

## ACADEMIC CULTURE AT MICHIGAN, 1938-1988: THE APOTHEOSIS OF PLURALISM

David A. Hollinger\*

What follows is not a complete account of Michigan's accomplishments during the Rackham era, with balanced attention to each department and school, with due recognition of the achievements of each president and dean. Instead, my inquiry is quite simple. There are a dozen or so major research universities with whom Michigan shares the academic leadership of the United States. When we look at Michigan since 1938 in relation to the history of this entire class of universities, what do we see? In what varieties of science and scholarship has Michigan made the most visible marks? Insofar as there is a "Michigan tradition," what is it? And are there aspects of Michigan's history that should be X-rated?

When the Rackham Building was dedicated in 1938, the University of Michigan was obviously comfortable with its longstanding reputation as a national university. Senior in years to Wisconsin and Berkeley, its only two intellectual peers among public universities, Michigan was decidedly more "eastern" in style and in composition.<sup>1</sup> In 1938 Michigan boasted an out-of-state enrollment of about 43 percent.<sup>2</sup> It was said to possess the largest living alumni of any university in the English-speaking world.<sup>3</sup> And the Michigan alumni were formidable qualitatively as well as quantitatively: Michigan was the fourth largest baccalaureate producer of the American scientists then designated as distinguished in *American Men of Science*, outproducing both Wisconsin and Princeton in that category at a rate of almost two-to-one.<sup>4</sup> On the occasion of Michigan's celebration, the year before, of one hundred years in Ann Arbor, a major address was delivered by Dean Christian Gauss of Princeton, perhaps the most respected humanistic educator of the interwar period, himself a native of Ann Arbor and holder of two degrees from Michigan.<sup>5</sup> But Michigan was more egalitarian than its eastern, private counterparts. Unlike them, Michigan had long been committed to the education of women,<sup>6</sup> and it was quicker than many of the Ivy league universities to detach humanities instruction from Christian apologetics: a decade before Columbia made room for its first Jewish professor of English, Lionel Trilling, Jewish faculty at Michigan chaired the Departments of English and Romance Languages, as well as Economics.<sup>7</sup> It is true that as late as 1930, the Michigan Law School had accepted fifteen million dollars from the avowed Anglo-Saxon supremacist and confirmed anti-Semite William W. Cook, and the University was willing to publish in its alumni magazine Cook's detailed instructions for the conservative doctrinal slant he expected in the scholarship he was funding. Cook, a few years earlier, had written a book urging his countrymen to "make life so uncomfortable" for Jews that they would cease to exist as Jews. Cook also suggested that American Blacks emigrate to New Guinea or Central America. But this extremism was at the margin; the campus atmosphere in the 1930s has been recalled by economist and eventual LS&A Dean William Haber as remarkably free of the open prejudice against Jews that was so prominent a feature of academic life between the world wars in the urban northeast.<sup>9</sup> Michigan in 1938 stood culturally midway between the Ivy and what we now call the Big Ten, displaying some of the stereotypical features of each. While Wisconsin prided itself on its special services to its state and region, Michigan looked eastward, and with the extensive support of the legislature in Lansing, fashioned for itself an image more national, more cosmopolitan, and more conservative than that of Wisconsin.<sup>10</sup>

This image of a national, cosmopolitan university was largely sustained in the character, scope, and stature of its academic programs.<sup>11</sup> Ann Arbor had always been a distinguished humanities university, especially in philosophy, classics, and in the romance and germanic languages; in 1938 this aspect of the tradition was intact. The social science departments were as a general rule smaller and less eminent, especially by contrast to the University of Chicago, but many of the professional schools at Ann Arbor were distinguished, including the Medical School, home of that legendary embodiment of the scientific

---

\*Copyright by David A. Hollinger

spirit, bacteriologist Federick Novy, the model, along with Jacques Loeb, for the preeminent scientist in American fiction, Max Gottlieb, in Sinclair Lewis' *Arrowsmith*.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, Michigan's stature in the natural sciences was extraordinary. Its Physics Department was then one of the most important in the world, presided over by Harrison M. Randall. Chairman Randall, by being among the first to hire theoretical physicists from Europe and by orchestrating a unique summer seminar for the international community of theoretical physics, had made Michigan's department strikingly European in orientation.<sup>13</sup> The Departments of Mathematics, Biology, and Astronomy were also exceptionally strong; only Harvard and Princeton, for example, had a greater number of distinguished mathematicians in 1938 than did Michigan.<sup>14</sup>

So Michigan entered the Rackham era as an extremely well established research university. In the midwest but not altogether of it, Michigan was a home for the national mainstream of academic professionalism, and was distinguished for the solidity and breadth of its programs, especially in the natural sciences, the humanities, and the professional schools.<sup>15</sup>

In tracing what happened to this University during the following fifty years it is important to remember a truth that each individual university is tempted to deny. The major research universities of the United States are, in many respects, all alike, and they seem to have become more alike during this past halfcentury.<sup>16</sup> For all their celebration of their own unique achievements and ethos" these universities - public or private, eastern or western, urban or suburban - are all subject by degree to the same political and economic forces. Chicago, Wisconsin, Yale, Berkeley, Harvard, Michigan, Princeton, Stanford, Columbia all respond to the same complex of interests and imperatives manifest in the National Science Foundation, the Department of Defense, the great private foundations, and the rather homogeneous body of trustees, regents, alumni, and in some cases legislators variously involved in the setting of policies and priorities for these elite institutions.<sup>17</sup> These universities are all trying to increase the numbers of minorities in their faculties and student bodies, and they all like to brag about how much progress they have made in hiring women.

Culturally, these major universities all share an elite professoriate found by our sociologists of higher education to be much more secular, much more Jewish, and much more liberal than other, comparable occupational cohorts, including the faculties at less prestigious colleges and universities. Intellectually, moreover, all of these elite universities share the same disciplinary discourses: they develop their curriculum and their research programs in terms set by national and international professional communities of physicists, historians, economists, and so forth. In keeping with the popular bumper-sticker, "Think Globally, Act Locally," all of these universities are essentially physical sites for intellectual projects the basic character of which is determined elsewhere, in arenas of larger scale. Hence, when we inquire into the particular history of anyone of these institutions, we necessarily encounter the generic research university as well as the specific institutional culture of one campus. It is not always easy to sort out the one from the other.

This sorting out is all the more difficult at the largest public universities, which are even more likely than their private peers to try to cover the waterfront, and to reproduce within each of their departments the contours and emphases of each discipline's national discourse at any given time. Throughout the past fifty years, Michigan has been known for one achievement above all others: for managing to perform reasonably well virtually every function major universities are expected to perform. This distinction for a single campus is more worthy of notice than it might first appear. Princeton has no schools of medicine, music, art, public health, education, natural resources, social work, nursing, or law. The Johns Hopkins University long regarded undergraduates as inconvenient obstacles to faculty research. When Clark Kerr celebrated "the multiversity" in 1963, exactly at the midpoint of our half-century, he described Michigan just as accurately as he did his own Berkeley.<sup>18</sup>

Michigan, moreover, has been famous for the intellectual pluralism within its many academic units. This is not to claim that all varieties of science and scholarship flourished equally at Michigan at all times during the last half-century. Subspecialty strengths have affected the character of a number of departments and schools: in Public Health, epidemiology; in Physics, spectroscopy; in Psychology, social psychology; in Music, composition; in Classics, papyrology; and in Mathematics, topology. The list of prominent examples could easily be extended. But even the units which attained extraordinary distinction in these specialties were often quite diverse. In philosophy, for example, William Frankena, C. L. Stevenson, and Richard Brandt made Ann Arbor unique in the United States as a center for the study of ethical theory, but the department, even while led by these men, became known for its breadth within the analytical tradition.<sup>19</sup> One can find exceptions to Michigan's reputation for pluralistic, comprehensive departments, but exceptions they truly are. There is a "Chicago School" of this and a "Chicago School" of that, but not a "Michigan School."<sup>20</sup>

Michigan, then, is surely *one of the most persistently generic* of the major universities in the United States. Hence Michigan, even more than most of the universities in its class, resists inquiries into campus-specific variations in academic culture. But recognition of this fact seems to me to be the first step toward understanding the Michigan tradition.

Michigan helped to invent the modern American university, after all, when the Ivies were still denominational colleges.<sup>21</sup> Michigan has been historically content to exemplify the university "whole" rather than to particularize it.<sup>22</sup> While Princeton, Harvard, and Yale have manufactured and sustained campus lore, constantly reinforcing their own particularity, building upon traditions of undergraduate exclusivity,<sup>23</sup> Michigan has instead identified itself with ideals *common* to institutions of higher learning. If there is a Michigan mystique, it is more democratic than exclusive, more egalitarian than hierarchical; it is a mystique more of pluralism than of uniqueness of any sort. Within the Big Ten and within the state of Michigan, Ann Arbor is sometimes perceived as arrogant and precious, even snobbish, but its image among peer universities, especially in the East, is very different.<sup>24</sup>

I dwell so long on the relatively generic character of Michigan because I have come to believe that Michigan's tradition is preeminently national rather than local. To dwell on local idiosyncracies is to risk losing track of the chief historical significance of the University of Michigan as an embodiment of the national academic culture, as an institution successfully devoted to both excellence and comprehensiveness. Yet I want to take that risk. I want to try to address local variations on national tendencies and norms.

In this comparative perspective, when we turn to the chronological development of Michigan during the Rackham era, it makes sense to concentrate on the two decades following World War II. It is a commonplace that during these years, American universities experienced unprecedented growth and a prodigious increase in perceived social significance. By the 1960s public discourse was flooded with studies and symposiums and screeds about the transformation of American higher education and the growth, in particular, of research universities. These were the pivotal years of change, and it is on the Michigan events of these postwar decades that I want especially to focus. Michigan was then a major site of the entrepreneurial transformation of American academia, and was simultaneously a major site of the intellectual revolutions in American social science associated with behavioral perspectives and quantitative methods. In both cases, the Institute for Social Research was a major factor. In 1945 the social sciences at Michigan did not amount to much, but by the 1960s, Michigan could claim one of the finest social science establishments in the world. In this same period, Michigan was a major site of the national struggle over McCarthyism. I believe these two sets of events - the story of ISR-related social science, and the story of how Michigan dealt with its accused communists and excommunists - can help us understand the terms on which Michigan's mainstream academic professionalism was consolidated.

After attending to these two sets of events, I will characterize the intellectual orientation of this university in the early 1960s, the midpoint of the Rackham era to date, in explicit comparison with two very different universities, Columbia and Stanford. I'll be suggesting that for all Michigan's greatness about 1963, Columbia and Stanford afford challenging examples of projects not carried out at Michigan with quite so much visible success. Finally, I'll comment very briefly on the more recent period, for the comprehension of which a historian's services are presumably less needed.

Michigan psychologist James Grier Miller, flying back to Detroit after a conference in California in the early 1950s, found himself seated next to Governor G. Mennen Williams. Miller was an enterprising fellow, and took advantage of the opportunity to educate the governor about the University's great potential for service to the people of Michigan and to the nation. He pointed out to Governor Williams that a mental health research institute under his own direction would be a wonderful way for such service to be rendered. By the time the plane touched down at Willow Run, the governor had virtually promised several million dollars to support a Mental Health Research Institute to be directed by Miller. The unit was established in 1955 and staffed in part by a cadre of scholars from the University of Chicago, upon which Miller, equipped with the necessary capital, made a spectacular raid.<sup>25</sup>

The local gossip of every research university includes such tales of successful entrepreneurship, more often involving private or federal patrons. The neoconservative savant Robert Nisbet has argued that the sudden importance in the late 1940s and 1950s of grants to individual scholars and to "small company-like groups of faculty. . . for the purposes of creating institutes, centers, bureaus, and other essentially capitalistic enterprises within the academic community" was "the single most powerful agent of change" in the entire modern history of universities.<sup>26</sup> Nisbet exaggerates this transformation, as universities did not await the year 1947 to partake of capitalist social relations; but he is onto something. Direct grants from private foundations and industry as well as from agencies of the federal government played a large role in the history of many universities.<sup>27</sup> A prominent set of examples at Michigan is the creating of the foreign area-studies centers in the early 1960s. Indeed, the openness of Michigan's administrative structure to the development of centers and institutions funded by outside sources is both an emblem for, and a source of, Michigan's pluralism. Nowhere in Ann Arbor was this entrepreneurial transformation carried out with more panache than at that supreme exemplar of academic enterprise, the Institute for Social Research.<sup>28</sup>

Although the name ISR was adopted in 1948, when the Research Center for Group Dynamics moved from MIT to Michigan to join forces with the Survey Research Center, the enterprise truly dates from 1946, when the Survey Research Center was established by a group of scholars who had spent World War II doing survey work for the federal government. Rensis Likert, Angus Campbell, George Katona, and others moved to Ann Arbor to try to find an institutional home for themselves at Likert's alma mater. If Michigan soon became the most entrepreneurial of America's universities in the social sciences, the credit belongs to these men and their closest colleagues, including Psychology chair Donald Marquis, the chief agent in bringing of this group to Michigan.<sup>29</sup> Large data-base survey research is of course a capital-intensive endeavor, and ISR was chiefly responsible for raising its own money. ISR did business with industry and government to the tune of more than \$200,000 in its first year of full operation, and by 1951-52 grossed \$850,000.<sup>30</sup> By the 1980s its annual budget surpassed fifteen million dollars, and ISR was regarded as the largest university-based social science research institute in the world.

A distinctive administrative arrangement helpful to ISR was the University's willingness to allow it to keep the "overhead" component of its gross revenue. In the name of "indirect costs," the University took a substantial cut off the top of grants and contract payments made to other affiliated institutes and individuals but suspended this standard practice in the case of ISR. The decisive factors in maintaining

the arrangement seem to have been the political skills of ISR leaders, especially Likert and Campbell, in integrating themselves and their staffs into the University's social science departments, and the formidable influence of Marquis on the central administration.<sup>31</sup>

Through the late 1940s and 1950s a number of ISR researchers were appointed to faculty positions, and others were hired by various departments to teach particular courses. Especially did the Psychology Department take advantage of the opportunities presented by ISR to make fractional and joint appointments; in a span of five years the legendary operator Marquis enlarged the Psychology faculty from eight to forty. The departments most affected intellectually by the presence of ISR appear to have been Psychology and Political Science, but the results were rather different in the two cases. The effect on Psychology was to facilitate pell-mell expansion and eclectic diversification, enabling Psychology, since it simultaneously pursued non-ISR opportunities, to become a classic case of the "comprehensive, pluralistic" Michigan department, embodying the diversity—however "chaotic" it seemed to some—of the national discipline. Political science is also a diverse discipline, but not nearly so diverse as psychology. And the national trend among political scientists was decidedly in a behaviorist, quantificationist direction precisely when the Political Science Department began to take advantage of ISR around 1960. Although Political Science grew in size through the use of joint appointments with ISR, its growth was more focused, methodologically and doctrinally, than Psychology's. By aggressively identifying itself with the best work being done in the "behaviorist revolution in political science," Michigan's political scientists raised their national ranking decisively.<sup>35</sup>

Sociology also made important appointments in connection with ISR, as eventually did Psychiatry, History, Statistics, Economics, Architecture, Internal Medicine, and Public Health. A great deal of distinguished social scientific work was done at Michigan in the 1950s and 1960s with no ISR connection whatsoever, to be sure,<sup>36</sup> and there did take place at ISR some work that the departments found too "applied" to be appropriate for a university. But ISR did much to make Michigan the social scientific powerhouse it had become by the early 1960s. It was through an ISR connection that the Department of Economics recruited its only member to be elected to the National Academy of Sciences, James Morgan, and it was through the same ISR connection that Economics would have recruited the eventual Nobel laureate Lawrence Klein had the Regents not stopped the tenured appointment on political grounds.

Before turning to the story of Michigan's struggles over accused communists and excommunists like Klein, I want to acknowledge that while the ISR-driven social sciences were attaining national leadership, Michigan's programs in natural science and mathematics underwent a very different experience. Although these programs grew and generally prospered amid the enormous increases in federal dollars then available, a number of other universities were more visibly successful in expanding their research capabilities and stature, especially in the physical sciences. By standard indicators, Michigan was not as formidable a science university in 1963, relative to its peers, as it had been in 1938. Michigan membership in the National Academy of Sciences, for example, had only doubled, while several of Michigan's peer institutions had tripled and quadrupled their representation in the National Academy during the same period.<sup>37</sup> Institutions as different as Wisconsin and Princeton, Berkeley and Stanford, advanced aggressively and visibly into "big science," while the attainments of Michigan's science departments came to seem modest by comparison.<sup>38</sup>

But Michigan's scientists as well as its social scientists were prominent actors in the second story of the postwar decades I want to tell, the story of Michigan as a major site of the academic struggle over McCarthyism.<sup>39</sup> Indeed, one reason this episode looms so large in Michigan's history is its campus-wide character. In this episode, the Michigan faculty experienced a rare moment of high institutional consciousness, acting not on the basis of disciplinary and departmental identities, but on the basis of their

identities as members of the academy in general, and as members of a particular faculty confronted with a particular administration. In the course of these events, faculty and administrators helped to define the political dimension of Michigan's academic culture. In the course of these events, the faculty actually cast out one of its members - the mathematician Chandler Davis<sup>40</sup> - a step it would not take again until 1983, when it cast out a member of the Psychology Department for sexual misconduct.

Everyone at Michigan was in favor of academic freedom, of course, but another ideal, potentially at odds with academic freedom, was suddenly on the agenda: "intellectual integrity." It was the possession of "intellectual integrity" that now entitled individual faculty to academic freedom. If it could be shown that a given colleague lacked this quality, the obligation to defend that colleague's academic freedom disappeared. Hence there was a great deal at stake when discussion turned to whether it was possible for a communist to have this supreme academic virtue, "intellectual integrity." By early 1953, when Congressional committees began the most active phase of their inquiries into American universities, a number of powerful voices had gone on record in the negative: to be a communist was to betray intellectual integrity, and to show oneself unfit to serve on a faculty. This argument was made most portentously in a statement signed by the presidents of all thirty-seven of the leading universities constituting the Association of American Universities (not to be confused with the faculty organization, the American Association of University Professors).<sup>41</sup> Michigan President Harlan Hatcher was of course a signer of this statement, and in May of 1953 he tried to get the Faculty Senate to endorse it. In the course of a lively debate - Senate meetings in those days were considerably more animated than they have been recently<sup>42</sup> - Kenneth Boulding attacked the presidential statement for weakening academic freedom, and historian Preston Slosson argued that mere membership in the Communist Party should not be taken as evidence that a colleague was simply a propagandist and was therefore subject to dismissal. Law Dean E. Blythe Stason addressed the Senate in a neutral voice,<sup>43</sup> in an effort to clarify the meaning of the statement Hatcher had placed before it. According to this statement, the invoking of the Fifth Amendment, Stason explained, makes a faculty person guilty, in effect, until proven innocent: invoking the Fifth Amendment "places upon a professor a heavy burden of proof of his fitness to hold a teaching position and lays upon his university an obligation to reexamine his qualifications for membership in its society."<sup>44</sup> Although the Senate tabled the AAU statement and endorsed instead an AAUP document affirming academic freedom in more conventional terms, it was the Hatcher-AAU position - precisely as interpreted by Stason that controlled events on campus a year later when pharmacologist Mark Nickerson and biologist Clement Markert pleaded the Fifth, and mathematician Chandler Davis pleaded the First Amendment, in refusing to answer the questions of a Congressional subcommittee at a session held in Lansing.<sup>45</sup>

Hatcher suspended all three the day after they refused to answer the subcommittee's questions,<sup>46</sup> and the University went forward with its own investigation. SACUA's Committee on Intellectual Freedom and Integrity, chaired by the distinguished psychologist, Angus Campbell of ISR, was ready to act as an appeal board, but the original jurisdiction fell to a Special Advisory Committee appointed by Hatcher and chaired by Law Professor Russell A. Smith. The Smith committee made clear at the outset that the issue was one of "integrity," not of research or teaching competence, and that the test of integrity was a willingness to answer specific and pointed questions about one's politics, especially about membership in the Communist Party. By this standard, Markert was found to have integrity. He was willing to answer for colleagues questions he would not answer when asked by HUAC. Yes, he had been a communist, Markert acknowledged, but he had become disillusioned with the party's dogmatism and its subservience to Moscow. The Smith committee recommended that Markert be retained on the faculty, and Hatcher accepted this recommendation.<sup>47</sup>

In the matter of Nickerson's integrity, the Smith committee split, voting three to two for his integrity and his retention. Nickerson, like Markert, had answered the questions put to him by the Smith

committee, but Nickerson reported merely drifting away from the party as he became more involved in his scientific work, not having experienced direct disillusion with the party. This was insufficiently decisive, and it was suggested that Nickerson had gone underground in 1948 and remained an agent of the communist conspiracy. As the chair of Pharmacology, Maurice SeEVERS, put the point when meeting with the Smith committee, Nickerson's table-talk at lunch "is a leftish type of conversation. . . basically following the communist line without saying so." When Hatcher eventually dismissed Nickerson, he characterized him as still "a communist in spirit" regardless of whether he happened to be a member of the party.<sup>48</sup>

The Smith committee had a more difficult time with Davis, who, unlike both Markert and Nickerson, refused to answer questions about his politics even when put to him by faculty colleagues, and who denied that his integrity depended on whether or not he was a communist. Davis, like Markert, had strong faculty support within LS&A. When the Smith committee met with the Executive Committee of LS&A, philosopher William Frankena took direct and repeated issue with the widespread presumption that Communist Party membership in itself compromised integrity and therefore justified dismissal. The contrary, more conservative side of this crucial theoretical dispute was argued, however, by economist William Haber, then also a member of the LS&A Executive Committee.<sup>49</sup> The Smith committee not only agreed with Haber but was unanimous in its own recommendation that Davis be dismissed. Yet before either Davis or Nickerson could actually be severed from the faculty, the two cases had to be heard by the SACUA-appointed Campbell committee, to which both Davis and Nickerson appealed.

The deliberations of the Campbell committee are by far the most important phase of this entire episode. Here, under the chairmanship of one of the most respected members of the faculty, was a group appointed by the faculty's own governance system. This group was charged not with the general task of advising the president how to handle a complex crisis but with the explicit responsibility of defending "Intellectual Freedom and Intellectual Integrity" in the face of HUAC-instigated inquiries into the politics of Michigan faculty. The Campbell committee was literally the interpreter and guardian on the Ann Arbor campus of the classical intellectual values at a historic moment when these values were put under severe public strain. What limits would the Campbell committee place on the "freedom" of Davis and Nickerson? What did "integrity" mean to the Campbell committee?

Integrity meant, above all, a willingness to tell one's colleagues exactly what one's politics were, and academic freedom did not extend to a right to refuse to do so. The Campbell committee wanted Davis to say whether he was a communist at that moment, whether he had been a communist in the past, and specifically whether he had been a communist at the time he signed a routine oath when joining the faculty. These are precisely the questions Campbell personally put to Davis in the opening moments of the Campbell committee's hearing of August 11, 1954. "Are you being honest in your associations with the University?" Campbell summarized his concern.<sup>50</sup> Davis's response to the effect that honesty about whether or not he was a communist was irrelevant did not cut Campbell's ice, nor that of others on the committee. Hence Nickerson, who answered all the questions put to him by the Campbell committee, passed the "integrity" test. Nickerson's retention was unanimously recommended by the Campbell committee. Davis did not pass the "integrity" test, and the Campbell committee unanimously recommended his dismissal.<sup>51</sup>

The fact that Hatcher ignored the Campbell committee and fired Nickerson<sup>52</sup> as well as Davis<sup>53</sup> conveys familiar, unremarkable lessons about the limits of faculty authority. Hatcher, too, claimed to be applying the integrity test; he simply evaluated Nickerson's performance differently, agreeing with the negative conclusion offered by the Executive Committee of the Medical School.<sup>54</sup>

One can still argue about whether the Campbell committee was correct to judge Chandler Davis a moral failure, but a striking implication of that judgment was its affirmation of the supremacy of professional solidarity. Faculty who wanted to support Davis balked when he insisted on placing other principles or interests above this solidarity with his professional colleagues. Even had he told the Campbell committee that he retained communist sympathies, there is good reason to believe that all or some members of that committee would have defended Davis, arguing that no matter how "red" his politics might be, his teaching and scholarship had "integrity." The Campbell committee and many other of Davis's colleagues desperately wanted him to join Markert and Nickerson in treating the professoriate as the salient community, distinct from the alien political world of HUAC and its critics. One can argue that Davis was wrong to hold out as he did for a higher loyalty, to his own conception of what he owed and did not owe to the academy, but his holding out was truly the gravamen of his dispute with those faculty most responsible for casting him out. Michigan's pluralism was thus narrowed by its professionalism: Michigan, at least in 1954, was not plural enough to accommodate the likes of Chandler Davis.<sup>55</sup>

The long-term and even the short-term effects of the Davis and Nickerson firings are not easy to assess. In the long run, the faculty cannot have been terribly intimidated; otherwise there would not have been by 1965 so many faculty in Ann Arbor ready to take a lead in organizing the earliest opposition to the Vietnam War.<sup>56</sup> But in the short run, there were some obvious indications at Michigan of the kinds of caution said to be characteristic of the academy nationally in the wake of the HUAC investigations.<sup>57</sup> The Economics Department put on hold the plans it was then making to add to its tenured ranks the ISR economist Lawrence Klein, even though Klein had repudiated communism in a private HUAC hearing, and thus passed the "integrity test" in spades. Even the following year when the economists, under the new and vigorous chairmanship of Gardner Ackley, tried to appoint Klein,<sup>58</sup> the appointment was stopped.<sup>59</sup> The chief agent in Klein's destiny was accounting specialist William Paton, for whom the Regents later named a building. Paton lobbied personally with five Regents against the appointment, pointing out that Klein sympathized with Norwegian socialism.<sup>60</sup> As Ellen Schrecker describes the incident in her recent book on McCarthyism and American universities, "the . . . Michigan administration, to its credit, never tried to hide the political nature of the decision" to stop Klein's appointment to tenure in the Department of Economics.<sup>61</sup>

Klein was an ISR man, and the work that had won the attention of his colleagues across campus and indeed throughout his discipline was econometric model-building, soon to become the most visible whitewater in the mainstream of professional economics. Hence reference to Klein, and to the genuine excitement that Michigan's economists felt about his work, provides a convenient opportunity to turn to the matter of what styles of scholarship flourished here in the wake of the two sets of events I have just described.

Since I am suggesting that both of these very different sets of events were conducive to the consolidation at Michigan of mainstream academic professionalism, Klein's having been both an ISR stalwart and Michigan's most obvious and well-known victim of McCarthyism can serve to prevent the misunderstanding that ISR and McCarthyism were somehow allied with each other.

The concept of "mainstream academic professionalism" is fairly straightforward. It involves a suspicion of grand theory and of epistemological quibbling, a preference for concrete and clearly manageable projects, a penchant for technical methodological refinements, and, above all, attention to aspects of the social sciences and humanities least likely to be mistaken for political advocacy, cultural criticism, or journalism. The Michigan that had come into being by the late 1950s and early 1960s

was a mighty engine of scholarship and science of just this type. In order to better recognize Michigan's mainstream academic professionalism for what it was, it may help to remember what was going on at the same historical moment at Columbia.

Columbia had plenty of mainstream academic professionalism of its own, of course, but it also had something else. Robert K. Merton, Paul E Lazarsfeld, David Truman, and Ernest Nagel of Columbia helped to endow their generation of American intellectuals with a language in which to talk about empirical social research, and their colleague C. Wright Mills provided the era's most enduring, most widely quoted critique of quantitative social science. Yet there issued from Michigan no theoretical works of the stature of Merton's *Social Theory and Social Structure* and Nagel's *The Structure of Science*, no manifestos for social research as widely quoted as Lazarsfeld's papers, no theoretical synthesis of behaviorist political science as influential as David Truman's *The Governmental Process*, nor any critiques of the whole enterprise comparable in bite and in influence to Mills's *The Sociological Imagination*.<sup>62</sup> This is not to deny that Michigan faculty wrote creatively about these issues; but it is to insist that the marks on the world of social science they made as theorists and critics were not nearly so deep as those they made as practitioners. Even behaviorist social science, Michigan's greatest glory during most of our period, was more commandingly practiced and exemplified at Michigan than it was vindicated theoretically or subjected to sustained criticism.<sup>63</sup>

Then in residence on Morningside Heights were not only Merton, Lazarsfeld, Nagel, Truman, and Mills, but also the historian Richard Hofstadter, the literary critic Lionel Trilling, and the all-purpose savant, Jacques Barzun. There, too, were Daniel Bell, Charles Frankel, Henry Steele Commager, John Herman Randall, Jr., Robert S. Lynd, Gilbert Highet, I. I. Rabi, Moses Hadas, and Meyer Schapiro.<sup>64</sup> Whatever else these men<sup>65</sup> accomplished or failed to accomplish, they articulated some of the central concerns of their respective callings in theoretical terms general enough to engage the attention of men and women of other academic fields.

Some of these Columbia scholars sought to address the implications for American politics and public doctrine of work within their disciplines.<sup>66</sup> Trilling and Bell, for example, functioned openly as moralists, as public intellectuals.<sup>67</sup> One can speculate on the role played by New York City in attracting these intellectuals to Columbia, in giving a special intensity to their collegial discourse, in providing them with inspiration to serve a public wider than their own disciplinary communities, and - through that city's unique media and publishing apparatus - in giving them the visibility that helped make them figures of national repute.<sup>68</sup>

Michigan at the same moment did have the popular naturalist, Marston Bates,<sup>69</sup> and Kenneth Boulding, who, even while surrounded by Michigan's increasingly econometric economists,<sup>70</sup> had the brass to write a book entitled *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century*.<sup>71</sup> But the work then being done at Michigan making the most waves, at least in the social sciences and humanities, where campus-to-campus variation among elite universities is of course the most evident,<sup>72</sup> was rather different. In 1960 there issued from ISR the book remembered by one study of the era as "the great monument of postwar political science," *The American Voter*, by Angus Campbell, Philip Converse, Donald Stokes, and Warren Miller.<sup>73</sup> This book's unflinching picture of an overwhelmingly apathetic, ignorant, irrational electorate was replete with implications for the state and fate of democracy, but the authors did no hand-wringing, foot-stamping, or arniwaving. Other political scientists disturbed by the book were quick to address its policy implications, but the Michigan group had produced an austere, methodologically painstaking volume now remembered as a landmark in the effort of political scientists to distinguish sharply between their scientific contributions and the discourse about policy in which any citizen could of course participate at will.<sup>74</sup> *The American Voter* was a scientifically self-conscious, rigorously professional work of data and methods which made no compromises with the world of *The New Republic*. Studied in its

aloofness from political advocacy, this book was mainstream academic professionalism at its confident best. Some of us still look to it in 1988 for help in understanding the current presidential campaign. Shortly after *The American Voter* appeared, Rensis Likert produced *New Patterns of Management*, and yet another ISR mainstay, George Katona, published *The Powerful Consumer*.<sup>75</sup> All three of these very significant works emanated from projects in large-data-base survey research, connected to theories of middle-range.<sup>76</sup>

By far the most distinguished of Michigan's humanities departments in the late 1950s and early 1960s was the Department of Philosophy, then ranked second only to Harvard. Here, too, mainstream academic professionalism was practiced at its best. I have already alluded to the department's distinction in ethics, and it should be pointed out that the work of Frankena, Stevenson, and Brandt was not applied ethics; these men did technical ethical theory in a rigorous, disciplinary tradition.<sup>77</sup> Classical Studies, too, was very distinguished, and my emphasis on rigorous professionalism is borne out by the fact that the emblem for classics at Michigan was the great papyrologist, H. C. You tie, not someone like the highly interpretive, even prophetic Norman O. Brown.<sup>78</sup> The Law School was filled with prolific scholars, known primarily for their codifications of private law.<sup>79</sup> Harold Wethey, the art historian, enjoyed a spectacular career as a cataloguer and classifier of the paintings of Titian. H. W Nordmeyer, for twenty-five years chair of German, was famous chiefly as a bibliographer.

Wethey and Nordmeyer were both "scholars" rather than "critics," in fields for which this distinction has traditionally marked off mainstream academic professionalism from a variety of alternatives. Michigan's English Department was then more oriented to teaching than to either scholarship or criticism, but its publishing members were certainly more scholars than critics. A major success of that department was *The Middle English Dictionary*, a monument of specific information.<sup>80</sup> Robert H. Super's enduring editorial work on Matthew Arnold is also a great legacy of those years, but Super himself accounted for two of his department's four Guggenheim Fellowships during one span of a dozen years in which some other, smaller Michigan departments won six, eight, or ten Guggenheims.<sup>81</sup> The illustrious critic Austin Warren was in isolated residence here at the midpoint of the Rackham era,<sup>82</sup> but he is the only Michigan person cited with any frequency in the many histories of literary criticism.<sup>83</sup>

In 1963 *The New York Review of Books* was established, but neither then nor in the subsequent quarter-century have Michigan faculty been prominent in its pages. Although most of us have misgivings about this magazine, in the 1960s and 1970s it was probably read by more American academic intellectuals than any other. The distance between Michigan and this important transdisciplinary journal of critical opinion is at least consistent with the dominance here of the strict professionalism to which I have referred.<sup>84</sup>

Reference to *The New York Review of Books* can bring us back again to the matter of New York City vs. a small midwestern city as contrasting settings in which Columbia and Michigan had achieved their rather different character by about 1960. A striking fact about many of the great urban universities, including Columbia, is the number of Central European refugee intellectuals they added to their faculties during the era of World War II. Given its great size and prestige, and its relatively cosmopolitan prewar tradition, Michigan appears to have recruited disproportionately few of these scholars. Of the forty-eight leading humanists and social scientists whose careers are summarized in Lewis Coser's recent book, *Refugee Scholars in America*, only one, George Katona, ended up at Michigan.<sup>85</sup> Hence the legendary enlivening and deprovincializing effect these intellectual immigrants had on American academia was less pronounced at Michigan.<sup>86</sup> More of these men and women might have made Michigan's pluralism yet more pluralistic, and its professionalism a bit more diversified intellectually than it was.

Is it possible that Michigan through the mid-1960s was the most persistently Protestant and native-born - with the exception, perhaps, of Wisconsin - of all the leading faculties in the United States?

I have not been able to obtain reliable campus-to-campus data to support this impression,<sup>87</sup> but it is an intriguing hypothesis. The situation at Michigan seems to have varied considerably from unit to unit. The Law School was long a midwestern-Protestant monolith; it appointed no one of Jewish origin until 1952, no Jew who had failed to convert to Christianity until 1955, and no Jew of East European descent until about 1960.<sup>88</sup> In any event, of the sixteen names I invoked earlier to remind us of Columbia's reputation for theorists and public intellectuals, more than half were Jewish. The irony is that easy-going Michigan, traditionally not much concerned with the question of who was Jewish and who was not,<sup>89</sup> turned out to be less dramatically affected in the 1940s and 1950s by the great opening of academia's gates to Jews, than was Columbia, so long resistant to the Jewish population of the city around it and then suddenly so responsive to many of the nation's most prominent Jewish scholars.<sup>90</sup>

If Columbia in the late 1950s and early 1960s was distinguished by the number and brilliance of its theorists and its critically engaged, public intellectuals, and obviously enriched by the sudden ethnic diversification of American academic life, Stanford affords a contrast to Michigan of an altogether different sort. Not only were theorists and public intellectuals of any ethnicity harder to find at Stanford than at Michigan; Stanford then had almost no distinguished departments of any orientation in the humanities, and in the social sciences Stanford ranked well only in psychology and economics, the two social science disciplines closest to the mathematical, technological, and natural scientific fields in which Stanford had chosen to concentrate.<sup>91</sup> And concentrate is the right word. Back in 1938 Stanford had been an institution of little distinction in any area of learning, but after World War II it propelled itself upward in the rankings through intensive enterprise on behalf of selected programs. Frederick Terman, the engineering dean most influential in shaping Stanford's research policy, fought against comprehensiveness, and succeeded in directing Stanford's resources into what at Stanford were called "steeple." Terman sought to build "superb programs in a few crucial fields" rather than "to try for comprehensive coverage and end up doing lots of things well but none with distinction." Terman said he would rather have one seven-foot high jumper than lots of six-foot jumpers. While Michigan as a public university with a pluralistic tradition was trying to sustain its leadership and its comprehensive scope amid economic pressures threatening to reduce it to just another garden-variety state university,<sup>92</sup> Stanford, a relatively small, highly centralized, extremely wealthy private school, roared past Michigan in the rankings in physics, math, chemistry, biochemistry, zoology, mechanical engineering, and electrical engineering. These events at Stanford were predicated, in part, on a calculated decision to allocate resources without specific reference to the needs of undergraduate programs. When Terman retired, he explained privately to his successor that indifference toward undergraduate programs was among the secrets of Stanford's success.<sup>93</sup>

Stanford and Columbia afford more striking contrasts to each other than either does to Michigan, but all the more do these two relatively ungeneric universities serve to bring out Michigan's character at the midpoint of the Rackham era. If Michigan by 1963 had lost some of its eminence in the natural sciences, it had held much of its leadership in the humanities and had made social science its most distinguished specialty. Its proliferating institutes and centers, growing apace with the new entrepreneurialism, were making Michigan more pluralistic than ever, and more responsive to those intellectual initiatives of its faculty for which federal and private dollars could be the most easily found. The most widely influential and respected work done at Michigan, whether within departments or institutes, perpetuated the mainstream academic professionalism which had always been preeminent in Ann Arbor. Michigan's pluralism had flowered within, rather than beyond, this professionalism.

Mainstream academic professionalism as it flourished at this midpoint of the Rackham era was sustained by a certain epistemological confidence, a presumption of the autonomy of knowledge from its sociopolitical matrix, and a faith in the social beneficence of knowledge honestly produced.<sup>94</sup> These protections were soon weakened by the work of Thomas Kuhn and Michel Foucault, by conflicts over the role of academic research in the Vietnam War, and by the development of its Marxist and feminist

perspectives in many disciplines. Knowledge and the processes of its production as well as its use came to be analyzed in political terms; the technical languages of the disciplines, once heralded for their autonomy, were said to be constituted by power relationships. Although these new winds of academic doctrine have blown in a number of different directions in the 1970s and 1980s,<sup>95</sup> all have served to encourage an increase in theoretical and political self-consciousness. If Michigan has not become a conspicuous leader in defining and acting upon this self-consciousness, neither is Michigan a notorious hold-out against it. Recent changes of intellectual direction in the Law School and the English Department are among many signs that Michigan's mainstream academic professionalism is being supplemented by projects of a more theoretical and critical character than was once the norm in many units here. If American academia as a whole is moving in these directions, Michigan, true to its generic character and its propensity to follow the mainstream, is part of the action.

Whatever may have changed at Michigan in the past twenty five years, the University has continued to set the national standard for productivity in professional journals. If Michigan faculty have not been writing for *The New York Review* and *Daedalus*, they have been prolific in advancing the technical progress of their disciplines. In a national assessment of research and doctoral programs carried out in 1979, Michigan's leadership in social science was even more decisive in sheer bulk of publications than in perceived intellectual value.<sup>96</sup> But indicators of high intellectual value were also numerous. In many recent seasons, Michigan has produced more Fellows of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences than has any other institution.<sup>97</sup> Although Michigan's natural science membership in the National Academy of Sciences in 1988 has slipped yet lower than it was in 1963, relative to our peer universities, Michigan's extremely high social science membership in that body is consistent with other signs of our continued leadership in social science.<sup>98</sup>

We learn something about the University of Michigan from national rankings, from lists of academy memberships and prestigious fellowships, and from citation counts, but the feeling persists - in me, and in many others - that Michigan is a more impressive university as a whole than in those of its parts that are measured by these conventional indices of excellence. Hence my constant harping on the range and diversity of the place. If Michigan's pluralistic tradition has been a liability in some respects, inhibiting the concentrating of resources in selected areas, that pluralistic tradition has also sustained Michigan's overall greatness. Pluralism is easy to fault. It offers few principles by which to set priorities, so it tends to respond uncritically to whatever initiatives and influences come upon it with the most force and capital. An institution devoted to pluralism is essentially passive, allowing itself to be pushed and pulled in various directions by agents who know what they want. Such pushes and pulls by political forces, by the shifting methodological and doctrinal fashions of the national disciplines, by the enthusiasms and prejudices of private capital and the federal government, have of course been a large part of the Michigan story during the Rackham era. These pushes and pulls have been contained and to some extent directed by two considerations, one of principle, one of chance.

The principled constraint has been the University's effort to govern itself by the standard academic values of free and open inquiry, veracity, objectivity, reasoned argument, and reliance on evidence. These are amorphous values, and their meaning is often contested. But mainstream academic professionalism is certainly an expression of these values. Both critics and defenders of Davis, Nickerson, and Markert saw themselves as the true champions of these values. The disagreements about classified and other secret research that have taken place on campus periodically during the last twenty years have been largely couched in terms of these classical cognitive values.

If this loyalty to the standard academic ethic has helped Michigan to resist or welcome different initiatives, a more decisive influence in shaping the University appears to have been chance. When I refer to "chance," I mean: Which department or school has been in possession of the basic vision and the

leadership skills to promote a given enterprise at a time when funds happen to be available and when the predilections of executive officers are propitious? Donald Marquis and Psychology and ISR together constitute a positive example we can all cite, but can we doubt that there were other chairs at other times in other units as talented as Marquis, other executive officers as responsive as Marvin Niehuss, other funds as available as that provided by the sponsors of early ISR research? It sounds like a simple combination of conditions, but I am not aware of any set of rules by which we can predict when this combination will come into being.

Multitudinous, sprawling, decentralized, contingent, imperfect, Michigan retains its capacity to inspire. That capacity derives in large part, I believe, not from any claims to uniqueness that might be made for Michigan, but from its strivings toward cosmopolitanism, from the enormous range of learned pursuits and doctrines available here. The University of Michigan has served the people of this state by its determination to remain a truly national rather than merely a state institution, making available here a diversity of intellectual opportunities and a level of excellence unmatched in the public sphere except at Berkeley and Madison. The University of Michigan has served the Midwest by refusing to be exclusively midwestern.<sup>99</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Although the University now treats 1817 as the year of its founding, its distinction as a university dates from the 1850s. Wisconsin was founded in 1849, California in 1868. Neither attained distinction until the 1890s. The standard work on late-nineteenth-century American universities is Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago, 1965).

<sup>2</sup> "Report on Student Residency Issues," Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (December 1987), 18, contains a table showing residency figures in selected years, 1860 to 1987. For 1936, the breakdown was 56.6% in-state, 43.4% out-state. The table was compiled from the Annual Reports of the Registrar. This document was made available to me by Vice President Richard Kennedy.

<sup>3</sup> The size of Michigan's alumni had long been a staple of conversation about American universities; see, for example, the popular book of 1910, Edwin E. Slosson *Leading American Universities* (New York, 1910), 477. Slosson, a prolific journalist, was the father of Preston Slosson, who was a member of the Michigan History Department from 1921 through 1962.

<sup>4</sup> Steven Sargent Visher, *Scientists Starred, 1903-1943* (Baltimore, 1947), 151. Visher's compilation is actually for 1943, not 1938; by 1943 the leading baccalaureate producers of scientists honored with a "star" in *Leading American Men of Science* were as follows: Harvard, 233; Yale, 109; Cornell, 89; Michigan, 82; Columbia, 65; Chicago, 64; MIT 63; and Berkeley, 61.

<sup>5</sup> Wilfred B. Shaw, ed., *A University Between Two Centuries: The Proceedings of the 1937 Celebration of the University of Michigan* (Ann Arbor, 1937). Among the other participants was the first woman to be a faculty member at Harvard, Alice Hamilton, an 1893 graduate of the Michigan Medical School. This celebration was a relatively classy affair, by the standards of the era. I have been sensitized to its virtues by my study of a comparable, much less successful event of the same era attempted by New York University, an institution much less sure of itself than Michigan: David A. Hollinger, "Two NYU's and 'The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order' in the Great Depression," in Thomas Bender, ed., *Universities and Cities* (New York, 1988), 249-66.

<sup>6</sup> See the informative book brought out by the University's Center for Continuing Education of Women, Dorothy Gies McGuigan, *A Dangerous Experiment: 100 Years of Women at the University of Michigan* (Ann Arbor, 1970). Part of the significance of Michigan's decision to admit women in 1870, McGuigan correctly notes (30), followed from the fact Michigan was then "the largest university in the country and had by far the greatest prestige of any college west of New England."

<sup>7</sup> The chairmanships of Louis A. Strauss (English), Mordecai Levy (Romance Languages), and Leo Sharfman (Economics) were called to my attention by Otto Graf, interview, June 23, 1988. The story of Trilling at Columbia in the 1930s has often been told; see, e.g., Mark Krupnick, *Lionel Trilling and the Fate of Cultural Criticism* (Evanston, 1986), 38.

<sup>8</sup> See Cook, *American Institutions and Their Preservation* (New York, 1927), esp. 142, 146. See also *Michigan Alumnus XXXV* (1929), 626 ff., as cited by Elizabeth Gaspar Brown, *Legal Education at Michigan, 1859-1959* (Ann Arbor, 1959), 773-75, for

the University's apparently unembarrassed public display of its tolerance for Cook's reactionary political views even in the form of explicit expectations for the scholarship appropriate for the law faculty (e.g., "Better no legal research at all than research for socialistic purposes").

<sup>9</sup> William Haber, interviews with Marjorie Brazer, May 2 and May 31, 1979, transcripts in MHC, Department of Economics, Box 5. Haber came to Michigan in-1936. Otto Graf, who was an undergraduate at Michigan from 1926 to 1930 and began teaching in the German Department immediately upon his graduation, recalls that antiradicalism was more prominent at Michigan in the 1930s than was anti-Semitism. Graf has the impression that admissions recruiters, on trips to New York, would exclude as "too liberal" applicants who admitted to reading *The New York Times* rather than one of the many papers with a more conservative editorial outlook. Graf, interview, June 23, 1988.

<sup>10</sup> The Madison campus's association with "The Wisconsin Idea" favored by turn-of-the-century reformers is properly emphasized in Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin, 1848-1925: A History* (Madison, 1949), one of the best institutional histories ever written of an American university. The state of Michigan's traditionally Republican politics established for the university at Ann Arbor a political context very different from that provided by the state of Wisconsin for the Madison campus.

<sup>11</sup> In 1934 a study of the American Council on Education listed 14 of Michigan's departments in the "high excellence" category. On the basis of this study, a widely noted magazine article ranked Michigan sixth in overall quality of American universities, after Harvard, Chicago, Columbia, California, and Yale. See Edwin R. Embree, "In Order of Their Eminence," *Atlantic Monthly* CLV (1935), 655.

<sup>12</sup> On Novy, see Horace W. Davenport, *Fifty Years of Medicine at the University of Michigan, 1891-1941* (Ann Arbor, 1986), esp. 46-49. Novy was one of four Michigan faculty and emeriti to be members in 1938 of the National Academy of Sciences. See *Report on the National Academy of Sciences, 1937-39* (Washington, 1938), 108-115. The other three National Academy members with Michigan affiliations recorded on the 1938 membership list were astronomer Heber Doust Curtis, chemist Moses Gomberg, and psychologist Walter Bowers Pillsbury. Of the four, all but Pillsbury were baccalaureate graduates of Michigan.

<sup>13</sup> Spencer R. Weart, "The Physics Business in America, 1919-1940: A Statistical Reconnaissance," in Nathan Reingold, ed., *The Sciences in the American Context: New Perspectives* (Washington, 1979), 300; Stanley Coben, "The Scientific Establishment and the Transmission of Quantum Mechanics to the United States, 1919-1932," *American Historical Review* LXXVI (1971), 442-66; Samuel A. Goudsmit, "The Michigan Symposium in Theoretical Physics," *Michigan Alumni Quarterly Review* LXVII (1961), 178-82. The Michigan Physics Department is the subject of a detailed intellectual and institutional history now being completed under the supervision of Jens Zorn. For an interim version, see Zorn, et al., *On the History of Physics at Michigan* (Ann Arbor, 1988), available from the Department of Physics.

<sup>14</sup> Visher, *Scientists Starred*, 485. See also the brief manuscript history by Wilfred Kaplan, "Mathematics at the University of Michigan," no date, c. 1987.

<sup>15</sup> Michigan's distinction as a research university at the end of the 1930s is emphasized by Roger L. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940* (New York, 1986), esp. 208-211.

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps this is why the large literature on the sociology of American higher education almost invariably treats the elite universities as a single entity, and offers little institution-by-institution comparison and specificity. This is true even of the work of the best students of higher education, Martin Trow and Burton Clark. See, e.g., Burton Clark, ed., *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings* (Berkeley, 1987). For less distinguished examples, see Talcott Parsons and Gerald M. Platt, *The American University* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973); Howard R. Bowen and Jack H. Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled* (New York, 1986); Martin Finkelstein, *The American Academic Profession: A Synthesis of Social Scientific Inquiry Since World War II* (Columbus, 1984); and Logan Wilson, *American Academics, Then and Now* (New York, 1979). One of the most valuable books in this genre remains Charles H. Anderson and John D. Murray, *The Professors: Work and Life Styles Among Academicians* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971). At the same time, most histories of single institutions remain frankly antiquarian, avoiding the issues that engage the Walter Metzgers, the Martin Trows, and the Burton Clarks of the discourse about American higher education in general. Obliviousness to such issues is, for example, a feature of the standard history of this institution: Howard H. Peckham, *The Making of the University of Michigan, 1817-1967* (Ann Arbor, 1967). This book is a useful source of basic information but offers little analysis. It was written "for Michigan residents, for alumni and students, and for parents of students." It was, "not produced," Peckham continues, "for my faculty colleagues." The intellectual development of the schools and departments of the University is dealt with more directly in *The Encyclopedic Survey of the University of Michigan*, 6 vols. (Ann Arbor, 1941-1981), but the departmental entries vary greatly in orientation, scope,

and quality. Separate histories do exist for several of the schools and colleges, but on the whole Horace Davenport is correct to observe that "the intellectual history of the University remains to be written." Davenport, *Fifty Years*, 16.

<sup>17</sup> For a refreshingly realistic acknowledgment of these truths, see Robert M. Rosenzweig, "Public and Private Universities: Much Alike, Usefully Different," in Leslie W. Koepplin and David A. Wilson, eds., *The Future of State Universities: Issues in Teaching, Research, and Public Service* (New Brunswick, 1985), 295-303.

<sup>18</sup> Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963). This remains one of the most thoughtful books yet addressed to the problems and potentialities of the large university determined to pursue excellence and comprehensiveness at the same time. Kerr deals with some of the same issues in his perspicacious but too-often ignored essay, "Remembering Flexner," which served as an introduction to a 1968 reprint of Abraham Flexner's important work of 1930, *Universities: American, English, German* (New York, 1968), vii-xx.

<sup>19</sup> My understanding of the history of Michigan's Department of Philosophy has been greatly aided by interviews with Arthur Burks (May 19, 1988) and William Frankena Uuly 14, 1988). See also Arthur W. Burks, "Department of Philosophy," *Encyclopedic Survey*, VI, 190-92.

<sup>20</sup> One does see references to the "Michigan School of Political Science," associated above all with the work of Philip Converse and his collaborators, discussed below. Marvelous as have been many of the contributions of the Chicago schools, they sometimes do foster a certain hermetic quality; Chicago's anthropologists advance a style of cultural-symbolic analysis so peculiar that our colleague Thomas Trautmann recently wrote of one such work, rhetorically, "Who thinks in this manner, outside the University of Chicago?" See Thomas R. Trautmann, "Marriage and Rank in Bengali Culture," *Journal of Asian Studies* XXXIX (May 1980), 520. This is an essay-review of a book by Chicago's Ronald B. Inden.

<sup>21</sup> See James Turner's essay in this volume.

<sup>22</sup> "Content to exemplify" might be contrasted to "vindicate theoretically," which Michigan leaders have not made much effort to do since the time of Henry Tappan, whose *University Education* (1851) is perhaps the most recent pronouncement of note on the nature and ideal course of American higher education to be written by a Michigan president (Tappan, moreover, wrote this book prior to his appointment at Michigan). Leadership in the national discourse about the aims and dilemmas of higher education has fallen to others, e.g., since the 1930s, Harvard's Conant, Pusey, and Bok; Chicago's Hutchins; and Berkeley's Kerr.

<sup>23</sup> The extreme of this mystification is perhaps Princeton's annual P-rade, in which alumni march through campus in period specific blazers. Princeton appears to be the only university to have convinced its alumni that merely to have attended a particular college was to have participated in a world historical event.

<sup>24</sup> E.g., "Michigan is a good, grey, university," an eminent biologist at the University of Pennsylvania told one of his postdoctoral fellows as the latter departed Penn for a job at Michigan in 1949. Alfred Sussman, interview, May 2, 1988.

<sup>25</sup> I first learned of this incident from Donald Brown (interview, June 20, 1988). There are several versions of this tale still making the rounds in Ann Arbor. Some place the crucial Miller-Williams conversation chronologically after the Institute's creation but before its full capitalization.

<sup>26</sup> Robert Nisbet, *The Degradation of Academic Dogma: The University in America, 1945-1970* (New York, 1970), 72-73. At almost the same time Nisbet issued his jeremiad on behalf of traditional academic virtues, journalist Spencer Klaw identified "the academic entrepreneur" as "the most conspicuous symbol" of the "new order" of scientific life that had developed in World War II and its aftermath; see Klaw, *The New Brahmins: Scientific Lift in America* (New York, 1969), 107.

<sup>27</sup> This transformation of the university research system is a major theme in Roger Geiger, "Research Universities and American Society, 1920 to 1970," in Alexandra Oleson and John Voss, eds., *Knowledge and Society in America, 1920-1970*, forthcoming. Geiger concludes (36) that the salient features of the new system "were shaped, not by any recognition of the importance of basic research, or by the considerations of science policy, but rather by the federal government's direct exploitation of university expertise in certain scientific fields during the war." See also the helpful discussion of the "commodification" of knowledge in David Dickson, *The New Politics of Science* (New York, 1984), 56-106. A thoughtful commentary is Dennis Florig, "The Scientist Entrepreneur and the Paths of Technological Development," in Malcolm L. Groggin, ed., *Governing Science and Technology in a Democracy* (Knoxville, 1986), 98-117. There remains within academia a good bit of disagreement and uncertainty about just what effect, if any, the interests of federal and private patrons have on the intellectual shape of the science and scholarship carried out in this entrepreneurial environment. Assertions that researchers simply do "what they want" and are glad

to get money for it are of course easy to come by. For an example in the social sciences of the contrary argument that the patron's interests can make a real difference in determining the direction of a discipline, see Peter J. Seybold, "The Ford Foundation and the Triumph of Behavioralism in American Political Science," in Robert F. Arnove, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Boston, 1980), 269-303. An unusually careful, discerning discussion - taking issue with the increasingly conventional Gramscian wisdom - is Barry D. Karl and Stanley N. Katz, "Foundations and Ruling Class Elites," *Daedalus* CXVI (1987), 1-40. In the large and often contentious literature on this question as it applies to the military and the natural sciences, the most challenging and technically detailed study known to me is Paul Forman, "Behind Quantum Electronics: National Security as [sic] Basis for Physical Research in the United States, 1940-1960," *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* XVIII (1987), 149-229. Persons who doubt that military priorities shape the intellectual development of science would do well to begin their refutation of this claim by answering Forman. See also Ian Hacking, "Weapons Research and the Form of Scientific Knowledge," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* (Supplementary Volume 12, 1986), 237-60.

<sup>28</sup> The early history of the Institute for Social Research is one of the best documented and most closely analyzed of any aspect of the intellectual history of the University of Michigan during the last half-century, thanks to a recent article by two major participants in the enterprise, Charles E. Cannell and Robert L. Kahn, and to a history of survey research in the United States published last year by Jean Converse. Charles E. Cannell and Robert L. Kahn, "Some Factors in the Origins and Development of the Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan," *American Psychologist* XXXIX (1984), 1256-66; Jean Converse, *Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence 1890-1960* (Berkeley, 1987); see esp. chapter 11 of this work, "The Survey Research Center at Michigan: From the Margins of Government," 340-78. I have not found a historical study of any other unit of the University of Michigan during the last half-century comparable in detail and sophistication to Converse's study of survey research at Michigan between 1946 and 1960. Especially notable is her balanced attention to institutional, personal, and methodological-ideological dimensions of the enterprise at Michigan, and her comparative perspective on similar projects at Chicago and Columbia.

<sup>29</sup> Another activist in the cause was Robert Cooley Angell, chair of Sociology. The pivotal role of Marquis and Angell is plain from the Michigan administrative documents collected in the Marvin Lemmon Niehuss Papers, Box 1, "Institute for Social Research," MHC. I have also listened to Niehuss's recollections of these events, interview, July 19, 1988.

<sup>30</sup> Converse, *Survey Research*, 344, 346. Just what to call these money-raising academics has been a delicate matter, Converse notes guardedly (264): "*Promoters, operators, and certainly hustlers* have all been used ironically among academics to lend a certain tarnish to these political skills of fund-raising and organizing." Converse appears to prefer "research entrepreneur" and "managerial scholar."

<sup>31</sup> ISR's high overruns did place the arrangement at risk more than once during the early years; see, e.g., the testy memorandum of W. K. Pierpoint to Rensis Likert, September 21, 1951, Niehuss Papers, Box 1, "Institute for Social Research," MHC. Converse describes (344-49) the salient relationships between ISR leaders and the central administration very well. Niehuss now remembers the early ISR social scientists as a very distinctive group; Niehuss and his colleagues in the central administration believed the group deserved special administrative attention; interview, July 19, 1988.

<sup>32</sup> "Department of Psychology," *Encyclopedic Survey*, VI, 207-8. Not all of the remaining 27 had the remainder of their appointments in ISR; Marquis also engineered joint appointments with other units. In Marquis, Michigan was blessed with one of the nation's most sophisticated social science planners, possessed both of a coherent vision of what the social sciences should be, intellectually, and of a program for organizing research communities in order to realize that vision. See his Presidential Address to American Psychological Association, "Research Planning at the Frontiers of Science," *American Psychologist* III (1948), 430-38, and the then-confidential (May 1952) Ford Foundation.

<sup>33</sup> My understanding of the development of the Psychology Department depends heavily on Wilbert McKeachie (interview, May 6, 1988), and "Department of Psychology," *Encyclopedic Survey*, VI, 207-212.

<sup>34</sup> Of the many treatments of the behavioral revolution in political science, one of the most incisive and provocative is contained within the recent book by Raymond Seidelman with Edward J. Harpham, *Disenchanted Realists: Political Science and the American Crisis, 1884-1984* (Albany, 1985), esp. 149-86. For a complacent, whiggish perspective, bolstered by weak research, see Albert Somit and Tannehaus, *The Development of Political Science: From Burgess to Behaviorism* (Boston, 1967). Also relevant but needlessly melodramatic is David Ricci, *The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship, and Democracy* (New Haven, 1984).

<sup>35</sup> For political science rankings, see Allan M. Canter, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education* (Washington, 1966); this study, known colloquially as "the Canter Report," was based on 1964 evaluations. Compare, for 1969, Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Anderson, *A Rating of Graduate Programs* (Washington, 1970), and for 1978-79, placing Michigan fourth in faculty quality, Lyle V. Jones et al., *An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Social & Behavioral Sciences*

(Washington, 1982). According to the departmental history written by Joseph E. Kallenbach, "Probably the most profound influence upon the department's curriculum and the approach to the subject matter field of political science has come through its close relationship with the Institute for Social Research. . . . Employing the techniques and methodology of empirical research, rather than the normative, descriptive, and analytical approach characteristic of earlier stages in the development of political science as a field of study, the department's offerings now [c. 1977] heavily emphasize political behavior studies." Kallenbach, "Department of Political Sciences," *Encyclopedic Survey*, VI, 205-6.

<sup>36</sup> The striking growth in size and stature of the Department of Anthropology is a prime example of non-ISR social scientific distinction at Michigan.

<sup>37</sup> So far as can be gleaned from the Academy's published membership list for 1963, Michigan had eight members in 1963, compared with four in 1938. National Academy of Sciences, *Annual Report*, 1963 (Washington, 1963), 141-64.

<sup>38</sup> In California, the enterprising President Robert Gordon Sproul exploited the Atomic Energy Commission and other federal agencies for all he could get, resulting in an unprecedented increase in buildings, equipment, and supporting funds for the natural sciences at Berkeley and UCLA. Verne Stadtman, *The University of California, 1868-1968* (New York, 1970), 369-70; Stadtman notes that Sproul's zeal for federal dollars was found to be excessive and incautious by some faculty leaders, including physicist Raymond Birge, chair of Berkeley's faculty Committee on Research. See also Robert Seidel, "A Home for Big Science: The Atomic Energy Commission's Laboratory System," *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* XVI (1986), 135-75. Any serious inquiry into the relative decline of Michigan's standing in the physical sciences in the postwar era would have to address the enterprise and initiative of several of Michigan's departmental chairs in the sciences. I have made no attempt to do this, but the story told above about Psychology chair Donald Marquis and the development of ISR leads me to believe that Michigan's central administration was responsive to innovative initiatives, even if not inclined, as was Berkeley's Sproul, to do the initiating. Jens Zorn and his collaborators are discreet and circumspect in dealing with this issue in *Physics at Michigan*, esp. 45. There is an oral tradition in some circles complaining that Michigan physical scientists were too proud of being able to build their equipment with "candle wax and bailing wire" and insufficiently insistent about the needs of capital-intensive research. Some of Michigan's science old-timers complain bitterly, but not for specific attribution, about "social science hegemony" in the leadership of LS&A, especially during the deanships of psychologist Roger Heyns and economist William Haber.

<sup>39</sup> Michigan's importance is implied by the extensive attention devoted to the Michigan events in a recent, widely reviewed scholarly study by Ellen W. Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism & the Universities* (New York, 1986). I have examined almost all of the documents in the Michigan Historical Collections used by Schrecker, and some she did not; I find her account of the Michigan events to be accurate, and her judgments about the meaning of these events to be essentially sound. In the book as a whole, however, I believe Schrecker subsumes under "McCarthyism" too wide a range of conduct and belief. I am also persuaded by Lewis Perry that Schrecker, by concentrating on the stories of victims of McCarthyism, diminishes the real significance of academic efforts to fight McCarthyism; see Lewis Perry, review of Schrecker, *History of Education Quarterly* (Winter 1987), 563-68.

<sup>40</sup> Michigan was subsequently censured by the American Association of University Professors. For the extensive justification of the AAUP's action, see the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee's report, "The University of Michigan," *AAUP Bulletin* XLIV (March 1958), 53-101. For the recollections of a local AAUP activist concerning the censure and the events leading to it, see Wilbert J. McKeachie, "Reminiscences of the 1950's," *AAUP Newsletter, University of Michigan*, March 1988.

<sup>41</sup> The AAU statement, "The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties," was adopted by the AAU at its meeting of March 24, 1953, at Princeton. For an account of the discussion among the AAU's leaders leading to the adoption of the statement, see Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower*, 187-89. Copies of the statement itself are in many files in MHC, e.g., Niehuss Papers, MHC, Box 2, "Angell's Loyalty Committee."

<sup>42</sup> The Senate and the Senate Assembly have engaged the rank-and-file faculty when the interests of the faculty are felt to be at stake in an issue that cuts across the lines of the schools and colleges. This was clearly the case during the McCarthy era, and again in the late 1960s when faculties debated the relationship of universities to the Vietnam War. Although Senate veterans of the 1930s and 1940s insist that a genuine, almost familial sense of community was once a reality at Michigan, during the last forty years the faculty seems not to have functioned very actively *as a polity* in the absence of crisis.

<sup>43</sup> Yet Stason's remarks imply sympathy for Hatcher's position. Three years earlier, moreover, Stason had chaired a commission that recommended state antisubversive legislation to Governor G. Mennen Williams; a copy of the Stason Report, dated August 26, 1950, is in Niehuss Papers, Box 1, "Subversive Activities Report (Governor's Panel)." That Michigan was one of the state

governments with the most initiative in antismunism efforts has long been noted by historians; see, e.g., David Caute, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower* (New York, 1978), 71-72.

<sup>44</sup> Minutes of Senate Meeting, May 11, 1953, Michigan Historical Collections, University Senate, Box 3. Stason was not, of course, declaring that persons who took the Fifth should be regarded as guilty of a criminal offense until proven innocent in court; the burden of proof he was addressing had to do not with crimes and courts, but with crime-like offenses and court-like determinations of fitness for membership in a faculty. Yet he spoke formally in his capacity as dean of the Law School, after all; the conflation of two realms was obvious and presumably intentional. In the absence of a desired legal aura, the text of the AAU statement could have well been interpreted for the Senate by a professor of English, like Hatcher himself.

<sup>45</sup> A passtime for some Michigan faculty has been speculating on why the HUAC subcommittee sent subpoenas to only four of its colleagues (Klein of ISR was also called; for a discussion of his case, see below) to appear at its session in Lansing. Part of the answer may be that Niehuss had gone quietly to Washington beforehand to try to learn what HUAC had in its files on Michigan faculty. Upon being shown this information by HUAC staff, Niehuss cautioned that the evidence was very weak indeed. He warned that the Committee would embarrass itself if it tried to depict certain individuals as communists. On other occasions, Niehuss also cautioned the FBI that its sense of who was subversive was open to question: an FBI agent once visited Niehuss's home and listed for him the Michigan faculty whom the FBI would "pick up tomorrow if war with the Russians broke out." On that list was LS&A Dean Hayward Kenniston. When Niehuss pointed to the absurdity of this, the FBI agent explained that Kenniston had once agreed to speak before a society devoted to American-Soviet friendship. Niehuss, interview, July 19, 1988. The same FBI agent once solemnly assured Niehuss in a phone conversation that the newly hired Wilbur Cohen - eventually, a distinguished dean of the School of Education and a member of the cabinet of President Lyndon Johnson in 1968-69 - had no record as a subversive. The character of FBI assessments of academic intellectuals and writers during this era has been addressed in detail by Herbert Mitgang, "Annals of Government," *The New Yorker*, October 5, 1987.

<sup>46</sup> Hatcher's action was widely protested. About 200 faculty signed a statement published in *The Michigan Daily*, May 25, 1954, defending the constitutional rights of their colleagues and protesting the introduction of "extraprofessional criteria" in the University's decision-making about faculty. The signers of this statement were almost exclusively from the College of LS&A. A list of the signers with affiliations is in Box 21 of the Niehuss Papers, MHC.

<sup>47</sup> Markert soon left Michigan for Johns Hopkins and later went to Yale, where he became chair of his department and was elected to the National Academy of Sciences. Schrecker concludes (227) on the basis of local FBI reports from the period found in Markert's FBI file that Hatcher accepted this recommendation because he believed he would be able to get rid of Markert when his contract came up for renewal. Niehuss disputes this vehemently; interview, July 19, 1988.

<sup>48</sup> "Proceedings at a Meeting of the Special Advisory Committee to the President on the Suspensions of Doctor Clement L. Markert, Doctor Mark Nickerson and Doctor H. Chandler Davis," Niehuss Papers, Box 21, MHC, see esp. I, 49, 67. The transcript of the Smith committee's session on Nickerson with the Executive Committee of the Medical School reveals many dimensions of anti-Nickerson feeling within the Medical School, especially on the part of SeEVERS. "Nickerson is basically anti-authority," SeEVERS told the Smith committee (50), "and that is something that I personally am unable to put up with." Hatcher's reference to Nickerson as a "communist in spirit" was an approving quotation from the minority report of the Smith committee; see his Report to the Senate, October 5, 1954, 16-17, in Niehuss Papers, Box 21.

<sup>49</sup> "Proceedings," II, esp. 76-81, 100.

<sup>50</sup> "Proceedings Had at the Appeal Hearing in Reference to the Appeal of Doctor H. Chandler Davis to the Senate Sub-Committee on Intellectual Freedom and Intellectual Integrity Held at Hutchins Hall. . .," page 3, found in Niehuss Papers, Box 21, MHC.

<sup>51</sup> In subsequent years Campbell remained adamant. When the AAUP censured Michigan, he joined his colleague Smith in an angry letter to the AAUP's executive secretary, declaring that all ten members of two faculty committees "became convinced that Mr. Davis was dishonest in his representation of his position as one of 'principle.'" Russell A. Smith and Angus Campbell to Robert K. Carr, January 13, 1958, in MHC, Angus Campbell Papers, Box 7, "SACUA: Intellectual Freedom and Integrity, 1954-1956." See also, in the same file, Campbell to Alfred F. Conard, May 27, 1958: Davis "was dismissed on the very legitimate charge of lack of intellectual integrity."

<sup>52</sup> Nickerson went to Canada, taking a job at the University of Manitoba.

<sup>53</sup> Davis, too, got to Canada eventually, at the University of Toronto. He first served a prison term for contempt of Congress.

<sup>54</sup> The "integrity test" was applied to Markert again early in 1956 when he was under consideration for promotion to tenure. Letters collected by Zoology chairman D. E. S. Brown from a dozen of Markert's senior departmental colleagues supplement their praise of Markert's scientific and teaching contributions with detailed and earnest evaluations of his candor and honesty. See "Markert, Clement L.," in MHC, Niehuss Papers, Box 5. Even the most negative letter in this file, written (April 11, 1956) by A. H. Stockard, insists that Markert's "political beliefs are of no concern to me, but integrity of character is important." The most favorable letter in the file includes a cogent attack on the integrity test, and a vindication of Markert within its terms, concluding that if Markert is a communist the university needs more communists; David L. Nanney to D. E. S. Brown, January 11, 1956.

<sup>55</sup> It is instructive that back in 1948 the integrity test helped determine the fate of philosopher Irving Copilowish in a case that appears to have been kept out of the press (neither *The Ann Arbor News* nor *The Michigan Daily* refers to Copilowish during the relevant period, September 18 through 24, 1948). I learned of it quite by accident, while scanning the minutes of the LS&A Executive Committee for 1948-49. The story of this remarkable case - so far as I have been able to piece it together - proceeds as follows. When Copilowish joined the Department of Philosophy in the fall of 1948, he warranted that he had never advocated the violent overthrow of the government but, in fact, he had once been involved in a Trotskyist group then construed to be subversive. A day or two after having deceived an administrative officer of the University about this matter, he confessed that he had lied and gave his colleagues in Philosophy an extensive account of his political past. Since the final approval of Copilowish's appointment as assistant professor was still to make its routine way through the Regents, LS&A Dean Kenniston wanted to be prepared to defend Copilowish. Philosophy chairman William Frankena was flown in from Harvard, where he was on sabbatical, to convene an extraordinary meeting of his department, the results of which were conveyed in a letter written to Kenniston that same afternoon. "We confidently believe," Frankena reported on behalf of his department, "that Copilowish has genuinely and entirely renounced his questionable connections, opinions, and activities, and has no intention of returning to them." We detect "nothing subversive or radical in his thinking," Frankena continued, and we find in him no "Marxist or other [b]ias." (See William Frankena to Hayward Kenniston, September 22, 1948, MHC, College of Literature, Science and the Arts, Box 81, Dean's Files, Department of Philosophy; See also Box 65 of the same collection, Minutes of the Executive Committee in 1948-49, pages 7 and 8.) The Executive Committee of LS&A was delighted, and Kenniston immediately informed Provost James P. Adams that Copilowish was not "today a supporter of subversive and revolutionary ideas." (Hayward Kenniston to James P. Adams, September 23, 1948, MHC, Dean's Files, Department of Philosophy, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, Box 81.) Copilowish was kept on. Kenniston was apparently the crucial force in saving him. (See Frankena's undated letter to Kenniston expressing his department's gratitude, *ibid*. I have also been helped by the recollections of these events shared with me by Frankena himself; interview, July 14, 1988.) Kenniston told Frankena, according to the latter's recollections, that Kenniston had carried his own letter of resignation when he went to see Adams about the Copilowish matter, but was not obliged to present it because Adams accepted the College's position on the matter. Copilowish, after changing his last name to Copi, wrote an exceedingly successful textbook in logic: Irving M. Copi, *Introduction to Logic* (New York, 1953). This book is now in its seventh edition. Copi left Michigan in 1969 to accept a position at the University of Hawaii. The Copilowish/Copi case is so interesting because it falls at the opposite extreme from that of Chandler Davis: Copilowish apparently told his colleagues all, threw himself on their mercy, uncompromisingly renounced political radicalism, and was willing to have it said of him that his "ideas," not simply his political conduct, were devoid of Marxism. The issue of Copilowish's candor was apparently reviewed again when he was promoted to tenure; a substantial folder dating from that era is closed until Copi's death, "Papers 1950-51, Copilowish (Copi), Irving," MHC, Provost, Box 13.

<sup>56</sup> Just how great a percentage of Michigan faculty were opposed to the war? The prominent, early opposition offered by Michigan faculty is of course a well-known and important aspect of the University's history during the 1960s, but an ISR study of 1967 suggested that at Michigan, "doves seem to be a minority group." See Howard Schuman and Edward O. Laumann, "Do Most Professors Support the War?" *Transaction* (November 1967).

<sup>57</sup> Some evidence of this was found in the spring of 1955, when 61 Michigan social scientists were interviewed by a survey research team from Columbia University interested in the impact on faculties of the widespread pressure for ideological conformity. The individual questionnaires seem to have been lost (Schrecker, 416), but "patterns of caution" in scholarship, teaching, and lunchroom conversation are a major theme in the published results of the survey, which also included hundreds of social scientists from many other American colleges and universities. See Paul Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., *The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis* (Glencoe, Ill., 1958), esp. 192-236. The Columbia investigators interviewed more faculty from Michigan than from any other single institution; see 434. The failure of Lazarsfeld and Thielens to disaggregate their data by specific institution is an early example of the tendency, noted above in note 16, of sociologists to treat the elite professoriate as a single entity.

<sup>58</sup> Klein received a favorable departmental vote by a margin of 16 to 2. The Executive Committee of LS&A and its then dean, Charles Odegaard, were in favor, too. Odegaard was careful to cover the "integrity" ground when recommending Klein's appointment, and to contrast Klein favorably in this respect to the three who had refused to answer the questions of the HUAC subcommittee (see Charles H. Odegaard to Marvin L. Niehuss, March 31, 1955, in "Lawrence Klein," Niehuss Papers, Box 5, MHC. Most of the documents relevant to the Klein case are in this file, and in one of the same label in Box 4 of the Niehuss Papers).

<sup>59</sup> There is a helpful account of this episode on pages 131 to 140 of Marjorie Brazer, "The Economics Department of the University of Michigan: A Centennial Retrospective," [1980], MHC, Department of Economics, Box 5. The same collection contains typescripts of interviews Brazer conducted in 1979 with the principals of the case, including Klein, Ackley, Paton, Haber, and Katona. Of special significance is Brazer's interview with Ackley, October 29, 1979. I have also profited from Ackley's comments about the case, interview, May 16, 1988.

<sup>60</sup> William Paton to Marvin L. Niehuss ["Dear Dix"], August 2, 1955, in "Lawrence Klein" folder, Niehuss Papers, Box 5, MHC. Paton sent copies of this letter to five Regents and advised his old friend Niehuss of this fact. Although there is no reason to suspect that the argument about Norwegian socialism carried any weight with Niehuss or Hatcher, the Regents were obviously moved by Paton's letter. Niehuss's response three days later reminded Paton of Klein's exceptional credentials and of the care with which the department and the College had prepared the argument, but continued circumspectly that "in view of all the circumstances" Niehuss was unwilling "at this time" to recommend Klein for tenure. (See Niehuss to Paton, August 5, 1955, *ibid.*) Although Niehuss eventually supported efforts to appoint Klein to a full professorship without tenure in the hopes of retaining him until regental opposition moderated and tenure could be awarded, Klein, then on leave at Oxford, wrote that he found this compromise gesture to Paton morally repugnant. (See Klein to Niehuss, December 9, 1955 and Klein to Gardner Ackley, same date, both *ibid.*) Klein accepted a position at the University of Pennsylvania. He paid a return visit to Ann Arbor in 1977, to receive an honorary degree from a University then eager to express its regrets.

<sup>61</sup> Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower*, 255. In the most thorough and comprehensive study of academia and McCarthyism, Schrecker judges (253) the Klein case at Michigan "perhaps the most egregiously political denial of tenure" known to her. Although Schrecker provides (254) an accurate account of the anti-Klein activities of "a professor of business administration," she does not identify Paton as this professor.

<sup>62</sup> Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Ill., 1949; second, expanded edition 1957); Ernest Nagel, *The Structure of Science* (New York, 1961); David Truman, *The Governmental Process*, (New York, 1951); C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (New York, 1959). The Michigan work most comparable to Nagel's is Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science* (San Francisco, 1964). As its subtitle implies, Kaplan's work was designed more explicitly for social scientists than was Nagel's more comprehensive treatise in philosophy of science. "The work is not a formal exercise in the philosophy of science," Kaplan's readers were assured in an introduction by Leonard Broom, "but rather a critical and constructive assessment of the developing standards and strategies of contemporary social inquiry" (xvii). Although this disclaimer suggests a book less sophisticated philosophically than Kaplan's work actually is, the disclaimer is consistent with the distinction I want to make between Kaplan's more "practical" approach and Nagel's greater concern with the classical issues of epistemology and logic. The two books were cited with almost equal frequency by social scientists between 1966 and 1985; see *Social Science Citation Index*, cumulative volumes, 1966-70, 1971-75, 1976-80, and 1981-85. Yet Kaplan's role in the culture of Michigan is not remotely as great as Nagel's at Columbia. Nagel was a Columbia man from 1931, when he began to teach philosophy there, until his death in 1985; Kaplan was at Michigan from 1963 to 1973.

<sup>63</sup> Compare my observation about Michigan's presidents, note 22, above. Although two volumes of methodological essays published in the early 1950s out of Columbia's Bureau of Social Research and Michigan's ISR have much in common - as noted by Jean Converse, *Survey Research*, 385-86 - the Michigan book was a narrower, more practical collection eschewing the "philosophy of social science" which made up 70 pages of the Columbia equivalent. See Paul E Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg, eds., *The Language of Social Research: A Reader in the Methodology of Social Research* (Glencoe, Ill., 1955), and Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz, eds., *Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences* (New York, 1953). Lazarsfeld had to face Mills in the elevator, but Jean Converse finds (534) no evidence that ISR social scientists made any effort to respond to criticisms of their brand of social science, including that of Loren Baritz, whose *The Servants of Power: A History of the Uses of Social Science in American Industry* (Middletown, Conn., 1960), she notes, makes frequent reference to ISR authors. But Baritz, interestingly, also cites the early (pre-Michigan) work of Theodore Newcomb as having been written from a refreshingly pro-labor standpoint, and some of the work of Daniel Katz as a rare example of self awareness on the part of social scientists of the function in social conflict of certain styles of "objectivity;" see Baritz, *Servants*, 136-37, 203-4, and 258.

<sup>64</sup> For convenient lists of Columbia humanities and social science faculty through the mid-1950s, see R. Gordon Hoxie, et al., *A History of the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University* (New York, 1955), 310-16, and John Herman Randall, Jr., et al., *A History of the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University* (New York, 1957), 289-96.

<sup>65</sup> I employ the male gender here because the Columbia scholars I list were, indeed, exclusively male.

<sup>66</sup> It is striking, too, how many prominent Columbia scholars addressed McCarthyism in their professional work. The Lazarsfeld and Thielens study mentioned above (*The Academic Mind*) is such an example; so, too is Richard Hofstadter and Walter Metzger, *Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York, 1955), and Daniel Bell, ed., *The New American Right* (New York, 1955). If there was a comparable outpouring of critically engaged social scientific and humanistic scholarship at Michigan, it has eluded me. Kenneth Boulding's occasional efforts along these lines were not so widely noted. Columbia's record in dealing with suspected subversives, incidentally, is very different from Michigan's; see Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower*, 255-56, who notes that President Grayson Kirk knew very well that committees of his faculty would resist inquiry into the "outside activities" of radical colleagues, so he resisted the temptation to convene such inquiries.

<sup>67</sup> This role is as easy to idealize uncritically as it is to dismiss. An undiscerning example of the former is Russell Jacoby, *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe* (New York, 1987). I find this work an embarrassment to its cause, as it foolishly denigrates technical specialization, methodological rigor, and theoretical sophistication. I have made these complaints in "Why Can't You Be More Like Dwight Macdonald?" *Reviews in American History* XVI (December 1988), 657-61.

<sup>68</sup> Such speculation can begin, for example, with the fact that New York institutions are home to most of the 60-odd academics mentioned in a recent overview of the political discourse of "intellectuals" between American entry into World War II and about 1960: Richard Pells, *The Liberal Mind in a Conservative Age: American Intellectuals in the 1940s and 1950s* (New York, 1985). Those not affiliated with Columbia, NYU, or one of the CUNY campuses are almost exclusively from other urban campuses, especially Harvard and Chicago. Pells's book is largely a retelling of stories familiar to readers of *Commentary* and *New Republic*, and it would not do to accept uncritically Pells's notion of just what should count as the history of "American intellectuals" during the era. A weakness of the book is, indeed, its obliviousness to mainstream professional scholarship. Yet for my purposes, the book's conventionality is very much to the point: Pell's confronts us with the most successful of the most journalistic endeavors of American academics during 20 years of the epoch I am addressing. That he finds no occasion even to mention *anyone* from Michigan helps us to determine just where Michigan faculty have and have not made an impact. Efforts to measure the standing of individuals outside their disciplines are even more impressionistic than the rankings of graduate programs. One scholar has tried to apply the techniques of survey research to the task; he produced a list of the "top 70" American intellectuals as of 1970: Charles Kadushin, *The American Intellectual Elite* (New York, 1974). Kadushin's list is heavily weighted toward nonacademics (e.g., Susan Sontag, Norman Mailer) but includes many academics. For whatever the survey is worth, no Michigan scholar made the top 70. Even within the "top 20," Columbia placed 3 (Bell, Hofstadter, and Trilling). See Kadushin, 30-31.

<sup>69</sup> Bates, a native of Grand Rapids, was an entomologist in his technical work. He published a number of popular works which went through several editions during his tenure at Michigan (1952-71); the best-known were Marston Bates, *The Forest and the Sea* (New York, 1960), and Marston Bates, *Man and Nature* (Englewood Cliffs, 1961).

<sup>70</sup> Marjorie C. Brazer, "Department of Economics," *Encyclopedic Survey*, VI, 144-48.

<sup>71</sup> Kenneth Boulding, *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1967). Boulding cast his claim in the form of a version of modernization theory.

<sup>72</sup> It is a truism that each of the natural science disciplines is controlled by a research consensus sufficiently tight as to prevent physics departments, for example, from becoming as different as are the economics departments of the University of Chicago and the University of Massachusetts. The "departmental cultures" of chemists and cellular and molecular biologists seem not to be as distinct from one another as those of anthropologists and philosophers. Yet attention to the subtle differences among departmental cultures is now a promising direction in history of science scholarship. For an example of sensitivity to these differences as they relate to the work of physicist Donald Glaser at Michigan, see Peter Galison, "Bubble Chambers and the Experimental Workplace," in Peter Achinstein and Owen Hannaway, eds., *Observation, Experiment, and Hypothesis in Modern Physical Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), 309-373, esp. 315.

<sup>73</sup> Angus Campbell, Philip Converse, Donald Stokes, and Warren Miller, *The American Voter* (New York, 1960). The characterization quoted is that by Robert Booth Fowler, *Believing Skeptics: American Political Intellectuals, 1945-1964* (Westport, Conn., 1978), 187.

<sup>74</sup> See, e.g., the discussion by Seidelman and Harpham, *Disenchanted Realists*, 151-69, esp. 152-53.

<sup>75</sup> Rensis Likert, *New Patterns of Management* (New York, 1961); George Katona, *The Powerful Consumer: Psychological Studies of the American Economy* (New York, 1960).

<sup>76</sup> For Katona's explicit reference to "middle-level theories," see his methodological appendix, *Consumer*, 263. When the distinction between middle-range and grand, or systematic, theory is now applied to the most influential social scientific works produced in the 1950s and early 1960s, Michigan's middle-range orientation is clear. Consider, for example, the rather different character of the Michigan and Harvard contributions listed among the 100 works most frequently cited by social scientists between 1969 and 1977. Two of the three Michigan items on this list are middle-range classics, *The American Voter* and Likert's *New Patterns of Management*. The third, Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn's *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, much influenced by the systems theories of Parsons and von Bertalanffy, is perhaps a borderline case. It is perhaps worth noting that Leon Festinger had left Michigan for Minnesota several years before he published *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Stanford, 1957), by far the most frequently cited work of social psychology in the Garfield study. Several Harvard entries on this list, however, are quintessentially grand theory: Talcott Parsons, *The Social System*; B. E Skinner, *Science and Human Behavior*; and John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard's entries also include John Kenneth Galbraith's *The New Industrial State*, which might be classified as middle-range theory but is broad enough to push the category to its limit. See Eugene Garfield, "The 100 books Most Cited by Social Scientists, 1969-1977," in Garfield, *Essays of an Information Scientist*, 9 vols. (Philadelphia, 1963-1987), III, 621-32, reprinted from *Current Comments* (September 11, 1978). Citation counts are not, in my view, of much value in determining the merit of a work, but they can help identify works that have been widely discussed. All of these Harvard books of grand theory are by single authors; yet two of the three Michigan works have multiple authors. Grand theory is almost always done by single minds - the collaborations of Marx and Engels are salient exceptions - while a major setting for team research in the social sciences has been the project of developing middle-range theories on a quantitative base, a project for which Michigan's ISR-dominated social science establishment has proven to be ideally suited.

<sup>77</sup> Abraham Kaplan did write in a more popular vein shortly before his departure from Michigan in the early 1970s, e.g., *In Pursuit of Wisdom: The Scope of Philosophy* (Beverly Hills, 1977), but the work through which Michigan philosophers were then making their mark is better represented by Frankena's *Ethics* (Engelwood Cliffs, N. J., 1963), a work distinguished, incidentally, by its accessibility as well as by its analytic rigor.

<sup>78</sup> O. M. Pearl, "Department of Classical Studies," *Encyclopedic Survey*, VI, 136-39. Michigan's classicists have established a distinguished record in epigraphy, numismatics, law, and especially papyrology but with few significant exceptions have not been as engaged by the more interpretive literary and philosophical dimensions of classical scholarship. The idiosyncratic Wesleyan classicist Brown published *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History* in 1959.

<sup>79</sup> See the complete list of publications of the law faculty through 1959 in Brown, *Legal Education*, 804-919. This book is a formidable archive of information about the Michigan Law School.

<sup>80</sup> The history of the Department of English written for the *Encyclopedic Survey* by Richard W. Bailey focuses on the department's teaching record; the dictionary is the one scholarly project mentioned by Bailey (VI, 148-52, esp. 152). For a brief account of this enduring feature of literary scholarship at Michigan, see "The Medieval World: Dictionary Project Chronicles Middle English," *University of Michigan Research News* (March-May 1988), 22-23.

<sup>81</sup> I refer to 1959 through 1971, during which time the Department of History, by far the leading Michigan producer of Guggenheim Fellows, won 10. During the entire half-century since 1938, the Department of English has won only 19 Guggenheim Fellowships, while Michigan's historians have won 29, all since 1957. When the rate of Guggenheim production is considered in relation to departmental size, only Michigan's philosophers - 10 Guggenheims since 1938 - compare to Michigan's historians in this distinction. These figures have been compiled from the annual *Reports of the President and the Treasurer* of the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation. During the past quarter-century Michigan has been the fifteenth ranking institutional producer of Guggenheim Fellows; the leaders are Berkeley, Harvard, Columbia, Yale, Stanford, and UCLA.

<sup>82</sup> To my knowledge, Warren was the only literary scholar from Michigan ever elected to membership in the National Institute of Arts and Letters. In understanding Warren's role at Michigan I have been helped by the recollections of Warner Rice (interview, May 6, 1988) and Otto Graf (interview, June 23, 1988). Warren was a devout but idiosyncratic Anglican, who crossed himself when passing portraits of Charles I.

<sup>83</sup> See Gerald Graff, *Professing Literature* (Chicago, 1987); Walter Sutton, *Modern American Criticism* (Englewood Cliffs, 1963); Rene Wellek, *American Criticism, 1900-1950*, Vol. 6 of *A History of Modern Criticism* (New Haven, 1986). Grant Webster, *The Republic of Letters* (Baltimore, 1979), points out that among "critics," Warren was something of a "scholar," if not an antiquarian. See esp. 163.

<sup>84</sup> Of the nearly 1000 names mentioned in a study of the first 10 years (1963-73) of *The New York Review*, I recognize only one that has ever been affiliated with the University of Michigan: Harold Cruse, Professor of History and Afro-American Studies; see Philip Nobile, *Intellectual Skywriting: Literary Politics & The New York Review of Books* (New York, 1974). The index of

Nobile's book, while not a comprehensive list of contributors, is a helpful indicator of just who was and wasn't part of the milieu of this periodical during the 1960s and early 1970s. Nobile's work is sufficiently facile and gossipy to inadvertently encourage noncontributors to *The New York Review* to be quite happy to have had nothing to do with the enterprise.

<sup>85</sup> Katona's career at Michigan is the subject of a splendid study by Daniel Horowitz, "George Katona and the Heroic American Consumer," chapter 3 of Horowitz's book-in-progress on American ideas about "the consumer." And see Lewis Coser, *Refugee Scholars in America* (New Haven, 1985).

<sup>86</sup> The chief institutional beneficiaries of the migration in the humanities and social sciences appear to have been Chicago, Columbia, and Harvard. The pattern is much the same in the natural sciences and mathematics, although in those fields Berkeley and NYU also hired many emigres. See Jarrell C. Jackman and Carla M. Bordman, eds., *The Muses Flee Hitler: Cultural Transfer and Adaptation, 1930-1945* (Washington, 1983); Bernard Bailyn and Donald Fleming, eds., *The Intellectual Migration, 1930-1960* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969); Laura Fermi, *Illustrious Immigrants: The Intellectual Migration from Europe, 1930-1941* (Chicago, 2nd ed., 1971); and Robin Rider, "Alarm and Opportunity: Emigration of Mathematicians and Physicists to Britain and the United States, 1933-1945," *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* XV (1984), 107-176.

<sup>87</sup> In 1969 the Carnegie Corporation conducted an ambitious survey of the ethnic and religious composition of the American professoriate. This study forms the chief basis for Stephen Steinberg, *The Academic Melting Pot: Catholics and Jews in American Higher Education* (New York, 1974). Yet the data were never broken down by specific institution. Michigan is not differentiated from others in the class of 17 "highly ranking" universities treated as a unit in the Carnegie study. "The extent of Jewish concentration" in these universities "is indeed striking," observes Steinberg (103): "Jews constitute 17 percent of faculty, 16 percent of graduate students, and 20 percent of undergraduates," while at the lowest-ranking institutions "the proportion of Jews hardly exceeds their proportion in the population," about 3 percent.

<sup>88</sup> See the list of faculty through 1959 in Brown, *Legal Education*, 470. From table-talk at the University Club - always a useful supplement to archival research - I have learned that S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, who joined the law faculty in 1952, was a convert to Christianity. In 1955 Eric Stein, a Jewish emigre from Czechoslovakia, was appointed.

<sup>89</sup> Although there were a number of Jews in the Department of Economics by 1955, William Haber, who was not especially quick to see signs of anti-Semitism around him, believed that Paton's opposition to Lawrence Klein derived in part from Paton's antipathy toward Jews. See Haber, in transcript of Marjorie Brazer interviews of May 1979, MHC, Department of Economics, Box 5.

<sup>90</sup> Columbia was simply a major site of the transformation of American intellectual life by immigrant Jews and their children; I have tried to sketch the dynamics of this historic transformation in "Ethnic Diversity, Cosmopolitanism, and the Emergence of the American Liberal Intelligentsia," reprinted in David A. Hollinger, *In the American Province: Studies in the History and Historiography of Ideas* (Bloomington, Ind., 1985), 56-73.

<sup>91</sup> Carrter, *Assessment*.

<sup>92</sup> Michigan during these years had to confront a significantly altered funding relationship with the state, which had implications not only for science programs but for the entire University. During the 1950s and 1960s the Ann Arbor campus was gradually surrounded by an entire system of state supported higher education. The old regional normal schools became full-fledged colleges and then "universities," and the old agricultural and technical college at East Lansing emerged as Michigan State University, a formidable competitor for the strategically vital social loyalties of citizens whose elected representatives appropriated state funds as they chose. For an account of the growth of public higher education in Michigan in the 1950s, see Willis E. Dunbar, *The Michigan Record in Higher Education* (Detroit, 1963), 349-62. In 1938 the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor had enjoyed the virtually undivided loyalty of all of the major elites within the state committed to higher education; 30 years later Ann Arbor was merely part of a system, its national standing and constituency potentially a vulnerability in the competition to prove to the state how much one could do for the taxpayers. The creation in Michigan of an extensive system of higher education was a natural response to the prodigious demand for public education that began to be felt soon after the war, but as the state increased its responsibilities, it diminished its capacity to support the Ann Arbor campus at the level required to maintain its traditional stature as one of the nation's leading research universities. Berkeley and Wisconsin confronted similar challenges as their respective state governments responded to demands for more public higher education. California was wealthy enough to finance an extensive system, and its flagship Berkeley campus enjoyed the unique, steady support of a sequence of strong governors. Wisconsin's predicament was closer to Michigan's, but with eventual results more threatening to the Madison campus: after years of contention over the place of this campus in the state-wide system, the legislature in 1971 diminished its autonomy by placing it under the control of a single board responsible also for the other campuses. See Clara Penniman, "The University of Wisconsin System," in Alan G. Bogue and Robert Taylor, eds., *The University of Wisconsin: One Hundred and Twenty-Five Years* (Madison, 1975), 113-30, and Philip G. Altbach, "The Champagne University in the Beer State: Notes on

Wisconsin's Crisis," in David Riesman and Verne A. Stadtman, eds., *Academic Transformation: Seventeen Institutions under Pressure* (New York, 1973), 383-408. At Michigan, the result was higher tuition. It went up and up, and ever up, until in 1988 tuition accounts for about half of the University's revenue.

<sup>93</sup> These quotations are the characterizations of Terman offered by Stuart W. Leslie, "Playing the Education Game to Win: The Military and Interdisciplinary Research at Stanford," *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* XVIII (1987), 55-88, esp. 57-58. This is the best single-institution study of research policy in the post-1945 era known to me.

<sup>94</sup> These presuppositions inform Kerr's *University* and a host of contemporary works, including Robert Lane's much-quoted article, "The Decline of Politics in a Knowledgeable Society," *American Sociological Review* XXXI (1966), and Walter Lippmann's tribute to the disinterested professoriate as the arbiter of virtually all contested questions, "The University," *New Republic* May 28, 1966, 17-20; they are conveyed with unusual clarity and force by a classic of the period, which remains, however dated as "pluralist political theory," one of the most thoughtful treatises on science policy ever written: Don K. Price, *The Scientific Estate* (New York, 1965). Note especially Price's conception of a "spectrum from truth to power," with scientific-scholarly issues at one end and political issues at the other.

<sup>95</sup> E.g., some of the latest offerings: Hilary Lawson, *Reflexivity: The Post-Modern Predicament* (London, 1985); John S. Nelson, et al., *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences: Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs* (Madison, 1987); Paul A. Bove, *Intellectuals in Power: A Genealogy of Critical Humanism* (New York, 1986); Joseph Rouse, *Knowledge and Power: Toward a Political Philosophy of Science* (Ithaca, 1987); Sandra E. Harding and Jean E. O'Barr, eds., *Sex and Scientific Inquiry* (Chicago, 1987); Mark Poster, *Foucault, Marxism & History: Mode of Production versus Mode of Information* (Oxford, 1985); James Clifford and George E. Marcus, *Writing Culture* (Berkeley, 1986); Zygmunt Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals* (Ithaca, 1987); J. Fisher Solomon, *Discourse and Reference in the Nuclear Age* (Norman, Okla., 1988); and Richard Levins and Richard Lewontin, *The Dialectical Biologist* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985). For a useful attempt at summarizing the state of this "conversation" about 10 years before these works were written, see Richard J. Bernstein, *The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory* (New York, 1976).

<sup>96</sup> Michigan's Political Science Department, for example, ranked 4th in quality but 1st in number of publications; History was 5th in quality but 2nd in productivity; Anthropology 2nd in quality, 1st in quantity; Economics 15th in quality, 8th in quantity. The pattern did not extend to the natural sciences, incidentally, where Michigan's programs were generally ranked lower in all categories, but had relatively higher ratings for intellectual quality than for number of publications. The study did not provide quantitative indicators for the humanistic disciplines. See *An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States*, printout by Daniel J. Fox, Statistical Research Laboratory, University of Michigan, April 26, 1983. I have been informed by Philip Converse, one of the designers of this study, that the study included some 20 pages of caveats and qualifications concerning the interpretation of these data; these caveats and qualifications were not attached to the printouts of Daniel Fox shown to me. Close attention to these methodological refinements may well invalidate my interpretation of the study's significance. In any event, in the gross results of this study, only one of Michigan's six leading social science departments, Psychology, ranked lower in quantity of publications than it did in overall faculty quality. It was only 4th in the nation in quantity, but 2nd in quality. Sociology ranked 3rd in both categories. In the 10 natural science programs addressed in this study, 5 Michigan programs did better in quality than in quantity; 3 the reverse, and 2 were tied. The figures, by program: Chemistry 20th in quantity and 31st in quality; Geoscience, 5th and 24th; Mathematics, 11th and 11th; Physics, 24th and 23rd; Statistics, 20th and 20th; Biochemistry, 30th and 19th; Botany, 17th and 8th; Molecular and Cellular Biology, 7th and 28th; Microbiology, 28th and 17th; Physiology, 13th and 7th.

<sup>97</sup> Between the founding of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in 1954 and last year, 1987, Michigan produced 70 fellows, making it the fifth ranking producer of CASBS fellows, behind Berkeley, Stanford, Harvard, and Chicago. See the *Annual Report* of the Center for 1982, which contains a detailed breakdown of the Center Fellows throughout the Center's history until that date. Michigan's Psychology Department, incidentally, is by far the University's largest producer of CASBS fellows, with 20, followed by Sociology with 12, and Political Science with 11. Statistics from CASBS carry an interesting hint about patterns of mobility: of the 77 scholars who were at Michigan when appointed to CASBS, at least 27 later left Michigan for other institutions, mostly in California and the Boston-Washington corridor, while of the 46 CASBS fellows currently at Michigan, only 7 have been recruited from outside, and of these only one was a social scientist recruited from a major university in California or the eastern corridor (that one recruitment took place in 1987, from Stanford).

<sup>98</sup> Michigan membership in the National Academy of Sciences has never been large. Still, its 4 members in 1938 represented a larger segment of the total academy membership than its 8 members in 1963 and its 13 members (plus one emeritus member) currently. The difference between 1963 and 1988 represents a considerable decline in regard to the natural sciences: in 1963, all 8 of Michigan's academicians were natural scientists, but in 1988, by which time the academy itself had become larger and all of Michigan's salient peer institutions had sharply increased their numbers, only 7 of Michigan's 13 active members are natural scientists. The other 6 are social scientists. The Academy did not admit social scientists until the early 1970s. Today, Michigan is not even close to being among the top 15 universities in Academy membership, even when social scientists are counted. The

following are the 15 highest ranking research universities (excluding Rockefeller, which is not the same kind of institution): Harvard, 111; Stanford, 85; Berkeley, 83; MIT, 80; Caltech, 52; Yale, 50; Chicago, 45; UC San Diego, 44; Princeton, 37; Wisconsin, 36; Cornell, 35; UCLA, 28; Columbia, 26; and Illinois, 24. These figures are based on the affiliations given for Academy members on the membership list currently being distributed by the Academy. Although I have not tried systematically to sort out the social scientists among the members from these other universities, it is obvious that for none of the 15 institutions listed above do social scientists account for more than a small fraction of the figure given. Michigan is exceptional among major research universities in having so many social scientists in the Academy, and in having so few natural scientists. Some figures for 1987 (I do not know the sections selected for the new 1988 members, so for this I am relying on the Academy's 1987 membership list) provide a sense of proportion: Michigan then had 3 of the 42 listed in the Academy's section on "social and political science," 2 of the 47 in the Academy's anthropology section, but 0 of 166 chemists, 0 of 69 mathematicians, 1 of 146 physicists, and 2 of 141 biochemists. The point is borne out yet more dramatically if one looks at the total elections to the National Academy from Michigan during the past 15 years, 1973-88: 11 social scientists, 5 natural scientists (social scientists: Dudley Duncan, and Philip Converse in 1973, Theodore Newcomb and Ronald Freedman in 1974, James Morgan in 1975, Stanley Garn in 1976, Kent Flannery in 1978, Angus Campbell in 1980, Charles Tilly in 1981, Clyde Coombs in 1982, and Robert M. Axelrod in 1987; natural scientists: Richard D. Alexander and Horace W. Davenport in 1974, M. J. Coon and Thomas M. Donahue in 1983, and Warren H. Wagner, Jr., in 1985).

<sup>99</sup> A number of people have offered helpful recollections and analyses, and answered specific questions in relation to this project. Of these, I wish especially to acknowledge the help of the following: Gardner Ackley, Robert Blackburn, Donald Brown, Arthur Burks, Claude Eggertson, Sidney Fine, William Frankena, Otto Graf, John Higham, Wilfred Kaplan, Richard Kennedy, Wilbert McKeachie, Marvin L. Niehuss, Warner Rice, Albert Sussman, Margaret Steneck, Nicholas Steneck, and Jens Zorn. I want also to acknowledge the assistance of Francis Blouin and his staff at the Bentley Library, especially Marjorie Barritt, Karin Mason, and Chris Weideman. The work of my research assistant, Brian Lloyd, has been of great value to me. This essay would have many more mistakes in it than it does were it not for the critical advice of Thomas Green. I have also been helped by the comments of John D'Arms, Joan Hollinger, and James Turner.