of Dr. Marvin may have committed the action. A member of the Alumni Committee notified the News and a reporter verified the fact.

The Alumni Committee wrote to Congressional Librarian Archibald McLeish to investigate the vandalism. "Under ordinary circumstances we should not presume to call this to your attention, but as you may know, this committee is now engaged in an investigation of Dr. Marvin's regime at George Washington University and we would like to have full source information available at the Library of Congress." 45.

The incident simply gave more fuel to the blistering campaign of the Alumni Committee. In a letter to President Marvin, the committee was shockingly direct: "It is clear that you and you alone are responsible for Miss Gibbon's resignation, if we are to accept Miss Gibbon's statement, and your silence leaves us with no alternative," the alumni wrote in a letter to Marvin after he refused to reply to earlier letters asking him to explain why he refused to promote Miss Gibbon.46.

The alumni also appealed directly to the AAUP for an investigation, the Post reported. "Dr. Marvin last night refused to comment on the proposed investigation and remarked that he had 'no side' when asked his views on the controversy," the Post continued.47. Dr. Marvin's silence on the entire controversy was particularly frustrating to the students and alumni.

After the Board of Trustees released the list of six reasons why they upheld Miss Gibbon's resignation, the Alumni Committee, in part satire and part seriousness, responded with a list of six reasons as to why the Trustees were wrong.
1. Miss Gibbon’s resignation was forced.
2. The Faculty Code makes no provision for faculty appeal to the Trustees.
3. Miss Gibbon was not actually secure in her position until 1944, as her contract must be renewed from year to year.
4. Offer of a sabbatical leave with pay proves Miss Gibbon would not have been expected to return if she had accepted the offer.
5. The alumni group accepts Miss Gibbon’s statement rather than that of the Dean that she was orally recommended for promotion by the dean of one of her colleges.
6. Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin, GW president, has not yet explained why he refused to promote Miss Gibbon, and the alumni group renews its demand for an explanation.  

After repeated student and alumni demands, Marvin finally did release a statement in a letter to the Student Committee. “A university president can only be guided by the reports he receives, not those he is supposed to receive,” Marvin wrote. “Annual reports of the English Dept., which have been presented to this office through the office of the Dean, have not been altogether favorable to Miss Gibbon.... Also, I never received an official recommendation for Miss Gibbon’s promotion to associate professor.”

Marvin asked that his statement to the students be kept confidential, as he did not want it to be “utilized against Miss Gibbon.” The students, on the contrary, immediately released it to local newspapers, perhaps in an effort to utilize it against Dr. Marvin.

After receiving the letter, the students consulted Miss Gibbon before replying to Dr. Marvin, saying that she “considered nothing quite so harmful to her as absolute silence about the grounds on which she was refused promotion, in the face of her 11 years of...
loyal, efficient service to the University," the Daily News reported.49.

The Alumni Committee's investigations into the administration produced several point-blank attacks on President Marvin. In late March 1940, when the Gibbon scandal was raging in the local press, Marvin promoted two faculty members who did not have Ph.D.'s, another indication, the alumni believed, that Marvin's treatment of Professor Gibbon was arbitrary and capricious. An assistant professor—the same rank as Miss Gibbon—was promoted to an associate professorship holding only an Bachelor of Arts degree, a lower degree than Miss Gibbon possessed, and an associate professor with only a Master of Arts degree, the same degree Miss Gibbon held, was raised to an adjunct professorship, a step between associate and full professorship.50.

The alumni also unearthed some other facts that may never have come to light if they had not been publicized by the committee and the local press. Marvin suppressed a report critical of his administration just two months before, the alumni alleged.

Each of GW's eight colleges holds a faculty membership list. Generally, the faculty members who hold the rank of instructor—the lowest faculty rank—are automatically included in the faculty membership ranks, with the full rights of higher-ranking faculty members, particularly the right to attend those faculty meetings that are pertinent to their work. The meetings allow all faculty members, instructors included, a voice in discussing policies that affect their teaching, and in defending their own work from criticism.

However, when the 1939-1940 catalogue was issued, it was discovered that a number of instructors—the Daily News does not indicate how many—were deliberately left off the faculty membership lists. In protest, the faculty in one of the colleges most severely affected (the News does not say which college) elected a committee to investigate the situation.

The self-constituted committee released a report recommending that the new system be abandoned and that all instructors automatically become members of their respective
college faculties. At two p.m. on a mid-January afternoon in early 1940, the faculty was to meet to consider the report, which had been received at the previous meeting.

At the same time on the same day, President Marvin called a meeting of all the full faculty members of the college that had released the report. Several members of the staff who were present recalled that Marvin stated that the matter was none of their concern, that they would not be permitted to make any recommendations or even to discuss it, and that the individual who originated the protest was ordered to call it off. The individual motioned later at the faculty meeting that the report be tabled. The matter was laid to rest.51

Some friction developed, inevitably, between the Alumni Committee for Investigation of Conditions at George Washington University, a self-constituted group of fewer than a dozen alumni, and the General Alumni Association, the organization of alumni and former students representing thousands worldwide. The president of the Association, Hugh L. Clegg, wrote to Secretary Himstead of the AAUP a letter of protest that the self-constituted committee was not “appointed or authorized by the Association.” In fact, Clegg argued, only one of the members of the Committee is also a member of the Association, which dates back to 1847. “Obviously a small group of this nature has neither the authority nor the right to speak for the entire body of the alumni, now numbering over 12,000,” Clegg wrote.52

Later, after the Post had printed the March 24 editorial in which the paper proclaimed steadfast loyalty to Dr. Marvin, Charles Coltman, the chairman of the investigating committee, wrote a letter disagreeing with the Post’s stand. The paper refused to print the name of the committee and printed only the name of the writer of the letter because the “committee represents only a fraction of the alumni,” Coltman alleged in a follow-up letter to the editor, this time in which the committee was named. “Of course,” Coltman wrote, “all the alumni are not members of our committee. All do not even agree with us; but we think that the quantity of correspondence received by The Post and other newspapers in recent weeks shows that many do.”53
In fact, the amount of letters written to the local papers by supporters of Martha Gibbon was staggering. “I was in her class in 1929, and the entire class responded immediately to her eager and stimulating instruction,” wrote Walter R. Lee, a former student of Miss Gibbon’s English class to the AAUP. “We realized that we had a ‘teacher’ in the truest sense of that word, and this realization was confirmed as the class progressed throughout the year, for Miss Gibbon’s teaching was not confined to the fifty minutes between class bells—the conference periods in her office never left her waiting for students to appear, but quite the opposite, and the line formed on the right.”

Lee wrote that while the immediate loss may be hers, “the real loss will be to the University, for there are many other schools and only one Miss Gibbon.”

Vera M. Connell, another alumni of Gibbon’s classes, wrote to the Post: “I have been her student and hate to think that other young people in search of higher education in this city will be deprived of her matchless instruction. If, by bringing attention to her resignation, enough interest can be aroused to keep her here, we may consider ourselves most fortunate.”

“Americans are horrified by the acts of dictators in other countries. If we have a petty dictatorship situated in the heart of the Capital City of the world’s greatest democracy, surely the citizens of that city should know about it,” wrote Eva Galbraith to the Post in another of the many dozens of letters written to the local papers on behalf of Miss Gibbon. Students wrote of tyranny, a cowed faculty, a repressed student body, and, most insightfully, on Miss Gibbon’s ability as a teacher and mentor both in and out of the classroom. A less popular, less cherished teacher would never have generated such an outpouring of support on her behalf, or such an embarrassing scandal for the administration.

Dissent came from other fronts as well during the Martha Gibbon affair, primarily from the Student Committee on the Gibbon case, and from the Medical School. Of all the schools at the University, none had suffered more under reorganization than the
Medical School had, and none were as resentful towards Marvin. When the Gibbon Affair was at its height, pressed to take action, the alumni and faculty of the Medical School joined the ranks of opposition.

In 1932, the summary dismissal of 71 members of the GW medical faculty occurred in a reorganization of the Medical School. Members of the dismissed staff, some of whom had served with distinction for twenty or more years, stated they knew nothing about their replacement until they found their names omitted from the university catalogue in 1932.

One dismissed staff member threatened court action and was given a cash settlement out of court. Another was granted professor emeritus status. A distinguished department head resigned in protest over the incident.

Appeals were made to the AAUP, the Rockefeller Institute, and the Educational Committee of the American Medical Association. The AAUP declined to make an investigation because most members of the dismissed staff were part-time professors whose livelihoods did not depend on their jobs. The Board of Trustees never acted upon an appeal made to them by the dismissed staff.\(^57\)

The incident left behind such intense bitterness among Medical School alumni that many refused to attend the meetings of the GWU Medical Society for many years to come.

At an April 20, 1940 meeting, however, many showed up to support Miss Gibbon and “a thorough-going, impartial investigation” of President Marvin’s administration. The resolution before the Medical Society claimed that such an investigation was vital to protect the interests of all undergraduate and graduate students, and “to restore harmony in one of the oldest and most worthwhile universities in America.”

The Medical Society represented 2600 GW alumni throughout the country and 300 in DC.\(^58\). The meeting was composed of both alumni and faculty members, some of whom had been involved in what had become known as the “purge” of 1932. The members of the Society declared that the purge was only the first in a series of “incidents” during Marvin’s regime that
climaxed with the resignation of Professor Gibbon.

The motion invited little discussion, and passed by a vote of 64 to one, emphasizing the intense bitterness that remained against Marvin throughout the years. That bitterness did not disappear for a long time, though Marvin improved his image as the years went by, and major changes, including the opening of a new hospital, were implemented.59.

The Student Committee for the Gibbon Case was, meanwhile, circulating petitions, holding fundraisers and rallies, and conducting letter-writing campaigns to local newspapers. One circular cited President Marvin’s statement saying that he wanted to help Miss Gibbon as much as possible. The flyers printed by the students showered the campus, sternly asking: “In view of what has happened, how, Dr. Marvin, as a man who should command the respect of 8000 students, do you dare say that you want to help Miss Gibbon?”60.

The Student Committee, by this time comprising 25 members, held a fundraising party at 8.30 p.m. on April 6, with a 35¢ admission. A flyer advertising the party gave some details of the controversy, with a sardonic headline: Evasions speak louder than words. The students demanded answers from the administration and from the Trustees. The “law of decency and justice” is not to be found in Doctor Marvin’s files,” the students wrote.61.

The most creative protest against President Marvin’s administration was a play performed on April 22, entitled “The Collegiate Mikado,” a parody on the Gilbert and Sullivan classic. About 100 students congregated in the Western Presbyterian Church lecture room. The parody, written by GW students Norman Rose, Nancy Nimitz, and Milton Salkind, was a hit.

Miss Gibbon was the heroine, characterized by Yum-Yum in the parody: “I asked Doctor Mikado why he is exiling me. He told me not to bother about that, but to make my exit like a lady. He forgets that even a lady has to eat.”

Other characters included Dr. Mikado, a portrayal of President Marvin, Dean Yes-Yes, and Professor Wish-Wash.
When asked to break his silence, Dr. Mikado displayed a copy of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* from which he prepared to read his "official statement" in the case. One very memorable quote found its way into a student letter to the AAUP: "A man with a past can't exile a girl with a future!" 62

The opening chorus of the production gives an insight into the creativity of the students:

Here's a how-de-do
This will never do
Some professors *ought* to perish,
But when the teachers whom you *cherish*
Must be forced out too—
Here's a how-de-do
Here's a how-de-do

Here's a pretty mess—
In three months or less
She must leave without a hearing—
Let the bitter tears we're tearing,
Witness our distress,
Here's a pretty mess,
Here's a pretty mess.

There's a state of things,
There's a state of things,
Meritorious promotion
Doesn't seem to fit his notion:---
Ph.D., he sings—
Here's a state of things,
Here's a state of things!

After the performance, the one hundred or so students present passed a resolution urging an AAUP investigation formally adding their voices to the Medical Society and the Alumni Committee, and denouncing "evasive and unjust conduct of the President and Board of Trustees in refusing to accord Miss Gibbon
an open hearing."

The students then formally abolished the Student Committee on the Martha Gibbon Case and organized the Student Association for a Democratic University, inviting all students to participate in the establishment of student and faculty self-government.63

The Martha Gibbon Affair was nearing its completion, but the protests against Marvin were just reaching a climax. The students had come full-circle; the issue was no longer whether Miss Gibbon had a job or not.

The issue was Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin and his dictatorial regime over students and faculty life. It was too late to save Miss Gibbon's job and possibly her career. The students hoped that some good would come out of her resignation, and they vowed to keep her cause sacred for future generations who would meet Dr. Marvin's cold dictatorship.

They could not have seen into the future, however. Their hopes for a free and democratic university under the control of a new president would not be realized for many years. But Martha Gibbon had not resigned in vain. If anything, some institutions still stood strong, even after their members would graduate, grow up, and grow old. One of these was The Hatchet, the campus student newspaper, that for the first time began demanding answers—not just news—from the administration. It was a role that the paper did not take lightly in later years as the great protests of Vietnam would be the climax of student activism on campus. It did not take this role lightly in the conservative '80s and optimistic '90s, and into the next century.

During the Martha Gibbon Affair, the GW student body had found its voice. It was to be silenced for a few years as war waged around the world, but by the end of the decade, the student body was again finding itself in a new type of conflict with the administration, that of the desegregation of the University. This time the students would not be silenced, and this time they would win.

"We are pleased to report that the agitation on the Campus is
on the wane," Professors Hansen and Van Evera, of the Zoology and Chemistry Departments, respectively, wrote to Secretary Himstead. "This was to be expected, since we know that Miss Gibbon had no case with respect to tenure, violation of academic freedom, or on any other grounds, that her resignation was not asked for or forced, and that she was extremely foolish to resign. We are sorry that she acted so unwisely, but we are convinced that her charges against the administration are quite unfounded and even absurd." The two men were among Marvin's strongest supporters in his anti-communist crusade.\footnote{64}

B.D. Van Evera was also, insightfully, the president-elect of the George Washington University chapter of the AAUP. At a May 20th meeting, the chapter unanimously adopted a resolution expressing its strong support of Dr. Marvin. "In view of certain recent unfortunate publicity concerning tenure and academic freedom at The George Washington University, the chapter wishes to go on record as stating that in [our opinion], the President has abided by both the letter and the spirit of the Faculty code."\footnote{65}

Almost immediately after this resolution was passed, the national AAUP organization rebuked Van Evera and the local chapter. Himstead verified to Hatchet reporters that the action was contrary to both AAUP policies and to the Association's by-laws. In this type of case, Himstead affirmed, local chapters are advised not to take this kind of action.

"Without any preliminary discussion, it is said, the resolution was brought before an unsuspecting assembly and 'rushed through,'" The Hatchet reported, also noting that the outgoing president, A. Curtis Wilgus, a virulent critic of Dr. Marvin, was not asked to sign the legislation. B.D. Van Evera, the president-elect, did sign the legislation though he had no authority to.\footnote{66}

In a letter dated May 20, Van Evera quoted the recently passed resolution to Dr. Marvin: "In view of certain recent unfortunate publicity concerning tenure and academic freedom at The George Washington University, the chapter wishes to go on record as stating that in the opinion of the chapter, the President has abided by both the letter and spirit of the faculty code." The 53 professors, according to Van Evera, gave unanimous approval
to an administration that would lead the campus through national emergency. 67

The school year was reaching its close. On May 14, The Hatchet announced that the Alumni Committee had released its report, "A Preliminary Survey of the Administration of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin at The George Washington University," as it was titled, detailing eighteen cases where Marvin's actions were under suspect.

"These accusations have covered every aspect of University life: the suppression of academic freedom, the curbing of student self-government, the denial of basic rights to the faculty, the abetting of racial intolerance and the damaging of the reputations of members of the faculty who have displeased Dr. Marvin," read the introduction to the report. The alumni insisted that the purpose of the report was to bring awareness to other alumni about the recent events on campus. Since the primary communication between the university and the alumni is the publication of the university-sponsored Alumni Review, the Committee members felt that their report, called a "white paper," was more impartial. They published 6,000 copies, which landed in the hands of every graduate since 1930, The Hatchet reported. 68

The report included some of the more famous cases: the purge in the medical school, the dismissals of Marvin Herrick and Dr. James Defandorf, the cases of A. Curtis Wilgus and Constance Connor Brown, the firing of the Hatchet Board of Editors, Marvin's refusal to appoint Jewish faculty members, the suppression of the Literary Supplement, and the resignation of Martha Gibbon. Also included were the stories of less well-known faculty members whose cases had not sparked as much student interest. The alumni prided themselves on the completeness of the report, and vowed to print similar reports in the future if necessary. 69

With the publication of the report, the grievances of the Alumni Committee were clearly much larger than Martha Gibbon. She was not the reason for the revolution; her case, not dissimilar from the Archduke's assassination in 1914, was merely the spark
that launched a war.

To say this is not to forget the outrage that many students felt when one of the most popular and most cherished professors at GW had to face such a future of uncertainty in the wake of so many questions. One of the last letters printed by The Washington Post from Miss Gibbon’s former students, was this one by James Bryce: "I cannot say that I am outraged by the unfair treatment accorded Miss Gibbon by Dr. Marvin at George Washington University, for I have seen too much of political injustice in life to have any other emotion than that of sorrow for another crusader for truth who has failed. Although I consider much of my academic life wasted, the brief semester in Miss Gibbon’s class can be listed as a worthy scholastic achievement."

Miss Gibbon received her last communication from the Board of Trustees on June 6, when Board Chairman Robert Fleming told her that the Trustees considered the matter closed. He noted that the Board recognized that she had never asked for a hearing, and since she resigned, she didn’t even have the basis to ask for a hearing. The Board was clearly upset with her for the storm of negative publicity that came out of the press in recent weeks.

Her response was most bitter, the voice of an outraged and upset, but tired and resigned woman. "Your refusal of a hearing denies me even the most rudimentary right of defense; yet the matter involved is the destruction of my whole academic career," she responded.

"You have heard only Dr. Marvin’s account of the case. Despite my requests, I have not been allowed to see statements against me in Dr. Marvin’s files, which, you inform me, ‘bring light’ on my ‘allegations’"

She made no apologies for going to the press with her case. "It was the only forum that was open to me. George Washington is a social institution, created by an act of Congress and responsible to the community which it was chartered to serve. It is good that there should be a public interest in the university and that the truth should be known..."
“When an American college president acts like a totalitarian dictator, he poisons the atmosphere of the university, encouraging uneasiness and timidity in his faculty and disgracing the institution in the minds of all democratic people.”

On June 11, the senior class gathered for Class Night exercises, where class President Eugene M. Lerner gave a farewell address. He noted with regret the deaths of the University Comptroller, the Dean of the School of Engineering, and a member of the Senior Class. In a touching student tribute, he concluded with the recent controversy on campus: “Unhappy, too, is our farewell to Martha Gibbon, who has resigned. Many of us in the class of 1940 feel an irreparable loss to the university in her resignation.”

The Hatchet summed up the year in an editorial printed the next day. The great moments of the year, the opening of Lisner Library, success in the dramatics and arts, accreditation of the School of Pharmacy, and others, were marred by the very difficult times experienced by the newspaper. The inexperienced editors felt that they had only produced a moderately distinguished paper that year, falling on hard times after the firing of the experienced and battle-tested Board of Editors. They noted also the great protests surrounding Martha Gibbon’s resignation; the propaganda directed vigorously against Dr. Marvin and his administration, causing resentment among many. “At the end of the year, the matter seems far from settled, Miss Gibbon’s unhappy fate having become a lost issue.”

The closing of the editorial was a poignant summation of the glory and disappointment of the year of 1940. “And so the year passed. Progress? Yes, and no. A good deal of wholesome advance was made in some ways this year, but at the same time many phases of the University activities are far from what they should be.” The editors wished their successors the very best.

The year of 1940 and its tumultuous events: Progress? Yes, and no.

Martha Gibbon returned to her native Wisconsin, where
Perhaps the eloquent Dr. Elmer Louis Kayser sums up best the events of the late 1930s and the effects on later generations. It seems, he wrote, that a new breed of students was coming into existence. They were a vocal minority, to be sure, but they could hold convictions, organize, and protest administrative actions. “In fact, while the turn to this new militancy was occurring, the University was going through one of the most interesting phases its athletic history. But while major athletics was to rise to its zenith and then fall, the militancy of the new breed did not disappear.” It was the forerunner to the great protests of later years, to full student participation in university life, to the independence of the students with all of its implications.

“The student body...was just becoming conscious of politics, organized itself into a political party, struck out on the line of militancy against war and fascism, demanded its right to cooperate with national organizations and movements, injected itself into questions of faculty tenure, and attacked the president personally and so bitterly that the Trustees had to take cognizance of its charges and clear the president by a sweeping vote of confidence.”

It is no exaggeration to say that something changed at George Washington that spring. It is no exaggeration to say that a new era had begun.
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The George Washington University looked very different on the eve of war in 1941 than it did fifteen years earlier when a new president with a new vision built upon the precious little left for him by his predecessors. Marvin did not, in a way, appreciate the legacies that Presidents Stockton, Collier, and Lewis had left for him, Dr. Kayser writes. The new president did not fully appreciate, for instance, how Stockton had saved the University from disaster and had slowly and meticulously rebuilt its credibility brick by brick; how Collier had reintroduced the University into the governmental and social spheres in Washington, for where Stockton was an elderly veteran, Collier was a prominent socialite and diplomat; how Lewis, with his extensive connections in the business community, raised the image of the once-struggling community in the eyes of the leaders in the private sphere.

Marvin would build upon the legacy left by each of these presidents, plus one other, President ad interim Howard Lincoln Hodgkins, an elderly man by the time Marvin entered office, who had served brief periods between Collier and Lewis's administrations and Lewis's and Marvin's administrations. From the time Hodgkins entered the preparatory school at George Washington in 1873, long since closed, he had risen through the ranks from high school student to acting president, and had a great personal interest in the history of the University. According to Kayser, Hodgkins was probably the only person connected with the school who could remember the former Columbian University in all of its homes: on College Hill, where the University had stood until 1882, when it moved to Capitol Hill at 15th and H Streets, its home until the move to Foggy Bottom in 1912, under a new name, that of the first President of the United States.

The most lasting gift of Dean Hodgkins was what became known as the Harris-Hodgkins Plan, after its two creators. The
idea was to build up the entire city block bounded by G, H, 20th, and 21st Streets, ever respectful of the University's modest budget and modest ambition. With the construction of Corcoran Hall in 1924 and Stockton Hall in 1925, the groundwork was laid for what was hoped would be an entire university condensed into a city block.

But Marvin did not fully appreciate the forethought and insight that his predecessors had placed in the Harris-Hodgkins Plan; and perhaps it was for the best he did not. Marvin started with a clean slate, and with a more powerful vision than that of his forebears. He rejected the Harris-Hodgkins Plan almost immediately, and instead launched one of the most successful building phases in the history of the University. Unbound by tradition, Marvin was unconcerned by the fact that at no time in the University's history had the campus ever comprised of more than a small handful of buildings. He would, and he did, lead the University to realize its potential.

Though he was not restricted by the traditions and groundwork of those who preceded him, Marvin was not yet, at this time, an entirely free agent. He was a stalwart follower of President Herbert Hoover, and he resisted, as Hoover had done, the temptation to dip into the public purse. Marvin did not want federal monies, lands, or perks; a dedicated critic of the New Deal, he felt the government had no business in business, even at a time when the purse had been opened wide and other university administrators across the nation were not hesitating to take advantage of it. Marvin still resisted the temptation, though as time passed, his resistance lessened and the University began to benefit from governmental land sales, tax breaks, contracts, and numerous other advantages. By the time the Second World War ended, Marvin had served on diplomatic delegations, on federal committees governing national parks and educational systems, and in the War Information Office. He had opened up the University to contracts with government agencies that turned the school into a powerful research center for war-related activities.

This was all still many years away, however. The University still operated in much the same way as it always had, with three
powerful deans, that of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (both undergraduate and graduate together), the Law School, and the Medical School, who worked out among themselves the specifics of the annual budget, which was then approved by the president and trustees. The presidents had little say in budgetary matters, and most were content with a weak figurehead role. In the reorganization of 1927, immediately after taking office, Marvin dropped the three sacred branches of the institution, and replaced them with nine deanships directly accountable to the president himself: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (undergraduate), the Graduate School, the School of Education, the School of Engineering, the Law School, the School of Medicine, the School of Pharmacy, the Summer Sessions, and the Division of Library Science.

This reorganization was made easier with an entirely new generation of university administrators; the dean of the Medical School, Dr. William Cline Borden, retired after twenty-one years; Dean Hodgkins of the School of Engineering died in 1931; the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, John Bell Larner, passed away the same year, after twenty-one years in office; Dean William Allen Wilbur of the Columbian College left George Washington in 1929 after twenty-four years in office; and, with the creation of the Division of Library Science in 1927 and the School of Government in 1928, Marvin was able to appoint respectable, influential new leaders. The Junior College, which provided a two-year Associate of Arts degree, was founded in 1930. Much of Marvin’s success lay in the fact that, like a President of the United States, he was able to appoint much of his own cabinet.

Marvin’s coming to power, as noted before, virtually coincided with the coming of the Great Depression. The few resources with which he had to work, meticulously gathered bit by bit by his predecessors through low overhead, meager faculty salaries, and careful administration, were stretched even more thinly. But in the fall of 1930, when college enrollments were dropping off, Marvin was able to announce to the Board a 6% increase in revenue from student tuition over the previous year. Though he bucked the style of his most recent predecessors, he retained the stringent
thriftiness that had brought the University to stability from the brink of disaster.

The reorganizations of the somewhat illogical system of rank and promotion were welcomed by the majority of the University community, though “the initiative was invariably the president’s,” Kayser writes. His plans to cut course duplication and redundancy also passed with much support.

The most lasting changes on campus during the 1930s, however, were the physical expansion of campus through the construction of new buildings. As noted earlier, the $1 million gift of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry sponsored the School of Government on the corner of 21st and G Streets. This was by far the most important of the new buildings, for it not only revived a popular but money-losing division of the school that had not survived the reorganization of 1910, but also because it brought an immense amount of prestige to the University, prestige that Marvin cherished and cultivated. In 1928, the School became an integral addition to the nine existing divisions.

Marvin also received, in 1929, two seemingly insignificant appropriations of $1200 for the improvement of the gardens in University Yard in the middle of Square 102, the block at the center of campus, and $1,750 to paint the buildings a light cream (except for Corcoran and Stockton Halls, with their New England style of brick and white trim). Marvin had an intense personal interest in the buildings and gardens, and wished for the diverse array of campus buildings to look somewhat unified, with planned landscaping. “He found recreation and intense satisfaction in supervising these matters personally, usually early in the morning with Norris, his gardener, and his other groundsmen in attendance.” As University holdings increased, Marvin hired a garden consultant, Mrs. Lilian Wright Smith, who took over the major supervision of the work; many years later, the efforts of both Dr. Marvin and Mrs. Smith would be immortalized by the famous rose gardens in University Yard. The President’s style of white paint on the buildings’ exteriors and “Marvin Green” on their interiors “remained a subject of conversation for years.”
Kayser presents a very different image of faculty-administration relations during Marvin's first ten years. Marvin had simplified the bureaucratic structure, increased the faculty salary scale and held to it throughout the Depression, introduced a general policy of sabbatical leave, "scrupulously respected" faculty prerogatives and tenure, and maintained and improved the wide variety of courses than were available in earlier years. As a matter of policy, effort was made to provide each professor with his or her own office. A retirement system was established, including a pension. In the first six years of Marvin's tenure, he had increased University holdings 26.5%, acquiring nineteen pieces of property. With the large gifts he had cultivated, the community was anticipating a period of unprecedented building.

In December 1934, the Board of Trustees authorized the construction of Alexander Graham Bell Hall between the old Lisner Hall at 2023 G Street and Woodhull House at the corner of 21st and G Streets, to be used for laboratories, classrooms, and offices of the Departments of Biology and Zoology. The building would also house the registrar's office and the offices of the deans of Columbian College and the Junior College. This was the first major addition to Square 102 since the Harris-Hodgkins Plan had been abandoned.

Strong Hall, the product of a $200,000 grant for a women's dormitory, was the first of the new buildings to be constructed outside the original Square 102. Contrary to Marvin's preferred design, it was a red brick colonial structure six stories tall. The building was important because, as the University's first major dorm hall, its construction inaugurated a trend that changed George Washington from a commuter school to a residential one, with all of the implications for the intensifying of student life on campus. To this time, most of the students who lived on or near campus lived in fraternity housing.

While work on Strong Hall was being completed, construction of Gilbert Stuart Hall, a mirror image of Bell Hall standing on the opposite side of Lisner Hall, was advancing rapidly, completed in time for the 1936-37 school year. Bell Hall and Stuart Hall, identical in construction and at first unimaginatively named
Buildings C and D respectively, were very much Great Depression-era buildings. They were illustrative of Marvin's dedication to build with private funds only, resisting opportunities to take public funds as many other universities were doing in this era. The two buildings were improvised by the President and designed for utmost economy in their original design and cost. Built of used brick, Kayser writes, and later painted white, they were essentially cubes, four stories tall with a basement, including hollow partitions between rooms and exposed pipes and wiring. Walls remained unfinished, rooms could be changed in size easily, by moving the hollow partitions, and exposed pipes and wiring made repair easy. The sum total of this was a highly ingenious mechanism of extremely low-cost construction and maintenance.

In 1938, the Hall of Government opened, the cornerstone having been laid in a full Masonic ceremony. Constructed with white stone instead of used brick, the building was, in Kayser's words, "a dignified home for the School of Government."

As the Hall of Government was nearing completion, work began on Lisner Library, located on the site of Lisner Hall, the old site of the St. Rose's Industrial School purchased by Admiral Stockton, the ever frugal president, in 1912, the University's first excursion into Foggy Bottom from its location on Capitol Hill. The building was named in honor of the late Laura Hartmann Lisner by her husband, Abram Lisner, a member of the Board of Trustees and longtime benefactor. Opened in the fall of 1939, it was the first building owned by the University devoted entirely to use as a library. Six stories high, it was built in the same manner as its two neighbors, Bell and Stuart Halls, and the three connected buildings formed quite an impressive group occupying the G Street side of Square 102, Kayser recalls.

"These major structures and several smaller ones constituted the building activities of the 1930's. Never before in the history of the University had there been such tangible evidence of the institution's growth or of the energy of its president." Construction of University buildings had gone beyond Square 102, and plans for larger projects were under way as the acquisition of property accelerated.
The conclusion of the 1930s brought one final unanticipated gift to The George Washington University. In 1904, Columbian University had taken the name of the first United States President, lobbied, in part, by the George Washington Memorial Association, composed largely of women dedicated to fulfilling George Washington’s request of a national university in the District of Columbia, enumerated in his will at his death in 1799. Negotiations between the Association and the Board of Trustees were consummated by an Act of Congress, which became law on January 23, 1904.

After the name change, the George Washington Memorial Association agreed to raise $500,000 for the building of an administrative building for the University on the National Mall. In 1904, the Association had collected only $17,000, but did not plan on transferring this money to the University until the whole sum had been collected.

By 1936, however, the Association had collected only about $220,000, and many of its members were advancing in age. Mrs. Susan Whitney Dimock, the president of the Association, named as her successor Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin, to facilitate the transferal of the funds to the University since it became clear that the Association would never raise the full amount. The sum of money was used to complete Lisner Auditorium. Today this Auditorium houses the Dimock Gallery, a professional setting for student artwork and exhibitions on campus.

Indeed, the University looked very different on the eve of war in 1941 than it had more than fourteen years earlier when Marvin took office. It had all the beginnings of a great university, but not only because the physical nature of campus changed. The education and prestige improved as well, accompanied by a proportionate increase in Cloyd Heck Marvin’s stature in the community.

Much of that prestige could be attributed to the activity at the University in scientific research during the late 1930s. Marvin recruited several outstanding scientists to the faculty, including Vincent du Vigneaud in biochemistry, winner of the Nobel Prize in 1955, and physicists Edward Teller and George Gamow.
Vigneaud and Teller remained in their positions for about six years; Gamow was on the George Washington University faculty for twenty-two, from 1934 to 1956.

Beginning in 1935, Teller and Gamow hosted the first annual Washington Conference on Theoretical Physics. Attended by representatives from twenty universities and research institutions that brought outstanding scientists to participate in the informal seminars, the three-day conference proved so successful that arrangements were made to host it the following year. Each of the informal sessions started with an introduction to the research made in a particular field, and the topics were then opened up so that participants could explore the theoretical possibilities and the significance of a particular field of research.

While each of the conferences, held until 1947 except for the war years, was significant in its own right, the Conference of January 26, 27, and 28 was by far the most important. Two distinguished guests arrived at the Conference hosted by Gamow and Teller: Niels Bohr and Enrico Fermi, both living at the time in the United States.

The first day of the conference, Gamow recalled, was not very exciting other than the fact that he got three flat tires running over a beer bottle driving the Bohr family to dinner. The next day, Bohr came to the meeting somewhat late, with a telegram in hand. The telegram was from a colleague in Sweden who had heard from her former colleague and nephew Otto Frisch that “uranium, being bombarded by neutrons, shows traces of radioactive elements of about one-half its weight,” Gamow later wrote. Frisch believed that the uranium nucleus underwent fission, or splitting into two about equal fragments, as the result of the neutron impact.

Pandemonium erupted at the conference, held in the new Hall of Government, as the participants realized the significance of the discovery. Bohr and Fermi began an animated discussion at the blackboard, armed with chalk. The journalists in the room were escorted to the door, but the word “fission” leaked into the press, and the next day Robert Oppenheimer called Gamow for details.
Today, on the second floor of the Hall of Government, a plaque has been posted commemorating the Fifth Washington Conference on Theoretical Physics, and the important announcement made there: the atom had been split, with all of its consequences.

While the United States had not yet gone to war, there was another battle raging on campus. Despite the tremendous progress made in the growth of the University throughout the 1930s, one section of student life was clearly under siege: the student publications. During the 1940s, the publications that had long flourished, such as the newspaper and the yearbook, were on the verge of destruction, and many others died in the cradle. It was not simply a matter of finances; it was a matter of bureaucratic inefficiency and administrative indifference. But the movement certainly had its heroes: those students who tried over and over again to create lasting literary, humor, and technical publications. These students, however, would be given the cold shoulder by an administration that did not see them as important.

Judging by the renown given to many other university publications nationwide, the strangulation of those that appeared on George Washington's campus in the 1940s constitute one of the greatest missed opportunities of the Marvin era.¹

The battles of the student publications: The Helicon

In 1937, Assistant Professor of English Douglas Bement wrote to AAUP Secretary Ralph Himstead with "the greatest reluctance and hesitation" about the situation at George Washington. "I have been on the staff for the past eleven years, ten of which have been under Dr. Marvin's leadership," Bement wrote. "It is not unnatural that, after this long period of service, I should have become loyally attached to the University; this letter, therefore, is painful for me to write."

Bement supported Marvin in his early years, as the University owed him much for the renovations, reorganizations, and accreditations. "During the past two years, however, the feeling
has been growing within me if the University is to maintain its place, a place which I should like loyally to defend, Dr. Marvin cannot continue to head the institution."

He based his opinion on a great deal of evidence, both personal and hearsay. The evidence has "led me to the conclusion that he is fundamentally dishonest in his dealings with faculty, students, and with others outside the University." It was a serious charge, but Bement made it with the full realization, he insisted, that it could in fact be proven in an AAUP investigation. These were not mistakes in judgment, but states of mind, products of habit: Marvin's legendary predisposition to lie. "Never anywhere in my experience have I seen the morale of either the faculty or the students at such low ebb; the situation has reached a point where, I believe, the University will be seriously injured unless Dr. Marvin resigns."2

Only weeks earlier, Dr. Marvin Herrick's appointment was terminated. Bement's time at George Washington was running very short as well.

Both Bement and Herrick took personal interests in their students outside of class; Herrick had been faculty advisor to the Literary Club, an extracurricular for English students, and Bement had tried several times to establish a permanent student literary publication. It was only in the spring of 1940, after both Herrick and Bement had left George Washington, that the Literary Club finally announced that it was trying again to establish a literary publication. It would die a difficult death.

The front page of The Hatchet on April 9, 1940 proclaimed: "Literary Club will publish magazine." The English Department had announced the publication of The Cocked Hat, the new name of the literary magazine. It would contain short stories, essays, feature articles, verse, and drawings approved by two English Department faculty members. The Art Department was sponsoring any artwork for the magazine.3

A staff editorial appeared the same day. "Once again, efforts are being made to establish a literary magazine for the University," the editors wrote. George Washington, "like many other universities, did have a magazine, years ago." Publication of it,
however, was discontinued, and later attempts to revive it amounted to nothing. Yet, by all means, George Washington should have "a cultural outlet for the great quantity of promising literary talent on this campus."

Finances, it seems, were to blame for the failure of the previous literary magazines. "As soon as ambitious young campus literati begin to 'dream dreams,' the Publications Committee, the Student Life Committee, or some other group has poured cold water on the idea, saying such an undertaking simply could not be a financial success," the editors wrote. Both the Publications Committee, which specifically governed student-run publications like *The Hatchet* and the student yearbook, *The Cherry Tree*, and the Student Life Committee, which governed all student activities, were joint faculty-student bodies that were responsible for suppressing many of the creative initiatives brought forth by students over the course of many years. They represented the beliefs of the administration that costs on student activities should be kept to a minimum. Hard cash was hard to come by, and should not be spent on guaranteed money-losers.4

Although *The Cocked Hat* was supposed to appear in the spring of 1940, it never did. Only the following April did the idea reappear in the pages of *The Hatchet*. The Literary Club was sponsoring a new literary publication, *The Helicom*, which would feature the winners of a literary contest sponsored by the Club.

As the date of publication neared, and the "m" in "Helicom" was changed to an "n," the newspaper staff offered their support to the new magazine. "Articles, stories, cartoons and humorous features catching the life of this campus and universities in general will build a large following." The key to a successful literary publication, the *Hatchet* staff wrote, was the condition that the publication be run not as a literary initiative, but as a business venture. Literary magazines, if their content is good, can "sell itself purely on itself," unlike the newspaper and yearbook, which rely on subsidies from the school.

"The magazine isn't going to make a big splash this first issue. Using wood cuts and mimeographed print, the first issue will not be much to look at, but will lay emphasis on the material it
contains." The point is to create a firm foundation for a stronger literary magazine to appear in the fall. The editors of the magazine will be able to find advertising and to sell the magazines for a small price, confirming the financial self-sufficiency of the magazine. The magazine could be a success, the paper proclaimed.\textsuperscript{5}

As the 1940-1941 school year closed, the first female president of the Student Council, Anne Blackstone, had been elected in surprisingly clean elections, and everything looked as though it was on track for next year. But with tensions heating up around the world, the students did not know then that the following year would be very different. It was during this time that the debate over the magazine \textit{Helicon} intensified.

The magazine was published in mid-May 1941, and 150 copies passed into student hands much more quickly than anyone had predicted. In order to solidify that success, the student newspaper wrote, \textit{Helicon} must publish more humor and cartoons with its present articles. The content alone cannot drive the magazine; the staff must also include several businessmen who face a very real challenge in the fall. "There is a crying need for a weekly or monthly magazine at the University and \textit{The Helicon} has taken the first step toward satisfying this need." There will be a future for the publication if the staff can handle the challenges in the right way, the editors wrote.\textsuperscript{6}

The following September, Ray Arceneaux became the editor of the \textit{Helicon}, with a mission to "foster the literary talent on the campus." The magazine planned on becoming a quarterly, sold on a subscription basis for 75 cents apiece. Consisting of about thirty pages, according to the editor, the magazine included no advertisements in the first half and only segregated, half-page advertisements at the end of the magazine so that no story would be interrupted by an advertisement. "Material for the publication will be carefully selected from over one hundred contributions and the \textit{Helicon} will attempt to print nothing except the highest type of story, poem, article, and woodcut."\textsuperscript{7} The issues also included articles on art and literature, as well as occasional short pieces by modern contemporary authors.
"The history of the Helicon has already been colorful," the student newspaper wrote. The first issue appeared last April, and sold out without fully satisfying demand. The magazine had some hard times as well: "at one time ink and paper were exhausted with no money available for the purchase of the much needed supplies."8

In October, the magazine passed another milestone: approval by the Student Council. "By a unanimous vote, the Student Council last Thursday night gave its unqualified approval to The Helicon and placed the campus literary magazine's future squarely in the hands of President Marvin and the Board of Trustees," a Hatchet article read. Editor Ray Arceneaux appeared before the nine voting members of the student council (though a tenth was voting by proxy), defended the magazine, saying that the first issue of the school year was "practically completed," when Dean Doyle, the chairman of the publications committee, ordered publication halted pending the approval of the Student Council and the administration.

The Student Council was only concerned about one point: that The Helicon (now addressed in the student newspaper with a capitalized "The") would be able to pay all costs incurred with publication. The editor insisted that this was not an issue; the publication of the magazine would be held up until all bills were paid. Satisfied with his response, the ten voting members of the Student Council endorsed the magazine.

A temporary permit for each issue had been granted by the Publications Committee, which made a report about the magazine that had been passed to President Marvin. Any future action would be in his hands.9

The students did not have long to wait. Within one week, The Helicon had been banned from campus. Although the Publications Committee had recommended the magazine favorably and the Student Council had endorsed it unanimously, the Board of Trustees brought to a halt the plans of the editors even after the advertising and subscriptions had been sold and the copy had been selected. The Trustees issued four reasons as to why they chose to ban publication of the magazine:
1. Three like publications have been tried here in the last decade, and each has failed.
2. The departure of Professor Douglas Bement has left the English Department "in no shape to be of service in helping such a venture.
3. The stress and strain of outside developments are calling for attention from all of us.
4. The economic situation at the present time is very uncertain.

President Marvin sent a letter to Dean Doyle, the chairman of the Publications Committee, saying that the Board was not criticizing the plan for a magazine but simply felt that "such a venture ought not to be entered upon at the present time." The Publications Committee had been permitted to grant temporary approval to one issue, but not to a continuing magazine.

A Hatchet editorial slammed the Trustees' decision. "To say that the decision itself shocked us is unnecessary. We are greatly disappointed," the staff wrote. "You have seen fit to deny the existence of The Helicon, a literary magazine which we all feel is sorely needed here. Since you are the University's supreme body, we can do nothing but accept your verdict."

"We can never, however, accept the reasons you presented in support of that verdict." The list of vague generalities provides no insights into the reasons why the Board decided to suppress the efforts of a large number of hard-working students. The editors criticized each of the four points the Trustees provided.

"This 'economic uncertainty' is the most puzzling of the Board's utterances. If you are referring to the Nation's or even the world's economic uncertainty, we should like to question when there ever was economic certainty."

The editors could not see the point of criticizing the magazine's funding. "Helicon Editor Ray Arceneaux, in presenting his plans to the Student Council, stated that his magazine would not be printed until he could show advertising contracts and advance subscription receipts which would cover the entire
printing costs. At this moment, Mr. Arceneaux can do just that."

The editors questioned whether the Trustees were even aware of these facts.

Then, the Hatchet editors made an oft-repeated criticism, one made by Miss Gibbon a year and a half before. "It is regrettable that there should be so little contact between the trustees and the students of this University. We know of the trustees only what we are told, and you know of us only what you are told." The implication was, of course, that the person who did the telling was President Cloyd Heck Marvin.10

The Hatchet also printed another letter to the editor in its pages. Editor Ray Arceneaux defended his magazine. He said that the four reasons provided by the Trustees as to why they banned the paper were not sufficient; he had, however, heard rumors of several other reasons. "The Board of Trustees hesitated to trust the editorship of a literary magazine to me because of my statement in The Hatchet that the magazine was ambitious of eventually attaining literary qualities comparable to the Yale Literary Magazine." While such a statement may have been ambitious and presumptuous, he said, striving for such a goal is "not unworthy."

"Let me make it explicit here that if the approval of disapproval of Helicon depends on my editorship of that publication, I will be more than glad to resign immediately and to see any other person deemed acceptable to the Board of Trustees elected in my stead," Arceneaux wrote. He promised to also issue a retraction for his comments concerning the Yale Review.

Another criticism had been reported, Arceneaux wrote: "Material written by students of the University...is not worthy of publication." It was perhaps perfectly fair to criticize the content of the first issue. Material for that issue had been limited, and selections were made from a small pool of contributions. However, in early fall letters were sent to all current and former English composition courses advertising the magazine, "well over one hundred excellent contributions have been received." Certainly, a high-quality magazine could be composed. "I will not believe that a University of 10,000 students cannot produce a
quarterly publication of top-ranking quality," Arceneaux concluded.

He made the same plea that the Hatchet editors made. He hoped the case was not a closed one, and that the Trustees would consider the approval of the magazine at the next meeting.11

A Hatchet columnist, Harvey Goldberg, wrote in the Hatchet pages at the end of October a column calling for more student freedoms. "The problem of the Helicon is, of itself, important enough," Goldberg wrote. "But it is momentous as it symbolizes the struggle that has taken place at GW for an extension of cultural activities." The school has expanded greatly, with new buildings and gardens. But the emphasis on cultural activities had not kept pace with the brick and mortar.

Goldberg wrote about the ill-fated Athenian Society, a group that studied Greek classics and culture; they were a recognized group without a permanent meeting place though repeated petitions for one had gone nowhere. The irony of the fact that Dr. Marvin himself belonged to a cultural group that, among other things, reads the great philosophers in the original Greek was not lost on Goldberg.

Then, The Helicon and its dedicated students appeared on the horizon. They wrote a Constitution. They elected officers. They found a brilliant and inspiring faculty advisor. They were approved by the English Department, then the Student Life Committee, and then the Committee on Publications. They collected, selected, edited, and compiled stories, poems, artwork, and articles. They sold advertising and subscriptions. Then, they were stopped in their tracks.

"George Washington needs a literary magazine; it needs an Athenian Society. It needs something more than new buildings; it needs a university spirit," Goldberg insisted, before turning his eyes toward Mt. Olympus and Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin. "Loosen the reins; understand our needs and desires, Administration. Don't ridicule us, Board of Trustees, with your Helicon excuses (Perilous times, no talent, and similar absurdities). Encourage us in our endeavors; repression forwards autocracy not democracy. Give us the school we need to fight these uncertain times."12

The debate over The Helicon was intensified in early
December when a letter was printed in *The Hatchet*. An article read: "In a letter to the Hatchet Board of Editors, Douglas Bement, former member of the English Department here, and present director of the Division of Composition and Creative Writing at the University of Washington, threw new light on the controversy over The Helicon."

The lengthy letter addressed each of the Trustees' complaints against the magazine. "I am now 3,000 miles from 20th and G Streets, where I spent fifteen years of my life attempting to teach writing. But it is only because of this very strong bond that I write you about the controversy over the Helicon," Bement began.

When Bement came to GW in 1926, he instituted a literary magazine called *The Colonial Wig*, a self-supporting literary periodical. It was reasonably financially successful; it was never in permanent debt. Mrs. William Mather Lewis, the wife of the then-GW president, contributed to the Wig's "endowment fund."

A year or two later, he recalled, he was made chairman of the Publications Committee by Dr. Marvin. Marvin endorsed the merger of all the campus publications except for *The Cherry Tree*, the student yearbook. At the time, the undergraduate student body published *The George Washington University Hatchet*, the weekly newspaper, *The Colonial Wig*, a monthly literary publication, and *The Ghost*, a humor magazine. The staff of *The Ghost* did not want to merge the publication with the others, so publication of the humor magazine ceased. The staff of *The Wig*, too, was reluctant to merge, but Bement was assured of the publication of *The Hatchet Literary Supplement*, once a month. Bement agreed to the merger himself partly because he wanted to please the new administration and partly because *The Literary Supplement*, as part of the student newspaper, would receive a subsidy from the University to help defray expenses.

For two years, this arrangement continued satisfactorily. The *Supplement* became, almost overnight, a very well respected college literary magazine. One of its short stories was reprinted in a prominent literary journal and later in a volume of short stories. Another won national recognition and was reprinted in several anthologies. There were many other examples in this period of
literary scholarship.

"In the second year of the Literary Supplement one story was criticized because its treatment of a 'delicate' theme. The story had been written in one of my classes by an extremely gifted writer, and I had given it my tacit approval by submitting it to the editors of the Literary Supplement for their consideration." The following year, however, found that the University could no longer finance the Supplement, Bement wrote.

This was the first of the three "failed" publications to which the Trustees make reference. "But I strongly object to the implication that the Literary Supplement failed. It did not die from natural causes," Bement countered.

Then, about 1938, a group of students again attempted to found a literary magazine. Together with two of his colleagues, Bement was asked to consider the approval of the magazine along with the Publications Committee, of which he was no longer a member. "I advised against founding this magazine for two reasons: first, the students' plan for financing it was not, in my judgment, sound; second, I was not willing, in view of my past experience, to act as a faculty advisor, if such a responsibility would include my being also a censor of the articles printed.

The third "failure" referred to by the Trustees, Bement wrote, may have been Albert Tate's Helicon of the 1940-41 school year. But the first issue had, it must be remembered, sold out within two hours of being placed on the newsstands. With a new editor, Ray Arceneaux, The Helicon had a very bright future indeed.

Bement also addressed another of the Trustees' allegations, namely the one that implied that Professor Bement's departure left the English Department "in no shape to be of service in helping such a venture." Such an allegation must have certainly been amusing to Bement who had grown rather disillusioned with the University administration in his later years. "Without being accused of false modesty, may I say that this is utter nonsense. I should like to flatter myself that the 'literary' future of the George Washington University died when I resigned. But the trouble is that even my best friends would not believe it." It was true, after all, that he had no experience with a literary magazine since the
Supplement, discontinued in 1933. And there were many others in the English Department, he was certain, who would be willing and interested to devote time and energy to the success of a responsible, well written, financially sound publication.

But—and here is my point—I believe: First, that Washington, especially through GW, presents an unusual opportunity here and now for developing writers, both fiction and non-fiction; second, that with sound business management, a literary magazine could sustain itself, even if the University could not give it financial aid; and third, that it is inadvisable for any member of the present staff to accept the responsibility of [faculty] advisor to such a magazine unless he is assured that his critical judgment is not to be subject to judicial review on questions of "taste." There is no virtue in talking glibly about "democracy" or "freedom of speech" or "freedom of the press" unless any man or woman, boy or girl, can write as they think and feel—provided, of course, that they do not violate the law of standards of "good taste" which their next-door neighbor has set up. And when you find a standard of good taste that all readers of a literary magazine will accept, won't you wire me collect?

Bement's letter caused waves among the students. A Hatchet editorial accompanied it, saying: "We believe [the letter] lends confirmation to our contention that there is a place for a literary magazine on this campus." If such talent appeared on campus ten years earlier, that talent would be greatly magnified at the present with a larger student body to draw from. It was time for a revival of a literary magazine, and the Trustees should reconsider their decision to ban the publication. Bement's letter was published on December 2, 1941. By the time the next edition of The Hatchet appeared, on December 9, the country had gone to war.
A Hatchet editorial appeared in that issue, calling for unification of the country and commitment to winning the war. But, the paper cautioned: "Our military leaders will direct us in winning the war. It is up to us—as a large and highly intelligent voting element in the nation—to decide upon the methods of winning the peace."

Immediately following the editorial on the declaration of war, the Hatchet staff reminded readers that the cause of The Helicon was not yet dead. "The fate of The Helicon will be sealed before Thursday's meeting of the Board of Trustees adjourns. During the long controversy, it is notable that not a single voice in opposition to the campus literary magazine has been forthcoming. The Helicon would never receive the approval it sought, however."

After the Trustees failed again to approve the publication, Ray Arceneaux wrote a letter to President Marvin proposing a delay in publication to the following school year. But that idea never came to fruition. The following September, The Hatchet reported that Arceneaux had transferred to Southwest Louisiana Institute. The Helicon never did appear again, and a great opportunity in the University's history was lost.

The campus in wartime

Cloyd Heck Marvin had been president of The George Washington University for slightly more than fourteen years when the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred. "In a way the outbreak of war ended the first period of his administration," Kayser wrote. "It had been a time of marked and rapid change. The shape of things to come was clearly visible." A tremendous reorganization of the University had taken place; land acquisition and construction showed the intention to expand in all four directions from the original Square 102. All of the branches of the University received accreditation, and a variety of student activities and organizations enjoyed national recognition.

The outbreak of war, however, placed a series of demands upon the University. Like other schools nationwide, it endeavored
to play its part in advancing the national defense of the United States. As time passed, however, it became increasingly difficult to replace staff members called to military service, and the remaining faculty had to buckle under increased workloads. Development and expansion of the University were temporarily put on hold; after the cessation of hostilities, another fourteen years were left in the Marvin administration, leaving plenty of time for expansion in the future.

On Monday, December 8, 1941, the day following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the faculty met in solemn congregation in remembrance of the incident. The ranks of faculty would be rather quickly depleted as younger members entered the armed forces and specialists in fields related to the war effort took leave of absence for government service.

Under contract with the U.S. Office of Education, the University over the course of the war offered 387 war-related courses, mostly in engineering, science, and military-related fields to more than 12,750 students. Meanwhile, an estimated 7,000 GW graduates saw active service in the armed forces. The Board of Trustees authorized a special series of relationships with the National Defense Council and the Department of the Navy, authorizing special research to take place on campus and to operate research facilities in Virginia and West Virginia. Numerous contracts, some large, some small, of varying lengths, were signed with federal and District agencies to provide for research facilities, training facilities, or hospital and medical facilities. The Trustees even set up a University Defense Unit, with wardens who would be trained in first aid and firefighting instruction in order to protect the University property and community in the event of an emergency.16

Within several weeks of the outbreak of war, new classes were instituted, including civil engineering, cartography, construction planning and inspection, electrical engineering, radio communication, mechanical engineering, artillery design, ship construction, high explosives, and small arms weapons and ammunition.

Student life changed as well; The Hatchet ran periodic stories
about alumni in the war effort, detailing the part military officers, diplomats, and government officials from George Washington were playing in war. Intramural athletics ceased, and the existence of many student organizations became precarious.

On December 16, 1941, The Hatchet published a thoughtful editorial about the effects of war on campus. Even though the country had been at war for barely a week, already many students around campus were asking each other: “Are you going to enlist?” One heard protests from male students insisting that they could not concentrate on their studies with war going on, that they have lost all interest in school, that they might as well enlist now to avoid conscription later. The paper warned only those students who had previously received deferments from the draft board until the end of the semester were in danger of immediate enlistment, since those deferments were automatically suspended.

“But the rest of you patriotic males—you who have heard nothing from your draft board or who are too young—should settle down again and continue plugging away at the books,” the editors wrote. Most students on campus had a good chance of at least finishing the semester and probably the year. In the meantime, it was more useful to concentrate on studies and wait to see how dire the need for men in military service was.

“There is going to be a world on the other side—though it may seem a long way off—a world far better than the one we are leaving, if our leaders, who have been calling for all-out aid to the Allies for some time, are given opportunity to put their ideas into effect,” the editors concluded, with foresight.

Another of the major changes to be instituted during the war years was a change in the calendar itself, so that two six-week summer sessions would replace the former nine-week summer session, permitting students to graduate in only two and two-thirds years rather than the customary four. A number of combined and joint-degree programs were established for the duration of the war, permitting students to condense their education. The Medical School—which had never before instituted a summer term—allowed students to speed up their education by attending school year-round. Students in the Medical School were granted
deferments from the draft until they completed the course, at which time they would be commissioned in the Army or Navy Medical Corps. A regular 3-year law degree was available in two years.\(^{19}\)

The war altered faculty life as well. President Marvin sought a review of the curricula, so that courses and personnel not indispensable to the war effort would be downsized or dropped. The question of faculty tenure raised its ugly head once again, as professors leaving for military service were granted one year's military leave without guarantee of renewal. The most notable change of all, however, was the significant drop in student enrollment. Within the first year of war, *The Hatchet* reported, a loss of about 16% in the student body was sustained. Seventy-three faculty members served in some branch of the war effort, either at home or abroad, within the first year. Over three hundred students enlisted.\(^{20}\)

The trend continued throughout the war. Eleven thousand students in 1942 became nine thousand in 1945. In the Medical and Law Schools, the number increased; for war-related courses in the School of Engineering, over 1,000 supervisors and lecturers were hired to train 13,000 men and women. The decline in student enrollment of about 20% throughout the war period contributed to a loss in income from tuition; the money raised from the contracts with the government, however, more than offset the drop.

In 1945, before the Rotary Club, Dr. Marvin spoke of the courage of the men The George Washington University sent to war:

> From our regularly enrolled students and from our alumni of Selective Service age, we have sent nearly 7,000 into the Armed Forces. One of my most trying tasks in these war days has been to grasp the hands of your sons and daughters as they have come through my office for a "Good-by" and a "God bless you." In these latter months the task of saying good-by has become even more trying, as it recalls all to
vividly the ever-growing list of those who will not return, and that of those who have already come back to us blind, and halt, and maimed. Approximately 7,000 have gone and still they go, clear-eyed but prematurely aged at eighteen years. The freedom of youth is not for them. Eagerly, but with a wistfulness, they go to take their places on our ships of the air. They go to our land monsters, and they go to urge their feet to carry them into the sand and mud, among mangled bodies, into the hell of battle. I cannot help but say now, and I know each of you will join me in the prayer, “God bless them and give them understanding.”

Marvin himself played a very personal role in the war effort. During the spring of 1944, for instance, Marvin appeared before the House of Representatives Committee on Veteran’s Legislation to testify on amendments to be made to the G.I. Bill, the provision of university education to the returning veterans. Marvin had a very powerful position at the time in the Conference of Representatives of Educational Associations, a lobbying organization. Ever the guardian of states’ rights, Marvin told the Congressmen: “Education in America is basically a local and state function. It should remain so. The setting up of an educational program federally administered, which [bypasses] state agencies is a threat to this fundamental principle in American life.” It was indeed ironic that Marvin initially opposed the G.I. Bill, albeit on purely ideological grounds, when, in fact, in later years, the Bill was responsible for an enormous increase in population—and revenue—for the University.

After the war ended, Marvin himself joined the government bureaucracy. Appointed the Deputy Director of the Research and Development Division of the War Department by President Harry Truman and Secretary of War Robert Patterson, Marvin dealt directly with the heads of colleges and universities, industrial laboratories, and the deans of graduate schools in the sciences as an advisor to the Secretary of War and his chief of staff.
According to The Hatchet, the appointment culminated Marvin's long dedication to scientific research as University administrator, exemplified by the theoretical physics conferences held at George Washington and a contract with a Maryland laboratory staffed by George Washington University technical personnel that contributed to the development of various weapons, including rockets, throughout the duration of the war.²³

Prestige was again bestowed on President Marvin and the University in 1948 when Army General Dwight D. Eisenhower presented Marvin with the Department of the Army's Award for Exceptional Civilian Service, in part for his position as deputy director and acting director of the Research and Development Division in the War Department, where he served for nearly a year from September 1946 to August 1947. The citation read at the ceremony noted the "unusual accomplishments" of the educator in integrating the research activities of the War Department with university education in the sciences. "He devised new methods of analyzing and improving the program, and has inspired others by his unselfishness, high ideals, and enthusiasm," the statement concluded.²⁴

There is no doubt that Marvin contributed immensely to the growth and rapid expansion of the University during wartime. Buckling under the strain of the war effort, George Washington became a war machine in the early 1940s as students, veterans, military personnel, and officers shared the campus not only in the classroom, but in student life as well.

Those most critical of the war effort were the students themselves, who tried to carry on with normal student activities even though global events were anything but normal. One example was the continuing controversy over Intercollegiate Athletics, abandoned by the Trustees at the outset of war. By the beginning of 1945, the student body had mobilized for their return; student government officials had been elected on the platform of bringing back athletics, a petition had been signed with over 2,000 signatures, and a resolution was passed by the Student Council favoring the return of sports. Students sought interviews with Marvin and the Trustees to convince them that it was the proper
time to bring back sports. While travel restrictions, declining interest, and scarce funds had prompted the abolition back in 1942, students felt that conditions had changed enough to bring sports back to campus. Nonetheless, they didn't return until the conclusion of the war.  

In the meantime, the student body had gone to battle on several other fronts as well.

*The battles of the student publications: The Surveyor and The Colonial Review*

In the fall of 1946, the student body was ready to try again with the dream of a literary publication. "Prospective literary magazine seeks talanted (sic) writers, artists," ran a *Hatchet* headline on Halloween day. The paper reported that thirty prospective writers and artists attended an informational meeting held for all of those interested in forming "an additional outlet for literary talent" at George Washington. The organizer of the meeting was a student named John McNabb.

Several committees were formed to price printing companies, design posters, plan layout and design, and contact other university-sponsored literary publications on other campuses. The magazine planned to publish short fiction, essays, poetry, photographic art, and etchings, and would be designed to "meet the taste of the general student body, with a high literary quality maintained."

The group had not yet applied for recognition from the Student Life Committee and the Publications Committee, but had come up with a tentative publication schedule: it would be a quarterly, just as its predecessor, *The Helicon*. The students planned to sell advertising and subscriptions.

"The University has in the past had several publications of this nature," *The Hatchet* reported, noting that the last was *The Helicon*, "discontinued for financial reasons, due largely to the fact that no advertising was accepted."

It is a wonder how time so readily forgets the details. *The
Helicon was not discontinued for financial reasons at all. The immediate question was, however, would The Surveyor, as the publication was named, be able to balance the books?

The following week, the literary group elected John McNabb head editor, along with an art editor, a photo editor, a prose editor, and a poetry editor. A business and advertising staff rounded out the list. The students also wrote a constitution and promptly sent it in for official recognition from the Student Life and Publications Committees, and, by extension, Marvin and the trustees.

In spring 1947, the Committee on Publications finally heard the application of The Surveyor for official University sanction. On March 7, the Committee passed a resolution and sent it to Marvin to be approved. The resolution had two points: first, the publication needed to have fifty percent of expenses on hand before the issue can be published. Insurance of this must be provided in advertising contracts, paid subscriptions, and invoices. The Student Council assumed oversight and financial responsibility for the magazine. Second, the Committee approved the appointment of Assistant Professor Muriel H. McClanahan of the English Department as faculty advisor of the magazine.

Marvin wrote to Professor Calvin Linton, the Chairman of the Publications Committee, that “all the precautions you are setting up for the proposed campus magazine ‘The George Washington University Surveyor,’ are most worthwhile.” Marvin decided to approve the Committee recommendations and give life to the literary magazine.

“By the way,” Marvin finished, “isn’t there a better name—‘Surveyor’ is not very literary.”

“Literary Magazine Receives Recognition,” a Hatchet headline read the following week. The article announced that Marvin and the Committee on Publications approved the publication, “which during four months has slowly overcome financial and constitutional difficulties,” according to the newspaper. The Hatchet office even announced that material for the publication could be delivered to the newspaper office. “There is an immediate need for material,” they wrote, and the newspaper remained a strong backer of a literary publication on campus.
The first issue of The Surveyor did not, despite the approval, appear until the following school year, with a new editor-in-chief, Louis Munan.

Dr. Marvin wrote a letter printed in the first issue of The Surveyor. "I am glad to congratulate you upon the completion of a difficult venture, the bringing to print of a literary magazine on the University campus." Marvin wrote that the magazine should stimulate readers, writers, and artists. "We all hope this first issue will be a worthy attempt in that direction."

In a preamble to the magazine, the editors championed the administration's approval for the magazine: "They realized that the most that any administration will do for a student magazine is to give it recognition, house it, and afford it the privilege of drawing from the knowledge and experience of the faculty wherever the need is felt; that it is up to the student to give the publication flesh and blood and movement." The editors ended with an ironic conclusion, ironic because of the course of later events: the students "wanted a magazine that would live, laugh, think, and inspire. Above all, one that would last."

The only wish of the magazine was that it would last. The Surveyor, however, never appeared again.

Professor Linton, the chair of the Committee on Publications and future long-time dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, explained the situation to Marvin: "The Surveyor was approved only with the definite provision that it be self-sustaining. This it has fallen far short of being, and we do not believe that circumstances suggest that it may become self-supporting in the future." The fact that the University was supporting a magazine will not increase the "sales initiative" of the staff.

The question remained, Linton added, as to whether the University should undertake, on a permanent basis, the expense of a literary magazine. "We believe it should not, on the principle that general funds should not be spent for the benefit of only a rather small part of the student body." Unlike the newspaper, which is of "general usefulness and appeal, the literary magazine is of particular interest and usefulness only to students enrolled in creative writing classes," he concluded, skeptical.
Marvin read his letter and wrote one to Professor McClanahan, who apparently had lobbied the President on behalf of the magazine. "I am sorry that the University feels that it cannot undertake the financing of a literary magazine," Marvin wrote her. Several attempts had been made to establish a literary publication, and each one failed. "I believe if you were to think about the social background in which we are situated that it would be clear why such is the case." That social background, evidently, was not one of a liberal arts tradition that championed creativity and individuality. It was quite the opposite, in fact.  

A summer, a fall, and a winter later, the Literary Club decided to try again with the publication of a literary magazine following the premature death (and debt) of The Surveyor. John J. Ford, the president of the Literary Club, requested approval from Professor Linton and the Publications Committee. The magazine was called The Colonial Review, though it was not the first publication in the history of The George Washington University to be given that name. In 1930, when The Ghost and The Colonial Wig merged, The Colonial Review was briefly published before changing its name to The Hatchet Literary Supplement. But the new Review was not a traditional newspaper or magazine. The goal was for The Review to be a scholarly journal of literature.  

"We understand that the magazine will not go to press until there are sufficient funds to pay for the first issue and that the board of editors will choose a faculty advisor to be approved by the Publications Committee," Ford wrote to Professor Linton. The new editor of the journal, Norbert Immen, provided Linton an estimate of the journal's publication: 700 copies, with 40 pages per copy, added up to $160.00.  

Immen and the editorial staff of the journal had on hand $184, which was more than enough to cover the cost of the first edition. They also solicited and won the support of Professor McClanahan, who agreed to be The Review's faculty advisor.  

The Publications Committee took a "dim view" of the project, in light of the recent demise of The Surveyor. But the constitution of the publication provided that no issue will be published until the entire sum necessary for publication is paid, and that all content
must be approved by Professor McClanahan. Impressed with these safeguards and with the publication’s finances, the Committee voted (with one dissenting) not to permanently recognize the publication, but granted permission to print “one experimental issue” with the understanding that the entire cost be paid up front. “After that experimental issue,” Linton explained to Marvin, “the group will be permitted again to bring their proposals to the Committee.”

Marvin was ready to follow the recommendations of the Committee, which was made up of several professors, two alumni, and two students, traditionally students who worked on the publications themselves, and who could not vote. “In spite of all that is said, I hate to see another fiasco being undertaken by the University,” Marvin wrote. “We may have one edition—we may have two—or maybe more. But in the end the problem is always the same—who is going to make up the deficits, and where will the materials for a magazine come from?” But he felt the Committee’s safeguards were satisfactory, approving the recommendation “with the understanding that at no time is there to be a magazine published unless all of the funds are available before the publication is undertaken.” Another hurdle was thrown in the path of the literary publications: they needed to pay up front the full costs of publication.

With Marvin’s approval of the Committee’s recommendations, Professor Linton informed Norbert Immen, the editor, that while the Committee does not approve with permanent recognition of The Review, the administration did agree to permit the publication of one issue. The editorial staff could bring the issue before the Committee again, if the publication was successful. The issue was to be published in Fall Term, 1949.

The following fall, the first issue was printed; a small 5.5” by 8.5” journal with a stiff plain cover. It was not the large, showy, full-color magazine cover of The Surveyor. The staff had spent only $180 on publication, and had earned more than $400, making a clean profit of over $220!

In January, they sought approval of a second issue, to be published in February. The Committee, in light of the journal’s
strong financial situation, unanimously backed a second issue. "The Committee desired me to express to you its congratulations on the success of the first issue of The Colonial Review, a success which is both artistic and financial," Linton wrote. 39

The Hatchet had words of praise too. In a review of the literary magazine, a reviewer wrote that the publication of the Review "is a gratifying indication that there is student literary talent at the University and student interest." The review heralded the lead article and one of the short stories, among several in the volume.

Another issue appeared that spring, and a new editorial staff issued a third issue the following fall. The Review had been able to do what its predecessors could not: be a continuing publication without going bankrupt or being suppressed. Only three issues ever appeared, but The Review successfully overcame the odds of financing a literary magazine. It was by no means permanent, but it was a good start.

The battles of the student publications: The Grind and The Speculum

In the spring of 1946, a campus literary magazine was not the only publication aching for recognition and endorsement. Another group of students sought recognition for a humor magazine, one that would be named The Grind. With a large editorial staff, numbering about thirty-five people and led by a faculty advisor, The Grind was a substantial publication that contained a great deal of drawings and artwork, as well as advertising, giving it a real magazine look unlike the mimeographed Helicon and the Review with its scholarly journal appearance. It planned six magazines for the year, selling $1 subscriptions for the entire season. 40

Only one issue ever appeared. The January 1947 issue had a noble mission: "To foster friendly spirit and good humor among the student body," according to the magazine's constitution (all student organization constitutions at this time also contained a
The humor was somewhat tongue-in-cheek, somewhat daring, somewhat controversial. It was, to be sure, very funny. Many of the jokes were alcohol-related or mildly sexual. Clever poem constructions and humorous short stories accompanied interesting use of clip art and fonts to create pages that were physically attractive. As technology advanced during this period, the publications progressed as well; the typewritten pages of The Helicon looked rougher and less professional than the new publications of the late 1940s.

Unlike The Surveyor, which appeared roughly the same time as The Grind, the humor magazine did not seek the same recognition as the literary one. While The Surveyor sought Student Council support and then the support of the Publications Committee, The Grind "did not make its appearance as a University publication; it merely implied that it functioned as the campus humor magazine," the Hatchet editors wrote. "Excluding its content, The Grind has overcome the two obstacles which have caused the authorities to deny other applications:" one, the student body is very much in favor of a campus humor magazine, and two, The Grind did not run a financial deficit.

Reaction to the magazine was somewhat mixed, according to the Hatchet editors: "The most glaring error is its adolescent insistence upon being tastelessly risqué." Students loved it or hated it, and some were not sure what to think.

The administration was very clear in what it thought, however. Professor Linton was livid. On February 5, a vote of the Publications Committee denied recognition of The Grind and Linton then explained the whole fiasco to Marvin in a strongly worded letter.

In the early part of Fall Term, Sherie Simon, the editor, and Phil Kagan, the managing editor, visited Linton to discuss the proper procedure for getting University approval for a proposed campus publication. Linton advised them to submit a constitution within the next day or so.
No more was heard about the group until early January when The Hatchet announced that the “new University humor magazine” was ready for publication. Linton at once wrote to Simon, the editor, informing her that no approval had ever been granted, or even sought. Her and Kagan went to Linton’s office and explained to him that they had Student Council approval. Linton told them that this did not constitute University approval; it was only one step in the process. The two editors insisted that it was too late to stop the publication; they would, however, remove all references to the University from the first issue. Linton agreed that at a minimum, the students must not misrepresent the magazine as “University approved.”

On the evening of January 29, immediately prior to the publication and distribution of the magazine, Managing Editor Kagan requested “provisional” permission to use the campus areas to sell The Grind. “I told him such permission could not possibly be granted, and that I was deeply concerned by the lack of good faith on the part of the Grind’s officers,” Linton wrote.

The next day, however, he witnessed two Grind salesmen stopping students outside of the Hall of Government to sell the magazine. Linton informed them that they must not use University areas to sell their product, which had no connection to the University.

The following Monday, Linton observed Simon and another student selling copies in the rear of another University building. Linton again pointed out that they could not distribute the magazine without administration approval. The students told him that they had Student Council approval, and they refused to leave campus. “Returning to my office, I telephoned one of the advertisers who had purchased space in the Grind to see if the officers had misrepresented themselves as a University-sponsored publication after my clear warnings on that point. [The advertiser] told me that they had indeed so misrepresented themselves, and that he would not have purchased space in a non-University publication,” Linton wrote. Infuriated by this evidence of bad faith on the part of the students, Linton advised the students “not to make the situation worse by continuing to flout University
At the February 5 meeting of the Publications Committee, the editors of The Grind gave what is, in retrospect, a perfectly reasonable argument. It had taken months for The Surveyor to receive recognition only to be suppressed. The editors of this magazine, to be sure, decided to circumvent the usual procedure and present the Publications Committee with a fait accompli. The gamble did not pay off, and Linton strenuously recommended to President Marvin "disciplinary action against the individuals involved."42

The Publications Committee decided that The Grind "gives no evidence of enriching student life on the campus, of providing an outlet for worthwhile literary efforts, or of contributing to the welfare of the University in any way whatsoever." They did not stop there, however. "The moral and literary level of the first issue of the magazine (published without University authorization) is so low that the University's name could never be associated with the magazine without actual discredit to the University." The Committee issued essentially a vote of no confidence in the editors who had so blatantly violated University policy.43

President Marvin's reply was brief; he wanted to make sure only that the students understood that they cannot use the University's name, they cannot sell the magazine on University property, and that they cannot solicit advertising in the name of the University. No mention of disciplinary action was made in the reply.44 Subscribers to the magazine were given refunds and advertisers were notified of the controversy. The University's name, however, was not printed anywhere in the magazine.45

Then, after the Publications Committee voted against recognition of the humor magazine, a new ally appeared: the Hatchet editors themselves, despite an earlier editorial questioning the tactics of the new magazine.

One former editor of The Grind, Bea Koenick, the publicity manager, wrote a letter to The Hatchet defending the magazine's actions. The Publications Committee would not grant approval to any magazine that has not balanced its books in the past, Koenick argued, and how could they balance the books without publishing
an issue? The failure of *The Surveyor* had raised the bar, making it even more difficult to receive already skeptical approval of the Committee. If the sales of *The Grind* were good (and they were very good, in fact; the magazine made a profit), the thinking was that the editors would be able to persuade the Committee for approval in the future based on the success of the first issue.

“Realizing only one way to substantiate a financial report to the Publications Board, a group of students published a humor magazine, *professing no connection with The George Washington University*, except that they themselves were students and wished *eventually* to become a recognized publication,” Koenick wrote. The strong support of a humor magazine among the student body was proven in the successful sales of *The Grind*.

“Why can’t we have another chance? I guess you have to be here for a while to understand the thinking. I’m only a freshman,” Koenick wrote.

A *Hatchet* editorial confirmed the students’ belief that the Publications Committee had, despite the content of the magazine, made a serious error in suppressing the magazine. “It would seem evident to any student that there are only two feasible reasons to withhold recognition—undesirable content, and financial instability,” the editors wrote. “On the former point, the Committee could have had a field day,” despite the magazine’s rigid regulations on content submissions. “The Committee chose, however, to deny recognition on the grounds that the magazine could not be a financial success.”

The Committee apparently did not do its homework. The magazine “has shown, in black and white, with facts and figures, that it not only can be, but is, a financial success,” the editors concluded. The Committee should have granted “provisional” recognition to the magazine provided that it proves a financial success, if it indeed was the financial success that they were concerned about. Any deficit would certainly have been small, and wasn’t it worth the risk, to have a student humor publication on campus?

“The editors of *The Grind* were discontent to go through the channels—and channels—and channels, which as one
administration official put it, 'are like the government, only worse.' Consequently they came out on their own, not representing themselves as a recognized University publication." And in so doing, the editorial read, they proved that a humor magazine would be quite popular on campus.

"Evidently the Committee on Publications feels that reams of 'dreams on paper' and months of stagnation are necessary before a new publication may become legitimate," the editors finished. A cartoon accompanied the editorial, showing a bird named "The Grind" getting its head chopped off by an executioner named "Committee on School Publications," with the caption, "Same Old Story."

The following week, *The Hatchet* launched an editorial campaign severely critical of how the University handled the humor magazine's request for recognition. The Publications Committee has, "as appears to be the custom, stifled student literary expression—the fruits of many months' labor, and one of the soundest financial programs ever developed by a University group on this campus." It may have been a slight overstatement, that the budget for *The Grind* was "one of the soundest financial programs ever," but the *Hatchet* editors were hitting hard.

"Once again, the Administration has 'pulled a fast one' on the student body," the editors wrote. The meeting at which the Committee denied recognition to *The Grind* was not even a formal meeting at all; it was a brief, informal meeting called by President Marvin, "at which time he made it quite clear his abhorrence of any group possessed with the 'dream' of publishing a campus magazine. Mincing no words, he gave the unmistakable impression that any such group would be suppressed—eventually."

Even more startling, according to the editors, is the fact that an official vote was never even taken. The "unanimous" decision of the Committee was an entirely fictitious assumption. "The sound financial set-up of The Grind was obviously without flaw; therefore, the efforts of this group have evidently been crushed because of the magazine's content, before they were given a chance to prove that it could possibly develop real merit," the
editors asserted, again slightly exaggerating the financial situation of the magazine (records indicate that the magazine spent $400 and earned $410—a profit of ten dollars).

The Hatchet claimed that The Grind was simply another victim in a long bloody line of failed publications from the 1926 Colonial Wig to the recent Surveyor. Just as Dr. Douglas Bement stated that The Helicon, another unfortunate victim, did not die a natural death, the editors made the same claim about The Grind: "the facts indicate that The Grind did not die from 'natural causes.' That The Grind is a failure has not been [proven].

"From all evidence, the prime prerequisite for a campus magazine is the blessing—which he chooses to withhold—of the President."

The editors concluded: "The condemnation of the magazine defies all logic—all rational thinking. Must this stone wall be forever impenetrable?"

An interesting side note from that same issue of the newspaper: a letter to the editor was printed criticizing Marvin for actions he took relating to an acrobatic performance at a basketball game. Two female students were pictured in the Post who had performed similar shows at other basketball games, which had rave reviews from journalists throughout the city. But Marvin had seen the picture in the Post and he was not pleased. The student wrote to The Hatchet: "the show never went on; it was squelched just as many of the student activities are squelched."

The two students were pictured wearing the uniform of the University's modern dance classes. The leotards were sold in the Student Club, were issued by the University, and were required by all modern dance students.

Marvin said the show could not go on because the girls were wearing "indecent, obscene" uniforms.

What a revelation! The University was requiring women to wear obscene uniforms! "A lot of people were very disappointed—a lot of people came to see that show," the student wrote. Nonetheless, either a change in uniforms or a change in attitude was certainly in order.

In the next issue of The Hatchet, a full page was devoted to
Linton's response. Apparently the editors did not have the full story the first time around. The denial of recognition was unanimously voted upon by all the members of the Committee at the February 5 meeting (the previous Hatchet editorial referred only to the February 13 meeting held by Marvin at which no vote was taken). The one student member who was absent, however, Hatchet editor Dorothy Henry (a member of the Hatchet Board of Editors sits on the Publications Committee) indicated that she would have voted for continuing the student publication. She was, in fact, a driving force behind the Hatchet editorials.

Linton's letter was continuously interrupted by “editor's notes” explaining the paper's positions on each of his arguments. Perhaps the most humorous one comes at the end. “The Hatchet has often demonstrated in the past what a good campus paper can achieve. It is the hope of the Committee that it will not permanently abandon the basic principles of journalistic honor—and common veracity—without which no paper can long retain the confidence of its readers.”

An editor’s note immediately followed Linton’s conclusion: “The Hatchet has no intention of abandoning at any time the basic principles of journalistic honor to which it has always adhered.” A political cartoon accompanied the Linton letter, memorably showing a student in a sinking lifeboat (“The Hatchet”) fighting a huge fire-breathing dragon (“Publications Committee”).

The paper concluded that Dr. Linton had entirely missed the point of the editorials. The point was, in fact, that the Publications Committee had criticized The Grind for not being financially viable (and for its content; however, the editors appeared not to know this, or not to care), despite the fact that the bills had already been paid on its first issue.56

The debate was over, however, and another student publication bit the dust.

The Grind had deliberately flouted University policy in order to “force” the University to grant de facto approval to a magazine that had already been published. The door had slammed shut in the faces of its editors, however. But two years later, another student
publication was published without seeking approval, and in a showdown with the Publications Committee, won.

The Medical School and Hospital had not yet, by this time, moved to Foggy Bottom; it was the only school of the University that still remained abroad at 15th and H Streets on Capitol Hill, the location of the old Columbian University. Autonomous of the University for all practical purposes, the students at the Medical School, because of location, were removed from many of the events that took place on campus. By the end of the decade, the Medical School would be deeded to the government in exchange for a large plot of land at 21st and H Streets, the site of the new Hospital.

The *Speculum*, the yearbook of the Medical School, was published yearly without any thought of receiving approval from the administration. "The *Speculum* is not an approved publication, nor has it ever requested approval," Linton wrote to Dr. Marvin. Yet, "I learn that it was published last year."

Linton promptly informed the editor, Mary O'Leary Matthews, that the yearbook needed to seek approval from the Publications Committee. Matthews, a senior in the Medical School, was surprised to learn of any such requirement, and told Linton that she was simply continuing the policy of the previous year's editorial board. "I told Mrs. Matthews further that no further plans for the *Speculum* may be made, that no contracts may be entered into, and that no funds may be solicited until the decision of the University is made known to her."51.

At the beginning of March 1949, *The Speculum* sought University approval. After a meeting of the Publications Committee, however, Linton reported to Marvin: "Their financial status appears to be extremely stable, and last year the book ended with a profit." The yearbook typically printed only 100 copies, to which members of the senior class subscribe and make full payment in advance, so there was no difficulty in securing the total amount of funds in advance with 100% student participation. In light of this, the Publications Committee approved the publication. Dr. Marvin followed with his own approval as well.52.

The only holdup was the Student Council, long the ally of the
student publications. The Student Council did not want two yearbooks for the student body, and the appearance of *The Speculum* was a slap in the face to the editors of *The Cherry Tree*. Medical School students did not consider themselves to be well-represented in the general student yearbook, so they had sought their own. Nonetheless, the Council gave its approval as well: "Such a publication has proven itself financially solvent in the past year, and under present contracts cannot fail this year," wrote the student body president to Dr. Linton.

“When the Medical School Buildings are moved to this campus area, we feel that the Medical School should then be considered an integral part of The University and should be adequately represented in *The Cherry Tree*,” the Council president added, qualifying his approval.53

His recommendation was not heeded; *The Speculum*, unlike most of the other student publications of the era, did not disappear, not even after the Medical School moved to Foggy Bottom at the end of the 1940s. It remains a part of the Medical School tradition to this day, still sold on a subscription basis.

*The strain of neighborhood relations*

Beginning in the mid-1940s, the very beginnings of another trend appeared that would later have a profound affect on the growth and development of George Washington. The Foggy Bottom neighborhood, threatened with the prospect of conversion either to dormitories or federal offices, started developing a community consciousness in opposition to the expanding institutions. In 1945, the community was jolted into action by the plans for the building of the University Hospital, which threatened some of the oldest landmarks in the vicinity. Among the victims were St. Paul's Episcopal Church and the rest of Square 54, which stood just north of campus.

On September 8, 1944, the President of the United States approved an application made by the University to the Federal Works Agency to build a hospital on Square 54. The application 236
had received approval in record time. Three days later, Rev.
Arlington McCallum, the rector of the Parish, read a letter to his
congregation from the Agency, informing the parish that the
government was about to institute condemnation proceedings for
the entire block, for the purpose of building a hospital for George
Washington. The parish was told to vacate by November 1,
according to Dorothy W. Spaulding, the author of a history of the
Church. The vestry determined that it was in their best interest to
remain in the current building or be moved to a location as close
as possible to the current one, if and when it became necessary to
move.

On October 2, Dr. Marvin spoke at a special meeting of the
vestry to present the proposed plan for the building of the hospital.
"The Vestry listened courteously, but remained tense and
unconvinced of the immediate necessity for the hospital project....
It was the unanimous opinion of the Vestry that Dr. Marvin's visit
had served no useful purpose as far as St. Paul's Church is
concerned." The vestry hired Roger Whiteford as counsel to fight
the condemnation order, and filed suit against the federal
government. Meanwhile, Father McCallum petitioned the Bishop
of Washington and other government officials to rescind the order.
Members of the congregation began a letter-writing campaign.

The Right Reverend Angus Dun, the Bishop of Washington,
protested to the head of the Federal Works Administration. "This
contemplated action will not only destroy a building," he wrote; "it
will scatter and threaten the very existence of a church in the
deeper sense. They cannot possibly find another site and make
provisions for their continuing common religious life in the time
allowed."

The suit filed against the government, later joined by some of
the other property owners and apartment tenants on the block,
claimed that the federal government could not take land from one
public institution (the church) and sell it to another public institution
(the University). The Federal Works Agency was operating under
the War Powers Act, which delegated certain powers of public
housing and public property to the President. At his first meeting
with the vestry, Whiteford, the attorney, expressed his doubts that
the Church would win if it went to court. The injunction went ahead, however, claiming that construing the law to permit the government to take over the Church property was unconstitutional. Furthermore, the suit argued that the University had other property it could use.

The parish's campaign among the religious community in Washington was stepped up as the eviction date approached, extended to January 1, 1945. The Vestry sent a letter to every rector and vestry in the diocese and to all other religious groups in the District of Columbia informing them of the injustice afforded the Church in the unconstitutional eviction. The Church gained a wide array of allies, but didn't change any minds in government.

In desperation, the Vestry wrote another letter to Bishop Angus Dun on November 18, distressed that he was not doing using his influence to save the Church, despite the one letter to the Federal Works Agency. "Can it be true that our Bishop is tacitly giving approval to this cowardly thing that the government is doing? Does the Bishop really think that the destruction of one of his Churches is the best for course of progress?" the letter read.

Judge Matthew Maguire of the District Court ruled that the government's action was not unconstitutional, but the government must pay $118,000 for the property. Arguments during the hearing focused on the hardships for the property owners and the Church, which lost its building between Christmas and Easter, the busiest time of the year. Some of the owners of the property were abroad fighting in the war; how ironic, some argued, that they should fight for that which was being taken away from them?

The Vestry appealed the decision, but the only change upheld by Judge Jesse Adkins was that the compensation was increased to $152,000, and the parish had the right to remove the furnishings of the old church and store them at government expense until the new building was completed. The furnishings included two altars, choir stalls, communion rail, windows, marble, font, organ, furnace, and forty-six pews. The fact that it was church property included in the condemnation order upset many people who would otherwise have paid little attention, remembers Spaulding. The fact that hospital facilities had to be provided at
the expense of a religious establishment aroused much indignation across the city. The prices given for the property approximated the current market value for the property, but did not pay for the cost of comparable properties elsewhere or the costs of moving.

Adding to the controversy was the fact that about a quarter of the property owners were black, and the University Hospital had not yet changed its policy prohibiting black patients. A spokesman for the black property owners contended that government funds should not be used for the benefit of an institution that discriminated against an integral part of the community.

The University community, however, seemed to be behind the University's actions. The *Hatchet* editorialized in January 1945 that the controversy had become muddled in the charges of prejudice, lack of sufficient time to move, and the legal issue around the Church's plea for "eminent domain." There were also those residents who claimed, "this University was engaged in a diabolical plot to enlarge its plant at the expense and without concern for its neighbors," the editors wrote. "To our minds it has always been a fact that the needs of this city for additional hospital beds and the opportunity to provide an already top-ranking Medical School with the much needed facilities for research, study and practice superceded any argument that it would be difficult to move the physical location of a place of worship."54

Most of the property owners accepted the government's actions and moved without incident. The government, however, was forced to evict several property owners who still had not left at the time of the eviction in January 1945. One ill 94-year old woman was accepted as a patient for sixty days in the old hospital without charge until she could find other accommodations.

Plans for a new building for St. Paul's Episcopal Church were in progress before the eviction took place. On December 6, the vestry authorized the purchase of the lot on K Street where the church now stands at a price of not more than $62,500. Philip Hubert Frohman, the architect of many prominent churches and cathedrals around the country, was hired to design the new church. The last services in the old church were held on Sunday,
December 31, 1944, and Monday, January 1, 1945. In the meantime, the congregation was invited to attend St. Thomas’s, where Father McCallum would hold services several times a week, including at 9:30 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on Sundays. Many members of the 75-year old congregation were in tears during those last few services. After the last service, the ceremony of the stripping of the altar was performed. The sacred objects were removed from the church, including the cross, candlesticks, and historical objects. The other furnishings were removed later in the week; some went to storage and some were donated to other churches. It would be nearly three and a half years before the congregation would return to St. Paul’s.

The Post reported that all the protests of the parishioners “were of little avail when dozens of men, old hands at tearing timber and stone, moved into the street and went to work on its wooden floor.” By the end of the day, most of the floor had been ripped up and cold cement was exposed. A stained-glass window rested against its pillar, waiting to be taken away to another church. An elderly man came in that morning to talk with the workers: “I wanted to be sure the window’s going to be saved,” he told them, adding that the window was worth $15,000 and can’t be replaced. The desolate, half-scrapped shell of a church, with its furnishings removed, was littered with paper from old hymnals and paper offering banks. The rest of Square 54 was already being razed. “There was little left in the entire square which proved that people had recently lived there,” the Post finished.55

Frohman’s designs were approved on April 28, 1946. With the desire to obtain “strength, simplicity and relative economy,” he wrote, most of the structure included qualities of eleventh century Norman and twelfth century early English Gothic architecture. “Throughout, the construction will be as honest and enduring as that of the old English parish churches that have been in constant use for over five hundred years. We hope that the new St. Paul’s will stand as a symbol of that truthfulness and integrity that are fundamentals of Christian character,” he concluded.56

In early October 1946, the Civilian Production Administration rejected the plans for the church, but the next month, approval
was granted. A construction company was hired, and the groundbreaking ceremony was held in January 1947 on the Feast of St. Paul. For the ceremony involving the laying of the cornerstone, a box containing many historic relics of the church, as well as one stone placed by each child in the congregation, was incorporated into the physical foundation of the building. The congregation moved in June 1948, before the interior was completed, and the new Church was dedicated on July 18, 1948.

Marvin's ideological beliefs were so closely held in the 1930s that Marvin refused to purchase property sold by the government at a reduced price because he didn't believe the government had a right to buy and sell property. The war altered his views. The dispute over Square 54, which became, in time, a large and bustling hospital, was initiated when the government, acting on behalf of the University whose application it accepted, suffered an embarrassing and costly legal dispute against a determined church congregation. No longer would Marvin harbor reservations about dipping into the public purse.

Marvin's battles with the neighborhood community continued intermittently throughout his term. Opposition grew stronger, however, with each successive battle, erupting into open war in the last few years of Marvin's term in office as Foggy Bottom underwent an urban renewal. In many ways, it was a crisis of identity.

By 1955, old Foggy Bottom, particularly the area directly to the north and west of the University, swirled in a flurry of renovation and building that made the community “the Capital's newest and most striking,” according to the Star. The government of the District of Columbia, in an effort to reclaim many of the deteriorating neighborhoods around the city, focused on Foggy Bottom as its first experiment. Once among the most neglected of neighborhoods, the area, stretching from the Potomac River to Pennsylvania Avenue, would be converted from old slum row houses to new, attractive Georgetown-style townhouses selling for around $20,000. Just south of these neighborhoods, where the
Watergate complex was soon built, were the ruins of the old Washington Gas Light Company.

All around the city, District officials were using broad powers to condemn old properties and raze decrepit buildings, and then officials planned commercial or residential complexes to be built on the old block. Critics loudly voiced their opposition; those in Foggy Bottom claimed that the neighborhood had already started a "natural renewal" on its own, and would be gentrified within a few years. The ancient neighborhood—created in 1768 as a rival seaport to Georgetown—slowly declined into slums, industrial plants, and vacant land. Part of the strain on development was the black smoke billowing out of the smokestacks that lined the Potomac River.

The renewal of the district began in the early 1950s and continued very rapidly. "From the first, the Foggy Bottom residents were an active, militant group," the Star reported. "They organized effectively a year ago to help kill moves to ban rebuilt alley dwellings which fully met health, sanitation and good housing standards." The citizens were just beginning to organize both in favor and against the urban renewal, forming the Foggy Bottom Restoration Association in early 1955, and several other organizations soon afterward.

South of campus, the federal government was slowly renovating the area stretching from Constitution Avenue to F Street. The future home of State Department buildings and other offices, the renovation of the site had a strong effect on future development to the north.59

Several months later, Foggy Bottom residents were clashing in two rival groups, the Restoration Association, which supported gentrification of the deteriorating area, including the construction of commercial establishments, and the Foggy Bottom Taxpayer's Protective Association, which opposed all non-residential development in the area. The latter filed suit against the University and the city for the proposed building of a parking lot and other small projects planned by commercial businessmen and the University.60

The Star reported the following month that the city had moved
to dismiss the lawsuit, filed after approval for expanded boundaries of the University were approved. The citizens' associations sought to prevent the University from buying more property in the neighborhood, a large 30-block region directly to the west.\textsuperscript{61}

The issue became more controversial as the city sought federal funds to complete a planning survey of the area. The Taxpayer's Protective Association claimed that federal intervention would dampen the fervor of building, remodeling, and speculation then going on. The Restoration Association claimed that the area needed full-scale planning and investment in order to maximize the building potential in the area. "But all sides see a bright future for the area, whatever happens," the \textit{Star} reported.\textsuperscript{62}

It was against this background that the University once again began wading into the waters of expansion. During the last few months of Marvin's administration, his time was devoted almost entirely to planning future growth. In a meeting with the Board of Trustees in October 1958, Marvin outlined his plan to make the current University area into a real campus by doing away with H and I streets, which crossed the campus. A series of sidewalks would take the place of the streets to allow for the creation of a more aesthetic and functional campus. Another neighborhood organization, the West End Citizen's Association, threatened to sue the University for the disrupted traffic flow that the new plan would create, the \textit{Hatchet} reported.\textsuperscript{63}

In November 1958, as Marvin's term in office was coming to a close, the University disclosed its long-range plans for development. The plan provided for the closing of H and 21\textsuperscript{st} Streets, the establishment of new law, medical, and science buildings, the conversion of apartment buildings to dormitories and rooming facilities, and several enclosed garage spaces. Although the plan would not be implemented in its entirety, Marvin's successors followed it as closely as they could, with the Foggy Bottom residents vowing to continue their battles. Soon, the University and the surrounding neighborhood would appear almost unrecognizable to the casual observer only ten years earlier.

In 1954, \textit{The Saturday Evening Post} published an exposé on
Marvin's accomplishments in office over the previous twenty-seven years. Marvin the dreamer was beginning to replace Marvin the builder. The Evening Post ends with an intimate insight into the mind of a powerful and renowned University president.

Today, gray-haired and sixty-five, Marvin still has his eyes focused on the horizon. In his crowded portfolio are plans to add two wings to the hospital, erect a great new law center and a block-square engineering building, and establish a patent, trademark and copyright foundation. More distantly contemplated is a project whereby Foggy Bottom—a wilderness of tumble-down shacks and gas works lying between GW's present boundaries and the Potomac River—will be transformed into a network of university playing fields. Marvin, who likes to roam about the area like an antebellum plantation owner, paused one recent day to gaze thoughtfully westward. "I've always hoped we would get to the river," he mused. "We'll do it, too, someday." 64

The battles of the student publications: The Cherry Tree and the student handbook

Two of the oldest and most recognizable student publications also came under assault in the late 1940s: the yearbook and the student handbook, both written and published by students. The Cherry Tree, the student yearbook, had been in existence under various names at least since 1891. For nearly fifteen years, it operated under the name The Columbiad. When the Columbian University became The George Washington University in 1904, the yearbook changed its name to The Mall, the winning entry in a contest to rename the yearbook. In 1908, the name The Cherry Tree was adopted, an allusion to an old myth that the first president had chopped down a tree. The student handbook first appeared around 1920, and contained much useful information for
new and returning students, including contact information and telephone numbers for University offices, “inside tips” from older students, and a variety of helpful academic, extracurricular, and social information for the everyday student.

During and after the war years, the two publications, long immortalized as traditions among the student body, suffered through the most difficult years of their long histories. The content, organization, and budget of both came under heavy scrutiny as cost-cutting and close administrative control threatened the independence of both. In early 1941, the Evening Star wrote that a controversy threatened “to chop down The Cherry Tree,” since some student organizations objected to the way it was being run. The yearbook depended heavily on the Interfraternity Council and other student groups for its financial support. In early 1941, the Council led a boycott of the yearbook over what it felt was incompetent leadership, poor use of the allotted budget, and succession of editors based on friendship and not on merits. Periodic editorials in The Hatchet also drew attention to these criticisms.65

The yearbooks of the late 1930s were, in the eyes of many in the school community, unsatisfactory. The artistic merit of the yearbooks left much to be desired, according to the newspaper editors. The staff positions were usually inherited among fraternity brothers or sorority sisters. Lists of student members in various organizations were often incomplete. The advertising campaigns of the yearbook, where advertisements were sold in order to raise revenue, were not aggressive enough.

The yearbook editors, however, were buckled by a number of constraints, none of which were of their own making. With cramped quarters and few typewriters on which to work, the paper also had to comply with a small staff and deadlines that many photographers and writers continually ignored. In addition, the yearbook had to operate under an even greater constraint: the slow approval of the Publications Committee, which had to approve many of the big decisions made by the staff.66

Two years later, the situation had worsened. The editors had started earlier on the book, not like editors of previous years who
started late. Some staff members worked on the new yearbook and the previous yearbook simultaneously. The yearbook staff even worked to repay the previous year’s deficit. Editor Mary Ring of the 1943-1944 yearbook staff held conferences with the printer to complete layout plans and set up a budget. In order to have a more tangible report to show the Publications Committee, the Cherry Tree staff sold over 200 subscriptions and earned over $330 in advertising. The Publications Committee had refused to ratify Ring’s appointment as editor until after the debt from the previous year was paid up; she conducted all of these actions unofficially, with no help from the University. The comptroller of the University even refused to discuss plans with the printer.

The Committee finally met to approve Ring as editor much later than normal, and then placed severe restrictions on the yearbook’s production, at President Marvin’s suggestion. The cost of the yearbook must be $3.00, not $3.50, the Committee decided. Six hundred copies must be sold. The total cost must not exceed $2,700, down from $3,050 from the previous year. The book must be out by May 1, 1944. Other student organizations may not contribute money toward paying off the Cherry Tree debt, as The Hatchet had done in previous years.

There was increased pressure on the staff for the 1943-1944 school year. The debt from the previous year had been so large that the University had to underwrite the yearbook. President Marvin told Mary Ring that if this yearbook incurred any debt whatsoever, editors for the following year will not be approved, and yearbook operations will be suspended until the war ended.67

The staff immediately found that adhering to these restrictions was nearly impossible. Nonetheless, they pushed on with taking student portraits, training photographers, and selling subscriptions and advertising space. “There will be a Cherry Tree,” Ring wrote in a Hatchet column. “However, it will have many limitations,” she conceded. “In the face of innumerable difficulties, the Cherry Tree is making progress. But, because of the delay in approval by the Publications Committee, the book is nearly as far behind as last year’s. Therefore, again we urge the cooperation of every member of the student body in helping us put out a Cherry Tree, 246
thereby continuing a tradition which should not be allowed to die." 68

The Cherry Tree editors found an ally in Hatchet editor-in-chief Eileen Shanahan. Ever on the lookout for a chance to criticize the administration, the feisty editor defended the job that Mary Ring was doing. "The Cherry Tree has been a problem in the past," she wrote. "But we can't help but believe that The Powers have deliberately delayed approval of the publication, partially, at least, to make it as difficult as possible for the editors to break even financially." But, the yearbook was on track to surprise a lot of people, she noted, especially The Powers, as she sardonically termed the University administrators, by coming out in the black. "Congratulations, you've done a good job; keep it up," Shanahan told Mary Ring and the rest of the yearbook staff. 69

The yearbook staff had surprised many people in the spring of 1944 by turning a profit under the most adverse conditions. In later years, however, straining under the mandate that the yearbook pay for itself, the yearbook, under orders from the Publications Committee, became involved in a dispute with the printer over how much to charge per yearbook. The Committee insisted that yearbooks be sold for only $3.25 while the printer insisted that such a price "is entirely too low and it is out of line with what other institutions charge their students for a book." The printer recommended that $5.00 was a fair price, and even a good bargain. 70

The book came out late in the 1946-1947 school year because the printer refused to print for as low a price as the University demanded. Straining under pressure to add more pages for the increased enrollment and more student organizations, the yearbook was further hampered by the Publications Committee who seemed to have no real concept for the publication process and the costs associated with it. The Committee pressured the yearbook to add more pages and pictures but continue selling the yearbook at around the same price as previous years.

The Cherry Tree only survived these difficult years by eventually cutting the size of the yearbook greatly so that it was no
longer an oversized hardcover volume, but a small paperback book with fewer pages and more pictures on a page. Only the foresight and industry of its editors prevented the yearbook from failing to meet the administration's almost impossible demands.

One editor defended the yearbook: "It provides the student with a collection of pictures and memories which he could not possibly obtain otherwise at such a low cost. It is his strongest tie to the school after he has left it. For the university it represents the esteem and accomplishment of a student body proud to have attended it; for by its very nature as a memory book it includes the year's biggest and best moments and has only praise for the school." 71

The student handbook was in much the same boat as the yearbook. The pocket-sized booklet containing essential information including the school and social calendars, student organizations, administrative offices, and faculty contact information had proved useful to many students over the years. It was the only complete compilation of information available to freshmen. 72

Forced to pay for itself, it had the added disadvantage of appearing at the beginning of the year, not the end of the year as the yearbook did. In fact, the handbook was even held up one year because the workers at the printer went on strike. A Hatchet editorial decried the delay in printing, noting that according to a press release from the union on strike, there had been no delays in production. 73 Periodic editorials gave both criticism and praise to the handbook's operations. A poorly constructed handbook full of spelling errors one year became a slim, well-organized manual the next year.

Much of the controversy surrounding the student organizations during the 1940s arose because of the degree of control that the administration had over student activities. The Publications Committee could censor or even strangle a student publication that did not meet its will, while the Student Life Committee could overturn actions of the Student Council. The Student Life Committee, a sort of judicial body set up to deal with student organizations, was composed of five faculty members and
six student leaders, including the president of the Student Council, the president of the women’s honorary society, the president of the men’s honorary society, a Hatchet editor, and the presidents of the Panhellenic Council (sororities) and the Interfraternity Council (fraternities). Like the students on the Publications Committee, however, the students on the Student Life Committee could not vote. Together, the two bodies acted as representatives of President Marvin and dominated student life for many years.74.

The battles of the student publications: The Hatchet editorial page

The University Hatchet had come a long way since 1904, even when Marvin’s leadership threatened its existence. A momentous year for the University, 1904 witnessed the renaming of Columbian University to the George Washington University. Like the yearbook, which changed its name to follow suit, the newspaper, then called The Columbian Weekly, became The University Hatchet. The Columbian Weekly first appeared in 1902, the successor to the ill-fated Columbian Call, a semi-weekly that appeared from 1895 to 1898. The Call met its demise through its loss of popularity, the strain of the Spanish-American War, and a drop in finances. Many of the stories appearing in its pages had to do with sports, accompanied by stories of the debate team and fraternities, fiction stories, and non-controversial editorials. A combination newspaper and literary magazine appeared in 1901 called The University, though the 30 to 40-page monthly only survived through a few issues.75.

"The University needed a newspaper," recalled Jesse W. Barrett, the founder of The Columbian Weekly, when later asked his reasons for starting what became an important campus institution. The University, which would not move to its present location in Foggy Bottom for another ten years, was scattered around H and 15th Streets, NW. Barrett felt that it would be an important boost to school spirit among the students on the disjointed campus if they could take part in a student publication. With the endorsement of then-GW President Charles Needham
and with a staff of just three students, a newspaper that would include tens of thousands of student reporters over the next hundred years tenuously began its first year of printing.

On October 5, 1904, Editor-in-Chief F.S. Hemmick introduced the first Hatchet, a 24-page weekly in magazine format. "The present time is the critical period in our University’s life," wrote Hemmick and his colleagues in the first editorial. "Under a new name and with awakened vigor, success seems to loom in sight." The paper survived solely on 10 cents per copy sales at the University Cigar Shop, meager advertising sales revenue, and funding from the University.

In the early years, the paper placed an emphasis on athletics, and most often sports games ran as lead stories. The debate team, club meetings, fraternity and sorority life, and faculty updates were also common story topics. Photos were rare, and mostly consisted of posed portraits of faculty members and student leaders.

In 1906, the first editorial campaign was launched, in favor of a new academic honor code that punished cheating. A 1915 editorial series championed a compulsory student fee to pay the newspaper and yearbook subscriptions. Another editorial in 1922 demanded that male students tip their hats when passing professors on the street.

World War One did not stop publication of The Hatchet, but stories about the war were uncommon, mostly focusing on student-related aspects of the war, such as on-campus recruiting. Throughout the next decade, the paper experimented with different formats, page sizes, and number of columns, as the paper slowly began to look more like the refined publication of today.

The beginning of the Cloyd Heck Marvin era, in the long run, radically changed the way the newspaper reported campus events. Instead of simply observing events, the newspaper began demanded answers and investigations. As Marvin’s control tightened, the Hatchet editorial page became more vocal in its opposition to Marvin’s most controversial policies. The battles of the 1930s over the peace protests, the freedom of action of 250
student government, and the questions surrounding faculty tenure only made the newspaper more resolute to defend the student body against an administration they felt was stepping on their toes. As the defender of the student body, a role the paper jealously guarded, the staff was ready to take any stand, go to any lengths, to prove to the GW community that the paper was a force to be reckoned with, even if it meant making a big deal of comparatively minor issues. For many years, they were a determined thorn in Marvin's side.

Although Marvin fired the Board of Editors in the spring of 1939, and chose a new staff that he found to be less critical of the University, such a situation could not last for long. Editors typically served for only a year, though some served for longer, but inevitably the President would have to make peace or make war with a different staff. To manipulate the Board every year would be costly and ineffective in the long-term. There was little continuity, though to some extent it was a self-perpetuating Board, as students rose from the Junior Staff to the Senior Staff and finally to the Board of Editors.

Entering into the picture was Eileen Shanahan, who became editor-in-chief for the 1943 to 1944 school year. Some members of the paper's staff had been called off to war; instead of a Board of Editors leading the staff with one editor elected head of the Board, the paper's administration was condensed to just one position: the editor-in-chief.

As one of the most dynamic people ever to hold the position, Editor-in-Chief Shanahan was also one of the most critical of Marvin's administration at the University. "He hated me, and I hated him," she said many decades later. "He was a terrible person." She certainly had her run-ins with the center of power; the newspaper of the 1943-44 school year was probably the most critical of a generation. As Shanahan later said: "We weren't afraid to criticize."

She billed herself as the first female editor-in-chief. As a matter of fact, she was the first editor-in-chief since 1939, or at least the first to carry the title. She was not the first female to lead the paper, however. Margaret Prentiss led the paper during the
spring of 1918. Helen Shaw was elected to the Board of Editors in 1924. Eleanor Heller was editor-in-chief for the 1935-36 school year. Although the paper had an editor-in-chief, elected by the associate editors every spring, Dr. Marvin abolished this position during the reorganization of 1939, during which time the Board of Editors was fired. From the 1940 to 1941 school year until the 1943 to 1944 school year, the paper was run by a rotating Board of Editors so that management, and responsibility for editorials, rested in the hands of not one person, but several. Declining enrollments due to the war, and declining interest in the paper as a result, reduced the positions to a single editor-in-chief.

This was the way it worked: every spring, around April, the Board of Editors (or the editor-in-chief and her senior staff during Shanahan’s time) chose the next Board from among themselves. Generally, the editor-in-chief or the members of the Board of Editors had experience in journalism courses and had worked on the paper for some years. The nominees would then be submitted to the Committee on Publications, and Dr. Linton and the voting members (all of whom were alumni or professors of the University, as the student members on the Committee had no vote) would ratify the decision and submit the names to Dr. Marvin for approval. In the event that the Committee did not approve, and the circumstance arose later in the decade as the Committee attempted to punish those students that it saw as overly critical of the University, a handful of people from the senior staff would be chosen as their replacements. There were times in the late 1940s and early 1950s when Dr. Linton and Dr. Marvin themselves chose the Board of Editors since none of the nominees would be approved. In fact, in fall 1947, there was no Board of Editors—only an Acting Board of Editors—since the Committee on Publications refused to ratify any of the nominees.

Eileen Shanahan ensured that a reorganization of the paper would follow after her graduation. Her critical attitude toward Dr. Marvin’s administration showed what could happen when editorial decisions rested in the hands of a single person, along with the members of the senior staff. So steadfast in her dislike of President Marvin, Shanahan refused to shake hands with him.
when she received her diploma in political science in 1944.

The trouble began in October 1943. Nationwide, with the advent of war, student activities at most colleges and universities had to operate a fairly low-key existence in order to preserve resources for use elsewhere. At George Washington, Marvin was able to solidify his control as the war years altered student life and the world of academia.

The *Hatchet* editors were keenly aware of this, as they struggled to produce not only their own paper on a limited budget; many of the newspaper staff members also held stakes in the yearbook and handbook production. With fewer resources available to the three institutionalized publications, *Cherry Tree* editors struggled to put out the yearbook for each generation of college students. The student handbook, which condensed into one yearly publication important phone numbers and addresses, contacts, overviews of university life, spirit songs, and other fundamentals, also lived a hand-to-mouth existence.

Ever the watchdog over student government, *The Hatchet* became, in these years, not the critic of the Student Council, a role the paper cherished in its earlier years, but its intense advocate. The paper represented the student body—and it advocated a student government with the same mission. As time wore on, however, the Student Council found its power eclipsed by the administration. The Publications Committee, with its power to save or destroy student publications, was only one of the ways that the University administration was able to exercise control over student activities. A Student Council recommendation on behalf of a student publication was neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition to insure a publication's survival, as the examples of *The Helicon* and *The Speculum* illustrated—one was suppressed despite the Council's approval; the other survived despite the Council's reluctance to grant approval.

As the Publications Committee had exclusive power over the student publications that rose and fell in this era, the Student Life Committee had such power over all other student activities. Like the Publications Committee, the Student Life Committee had both student and faculty representation, but like the Publications
Committee, the students had no voting power. Also, similarly, the faculty were recommended and appointed by President Marvin himself.

These Committees chipped away at the power the Student Council held, or wished to hold. During the 1940s, the Council was reduced to dispensing money for only a handful of student activities: homecoming, spring fling, a student bookstore, and other social activities. While the Council elections remained a popular activity for students and the elections themselves were an educational experience in political maneuvering, in reality it mattered little who was elected as each consecutive Council had to deal with the same manipulation from above. Despite this, once a year the campus would light up with fervor as the two competing political parties challenged one another at the polls.

In four consecutive Councils, from 1935 to 1939, the Service Party dominated at the polls before succumbing in 1940 to the Reform Party, which won 8 of 10 seats, and then again the following year with the first female president at the top of the ticket. In 1942, both parties were abolished as the Council tried, for the first and only time, non-partisan elections. The following year, however, the United Student League and the Allied Party were back in the race—and the Allied Party, led by a former Hatchet editor, celebrated victory.

Campus politics aside, the newspaper was indeed a champion of student democracy, which is why the editors were pleased when President Marvin spoke at Convocation on the subject of student government in the fall of 1943. "We are pleased and grateful," the newspaper staff wrote after Marvin's speech, impressed he had addressed the issue of student government at all. Nonetheless, one statement of Marvin's disappointed them: "no attempt has been made to give student government legal validity of any sort other than that sponsored by the students themselves," the President told the students.

While Marvin supported the concept of student government in theory, or so he said, it was clear that he was denying legitimacy to the Student Council by telling the entire student body that the administration had not given "legal validity" to this organ of student
government. If the Council was not seen as legitimate by the administration, the power and decisions associated with the body would not be seen as legitimate either. In other words, it seemed Marvin was reserving for himself the power to abolish the Council in the future should the need arise—and only he would be able to make that determination, “since it could be rightly claimed that there had been no authority for that [student] government in the first place,” a staff editorial proclaimed. “We ask immediate rectification of this condition.”

Furthermore, it left open the door that the Council’s power would be usurped by other committees more favorable to President Marvin—or by other persons operating under Marvin’s direction.77

By early February 1944, The Hatchet warned that student control over student activities was in mortal danger. “It is in danger because a faculty member, appointed by the President of the University, operating on funds granted by the University, funds that appear to be sizeable, has nominally taken over the job of ‘advising’ activities, and has actually taken over control of many of them.”

The threat came from Ruth Atwell, the Women’s Activities Advisor. According to the student paper, she had circumvented the Student Council’s power to delegate funds because she had power over her own resources, and she had personally delegated the Council’s activities to other students. The editors of the paper cited numerous instances where she had taken over the duties of the freshman activities director, the war activities committee, the Women’s Advisory Council, and the Activities Council. The paper was afraid she was about to interfere with the duties of the Social Chairman and the Program Director.

“President Marvin, we have no way of knowing how much of this has been done with your knowledge or consent. But you have pledged yourself as the guarantor of our student democracy,” the editorial continued.

If you can read these facts and come to any other conclusion than that stated above—that student
government and control over student activities are about to be wrested from the hands of the students—then let Ruth Atwell remain in her present position.

But if you agree with us, and we do not see how you can fail to, remove this menace in advisor's clothing.²⁸

Not all students agreed. The following week, one student, the head of one of the women's organizations on campus, protested in a long editorial that commended Atwell for her efforts at coordinating and organizing the women's groups. The fact that Atwell had University funds at her disposal, the anonymous student wrote, only contributed to filling the void of which earlier Hatchet editorials had warned: the lack of funding for student activities.

The president of the Student Council, Charles Daugherty, himself a former editor of The Hatchet, attempted to shed some light on the dispute. Eileen Shanahan, the current editor-in-chief, appeared before the Council some weeks before and announced that after much consultation with numerous students, she was determined to write an editorial calling for Atwell's resignation. The Council asked what Shanahan's reasons were for doing so; the astute but hard-headed editor laid them out in detail. A great majority of the Council came to see her position and supported the editorial.

But the Council was fearful of retributive action on Marvin's part, especially after the Council had endorsed Marvin's appointment of Atwell at the beginning of the school year, and so resisted calling for her resignation, as Shanahan and the newspaper staff had done. Nonetheless, the members of the Student Council clearly saw the danger of her increasing power.

Council President Daugherty recognized the threat to the Council's integrity: “the Student Council has been granted by its Constitution control over student activities, except intercollegiate athletics and intramural athletics where credit is given. We must jealously guard this authority, and are doing so. If we do not, then, whether by accident or design, the whole structure of student
government will in a short time collapse." In addition, the threat posed to the Council's power to delegate funds was serious: "It has been true and must remain true that if an activity needs money and has none, it must come to the Council," Daugherty concluded.79

The students guarded the prestige and power of the Council zealously. As Ruth Atwell began using Strong Hall rooms for meetings without permission, even as several of the fraternities and sororities, denied permission to use Strong Hall rooms, were looking for places to hold their meetings, a Hatchet editorial decried the unfair practice.80 It was later discovered that after one fraternity lost its housing, the administration promised its members the right to use Strong Hall rooms. When the administration later changed its mind, The Hatchet noted that the rooms in question were "being used, rent-free by Miss Atwell's freshman girls' clubs."81

According to the Student Life Committee, all student organizations must go through a step-by-step approval process in order to be recognized by the University. At the beginning of March, it was learned that Atwell's two freshmen girl's organizations had not registered with the Committee. Atwell surely knew of the process; she herself was a member of the Committee, the editors pointed out. So incensed were they at the Student Life Committee's double standard, the editors notified the Board of Trustees.82

Under Shanahan's direction, the paper won numerous awards for its work, including the coveted Pacemaker award, the top prize given to a college newspaper. But the paper also had its run-ins with the administration.

She later recalled the highlight of her year at The Hatchet. Her staff broke a story about Marvin's plans to convert George Washington into a strictly science and engineering school. One source, incensed at the plan to eliminate other aspects of the University, leaked the news to The Hatchet. The paper published the story and brought it to the attention of the other D.C. newspapers and the Board of Trustees. While the Board almost certainly would have vetoed the plan anyway, the Trustees were
so enraged by the story in the student press that they terminated the plan immediately.

After the incident, the controversy allowed Shanahan to truly understand the power of journalism, she later recalled. "It didn't undermine my belief, essentially born out of that episode, and which I hold to this day, that good journalism can change outcomes," she wrote, recalling the student editorship that launched her groundbreaking career in journalism.83

The editorial staff started a campaign at the beginning of the 1943 to 1944 school year to preserve the delivery of copies of The Hatchet to all former University students serving in the military. While the "practical viewpoint" of the administration called the program a waste of money, and "any open-eyed student should be aware by now that the practical viewpoint is all that has interested or will interest the present hierarchy," repeated demands from servicemen all over the world were printed in the Hatchet pages. The letters "awakened The Powers to the truth of our views," and the administration ("The Powers") caved, deciding to send the paper to all former students who requested it. It was a small but symbolic success for the paper.

Hatchet editorials against the administration grew more dangerous; staff wrote editorials criticizing the University's academics, particularly with departments whose courses had been reduced or cancelled because of the war: biology, geology, journalism, pharmacy, and sociology. A flurry of letters followed the editorial, including one that read: "It is really wonderful to see that the Hatchet has awakened and is taking the important place which the press should hold in a community." The Hatchet had awakened, for sure, and in a matter of weeks it would be paying the costs.84

Editors alleged Dr. Marvin was neglecting student activities; the question of fraternity housing arose again in several editorials at the end of March 1944. The paper was taking up the cause of Acacia fraternity, which "had been almost shoved onto the rocks by the Administration's inactivity in doing anything about providing a meeting place for them." A cartoon accompanied one of the editorials, showing Marvin knifing the fraternity in the back.
Marvin, angered by the cartoon, demanded an apology from the fraternity, "and made the veiled hint that unless that apology is forthcoming, he will take steps to see that the group is forced to go inactive."

The paper announced its anger against Marvin for not notifying *The Hatchet* of his offense to the cartoon. He criticized the fraternity, as if the fraternity had any control over the content of the paper. "This is indirection of a most vicious sort," the editors wrote, annoyed that Marvin was seeking, what they felt, was an excuse to kick Acacia fraternity off campus.

What made the editors even more upset, however, was the fact that Marvin insisted that he had never promised Acacia housing in the first place, that the promises had been made by a dean of the University "without official authorization." The paper had given the promises, made some weeks before by the administration, a great deal of press and publicity. Why had Marvin not notified the paper that the paper was mistaken?

"We can find but one answer to this question," the editors concluded. Marvin had lied to the paper and to the student body in order to find an excuse to kick Acacia fraternity off campus.\(^{85}\)

Acacia fraternity was composed of Freemasons and the fraternity had a formal tie to Masonic organizations. Like all fraternities during World War Two, membership declined sharply. By 1944, the Acacia chapter at George Washington had only six members. According to fraternity records, chapters nationwide had suffered a tremendous loss of membership. By 1948, however, the fraternity was back to its pre-war strength, nationwide and at George Washington.\(^{86}\)

By May 1944, critical *Hatchet* editorials had gone too far. In one small editorial, the paper managed to criticize the Student Council, the Interfraternity Council, the senior class president, two deans, and "the student body as a whole" for a variety of reasons.\(^{87}\) After that editorial came an even worse one, criticizing the administration in a manner that had not been done since 1939, prior to the firing of the entire *Hatchet* board of editors.

At a closed meeting of students and faculty, President Marvin made "[a] direct threat that there might be no *Hatchet* after this
year," the editors wrote bitterly soon after the meeting, though they were told not to print the information. "Not at any time during the year, has the President mentioned to the editor any objections to The Hatchet's policies," the editorial insisted; "not at any time has he called us in to confer on personnel or other problems. It is the 'behind-our-back' quality of the remarks which most infuriates us."

After all, Hatchet editorials during the school year were successful, the staff concluded; in the end, Acacia fraternity was granted meeting space and Ruth Atwell's powers were severely circumscribed. "Presumably, these reforms would not have been made if the Hatchet's criticisms had not been just." The newspaper was not even subsidized by the University; the student activities fee, mandatory for all students, pays for subscriptions to the paper.88

Three weeks later, the paper lost to the administration again, not for the first or last times, though the battle was less dramatic than in 1940, and less dramatic than future battles would be. The paper printed on its editorial page new guidelines for the editorial board the following year—an editorial board without an editor-in-chief. Instead, the organization of the paper reverted to the way it was prior to the 1943 to 1944 school year, led by a rotating Board of Editors.

The paper pledged to "cooperate with the administration and faculty, realizing the limitations placed on the University during war time, and considering at all times the ability of the administration to meet the needs and desires of the student body." Marvin and the Publications Committee, predictably, were behind the changes.88

But the next year, the editorial board was at it again with a very prominent editorial entitled, "Atwell Again," this time over the advisor's attempts to take over the duties of the Freshman Director of the Student Council with her Freshman Orientation program. Even though Marvin had circumscribed Ruth Atwell's duties at the end of the previous year, the paper felt that she was again duplicating the Council's activities and undermining its responsibilities.

Unlike the previous year, the paper did not call for her resignation. Instead, the editors' recommendation was quite the
opposite—the student president, Miss Atwell, and President Marvin should “get together over a cup of tea” to discuss the matter, the paper wrote. The militarism of the previous year’s editor-in-chief was reduced to the mild and compromising position of the 1944 board of editors.\textsuperscript{90}

The Hatchet received a slap in the face from the Alumni secretary of the University later that year when the editors proposed an alumni issue to be sent to all alumni. In response to the proposed Alumni Edition, the Alumni secretary said, “I don’t want the Alumni of this University to read the Hatchet.” When pressed further, he added, “I don’t want the Alumni to read anything in which I have nothing to say about what is to be printed.”

The editors were mortally offended. “Of all the unmitigated gall and high handed practices we have ever heard about, this tops them all,” they proclaimed. Colleges all over the country were reaping the benefits of alumni donations, contributing to the size, power, influence, and sometimes the very existence of the institution. Yet, the paper wrote, the alumni at George Washington were largely inactive, with the notable exceptions of Hattie M. Strong and Abram Lisner.

The paper hit the nail on the head; one of the enduring legacies of Dr. Marvin’s presidency is that for a number of years during and after his presidency, alumni donations to the University endowment were comparatively quite low. This was not due to lack of wealthy or influential alumni; it was due to the fact that many had left George Washington with little sense of community or school spirit, and perhaps more than a few had a bitter taste in their mouths from their time spent here. During Marvin’s entire tenure in office, in only a handful of times was an alumni presence felt; the Martha Gibbon Affair piqued alumni interest at its most intense, and it had provided an unalterable source of opposition to Dr. Marvin.

Providing the newspaper to all alumni, just as it was sent to servicemen around the world, would do much to inspire alumni to a greater sense of community; “so long as they are neither informed of or encouraged to take part in controversial matters,
they will remain just as they are... an interested, inactive group, whose sole overt act is to hold occasional meetings, elections, and get-togethers for social purposes." Isn't it possible, after all, that by providing newspapers to all alumni that a sense of community could be renewed, even possibly shaking loose a few dollars to help build up the endowment?

"Or could it be possible that nobody wants the Alumni to have much of a say in what goes on around here?" the editors finished, leveling yet another, somewhat valid, criticism against the administration. 91

In early 1945, The Hatchet published an editorial showing what might happen if the administration were permitted to review and censor the paper before it was published. The editors recounted a controversy at the College of William and Mary where The Flat Hat, the student newspaper of the Virginia school, published an editorial calling for equality between whites and blacks. The controversial editorial insisted that ethnologists had proven that no real difference between whites and blacks existed, that racial prejudice was a "Nazi strategy," and that blacks should "go to our classes, participate in college functions, join the same clubs, be our roommates, pin the same classmates, and marry among us." The editor-in-chief of The Flat Hat was immediately fired.

The Hatchet editorial board wrote that while she had violated a sacred tenet of journalism, that a newspaper should never publish anything deliberately repugnant to its readership, the school administration of William and Mary made a serious error in placing the newspaper under the control of faculty members for review and censorship purposes, the same debate then raging at George Washington. "If student leaders of today are to be considered the potential leaders of tomorrow, then their opinions and beliefs must remain unfettered," the Hatchet editors wrote. 92

The state of affairs between The Hatchet and President Marvin could not last for much longer. A battle was looming on the horizon. The fact that it started over something so small, however, is a testament to the fact that Marvin had taken very personally 262
something quite minor.

In March 1947, a new Board of Editors printed a small, nondescript editorial. “This is another to add to that long list of rhetorical questions,” the editors wrote. They had learned “with surprise and chagrin” that Dr. Marvin’s personal library had been put up for sale by public auction in New York City. The editors noted that no announcement of the sale had been made in any local newspaper, and that the sale came just before the twentieth anniversary of Marvin’s time at George Washington.

“For a number of years it has been generally anticipated (and certainly reasonably so) that the collection would be donated to our own very needy library—one which a good number of the faculty and most of the student body condemn as hopelessly inadequate,” the students continued. Dr. Marvin’s books would have added a beautiful pearl to the library’s collections.93

The next day after the editorial was published, all hell broke loose. The Student Council appointed a committee of five to “investigate” The Hatchet’s organizational structure and, more importantly, its editorial policies. The Council voted to suspend the paper. John Morris, a former Hatchet journalist, made the demand for an investigation to the Council, requesting that the paper publicly apologize for its editorial about President Marvin’s personal library. If the paper refused to do so, the Board of Editors should be fired. Morris sought a different organizational structure than the three-person rotating Board of Editors, the appointment of a Faculty Advisor to the newspaper, and a close association with the Department of Journalism at the University. It was, of course, common knowledge among the editors and students that Dr. Marvin was behind the entire investigation.94

“We regret that we cannot put on our rose-colored glasses, fill our opium pipes, sit back, and declare that all is well at The George Washington University,” the editors editorialized. The paper believed that its editorial page served an important service, to be a voice of the student body. With that power, the paper found much on which to comment—the good as well as the bad. “But to search far and wide, to dig, scrape, and peer to find something worth commending, when there are obvious major iis
staring at us from all sides, is not our idea of the conviction, the
courage, and the progressive attitude which an editor must
possess in order to hold his head high in justified pride of the job
he has done," the editorial continued.

Certainly, the subjects of the editorials were offended, as is
the nature with all constructive criticism. Because of this
perceived offensiveness, the paper was under investigation,
though no one was exactly sure of the reason. "Just how this
whole matter began, we can't be sure," the editors wrote.
Evidently, it was because the paper stepped on the toes of
someone. The Committee was made up of five people whom The
Hatchet had criticized in recent years, including a former editor
demoted the previous year for incompetence; the president of the
Veteran's Club, upset over some Hatchet statements concerning
the desegregation of Lisner Auditorium; and Dr. Linton, the
chairman of the Publications Committee, who had since resigned.
"The whole plan reeks of attempts at putting The Hatchet under
the control of the Student Council or of the Administration."

The paper was well aware of so-called "meetings" at which its
future was discussed, where so-called "unanimous" votes were
taken, the editors pointed out. If the University wanted to wage
war on The Hatchet, the paper would have to fight back.

The following Friday, the investigation began.

Before the Committee, Richard Generelly, the vice-president
of the Student Council, introduced the session: "the purpose of this
Committee is to evolve, if possible, if warranted, if necessary, on
the basis of the facts presented, a new organization plan for The
Hatchet...and to take into consideration any statements regarding
the editorial policy," and to come up with a comprehensive set of
guidelines as to how a change in the organization of the paper's
staff could better reflect student opinion.

Several members stood to give testimony against The
Hatchet. James Lyda, a member of the student body, told the
audience "The Hatchet doesn't have a leg to stand on in its
obstinate defense of The Grind." He continued, "The Grind is a
classic example of pornography... It is indecent, unwholesome,
and caters to the lowest in all of us." The paper had no right to
steadfastly defend The Grind as it did.

His criticisms grew worse, however, and provide an insight into the real reasons why the investigation took place: “The mode of attack of the editors gives every earmark of...following the party line, the Communist Party line.” He continued: “The actions and techniques of The Hatchet at this hearing and in its editorials clearly demonstrate that there is a Communist influence in the woodpile at the Hatchet office.” The mode of attack was simple: the paper was conducting a smear campaign against President Marvin, Dr. Linton and the Publications Committee, the Student Council, and Lisner Auditorium, to name a few. The paper was denouncing the University administration as corrupt—wasn’t that the first doctrine of the Communist Party?

Even the paper’s organization was vaguely reminiscent of the Communist Party—it was a self-perpetuating body, just like the Politburo in Moscow. When one member of the inner ring dies, a colleague replaces him. Even The Hatchet’s argument that the freedom of the press defended its content was invalid, because the paper was not free of Communist influence.

“If it continues in power,” Lyda said, referring to the Board of Editors, “I presume it will ask for the resignation of President Marvin, and I would like to know whom they expect to put in his place—Gromyko, Stalin, or William Z. Foster?” The Hatchet was probably the most powerful campus newspaper in the country; it found its way into The White House, The Treasury, Congress, and other institutions. The paper was exporting its Communism throughout the highest levels of government. Like a cancer, the Communist element was spreading.

“It may sound silly as hell,” Lyda concluded, “but there are Communists on this campus, and there are leftist inclined intelligences here in this room, too.” He indicated that the paper would do better under Student Council, administration, and Journalism Department oversight. With applause, he returned to his seat.

The next several speakers debated the charge of Communism before the audience. One said, “the best way to combat Communism is to let them shout and holler all they want
to, and let the rest of us who are still free-thinking evaluate what they have to say and punch holes in it and improve our system so that they have no case.” Applause followed his statement.

Several more speakers bickered with Chairman Generelly over how much of Lyda’s testimony was relevant to the investigation. “I believe this has gotten out of hand,” Dorothy Henry, a member of the Board of Editors, interrupted. The Committee called for a recess.

When the recess was over, Eileen Shanahan Waits, the former editor-in-chief who had married since her time at the paper, testified in The Hatchet’s defense. Refuting John Morris’s charges, that “the work of the editors of The Hatchet is shoddy and incompetent” and Dr. Linton’s charges that the editors display an ignorance of good journalistic practice, Shanahan discussed her criticisms of the paper: that stories were misplaced on the page, that the masthead was too small, that headlines were not always well constructed. “Anybody who knows Hatchet style would shriek to see what we call a 2/24. Hatchet style is 3/24,” said Shanahan, using her journalistic lingo in referring to the size of a particular headline.

While not defending the paper’s format, she defended its editorials: “Various uninformed persons who have appeared before this Committee seem to think that fair play means presenting both sides in an editorial. If that is what it means, why write editorials at all?” She added that editorials were by definition statements of opinion, and news stories elsewhere in the paper present the opposing argument. Some of the complainers indicated that President Marvin should view any editorial before it was printed; Shanahan rhetorically asked whether The Washington Times-Herald permitted President Roosevelt to view its editorials before they were printed. Laughter erupted in the audience.

Shanahan spent much of her lengthy testimony defending the organization of the newspaper. She warned against making the Board of Editors too large, as an unwieldy Board encounters difficulties in planning the structure and content of the paper, especially on the editorial page. She also criticized the Council’s 266
plan to make *The Hatchet* an organ of the Council, and condemned efforts to permit the administration to censor or preview the content. Finally, she commended the editors who came before her on the *Hatchet* staff who had gone on to important and successful careers at the various Washington, DC papers and national publications. They had not been successful because of George Washington's nearly defunct Journalism Department; they had become successful because of their experience at *The Hatchet*, Shanahan declared. "I attribute 90 per cent of the success of these people to the fact that *The Hatchet* has been free and uncontrolled, that they have been able to learn from doing and from making mistakes," she said.

Nevertheless, the testimony had its tense moments, as Larry Strickland, the president of the Student Council, was interviewing Eileen Shanahan Waits, who continually used her quick wit against his peppering questions, as the transcript shows:

*Mr. Strickland:* Do you have any reason to question the freedom of *The Hatchet*?

*Mrs. Waits:* I think there can be no denying that this present hearing has as its basis an attempt to curb to a certain degree the freedom of *The Hatchet*.

*Mr. Strickland:* Do you base that on what you have heard here or on what someone has told you?

*Mrs. Waits:* I base it on the written transcript of the previous hearing.

*Mr. Strickland:* That is to curb the freedom of the press, is that correct?

*Mrs. Waits:* Yes.

*Mr. Strickland:* I think you are entirely wrong on that.

[Laughter.]

Later:

*Mr. Strickland:* You also say, Mrs. Waits (and may I remind you that you haven't been in school for a while), that other Student Councils were "more far-sighted and more secure" than the present one.
What do you base that on?

Mrs. Waits: I think I made it clear that I was harking back to Student Councils which were in my time in the University. When I say they were more farsighted, I mean that they saw things as I saw them, naturally. [Laughter.] What do we consider farsightedness, after all? As for being more secure, I will only say that it is my opinion that anyone who raises the groundless charges you have raised must be insecure. [Applause.]

On another occasion, Strickland had asked Shanahan: "Would you qualify what you mean by "uninformed persons?" to which she quickly replied, "You." According to the transcript, prolonged applause followed.

After Shanahan's testimony and a few brief speeches by current Hatchet staffers, Dorothy Henry, one of three editors on the rotating Board of Editors, stood to give her testimony. She defended what was, perhaps, second to Dr. Marvin's library auction editorial, the most controversial piece written by the staff: the editorial campaign defending The Grind. The person most critical of these editorials was, not surprisingly, Dr. Linton, who claimed that his actions were misrepresented. Dorothy Henry, also a member of the Publications Committee (neither she nor the other students had voting power), confessed that she missed one of the meetings and was unaware that the Committee had formally voted to refuse recognition to The Grind and had passed on a series of recommendations to Dr. Marvin for appropriate action to be taken. No notification of these actions had ever reached the Board of Editors.

Henry made The Hatchet's position clear. The content of the first issue of The Grind could not be defended; however, the Board had the assurances of the Grind staff that the next issue would be cleaned up to an "acceptable standard." The Hatchet Board had even seen copy for the second issue, which was never published. "Add to this that The Grind was operating on a financial setup which was most sound from every aspect, and the editors of The
Hatchet concluded that the magazine deserved a second chance—a chance which was denied them by the Publications Committee," Henry told the Investigating Committee.

A war, indeed, had broken out between the Board of Editors of the newspaper and the Publications Committee over the editorial campaign. Henry explained to the audience how at the following Publications Committee meeting, which she attended, Dr. Linton attacked her and the paper "in a manner which I do not think any of the members of this [Investigating] Committee would sanction as befitting such a group as the Publications Committee." She left that meeting of the Publications Committee shocked and upset at Dr. Linton's outburst. Further communication between the Committee and the Board of Editors was hardly cordial, and at times quite violent.

The Hatchet defended its independence from the Publications Committee, from the administration, from the Student Council, and from the Department of Journalism. In truth, the Publications Committee and the administration had the final say over who would be elected to the Board of Editors each year; the Council had successfully excluded Hatchet journalists from its meetings (though not without a bitter editorial the following week); and at least one professor in the fledgling Department of Journalism—Dr. Linton himself—served on the Publications Committee, so it is true that even the paper was not entirely independent.

Nevertheless, it is quite clear that The University Hatchet was probably one of the freest and most independent student newspapers in the country. It had no censors, faculty advisors, or overseeing bodies, and while the administration and Student Council could raise hell and high water over the paper's editorial stances, the paper still resisted their efforts, often refusing to print apologies, for example, when members of the administration protested over the paper's content. As a result, when matters became too difficult, the measures used by the administration were drastic: editors in the 1940s and 1950s found themselves fired, suspended from school, or denied promotion, and the relations between the University administration and the paper remained at an all-time low.
The Hatchet guarded its independence very zealously. Part of the reason was that the paper had some of the most liberal, politically active voices of the entire student body; part of the reason, no doubt, was because the paper was so old (it had been founded while Marvin was still in high school), and operated largely free from administration control until the late 1930s when Dr. Marvin began tampering with the paper’s organization. Also, its publication was not subsidized by the University; the source of funds was a Student Activities Fee paid by all students that went directly to certain student activities—among them, the yearbook, the intramural athletics (abolished during the war years), and the dramatics organizations. The only formal link between the paper and the administration (other than the approval of the Board of Editors nominees) was the office for the newspaper, which was on University property and free of charge. Advertising decisions, printing costs, and the hiring and training of journalists rested solely in the hands of the business and editorial staffs of the paper, except for a final budget submitted each year to the Publications Committee for approval.

This is why, uniquely among the student publications, The Hatchet survived and prospered, despite continual administrative interference. The paper had become an institution on campus, and overt changes to its organization, or its abolition altogether, would have raised the ire of students and alumni alike—and surely more than a few professors who relished the paper since it was so critical of the administration, at times, and could say what the professors, for fear of their jobs, could not. Surely even the Student Council, which was continually manipulated by an administration that did not even recognize its legitimate existence, must have been jealous of Hatchet independence.

One clear manifestation of that independence was, each year, the publication of a satirical issue on or around April Fool’s Day on April 1, The University Tomahawk. Every April since 1941, the Hatchet poked fun at University rules and personalities with non-offensive good humor. At least twice during Marvin’s administration, however, that humor bubbled over into controversy as the content of the satirical issue offended some administrators.
In April 1951, first-year reporter Warren Robinson contributed a story to *The Tomahawk* about how Monroe Hall had collapsed because of faulty construction. An editor faked a picture to go with it, showing Monroe Hall sinking into the ground. Robinson later admitted he got too carried away, including tidbits about the body of a professor found in the rubble and about contractors who had bribed the University.

President Marvin read the story. He “never did have a sense of humor, and unbeknownst to me this new building was his pride and joy,” Robinson later recalled. Marvin, backed by Dr. Linton, fired the editor-in-chief.97

The next year, the paper crossed the line again, printing more satirical stories that the administrators found inappropriate. Dr. Linton wrote in a letter to Marvin that *The Tomahawk* was largely constructed by the senior and junior staffs without much input from the Board of Editors, which is why it was so difficult to ascertain who wrote what. The paper refused to tell Linton the authors of its stories. As a result, due to the “offensiveness of this issue of the ‘Tomahawk’ plus the almost total scholastic and journalistic inadequacy of the sub-editorial group (from which, normally, next year’s Board would be selected)” Linton encouraged Marvin to “re-examine the whole status” of *The Hatchet*, including making a professor of journalism at the University editor-in-chief the following year.98

The April Fool’s Issue did not die during Marvin’s time, however, and remains a part of student life to this day. Because of the paper’s relative independence from the University, it has been able to do something that few college newspapers could do, and only a handful has done for as long. Despite the occasional reaction by the administration, the April Fool’s Issue underscores the paper’s dedication to defending the freedom of the press.

After the investigation of *The Hatchet* was complete, the Investigating Committee released a series of recommendations for *Hatchet* reorganization. The report was shockingly mild, given the nature of the testimony, and the Committee chided the Student Council’s actions several times in the midst of a vigorous defense.
of *The Hatchet*. The report called the Council’s appointment of its own vice-president to be chairman of a Committee to investigate the Council’s own charges “injudicious” as was appointing Dr. Linton (though he soon resigned) to the Investigating Committee. The Committee was therefore not wholly impartial, according to its own report.

“One cannot fairly judge a college newspaper by professional standards,” the Investigating Committee began. “They are *learners* in journalism, just as they are *students* in their university classes; they are not journalists any more than they are scholars.” This must be remembered in any investigation of the paper, especially in regard to the editorial concerning the auction of Dr. Marvin’s library.

The editors discovered the auction in *The New York Times*. They did not ask Marvin whether he was selling his whole collection or whether he had given any thought to donating them to the library. After the *Hatchet* editorial was published, a reporter from *The Washington Daily News* wrote a story asking those very questions. Marvin had, in fact, gone through the collection with the university librarian, and books that were thought to be useful were donated to the library. “Nothing that was sold,” *The News* quoted Marvin as saying, “would have been of particular value to a student library.”

Had the *Hatchet* staff asked these questions, a fairer and more interesting story would have resulted. “Another point worthy of consideration in connection with this editorial is the implication that there was something sneaky in President Marvin’s action,” the report read. An innuendo in the editorial implied that Marvin had deliberately kept notice of the sale of his library out of the major D.C. newspapers. But Marvin had not placed the notice in *The New York Times*, nor did he place it anywhere else. The gallery where the library was to be sold, the Parke-Bernet Galleries, had placed the notice.

“But nothing is to be gained by cataloging [The Hatchet’s] errors.” The public hearings made it clear that the paper is less than perfect, and the editors themselves had acknowledged their own fallibility. As to the charges that the editors lied and
deliberately sensationalized news (especially related to *The Grind* editorials), the Committee refused to comment. "This committee is not a court of law, its hearings were not a trial, the witnesses were not under oath. On this and other conflicts of testimony noted in the transcript, charity, rather than judgment, seems to be in order."

On the one hand, if the paper's organization were as efficient as it could be, there would have been no investigation, of course. On the other hand, if the paper were as ineptly organized as was originally alleged, it would not have been so vigorously defended during the hearings. "It seems reasonable, therefore, for this committee to conclude that while the editors have been amateurish in some of their editorial practices and injudicious in some of their expressions of opinion," *The Hatchet* is a fairly good paper, bearing in mind the youth and inexperience of its staff.

"But 'fairly good' is not enough. The university needs—indeed wants and deserves—the best paper that college journalism can produce," the report read.

*The Hatchet* "must remain free and independent," the report continued, detailing its first recommendation. "But freedom is not to be confused with license, nor independence with irresponsibility." A free and independent *Hatchet* must always be an ethical and responsible *Hatchet*.

Secondly, the Student Council must never have any control over the paper, the Committee wrote in its second recommendation. No newspaper would submit to control by a municipal government. The Council did, in fact, have the right to divide the Student Activities Fee between the organizations that it was used for, determining which ones received how much money, but this does not amount to control. It was "a mere bookkeeping expedient," the Committee reported, "and in no way implies the slightest authority over the paper or its editors or staff."

The Committee also recommended the appointment of a professor of journalism to serve as Technical Consultant to the newspaper. The Technical Consultant would, each week, provide a technical critique of the paper in writing or in conference. The editors could follow the advice or not, as they see fit. "Furthermore, it is explicitly understood that the Technical
Consultant is to have absolutely no voice in matters of policy and absolutely no power of censorship," the Committee added.

The Committee also recommended a change of organization. The Board of Editors system where each member is of the same rank was not working, they insisted, and should be replaced by a Board with an editor-in-chief, two associate editors, and a managing editor. In this way, finding responsibility for a particular offense will be much easier. The Investigating Committee also recommended that when the Publications Committee decides to appropriate disciplinary action on a member of the paper's staff, at least three members of the Journalism Department must approve the action, adding another check on Dr. Linton's and the administration's powers to punish The Hatchet.99

Because the report had not been very critical of the paper—and was even very defensive of the paper's actions—the administration gave little credence to it. Instead, what transpired was a long, drawn-out dispute over the creation of a Hatchet constitution. It began with the refusal of the Publications Committee to appoint a new Board of Editors for the following year, and instead chose an Acting Board, who would serve until a constitution was ratified. In October 1947, the Publications Committee rejected the final constitution, started the previous spring. Dr. Linton told Marvin that the Publications Committee "found it entirely inadequate. In most details it follows the old charter, and in no detail offers any solution to the basic Hatchet problem, which is one of defining the Hatchet editorial responsibility."100

But it would not have mattered anyway. The Committee on Publications, under Linton's direction, believed that the dispute with The Hatchet "is not likely to be solved by revisions of its constitution, or by any other adjustment of a superficial nature." Instead, a close relationship with the Department of Journalism was most preferable.

Because the final constitution was rejected, the Committee on Publications still refused to approve a new Board of Editors, noting with dubious reasoning that a permanent Board cannot be approved without a permanent Constitution, even though the 274
previous Hatchet charter was still in effect. It took the remainder of the school year to hammer out a new constitution.\textsuperscript{101}

The Student Council, however, had heard enough of the talk of placing the paper under the Journalism Department’s direction. By a majority vote, the Council opposed the Publications Committee’s recommendations. Marvin had so downsized the Journalism Department during the war years that the department was barely functioning and could hardly provide adequate direction to the newspaper. “The proposed constitution necessarily depends upon the establishment of an adequate Department of Journalism before it can be put into effect,” the Council told Linton on Valentine’s Day, 1948. “Therefore, we cannot see how this constitution can be put into operation until such a Department is created.”\textsuperscript{102}

Even the Council now saw that Dr. Linton’s efforts to make the newspaper an organ of the Journalism Department were merely thinly veiled attempts at censoring the content of the paper. The student body was finally united in defense of the paper. But they were not united in all things.

The largest battle between the paper and the administration was yet to come. This time, the paper would win.

“The time has come, we feel, for the University to reconsider its present admission policy and remove the barrier it has maintained against Negro students,” the editors wrote on November 15, 1949 in the most famous Hatchet editorial, entitled “The Time Is Now.”

Within the past two years, Georgetown opened its doors to black students, joining Catholic, American, and Howard Universities that years ago had outlawed the practice. Only The George Washington University remained as a steadfast proponent of whites-only education.

“There will be many who, at first thought, will cry, ‘Let us wait awhile.’ To them we say, THE TIME IS NOW.” The editors did not go into specifics about social, economic, moral, or political conditions as to why black students should be given the same educational opportunities as white students. “It should be sufficient
to say that equal treatment, and equal rights and privileges are principles of American democracy that are as deep as any we have," they determined.

The editors concluded on a forceful note: "We believe we should begin 'moving forward' now. We feel that the time for action has arrived."103

The Washington Evening Star ran a story about the editorial later that day, noting Marvin's vague reply: "The Hatchet, as the student newspaper of the university, is free to reflect without interference the opinion of its editors. The position of the university in the matter of its membership is known to the community."104

The newspaper staff was immediately suspended, Jack Skelly, a former staff member, recalls. After the editorial, the newspaper staff held a meeting to which all interested persons were invited to attend. At least twenty anti-integration students showed up to denounce the editorial, telling the editors that they would transfer to North Carolina if a black student ever set one foot on the campus. "We wished them all well," Skelly remembered.

Marvin invited the students to his office to explain why he had suspended the editors and why integration at that moment was not good for George Washington. The will of Abram Lisner, and several of the other generous benefactors of the University, stipulated that black students should not be allowed to attend the University.

The two children of J. Russell Wiggins, the editor of The Washington Post, attended George Washington and were good friends with some of the editors. Shortly after the meeting, they got word to their father about the incident, and he, most politely, informed Marvin that the suspension should be lifted. It was so done.105

Letters flooded into the paper, most supportive of the editors' stance. A few heaped warm praise on The Hatchet. "Now is the time for our University president to prove that his faith in democracy is more than lip-service," one student wrote. However, not all were positive; another student wrote, "Assuming that you
are Caucasian, remember the white is in the minority and mix-breeding will eventually eradicate it from among the peoples of the earth." The editors responded that ethnologists have long disproved such "pure race" theories and discounted his letter.

One former professor at George Washington also chimed in: "It undoubtedly took more courage on your part to take this stand than it would have for the administration to have done so." Even Senator Hubert Humphrey congratulated the paper, endorsing the editors' "higher democratic values." Overall, most of the letters—19 out of 23 for the first issue after the editorial—were positive and favorable toward the editorials.\textsuperscript{106}

The paper printed three more editorials over the next several weeks, each encouraging the Board of Trustees to take up the matter. On November 22, the editors wrote, "Regardless of what the Board of Trustees decides, we have no doubt that what we urge is right and just." All clear-thinking Americans, the editors added, can see the injustice of the present policy. How long it takes to desegregate depends on how much pressure students, alumni, and friends of the University place on the Trustees.\textsuperscript{107}

The following week, an even stronger editorial encouraged the Trustees to act. At no time, the editors insisted, had they ever implied that desegregation would be easy. "What we have contended is that admitting students on the basis of scholastic ability and potential alone, disregarding race entirely, is the right, the moral, the just course of action for the University to follow," the editorial declared. Heartened by a Trustees meeting two days away, on December 8, the editors again encouraged the highest decision-making body at the University to take a stand against racial inequality.\textsuperscript{108}

Although the Trustees, in the end, declined to address the racial policy that year, the impact of the racial issue began to snowball. The advocates of desegregation, an editorial stated after the Trustees' meeting, were not idealists; the policy change is entirely practical and in the best interests of the student body. "Thus, the Board of Trustees' failure to act should serve as a stimulus," the editorial board wrote. Students, alumni, administrators, and community leaders should be relentless in
their opposition to a policy of segregation in the Nation's Capital.¹⁰⁶

In fact, the controversy was about to spiral out of control as a community began to unite in opposition against President Marvin and the Trustees.
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"There are no colored students in The George Washington University," Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin wrote in 1938, dictating the University policy concerning students of racial minorities that was to stand another fifteen years. He continued:

The presence in Washington of abundant education resources on all levels for the colored people, including Howard University and the public educational system, explains this practice. Students of any race or color perform their best educational disciplines when they are happily situated in a congenial and homogenous group, and the University, in its tradition and social environment, has long preserved this policy. Consistent with this long standing observance, The George Washington University does not register colored students.

There remain to this day few clues revealing just how comprehensive the ban on African-American students was. While records indicate that international students from the Middle East, East and Southeast Asia, and Latin America at various times enrolled at George Washington, especially during the post-WWII era, at least one person of Haitian descent was denied admission, and the number may have included more. It is unclear whether The George Washington University ever passed a regulation or by-law of the Board of Trustees specifically forbidding black students from enrolling, though the evidence indicates otherwise. It was merely in "tradition" and long-standing "social environment," not in formal University code or regulation, that blacks had been consistently denied admission to the University.

On the same day as the 1954 decision Brown v. Topeka
Board of Education was handed down desegregating public schools, the Court also decided a lesser-known, but no less important case: *Bolling v. Sharpe*. Since the *Brown* decision did not apply to the District of Columbia because D.C. is not a "state" within the purview of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Amendment provides only for equal protection of the laws among the states, the Court had to try the question separately. In the case, the Supreme Court ruled "discrimination may be so unjustifiable" that a violation of the Fifth Amendment, which provides for the due process of law, may be committed—and the Fifth Amendment did, in fact, apply to the District of Columbia. This complex reasoning resulted in a straightforward and stern decision.

"In view of our decision that the Constitution prohibits the states from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government," wrote Chief Justice Earl Warren. "We hold that racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is a denial of the due process of law guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution."

According to Alfred Harding, a prominent person in the field of dramatics and theater in Washington, DC, the city was still "a very confused city at the present time. It is still uncertain as to whether it is a southern provincial town or the capital city of a great world power." The city had attained an uneasy truce: it attempted to think as a world power and feel as a provincial town. "Nowhere is that confusion between head and heart better exemplified than in the pattern of its relationships between its white and negro [sic.] citizens."

This confusion was very blatant in the educational realm. Some of Washington's universities and colleges had always excluded black students; another accepted all students without distinction. Still another university accepted black students on an "off-and-on" basis. The public schools further obscured the pattern, because it maintained complete racial segregation—the Miner Teacher's College for black students, and the Wilson Teacher's College for white students. Many of the District's
hospitals practiced a form of segregation, including the Georgetown and George Washington University Hospitals, as well as Garfield, Sibley, Emergency, and Providence. Each would undergo a different path to desegregation—some earlier, some later, some more quickly, some very slowly.

Georgetown University, founded in 1789, and George Washington, founded in 1821, had always been segregated in some form or another. Georgetown is notable because of the fact that a president of the institution, Father Patrick Healy, S.J. (1873-1882), was the son of an Irish planter and a racially mixed slave. On December 3, 1851, the Miner Teacher's College opened; its founder Myrtilla Miner wanted to train black female students to teach members of their own race. It was not until 1874 that the District School Board established the Wilson Teacher's College for whites; both eventually became one-year and two-year institutions, then three-year, and finally four-year degree-granting teacher's colleges—always white and black by formal Board policy and scrupulous practice.

On the other hand, Howard University's establishment in 1867 educated all students, regardless of race; in fact, the first students were white, the sons and daughters of founders and faculty. Although black students make up a large portion of its population, the University never had any restrictions, formal or informal, on the enrollment of any race; it was non-segregated from its inception. Black students were able to attend Catholic University until 1919, when a new rector came with a new change of policy. The restriction was rescinded in 1933, when the school admitted a group of African-American nuns, and graduate and undergraduate students three years later.

"Adhering to the most rigid racial policy-practice of all District colleges, George Washington University even extended racial exclusion to the institution's Lisner Auditorium," wrote historian Paul Cooke. The National Committee on Segregation wrote a scathing report of the institution; George Washington had 15,000 students, the Committee said, afforded a unique cultural advantage by the proximity to government, and the University makes every possible effort to attract foreign students. "But no
American Negro will be admitted. Not even a West Indian Negro, as the Minister from Haiti discovered a few years ago when he tried to enroll his son with the aid of State Department influence.  

According to Cooke, at the time of the Supreme Court decision in the spring of 1954, only George Washington and the two teachers' colleges still practiced some form of racial discrimination. Within days of the Court decision, the District of Columbia Board of Education had drawn up plans to integrate the two teachers' schools, and both admitted all students by the beginning of fall semester. This only increased the pressure on George Washington to remove all racial barriers. The George Washington University Hospital, however, had desegregated earlier, and black nurses and patients and white nurses and patients intermingled with few problems. Likewise, blacks were admitted to certain off-campus graduate programs and to courses in the Medical School that the other universities in the area did not offer.

Dr. Marvin often said that The George Washington University admitted black students after the Civil War for a number of years, and records indicate that students from Howard University came to George Washington to take some courses. In the years after its founding, however, Howard University was about half white, so it is difficult to ascertain the color of these students. Nonetheless, according to Marvin, that policy changed by social practice and tradition, which dictated that white would attend George Washington and blacks would attend Howard.

In the postwar years, when the University community and, indeed, the larger community, were changing so rapidly, many began critiquing these old social traditions. Although official histories and publications of the University indicate that the desegregation of the University occurred almost overnight with few problems, the record reveals that the protracted struggle was fairly long and complex, with ruined careers and futures lining the path.
The “Lisner Question”

In 1946, one of the most celebrated events in many years took place on campus at The George Washington University, the inauguration of Lisner Auditorium with its 59-foot stage and 1,550 seats. Made possible by the $750,000 bequest of Abram Lisner at his death in 1943, the theater was said to be the largest south of New York City, and was immediately recognized as a significant asset to cultural life in the District. With its ultra-modern light and sound systems, it was only natural that major theater producers would consider Lisner a prime site for their theater productions.

Immortalizing a great benefactor of the University, the auditorium provided a home for graduation exercises, large public lectures, a radio studio, and an art gallery. But Abram Lisner was more than just a philanthropist who had donated the money for Lisner Library along with his wife’s smaller gift for the grounds and gardens; he was a longtime friend of the University and many of its presidents beginning with the thrifty Admiral Stockton during the World War One era. In the last year before he died, he turned constantly to President Marvin for friendship and counsel when the death of his wife weighed heavily upon him.

Small, wiry, and meticulous in his courtesies, he was nonetheless keen and methodical; Marvin had once described him as “one of the most alert minds I have ever known.” Although he was a trustee of the University, he was not particularly well known on campus as an individual; his deeds, however, were recognizable by the entire community. “Mr. Lisner’s gift leaves all associated with the George Washington University with a deep sense of gratitude and responsibility,” President Marvin told The Hatchet after the executor of Mr. Lisner’s will made the circumstances of the gift public.\(^5\)

The theater house opened with a two-week showing of Joan of Lorraine, the Joan of Arc story, starring 29-year old actress Ingrid Bergman. The future stage of operas, symphonies, ballets, dramatics, concerts, and lectures was marred by an unsurprising reality, enforced by community tradition and at Mr. Lisner’s request: the theater would open segregated.\(^{287}\)
The question of segregation in the Auditorium first arose at a debate forum on October 14 in which two congressmen, Republican Owen Brewster of Maine and J. Percy Priest of Tennessee, were debating which party to vote for in the elections the following month. At the debate, according to The Hatchet, the president of Howard University was denied admittance. Later, at a performance of the “Ballet of America,” the dean of Howard University’s Medical School was denied admission. However, nothing could prepare the University for the intense controversy surrounding Ingrid Bergman’s performance at the end of October.

The Playwrights’ Company, the dramatic group putting on the performance, distributed tickets for the event. The demand for Ingrid Bergman’s performance, however, was so great that it sold out by mail before the box office even opened. The Company did not know of a racial discrimination policy at Lisner Auditorium when they sold tickets, but eventually the managers of the Auditorium decided to conform to the general practice in Washington and refuse admission to blacks.

Washington, DC “is what is known as ‘a great show town,’” wrote one protestor to the Post. “The audiences are exceptionally intelligent and the press generous in the support it gives to the theater as an institution.” One would assume with this environment, the entrance policy to Lisner and the other segregated theaters in the District, would be more open. The protester continued, “the revenue to be derived is poor compensation for the injury done to the conscience of American citizens by this continuance of injustice in our National Capital.”

On October 31, on the eve of the opening of “Joan of Lorraine,” The Washington Post severely criticized the University for its racial discrimination. “The George Washington University is an endowed institution, chartered by the Congress of the United States,” the editors wrote. They continued:

One would suppose it, as a seat of scholarship, to be above prejudice. One would suppose it, as a place of learning, religious in origin and consecrated to Christian ideals, to be above the meanness that
would deny men opportunities for entertainment on account of the color of their skins. One would suppose it, as an academic institution, professedly devoted to the vital principles of American society, to be above so reactionary a flouting of them.8

Ingrid Bergman, famous for her liberal views throughout her career, decided to make her distaste of the whites-only policy for the theater clear. She told reporters “Washington was a bad town in which to open a play,” because of its racial discrimination. A petition she had orchestrated and signed along with all the other members of the cast and crew, found its way to the Lisner Auditorium Board of Directors. The petition read: “The following members of the cast of Joan of Lorraine, having learned that you intend to practice racial discrimination, wish to go on record as protesting what we regard as an undemocratic and un-American practice.”9 The guild of actors and crewmembers sought a ruling from their production company stipulating that never again would the guild appear before a segregated audience.

“It is time for the people of this community to demand that such a change take place,” the editors of the Post concluded. “Entertainment, as Miss Bergman said, is for all the people.”10 On opening night at Lisner Auditorium, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, an anti-segregationist organization, picketed in front of the entrance. The president of the Conference told the Post that he hoped universities that practiced racial discrimination would be denied their tax-exempt status.11

Not all agreed with the actress’s stance. “If she wants to do local people a favor, all she has to do is buy herself a one-way ticket back to Sweden. No one here will cry,” one wrote to the Post. Another wrote of the implicit tradition of segregation: “In the conduct of our business there is no difference between the white and colored employees; however at quitting time there is that social distinction that neither would care to violate.”12

For the most part, however, the letters that poured into both The Washington Post and The Evening Star were very critical of how the University handled the Lisner situation. Lisner
Auditorium, however, was not the only theater then under criticism for its segregationist practices; National Theater, three blocks from the White House, was also being harangued in the press. As a later Post staff editorial pointed out in mid-November, not only should the two theaters, Lisner and National, permit mixed audiences, but the fact that they were not competing to be the first to do so was poor business foresight. The theaters could desegregate "without suffering the slightest loss of revenue and without causing a ripple in their audiences," the editors wrote. "They ought to be rivaling one another for the prestige of doing it first."

As the play companies, including the dramatics guilds that performed in both Lisner Auditorium and National Theater, began boycotting segregated establishments, the prospect that Washington, DC could lose in the world of the arts to more egalitarian cities like New York because of silly Southern stubbornness, incensed the paper’s editors. "By acting together to abandon a senseless ban, [the two theaters] could save their faces and save the people of Washington from a playless winter."13

National Theater's existence hung in the balance as the Dramatists' Guild, an organization composed of Washington's leading playwrights, announced its intention to sign no more contracts with any Washington theater that practiced racial segregation. This threatened the four performances scheduled at National for fall 1946 and the one two-week production of Joan of Lorraine at Lisner Auditorium, which had already opened.

Edmund Plohn of National Theater and Vincent De Angelis of Lisner Auditorium both defended the practices of their respective theaters. Plohn told the Star that "National Theater cannot be coerced," and the establishment was simply following the customs of the community. De Angelis, the manager of Lisner Auditorium, defended the institution's racial policy as "no different from the dual systems at the other Washington theaters or restaurants or schools generally."14 Plohn seconded these thoughts, insisting that National Theater—a private institution—should not have to desegregate when even the public schools in the city were fiercely
The Dramatists, however, stood by their decision: "Racial discrimination is as anachronistic as it is offensive in this great, cosmopolitan capital city. Recently, there has been increasing protest from Washingtonians and we support this protest even if it leads to the boycotting of our own plays," the members of the Guild wrote.\textsuperscript{15}

The \textit{Evening Star} answered the Lisner question very differently than the \textit{Post} did. In a late November editorial, the \textit{Star} wrote that it did "not believe that local sentiment supports the elimination at this time of restrictive [racial] practices." The politicking, petitioning, protesting, and picketing by the opponents of segregation in the District theaters were hardening hearts, not softening them. "In fanning one emotion, others are ignited. More snakes are likely to be stirred up than are killed," the editors wrote, questioning the methods used by the protestors.\textsuperscript{16}

The press was as divided as the community.

Meanwhile, as the controversy over "the Lisner question" raged in the city newspapers, it also caught attention back on campus, where it threatened to divide the student body and embarrass the administration. On the opening night of \textit{Joan of Lorraine}, several organizations joined the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in picketing in front of the 21st Street entrance to the auditorium. One of these organizations was the George Washington University chapter of the American Veterans Committee, which passed out flyers and picketed.

The debate over the presence of the American Veterans Committee (AVC) on campus caused a great deal of resentment from the University Veterans Club. While the latter claimed to represent the vast majority of the University's 6,000 veterans, in reality its membership was around 600, compared to a membership of about 300 in the AVC. The major difference between the two organizations was that the administration had sanctioned the University Veterans Club as an official student organization, and denied the AVC recognition because it was a local chapter of a national organization and political in nature, and segregated by race.\textsuperscript{15}
therefore violated the infamous Rule 6 of the Board of Trustees, much as the student anti-war organizations did almost ten years earlier.

The debate boiled down to two minor points: the AVC claimed to represent the University's veterans community, which they arguably didn't, and it used "The George Washington University" in its title and held meetings on campus, which they could not do without recognition as a student organization by the Student Life Committee.

On November 6, 1946, acting on President Marvin's recommendations, the University Veterans Club voted to denounce the liberal AVC for violating University policies. While Marvin did not recognize the AVC because of its anti-segregationist stance— it had, after all, taken part in the Lisner protests—and because the president felt that the AVC was a Communist propagandist organization, the Veterans Club was simply jealously guarding its position as the only veterans' organization on campus. They passed a resolution denouncing the AVC and submitted it to President Marvin.

But the University Veterans Club went even further. In addition to the resolution denouncing the AVC, the Club passed one denouncing segregation in Lisner Auditorium, recommending that "no one be excluded on the basis of race, and that if the University is unwilling to adopt this policy, it restrict the use of Lisner Auditorium to University functions." This presented a conundrum for the administration, which had painted the AVC as a Communist front for opposing segregation. Nonetheless, upset that the AVC continued presenting itself to the student body and local press as a University organization and that it continued meeting on campus, Dr. Marvin decided to take drastic measures to suppress what he saw as an overtly political organization: he threatened to expel the leaders of the AVC.

The Hatchet editorial page had no shortage of condemnation for either the University Veterans Club or for Dr. Marvin's actions. The AVC had passed out leaflets with Ingrid Bergman's picture and a statement by her: "I feel very bad about the policy of discrimination at Lisner Auditorium. I wouldn't have come if I had
known in time." Because of this, the Hatchet editors condemned Marvin's actions as a threat to free speech and free assembly. Be warned, they told the student body, that one's anti-segregationist views could bring expulsion from an embattled University administration.

"The Veterans Club has placed itself in the position of a young upstart, much like the child who wishes his mother to buy him everything in sight, regardless of cost," the editors sternly intimated. The divisive battle over the status of the AVC had exasperated many students, especially the 300 or more AVC veterans at George Washington who insisted that they had not acted improperly. One letter to the editor from a veteran at the University decried the AVC as a "petty partisan" organization. "That the AVC should have chosen to seize so avidly on an issue which has long been the favorite point of selfish agitation by the Communist Party and left wing movements in general, is most unfortunate," the student wrote. Dr. Marvin and the supporters of the discriminatory racial policy raised the possibility of a connection between the AVC and the Communist Party; this affiliation in retrospect appears entirely unfounded.

As Marvin's actions became clearer, the editorials in The Hatchet and in the local newspapers became more severe. The prospect of expelling the leader of the AVC from the University for his "belligerent" behavior in the protests on Lisner's opening night proved to be more than the University community could handle. A Hatchet editorial entitled "Expulsion—Be Damned!" explained that it made no difference whether "the American Veterans Committee [was] right or wrong, Communist or Fascist, sincere or selfish," its members had protested in order to protect the rights that they had risked their lives in war to defend. The editors made it clear that they "strongly oppose any move to deprive them of license by the baseball bat with the label 'expulsion' being swung at them." The rights guaranteed to every American were being swept away "in lustful and unjustified attempts to suffocate" all freethinking people, the editors proclaimed.

The city newspapers were equally harsh in their attacks. The
fact that Marvin would expel Don Rothenberg, the chairman of the AVC, for his participation in a protest against segregation was not only intolerable because free speech was being violated; it was intolerable because Rothenberg was standing up for what he believed—and for what most Washingtonians believed, according to the Post.

As the recommendation for expulsion for Rothenberg tumbled from Dr. Marvin to the Student Life Committee to the director of men's activities, the fervor in the city newspapers was increasing. Marvin was on the defensive, telling the Star that no student would be expelled for standing up for his beliefs and insisting that students who break University rules would be punished. The AVC leaders were threatened with expulsion from the Student Life Committee because they violated student regulations and "not because of the Negro issue which they are dragging in like a dead cat," Marvin told the Post.22

A Post editorial proclaimed that the veterans should not have any trouble adjusting to life back at the University; "For their former drill sergeants they have exchanged a university president who seems to think that an institution of learning is a school for conformity," the editors wrote. The actions of the administration made it quite clear that the motive for attempting to expel Rothenberg was his participation in a protest against segregation. "There must be room in a university, of all places, for clashes of ideas," the Post editors concluded. "Where intolerance is encouraged, whether in respect of race or of opinion, education can be nothing more than a sterile recitation of dogmas."23

Student letters poured into the Post. "Does the student life committee [sic] plan to expel all students with whose opinions it disagrees?" wrote Helen Bissell of the class of 1947. "Whether I agree with AVC or not I am ashamed that the university with which I am associated has taken such a stand."24

On November 20, the front page of The Evening Star reported to the world that the University administration had decided not to expel the student leaders, led by Don Rothenberg, but had decided to deny AVC the right to use campus facilities for meeting grounds, a right the organization had hitherto enjoyed.294
An investigating committee composed of five faculty members and student leaders, including three members of the Student Life Committee, exonerated Rothenberg and the other students, a decision upheld by President Marvin and forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

The charges brought against the AVC included the unauthorized use of the University's name, the picketing of University buildings, the prohibited political activities conducted on campus, and the fact that the organization "was doing the university irreparable harm" and seeking to "destroy" the university. Rothenberg protested each of the charges, especially the last, insisting that his organization never wanted to destroy the institution.\(^5\)

The Post reported the same day that while Rothenberg had been acquitted, Marvin was keeping the final report of the committee secret, even from Rothenberg's attorneys. The attorneys were kept out of the hearing as well. Rothenberg also criticized the fact that three members of the investigating committee, including the University registrar, the director of men's activities, and the president of the Student Council, were members of the Student Life Committee, which had originally brought the charges against the AVC.\(^6\)

Nonetheless, the Post's editorial page was critical of how the entire situation was handled, defending the student members of the AVC: "We think they were not only wholly within their rights as free citizens in doing this but that their action was also directly in the university's interests." The editors championed the decision, noting that it had a "happy ending." The editors congratulated Dr. Marvin "on the forthright handling of an issue directly involving the principle of academic freedom and on the rejection of a course which would have been wholly discreditable to an institution of learning." But the paper encouraged Marvin to address the underlying issue involving segregation, because in doing so, "he would redeem and enhance the prestige of the university."\(^7\)

Meanwhile, the national chapter of the American Veterans Committee was under investigation by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Amongst the evidence submitted against
the national AVC organization on the House floor was a review of the Lisner Auditorium incident.28

Because of the Dramatists' Guild strike, Lisner Auditorium found itself unable and quite unwilling to permit any more commercial plays in the immediate future, especially if the controversy that had brought the establishment and the University so much negative publicity should continue. In lieu of plays by the Dramatists' Guild, Vincent De Angelis, the manager of Lisner Auditorium, scheduled performances sponsored by the Children's Museum and the Columbia Light Opera Company. After these shows, Lisner temporarily closed its doors to commercial plays of any kind, and restricted the theater to University functions, as students at George Washington were, of course, all white.29

In February 1947, immediately prior to a Board of Trustees meeting, The Hatchet encouraged the Trustees to look at the "Lisner Question," as it had come to be known, one last time. An editorial looked at the events of the last several months, as the controversy aired in papers nationwide, and the resulting inaction by the Trustees who had only heretofore said the issue "had been taken under advisement" when met with community protest.

"It is our conviction that a change in admissions policy, whereby Negroes would be allowed to witness events at Lisner, would be a commendable and progressive step," the editors wrote. According to University officials, should Lisner be reopened for commercial performances, some of the finest Broadway shows would be available for booking. Such performances "would add immeasurably to our cultural life and to the prestige of the University."

The Board heeded the paper's request and reopened Lisner to commercial performances. "When opened for lease for such purposes, the University will impose no restrictions on attendance," the Trustees decided.30

But with that decision came an implicit assumption: the theater would not permit performances that may draw a mixed audience. Purely on an informal basis, Lisner would be leased only to organizations that were already segregated.

By this political maneuvering, the theater, though no longer
formally segregated by University policy, had allowed Jim Crow to continue. Within several years, however, the situation became untenable, and a series of events forced the hands of administrators.

The fortress begins to fall

In 1950, the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) adopted a resolution committing its members to the professional duty to abolish “at the earliest practicable time” segregation or discrimination in legal education on racial grounds. In 1951, AALS amended its Objectives to include “equality of opportunity in legal education without discrimination or segregation on the ground of race or color.” With that change in policy was a very serious condition: any institution that had not desegregated within two years’ time would be denied accreditation by the AALS.

The George Washington University Law School was one of 110 law schools accredited by AALS. By the end of that two year period, only 6 public schools (several of which were awaiting litigation in the state legislatures to desegregate) and 11 private schools, all of which were located in southern states, still prohibited the enrollment of African-Americans and were thus in danger of losing accreditation. The George Washington University Law School was one of them. It was also the furthest north, and the only accredited institution in Washington, DC to have a whites-only ban. (Columbus University Law School, in Washington, DC, still prohibited African-American students, but was not accredited by the Association of American Law Schools.)

With the law school admissions policy under particular attack from outside, professors and administrators themselves also began to chip away at the all-white façade surrounding the school. In December 1951, the faculty of the law school overwhelmingly approved desegregation, believing that segregation and discrimination should be abolished at the soonest possible time.

During the academic year 1952-53, George Washington opened its doors slightly to a handful of African-American students
in off-campus classes of the Graduate School, to certain postgraduate courses of the Medical School, and to students under specific contract with the government, such as the contracts with the Air Force, the Departments of State and Commerce, and other departments and agencies. Law School faculty at George Washington set up a committee to issue recommendations on the issue to the Board of Trustees.

The report of the Faculty Committee on the Admission of Negroes, clearly marked “Confidential” at the top of the first page, was published on December 1, 1953, several months before the educational world would be shaken by the Supreme Court decisions the following spring. On the first page, the Committee reported that, pursuant to the AALS resolution calling for desegregation at the “earliest practicable time,” the time had come for George Washington Law School to admit African-American students.

The Committee had extensive conversations with administrators in the AALS, with other universities nationwide, and with students, alumni, parents, and community groups. Noting a “general trend” toward desegregation in Washington, DC, the Committee went into great detail about the effects on legal education of removing all race bans.

Predicting the numbers of African-Americans who would enroll at the law school should the prohibition be rescinded, the Committee felt that the number would be, at first, quite small. At Catholic University Law School, which desegregated in 1943, only five African-American students enrolled out of a total of 71 law students. At Georgetown Law, which desegregated in 1948, thirty African-Americans were enrolled out of a total 809 law students. Desegregating in 1949, American University Law School had a total of 20 black students enrolled out of a total 229. National University Law School had 9 black students out of a total 176.

At most, then, the Committee noted, perhaps a dozen African-American students would enroll at GW Law School within the first year after desegregation. While it may be true that George Washington Law would pull black students away from the other law schools, including Howard University Law, the
admissions standards at National, American, and Howard were somewhat lower than George Washington's as they only required 3 years of undergraduate study before admission; Georgetown, Catholic, and George Washington required 4. As a result, the Committee noted, it is probable that George Washington would not draw many black students away from National, American, or Howard Universities since many would not be eligible for admission into George Washington.

Compared to the two schools in the same admissions category, Georgetown and Catholic Universities, George Washington Law School had the highest tuition of the three; for full-time students, at Georgetown, tuition was $450 per semester compared to $476 at George Washington. For part-time students, the cost was $340 at George Washington, $320 at Georgetown, and $300 at Catholic. “The number of Negroes annually admitted to The Georgetown and Catholic University Law Schools in recent years has been about 20. Although this number of qualified Negro applicants who would seek admission to this Law School cannot be forecast with precision, it seems clear that the number would be small,” the Committee reported.

The Committee further noted that none of the schools that had recently admitted black students had experienced declines in white enrollments. This possibility is even lower in the District of Columbia as all accredited law schools in the District and in Maryland admitted black students, and, excepting the University of Richmond and Washington and Lee University Law Schools, in Virginia as well. Few deans reported hearing any complaints at all, and only on a scattered and temporary basis.

The main point of the report, the Committee added, was that in truth, less trouble than anticipated accompanied desegregation at all universities that recently underwent the process. The change in policy was smoother and less tumultuous than the deans and administrators had expected. In the classroom and auditorium facilities, white students were permitted to change their seats should they prefer not to sit next to a black student, but very few students exercised this privilege and it was quickly abandoned. Separate toilets and segregated classrooms were
also quickly abandoned due to lack of support.

At The George Washington University, Monroe Hall had been used for classes with black students in them for some of the Air Force contract programs, and had once been used for an "off-campus" Graduate School class that had an emergency change of location. No incidents at all were reported. Likewise, the desegregation of Lisner Auditorium and other public facilities had aroused little opposition among the University community.

In most cases, black students had been admitted without any problems to housing facilities and dormitories that had been all-white facilities prior to the change in policy. At George Washington, this problem would be even more minor, as dormitory facilities for law school students were extremely limited. In addition, black students in the graduate classes and special programs had used the Student Union building, and The George Washington University Hospital admitted black patients. No incidents had yet been reported.

In social and athletic settings, few incidents arose among black students who attended dances or fraternity parties, though some black students chose not to attend certain functions of the bar associations in the deep South. Some schools have a private room or area rented for black students, if necessary, for events at hotels or restaurants. Most schools desegregated their athletic facilities without incident; in fact, among those schools that admitted black students for the first time that tried to maintain desegregation in athletic facilities, protests by white students quickly changed the policies. Turning a whites-only school into a school segregated by race causes more problems among white students than total desegregation.

A number of law schools had reported that African-American students had higher failure rates than white students, according to the Committee. "This was attributed to inferior standards of pre-legal education in many Negro institutions," even those considered to be the top of their class. But as long as the school made "a good faith showing that the faculty attitude was one of sincere desire to help the Negroes," that was as good as they could do. So long as the applicant met the requirements for admission, he
could not be given detrimental treatment on the basis of his or her race. The school should not lower its standards for this new group of students, continuing to admit "only students with high scholastic records."

Finally, the Committee concluded, it was not recommended to permit the enrollment of black students in the graduate programs and not in the undergraduate programs; that is, some sort of partial segregation policy that kept black students out of the general study programs, but permitted their entry in courses not offered by other desegregated schools. The Committee decided that it was not advisable, for instance, to allow black students to compete for a LL.B. degree (Bachelor of Laws), but not for a Master of Laws (LL.M.) or a Doctor of Juridical Science (S.J.D.), which are more advanced degrees. Most importantly, a form of partial desegregation would probably not meet the criteria of the policy adopted by the Association of American Law Schools.

"The admission of Negroes to the Law School will call for careful handling, but it can be handled." The social and academic problems associated with desegregation "can be dealt with successfully by the use of tact, intelligence, and good will." This was the Committee's final recommendation, and the champions of desegregation at George Washington garnered another ally—the Law School administration.31.

It is clear that the University took the change of policy of the AALS very seriously. In a 1952 directive on the admission of Negro students, the Director of Admissions, H.G. Sutton, questioned the school's continuing policy of segregation. While a segregationist himself, his correspondence implies, he was very aware of the social costs of continuing total segregation at the University. It is not clear how much control over he had over admissions policies; there is evidence, however, that several of his recommendations were put into practice.

Sutton wrote that the University should consider admitting several groups of black students: graduate students, limited to exceptional students and those who cannot get desired work at Howard University; black veterans of the Korean War; hospital nurses; and assignees from government departments such as the
Departments of State and Commerce that come to this country for special study. In 1950, before a meeting of the Association of American Colleges, Marvin criticized the accrediting organizations that "interfered" with University administration. Like his criticisms of the American Association of University Professors some years before, Marvin's scorn for Association of American Law Schools as "dominated by" special interests, shocked many in the educational field, including his audience at the Association of American Colleges. The Washington Post printed an editorial soon after, believing his criticism of the AALS to be unjustified. Marvin believed his administration should be kept in the hands of University administrators and free from the dictation of professional organizations.

Debate over the racial policy soon heated up. The question of the admission of black hospital nurses illustrates a glaring loophole in the University's regulations. All hospital nurses, an administrative rule created many years before dictated, had the right to take one free course in the University. That rule had never been amended even with the desegregation of the hospital staff. Records from the George Washington University Archives show at least five African-American women attempted to enroll in classes in the University, but were denied on the basis of their race (and in violation of the administrative policy stated above).

One was Emma Parker, who wished to take Secretarial Studies in the Division of University Students, the non-degree seeking students then still under the deanship of the long-serving Elmer Louis Kayser. Parker had told Sutton, the director of admissions, a statement had been made to all nurses that each could take one free course in the University. Sutton, perhaps realizing that a strong case could be made in her favor, referred her application to President Marvin. If the next case provides any indication, it is unlikely that he took any action.

"We are four professional employees of The George Washington University Hospital," wrote Evelyn Harris, Lorraine Paul, Georgia Morgan, and Charity Jackson, all therapeutic dieticians in the Dietary Department. "On Wednesday, January 302
28, 1953, two of us went to the Office of Admissions to fill out necessary forms for registration for an evening course this semester. After waiting an hour we were informed that the University had an Anti-Negro Policy."

They wished to draw President Marvin's attention to the double standard in the admissions policy. "We are being deprived of an extremely important privilege offered all professional employees of the University," the women told the president. "We were subjected to a cruel form of embarrassment." They asked Marvin's help in closing the loophole.35

Marvin responded courteously to their letter: "I well understand the significance of your letter," he wrote. "There are some problems that take time to work out and the problem which you put before me is one of them. I can say to you that your letter has helped bring the solution of the problem closer, and I ask that you have in mind that I am fully cognizant of the request that is being made, and that I am sympathetic with it." Marvin added that he was sure the problem could be worked out in the near future, and he asked for the women's patience in the meantime.

"I hope the time may be soon at hand when the rules can be changed to meet the problem mentioned," he finished.36

The George Washington University also supposedly permitted black students to take courses not offered by Howard University. The admissions office was inconsistent about this, however. The office had received applications from Howard University students wanting to take graduate courses in Chemistry, but on at least one occasion admission was denied to a very well qualified candidate.

In the spring of 1952, The George Washington University's admissions office received an application from an assistant professor at Howard University who was unable to get a promotion until he received his Ph.D. As a full-time faculty member, however, he was only able to take courses at night. Howard University did not offer Inorganic Chemistry at night, which was the course he needed to take for his degree; George Washington was the only one in the area that did. A letter from the executive officer of the Chemistry Department at George Washington to President
Marvin recognized "that present university policy does not permit his registration here," but the question had never been answered definitively. After discussing it with the Board of Trustees, Marvin answered the question definitively, and denied admission to the Howard University professor. "The only answer we can give at this particular time is that we cannot be of service," Marvin wrote.

About six months later, the admissions office finally released its policy on the admission of black students. First, black students from the four categories listed above should be considered for admission: certain graduate students, veterans, hospital nurses, and students under contract with the federal government. They must be held to the same standard as white students, and they must not be simply applying for the sake of creating publicity. They must not have "communistic ideals." And finally, neither the University nor the student may publicize the acceptance, as the admission is only experimental.

From an administrative standpoint, one other factor contributed to the change in racial policy in mid-1954, when the University formally desegregated. This was the merger of The George Washington University Law School and National University Law School. National University, according to the 1953 Committee report, enrolled nine black students in its law programs—nine more than the Law School at George Washington.

Founded in 1869, National had about 175 students, all of whom, including the black students, were transferred from their previous institution into George Washington without interruption. The assets and debts of National transferred to GW as well, along with a handful of professors. The most important asset was a famous law library, which was transferred to the law library at GW.

It is possible that the issue of segregation held up the merger of the two law schools; National had already desegregated some two years before. On June 30, 1954, George Washington formally desegregated; at the same meeting, the Trustees approved the merger with National University and announced it in the local
press.\textsuperscript{40} The next week, the \textit{Post} reported that the six black students at National University “will be accepted at George Washington on the same basis as other National Law students.” Depending on each student’s qualifications, they were eligible for either a National law degree or a George Washington law degree.\textsuperscript{41}

While the segregation issue was passing around the highest levels of the administration, others in the University community were forcing the issue through different channels. The student body was finding new avenues of protest against the administration’s lack of enthusiasm for a change in racial policy. While the traditional sources of dissent remained intact—the \textit{Hatchet} editorial page was still relentless in its opposition to segregation, for example—the religious student organizations at the University also became wrapped up in the desegregation question.

The George Washington University, although technically nonsectarian, had a strong religious presence on campus throughout much of the twentieth century. One of the staples of University life was the non-sectarian chapel service, though many felt that the service too closely followed a Protestant liturgy. Nonetheless, campus ministries for Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic students, as well as an interfaith Religious Council, had strong membership throughout the 1950s, and chapel services remained popular.

One of the largest religious student groups was the Hillel Foundation of B’nai Brith, the Jewish student ministry and student organization on campus. The director, Irwin Glatstein, was a steadfast supporter of desegregation, and in the month following the \textit{Hatchet} editorials calling for the removal of racial barriers, Glatstein added his voice, and Hillel’s, to the growing opposition. In a letter to the editor of the newspaper, the president of the Hillel student council wrote, “the Hillel Foundation favors the stand against any discrimination at this University,” and will support other organizations that make moves in that direction.\textsuperscript{42}

On January 13, 1950, a report by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency told the world that Marvin had attempted to fire Glatstein
for his opposition to the racial policy and force Hillel off campus. The report claimed that Marvin had spoken wildly of a “Jewish plot” and intimated that the president ordered Glatstein to deny any knowledge of the meeting. The article also alleged that veteran amputees were denied admission to Lisner Auditorium, that a Jewish student—evidently Don Rothenberg—was nearly expelled for protesting the racial policy, that Marvin censured Hillel for bringing certain guest artists to events, and that “Hillel was now in the process of waging a fight with the University’s administration.” A similar rumor, that the University had quotas on Jewish students, floated around for many years, but does not appear to be true.

Marvin did not hear of the accusations until late February when Congressman Arthur Klein, a Democrat of New York, charged Marvin with an “outburst of racial and religious bigotry” when he attempted to fire Irwin Glatstein. Congressman Klein said in a bitter press release he was “sickened” by such a dispute at an institution “which was chartered by Congress over a century ago,” the Star reported.

Marvin promptly denied the charges, noting that he did hold a meeting with Glatstein to clear up the points in the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA) article. Marvin emphasized that relations between Hillel and the University had “at all times been friendly.”

Congressman Klein’s version of events differed from Marvin’s. After Marvin found the JTA article reprinted in other newspapers of the Jewish community, he called Glatstein into his office. “Immediately the wrath of Olympus descended” on Glatstein, Klein said, and Dr. Marvin attempted to fire him.

The community was divided as well. Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld, the national director of the Hillel Foundation, issued a statement of regret “that Mr. Klein, although undoubtedly well intentioned, made serious charges on the floor of Congress without having ascertained the facts from those directly concerned.” The Anti-Defamation League issued a statement calling the charges untrue. The Washington Post reported that Klein’s allegations had “backfired.”
Glatstein spoke up also, insisting that Hillel and the University denied "unequivocally and categorically either the authorship or sanction of the press release sent out by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency under the date of January 13, 1950." Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, said he felt that the charges were "most unfair to a great university and its devoted president."

The writer of the original JTA article, however, Milton Friedman, a former George Washington student, vigorously defended the article. He had in his possession affidavits and sworn depositions "to prove the integrity" of his report. Implying that Hillel officials were being intimidated and pressured not to speak about the administration, he also defended Klein's statements: "I think Representative Klein is to be commended for his fearless and accurate exposé."

Klein did not recant his statements, either. "I have no retraction to make, and intend in the future to continue my exposure of the brutal policies of racism embraced and practiced" by the University, he said. He was "very much surprised" that the Jewish community was not unanimous in its condemnation of Dr. Marvin. According to Klein, Marvin "conducted himself in a pattern reminiscent of the late and unlaunched Herr Dr. Goebbels," referring to a prominent Nazi.

"I admit error on only one point," he added. "I seriously underestimated the depth and the strength of the bigotry of Dr. Marvin's policies." 44

Klein's allegations are not easy to prove. The charges, however, were not new, and many alumni and students passed rumors for years that George Washington University administrators had anti-Semitic tendencies. The most concrete and widespread of these rumors was an alleged quota on Jewish students. No evidence can be found, however, that there was ever a formal quota, and it is impossible to verify now whether an informal quota existed. 45

Hillel was not the only religious student organization to come out against the racial policy. Both the Baptist Student Union and the Newman Club, the Catholic student organization, joined the
Religious Council and other smaller religious entities in condemnation of the racial admissions policy. The president of the Baptist Student Union told editors of the newspaper that at a recent meeting, the members discussed the issue of segregation; "the conclusion at which we arrived is one which openly expresses our favoring a non-segregation policy," the president wrote.

During the week of the Hillel controversy, the University was in the midst of Brotherhood Week, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Marvin wrote a special statement to The Hatchet listing the objectives of Brotherhood Week: a student "will realize that believing in brotherhood and acting in brotherhood are not always the same thing. He will understand what he can do to further the ideals he has held since childhood."

The Week became a time for student leaders to attack the racial policy of segregation. In a statement signed by the student body presidents of American, Catholic, Howard, Georgetown, and George Washington Universities, and the University of Maryland, the student leaders wrote that "all men have the same dignity as children of God, are entitled to the same amount of respect and good will, and to the same opportunities to perfect themselves as human beings without distinction of race, religion, or color."

In March 1950, the culmination of student protest against segregation took place with a Student Council resolution backed by President Charles Chrichton, one of the signers of the Brotherhood Week statement. A report published by the student Committee to Investigate the University's Racial Policy was unanimously passed by the Student Council and sent to the administration and the Board of Trustees. The report insisted, "a change in the university's admissions policy with respect to race is desirable, necessary and practical." The Committee was instituted shortly after the Hatchet editorials were published.

"Injurious effects of segregation to both Negro and white are very real and cannot be discounted," the report read, in an article below a large six-column headline across the front page. "It is quite evident to this committee that segregation has no justification at George Washington University, either morally or ethically," the
A Hatchet editorial accompanied the article, hoping that the Trustees "will take to heart the recommendations of its students and speed up the process of making more democratic the University's admissions policy."48.

The debate also raged among the athletes. In the fall of 1946, the George Washington University football team played Miami University on a date only open because of Miami University's refusal to play a team from Pennsylvania State University that had both white and black members. Most of the other members of the Southern Conference, including North Carolina, Duke, and Clemson, refused to play the whites-only Miami University football team.49.

Dissent from the student body over the actions of the newspaper and the Student Council accompanied all of the bold moves made by the student organizations. One student lamented the "Holy Crusade" undertaken by "the Great God Hatchet and the phenomenally altruistic Student Council" in representing the opinions of only a minority of students. The majority, the student wrote, were in concurrence with the admissions policy. While it is true that the newspaper never commissioned a poll to gauge the opinion of the student body, and, certainly, the paper had misjudged student opinion in the past, a response from the editors to the student's letter indicated that neither the newspaper nor the Council had ever claimed to be acting on behalf of a majority of students. At no time, the editors wrote, had the paper ever represented any opinion "other than its own sentiments."50.

Like it had done every year, at the end of the 1949 to 1950 school year The Hatchet printed its year-in-review article. In it, the editors gave their rationale for printing the desegregation editorials. Believing desegregation to be inevitable, the paper had received support from numerous alumni, students, faculty, and civic officials, heartened by the fact that a change in the admissions policy seemed so close. Throughout all the discussions and debates on the subject that ran in the editorial pages, in student forums, in petitions and letters, and in the city newspapers, what gave the editors the greatest satisfaction was
when a student said, "Don’t know whether you guys are right or wrong, but we’ve thought about the problem more than ever before after reading your editorials."51.

If the editorials had achieved anything at all, they certainly set into motion a series of events that mobilized the student body and encouraged faculty members, administrators, and alumni into at least an awareness of the glaring inequality between the whites-only schools and the desegregated schools. They had several more years to wait, to be sure, but together their voices made desegregation not only possible, but inevitable.

*The University desegregates*

On June 30, 1954, immediately after voting to approve the merger of National University and George Washington Law School, the Board of Trustees raised the issue of race in the admissions policy for the final time. President Marvin issued his report to the Board, detailing the events of the past several months. Earlier that day, the tenured faculty voted 83 to 4 to change the admissions policy. Coupled with the report of the Law School committee and the threatened loss of government contracts to institutions that practiced segregation, Marvin noted that the University has certain social obligations if the University was to maintain its leadership in the community. He later wrote, "in light of the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court, in light of our holding a Federal Charter, and in light of our relationship to governmental departments through contracts, it was felt that we could not lag behind the new social front that is establishing itself."52.

Chairman Robert Fleming told the Board that should the University relax its admissions policy, every person admitted still must meet the institution’s scholastic standards. This should be made clear at the time of admissions, he said.

Trustee Charles Tompkins, after whom Tompkins Hall of Engineering was named in the last major building project of the Marvin administration, asked whether standards could be
maintained. He questioned the scholastic validity of the credentials of historically black universities.

In response, Chairman Fleming told the Board that he had every confidence that Marvin and the faculty would not let the academic standards of the University be compromised. Then, he added that if the Board did not open its admissions policy, there would be grave danger of public pressure, and of course the loss of government contracts, which had, in the years after the war and continuing into the 1950s, proved crucial to the University's endowment and prestige.

President Marvin recommended no action be taken at that time in order to appoint a committee to study the implications of a change in policy. The Trustees decided unanimously, however, to draft a final statement officially changing the admissions policy of the University:

In accordance with The George Washington University's long established policy of seeking to meet the changing needs of the American community, it accepts as students, without regard to race, all who are able to profit by the educational service it extends, as made manifest by their meeting its admission requirements and maintaining its standards of scholarship.

Marvin had his doubts about the policy change, however, noting in an open letter to University staff, "I do not think that with the change in admission policy there will be many differences in the way our student body is made up." He added that Robert Bolwell, the Chairman of the Graduate Council and former dean of the Summer Sessions, has had the authority to accept "certain persons," meaning black students, into the graduate school of arts and sciences, but none had even applied. "I think our standards of admission and the high expectancy of our classroom work will deter many," Marvin added.

Released to the press on July 8, the same day that a letter noting the change in policy was sent to all staff members, the
admissions policy change captured front-page headlines in The Evening Star. “The action by GWU means that all major colleges and universities in the Washington area have dropped race bans,” the Star reported. “Although the memorandum from Dr. Marvin to his deans and department heads carried no time element, school spokesmen said the first opportunity for colored students to enroll would be during the September 23 and 24 registration for the fall term.”

Marvin received one congratulatory letter of note, from Arthur B. Caldwell, a graduate of George Washington. Caldwell would become famous the following year when he became the primary force within the executive branch pushing to send the National Guard to the Arkansas school system in order to enforce desegregation. A native Arkansan, Caldwell was the chief of the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice.

Since assuming his position in the Justice Department, he told Marvin, he had “become acutely aware of many of the problems growing out of racial difficulties and while you may have a few protests from other graduates, permit me to assure you that I, for one, heartily support you in this move.” He added, “Racial prejudice, like other ‘imaginary horribles,’ is wholly inconsistent with the facts of life and has no place in the makeup of a mature and educated individual.”

Marvin replied that the University had been attempting to change the racial policy for many years. “Now we have wiped out the last vestige of prejudice,” he wrote. The president added that he did not believe the University should provide “special racial benefits” to black students, noting that the Supreme Court decisions had eviscerated discrimination on the basis of race.

The following fall, the University opened with no restrictions on the basis of race. A Hatchet editorial proclaimed that its long-held wish had come true: “The Hatchet, as an organ of student opinion, has been a strong advocate of racial integration, and it is with gratification that we welcome this long-awaited stance.” While it is true that George Washington remained virtually entirely white for several years after the policy change and didn’t make efforts to attract black students until well after the conclusion of Dr.
Marvin’s presidency, the change was symbolic of something greater.59

However small a victory the decision of the Trustees was, it nonetheless opened a new era in the history of George Washington. It proved that a University community could, indeed, come together to make as important a change as desegregation. It also proved that the old order was slowly dying out, that the segregationist stand of many of the University’s administrators, including Marvin, was neither popular nor legitimate.

The old order was slowly dying. Many changes took place, and not just in the social relations front. The method of organization and governance that Marvin had slowly and painstakingly created over the years was slowly being dismantled. During the early 1950s, the University had expanded so much that the president’s method of personal control over University life was becoming too cumbersome. A reorganization of the administration was inevitable.
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Dr. Marvin's administration is typically remembered for two major trends: first, the rapid expansion of the University physically and academically, and second, the personal control over the University's functions in the office of the President. Marvin's reorganization of the University had been remarkably successful and amazingly complete. Soon after he had entered office, he immediately began reducing the power of deanships that had been to that point semi-autonomous and very powerful, and imposed an entirely new system that made the power and responsibilities more vertical—with the President's Office, not faculty committees, councils of deans, or powerful department heads, at the very top. It is little exaggeration to say that every directive, every policy change, every order and clarification and mere recommendation, passed over his desk. And although he had a long-serving and industrious secretary, Myrna Sedgewick, by his side every day, it was inevitable that it should become too much for one man, even with her firm grasp of every detail.

The two trends existed side by side for many years, especially in the war years and immediately after hostilities had ended. The dissent among the students, faculty, and alumni that had bubbled over in the peace strikes and culminated in the Martha Gibbon Affair, had passed. This dissent did not die out, even as the specter of war became war itself; it merely found other effective ways of presenting itself, adapting as it did to the new realities that confronted each generation of college students. The student publications, the Student Council, and the religious student groups comprised a formidable front when the time warranted.

Marvin's administration was still strong and secure, but his personal power had begun to wane. He had been able to virtually remake the entire bureaucracy with the loyal, and sometimes
blind, support of the Trustees. But his office did more than simply remake and govern a vastly expanding University. Marvin was responsible for negotiating and implementing government contracts, for planning the purchase of land and the construction of buildings, for fundraising and managing the budget, and for performing his personal duties in the War Department and in various other positions.

As Elmer Louis Kayser points out, in later years his relationship to most of the University was purely fiscal. Gone were the days when he would review teachers' credentials and personally recommend them for promotion or termination. Relations with the faculty, as a result, improved. Except for the occasional reprimand of a student organization, he was far removed from student life, save those few times a year when he would speak at convocation or formal ceremonies. In his early years, he held "smokers" with fraternities or sports teams; he was accessible and visible to the vast majority of the student body. Even during and after the war years, he held events for veterans and took a personal role in veterans' life on campus, doing a great deal to assist in their reintegration into the University community.

By the time Eisenhower was reelected in 1956, Marvin was nearly seventy years old, and about the only times he could be seen on campus by the students was when he walked to and from his office. His approach to the faculty became more "hands-off," and faculty committees and meetings were mere formalities. In reality, his policy of centralization had begun to crumble, at least so far as academics was concerned. The deans had acquired much of their old stature back, with wide leeway to use the budget that Marvin and the Trustees had delegated to each school. "Centralization had broken down through the utter impossibility for one man to carry on his shoulders the whole burden of central administration," Kayser remembers.

Dr. Marvin seemed to realize the changing functions of the University as he proposed the creation of an administrative level immediately below the Office of the President. Starting soon after the conclusion of the war, Major General Ulysses S. Grant III, a Trustee of the University and veteran of the U.S. Army, was
chosen and elected the first Vice-President of the University, a position he held from 1946 to 1951. Under his direction, a new spurt of buildings were constructed and opened, including Lisner Auditorium, James Monroe Hall, and the University Hospital, among the constant activity in remodeling apartment buildings as dormitories, assembling real estate, and constructing smaller structures. Grant had extensive experience in urban development as chairman of the National Park and Planning Commission, though while in the position he conflicted with a number of African-American advocacy organizations involving the redevelopment of certain low-income properties in the city.  

In addition to the appointment of a vice-president, Marvin also appointed Henry W. Herzog, the comptroller, to be comptroller and treasurer, putting him in charge of all business-related aspects of the University. Vice-Admiral Oswald Symister Colclough, the dean of the Law School, was appointed Dean of Faculties, and given responsibility over the library and various other academic units of the University. He was to serve as acting president in the absence of a president. As Marvin began shifting duties to others, it became clear that his administration was coming to a close.

Marvin had loomed so large in University life for so many years that it is entirely impossible to overstate his legacy and his contribution to the school. He was the nerve center of the University, the brain of the sprawling body. When it would come time for his retirement, the responsibility that rested on the shoulders of the Trustees was very significant and not easily discharged.

But the time for his retirement had not yet come, as the mid-1950s progressed. His lengthy saga was not yet at an end.

In late 1956, while Hungarian refugees were fleeing the invading Soviet army, several stories in the local press reported that Dr. Marvin had made statements threatening academic freedom and the free exercise of religion. After a speech before the Washington Ministerial Union, Marvin revealed that The George Washington University would not hire a teacher who did not believe in God. "As a matter of policy," he told the Union, "we
do not have anyone teaching who does not have faith in God. This means we have a dedicated staff."

The Post reported in a front-page article that, in line with this policy, the University had fired a science teacher because he was an acknowledged atheist, though, according to Marvin, an "able scientist." The Star reported the policy in slightly less obnoxious terms; the paper wrote that a University professor had been allowed to leave because he could not profess faith in a divine being.

"Eight or nine months ago, the question came up as to whether this man should stay on," Marvin said at the meeting. "The decision was reached that he couldn't be a good teacher of science without faith, and so he went to another institution." Marvin later said that the professor had been teaching at the University for three or four years and had recently suffered a series of family crises, including divorce from his wife and alienation from his son. The teacher had lost contact with "the basic spiritual things" in life.

"He was a man that's gone all to pieces psychologically," Marvin added, noting that he always informally asked the general spiritual beliefs of candidates for positions, but he never inquired into specifics about one's religious denomination or patterns of worship.

"I don't think an agnostic has much to offer young people. How can a man teach without faith?" the devout Presbyterian president asked the assembly. He insisted, however, that he would never expel a student who expressed atheistic beliefs, nor did he feel like academic freedom at the University was threatened, ironically asserting that his "record here of 30 years [stands] as argument against any infringement of academic freedom."

Both the presidents of Georgetown University, Rev. Edward Bunn, and American University, Dr. Hurst Anderson, affirmed that their faculties did not include atheists, and that their policies including a prohibition against hiring people "unsympathetic to the church," according to Anderson. The administrations of Georgetown, a Catholic Jesuit institution, and American, affiliated
with the Methodist Church, wholeheartedly supported Marvin's position, according to the Star. The presidents of Howard University and the University of Maryland both told the paper that their hiring practices did not include a religious litmus test of any kind.²

Immediately after the publication of the Post article, Marvin wrote a letter to all faculty members at the University, denouncing the "annoying article" in the daily newspaper. He was simply telling the Washington Ministerial Union that all faculty members had faith in God, and added an anecdote about one faculty member, who said he had no faith in anything, that his life was breaking underneath him, and that he questioned whether he should continue as a teacher. Marvin indicated to the professor that he should not.

"I regret that any words of mine might cause any member of the institution any perplexity, for the policies of this institution have not changed one whit from the pledges we have given one another throughout the past years," Marvin told the faculty.³

Dr. A. Powell Davies, a prominent liberal Unitarian minister called Marvin's remarks "undemocratic" and "blasphemous." Marvin later told the Star in an interview that he had not meant to imply that the university had a policy against hiring atheists. "I meant only that we wouldn't hire a teacher who didn't have faith in something. I wish there was a word in English to express it," he said.

Most ironically, the incident occurred during Religion in Life Week at George Washington, sponsored by the Religious Council, the Department of Religion, and the Faculty Committee on Religious Life, for the purpose of celebrating religion in University life. The most anticipated of the events, the Hatchet editors announced, was the annual Skeptic's Hour, planned by the Religious Council along with a variety of lectures and discussion groups for Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant students. An editorial acclaimed the upcoming Skeptic's Hour, for "it is here the 'doubter' may express himself freely and argue intellectually on any aspect of his faith." A variety of inter-faith dialogues accompanied the Skeptic's Hour.⁴
Marvin's harshest critic on the episode, however, was a student who penned her complaint to the *Hatchet*. "I fear that Dr. Marvin, like Samson, has pulled down the walls of the temple around his head," she wrote, noting the dangerous implications of his remarks, with uniquely inappropriate timing during Religion in Life Week. Noting that the following week was Thanksgiving, she compared the flight of Pilgrims from religious persecution to the religious litmus test proposed by Marvin to determine fitness for a job. Surely, she asserted, atheism and agnosticism are both, to their followers, a religion in the broadest sense of the term. Religious freedom is guaranteed to protect the rights of the minority, not the majority; it is guaranteed to protect the rights of those beliefs that offend us.

"If we submit silently to this discrimination, where will it end?" she rhetorically asked. "Tomorrow Catholics, the next day Jews; then one by one the various sects of the Protestant Church may be banned, until finally we have a 'pure' faculty, composed strictly of believers in the One True Church—of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin."

Had atheists or agnostics really done harm to the integrity of the institution? Most students did not abandon their religious upbringing upon their exposure to atheism or agnosticism, and it was crude to think the students to be so immature. Students are not "of such weak stuff intellectually that one good non-believer piping his tune like the Pied Piper can lead us all astray." The ministers in the audience during Marvin's speech must have been discouraged indeed to know that the presence of one non-believer on the faculty could erase all the work they had accomplished in trying to instill religion their congregations.

In fact, the student argued, it was good that there should be at least one non-believer on the faculty, in order to present diversity of opinion. "Only by being exposed to opposing ideas can we try and test the bases of our conclusions," she added.

"In recent weeks, we have all been applauding the blows struck in Hungary for religious and intellectual freedom, and wishing we could help." she concluded, harshly. "Perhaps we can. The battle in the streets of Budapest must also be fought on G street [sic]."
It was little wonder that questions about academic freedom again arose after the incident. Marvin's long and tumultuous relationship with professional associations that protected faculty tenure and academic freedom began decades previously and continued intermittently throughout his administration. Marvin was able to deflect some of these criticisms by correlating the professor's views or activities with certain outside organizations that were attempting to interfere with academic freedom on campus—in essence, violating the academic freedom of a professor with Communist sympathies in order to protect the academic freedom of the faculty members of an institution who had the right to be free from Communist influence. It was a matter of semantics, and Marvin often came out ahead.

After the Martha Gibbon incident, where Marvin painted an assistant professor of English as a Communist, causing many at the time to protest her academic freedom was violated, Marvin wrote to the faculty, "It has always been my endeavor—I hope that it always shall be—to keep the University free. I do not believe that outside groups or organizations should be permitted to encroach upon the educational policies of the University." Permitting faculty members with Communist sympathies to teach at the University, he implied, violated the academic integrity of the institution as a whole.

A similar circumstance arose in late 1946, after the Lisner incident. After Marvin attempted to expel a student for protesting Lisner's segregationist policies, some patrons questioned openly his attitudes toward faculty who opposed the racial policy as well, no doubt aggravated later by the articles appearing in the local press that the president had attempted to fire the Hillel director, Irwin Glatstein. The pressure became so heavy that the George Washington University chapter of the AAUP had to pass a resolution defending Marvin. The resolution held that,

1. In no way has the administration attempted to interfere with an instructor's freedom in investigation or freedom of exposition of his own subject in the classroom or in addresses
2. There has been no interference with an instructor’s freedom of speaking and writing as a citizen on matters beyond the scope of his own field of study.\textsuperscript{7}

_Hatchet_ nemesis Ruth Atwell, the secretary of the AAUP chapter, sent a copy to Marvin. In response, he wrote, “I hope that some day I shall be able to tell the faculties the details of the problem that has caused certain adverse, as well as commendatory criticism of the University.” The administration kept such a tight lid on the criticisms involving academic freedom that not even the members of the AAUP chapter, in voting confidence in President Marvin, were permitted to know about the specific criticisms.\textsuperscript{8}

Ten years later, in December 1956, the question arose again after Marvin allegedly let a professor go because he no longer had faith in God. This time, a strong defense of President Marvin came from the unlikeliest of sources: _The University Hatchet_, the student newspaper.

“Two weeks ago today a very serious question was raised by the press of this city in regard to a statement made by the president of our University,” the editors wrote. With a poll conducted among the faculty and student leaders, the paper attempted to determine the answer to a very important question: “Is there academic freedom at the University?”

With quotes from ten different professors printed in the editorial, the editors felt the evidence spoke for itself; all the professors interviewed believed not only that academic freedom was alive and prosperous at the University, but also that George Washington remained among the freest universities in the country. Never had a single one been asked his or her religious affiliation. Never had one felt threatened because of his or her religion.

“We do not believe that a professor would be forced to leave the University only because of disbelief in a greater force which controls and directs the world about him,” the editors wrote sharply. The professor in question asked to be released from his 324
contract; his faith may have been a factor, but the reason he left was because he no longer felt able to teach. The Hatchet editors concluded on a strong and, in light of past events, ironic note: “We know there is an academic freedom which is the life blood of our institution and we defy any person to find a way in which this freedom has been challenged in the past 30 years.”

The end of an era was approaching. “The veteran student is gradually disappearing from the American campus,” The Hatchet announced. Veterans had been accused of a variety of ills, including “dragging down scholastic standings” and “sponging off the taxpayer,” and many people have remarked that things would one day return to “normal.” Yet, the editors rebuked, veteran students on campus have made better grades, done more research, and taken advantage of opportunities in lectures and laboratories. The combination of vocational training and cultural education would make veterans into more intelligent, constructive citizens.

“Normalcy” appears to be returning, the editors wrote, as non-veteran high school graduate enrollment at George Washington was enrolling. It will not be easy for these new students to match the mature attitude of the veteran students. Surely, the youthful and eager curiosity that high school students possess enrich the educational life a great deal. “Yet, it will undoubtedly be difficult for them,” the editors concluded. “They will have no small task in living up to the standards and accomplishments of their predecessors: the now vanishing veterans.”

Marvin as well commented on the changes to the student body in the post-war years. The average student has become more mature, in ability as well as age, over the preceding two decades. The standards for acceptance were much higher as well, and the University was more secure in its neighborhood. In the early 1930s, the decision of the Board of Trustees to keep the University in Foggy Bottom had not yet been firmly made, and much talk ensued privately among the Trustees of moving the school to the outer parts of the city or suburbs. With Marvin’s building frenzy, however, the decision became a fait accompli, and
The George Washington University was firmly rooted in its present neighborhood, not far from where the first United States President officially chose for the creation of a university as enumerated in his last will.

During the early 1930s, Marvin made a tour of famous European universities to help answer the question of a permanent location for the University, studying the location of the institutions relative to the population centers. The results of the trip confirmed Dr. Marvin's view that the University should stay in its present location and battle the streets of downtown Washington, DC, rather than uproot to a new location. In fact, Kayser writes, it was not until as late as 1955 that the question of The George Washington University's permanent location was settled, with the approval of the University's urban renewal project, a long-term plan for expansion. With the approval of the District of Columbia Land Development Agency, in conjunction with the Treasurer of the University, Henry Herzog, in 1955, the location of the University became at last permanent.

With the rapid expansion of the student body, the school bureaucracy became increasingly unwieldy, and Marvin's monopoly on administrative functions began to slip. Registration at the beginning of the school year often resulted in long lines and floods of paperwork. The newspaper complained that the Business Office did not act quickly enough on requests and reimbursements for student activities, often missing deadlines. The Registrar's Office, where all of a student's permanent records were held, became overburdened with work.

Two editorials from The Hatchet in 1950 and 1956 show the decline, over time, of the effectiveness of the Registrar in keeping pace with an increasing student enrollment. "One of the smoothest-running, efficient parts of the University's administrative machinery is the Registrar's Office at grade-time," the editors wrote in 1950. Most grade reports were in the mail only forty-eight hours after the student's last final exam was taken.

Just six years later, on the close of the Marvin era, those congratulations had turned into accusations. "Why, if the system is so well set up and functions so properly, are records constantly
being mixed up?” the editors asked. “Why does mail for two students with similar last names but totally different first names always get sent to the wrong person?” The editors complained about misspellings, omissions, incomplete lists, misplaced files, duplications, and a variety of errors easily eschewed by simply double-checking.

“We are not concerned with the method used to keep our records,” the editors concluded, “only its efficiency. We want to know that our records are correct, that no one’s ‘D’ has been substituted for our ‘B’ and that when the time comes for job-hunting our record will be as good or as bad as we have made it—not as good or bad as the Registrar’s Office has made it.”

It was impossible, of course, for an administration as long and controversial as Cloyd Heck Marvin’s to end quietly. In his last months of office, Marvin did what was now a tired routine: he suppressed a literary magazine and a radio station, despite evidence that ample resources were available to cover costs and that both media were financially self-sufficient.

In late October 1958, during Marvin’s final semester at George Washington, WRGW, a campus radio station, petitioned for recognition. Initially called WGW during its first months, the Hatchet editors announced on October 21 that Stuart Gelber, the student spearheading the project, was holding an informational meeting the following night. Students interested in technical work, script writing, or a variety of other position were invited to come discuss the proposal. Planned presentations included recording from football and basketball games, concerts and events in Lisner Auditorium, and interviews by prominent faculty members. Such presentations “would serve as excellent publicity for the University,” the editors wrote, giving the prospect of a George Washington University radio station their whole-hearted support.

Equipment was not a problem; a control room in the Speech Department could adequately provide for the proposed radio station, Gelber said. The Hatchet editors added that perhaps a Department of Radio and Television was in the future. Surveys of students showed that the idea of a radio station was immensely
"Time is of the essence!" said Gelber, in pushing to get the station on the air. "Starting a radio station is like getting a tiger by the tail." Students working on the radio station were divided into three groups: programming, engineering, and business. Students on the programming committee planned programs and scripts for broadcasting; the engineering committee worked on planning the technical aspects, including the purchase of a transmitter for $750; and students in the business field considered accounting procedures and directed publicity, followed up by the solicitation of advertising. One member from each committee will assist with the creation of a constitution for the organization, a requirement for all student groups.  

The students tentatively set the date of December 1 as the premier broadcasting date. The radio station quickly won the approval of the Student Council and the Student Life Committee, placing powerful student groups and faculty members on the side of the radio station.  

The semester was a particularly active one at the University. A renewed cultural interest swept campus in the fall of 1958. A jazz movement of sorts began, with bands around campus forming, including one called the Dixieland Band. Students proposed adding a course in jazz history to the curriculum, holding jazz concerts in Lisner, and promoting jazz music around campus. With the prospect of having a University-sponsored radio station, a nightly jazz program and interviews on jazz history and culture seemed attainable goals.  

Between rehearsals for "Guys and Dolls" and the first male cheerleaders joining the sports team, student life at the University had greatly revived from even just ten years before when the surplus of older students, many of them veterans and with families, as well as part-time, night, and commuter students, depressed student life for a number of years. At the dawn of the 1960s, student life was already at a level unmatched in earlier years. For the first time, fraternities and sororities did not dominate the social life of the University. They were important players, to be sure, and would remain so for about the next 328
decade, but gradually their dominance came to pass. In the late 1960s, the University forced the whites-only fraternities and sororities to shut their doors, effectively leading to a collapse of the fraternity system on campus.

"For the past several years at George Washington University, there has been a growing realization of the failure of students to utilize to the fullest capacity the numerous educational, cultural, aesthetic and scientific opportunities and facilities available in the Washington area," one Hatchet journalist wrote at the beginning of the Fall 1958 semester. The cultural revival led to the creation of the GW Cultural Committee, a special committee of the Student Council, to assist with the publicity and planning of cultural events on campus. Among the Committee's greatest success: acquiring tickets to events at the National Symphony Orchestra and the National Theatre at reduced student rates. In September, a traveling exhibit sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), made its first American appearance at the University library. Seventy-two watercolors and reproductions were on display, largely European artists such as Paul Cézanne, but including several works from the Far East.

With the support of the GW Cultural Committee, an editorial board formed to publish a literary publication, an endeavor not pursued since The Colonial Review in 1951. The magazine, later named The Potomac, sought short stories, essays, humor articles, critical reviews, translations, poetry, and graphic art. A project of the Writer's Club, the literary magazine sought to complement the Club's other activities, especially workshops assisting student writers who were seeking publication for their work.

In late November, the administration took drastic action to prevent approval of either the literary magazine or the radio station. On November 21, the administration gave WRGW (still called WGW at this time) a thumbs-down. An assistant to President Marvin gave The Hatchet a statement detailing the reasons. First, the administration was not assured that the radio station would be financially self-sufficient; second, the administration felt that there was not enough student support for
the radio station despite the fact that with over 60 student members it was one of the largest organizations on campus; and third, the administration was concerned about the competency of student leadership.

Stuard Gelber, the station’s manager, was shocked. His reaction was “one of disbelief” upon hearing the administration’s decision, The Hatchet wrote. He vowed to continue fighting, and arranged an appointment with President Marvin to try to change his mind. “I feel that the administration has no possible grounds upon which to deny us the ability to transmit,” Gelber said. “And when we get to talk to the president, I think that he will change his mind and grant us approval.”

In fact, WRGW had encountered some lucky breaks in its first few months of life. Instead of buying a transmitter, students in the School of Engineering built one and donated it to the radio station. A record shop and several individuals offered the station financial backing. Rent was free, since the students were using existing facilities at the University. The only cost involved was the same cost required to power six 100-watt light bulbs, to provide the electrical power to the transmitter.

The radio station had sixty members, all of whom had donated $1 in dues to the station, but membership could climb to 150, Gelber believed, which would make the radio station the largest student-run group on campus by quite some margin. An engineering professor told Gelber that it would cost fifty dollars maximum to put the radio station on the air. Even more importantly, other student groups sought radio station programming for their own events; the Engineering Council felt that a program on WRGW would tie them into the rest of the University. The International Relations Club felt that the radio station facilities would provide a worthwhile medium to broadcast events such as mock trial.

The station had a great deal of student interest, and it was felt that audiences in the dormitories, fraternity and sorority houses, and campus audiences would provide a sufficient listening base. “I wonder why, if 150 other college radio stations can stay on the air, that the University cannot do the same,” Gelber said, noting
that content would be non-controversial and non-editorial.\textsuperscript{18}

The \textit{Hatchet} editors were incredulous at the University's actions and aghast at the reasoning provided by the administration. According to administrators, "enough student support and competent student leadership is not present. These two reasons are by far the most unbelievable," the editors wrote. "If the administration has kept any tabs on the radio station's progress the administration should realize that more people are supporting the station than any other organization on campus. Radio meetings have attracted up to 100 people and many more have given their support."\textsuperscript{18}

Although the administration abandoned the idea of a radio station, WRGW did not die. Rather, commissioned by the board of the Student Union building to broadcast in the Union building itself, the station hoped that the small broadcasts would warm the administration to recognition at a later date. Many local news and sports broadcasters and disk jockeys had volunteered to speak at workshops and on the air. One show with an NBC broadcaster was scheduled, as were morning prayers, University news, and light music in the morning, sports broadcasts in the afternoon, and student organizations and campus personalities appearing on air in the evening. Students could go to the Student Union building to hear the radio shows. WRGW had bigger plans in mind, however, and with letters of support from college radio stations around the country, sought to make real the dream of broadcasting on open air.\textsuperscript{20}

The literary magazine, \textit{The Potomac}, had met with a similar fate, as administrators postponed recognition indefinitely, stalling plans for publication, but not deterring the staff from reviewing material for future use. But the fortunes of both the literary magazine and the radio station were about to change.

Dr. Marvin's retirement had been expected; the previous March he notified the Trustees, who began the long and difficult task of finding a replacement for the president. On December 12, 1958, the Board of Trustees announced that Marvin's resignation had been accepted, effective January 28, 1959. Vice-Admiral
Oswald Colclough, the dean of faculties and former dean of the Law School, would serve as acting president while the Board searched for a successor.

Becoming President Emeritus, Marvin moved into a permanent office on the fifth floor of the library and left for England for the spring. His wife had long wanted to study 16th and 17th century England, her favorite subject, and he needed to reorient himself in his new position, he concluded.21

"For his spirit which has guided us we will always be thankful," the Hatchet editors wrote of him. "Our University and all that we have found here, our freedom of expression and of acquiring knowledge, will always remain an integral part of our lives." The newspaper listed Marvin’s remarkable achievements in office: "During President Marvin’s administration enrollment has tripled, University endowments have increased nine and one-half times and actual physical properties, such as buildings, have increased almost eighteen times." The paper also, shockingly, praised Marvin’s respect for freedom of the press, noting that one of his first actions in office was to remove the paper from faculty control. In truth, however, at no time did the paper suffer more than under Dr. Marvin’s presidency and the dictate of the Publications Committee to whom he gave the responsibility of oversight.

The editors also gave warm praise to Colclough, the former commanding officer of the battleship North Carolina, a graduate of the United States Naval Academy and The George Washington University Law School, and naval veteran of both world wars. A diplomat, scholar, and soldier, Colclough served on the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, was appointed Judge Advocate General of the Navy, and chaired the District of Columbia Juvenile Court Advisory Committee. "Acting President Colclough, may the University go on to greater heights through your knowledge and experience," the editors praised.22

In an interview with editors, Colclough made his plans known; he was interested in improving the law center and medical school, expanding classroom facilities, and completing the long-term
urban renewal plan that had caused severe opposition against the University from neighborhood residents. The residents had filed suit, and the case was still languishing in court.23.

On January 28, 1959, Marvin had his last meeting with the faculty before he retired. At a ceremony held in Lisner Auditorium, Marvin was made President Emeritus. During his closing remarks to the audience, Marvin presented Colclough with a copy of the 1821 Congressional Charter, a gavel made of wood taken from the White House restoration during Harry Truman's term in office, and a master key to all offices at the University. Briefly summarizing his administration through economic depression, financial panic, the threat of war and then war itself, the uncertainties of the Cold War, social revolution on the domestic front, and the struggle for democracy on the international front, Marvin told the audience that periods of stress, like these “activate men's minds. They create needs to be filled, and challenging opportunities to be met. "And what of tomorrow?" he questioned. "Quien sabe? (Who knows?)" Mrs. Marvin had remarked before the ceremony that his retirement was “the start of a new adventure.” But Marvin said only that retirement meant that for the first time in decades, he could sit at the breakfast table in the morning long enough to let his coffee get home.24.

With that, the longest and most personal presidency in the history of the school came to an end.

For the radio station and the literary magazine, Marvin's resignation came at an opportune time and, though they were snubbed before, both appealed for recognition from Acting President Colclough. At two-thirty in the afternoon on March 4, the Publications Committee listened to The Potomac's official bid for University recognition. The magazine had secured donations from student organizations, group subscriptions from several fraternities, and advertising from several of the neighborhood bookstores and restaurants. The issue planned to run about 40 pages for a total print run cost of around $200 for between 500 and 700 copies, with the final cost dependent on the amount of artwork in the magazine.25.
The Publications Committee gave unanimous approval to the publication of the first issue of The Potomac, with the approval of future issues resting on student reaction to the first. Dr. Linton, now the dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, was still also the chairman of the committee that he had headed for years. He passed on the approval to the administration.\textsuperscript{26}

In May, it was reported that the magazine had sold out its first edition. The magazine received a warm response from the student body, especially the artwork. "The artwork (sic) was tremendous and the highlight of the magazine," said one student. "I hope that the students will give The Potomac support, and that more interest will be generated in the magazine."\textsuperscript{27}

By mid-May, WRGW also received administrative approval to go on the air after nearly two semesters of seeking University support. Max Farrington, an assistant to the President, told The Hatchet how he had initially expressed disbelief that the radio station could get on the air without any money from the University, but two professors convinced Farrington that the goal was not only possible, but likely. When Farrington realized that the radio station was not merely wishful thinking, he agreed to speak with Dr. Marvin about it. Several weeks later, Dr. Marvin gave the radio station the thumbs down and refused to even speak with the students involved in the enterprise about resurrecting it.

The station's leaders continued planning and training, hoping that the President would change his mind. At the end of January, Marvin resigned, and Colclough promptly agreed to meet with the student leaders of the radio station. The Acting President made minor changes to WRGW's constitution, but gave it his approval late in the semester. Because of the delay, a number of difficulties arose, including the fact that the fall and spring schedules had to be almost entirely cancelled. But the long-sought approval had been won, and WRGW was able to officially broadcast around campus.\textsuperscript{28}

On April 28, 1969, at age 79, Marvin died at home after a long illness. An obituary in the major newspapers detailed the life of The George Washington University's longest-serving president. 334
His lengthy career, though it certainly had stormy incidents, was one of accomplishment. Marvin had served on educational committees, on diplomatic delegations, and in appointed civilian posts in the War Department. Lloyd Elliott, a later president of George Washington, was quoted in The Hatchet after Marvin's death: “all of us and all who will come after us will be forever indebted to Dr. Marvin.” His legacy was too large to comprehend.

It was a simple ending to a long and accomplished life. He was buried in Oak Hill Cemetery in Georgetown, in a University-owned lot.
Notes on Chapter 7: “The Administration’s Final Years”

One day in the months following Marvin’s death, his widow, Dorothy Betts Marvin, made an appointment to see the new president of The George Washington University, Lloyd H. Elliott. Elliott enjoyed Mrs. Marvin’s company, and welcome though she was at any time, he saw her rarely. She had remained very interested in University life and the Elliott’s development and expansion of both the academic life and the physical construction of the school, even after her husband’s death. Little did the new president know that she was interested in various options for a large donation to the University.

After pulling a dog-eared brochure out of her purse that listed several gift opportunities at the University, Mrs. Marvin asked him, “Now, Dr. Elliott, if I understand this correctly, $1 million will name the student center.”

“Yes, Mrs. Marvin, that is correct,” Elliott responded.

She then asked if anyone had yet donated the half million dollars it would take to name the theater on the main floor of the student center. Elliott assured her no one had. She immediately responded, “I would like to take both of the gifts.” She would name the student center for her husband and name the theater in the memory of her mother and her mother’s sisters.

The lively Mrs. Marvin was not a wealthy woman, and though Elliott appreciated her generosity, he was skeptical that she had the money with which to donate $1.5 million to The George Washington University. A few days later, however, she returned, and, in Elliott’s office on the top floor of Rice Hall, Dorothy Marvin signed over $1,445,000 worth of stock certificates to the University. The rest of the commitment was covered from other sources.

It turned out that she had inherited $100,000 in the 1940s and, after researching the investment possibilities, had decided to
buy stock in Xerox, a small company based in Rochester, New York. Over the ensuing years, the small investment had made handsome profits.

In this way, the student center became the Cloyd Heck Marvin Center, and the theater adjoining the Center became the Dorothy Betts Marvin Theatre. After the opening in Lisner Auditorium in February 1971 and the disruption that took place during the ceremony, it was not long before the incidents were forgotten and the Marvin Center became the center of student life on campus. Today housing an impressive array of dining facilities, conference rooms, administrative offices, and a game room, the center is an integral part of University life and a fitting memorial to the man whose vision set the University on a path toward greatness.

Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin’s term as president coincided with a dramatic shift nationwide in educational philosophy that altered how universities were governed and how students and administrators interacted. The era of the *in loco parentis* doctrine, where school administrators operated in place of parents, was slowly coming to an end. All over the country, politically aware students were challenging long-held regulations that curbed the rights of students to free speech, free assembly, and privacy. Whereas school administrators had acted before as judge, jury, and executioner when it came to enforcing school regulations, a trend developed toward a more democratic system of hearings and appeals with student and faculty input. Universities began permitting students to organize and form political groups. The old regulations requiring students to attend class and enforcing a dress code were discarded. Student government began holding real power. The student press and student publications took a large step toward independence, away from the censors and faculty advisors that had overseen them for many years.

The *laissez-faire* doctrine was replacing the *in loco parentis* doctrine, and university administrators around the country were beginning to allow students to operate and make decisions on their own. *In loco parentis* had operated for centuries, rooted in
common law, stipulating that school officials had a right, duty, and responsibility to act in place of a parent, including the right to carry out parental powers such as searches and seizures and censorship. Culminating in the *Tinker* decision at the Supreme Court in 1968, the *in loco parentis* doctrine was placed in subservience to the constitutional rights of students. A student could no longer be forced to attend class or dress a certain way, his ideas and associations could not be suppressed, and his personal items could not be searched without probable cause.

The rise of student libertarianism, of the *laissez-faire* doctrine that allowed students to act as they pleased so long as they didn't disrupt the educational environment of the school, became immortalized in the great anti-war demonstrations that swept campus after campus in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Students began organizing, agitating, and making demands in a way they had not done for decades.

These trends took place at George Washington also. The dissent enumerated in the newspaper's editorial page in the 1940s could not compare to the dissent of later years. The non-confrontational 1950s evolved into the controversial 1960s. The end of Marvin's term in office ended not only the longest and most productive administration in the history of the school. It ended an era; it ended a philosophy that had governed the University from its humble beginnings. Although the Marvin Doctrine would dominate for over a year after his resignation in the person of Oswald Colclough, the acting president of The George Washington University and dean of the Law School, who, in many ways, governed in the likeness of Dr. Marvin, the election of Thomas Henry Carroll to the presidency signaled a dramatic shift in the history of the University.¹

At its root, the Marvin Doctrine had two pillars: first, an administrative organization centered around the person of the president, and second, an academic bias toward courses in the sciences and business engineered to make education more productive, efficient, and "business-like." This pillar, which Marvin
called "commercial education," was roundly considered by critics to pander to a one-size fits all curriculum.

Among Marvin's critics, perhaps a final look into the criticisms of Frank Lockwood, a dean at the University of Arizona, and Martha Gibbon, an assistant professor at The George Washington University, would help explain the controversy that surrounded the Marvin Doctrine over the years. Both Lockwood and Gibbon were liberal arts professors in history and English, respectively, two subjects that Marvin shortchanged in his reorganizations. Liberal arts curricula did not produce tangible results that more technical fields did; the benefits of a liberal arts education were, to Marvin, less real and concrete. The concept of educating students to be well-rounded and complete individuals in the sciences as well as cultural subjects had not yet triumphed in educational philosophy.

Lockwood's and Gibbon's criticisms of Marvin were not simply rooted in Marvin's de-emphasis on a liberal arts education. Perhaps more insightfully, they both resented Marvin's system of administration, which placed all substantive decisions in the hands of one man. Lockwood had often claimed that Marvin abused power by dissolving the powerful faculty committees in favor of a powerful presidency; Gibbon claimed that Marvin abused power by vetoing the recommendations of the deans and department heads. They both insisted that Marvin was undemocratic, a "totalitarian dictator," because he had absolute power over the functions of the University. To both Lockwood and Gibbon, Marvin's strong control over the administrative aspects of the University was anathema to their conceptions of what a university should be, a place to live, make mistakes, and learn.

Marvin's administration lasted longer than any other in the history of the school, despite the opposition he encountered. His reorganizations at both the University of Arizona and The George Washington University were, in fact, very similar: he reduced the dependence on part-time professors; he attempted to hire noteworthy professors; he exercised veto power over the suggestions of the deans and department heads involved; he followed the letter, but often not the spirit of codes governing
faculty tenure; and he failed to bring disputes to a satisfactory conclusion, fomenting bitterness and distrust among the faculty.

Why, then, was his administration at the University of Arizona considered to be, in many ways, a failure, while his administration at George Washington was considered a tremendous success? Evelyn Jones Kirmse provides an interesting answer to this when she says that Marvin was able to manipulate the self-perpetuating Board of Trustees at George Washington, while a Board of Regents accountable to the voters and to the State of Arizona proved less willing to approve of Marvin’s actions in office. There is a grain of truth in this; never during Marvin’s administration had the Board of Trustees issued any serious rebuke to his decisions; even in the direst of circumstances, they voiced their resounding approval. The Board of Regents in Tucson, however, had gone so far as to consider impeachment charges against Marvin—charges considered and then narrowly defeated in a final vote.

As the years passed, Marvin also had the added advantage of having time under his belt. In the early years, he was seen as a usurper, an intruder, who did not fully grasp how the University functioned and didn’t care to listen to those who did. But as his administration progressed, he earned a great deal of respect for his wise business decisions and his rapid advances in the development of the University. There was also, to be sure, no continuous opposition to his rule among the students, as student organizations, like the Liberal Club and the Strike committee in the 1930s, among others, disappeared not long after they came into existence. Only The Hatchet, whose one advantage was that it had become an enduring institution on campus, predating Marvin’s administration, and therefore was not easily abolished, had proved to be a continuing source of dissent. But Marvin was able to manipulate the newspaper in the most serious times, placing into power those more cordial to his administration.

At the University of Arizona, by contrast, Marvin was never able to assert control, as he would be able to at George Washington. His opponents on the Board of Regents, in the Governor’s office, and in the University faculty could not be removed simply at his will; Frank Lockwood, for instance, was
immensely popular on the faculty and carried tenure as stipulated in state law. The University's budget had to be approved by the state legislature. The governor appointed Marvin's superiors. At George Washington, Marvin was able to operate as a free agent, with only his own conservative political ideology and a meager budget restraining him.

The Marvin Doctrine was successful at George Washington because Marvin had firm control over the organization of the bureaucracy with which he could institute the second pillar, his "commercial education" philosophy originally formulated in his college days. At Arizona, the Marvin Doctrine failed because the president could not muster enough support for his philosophy, though there were times he did celebrate success, as with the opening of the School of Military Science.

There remains one final aspect of the Marvin Doctrine that requires analysis. Was it successful? At Marvin's election in 1927, The George Washington University was hardly a top-tier school. It had much potential, to be sure, but little endowment and few assets. Marvin's three predecessors, Admiral Charles Stockton, Ambassador William Collier, and William Mather Lewis, all served important and successful, though short, terms in office. They had saved the University from ruin and placed it on firm footing.

But it took a certain type of president to take this precious little and turn it into something grand. It took someone who was a visionary, but also someone who was a builder. Marvin proved quite readily that he could do both. The University needed a president who was persistent and strong-willed. Perhaps, inevitably, this type of person should be someone who had a personality that conflicted with others. The University needed someone who could command respect and get his way. It mattered less if he was liked.

The George Washington University's growth from 1927 to 1959 was absolutely phenomenal. Careful administration and cautious expansion had physically increased the campus about fifteen times over. The student body and faculty had expanded and their caliber improved. The endowment had been increased
ninefold. It is hard to overstate how much of an affect Marvin's presidency had on the University. He had his critics, certainly, and he was followed in office by three presidents who espoused a very different kind of educational philosophy and a different kind of vision. But these presidents, Carroll, Elliott, and Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, were only successful because Marvin had been successful. Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin had laid the groundwork for much of the development that followed him.

Oswald Symister Colclough became Acting President immediately upon Dr. Marvin's resignation. For the next year and a half, he governed in the Marvin tradition, bringing to completion many of the projects that Marvin had started. Among the most important of Colclough's accomplishments was the foundation of two bodies that provided for the representation of faculty members in the governance of the administration: the University-Faculty Assembly, consisting of all full-time faculty members and certain administrative officers, and the University Senate, later called the Faculty Senate after the Student Council became the Student Senate in the 1970s. The Faculty Senate gave elected faculty members a voice in University affairs, especially concerning the faculty themselves, and could recommend policies to the President. The Senate was composed only of faculty members, not deans and executive officers, so the operations of the body were completely independent of the administration.

Also during Colclough's term, the Articles and bylaws of the General Alumni Association were approved by the Board of Trustees and put into effect immediately. Any matriculated student who had left the University in good standing along with any member of the staff or Board of Trustees was eligible for membership in the Alumni Association. Alumni Association members also elect the Alumni Trustees and the members of an elected alumni body, composed of delegates and representatives of each school. For the first time, alumni of the University had a real voice in the governance of the University.

For students as well, the post-Marvin years brought new protections of their civil liberties. In 1970, the Statement of 344
Student Rights and Responsibilities was approved by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, stipulating specific protections for the freedom of expression. “Student organizations and individual students shall be free to examine and to discuss all questions of interest to them, and to express opinions publicly and privately, according to Article 1. They shall be free to support causes by orderly means which do not disrupt the regular and essential operation of the institution.”

Later articles protected many of the rights not guaranteed in the Marvin era. The student press shall be free of censorship, suspension, and arbitrary removal because of the disapproval of editorial policy or content. Students removed for proper causes must be given the right of due process. According to Article 4, “the University shall provide sufficient editorial freedom and financial autonomy for the student publications to maintain their integrity of purpose as vehicles for free inquiry and free expression in an academic community.”

In the years following the Marvin administration, the University community instituted new protections for the rights of students, faculty, and alumni against unlawful actions of the University administration. The beginnings of the Parent’s Association also formed during this time; the month Marvin left office, a group of forty-four parents met and voted approval of instituting a GW Parent’s Day. The four groups finally enjoyed a meaningful voice in University governance, denied them under the Marvin administration.

As the brief Colclough administration ended, a scandal erupted that paralleled the faculty-administration conflicts in the late 1930s, involving a young professor who was fired for having an alleged association back in his college days with Communist activities. Hired for a contractual period of two years as an associate professor of history, Richard W. Reichard’s name and courses were already listed in the catalogue of classes for the 1959-1960 school year when his “qualifications and suitability” were reexamined. The University received information that Reichard had been investigated by the House of Representatives.
Committee on Un-American Activities, and that Reichard had pleaded the Fifth Amendment to all questions concerning alleged communist activities while he was a graduate student at Harvard over a decade before.

The American Association of University Professors launched an academic freedom investigation into the incident, and the committee composed of members of the History Department that cancelled Reichard's contract was called to defend itself. Roderic Davison, the chairman of the committee wrote in response to a harsh report handed down by the AAUP that the faculty committee had not wanted to fire Reichard, they only wanted him to be honest and confident, and Reichard's refusal to cooperate sealed his fate. "It was only his lack of candor that led to our conclusion that we could not justify continued recommendation of his appointment, and that he should be relieved at once of all academic duties," Davison wrote.3

Immediately after his termination, Richard Reichard wrote a strongly worded letter explaining his situation to The Nation. "I bitterly resent even the most distant insinuation that I am in any way un-American. I have never participated in a conspiracy. I have never advocated the overthrow of the government by force or violence," Reichard wrote, reminiscent of Martha Gibbon's intense press campaign a full 20 years before.

At times I have held unorthodox beliefs. I declined to tell The George Washington University, under duress, what those beliefs may have been or may be. No authority, neither that of the government, nor of one's employer, has the right to inquire into the innermost workings of a man's mind. Because I held to this principle, The George Washington University found me "unqualified" and "unsuitable," and notified me, on December 22, that my two-year contract had been "withdrawn...as of August 21, 1959."4

The case was ended with the full payment to Reichard of the total salary he would have received during the total contractual
period of two years.\textsuperscript{5}

It was quite clear that Marvin's legacy had endured in some ways. The major difference, however, was that Reichard's contract was terminated by a committee composed of faculty members in the History Department, not by administrative fiat from the deans, executive officers, or the president and Trustees. At least the violations of faculty tenure and academic freedom had become more democratic!

Colclough's administration ended with the election of Dr. Thomas Henry Carroll on February 1, 1961. Carroll was from a new breed of college presidents, educated in the Ivy League schools of New England with backgrounds in the business sector and in the non-profit sector. Carroll's educational philosophy was quite different from Marvin's; it was an entire generation younger. He championed a more liberal education than Dr. Marvin, and the generational shift was marked by the appearance of John F. Kennedy, the new United States President, at Dr. Carroll's inauguration. Neither of their terms lasted long; Kennedy would be struck down by an assassin's bullet, Dr. Carroll by illness.

The brief term Carroll spent in office soon faded into the Lloyd Elliott era, which lasted for nearly a quarter of a century, bringing to fruition many of the dreams that Marvin had envisioned so many years before. With the election of Lloyd Elliott to the presidency, the Marvin Doctrine had effectively been repealed. Elliott had his authoritarian moments, to be sure, especially against the protests of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Unlike Marvin, however, he did not micromanage the University. He set up a more efficient bureaucracy and organizational structure that more easily accommodated growing numbers of students. He did not try to run the University on his own. It was against this backdrop that the rapid expansion of the 1980s and 1990s is set. The new century, to be sure, owes much to those who carried the University through the previous one.

If this study proves anything it all, it proves, at the very least, that the complexity of a man who so dominated University life for
so long a period makes judgment difficult to render. Many have alleged over the past several decades that Marvin was a racist or an anti-Semite, among a variety of other charges, but these are difficult to sustain with so many years having intervened. It is not easy to replay in full the thoughts of a man simply from primary and secondary documents and other sources. It is, however, possible to construct an order of events that sheds light on the motives for many of the actions taken by persons lost to history. This is the goal that drives historians, as the future becomes the present, and then the past.
Notes on Conclusion:

1. See From Strength to Strength, 1996.
5. See Bricks Without Straw, 1971.
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With a career in higher education that spanned more than four decades, the legacy of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin (1889-1969) remains one of the most controversial among university administrators. Through depression, war, and reconstruction, Marvin's leadership as president of the University of Arizona (1922-1927) and The George Washington University (1927-1959) witnessed tremendous growth and expansion as the two institutions progressed into greatness. His conservative beliefs, his violations of faculty tenure, his support of segregation, and his education philosophy, however, attracted many dedicated critics over the years.

This book tells the story of Marvin's tumultuous years as educational administrator and thinker. It also tells the story of his critics: a dean that led an impeachment crusade against Marvin's administration in Tucson, a young professor of English who sacrificed her career to launch a revolution against his tight-fisted rule, and dozens of students, faculty members, and alumni who chafed under his leadership. His complex legacy is recorded here for future generations and all who are interested in the history of educational administration.

Andrew Joseph Novak was the historical research editor for the GW Hatchet, president of the George Washington University Historical Society, and an assistant to the University Archivist. This is his first book on the history of the University.