

Vitae Scholasticae, 2005

Politics and Principles: Joseph Kinmont Hart and the University of Washington, 1910-1915

Deron Boyles
Georgia State University

Introduction

The years 1910-1915 marked a tumultuous time at the University of Washington (UW). The university had three presidents during this time, beginning with Thomas Kane, then interim president Henry Landes, and after a protracted search, Henry Suzzallo. Student unrest over corporate railroad influences and a donation of carillon chimes turned into an incident that spotlighted university governance issues and increased student and faculty protest during Kane's administration. It was also during this time that Kane decreed "gag orders" which banned political speeches on the UW campus. Interim president Landes fired the entire department of education in 1915 and Suzzallo entered the presidency of the university in the aftermath—and dealt with the ramifications of the fired education professors as well as the general tumult of the previous five years.

Joseph Kinmont Hart was a young professor of education during this time and played a role in the unrest at the university. Hart was a popular teacher, a sought-after speaker in the community, and an agitator for social change. His politics were in contrast to most of the Board of Regents and the state legislature and the battles he fought with his own colleagues ultimately led to his being fired with the rest of the department in 1915. Hart was among a number of people who questioned Suzzallo's candidacy for the UW presidency. It was widely believed that Hart wrote an article critical of Suzzallo in *The Northwest Journal of Education*.

Whether Hart actually penned the essay or not, Suzzallo believed he did and in his correspondences with one of Hart's enemies, Frederick Bolton (who ultimately was fired along with Hart), Suzzallo makes clear his dislike for Hart. This point may be important given the timing of Hart's firing by interim president Henry Landes: one day before it was announced that Suzzallo was selected to be the new president of UW.

This essay briefly explores Hart's background, the major events at UW during 1910-1915, Hart's role in some of those events, and the results which ultimately followed—both for Hart and for UW. While a variety of articles exist that focus on

most of the major figures and events at UW during this time, little has been written concerning Hart, his situation, and his views.² This effort intends to craft a more complete picture of the tumultuous times at UW from 1910-1915. In the end, this essay questions whether Hart was used as an example to send a signal to the Board of Regents and the governor of Washington that the unrest during 1910-1915 would be brought under control. Specifically related to academic freedom issues, was Hart terminated because of his ideological stances or for personal reasons? Are these concepts easily distinguishable? Did Suzzallo have any personal disdain for Hart separate from professional considerations? If so, did personality and ego have an impact on the final decision to fire Hart? Was the announcement of Suzzallo's ascendancy to the presidency of UW indicative of something more than coincidental timing? Was the American Association of University Professors' investigation of Hart's case compromised by personal connections Suzzallo had with the American Association of University Professors? Ultimately, this study asks what lessons might be learned as a consequence of Hart's situation.

The Man from Cresco County and UW: Contexts for Constestation

Born in 1876 and raised in Columbia City, Cresco County, Indiana as one of five brothers and three sisters,³ Hart went to Franklin College in Franklin, Indiana, and interrupted his studies to serve in the Spanish-American War in 1898. He earned his A.B. degree from Franklin College in 1900 and immediately went on to the University of Chicago for graduate study with William Rainey Harper, William I. Thomas, and George Herbert Meade.⁴ Hart postponed his studies to teach mathematics and history in Ottumwa, Iowa in 1902. After two years, and marriage (to Lulu Calvert), he returned to the University of Chicago as a "Fellow" in 1904.⁵ Hart graduated in 1909 and his dissertation, *A Critical Study of Current Theories of Moral Education*, was published by the University of Chicago Press in 1910.⁶

After Chicago, and his study of experimentalism, psychology, and social change, Hart taught at Baker University in Baldwin, Kansas. It was at Baker that Hart found an eager young student named George Counts, the influential educational reconstructionist.⁷ Counts, like Hart, studied John Dewey and earned his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. As Potts points out, "both [men] were strong, outspoken theorists of social and educational reform, both close followers of Dewey, both editors, and both voiced their program as strong public speakers. In the end, however, Counts' influence. . .rose steadily in later years, while Hart's star faded from view."⁸

Edward O. Sisson was the chairman of the department of education at UW (since 1906) and was responsible for bringing Hart to the University in 1910. Sisson was a popular professor and had ties to other important faculty members at UW during this time, namely J. Allen Smith, Vernon Parrington, Edward and Theresa McMahon, and William Savery. This point is important, as Rulifson points out, because “in spite of the rather low reputation of departments of education throughout the country, Sisson was able to gain the very strongest kinds of personal and professional ties with the academicians on the campus.”⁹ Smith, Sisson, Parrington, the McMahan’s, and Savery were among a group of influential faculty who, generally speaking, were liberal crusaders in favor of public power over private interests. They championed free speech and contested graft practices and special privileges for corporate leaders.¹⁰ This group becomes central to the Hart-UW story because of the influence of the members of the group on both students and community activists. Hart attended the informal meetings held at the McMahan’s house on Friday nights and was the youngest faculty member in the group.¹¹ Because Sisson was a member of the group and was responsible for hiring Hart, it is conceivable that Sisson hired Hart for his ideological stances as well as his promise as a scholar and teacher. In any event, Hart, then just thirtyfour years old, came to a department headed by Sisson that included one other faculty member, Herbert Lull—also brought in by Sisson (in 1907).

Franklin Kane was president of UW during this time, having been named interim president in 1902 and president in 1903. Kane was a classicist, considered even-tempered, and generally well-regarded as a competent administrator.¹² He presided over the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition in 1909, using the “mini world’s fair” to spotlight the region and add needed facilities to the UW campus. The Exposition also indicated the rising tide of expansion and growth in Seattle and surrounding areas. Kane, the unassuming, proper, and private classicist, found himself at the helm of an increasingly expanding university in a city and a state that were also changing rapidly.

One feature of such expansion included political battles over the purposes of the university and the role government would play in supporting the institution. Concurrent with these battles were similar fights over the role of government in city and state affairs. Seattle was a city that grew from 80,671 people in 1900 to 237,194 people in 1910.¹³ Similarly, during Kane’s administration, the student body increased from 650 students to 2,854 students.¹⁴ The Yukon Gold Rush, lumber manufacturing, and new railroad lines help explain the large increase in population and the residual increase in enrollment at UW. Yet, as Rulifson and others point out, timber interests and railroads were backed primarily by non-Seattle, i.e., outside, capitalists.¹⁵ This point is significant insofar as Washington workers were seen to be mistrustful of Eastern influences.¹⁶ An ethos of criticality or suspicion regarding the East was increasingly evident during this time. In addition, immigration, workers’ rights, wages, labor influences, etc., all emerged as important initiatives at the time—

though not without controversy.¹⁷ Indeed, the struggle over issues like workers' rights, socialism, capitalism, business practices, and the like, emerged at this time as overtly contested terrain. Perhaps it is this environment of contestation that would affect Kane, Hart, and UW the most during the 1910s. Writes Rulifson,

The university was a state institution, receiving its charter, its authority, and most of its money from the state. Yet it was set in an urban area and served primarily, whether it chose to or not, the needs of the city of Seattle. The problems raised by serving an urban area through a state government whose base was largely rural was a problem the university has had for years. Politicians elected from the rural areas chose to regard the university with suspicion and distrust, and they often demonstrated their lack of identification with the University by attempting to withhold funds....And while [state governors] each made protests that the University should be free from politics, their rather consistent interference in the internal affairs of the University indicated that they really felt that the University should be free from someone else's politics.¹⁸

The way governors influenced UW presidents was by changing the makeup of the Board of Regents. Not universally deterministic, insofar as some Regents did not always tilt in the direction the political winds were blowing or were being blown, Regents were not infrequently replaced by governors whether the Regents' terms had expired or not.¹⁹

The national context was not lost in Seattle either. Schools were increasingly seen as instruments for industrialization and vocationalism. From federal reports touting agricultural and manual arts training to the struggle between the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) and unions, the rising tide of a manufacturing mentality found its way to Seattle.²⁰ UW would not be spared from competing demands between education, schooling, and training. Such struggles would bring to light questions about the purpose of UW as an academic institution in the midst of a growing industrial, increasingly capitalistic city and region.

The Beginning of the Turmoil and the Ensuing Tumult

In 1909, the Seattle Electric Company proposed building a railroad trestle on part of the UW campus. This was one example of increasing capitalistic encroachment. Students and alumni were opposed and the battle over the proposal dragged on until 1911 when the Seattle City Council approved building the railroad trestle, but one that bypassed the major areas of campus. In effect, neither side won, but Kane demonstrated allegiance with students and faculty by opposing a powerful business interest in the city. The city, in fact, was enduring its own set of troubles. Seattle Mayor Hiram Gill was alleged to be corrupt and a major campaign was underway to recall him. Political science professor J. Allen Smith and a number of his students were outspoken critics of Gill and were openly involved in the

recall campaign. In addition, at its December 1911 meeting, the Board of Regents agreed to accept a gift of chimes if anyone would offer them to the university. The board also passed a resolution that read, in part, “that no political speakers outside of the student body be invited or permitted to speak on campus in advocacy of or in opposition to any candidate for public office.”²¹ Student response was swift and furious. They were outraged at what they termed a “gag rule” and complained bitterly about the ban on non-student political speeches on campus.²²

Kane dealt with the issue in the “even-keeled” way for which he had become known. As Kumor notes,

Kane mentioned the gag rule without condoning or condemning it. Rather, he discussed the importance of students’ training in critical, analytical decision making through exposure to differing views. Much criticism had been heaped upon the faculty for following this principle, but Kane insisted that it was essential to the total educational experience. Beyond this, he hoped the controversy would force the regents to recognize the need for a faculty code defining disciplinary responsibilities.²³

While the Board of Regents ultimately amended their original resolution to allow all candidates equal time to voice their ideas, the political atmosphere was so intense that Kane banned *all* political speeches from campus.

As if the unrest that followed Kane’s decision to ban all political speeches was not enough, a former regent, Alden J. Blethen, answered the request from the Board of Regents for a set of chimes for the university. Blethen, publisher of the *Seattle Times*, had also been the publisher of the *Minneapolis Tribune* in the 1890s. Students of J. Allen Smith again, as with Mayor Hiram Gill before, raised questions. They researched Blethen’s background and came up with specific charges against him as reasons for not accepting the chimes and as an indication of the need to ask questions of the regents and the university administration. The first charge was that Blethen, in his role as publisher of the *Minneapolis Tribune*, had been a “mouthpiece” of the Minneapolis Street Railways, effectively supporting a monopoly. Blethen was also accused of being a “backer of ‘white-slavers,’” given his connection with Ludovic Dallagiavanna (who was accused by students of running houses of prostitution across Europe, South Africa, and Alaska). The final charge was that Blethen was involved in the Hiram Gill administration—opposing the recall of the mayor even after corruption in the Gill administration was uncovered.²⁴

A series of student newspaper articles appeared regarding the chimes, but on October 21, 1912—the day before the chimes were to be officially dedicated in a ceremony on campus—a letter signed by fifty-one students contesting the “Blethen Chimes” was received by the student newspaper, the *University of Washington Daily*.²⁵ The faculty advisor of the *Daily* contacted Kane. Kane contacted the student editor and asked that it not be printed. When the editor refused, Kane shut down the paper until after the dedication ceremony of the chimes. Students took their letter to Seattle’s labor newspaper, the *Union Record*, and persuaded the paper to print their letter in pamphlet form. Titled “Suppression!

Free Discussion of Chimes Question Denied by President Kane,” the pamphlet was handed out to everyone leaving the dedication ceremony. “The regents were humiliated,” notes Kumor, “Blethen was furious, and the matter was handed to Kane for disciplinary action.”²⁶ In the final analysis, it was a victory for the students. While Andrew Eldred, the editor of the *Daily*, was suspended, the students involved in the scenario eventually were not punished.²⁷

Because of the intensity of the debate, two camps emerged that would put Kane in a very bad spot. For those who saw him as a mouthpiece for regents, he was considered a patsy and a conservative. For those who saw him as an indecisive leader afraid to take serious action against the student uprising, he was considered a spineless liberal.²⁸ Given the turmoil, one can only sympathize with Kane. He was trying to meet the demands of the Board of Regents at the same time as he was trying to exert an “even-keeled” approach to the UW faculty, students, and alumni. By attempting to satisfy all parties, he arguably satisfied none.

This is where Kane demonstrates an enigmatic side. When called before the Regents, he would defend an idealized notion of a university: a place where free exchange of ideas and readings from a broad range of areas should be fostered; a place where faculty should challenge students and engage in experiments and debates; a place where faculty governance meant a distribution of power and responsibility, etc.²⁹ Back on campus, however, he suppressed speech and was said to conspire against faculty, namely education department chair E. O. Sisson and J. Allen Smith, who questioned his authority.³⁰ Sisson did leave the university in 1912 and Kane was the one who brought in Frederick Bolton as the new chair. Perhaps indicative of Kane’s camouflaged unilateralism, he did not inform the other members of the department of Bolton’s hiring. In fact, Herbert Lull was expecting the chairmanship and he, along with Joseph Hart, found out about Bolton’s hiring in the newspaper after the Regents accepted Kane’s recommendation.³¹

Wrong Place at the Wrong Time? Hart’s Role in Kane’s Troubles

The gag rule, the chimes affair, Sisson’s leaving, Bolton’s being named as head of the education department without consultation with the faculty, the political turmoil in Seattle—all of this should have been enough for Kane to grapple with in and around 1912. Unfortunately, Joseph Hart added to Kane’s problems. Between 1910 and 1912, some of Hart’s student teachers openly questioned their supervising teachers. They were doing what Hart encouraged and what J. Allen Smith’s students had already been doing: questioning the status quo. In fact, it was Hart’s view that the role of the department of education at UW was to evaluate school practices and publicly criticize those aspects that were deemed problematic. The students’ criticism was condemned by the superintendent of Seattle schools Frank Cooper: “The schools are for the sole benefit of the children of Seattle.... The [student teaching] work may be permitted, [student teachers] and their University supervisors may raise questions with the proper school authorities, but when they

leave the schoolroom they are to keep their mouths shut.”³²This is exactly what Hart and the Friday-evening, Smith-McMahon group was arguing against. Without the freedom to criticize, traditional expectations would fester into routines that would also squelch public debate.³³To the ideological Hart, no less than democracy was at stake. When questioning and independent thinking cease, politics lead back to greed and ruin the promises of democracy. Wrote Hart in 1913, “the real democratic problem is that of securing independent thinking along political lines by every individual. Thus constantly the local community is at the mercy of the political boss, who usually has some more or less corrupt alliance with insidious financial elements and manipulates the political life of his community so that these financial interests flow constantly in his direction.”³⁴Hart voiced concerns about the influence of business interests on free speech and highlighted the “Easternizing” elements involved in the graft practices he identified. Perhaps even more indicative of Hart’s boldness, he gave a speech in Everett, Washington that was said to be so atrabilious that had he given the speech in Seattle, he would have been run out of the university and out of town.³⁵

That Hart would give such a talk should not have surprised Kane or anyone else. Since coming to Seattle in 1910, Hart had been speaking out frequently and trying to demonstrate the connection between his ideas and his practice by becoming involved in community activities. He worked with the YMCA, the Seattle Playground and Recreation Association, the Municipal League, and the Central Council of Social Agencies (a council he helped organize). Hart also served as chairman for the State Conference of Charities and Corrections, an organization that dealt with the immigration concerns like exploitation and discrimination in the Seattle area. In Seattle, Hart honed his public speaking by addressing practically any audience that would hear him, regardless of size or kind. He addressed church, civic, political, educational, and social clubs—both small and large—and was considered a provocative orator who threw “intellectual hardballs” in the air to see who would catch them.³⁶He was in demand as a speaker and became known for his forceful and persuasive style. Hart’s success was, in some ways, part of his problem. He cared so passionately about the role of education in society and argued so strenuously for egalitarianism and democratic participation and against mechanistic, routinized teaching that he was considered by some to be dogmatic and a radical. He occasionally published harsh reports about area businesses and manufacturing interests, giving rise to his being named a crusader, actually being censured by the State legislature for “radical pronouncements.”³⁷He was not alone. J. Allen Smith had been derided for “socialist teachings” at the university—repeatedly.³⁸Smith also had major disagreements with Kane and Suzzallo, but even with threats from the Board of Regents, was never fired.³⁹Smith was already a “star” academic. It was Hart, perhaps primarily because of his sheer enthusiasm and emotiveness, who was a rising star in the region.

Shooting Star, Falling Star

Hart’s rising star plummeted in 1915, five years after coming to the university.

When Sisson withdrew as head of the department of education and left the university at the end of the 1912 school year, Kane brought in Frederick Bolton to head the department without consulting the faculty. Herbert Lull, then the head of the summer school, was considered “in line” for the post, but Bolton’s arrival changed everything.⁴⁰ Lull was an associate professor, Hart an assistant professor. Hart’s sympathies were with Lull, even though the two men held different views on education and each approached their work in contrasting ways: Lull was plodding and orderly, Hart was eager and enthusiastic. Hart and Lull were aligned against Bolton. It was only a matter of time before all three men crossed swords.

In correspondences between Bolton and Hart prior to Bolton’s arrival on campus, one can see the beginning of the problems. While courteous, the letters show mounting tension over course assignments, degree programs, and governance within the department.⁴¹ Where Sisson had been open and democratic, Bolton was more structured and hierarchical. Where Sisson had allowed faculty to choose their own courses, Bolton ultimately made assignments. But Bolton also made overtures to quell some of Hart’s concerns. Where Hart had not been happy doing classroom observations in Seattle schools, Bolton volunteered.⁴² In fact, Bolton placed great emphasis in the methods of teaching, classroom observations being one element of that part of teacher training. One might read more into the specifics, however, if one considers the general difference between social foundations of education faculty (those who teach courses like history, philosophy, sociology, and cultural studies of education, etc.) and methods faculty (those who teach specific subject techniques, supervise classroom teachers, focus on classroom management, pedagogical strategies, etc.).⁴³ In effect, Hart was a social foundations of education professor, Bolton a methods professor. While the ideologies need not clash or be antithetical to one another, the outlooks of each area color the views and purposes of teacher education or training. In Hart’s case, he was more interested in teacher *education* and less interested in teacher *training*. Bolton, on the other hand, was more interested in *training*.⁴⁴ Beyond initial issues, however, once Bolton arrived on campus, even the pro forma cordiality of the early letters became strained.

One example of the strain was Bolton’s charges that Hart was lax with class meetings, that Hart opposed Bolton’s policies from the beginning of his tenure, and that Hart even conspired with a dismissed janitor to “stir up trouble.”⁴⁵ Bolton’s opposition to Hart’s salary increases and his bids for promotion and tenure in 1913 and 1914 made matters more clear, and more troubling for Hart. By that time, however, Kane was gone, Henry Landes was in, temporarily, and a protracted search was underway for a new president.

The search was initiated in 1913, extended another year (keeping Landes as interim president) and resulting in hopes by the search committee that James Rowland Angell would accept the job during 1914.⁴⁶ Angell was not the only candidate. Henry Suzzallo’s name was mentioned at the time, but a few issues

conflated: the *Northwest Journal of Education* insinuated that Suzzallo was part of a Columbia-Carnegie Foundation effort to “Easternize” the west; that Suzzallo was unmarried (a belief that was not true as of 1914); and that he had no executive experience.⁴⁷

Hart’s role in all of this is left to little speculation. As associate editor of the *Northwest Journal of Education*, Hart is widely believed to be the author of the piece that appeared in May of 1914. In the essay, the author wrote that “educational conditions of the Northwest; especially in the institutions of higher learning, are being carefully looked after by certain groups of benevolent feudalists in the East.”⁴⁸ In so writing, the author reflected the concerns of many westerners about “Easternizing” influences. The article also cast aspersions on Nicholas Murray Butler, the president of Columbia, and the “Columbia men” who were actively seeking leadership positions at Northwestern universities. While Butler tried to minimize the claims, it was nonetheless true that two other Columbia men, E. O. Holland and William Foster, were soon to be appointed the presidents of Washington State College and Reed College, respectively.⁴⁹

One strong indication of the widespread belief that Hart wrote the piece in the *Northwest Journal of Education* came in the form of a letter from John Dewey. Dated May 18, 1914 Dewey wrote directly to Hart of the “alleged conspiracy to get control of the higher education institutions of the country” that it was “all news to me, and all I have to say about that particular feature of the situation is that if the conservatives are counting on Columbia men (as the article says) they are likely to get stung—as the boys put it.”⁵⁰ Dewey goes on to note that it would be “a particularly happy stroke of the reactionaries to kill off Suzzallo’s chances on the ground that he was one of them. It is not a fatal matter for Suzzallo not to have this opportunity; it is most disgracefully unfair that his name should be associated in any way with such a rumor, or that it should have any weight whatever in prejudicing his chances.”⁵¹ If Hart wrote the piece and thought it would help keep a “Columbia man” from becoming the president of UW, the plan backfired. Given Dewey’s strong support for Suzzallo, any concerns about Butler’s conservatism and “Easternizing” agenda were at least balanced by Dewey’s view that Suzzallo was “thoroughly progressive.”⁵² The mild uproar also focused attention on Suzzallo and away from other candidates, including interim president Henry Landes.⁵³

While Dewey wrote Hart, Suzzallo wrote Bolton. In a letter dated September 28, 1914, Suzzallo claimed that Hart was behind the *Northwest Journal of Education* article. Given the detail and character of the letter, it appears that Bolton and Suzzallo had been in contact before. Wrote Suzzallo, “My understanding of this whole fight was similar to yours. There is a crowd in the N.E.A. [National Education Association] led by James of Illinois, Thompson of Ohio, and Seerley of Iowa, who are all waging war on the Carnegie Foundation. Because President Butler recommended me they thought this was a chance to make a case and so several of these ‘big names’ are said to have flattered Mr. Hart into starting the campaign. Now Hart ought to have known better about me, even if

he hadn't stopped to investigate the facts, because he was in a position to know the type of man I am through Professors Cubberley and Terman of Stanford University who had written him more or less fully about me."⁵⁴ Suzzallo goes on to explain his political stances and allegiances, noting "What you probably do not know is that I was one of the twenty Columbia men who signed the call for the organization of a national academic association of college professors [the AAUP]. Hart could have known these things for the asking. John Dewey knows me and he wrote a letter of protest to Mr. Hart on his editorial."⁵⁵ Suzzallo and Bolton were in close enough contact and were apparently familiar enough with one another that Suzzallo felt free to write a note at the bottom of one of the letters he sent to Bolton. In a March 23, 1915 letter, Suzzallo writes Bolton sympathizing with Bolton's "educational work." Beneath a post script informing Bolton that "Miss Neal is our kind," Suzzallo writes, in his own hand, "Are you getting rid of Hart? Or will the acting president lose out in his controversy with him?"⁵⁶

On May 17, 1915 the interim president of the university, Henry Landes, answered Suzzallo's question. He declared that conditions in the department of education were deplorable. Bolton, Lull, and Hart were *all* to resign after a one year period of time. Wrote Landes:

During the past three years, the personal antipathy, animosity, and distrust existing among and between you have increased steadily in intensity until now a state of bitterness exists between you which has destroyed the cooperation and coordination absolutely necessary for the successful administration of the department... This condition of affairs has brought reproach for the institution and can be tolerated no longer.⁵⁷

This climactic resolution might indicate a perverse victory of sorts for Hart. That is, if Hart was the only problem in the department, he should have been the only one dismissed. That the entire department was fired indicates, at least on Landes' view, a problem larger than Hart alone. Or is there something more intriguing and more sinister here? Was firing the entire department a ruse intended to get rid of Hart? That is, is it the case that by firing the entire department, Hart would not be singled out and therefore would have no foundation for charges of personal bias?

Timing Is Everything

On April 25, 1915, Regent Charles Gaches reported to Washington's governor Ernest Lister on the progress of the presidential search committee. He explained that the committee had found no one from the Midwest and that the search would likely conclude with a recommendation of one four new candidates or Suzzallo.⁵⁸ Six days after Gaches reported to Lister, Ellwood Cubberley (of Stanford University and one of Suzzallo's professors) wrote to Suzzallo telling

him that he had just been interviewed by Gaches regarding Suzzallo's candidacy. Van de Wetering notes that "the day before Gaches' interview with Cubberley, Regent John Rea wrote a confidential letter to Suzzallo. He explained that Suzzallo would soon receive a telegram inviting him to visit Seattle, which was tantamount to an offer of the presidency. . . . The same day that Rea's letter arrived on Suzzallo's desk he received the promised telegram."⁵⁹ On May 17, 1915—the same day that Landes' letter firing the entire department is dated—Suzzallo arrived in Seattle. On May 18, Suzzallo was announced as the new president of UW.⁶⁰ Is it conceivable that Landes did not know on May 17 that Suzzallo was going to be announced as the next UW president instead of him? Given that he was interim president, is it likely that he would not have had the courtesy of such information being extended to him, particularly given the time frame in question?

In Suzzallo's March 23 letter to Bolton, he revealed that he had already given thought to the situation as Bolton described it. He noted that he "came into an early confidence of [his] diagnosis of the place."⁶¹ According to Rulifson, what Suzzallo had already heard "had reaffirmed his convictions that Hart had to go, but he made certain that he followed procedures which would be acceptable to Hart's liberal supporters."⁶² In October, 1915, four months after moving to UW, Suzzallo wrote to Butler describing how he "struck hard" and dismissed Hart, mentioning that Hart "happened to be a socialist and a radical."⁶³ Rulifson also reveals an important feature related to the climate of the university and the controversy over "radical" professors.

James A. Duncan, then Secretary of the Seattle Central Labor Council and a close friend of J. Allen Smith's, had heard rumors that Suzzallo had been hired to fire Smith. When he heard of Hart's firing, Duncan went to Suzzallo to protest Hart's dismissal. Based on an interview with Duncan, Rulifson notes that when Duncan questioned Suzzallo on the specifics of Hart's situation, "Suzzallo replied that Hart was a propagandist [and] Duncan said that the same charge had been made about Smith. Suzzallo answered that Smith 'was a great teacher.' Duncan was convinced, however, that Hart and Lull were simply the first names on a list of people to be fired and that Smith's name was on the list. Duncan felt that in forcing Suzzallo to take a stand he had in fact saved Smith's job."⁶⁴

Duncan did not save Hart's job, though. According to the letter from Henry Landes, Hart was gone after the next year, along with Lull and Bolton. Lull used the year to find another job and eventually left Seattle for a job at Kansas State Normal College in Emporia, Kansas. Bolton petitioned to be reinstated. So did Hart, but he was in an even more awkward position. Hart had already requested a leave of absence for the 1915-1916 academic year prior to Landes' letter. In effect, he would not be around for the beginning of the Suzzallo administration. Once fired, however, Hart worked quickly to keep himself on campus. He asked the Board of Regents to allow him to defer his leave and teach during the coming year. The regents rejected his offer. He then wrote Suzzallo in July, 1915 to submit his name as his own substitute, apparently after having a disturbing conversation with Suzzallo. Playing down the fact that the regents denied his original request, Hart wrote:

I was rather indifferent to the outcome of the case, having been very anxious to take the year off. But since my conversation with you on Friday last, the issue has vastly changed. You then declared that my standing as a scholar had been viciously assailed, and that my position in the university faculty would largely depend upon the determination of the questions of scholarship, cooperative ability, etc. Under this aspect of the case, I am vitally interested in remaining in the university this next year, in order that you may observe, at first hand, my work, my attitude, my teaching ability, my general fitness for university life. . . .Hence, I am enclosing herewith my formal application to act as my own substitute next year.⁶⁵

Unfortunately for Hart, the regents' original approval of his leave read that he would furnish a substitute that was acceptable to the president and the head of the department. Not surprisingly, Suzzallo rejected Hart's request.

More letters were exchanged and the tone became increasingly terse. Hart was operating under the assumption that Landes' decision to fire the entire department was true to the letter he sent. That is, Landes blamed all parties concerned and laid responsibility at the feet of all three men. In a letter to Hart on August 13, 1915, however, Suzzallo shifted the basis for the original decision. He wrote that a "review of past relations between you and Professor Bolton indicates that you are to blame. . . .The head of your department had shown a cooperative attitude toward you from the beginning of your relations. . . .The only conclusion I can come to is that you are responsible for your own difficulty."⁶⁶

Hart was livid. He wrote to Suzzallo that the August 13 letter "was pathetic" and that Suzzallo's case for his dismissal was based on the charge that he "could not cooperate with Bolton." Perhaps seeing for the first time what he took to be a conspiracy between Suzzallo and Bolton, Hart charged that Suzzallo made "cooperation with Bolton a standard of University values. . . .But on that basis you would have to dismiss a great many other men from the faculty, for you will find a dozen or more there who can no more cooperate with him than I can. . . . And if you want to know why, turn again to [William] Savery's characterizations of the man, and you will know."⁶⁷ Hart continued by noting that the charges used by Suzzallo were either unfounded or lies and wondered why Suzzallo had not brought him and Bolton together to cross-examine one another in Suzzallo's presence. Hart ends the letter in what would become characteristic fashion:

Oh, I know that I am down and out. I have know that for three years. Yet it has been it has been a good fight; I have kept the faith and am ready to take the punishment. You utterly mistake the situation when you say that I have brought my troubles upon myself. I have got away from my troubles. I fought for a free university, in which free and generous service to the state would be a prime consideration, and in which men would be big enough to work together without meanness [sic] and pettiness for the common good. But men like Bolton do not want that; and the politicians of the state

do not want it; and you have carried out their wishes. And I am free now to give over other peoples' troubles and settle down to the tasks I have been wanting to for years to get at. Don't you worry about my troubles, you have troubles of your own.⁶⁸

If anger and frustration seem to appear in Hart's letter to Suzzallo, their degree would pale in comparison to Hart's reaction when he learned that Bolton's request to be reinstated was seriously being considered. Bolton sent scores of letters to colleagues in the community and at other universities appealing to them to send Suzzallo letters of support. Many did.⁶⁹ Some of Bolton's students petitioned to reinstate him but, as Rulifson notes, "it was probably his relations with Suzzallo which saved his position...."⁷⁰

When the regents permitted Bolton to stay in February, 1916, Hart vigorously protested. He took his complaint to Allyn A. Young, chairman of the committee on Academic Freedom within the newly established American Association of University Professors (AAUP).⁷¹ Young appointed a committee to investigate, but he was also in contact with Suzzallo. Incredibly, Young wrote to Suzzallo—before the investigation began—that Hart lacked incriminating evidence.⁷² Hart spent most of the academic year 1915-1916 in exile "in the woods" in Seabeck, Washington.⁷³ From there he waged a fierce battle to clear his name and make the case that the firing was intended to smear his academic reputation based primarily on political reasons. Hart, in fact, suggested that Landes' firing of the entire department was done to shroud the real intention: to get rid of him. Bolton's reinstatement, he argued, made that point clear. In his letter to the AAUP, Hart wrote that "Lull has been eliminated not because there were any real charges against him, but...in order to prove that my removal was not political."⁷⁴ Hart was not alone in his view that there was a conspiracy against him. The [*Seattle*] *Star* reported that Hart was "a leader of the movement for social and industrial justice in the state, and [as a result] reactionary members of the legislature. . .threatened to cut off the appropriations of the university if Hart and others of radical tendencies were retained."⁷⁵ Lydia McCutchen also recalled, in a narrative written many years later, that "Suzzallo had to sign a contract to get rid of him [Hart] before the legislature would give a cent for the University."⁷⁶

After Hart's appeal reached the AAUP, Young appointed a committee including W.D. Briggs from Stanford University and O.K. McMurray from the University of California. The investigating committee was chaired by Harry Beal Torrey of Reed College. The hearings were held for three weeks in July of 1916. From July 26 to July 28, Torrey interviewed twenty-five witnesses. Some stories were published in the *Star* but, owing perhaps to Torrey's instructions to witnesses and participants that they were not to say a word about the investigation, the sensationalism was somewhat bounded.⁷⁷ The investigation did not support Hart's contention that he was the subject of political manipulation and that his academic freedom had been violated. The committee reported its findings in the

AAUP *Bulletin* as follows:

1. That there was a serious lack of harmony within the Department of Education for which Professors Bolton, Lull, and Hart were jointly responsible.
2. That no evidence has been presented showing that their dismissal was a result of political or other external pressure on either the Board of Regents or Acting President Landes.
3. That the conditions within the department were alone adequate grounds for this action.⁷⁸

As Rulifson notes, it seems that “the committee report was a defense of the dismissal not only of Hart but also of Lull and Bolton on the grounds that they were jointly responsible for the poor morale within the department.”⁷⁹ Indeed, the investigating committee was focused on Hart. That they made their general conclusion inclusive of Lull and Bolton makes Hart’s frustration at the final outcome more understandable and more interesting. Regardless, in the final analysis Hart was fired.⁸⁰

Being Nice Versus Being Right: Interpretive Concluding Considerations

Hart’s case is interesting, in part, because while he argued that there were political reasons behind his firing (generally considered a violation of academic freedom⁸¹), the AAUP committee determined personality to be the basis for dismissal. They upheld the decision to fire Hart based on a “lack of harmony” among Bolton, Lull, and Hart. Two points occur here: (1) if Hart’s dismissal is based on a lack of harmony for which all three men were “jointly responsible,” why was Bolton reinstated?; and (2) is it possible to distinguish between personal characteristics and political ideology, particularly given the topics Hart took up and the forums in which he presented them?

Firstly, given the early relationship between Suzzallo and Bolton and given the timing of the hiring of Suzzallo over Landes, one wonders if there is more to the story than the AAUP findings indicate. The investigation concluded that outside pressure, especially from the legislature and Board of Regents, was not a major force. But they did conclude that Hart was not alone in being responsible for deteriorating conditions in the department of education—conditions presumed to be personal rather than political. Such a finding was used as support for getting rid of Hart, but Bolton was retained even though Bolton was identified by name as being equally culpable for the conditions that the investigating committee concluded were sufficient grounds for dismissal. If it all came down to whether Suzzallo liked Hart more than Bolton or Bolton more than Hart, it is no surprise that Hart was fired and Bolton re-hired. But this does raise at least a question or two about power and ego.

With Suzzallo as the new president of a university that had recently endured some major political battles, one wonders if the real justification for his actions (including, but not limited to Hart’s firing) was power. Was Suzzallo part of what

Clark Kerr called “the day of the monarchs” with Hart as collateral damage resulting from the coronation?⁸² That is, did Suzzallo extend to the Pacific Northwest the features of a controlling, commanding, and manipulative university president characteristic of Charles Eliot (Harvard), Daniel Coit Gilman (Johns Hopkins), William Rainey Harper (Chicago), Robert Maynard Hutchins (Chicago) and Nicholas Murray Butler (Columbia)? As Williams notes, “the character of Suzzallo’s early months at the University reflected more the style of his mentor, the autocratic [Nicholas Murray] Butler, than it did the democratic principles to which [John] Dewey had pointed in his recommendation to the Seattle authorities.”⁸³

Is it simply because Hart initiated the AAUP investigation that the findings were only applied to him? If all three men were at fault, why would any one of them be re-hired? Beyond specifics of the case, what does Hart’s situation reveal about the politics of higher education and the most general interpretation of academic freedom? Indeed, whether Hart was belligerent and cantankerous or whether he was radical and socialistic, a careful review of the relationships involved in Hart’s story reveal a more tangled web than a quick glance might signal. Suzzallo was upset with Hart about Hart’s editorial in the *Northwest Journal of Education*. He communicated as much to Bolton, with whom he was also in contact prior to his coming to UW.⁸⁴ Two members of the investigating committee were from Suzzallo’s home state of California (he was born in San Jose), one from Stanford (where Suzzallo earned his B.A. and had been a professor) and one from the University of California. While it is true that Torrey was from Reed and did the lion’s share of the investigating, one wonders if the outcome was determined before the hearings were held. Suzzallo did receive a letter from the AAUP’s Allyn Young assuring him that Hart lacked credible evidence before the investigation even took place. Again, beyond procedural consideration, if Suzzallo wanted a lackey to control, Hart would not work (even if there had been no personal animosity on the part of Suzzallo prior to coming to UW). Bolton would more likely carry out the plans Suzzallo laid out, especially if he was re-hired by Suzzallo after being fired by Landes.⁸⁵ Bolton would be in no position to complain, in other words, and would have to be satisfied or leave before redeeming the tarnished reputation he gained due to the Hart investigation.⁸⁶ Perhaps the real lesson here is how ruthlessness and controlling power are used by university presidents (and other leaders both inside claims of inclusiveness, shared-governance, and democratic participation.⁸⁷

Concerning whether it is possible to distinguish between Hart’s personal characteristics and political ideology, it is arguable whether Hart’s personal traits (e.g., confrontational speaking style, bold when contesting ideas, not always politic in his interactions) and political ideas (e.g., regarding the social roles of schools, the vital importance of critique for a democracy, and the role

private trusts qua industry played in influencing public spheres) are separable. For Hart, being confrontational was the cost of doing the business of social agitation. One does not effect change in society by meekly agreeing with the status quo. Hart was said to “throw intellectual balls” at his audiences and classes in order to “wake them up.” His ideas and his means of communicating those ideas are not distinct. They are conjoint. The method and the message are the same thing, in effect. If one intends to alter the status quo, one does not, on Hart’s view, play by the same rules established by the status quo.⁸⁸ How can the personal be divorced from the political? What personal interests are devoid of political connections?

Relatedly, Hart’s teaching provides some insight along similar lines. Since Hart held that teachers should be agitators for social reform, he would be Janus-faced not be an agitator in his own classroom. Lydia McCutchen, one of Hart’s students at UW, wrote in a 1916 letter to Torrey about Hart’s teaching and the means he used to make his point: “He told our class we were terribly stupid for he could say nothing preposterous enough to cause an objection, that we were not thinking or had not the courage to express our thoughts. He is not an instructor, a mere imparter of facts, but a teacher, an inspirer of independent thinking and searching after truth regardless of prejudice, precedent, convention, or authority.”⁸⁹ Considering that students were not used to such means, one can imagine the overly-trained university student writing down the preposterous claims Hart made—as though they really represented Hart’s position. At the same time, the example is an object lesson of very thing Hart repudiated, namely, passive students who had no “courage to express [their own] thoughts.” Importantly, Hart was not asking students to do more than what he was already doing himself. He was asking students to critique their roles as teachers and the functions of the organizations called school. Hart did the same thing as a professor at UW.

In May of 1915, an article appeared in *The [University of] Washington Alumnus*. While the author is anonymous, the article is believed to be written by Hart.⁹⁰ Demonstrating, in essence, the larger point he was making to his students, Hart outlined the problem of a lack of power on the part of university professors in relation to administrators.

What the American professor wants is the same status, the same authority, the same participation in the government of his university as his colleague in . . . European countries. . . . He chafes at being under a board of trustees which in his most critical moods he feels to be alien to the [ideal of a] Republic of Science and Letters. . . . because under the existing plan of government they obstruct the realization of this ideal—nay, worse, actually set up and maintain an alien ideal, the ideal of a business corporation engaging professors as employees and controlling them by means of authority which is exercised either directly by “busybody trustees” or indirectly through delegation or usurpation by a “presidential boss.”⁹¹

By putting his ideas on paper for all to read, by putting his ideas in speeches for all to hear, and by making the kinds of remarks he made in the context of social agitation that he did, Hart was practicing what he was preaching at the very time he was preaching it. Hart's boldness and outspokenness is not in dispute. The question becomes whether a faculty member has the right to be bold and outspoken—especially as pertains to public institutions for which the professor is regarded as an authority. More directly, the question is whether one's boldness of personality is separable from the political ideas one attempts to advance.

In the final analysis, one wonders if Suzzallo's ego obscured what Dewey considered his ability to rule democratically. Assuming the presidency amidst turmoil, did Suzzallo take more of a lead from Butler than Dewey and, in so doing, demonstrate his interest in personal success over shared governance and the struggles that emanate from it? If so, it might explain why Hart was dealt with in the way he was. Without denying Hart's belligerence, what he actively promoted was an open and free exchange of ideas at UW (and beyond). On Hart's view, the way to achieve democratic participation and shared power is to set aside the pleasantries of protocol and get on with the business of argument and debate.⁹² Ironically, the vision Hart held out for school and society was in some ways similar to Dewey's.⁹³ He wanted schools (and colleges) to be miniature communities where engagement would include cooperation, but not at the expense of disagreements.⁹⁴ A free society is one in which ideas are exchanged openly and, for Hart, forthrightly. Should forthrightness and contrariness undermine the open exchange of ideas that academic freedom is supposed to protect?

Notes

¹ This research has been carried out, in part, with the support of a Georgia State University Research Initiation Grant. The author is grateful to the university, the Department of Educational Policy Studies, and the many knowledgeable and helpful people who made this project possible. The author is especially grateful to Marybeth Gasman for her insightful critiques and very helpful suggestions. Special thanks also go to Gary Lundell and Avril Madison, Special Collections, Manuscripts, and University Archives, University of Washington and Marilyn Kierstead, Reed College Archives.

² See, for example, Georgia Ann Kumor, "A Question of Leadership: Thomas Franklin Kane and the University of Washington, 1902-1913," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 77, no. 1 (January 1986): 2-3; Theresa McMahon, "My Story," (unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, n.d.), University of Washington Archives, Theresa McMahon Papers, acc. 110-70-49, vertical file 1728a; James L. Colwell, "The Populist Image of Vernon Louis Parrington," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49 (June 1962): 52-66; Richard Hofstadter, *The Progressive Historians: Turner, Beard, Parrington* (New York: Knopf, 1968); H. Lark Hall, *V.L. Parrington: Through the Avenue of Art* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1994); Thomas C. McClintock, "J. Allen Smith: A Pacific Northwest Progressive," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* (April 1962): 49-59; Eric F. Goldman, "J. Allen Smith: The Reformer and His Dilemma," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* (July 1944): 195-214; Frederick E. Bolton, "History of the College of Education: University of Washington" (unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, 1948); and John Robert Rulifson, "Frederick Elmer Bolton: American Educator in the Pacific Northwest," (doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1967).

³ Kenneth J. Potts, "Joseph Kinmont Hart: Educator for the Humane Community" (master's thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1995). See chapter 1. Potts mistakenly notes

that Hart was the third youngest of four brothers (p. 10). In a 1938 *Superior Telegram* article, Hart is pictured with four other brothers in two different photographs (one from 1906 and one from 1938). Another brother died in infancy. See "Brothers Reunited After 32 Years at Washburn Home," *Superior (WI) Telegraph*, 11 July 1938, n.p. Interestingly, perhaps the first in a series of pseudo-symbolic instances related to Hart's legacy, Cresco no longer appears on Indiana maps.

⁴*Northwest Journal of Education* XXV (February, 1916): 251.

⁵Potts, 10-15. Hart ultimately divorced Calvert and married Frances Stuyvesant Uhrig in 1929.

⁶By "moral education" Hart loosely meant liberal arts grounded in practice. He was particularly concerned that schooling be neither too vocational nor too intellectual.

⁷See Herbert Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 156-171.

⁸Potts, 21. See, also, John Childs, *American Pragmatism and Education: An Interpretation and Criticism* (New York: Henry Holt, 1956), 213. Childs clarifies that it was Hart who introduced Counts to Dewey, in a course on ethics. As one indication of how Hart's success paled in comparison to Counts', Childs only mentions Hart once in the entire text, as Counts' teacher. In contrast, Counts is the subject of an entire chapter (Chapter 8) and is mentioned throughout the text.

it, however, and the regents essentially defeated the committee's proposal when they cast a tie vote over the issue. See University of Washington Archives, Regents Records, acc. 78-103, boxes 31 and 35.

²⁸See, for example, "The Chimes that Curb the Consciences," *The Seattle Republican* (13 December 1912); "Socialists Use Name of Students as Lure," *The Seattle Daily Times* (28 October 1912), n.p.; and "Put the Clamps on 'U' Students," [*Seattle*] *Star* (26 October, 1912).

²⁹See President's Report, Board of Regents Meeting minutes, 21 February 1911, University of Washington Archives, Regents Records, acc. 81-102, box 2; Board of Regents to Thomas F. Kane, 12 December 1913, University of Washington Archives, acc. 78-103, box 10; and Clyde W. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), 114.

³⁰"Will Landes Follow the Beaten Path," *Washington Alumnus* 8 (April 1914): 3-4. Rulifson claims that Sisson refused to sign a petition in support of keeping Kane as president unless the word "temporary" was inserted. See Rulifson, 84. For more on the public dissent between Sisson and Kane, see [*Seattle*] *Star* (18 December 1913); and [*Seattle*] *Star* (22 July 1916). For more on the different interpretations of Kane in local papers and, interestingly, of Theresa McMahon (part of the liberal faction including Kane nemeses Sisson and Smith), see Rulifson, 140-144; and Theresa Schmid McMahon, "Letter to the Editor," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 51 (January, 1960), 47.

³¹See "Statement of Proposals to be Investigated in the Case of the Relationship between the University of Washington and Mr. Joseph K. Hart," University of Washington Archives, W.U. President's File, acc. 71-34, box 117.

³²Frederick E. Bolton, "History of the College of Education: University of Washington" (unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, 1948), 8. One might raise questions as to the source of the quote. Bolton, after all, was an enemy of Hart's. It is not unreasonable to think, however, that the superintendent of schools, ironically a friend of E.O. Sisson, would be upset by student teachers questioning the running of the Seattle schools in which they apprenticed.

³³See, also, David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).

³⁴Joseph K. Hart, *Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913), 100. For more on Hart's views regarding democratic governance in higher education, see Joseph K. Hart, "The Democratic Organization of a State University," *Popular Science Monthly* 84 (January 1914): 91-99.

³⁵See Edwin B. Stevens, "Henry Suzzallo: President, University of Washington, 1915-1926" (unpublished manuscript, Stevens papers, University of Washington Archives, n.d.), 2; Rulifson, 156.

³⁶Hart also reported giving over 136 talks to teachers, general audiences, high school commencements, university assemblies, and Y.M.C.A. groups during the 1912 academic year. See Joseph K. Hart to Edmund S. Meany, n.d., University of Washington

Archives, Edmund S. Meany Papers, acc. 106-70-12, box 52.

³⁷ See "Professor J.K. Hart, University of Washington," *The [Seattle] Patriarch* (1 June 1912): 1; Joseph K. Hart, "The Problem of Unemployment," *Welfare: The Journal of Municipal and Social Progress* 213 (1914): 18-21; and Potts, 23-25. See, also, Lydia

professional courses in education to the potential teachers' courses of study." Rulifson, 99. Hart was partly in favor of the shift from education out of the liberal arts to its own standing, but for different reasons than Bolton. Hart's point was to immerse students in the study of schooling from a broad and critical outlook, which was different from Bolton's notion of training future professionals. For more on Hart's stance on the role of undergraduates and the need for criticality, see Joseph K. Hart, "Helping the Freshman to Find Himself," *The Nation* 94 (22 February 1912): 182-183. The School of Education was further reorganized in 1914, with Frederick Bolton as dean, when it became the College of Education.

⁴⁵ Frederick Bolton to Henry Suzzallo, 9 September 1915, University of Washington Archives, W.U. President, acc. 71-34, box 117.

⁴⁶ Donald T. Williams, unpublished manuscript, University of Washington Archives, acc. 3332-84-37, box 1. See, also, Kumor, *op. cit.*

⁴⁷ See Donald T. Williams, "Henry Suzzallo and the University of a Thousand Years," *History of Higher Education Annual* (1985): 57-82. Concerns were also expressed about Suzzallo's religion (he was raised a Catholic, but became an Episcopalian). The curiousness of the questions about Suzzallo's marital status, religion, etc., had more to do with their timing than the questions themselves. See Van de Wetering, *op. cit.*, McClintock, *op. cit.*; and Goldman, *op. cit.*

⁴⁸ *Northwest Journal of Education* XXV (May 1914): 389-390.

⁴⁹ Rulifson, 148-153.

⁵⁰ John Dewey to Joseph K. Hart, 18 May 1914, University of Washington Archives, W.U. Regents, 78-103, box 2. If there was any animosity between the two men, it ultimately dissipated given Dewey's glowing introduction to Hart's *Inside Experience*. See Joseph K. Hart, *Inside Experience* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927), xxi-xxvi.

⁵¹ Dewey to Hart, *ibid.*

⁵² Van de Wetering, 106.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 102. Ironically, Landes had the support of J. Alden Blethen.

⁵⁴ Henry Suzzallo to Frederick E. Bolton, 28 September 1914, University of Washington Archives, Frederick Bolton Papers, acc. 194-70-1, box 1.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ Suzzallo to Bolton, 23 March 1915, University of Washington Archives, Frederick Bolton Papers, acc. 194-70-1, box 1. What "kind" Miss Neal represented is unknown, but the post script intimates that Bolton would know what Suzzallo meant.

⁵⁷ Henry Landes to Dean Frederick E. Bolton, Professor Herbert G. Lull and Professor Joseph K. Hart, May 17, 1915, quoted in "Report of the Sub-Committee on the Case of Joseph K. Hart of the University of Washington," submitted by Harry Beal Torrey, Chairman, W.D. Briggs, and O.K. McMurray, *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 3 (April 1917), 13; Potts, 31.

⁵⁸ Suzzallo's chances for becoming president of UW were still in jeopardy in 1915 even though James Angell ultimately rejected the presidency around Christmas of 1914. Angell had five major reasons for turning down the offer: (1) that the facilities were inadequate and in need of over one million dollars immediately; (2) faculty pay was too low and the difference between the president's salary and the faculty salaries was too large; (3) Washington Governor Lister was planning retrenchment; (4) the

rivalry between University of Washington and the State College was unhealthy and seemed limitless; and (5) the university needed a lively speaker to rouse support in the state. After Christmas, 1914, Suzzallo's name was brought forward again and the Board of Regents took Angell's decision not to accept the presidency to the legislature. The hope was to convince the legislature that the university could not attract a man of quality unless Angell's concerns were addressed. See Williams, *op. cit.*

⁵⁹ Van de Wetering, 106.

⁶⁰ Although Rulifson suggests that Landes recommendation did not get to the Board of Regents until an hour before the selection of Suzzallo, two concerns stand out. Firstly, a full week before the formal selection, Suzzallo had a clear indication from

Regent John Rea that he had the job. See Van de Wetering, 106. Secondly, Rulifson's source is Frederick Bolton. See Rulifson, 161.

⁶¹ Suzzallo to Bolton, *op. cit.*

⁶² Rulifson, 164.

⁶³ Suzzallo to Butler, 16 October 1915, University of Washington Archives, W.U. President, acc. 71-34, box 117. See, also, Williams, "Henry Suzzallo and The University of a Thousand Years," 68; and Rulifson, 163.

⁶⁴ Rulifson, 165-166. See, also, Williams, *ibid.* Williams writes that "Suzzallo isolated [a] controversial professor and department chairman, J. Allen Smith, by dividing his department into several parts and leaving Smith the lone member of one of the remaining parts." (68) Smith's job may have been saved, but Suzzallo was apparently interested in establishing his administration in ways that would not be tolerant of the kinds of questions and actions that both Kane and Landes had to face.

⁶⁵ Hart to Suzzallo, 12 July 1915, University of Washington Archives, W.U. President, acc. 71-34, box 117.

⁶⁶ Suzzallo to Hart, 13 August 1915, University of Washington Archives, W. U. President, acc. 71-34, box 117.

⁶⁷ Hart to Suzzallo, 25 August 1915, University of Washington Archives, W.U. President, acc. 71-34, box 117, emphasis in original.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ See University of Washington Archives, Frederick E. Bolton Papers, acc.194-70-1, box 1 .

⁷⁰ Rulifson, 165.

⁷¹ Ironically, Bolton was a founding member of the UW chapter of the AAUP. Suzzallo was a founding member of the national organization. Hart was not a member, but there is no information yet found to indicate why not. See, also, [*Seattle*] *Star*, "Dismissal of Hart Will Be Given Hearing," 19 July 1916, n.p., University of Washington Archives, President's File A-M, "Hart, Joseph K." Special Collections Biography Pamphlet File; and *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 3 (April, 1917); and, for other initial cases, Walter P. Metzger, ed., *Professors on Guard: The First AAUP Investigations* (New York: Arno Press, 1977) and Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955).

⁷² Allyn A. Young to Henry Suzzallo, 4 May 1916, 26 May 1916; and Suzzallo to Young, 15 June 1916, University of Washington Archives, W.U. President, acc. 71-34, box 117. See, also, Potts, 36-37.

to fill. That changed in August 1916 and Foster ultimately offered Hart a job and Hart accepted. See Potts, 39-41.

⁸¹ Academic freedom is understood to mean something somewhat different during this time than contemporary understandings of the same concept. Given that the AAUP was founded in 1915 and the more detailed and formal statement regarding a variety of topics, inclusive of academic freedom, did not appear until 1940, this paper does intend to equate current interpretations of academic freedom with the more broad conception under which Hart and others operated. See Philo A. Hutcheson, *A Professional Professoriate: Unionization, Bureaucratization, and the AAUP* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000), 9-10; Louis Joughin, *Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of The American Association of University Professors* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967; and Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955).

⁸² Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), 32.

⁸³ Williams, "Henry Suzzallo and the University of a Thousand Years," 67. It apparently was not only in his early months at UW that Suzzallo took his cue from Butler. Williams reveals how World War I provided Suzzallo with the opportunity to squelch criticism of the war in a Butler-like way. In a 1918 speech, Suzzallo claimed that "we have made sedition, either doctrinaire, academic, or hostile so disreputable, it can no longer thrive [at UW]." Butler had said similar things about Columbia. See William Summerscales, *Affirmation and Dissent: Columbia's Response to the Crisis of World War I* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970, 88; Suzzallo is quoted in "Appreciation of Admiral Coontz Warmly Voiced," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* (5 January 1918); and

Williams, "Henry Suzzallo and the University of a Thousand Years," 71. Perhaps more revealing, Williams notes that Suzzallo, "in response to a question from one of his Regents. . .told of how he had asked Federal Secret Service agents to keep an eye on all faculty members in the German department and all persons [of] German descent. The letter also contained reference to a 'volunteer secret service' at the University which reported regularly to the President. Policies such as these may account for one Seattle resident. . .referring to Suzzallo as the Campus Kaiser who had killed the University." Williams, 71. He cites a letter from Suzzallo to Regent McKee and Anna Louise Strong, "Who Killed Our University?" *Seattle Call* (12 November 1917).

⁸⁴ Recall that Suzzallo was a founding member of the AAUP. Bolton was a founding member of the AAUP chapter at UW. Their correspondences indicate the kind of familiarity with one other in the context of AAUP to suggest their relationship was more than a distant and pro forma one.

⁸⁵ Suzzallo did indeed exert considerable control over Bolton after the Hart affair was concluded. One example of the control exerted by Suzzallo was the hiring of education faculty without input from Bolton. Another example was Suzzallo's increased participation in articulating the purpose for the College of Education, indicating to most observers at the time that Bolton's credibility suffered during the Hart hearings. See Rulifson, 170-173.

⁸⁶ Rulifson, 169.

⁸⁷ As with John Dewey's claim regarding Suzzallo's commitment to democratic

principles applied to university administration.

⁸⁸ See Joseph K. Hart, ed., *Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1914), 3-5.

⁸⁹ McCutchen to Torrey, *op. cit.*, 8.

⁹⁰ Potts, 33. Potts compares the language to Hart's "The Democratic Organization of a State University," *Popular Science Monthly* 84 (January 1914): 91-99.

⁹¹ *The Washington Alumnus* 8 (May 1915): 1-2. If, in fact, Hart authored the piece, it would be interesting to know whether it was written before or after Landes' decision on May 17, 1915.

⁹² Joseph K. Hart, *Democracy in Education* (New York: The Century Co., 1918); Joseph K. Hart, *Inside Experience* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927); Joseph Kinmont Hart, *A Social Interpretation of Education* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929); Joseph K. Hart, *Mind in Transition* (New York: Covici-Friede Publishers, 1938); and Joseph K. Hart, *Education in the Humane Community* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951).

⁹³ The irony is that Dewey wrote to Hart complaining about the editorial in *The Northwest Journal of Education* and was a supporter of Suzzallo's. Dewey nonetheless wrote a glowing introduction Hart's *Inside Experience*. In terms of their theories, Hart adopted much of Dewey's philosophy—especially those features that criticized "traditional" schooling and called for change.

⁹⁴ Hart, *Democracy in Education*.

References

Barrow, Clyde W. *Universities and the Capitalist State Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.

Bolton, Frederick E. "History of the College of Education: University of Washington." Unpublished manuscript. University of Washington, 1948.

Childs, John. *American Pragmatism and Education: An Interpretation and Criticism*. New York: Henry Holt, 1956.

Clark, Burton R. *The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed, & Swarthmore*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Colwell, James L. "The Populist Image of Vernon Louis Parrington." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49 (June 1962): 52-66.

Counts, George S. *The Social Foundations of Education*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Foster, William T. "Faculty Participation in College Governance." *School & Society* 3 (22 April 1916): 594-595.

Friedheim, Robert L. *The Seattle General Strike*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington

Press, 1964.

Gates, Charles M. *The First Century at the University of Washington, 1861-1961*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1961.

Goldman, Eric F. "J. Allen Smith: The Reformer and His Dilemma." *Pacific Northwest*

(January, 1960): 47.

McMahon, Theresa. "My Story." Unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, n.d. University of Washington Archives, Theresa McMahon Papers, acc. 110-70-49, vertical file 1728a.

Metzger, ed. *Professors on Guard: The First AAUP Investigations*. New York: Arno Press, 1977.

Miyamoto, S. Frank. "The Japanese Minority in the Pacific Northwest." *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 54 (October 1963): 143-149.

National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education. *Legislation upon Industrial Education in the United States*. New York: National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, 1910.

Perry, Fredi. *Seabeck: Tide's Out. Table's Set*. Seabeck, WA: Seabeck Christian Science Center, 1989.

Potts, Kenneth J. "Joseph Kinmont Hart: Educator for the Humane Community." Master's thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1995.

Potts, Kenneth J. "The Democratic Organization of a State University." *Popular Science Monthly* 84 (January 1914): 91-99.

Rugg, Harold Ordway and William Withers. *Social Foundations of Education*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

Rulifson, John Robert. "Frederick Elmer Bolton: American Educator in the Pacific Northwest." Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 1967.

Stevens, Edwin B. "Henry Suzzallo: President, University of Washington, 1915-1926." Unpublished manuscript, University of Washington Archives, Stevens papers, n.d. 2.

Summerscales, William. *Affirmation and Dissent: Columbia's Response to the Crisis of World War I*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Tozer, Steve and Stuart McAnich. "Social Foundations of Education in Historical Perspective." *Educational Foundations* no. 1 (1986): 28-29.

Tyack, David and Larry Cuban. *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995

United States Bureau of the Census. *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1913.

Wagoner, Jennings L. "Should There Be Life After Death? The Case of Foundations of Education." *Educational Studies* 7, no. 1 (1976): 1-7

Wetering, Van de. "The Appointment of Henry Suzzallo." *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 50 (July 1959): 99-107.

Williams, Donald T. "Henry Suzzallo and the University of a Thousand Years." *History of Higher Education Annual* (1985): 57-82.