Northwest Ohio Quarterly

Volume 21

Issue 2

The University of Toledo Comes Of Age, 1909-1940

By Frank R. Hickerson

1. *A University on a Shoestring*

"Onward for Toledo and Toledo University." The University of Toledo had survived its darkest hour in the Spring of 1909. Deprived of its Polytechnic School for manual arts high school work, retaining only a legal interest in the Medical and the Pharmacy College, and with no liberal arts courses of college calibre, it had been granted $2,400 in 1909 by a reluctant City Council. With this paltry sum the University was to start its slow climb toward actual University stature. The appropriation had been made possible by the faith and vigilance of Dr. John S. Pyle and Postmaster William H. Tucker, members of the University Board of Directors.[1] It was the same faith and vigilance of these men, and of others who caught their spirit, which made it possible for the shadow University to take on substance and independence. When others said that it was impossible for Toledo to establish a university which could afford advantages equal to those offered by Ohio State University and the University of Michigan, it was Tucker who in a letter to the *Blade*, June 21, 1909 breathed forth the confidence of the University that was to be:

> *We believe the time is ripe for starting a complete university. We believe the people will gladly support such an institution. We have recently tried some of the leading moneyed men along these lines and they have responded to the proposition freely, showing that they are in sympathy with the university project. Such an institution would mean the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars to our city, which would go into the business and manufacturing advancement and betterment of our home city.*
>
> *We propose to stand by our oaths and to perform to the best of our ability our duties to the end that the city of Toledo today and for all future time may receive the beneficial and elevating effect of an institution of higher learning.*

The Scott bequest is a mere incident. We propose to go ahead with it or without it. Our watchword is onward for Toledo and Toledo University.[1]

The Case for the Opposition to the University. There was need for confident faith in the University's destiny because the opposition was not silenced in 1909 by the hard-won appropriation of $2,400. Chief among the points in opposition was the simple fact that in these years the University was not in fact a university, that its courses were not of college caliber, and that its colleges were merely shadowy pretenses. If it had not been for the fact that it had been chartered in accordance with Jesup W. Scott's fantastic idea that a trade school could be called a university, the institution would have ceased to have even the legal existence that the courts fortunately gave it. The best statement of the opposition point of view was in the petition filed in the Lucas County Court of Commons Pleas on February 6, 1912 seeking an injunction to restrain the city and county auditors and treasurers from issuing orders for collecting the small University levy:

At the time of the levy, for some time prior thereto, and ever since, said board of Toledo University, without buildings, equipment, or funds therefor, present or prospective, has pretended to maintain a university, but in fact, only maintains unauthorized instruction in a few studies, in no way constituting the work of a university; pretending all the while to be thereby maintaining and conducting a university. There does not exist, and there never has existed, in said city, any municipal university, whatsoever . . .

. . . The instruction given in said so-called university is not of university grade, as pretended, and said city and said board of directors of said so-called "university" are without power to maintain the kind of instruction implied by the term "university," and said levy was made wholly without authority of law and is totally invalid.

. . . Said board of directors pretends, by advertising and otherwise, to support, conduct and maintain the following colleges, to-wit; Graduate College, University Extension College, College of Law, College of Medicine, College of Arts and Sciences; whereas, in fact, said board of directors does not support, conduct, and maintain any one of said colleges, and does not have the buildings, libraries, laborator-

ies, equipment, funds and resources for the support conduct and maintenance of any one of so-called colleges.

These plaintiffs allege that said university is a mere sham, and is being carried on for the benefit of a few who seek to obtain money from public taxes, wrongfully diverted, contrary to law, for purposes in no wise contemplated or provided for by law . . .

The only semblance of a school said board of directors maintains is a small unclassified school, in which it employs three instructors and an executive officer, called "The President" of the alleged university, all secured at small salaries, far below the average salaries which are demanded and secured by teachers in first-grade high schools in Ohio. The number of students in the said school is relatively small, and they are not systematically graded in a four-year course, many taking only one to three classes per week; and no evidence of sufficient preparatory work to enter the freshman class of a reputable college is demanded. Such institution, as furnished by the three teachers and executive officer, is not of college grade, but is of a narrow scope and less efficient than in like institution furnished, and authorized to be furnished by the board of education of the city of Toledo.[2]

This was a severe, and in large measure, a true indictment.

Student Enrolment Proves the Need for the University. The University's fate in the years immediately following the appropriation of 1909 was hanging by a thread. It depended on whether or not the growing student enrolment could become representative enough of the city's population to stifle the opposition in the City Council which shared the views expressed in the petition to the Court of Common Pleas. Student enrolment did so increase, and the reasons lie in two factors: (1) the activity of the University's first President, Dr. Jerome H. Raymond in setting up the faculty and courses offered by the College of Arts and Sciences; and (2) in the stand-by financial support given informally by the friends of the University who provided the funds denied by the City Council.

The University's First President: Dr. Jerome H. Raymond. Dr. Raymond was an excellent administrator. He was brought to Toledo from the University of Chicago at a salary of $3,000 which included Mrs.

Raymond's part-time services as Professor of Comparative Literature. Much credit is due to him for his efforts to organize the University out of an almost impossible situation. He was an eloquent speaker and appeared before church groups, labor organizations, commercial bodies, clubs, societies and the common folk in general, in order to tell them what the university hoped to do for the intellectual and industrial welfare of the city. His friendship for the common man led him to appreciate the views of the great Socialist leader, Eugene V. Debs, whom he called "one of the greatest souls that ever lived". This shocked the conservative element in Toledo and led opponents of the University to call it a hot-bed of radicalism and unworthy of the support of a people who believed in the capitalistic system.[3]

The New Colleges. The first administrative act of President Raymond was the organization of the new College of Arts and Sciences. The new faculty consisted of six full-time paid professors and fifteen part-time teachers serving without pay. The six full-time professors were Frederick M. Tisdel, Dean and Professor of English (salary $1,800), Thomas M. Hills, Professor of Geology ($1,200), Charles A. Cockayne, Professor of Philosophy and Education ($1,000), Carlotta G. Cipriani, Professor of Modern Languages ($1,000), Mary J. Lanier, Dean of Women and Professor of Geography ($1,000) and John H. Blair, Professor of History ($1,000). Albert E. Macomber called the part-time teachers "dummy and decoy professors." An effort was made to affiliate the Toledo Conservatory of Music with the University. Eugene B. Knowlton was made dean of the new School. But the arrangement did not work well because it exempted the policies, finances, and faculty appointments of the School of Music from the jurisdiction of the University Board. The arrangement was discontinued in March 28, 1910 after one year's duration. Another institution added to the University on November 10, 1909 was the unaccredited Y.M.C.A. College of Law. It was supported in part by student fees and it was agreed that five dollars of each yearly student fee was to go to the Y.M.C.A. But the University assumed no obligation to pay the salaries of the Law College faculty. The College remained in the Y.M.C.A. building on Michigan Street for a year and then moved into the Medical College building at Cherry and Page Streets along with the other colleges of the University.[4]

2. *Winning Over the City Council*

Emergency Financing from Friends of the University. It took more than a college president, a faculty and a small student body to survive the financial famine of these crucial years. The City Council's $2,400 was not enough. The leading spirit in the resulting emergency financing was Dr. John S. Pyle and he found a quick response from his fellow members of the Board and other friends of the University. At a meeting of the Board of Directors on July 28, 1909 Dr. Pyle offered a form of subscription blank, or "Founders Book" which was adopted. Whereupon Dr. Pyle started the campaign as chairman of the Finance Committee by contributing $100. M. R. Coney was later employed to solicit funds at a stated compensation of 10%. The sum of $4,000 was raised the first year most of the contributories ranging from $10 to $100 and Coney's commission, at his own request, was forgotten with a resulting complimentary dinner and vote of thanks.[5]

The financial going was hard and called for sacrifices not only from men with money to spare but from the faculty members and creditors who often went unpaid for long periods. At monthly Board meetings President William H. Tucker would invariably ask, "Well, boys, how much can each of you give to make up the deficit?" They generally gave $25 to $50 apiece each month during the first year after the university was reorganized. The members of the board who made the heaviest contributions were William H. Tucker, J. Gazzam MacKenzie, Charles M. Milroy, Dr. John S. Pyle, Henry Streetman, and Charles F. Weiler. Streetman sometimes advanced several hundred dollars to cover deficits, and was given due bills for the amount by the directors until they could raise funds. Later, during President Charles A. Cockayne's administration, a new friend of the University contributed. This was E. Russell Huston who, with his helpers, raised several thousand dollars for the cause. A little help came from student fees when the Board finally decided to drop the principle of free tuition and charge Toledo resident students five dollars a year and non-residents nine dollars.[6]

Pressure on the City Council. The longer the friends of the University could enable it to hang on by emergency financing the more students were able to attend and give evidence of the popular need for a University. This meant that, as time passed, the opposition in the City Council would be unable to resist the need of the University for increas-

ed appropriations. It was good tactics for the University's friends to take advantage of the growing enrolment by using spirited methods of publicity to pressure the Council into assuming its responsibility. It was the faith of these men more even than that of founder Jesup W. Scott that made possible the University of Toledo that we know today.

The *Blade* Supports the University. Fortunate also for the progress of the University was the support given it by one of the city's leading newspapers, the Toledo *Blade*. On March 17, 1910, in the midst of the 1910 campaign for an increased appropriation, the editor called upon the City Council to give the University Board a chance to show what it could do:

> *After many years of campaigning and many months of hard work with practical results, the trustees were enabled to launch the College of Arts and Sciences. We felt that they were entitled, on the part of all citizens, to at least one year of unhampered labor. It seems only just that opponents should fold their arms until their combatant got upon his feet. After that, let the fight be fought fairly, with something of past record to balance against prediction and warnings, with all the citizens interested instead of groups.*

Dr. Pyle Calls for Public Education at the University Level. Dr. Pyle added his voice to the debate by pointing to the same need for fair play by giving the University a chance to show the good that it might do in extending higher education to people who could not afford to go to out-of-town institutions. In a letter to the Toledo *Times* on April 11, 1910, he deplored the fact that "men whose hair was whitened with age, and in the natural course of events ready almost to bid adieu to the bickerings and struggles of this world, devote their whole time and energies to befogging the understanding of people who want to improve their powers of intellectual enjoyment." After giving a history of the opposition to the University, he concluded:

> *The systematic operation of the "group of barkers" has been carried through thus far with all the energy of paid hirelings. It is not patriotism that animates them. The connivance with the city council and state legislature was not all; it captured the school board and through this body it continued its underhanded work to down the university. It is inconceivable that a public body of Toledo citizens*

engaged in educational work would join in opposition to a broad policy of advanced educational work. One would think from the extravagant statements and slanderous methods used by the opposition that the board of directors was trying to establish an institution that would do the city irreparable harm.

Pyrotechnics in the City Council, 1910-11. The issue was not determined without more of the pyrotechnics that had characterized discussion of University matters for so many years. In 1910 the City Council and the University Board collided over the question of an appropriation. Backed by Mayor Brand Whitlock the Board astounded the Council by asking for an appropriation of $40,800 and a bond issue of $75,000 for a new building. The result was four noisy public hearings in which the friends of the University were denounced for their attempt at a colossal raid on the public treasury. The University was accused of being the source of a Socialistic spirit which was infesting and poisoning the body politic. Labor organizations came out unanimously in support of the appropriation and the bond issue. So outraged were the opponents of the University that, even when the Council finance committee cut the appropriation down to $8,100 and included it in the general appropriation ordinance, they determined to kill it. (The proposed bond issue for a new building never had a chance.) It was claimed that sharp practices by Mayor Whitlock and others were responsible for belated submission of the budget so that the Council would be forced to give the University $8,100 in order to meet the deadline required by the state law for the passage of the city appropriations ordinance. Therefore the Council on June 27 refused to accept the ordinance and recessed to June 30, the last day on which it could act.[7]

The June 30 meeting was a spectacular one and resulted in paring down the University appropriation to a paltry $3,600. Said the *Blade,* "No council session in ten years had been so long and none so full of bitterness and personalities." Since the appropriation ordinance had to be passed under a suspension of the rules which required unanimous consent, the opposition was able to block passage until the University's appropriation was cut. Solicitor Cornell Schreiber threatened to mandamus the members and keep them in session until the ordinance was passed. Councilmen sat back and sang "We Won't Get Home Until Morning." Councilman James M. Staunton attacked Mayor Whitlock's motives in

submitting the budget and the Mayor, after asking for time to control his feelings, explained the necessity of waiting upon certain state legislation before submitting the budget. Staunton refused to be convinced and declared, "I'd go to jail a hundred years before I'd swallow such a thing as this." Finally at 2:00 A. M. the friends of the University gave in, acquiesced in a cut to $3,600, and adjourned amid a profusion of apologies.[8]

The City Council Ends Its Opposition to the University. The next year, 1911, was a different story. Heavy appropriations and bond issues were not asked for, and the budget included an item of only $12,000 for the University. The opposition was again led by Staunton who questioned the right of the University to so much when the city was contemplating the construction of such expensive projects as the Cherry Street bridge, the Ash-Consaul bridge, and the proposed high pressure Lake Erie water pumping station. Friends of the University replied that, because of graft and inefficiency, the public improvements were costing the city too much money. Staunton could marshall little support for his cause and the ordinance on passage received a thumping majority of 13 to 5.[9]

This was the last important fight in the Council to prevent the University from sharing in the city levy. The opposition was practically crushed. It occasionally made feeble fights against the University, but never a serious threat. In fact, after this time levies were increased each year for many years, in order to keep pace with the growth of the University. The reason for the collapse of the opposition after 1911 was that the University had begun to demonstrate its usefulness to the community and to register larger enrolments. No councilman wanted to oppose a useful public institution.[10]

3. *The University Finds a Home of its Own*

The University's Search for Housing. The next step in the University's improving fortunes was the finding of a building, if not a campus, of its own. For years it had shared rooms with the public school system and, in 1906, had finally suffered the humiliation of being dispossessed when the Board of Education had taken over the Manual Training School which had originally constituted the University. With the crea-

tion of the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Law an arrangement was worked out in August, 1910 by which the University leased rooms from its own Medical School. This unusual dependence by which the University paid one of its Colleges for already overcrowded classroom space led President Raymond to despair of the University's future and to resign. The failure to get a bond issue authorization from the City Council in 1909 had already discouraged him.[11]

Transfer to the Meredith Building. But strangely enough the destruction by fire of the Medical College building on January 9, 1911 helped the University out of its predicament. The Toledo Medical College was already in the process of being discredited academically by the American Medical Association. The complete loss of its physical facilities enabled the friends of the homeless College of Arts and Sciences to give it a new home while the Medical School sought to rebuild on the old site with its inadequate insurance funds. The men responsible for this new turn of events were the well-tried University Board members, E. Russell Huston, and some new friends in the persons of the brothers James M. and Charles Ashley. On the morning of the day after the fire, one Board member commented ruefully as he surveyed the still smoking ruins, "We are through. There isn't anything to do but to close the school." "Aw, you are crazy," quickly replied Huston, "leave it to me and I'll provide quarters, and we can start classes next week." He was as good as his word. The same afternoon he got the Ashley brothers to lease to the University without charge the former lodge quarters on the third floor of the Meridith building at Eleventh and Adams Streets. There was much work to be done to make the new quarters fit for classrooms, not the least of which was the reconditioning of the heating system to prevent smoke leakage. But the necessity of the situation produced unexpected resources in friends and services. With the help of Emma K. Snow, Elizabeth Aufderheide, and Mary Hutchison, school teachers in Toledo who attended the University, funds were raised to clean up and remodel the building for occupancy. William H. Tucker donated forty chairs and Dr. Pyle several hundred dollars. School work was resumed on Saturday morning, six days after the fire.[12]

The University Outgrows the Meridith Building. Fortune was at long last beginning to smile on the University of Toledo. Professor Charles A. Cockayne of the Department of Philosophy and Education had

succeeded to the presidency following the withdrawal of President Raymond, and soon found opportunity to seek more commodious quarters for the University than the Meridith Building afforded. There were many undesirable features about the Meridith Building, even though increased enrolment led to the leasing of its third and fourth floors in the fall of 1911. It was in a business district and the first two floors were occupied by business establishments. Students reached the University quarters by means of an elevator. The operator of this elevator was an old man who was irritated by the frequent, and sometimes unnecessary, buzzing of the bell by the students. He would refuse to respond or would take his time in operating the elevator. The business office was equipped with two tables, some shelves, and a few paste-board boxes for filing records. The classrooms were small. Some of them had slate blackboards. The place had a dingy, makeshift appearance.[13]

Occupation of the Illinois Street School Building. The occasion for the departure of the University from the Meridith Building was the favorable outcome in the Ohio Supreme Court of the suit contesting the seizure of the Manual Training School building. This had been seized by the Board of Education in 1906. It would have been folly for the University to have insisted on repossession of the Manual Training School because it would have reopened all the scars of those years of contention from 1900-1906. The people of Toledo were proud of their Manual Training School which the Board of Education had made an integral part of the Toledo public school system. When forced to choose between the Manual Training School and the new University at the college level the people would have chosen the former. The good will that the University was beginning to acquire would have been lost. Accordingly the University Board chose to negotiate with the Board of Education for the exchange of the title to the Manual Training School for title to the abandoned Illinois Street school building at the corner of Illinois (now John R.) and Eleventh Streets. The result was an agreement, dated October 6, 1913, consummating the transfer on the understanding that the Board of Education would pay $5,000 down in cash and $20,000 by January 1, 1915 at 5% interest.[14]

A New Chance for the University. The agreement was of tremendous importance to the future of the University. It ended the years of discord between the Board of Education and the University Board which could only have been disastrous to the University if allowed to

continue. It gave the University a building of its own and a fund of its own. This meant a full opportunity for it to go ahead to prove itself worthy not only of the confidence of the people of Toledo but of its claims to the right to become a true institution of higher learning.

Symbolic of this new era of good will was the spirit of cooperation shown in the rehabilitation of the "new" building. The Illinois Street school house, unused for three years, was sadly in need of repair. The sewer was clogged, the plumbing condemned, the walls cracked, the foundation undermined, and the roof full of holes. The lowest contractors bid for the work of repair was $17,000. The total sum in the treasury was $10,000.

Huston, Pyle and the Workingmen to the Rescue. Into the breach again came E. Russell Huston who agreed to take the contract for $10,000 or less, his pay to be a 10% commission on all money expended for labor, materials and equipment ordered under his direction. His job was two-fold: first to make the building habitable; second to touch the well springs of good will so as to secure donations of materials and labor. His first step was to ask the foreman for the bricks which were being removed on a pavement job. "Not a brick for that institution," said the foreman. Huston asked him whether he would let the University have the bricks, if Councilman James M. Staunton would approve of this action. "Sure, anything that Staunton says goes with me," said the foreman. Presently drays were hauling load after load of bricks to the new campus. There followed a veritable outpouring of good will. Most of the masons, carpenters, painters, and plumbers who helped donated a part or all of their time. The various labor organizations of the city, for several years, had been outspoken in their enthusiastic support of the University. Dr. Pyle also helped in his usual and effective way. Against bids of over $5,000 by local business men he was able to get the electric fixtures installed for $650, an expense which he assumed entirely by himself.[15]

When at last the reports were in, it was found that the entire job had been done for $7,402. The University Directors extended a warm vote of thanks to Huston for his generous services. They now had a building with ten classrooms, a large drawing room, an auditorium and a library. The science and pharmacy departments were housed in the rebuilt Medical College building, a mile away, to and from which faculty

and students had to walk through what is still remembered as a "red light" district.

Dedication. Great was the rejoicing of the students, faculty and friends of the University. Dedicatory exercises were held on January 30, 1914. A throng jammed the auditorium and corridors, and hundreds of others were turned away because there was no room for them. William H. Tucker, acting chairman of the program, said, "Tonight is the proudest moment of my life. I have witnessed the support of the people who are interested in this school. Hundreds have been turned back from the doors because we have no auditorium that will hold such a crowd. This indicates that the municipal university needs no defense." Addresses were made by President Charles W. Dabney of the University of Cincinnati on "The University and the People," by President Parke R. Kilbe of the University of Akron on "Municipal Cooperation," and by President Cockayne on "Struggles and Triumphs."[16]

4. *A Citizens' University: The Program of A. Monroe Stowe*

The time had come for the University to prove itself. Its friends, Huston, Tucker, Dr. Pyle, the Ashleys, the workingmen and all the others had done their part. It was now up to the teachers and educational administrators to fashion a going university.

Removal of President Cockayne. The dismissal of President Cokayne in May, 1914, paved the way for this. It had become evident that Cockayne and the University Board were not in accord as to the educational function of the University. "The University," said President Tucker of the Board, "has not grown on account of him, but in spite of him. He has been a check on its progress. The trustees have wanted it to grow along industrial as well as literary lines. He has been opposed to this and there has been discord." His resignation was called for and sustained by a five-to-four vote of the Board. Cockayne refused to resign and was forced out of office by the direct process of placing new locks on his door and stationing a policeman to prevent his return.[17]

President A. Monroe Stowe and the Idea of a Citizens' University. In selecting a successor to Cockayne the Board sought a man who would guide the University "along industrial as well as literary lines," to use Tucker's phrase. Such a man was Dr. A. Monroe Stowe,

graduate of Northwestern, Harvard and Columbia who was destined to guide the University into greater usefulness from 1914-1925. His more practical approach to the University's function contrasted sharply with Cockayne's more classical and old school attitude. Said Stowe:

> *The modern municipal College of Arts and Sciences which takes the municipal character seriously has its work pretty well marked out by its title. As an educational institution its function is to develop intelligent, efficient citizens, and as a branch of the city government its function is to place at the disposal of the city the services of its experts in so far as these services can be utilized by the municipality or its citizens in the endeavors to improve the social and civic life of the city.*[18]

Stowe's Program. President Stowe's fulfilment of this ideal included several items: (1) the setting up the College of Education; (2) the introduction of courses in business; (3) the building up of the industrial arts program; (4) the enlargement and reorganization of the College of Arts and Sciences; (5) strengthening the College of Pharmacy; (6) the creation of the Junior College; and (7) the prevention of a top heavy University with too many weak Colleges, a policy embodied by dropping the College of Medicine as well as agricultural education, and by integrating education in law, engineering, commerce and graduate work with the general arts program. All of this adjustment was administered with emphasis on late afternoon and evening classes because so much of the University's clientele was made up of school teachers and others who worked during the day.

The College of Education. Most striking of President Stowe's civic-minded policies was the increased emphasis on the training of school teachers. At the time of his taking over the presidency, teacher training in Toledo was carried on by a branch of the Bowling Green State Normal School. It was planned to drop this Toledo branch in 1916 and Stowe was ready in 1915 with a plan to fill the gap. The key item in his plan was a system of teacher training carried on within the Toledo public school system. In this respect the University had a great advantage over the Normal School at Bowling Green. The Toledo Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools, William B. Guitteau, were enthusiastically cooperative in working out the training courses for elemen-

tary school teachers. They were granted the title Apprentice in Arts upon completing the two-year teacher-training course. The next year, 1916, the work was expanded by transfering the Teachers College Division of the College of Arts and Sciences into a separate Teachers College (renamed College of Education in 1920). This made it possible to train high school teachers as well as elementary school teachers. Soon candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Secondary Education involving a four-year course began to make their appearance. By commencement time in June, 1916 President Stowe was able to announce the official recognition by the Ohio Department of Education of the curriculum of the University of Toledo Teachers College as qualified to lead to the accreditation of high school and elementary school teachers. The new College was extremely popular and useful, its enrolment jumping from 55 in 1914-15 to 271 by 1916-17. The faculty included President Stowe who was himself a specialist in teacher training, acting dean Dr. Augustus W. Trettien, and Professors David W. Henry and Benjamin Mallory.[19]

Business Education. Another important item in the new civic relationship of the University was the establishment of the College of Commerce and Business. In November, 1914 President Stowe recommended the establishment of a business course but so great was the demand that the Board approved of the establishment of a separate College under the deanship of E. E. Troxell, Professor of Journalism. There was a humanistic as well as a technical approach in the course offerings as stated in the College's catalogue of 1918-19:

> *A business education gives a clearer perspective of the factors that have to do with the productive process—the human factor, the natural resources, the mechanical factor and the governmental. It makes a man a more intelligent and broader minded student of the conflict of interest among the productive factors and this is an advance step in the solution of such problems; it gives a method of approach, a power to investigate, to mass evidence, and to analyze and to conclude—all with scientific accuracy and precision.*

It is this emphasis which probably led to the transformation of the College of Commerce to a department in the College of Arts and Sciences in 1922. Students who could spend but two years in the department were advised to seek a certificate of Associate in Science. The school was eventually revived in 1930 as the College of Business Administration.[20]

Industrial Science. Rather popular among the workingmen of Toledo was the College of Industrial Science. This was somewhat reminiscent of founder Jesup W. Scott's original idea of a "Toledo University of Arts and Trades" which had degenerated into a school of design offering courses in mechanical and architectural drawing and in painting, and which still later became the Manual Training School for grammar and high school students. A college-level industrial school had been the idea of E. Russell Huston who had gotten the Board of Directors to organize the College of Industrial Science in 1910. However, the necessary physical equipment involved a major cost item and the City Council was not of a mind to authorize the expenditure.[21]

Aristocrats Versus Laborers. This led to the drawing of sharp lines between the "Aristocrats," who did not believe the common workingman required an advanced technical training in mechanics, and the "laborers" whose representatives insisted on engineering courses, including theoretical and practical instruction for the development of skilled mechanics and tradesmen. Spokesman for the "Aristocrats" was Councilman Peter J. Mettler who on February 24, 1910 stated in City Council:

> *Honestly what do you mean by an education for workmen? Certainly not the study of chemical analysis, or differential calculus, or medicine, or any of the other numerous university branches that require life study. They don't make better citizens or better workmen. What you probably mean by an education is a repetition of the elementary branches that have been neglected in boyhood and a course in popular lectures on economic and general scientific topics, such as are given in Germany; but don't call that university.*

Sharply in rebuttal spoke Councilman and labor leader, James P. Egan, president of the Toledo Central Labor Union. "I refuse," he said, "to be paralyzed with awe at Mettler's masterly combination of mistatements, figures, ridicule, and facts." He sarcastically commended Mettler for his courage in declaring for an "aristocracy in education." Mettler, he said, thought that a trade unionist's idea of education was to brush up on the multiplication table, recall the capital of Brazil, and listen to some popular lectures. "Mr. Mettler is about two decades to the rear with his idea that unionists should be patronizingly educated and watched. If he is really interested, I will show him unions in this city that maintain class-

es in mathematics, algebra, mechanical drawing, etc., etc., and his pleas for popular lectures would be laughed at."[22]

By 1913 the equipment was forthcoming, though at first $4,000 was quite a tug on the Board of Directors and the City Council. Dean Allen R. Cullimore, graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and later President of the Newark (N.J.) Engineering College, was responsible for the persistent planning and detailed estimates. He skillfully led the way by planning a two-year course, which, with two years of other work, would lead to the degree of Bachelor of Science in the College of Arts and Sciences. Quality rather than quantity was the emphasis. It was held that it would be more practical to offer only the first two years and have the work irreproachable rather than to attempt to cover four full years. The staff claimed that their laboratory facilities were fully adequate and that the technical work would compare favorably with that given in the first two years of any of the larger universities. Courses were outlined to parallel those given at the University of Michigan and at Ohio State University. Only when there would be money available to purchase the necessary laboratory apparatus and to provide proper instruction would the last two years be added. Those completing two years of work in the college would be awarded a Junior College engineering certificate.

In 1922 upon the recommendation of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools the College of Industrial Arts was abolished and made a department of the College of Arts and Sciences. The curriculum continued to be planned so that students could transfer to Ohio State University or to the University of Michigan. Arrangements with Ohio State made it possible for a student in electrical engineering to take the first three years of the course in Toledo and to enter Ohio State as a senior. When eventually in 1931 the longer course of study was added leading to the degree of Bachelor of Engineering, it included theoretical engineering courses and cooperative engineering courses. The former, covering four years, were analagous to the courses given in first-grade engineering schools. The latter, covering five years, were planned to combine theoretical instruction and practical work to the end that a student might appreciate the intimate relation between theory and practice. The theory was taught in the classroom, and the practice was obtained in manufacturing plants in the city. Each class was divided into two alter-

nating sections: one in the shop and one in the classroom. Upon occasion, specialized courses were adopted such as those for training automobile mechanics for the army during World War I.[23]

The Junior College. A most striking development in the movement toward the new civic University was the establishment during Stowe's administration of the Junior College. Because of the fact that many students were unable to take more than two years of University work, the College of Arts and Sciences was organized into the Junior and Senior Colleges. The aim of the former was "to familiarize the student with the most important phases of his modern urban environment, as well as to introduce him to the important line of human thought and endeavor with which the student in the senior college dealt more intensively." It was felt that too often the student who had completed two years of college work felt that his studies took him nowhere, whereas the student who completed two years of terminal courses in a junior college would be better prepared to meet the social, economic and political problems which would confront him. This plan was implemented in 1915 by admitting all students engaged in the elementary teacher-training program into the Junior College and by setting up a terminal program for non-teachers. At the end of two years of successful work, each student was to receive a certificate awarding the title of "Apprentice in Arts." This program consisted of six semester hours of collegiate work in English, two in hygiene, two in physical education, and fifty-two in electives, mostly in the College of Arts and Sciences, selected under the guidance of the dean of the Junior College.[24]

The Agricultural Department. Not all of the Stowe civic-minded reforms meant permanent enlargements. Some indeed were additions which, through trial end error, were dropped. Such was the attempt to establish an Agricultural Department. The University possession of the Scott farm (now Scott Park) was an incentive for such a proposition. In 1912 a proposal was made by the University for such a department but it had been neglected by the City Council because of the expense involved. In 1915 President Stowe proposed a plan by which the Scott farm would become a University demonstration farm with the actual work being done by the inmates of the City Workhouse. (In 1911 the City Council had proposed building the Workhouse on the farm itself). Only with the entry of the United States into World War I was a practical plan evolved

when the City Council, on February 11, 1918, requested the University to establish a department of agriculture to cooperate with the War Garden Division of the City Department of Public Welfare. The University Board sought an appropriation of $2,800 which was made by the Council for equipment and services, and W. H. Steffins was appointed acting professor of agriculture. The war ended in 1918 and so did Steffins' plans to increase the farm equipment to make it self-sufficing.[25]

War Work. It was natural that entry into World War I would enable President Stowe to find other opportunities to enlarge the University's usefulness during the emergency. The first example of this came in the fall of 1917 when the University offered a course in telegraphy for men preparing to enter the U. S. Signal Corps. In the spring of 1918 the City Council appropriated $25,000 for the construction of a machine shop and dormitory on the Scott farm to enable the University to train automobile mechanics. This was a temporary structure built in 17 working days and was intended to be converted into a gymnasium. The shop eventually was turned into a stable for the farm. It enabled the first course in automobile repair training to begin at once. In the meantime a more pretentious building to cost $198,000 was begun with a generous City Council appropriation. This was intended to house a school to enlarge the program, so as to train 500 automobile mechanics at one time, the enlarged course to open in the fall of 1918. After the war the building was to become part of the peace-time University plant. As will be pointed out later, this actually took place, but the end of the war came before the building was completed. However, on October 24, 1918 the second course for automobile mechanics was opened with much ceremony and over 500 expectant young men were sworn into government service. Patriotic speeches were made by city officers and messages were read from President Woodrow Wilson and War Department officials. The trainees were housed in the Toledo Armory. Some of the best experts from the Overland Company, the Electric Power Maintenance Company, and the Auto-Lite Company served as instructors. However, the sudden end of the war on November 11, 1918 led to the student mechanics being mustered out of service. The same fate met the newly organized Student Army Training Corps for the preparation for army service of draftees who were in the University.[26]

Dropping the Medical College. It was not essential to the new University program for it to serve the City of Toledo with a low-grade

Medical College. The story of this institution is told in another place. The American Medical Association, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the Ohio State Medical Board had conducted investigations which led to the discrediting of the College and the closing of its doors early in 1914. The fact that over 50 Toledo physicians had joined in denouncing the adequateness of the College's laboratory and clinical facilities indicated to Stowe that it would do the University no good to continue to include this alleged "diploma mill" in its association of colleges. And so the Medical College Building became the headquarters of the University's science departments and School of Pharmacy until 1921, when the latter were housed in the University's first campus on the Scott farm. Today the Medical College is memorialized in the Medical College Fund which consists in large measure of the assets from the sale of the old building. The income is used to promote the Toledo Annual Medical Institute and to buy equipment for the pre-medical work of the University.[27]

Continuing the College of Pharmacy. The dropping of the Medical College made for a concentration on preserving the advantage of a good pharmacy school which could do more for Toledo than a poor medical school. The College of Pharmacy was established as a part of the Toledo Medical College when the college became part of the University in 1904. William McKenzie Read was the first dean and Professor of the Theory and Practice of Pharmacy, and served in these capacities until his death in 1937. Both he and the College of Pharmacy were destined to outlive the mother institution. However, as first established, the College of Pharmacy offered only the Ph. G. certificate at the end of two graded courses of 26 weeks each. During Stowe's administration it was considered more fitting to reduce the work of the College of Pharmacy to a part of the Junior College offerings within the College of Arts and Sciences. Thus it was not until 1938 that the College of Pharmacy was restored with a four-year curriculum leading to the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy. This was in keeping with the requirements of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy and of the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education.[28]

Services in Health, Government and Psychology. President Stowe's concept of civic service led him to set up precedents which would enable the City and the University to be mutually helpful to each other whenever occasions might arise. It was natural that the first application

of this idea should be rather overly optimisic. The years have shown that there are times when the University and the City should be free to call upon each other for help. It was Stowe's recommendation in 1915 that led to an agreement between the University Board and the Toledo Board of Health whereby the Health Department and the Chemical and Bacteriological Laboratories in the Valentine Building became University laboratories. Dr. Daniel W. Iford, director of Public Health Laboratories, was made University Professor of Hygiene. This department was "to secure, organize, formulate, and furnish in usable and readable form facts on scientific and technical information which may be requested by citizens, school authorities or other officials." Similar service was provided by the University's Public Service Bureau through its three divisions of Municipal Research and Service, Social Service, and Educational Research and Service. The first named Division under the leadership of Dr. W. M. Leiserson gave valuable assistance to the city administration and legal officials. The city has taken over the Public Service Bureau in recent years. Still another important service agency was the Psychological Clinic which was organized to provide consultations with parents, juvenile court officials and teachers in regard to the conduct and deportment of children who needed special attention.[29]

Readjustment. In 1922 President Stowe found it necessary to adjust his civic university program to the necessities of intercollegiate accreditation. The University was seeking membership in the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This organization objected to the University having so many weak colleges (law, commerce, industrial science and pharmacy). It was suggested that they were more properly departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and that students might major in one or the other of them while obtaining their bachelor's degrees. In the case of students spending only two years it was possible for them to enrol in the Junior College and receive their appropriate certificates. These changes were accordingly made.

The College of Law became a department in the College of Arts and Sciences, and dropped its practice of granting the LL. B. degree upon the completion of 40 semester hours of required courses and 8 of electives. Instead the B. A. was permitted for law students who had completed 94 semester hour of college courses of an approved distribution plus 30 hours of approved law work. Forty-eight hours of law in the College

would be applied toward the requirements for a B.A. degree. Similarly the College of Industrial Arts, the College of Commerce, and the College of Pharmacy were made departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. It was not necessary for the University to pull in its horns in regard to graduate study because this had been done in 1916 when the Board directed that its Graduate College of 1910 be abolished until such time as the University's resources would enable it to maintain an acreditable college. In place of it was set up the Division of Graduate Study which exists to this day.[30]

5. *The Scott Nearing Controversy*

The growing strength of the University during Stowe's administration was well brought to a test by the controversy involving Dr. Scott Nearing, Professor of Sociology and Economics. This affair took place in the years 1915-17 when the people of Toledo were going through the ordeal of preparation to enter World War I. Opinions were sharply divided and feelings were strong as people took sides in the matter of the growing aggressions of both Germany and England.

Scott Nearing. Nearing was a pacifist and was somewhat radical in his economic views. He had been refused reappointment at the Wharton School of Finance of the University of Pennsylvania. His scholarship was known to Dr. Pyle and he was brought to the University of Toledo on Dr. Pyle's recommendation. As the war fever mounted Nearing became more and more outspoken in opposition to entrance into it by the United States. He took the ground that American security would not be endangered by either a German or an Allied victory. Indeed he felt that it would be wasteful of our resources to plunge into a war in which we had nothing to gain. He believed that big business was promoting the war hysteria in order to protect its investments in the sale of munitions and supplies to the Allies. He was an eloquent speaker and lost no opportunity to expound his views before audiences and in publications.

Opposition to Nearing. Nearing's opponents denounced him as a dangerous radical. They accused him of being a Socialist, a publicity seeker, a rabble rouser, a preacher of class hatred, and a demagogue. The

press took sentences from his addresses and quoted them as typical of his views. Examples of these from the Toledo and Cincinnati papers are:

> *President Woodrow Wilson is for preparedness because he is a tool of the United States Steel Corporation.*
>
> *The flag belongs to the capitalists, and why should we fight for the capitalists?*
>
> *In view of the frightful social injustices that menace our society from every direction, that phrase "freedom and justice for all" as recited (in oath of allegiance to the flag) by innocent children is humbug, and we are putting misstatements into the mouths of children when we ask them to repeat these words.*

These and similar utterances soon roiled the conservative elements of the community. The Anthony Wayne Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution passed a strong resolution condemning the remarks of Nearing. "Such utterances on the part of a man occupying an honorable and profitable position on the payrolls of this city," said J. Kent Hamilton, chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, "are utterly repugnant to the intelligent, loyal, and patriotic people of Toledo, and do great harm and injustice to our city and country in many ways." The Toledo Real Estate Board and many other civic bodies likewise condemned statements attributed to Nearing.[31]

Nearing's Conditional Resignation. The controversy reached its climax in the fateful spring of 1917 when Germany inaugurated its campaign of unrestricted submarine warfare on all shipping including that of the United States. Nearing himself brought affairs to a head on March 9 by presenting his resignation to President Stowe "to take effect whenever the Board of Directors feel that my retention is detrimental to the best interests of the University." The Board's action was prompt and fair. A committee of three was appointed to prepare opinions both for and against acceptance of Nearing's resignation. A special public meeting was called for April 10.

The Board Supports Nearing. War against Germany had been declared when the special meeting was held. The atmosphere was tense with excitement. Supporters of Nearing were out in force. Hyman Le-

vine for the University student body, and both Henry Baum and Victor Gauthier for the Central Labor Union spoke in favor of retaining Nearing. Gauthier presented petitions with 8,000 names asking that the resignation be rejected. Albert Miller of the University Board spoke against Nearing, saying that the resignation was uncalled for, that it caused unnecessary and unfavorable publicity, and that Nearing's continuance on the faculty would be detrimental to the best interests of the University. On the other hand Board Members William H. Tucker, Dr. Pyle and Ben W. Johnson supported Nearing. Johnson pointed out that Nearing did not carry into his classes his personal opinions, but submitted opinions of those scientifically interested in the problems at hand. He encouraged his students to make their own researches and draw their own conclusions without dogmatic interference on his part. Johnson concluded his defense of Nearing in the following words:

> *The only objectionable novelties that Dr. Nearing has given out since he came among us, have been declarations on pacificism. Here his mistake seems to have been that he has accepted too literally the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. And it seems outside the province of this board to attempt here to interprete those teachings, or decide whether Dr. Nearing's interpretation is a heresy. At all events he is not alone in his idea of Christian conduct, but seems to be quite at one with such men as the late Golden Rule Jones, David Starr Jordan, William Lloyd Garrison, James Russell Lowell, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Williams, William Penn, and members of the Society of Friends and other non-resident sects.*
>
> *Considering how long Professor Nearing dwelt in the State of William Penn, and in the City of Brotherly Love, he is perhaps excusable for having imbibed something of the spirit of peace on earth and good will to men.*

The resignation was rejected by a vote of five to four.[83]

Nearing Is Dismissed. The victory of Nearing's supporters was short lived. A week later the board met again to consider the faculty appointments for the active year 1917-18. For some reason or other two of Nearing's supporters were absent. The opposition, led by Miller, took advantage of this and moved that Nearing not be reappointed. Miller

reaffirmed his remarks of a week before stating, "Dr. Nearing and I disagree on matters which are fundamental to the best interests of the University. I believe his recent resignation and the controversy which has arisen has done the University a great harm." According to Dr. Pyle, who voted for Nearing at both meetings of the Board, the absence of these two supporters of Nearing was due to their embarrassment at having to back him against the wishes of their conservative friends.[33]

The result was a vote four to three in favor of non-reappointment. Official spokesman for labor placed the blame for the action squarely on the absences of two of Nearing's supporters. Said the Toledo *Union Leader* on April 20, 1917:

> *We regret the action of the trustees and believe they have made a big mistake. But it is no use crying over spilt milk. The deed is done. There is one lesson that should be learned from the incident, that is for members of all boards and councils and similar leaders to be strict in their attendance. No one can foresee what may happen and we have a right to think that the opposition to Prof. Scott Nearing on Tuesday evening saw a grand opportunity to slip one over, as it were, not implying that the business was not legitimate, but the members antagonistic to the pacifist professor were present and seeing the time was opportune forced the issue and won out.*
>
> *We again say we regret the action, believe it was a mistake, and shall be truly sorry if Scott Nearing has to leave Toledo, for he was a good friend to organized labor and workers.*

6. *New Campuses and New Leaders*

Crowded Classrooms. One of the outstanding acts of the Stowe administration was the removal of the University from the confinement of the Illinois Street building and its annex (built in 1915) to more spacious quarters on the Scott farm out on Nebraska Avenue. The war had brought the enrolment to over 2,000 and there was every expectation that it would never again fall far below that mark. The Illinois Street quarters were woefully inadequate. There were not enough classrooms and the auditorium would seat only a fraction of the student body. The library room was used not only for classes and forums but for dances and parties. In the winter overcoats had to be folded and placed on the floor

next to the walls. On one occasion the school paper, called the *Record-Herald,* ran a student advertisement reading "Wanted: More clothes hooks in the cloak-room."[34]

The University Gets a Campus of its Own. The move to the new location was made possible largely by the erection for war purposes of the building to house the school for automobile mechanics. The Armistice of November 11, 1918 interrupted its construction leaving a substantial shell, without floors, ceilings, permanent wiring or plumbing and heating arrangements. In 1920 it was leased to the Milburn Wagon Company for $400 a month. Having already spent $198,000 on it, the City Council was willing to authorize bonds for another $50,000. This would put it into condition to provide classroom space for the Illinois Street students plus those who took courses in the sciences and pharmacy at the Medical College building on Page Street. The move was further facilitated by the leasing of the Medical College building to Bishop Joseph Schrembs of the Catholic Diocese of Toledo to house the new Central Catholic High School. Thus in 1922 the University found itself all in one place and with a campus of its own.[35]

Henry J. Doermann and the New Campus on West Bancroft Street. The Nebraska Avenue Campus on the Scott Farm was not a satisfactory location for the young University and it fell to a new president, Henry J. Doermann, to preside over the transfer to its present status on Bancroft Street. Stowe had retired in 1925 after a sharp disagreement with the factulty. The teachers had insisted on the opening of certain courses to freshmen only, on the grounds that the courses were not recognized in other universities. Stowe was succeeded by John W. Dowd, former Toledo Superintendent of Schools and lately Professor of Mathematics, History and Social Sciences at the University. Dowd served until his death on May 15, 1926, and was followed by Dr. Ernest A. Smith, formerly President of the State Teachers College at La Crosse, Wisconsin, who died a few weeks after taking office. This led to the appointment in September, 1927 of Dr. Doermann who came to Toledo from his position as dean of administration and vice chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico.[36]

It was Doermann's chief responsibility to guide the University into quarters where it could acquire facilities which the Scott Park area could

never permit. The main objection to the farm as a campus site was that it was located in the midst of an industrial section of the city and was hemmed in by railroad properties. The location was not easily. reached by students and faculty. Many were apprehensive of vagrants who were said to frequent the district, especially at night. An episode which brought considerable publicity was that of a woman student who was attacked by a tramp in December, 1925. Following this, several women including two school teachers and a University instructor sought permission at the safety building to arm themselves. One of the women said, "I live alone and I walk home alone, and although the idea of carrying a revolver doesn't appeal to me, I don't intend to take any chances. I'll shoot anyone who accosts me."[37]

The Bond Issue of 1928 Paves the Way. It was the $2,500,000 bond issue of 1928 that made possible the present campus of the University. There were many assets that made this great achievement possible. Most important was the good will of the city of Toledo which, by this time, was sending over 2,000 students a year to the University. The University's income in 1928-29 was $282,029.38 of which $174,-243.74 came from city taxes and $62,045.43 came from student fees. There could no longer be any doubt that the University had "arrived" and that facilities must be provided to enable it to expand toward a first-class rating. Its properties included the old Medical School, the Illinois Street Building and Annex, and the Scott farm with its new science building (converted from the intended war time school for automobile mechanics). The Medical School was sold in 1937 and its proceeds ($5,-587.56) deposited in the Medical College fund for the promotion of pre-medical education. The latter two properties were taken over by the Toledo Department of Public Welfare, the Scott farm becoming the present Scott Park. Still other favorable circumstances were the prosperity of the 1920's, the rapid growth of Toledo's automotive and glass industries, and the universal increase of college enrolment in the post-World War I years. This latter circumstance resulted from the growing need of more advanced and technical training for high school graduates before they could take a mature part in the complex 20th century society. Thus it was that on November 6, 1928 the people of Toledo registered their solemn approval of the University by upholding the bond issue by a vote of 48,905 to 36,477.[38]

University Hall and the Field House. Aided by the expert advice of city planners Harland Bartholomew, the City Council on January 31, 1929 bought the present site for a new campus. It was then an 80-acre farm owned by Rufus Wright and cost the city $275,000. (34 more acres were subsequently added which included the low lands about Ten Mile Creek on which the Glass Bowl is now situated.) Plans were then drawn up by Mills, Rhimes, Bellman and Nordhoff, architects, for the 337-room, six-floor, "collegiate Gothic" University Hall with its white limestone exterior, its classic tower and its broad sloping-roofed wings on either side. It was dignified and utilitarian in its concept with two enclosed courts resembling those of the Yale Quadrangle, with wing structures in effect constituting individual buildings connected by sally ports, so that students could move from one section to another without exposure to inclement weather. The contract was awarded to Henry J. Spieker Company on March 1, 1929. The corner stone was laid on June 12, 1929 with appropriate ceremonies presided over by Dr. Doermann, and by Dr. Steven K. Mahon, pastor of the Epworth Methodist Church and chairman of the University Board. The corner stone contained a box including the following items: a history of the University; a description of the bond issue campaign; copies of the University catalogues, the *Block House,* the *Campus Collegian,* and the Toledo *City Journal;* a list of students who took part in the bond issue campaign; a map of the city showing the city blocks where houses were visited during the campaign; the election ward count by precincts indicating the success of the bond issue; and pictures of the ground breaking ceremony of March 3, 1929. It took almost two years to complete University Hall and its companion unit, the Field House. Finally on February 1, 1931 moving day came so that on February 8 students and teachers were able to begin classes in new surroundings.[39]

Philip C. Nash and the Larger University. Dr. Doermann did not long survive the coming of the University to the new campus. His career was brought to an abrupt close by his death on November 20, 1932. He was succeeded by Dr. Philip C. Nash who was elected to the University presidency on June 21, 1933 after the interim administration of Vice President Lee W. MacKinnon. Dr. Nash was a Harvard man with specialties in engineering and came to Toledo from the deanship of Antioch College at Yellow Springs, Ohio. The University had relatively smooth sailing under his vigorous administration in the spite of

the fact that he took over in the midst of the depression. Taking full advantage of the new facilities he was able to raise standards and bring student enrolment from 2400 in 1933 to 3,518 in 1939-40. In the same period University income rose from $272,316.16 to $435,953.26. The latter figure gains added significance from the fact that more than half of it, $220,982.43, came from student fees. These had been raised, much to the relief of the depression-ridden city taxpayers. Another outstanding achievement during the Nash administration was the establishment of the College of Law and the College of Pharmacy. In 1937 on Dr. Nash's recommendation the restored College of Law was able to set up a fully staffed faculty and courses which were approved by the American Bar Association and which led to the degree of Bachelor of Laws. It was eventually certified by the Association of American Law Schools. On January 10, 1938 the Division of Pharmacy was separated from the College of Arts and Sciences and reestablished as a college with Dr. George L. Baker as dean. A new four-year curriculum was set up leading to the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy and meeting the requirements of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy and of the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education. The college has been recognized by the Ohio State Board of Pharmacy as an institution in good standing.[40]

Federal Aid Brings New Campus Units. The expansive possibilities of the Bancroft Street location were strikingly demonstrated during the 1930's by the adding of new campus units for the housing of faculty and students as well as for the accommodation of student activities. With the aid of federal emergency financing five new structures soon graced the campus: Scott and Tucker Halls for faculty women and sorority apartments; MacKinnon Hall for faculty and men's dormitory purposes; the Student Union building with its coffee shop and activity rooms for student use plus girls dormitory rooms in its upper floors (known as Libbey Hall) ; and the football stadium now known as the Glass Bowl. The Student Union and Scott and Tucker Halls were financed by government loans of $195,000 plus an outright grant of about $75,000 from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Part of the $195,000 was represented by 20-year city bonds which have proved to be a good investment. It was specified that these buildings were to be self-sustaining and self-liquidating over a period of 20 years during which the city loan should be repaid. After that the buildings were to become a permanent part of

the campus. The Stadium was in effect a gift financed as a W. P. A. project, $272,001.86 being paid by the federal government and $41,588 by the city of Toledo as the sponsor. MacKinnon Hall was financed by a federal grant of $58,000 and a federal Public Works Administration loan of $74,000. Other improvements made with federal aid included the construction of a large machine shop, a parking lot, the landscaping of the campus, and the laying of 1.3 miles of roadway.[41]

The University a College Haven to Toledo Citizenry. There could be no stronger test of the University's coming of age than the period of the 1930's. In 1909 it had been utterly dependent on the city for the miniscule appropriation of $2,400 which Dr. Pyle and his embattled friends of the University had been able to wring from a reluctant and hostile City Council. Forty years later the positions were reversed. A University, strong, confident and capable of the very highest standards, was able to provide a college haven in time of need for a citizenry which had learned to respect it.

FOOTNOTES

1. Frank R. Hickerson, "The Fight For Life. The University of Toledo, 1900-1909," *Northwest Ohio Quarterly* (Autumn, 1948), vol. 20, pp. 168-191.
2. Lucas County Court of Common Pleas, vol. 164, p. 510.
3. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 141, 142; Toledo *News-Bee,* July 29, 1909; Toledo *Times,* Feb. 19, 1910; interview with ex-city Solicitor and ex-mayor Cornell Schreiber, July 16, 1940.
4. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 144-147, 150; A. E. Macomber, *Pamphlets on the Relation of the Toledo University to the Scott and Mott Bequests, Number Three* (Published by the author, Toledo, 1916), p. 21; Toledo *News-Bee,* June 22, 1909; letter of Jerome H. Raymond to President Bradford Mills of the Toledo Conservatory of Music, March 29, 1910; interview with Judge Herbert P. Whitney, October 13, 1940.
5. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 142, 165; letter to author from M. R. Coney, September 14, 1940.
6. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 145, 287, vol. 2, p. 9; interviews with Dr. John S. Pyle, June 12, 1940, E. Russell Huston, June 14, 1940, and ex-president Charles A. Cockayne, August 13, 1940; "College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Industrial Sciences, 1910-11" in *Toledo University Bulletin,* vol. 2, No. 3, p. 5 (1910).
7. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 173, 175; Toledo *Union Leader,* March 10, 1910; interview with Cornell Schreiber, July 16, 1940; Toledo *Blade,* June 28, 1910; Toledo *News-Bee,* June 30, 1910.
8. Toledo *Blade,* June 30, 1910; Toledo *News-Bee,* June 30, 1910; interview with James M. Staunton, June 21, 1940.
9. Toledo *Blade,* June 25, 1911.
10. Interview with James M. Staunton, June 21, 1940.
11. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 200, 204.

12. Toledo *Blade,* January 9, 10, 1911; Minutes of the Trustees of Toledo Medical College, p. 239, January 19, 1911; interviews with E. Russell Huston and Dr. John S. Pyle, June 13, 1940, and with Huston and Emma K. Snow, June 19, 1940.
13. Interviews with Lucille Mack, secretary of the University, August 7, 1940 and with Emma K. Snow, June 19, 1940.
14. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 289-290.
15. *Ibid.,* p. 284; statement of Dr. John S. Pyle to Randolph C. Downes, April 13, 1949.
16. Toledo *News-Bee,* January 31, 1914; Toledo *Blade,* January 31, 1914.
17. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 312, 338; interviews with James Nye and Dr. John S. Pyle, July 9, 1940 and with Lucille Mack, August 8, 1940; Toledo *News-Bee,* May 9, 1914; Toledo *Blade,* June 11, 1914.
18. A. Monroe Stowe, "The Work of a Municipal College of Arts and Sciences," *School and Society,* vol. II (November 27, 1915), 786-788.
19. Interview with Dr. Charles A. Cockayne, August 13, 1940 and with Josephine Leach Guitteau, September 25, 1940; "The College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Industrial Science, 1910-1911" in Toledo University Bulletin, vol. 2, No. 3, 1910 pp. 14-15; Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 2, pp. 49, 59, 106, 114, 338; Toledo University Announcements, "The Toledo Elementary School Teacher Training Course, 1916-17"; Walter L. Collins, Director of the Division of Instruction, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio to the author, August 6, 1940.
20. Interview with M. T. Skinner, December 1, 1940; Minutes of Directors of Toledo University, vol. 2, pp. 18-19, 30, 124; Toledo *Times,* September 11, 1917; "College of Commerce and Business, 1918-19 in Toledo University Bulletin, vol. 10, No. 3, p. 8 (1918).
21. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, p. 214.
22. Toledo *Blade,* February 25, 1910.
23. Allen R. Cullimore to the author, September 17, 1940; Toledo *City Journal,* vol. III, (July 6, 1918), pp. 338-339; A. Monroe Stowe to the author, September 8, 1940; interviews with Dean Delos M. Palmer and Professor John B. Brandeberry, September 4, 1940.
24. "Toledo University Catalogue, 1917-18" in *Toledo University Bulletin,* vol. 9, No. 3, p. 58; "Toledo University Catalogue, 1918-19" in *Ibid.,* vol. 10, No. 14, p. 38; Toledo University Announcements, "The Toledo Elementary School Teacher Training Course, 1916-17" (1916).
25. Toledo *Blade,* January 5, 1911, July 10, 1913; minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, pp. 261, 270, vol. 2, pp. 41, 68; Toledo *City Journal,* vol. III (February 16, 1918), 86; Toledo *News-Bee,* June 12, 1917.
26. Toledo *City Journal,* vol. III, 338, 415-416; minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 2, pp. 252, 265-266, 268-270; Toledo *Blade,* November 2, 1918; Toledo *News-Bee,* October 25, 1918.
27. Frank R. Hickerson, "The Toledo Medical College" in NORTHWEST OHIO QUARTERLY, vol. 19, No. 4 (October 1947), pp. 168-185.
28. Interviews with Dr. John S. Pyle, July 10, 1940, with ex-President Charles A. Cockayne, August 13, 1940, with ex-President Philip C. Nash, August 29, 1940, and with ex-Dean George L. Baker, September 2, 1940; "Twenty-First Announcement of Toledo Medical College, 1905-1906", *Toledo University Bulletin* (1905), p. 55, 57; Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 1, p. 285, vol. 5, p. 56.
29. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 2, p. 64; "Toledo University Announcements, 1918-19", *Toledo University Bulletin,* vol. 10, No. 14 (1918), pp. 22-25; interviews with Dr. O. Garfield Jones and Blake-More Godwin, September 7, 1940, and Dr. William E. McClure, January 30, 1939.

30. "The Catalogue, 1925-26", *Toledo University Bulletin,* vol. 3, No. 5 (1925), p. 49; letter from ex-President A. Monroe Stowe to author, September 8, 1940; interview with Dr. Robert N. Whitford, September 12, 1940.
31. Toledo *Blade,* January 31, 1915, March 4, 1916; Toledo *Times,* May 9, 1916; Cincinnati *Enquirer,* April 2, 1916; Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 2, p. 125.
32. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 2, pp. 166, 172.
33. *Ibid.,* p. 181; interviews with Mrs. Josephine L. Guitteau and Dr. John S. Pyle, August 30, 1940; statement of Dr. Pyle to Randolph C. Downes, April 13, 1949.
34. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 2, pp. 81, 369; interviews with Lucille Mack and David W. Henry, June 16, 1940.
35. *Ibid.;* Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 2, p. 347; Toledo *City Journal,* vol. 6 (April 16, 1921) pp. 178, 211, vol. 7 (May 27, 1922) p. 232.
36. A. Monroe Stowe, *Modernizing the College* (N. Y., A. A. Knopf, 1926), pp. 66-82; Toledo *Union Leader,* March 27, 1925; Toledo *City Journal,* vol. 10 (April 8, 1925), p. 202; Minutes of the Director of Toledo University, vol. 3, pp. 124, 174-175; Toledo *Blade,* November 22, 1932.
37. Toledo *News-Bee,* December 11, 1925; Toledo *Blade,* October 29, 1926.
38. Annual Reports of the Treasurer of Toledo University; Minutes of the Trustees of Toledo Medical College, p. 256; Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 3, p. 210, vol. 4, pp. 137, 142, 262, vol. 5, p. 28; interviews with ex-President Philip C. Nash, Dr. E Benjamin Gillette, and Dr. Barney J. Heim, August 30, 1940.
39. Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 4, pp. 1, 28; Lucas County Recorders Office, vol. 777 of Deeds, No. 465, 355 (May 13, 1929), p. 77; Toledo *Times,* January 9, 1929, July 1, 1930; Toledo *Blade,* February 4, 1929, June 13, July 1 and November 19, 1930; Toledo *News-Bee,* February 14, 1931.
40. Toledo *Blade,* November 21, 1932; Annual Reports of the Treasurer of Toledo University; interviews with ex-President Philip C. Nash and Dean Edward S. Stimson, September 9, 1940; "College of Law", *Toledo University Bulletin,* vol. 17, No. 10 (1940), p. 4-7.
41. Toledo *City Journal,* vol. 18 (October 28, 1933), p. 380, vol. 19 (April 28, 1934), p. 151 (May 5, 1934), p. 156, vol. 20 (October 26, 1935), p. 396; Minutes of the Directors of Toledo University, vol. 4, pp. 161, 274.

The Fort Meigs Whig Celebration Of 1840

By Robert Gray Gunderson

At Perrysburg, Ohio, on June 11, 1840, "Heaven's arch above was clear, bright, and glorious" for the great celebration in honor of William Henry Harrison's victory at Fort Meigs during the War of 1812. "The latch-string of nature was out," and Whig papers estimated that twenty-five thousand persons were gathered from seven states to honor General Harrison, the log-cabin and hard-cider candidate for President.[1] Since their State Convention in February, Ohio Whigs had been promoting the candidacy of the Hero of Tippecanoe. Senator James Buchanan of Pennsylvania wrote President Martin Van Buren that the whole population of the state had "abandoned their ordinary business for the purpose of electioneering."[2] Thomas Ewing's nephew testified that "with some azziztance the Old Generals name echoez and re-echoez from the highest hills to the lowest valleyez and the old farmers that has alwayz ben locofocoes steps forward and says that he has been in the field of battle and saved them as their General and shall serve them as their Presadent."[3] Indeed, the Frontier resounded with shouts for "Tip, Tyler, and the tariff," and Whigs everyhere were chanting, "Van, Van —Van's a used up man."

During the afternoon and evening of Wednesday, June tenth, delegates swarmed into Perrysburg for the festivities. Three hundred members of the Lorain County delegation, led by the Elyria band in "a splendid omnibus," came ninety miles in parade formation "with bands playing and banners flying."[4] Many delegations arrived by lake steamers which offered half-fare rates to convention-goers. The *Axe* reported that on Tuesday Cleveland was "alive with people, congregated from all parts of the country, to embark this evening for Fort Meigs." "There will be a gathering in the old battle ground," the editor predicted, "and no mistake."[5] Among the delegations were entire military companies from Cleveland, Akron, Buffalo, and Fredonia: the Cleveland Greys, the Summit Guards, the Buffalo Flying Artillery, the Fredonia Guards, and others. Early Wednesday evening, steamboats from Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo began to converge on Perrysburg. As the boat bearing Gen-

eral Harrison approached the dock, the correspondent for the Buffalo *Journal* noted that "the town, the trees, the roofs of the houses, the decks and rigging of the steamboats lying at the wharves were covered by the thronging thousands anxious to obtain a view of their venerable chief." When Old Tip disembarked, the various military units roared out a seventeen-gun salute of welcome, which the cannon aboard ship returned.[6]

One reporter despaired of giving his readers an adequate description of the imposing scene. "Let our readers suppose," he suggested, "some ten or twenty of the largest camp meetings they ever attended, all thrown into one, with all the accompanying exhortations and singing, these heightened in effect by the music of innumerable bands, and they will be able to form a better idea of the aspect of Fort Meigs the night of the tenth than we could give by the most labored description."[7] By nine o'clock, it was estimated that there were twenty thousand assembled in several groups ranging from one to five thousand, "listening to and cheering some favorite speaker or singing Tippecanoe songs."[8] The tents of the military companies were pitched along the front embankment of the Fort, and those of the delegates dotted the surrounding forest. Many of the more enthusiastic visitors, however, did not bother to provide themselves with places to sleep. Instead, they "walked the streets of the Fort . . . and sang songs."[9] There was little reason to find sleeping accommodations, for speaking continued until "the midwatch of night" when "the alarm drum, the trumpet's clangor, the savage yell, the rifle's crack, the blazing musketry, and the cannon's roar" signaled the beginning of the mock attack on the Fort. "The illusion," said the Detroit *Advertiser,* "was perfect, and the scene sublime":

> *The lighting up of the heavens by the quick flashes of the small arms—the thick smoke which rolled out in clouds from the cannon's mouth—the rushing of the soldiery as they changed position to repel the attacks of the assailants—the burnished musket, as it cast back reflections of the moon-beams—presented a spectacle really magnificent . . .*[10]

Next morning, dawn was greeted by a salute of one hundred guns. So great was the crowd that no attempt was made to form a procession, but there were exciting substitutes. Sixty or seventy persons "dressed in

complete Indian war uniform" danced and war-whooped through the throng and surrounded their former conqueror, General Harrison. "So completely had they drilled themselves in Indian exercises, and so faithfully did they go through the various evolutions of dancing, whooping, firing," the Cleveland *Axe* claimed, "that a few . . . actually supposed them to belong to some of the broken tribes of Wyandots or Ottawas."[11] After this excitement, the Lorain County delegation presented the "Presidential Ploughman from North Bend" with a "beautiful pitchfork" for use in the approaching harvest. Banners proclaimed Harrison "The Poor Man's Candidate," and bands from Bellevue, Elyria, and Lower Sandusky helped set the celebration to music.[12]

The music was a featured attraction of the celebration. Since early spring, the Perrysburg Fort Meigs Club had kept "a *song factory* constantly in blast."[13] Its choir of "choice singers" found joy in caroling in the administration of Old Tip with such lyrics as:

> *Ye jolly young Whigs of Ohio,*
> *And all ye sick Democrats, too,*
> *Come out from amongst the foul party,*
> *And vote for OLD TIPPECANOE!*[14]

Whig counterpoint also served to promote Tom Corwin, a former wagon-driver for General Harrison in the War of 1812, in his race for Governor of Ohio. The refrain of a popular Buckeye tune predicted that:

> *Wilson Shannon will get a tannin'*
> *From Tom, the Wagoner Boy.*[15]

"*Singing* is one of the principal accomplishments now relied on to make HARRISON President," opined the Washington *Globe*. "The Federalists have put out innumerable song books, and have actually set up singing schools to fit itinerant singing orators . . . for their vocation."[16] One such singer, acclaimed as "Titus of Toledo," entertained the audience between speeches. "Twice, thrice in succession he took the stand," said the *Ohio Whig*, "and yet they called for him again and again." He sang the "National Whig Song" to the tune of the "Marseillaise," and a song entitled "Up Salt River," composed especially for the occasion.[17] According to the testimony of the Detroit *Advertiser*, "more than ten thousand" joined in the choruses. "The effect of the popular songs was

electric. While being sung, a perfect tumult of enthusiasm seemed to pervade the entire mass of people present."[18]

Whig enthusiasm was no doubt stimulated somewhat by frequent resort to hard cider barrels which were conveniently located about the grounds. Cider was "free as water," said one observer. "Men drank from dippers that hung from the barrel, and frequently the cider was too hard to admit of graceful walking after two or three visits."[19] Still, the Buffalo *Journal* insisted that "not a single drunken or quarrelsome man could be seen."[20] In spite of such pious assertions, temperance advocates deplored "these conventions (where) . . . many a young man will take his first lessons in drunkenness, which will bring him to the alms-house or the prison, and the drunkard's grave." The Reverend Leonard Bacon told the New York State Temperance Society that "within three or four months, *Intemperance has become the badge of a political party!* . . . More than ten thousand men will be made drunkards in one year, by this hard-cider enthusiasm."[21]

The climax of the celebration came with the speech of General Harrison, who cast aside tradition to campaign for the presidency. When the General came to the platform, "the whole population of the Valley of the Maumee" greeted him with "rounds of the most tremendous cheers."[22] "None of the papers," announced the *National Intelligencer*, "have given an . . . estimate below *twenty-five thousand*" in attendance,[23] and "it was conceded that the mass of listeners directly within range of his voice did not number less than fifteen thousand in very compact order."[24] The Reverend Joseph Badger, "whose head was whitened by the frosts of some ninety winters," addressed "the Throne of Grace" in an "affecting and appropriate prayer"; and Thomas Ewing, President of the Celebration, called on General Harrison, who spoke "under a burning sun" for nearly an hour and a half "straight on, without a moment's hesitancy."[25] "Fellow-citizens," began Old Tip:

> *I am not, upon this occasion, before you in accordance with my own views or wishes. It has ever appeared to me, that the office of President of the United States should not be sought after by any individual; but that the people should spontaneously, and of their own free will, accord the distinguished honor to the man whom they believed would best perform its important duties. Entertaining these views, I should, fellow-citizens, have remained at home, but for the*

pressing and friendly invitation which I have received from the citizens of Perrysburg, and the earnestness with which its acceptance was urged upon me by friends in whom I trusted, and whom I am now proud to see around me . . .

But, fellow citizens, still another motive induced me to accept the invitation which had been so kindly extended to me. I knew that here I should meet many who had fought and bled under my command—that I should have the pleasure of taking them by the hand and recurring with them to the scenes of the past . . .[26]

Thus began one of the first speeches ever to be delivered by a candidate in an American presidential campaign.

After General Harrison had proceeded for a time, "his eye caught the form of General Hedges," who had served with him during the War of 1812. "General Hedges," said Harrison, "come up here. You stood by my side on this spot once before, I see you here to sustain me again. Walk up to the stand with your staff." In an instant, according to the *Ohio Whig,* "the soldierly form of the Marshal seemed to be lifted to the stand by the deafening shout from the multitude, which was succeeded by a moment of silence, as the two veterans stood once more shoulder to shoulder on the spot which once they had consecrated to the God of Battles."[27] At another point in his speech, "the General looked around as if for some water," and a cry went up: "Give the General some hard cider." "This was done," said one observer, "much to the satisfaction of the multitude."[28]

A good portion of Harrison's speech was devoted to describing the battles and lauding the soldiers of the Indian wars. With no false modesty, the old warrior revealed his inmost anxieties during the battle at Fort Meigs:

I receive these evidences of regard and esteem as the only reward at all adequate to compensate for the anxieties and anguish which, in the past, I experienced on this spot . . . I could point from where I now stand, to places where I felt this anxiety pressing heavily upon me, as I thought of the fearful consequences of a mistake on my part, or the want of judgment on the part of others. I knew there were wives—mothers who had clothed their sons for battle; and I knew that these expecting wives and mothers were

looking for the safe return of their husbands and sons. When to this was added the recollection, that the peace of the entire West would be broken up, and the glory of my country tarnished if I failed, you may possibly conceive the anguish which my situation was calculated to produce. Feeling my responsibility, I personally supervised and directed the arrangement of the army under my command. I trusted no Colonel or other officer.[29]

When taking leave of his men in 1814 after his resignation from the army, General Harrison had assured them "that you will never find my door shut and the string of the latch pulled in."[30] The presidential candidate now parodied his former guarantee of personal hospitality with an implied campaign promise: "If it should ever be in my power to pay the debt which is due these brave but neglected men, that debt shall first be paid. And I am very well satisfied that the Government can afford it, PROVIDED THE LATCH-STRING OF THE TREASURRY (sic.) SHALL EVER BE MORE CAREFULLY PULLED IN."[31]

Turning from military to political subjects, Old Tip denied that he was once a Federalist, attacked the Sub-Treasury Bill, and implied that President Van Buren was a tyrant. In the climax of his speech, he urged his supporters to be vigilant:

Now, fellow-citizens, I have very little more to say except to exhort you to go on peacefully if you can—and you can—to effect that reform upon which your hearts are fixed. What calamitous consequences will ensue if you fail? If you should fail how the tyrants of Europe will rejoice. If you fail, how will the friends of freedom, scattered, like the planets of heaven, over the world, mourn, when they see the beacon light of liberty extinguished—the light whose rays they had hoped would yet penetrate the whole benighted world. If you triumph, it will only be done by vigilance and attention . . .[32]

At the close of Harrison's speech, "the vast multitude gave 'three times three' with an unanimity and heartiness which spoke eloquently . . . of their sentiments as to the force, truth, and beauty of the speech, and the worth, merit, and virtue of the speaker."[33] Though many declaimers took the stand after the General, few were concerned with the major political issues of the day. Instead, they recalled memories of Tippecanoe, Meigs, and the Thames, and recited much fulsome praise for

the Hero of North Bend. Speaking and singing continued until ten o'clock when the assemblage adjourned *sine die.*[34]

Whig papers reported Harrison's unprecedented campaign speech in superlatives. The *Ohio Whig* declared it "rich in sentiment, and characterized by a degree of classic elegance, which we never heard excelled." The General's voice was "strong, clear, and musical"; his gestures were "graceful and full of vigor."[35] "Every syllable," noted a correspondent for the *National Intelligencer,* "fell in silvery tones from his lips." "His manner is both graceful and impressive, without any attempt at display, and seems entirely becoming his years, the dignity of his character and the position he occupies before the country."[36] "His full, clear voice," the editor of the Detroit *Advertiser* said defensively, "gave another demonstration of the falsehood of the charge of imbecility and decrepitude, which the Locofocos have seen fit to heap upon the worthy soldier." To the *Advertiser,* "it was a speech which would have added to the fame of a PRESTON, a WEBSTER, or a CLAY."[37] "We have listened to many of the best public speakers in the country," testified the reporter for the Buffalo *Journal,* "and from none, either in style, elocution, choiceness or fluency of language, did we ever hear a more effective or appropriate speech." In short, all Whig accounts agreed that "the celebration will be forever remembered by those who participated in it. Not an accident or circumstance occurred to mar the

In their enthusiasm, Whig correspondents no doubt forgot one unhappy incident which provoked a "sulphuric storm" of invective on the opening day of the celebration. Local delegations from several different counties had hauled huge logs for many miles in hopes of constructing a log cabin as a headquarters for the gathering. The logs were piled at a designated place near the Fort on the banks of the Maumee. But late Tuesday evening—the night before the cabin was to have been erected—a contingent of "brawny-armed Democrats swooped down on the Whig camp" and tumbled the logs into the river.[39] Locofoco vandalism thus deprived Hard-Ciderites of the opportunity of building a shrine to their leader.

Democratic accounts of the celebration answered Whig praise for Old Tip with contrasting acrimony. One hostile editor counted the times Harrison "alluded to himself in the first person," and found "eighty-one

'I's' in the two-column speech."[40] "What a prodigy of garrulous egotism!" exclaimed the Washington *Globe,* after taking pains to point out that Colonel Croghan and "all the devoted actors of the scene" were forgotten. In parallel columns, the *Globe* published the General's speech at Fort Meigs with his official account of the battle, written in 1813. The discrepancy between the two versions of the conflict hardly required editorial comment.[41] Quoting a cousin of Ethan Allen, *The Rough-Hewer* charged that Harrison "always had the 'cannon fever' when he went into action."[42] Sam Medary, editor of the *Ohio Statesman,* attempted to disparage the celebration by announcing the attendance of "a dozen fine large NEGROES . . . from Lake County and other places." Medary "really wished that some of the patriotic Southerners, who will not believe the dangerous progress that Abolitionism is making, could have been there to witness the fact with their own eyes."[43]

In spite of Democratic criticism, Whig partisans prolonged their shouts for Old Tippecanoe—"without a why or wherefore!" The glories of the great celebration at Fort Meigs were recounted in verse:

There was a speedy gathering then
Of fiery youths and fearless men;
Ne'er had Miami's blood wash'd shore
Beheld such numerous hosts before

Through river pass, o'er wooded steep
In long, unending files they sweep;
With banner, fife and pealing drum
And clashing horn, they come! THEY COME![44]

Throughout the summer and fall, Whigs denounced the reign of an effete Locofoco aristocracy and heralded the virtures of "cabins, coons, and cider." In November, William Henry Harrison carried nineteen of the twenty-six states to become the first Buckeye President. Whig papers thanked the Almighty for victory over "weak and wicked rulers." The Boston *Atlas* declared, "All that was evil and monstrous in our government has been trampled underfoot by the People of the United States."[45] *The Log Cabin* tolled "the knell of Locofocoism,"[46] and the *National Intelligencer* jubilantly proclaimed "the gratifying intelligence" that "the country is redeemed."[47]

FOOTNOTES

1. Cleveland *Axe,* June 18, 1840; see also the Washington *Globe,* June 29, 1840; *National Intelligencer,* June 23, 1840.
2. James Buchanan to Martin Van Buren, September 5, 1840. Martin Van Buren MSS., Library of Congress.
3. N. H. Ewing to Thomas Ewing, March 17, 1840. Thomas Ewing MSS., Library of Congress.
4. Cleveland *Axe,* May 14 and June 18, 1840.
5. *Ibid.,* June 11, 1840.
6. Buffalo *Journal,* June 15, 1840, quoted in *Niles' Register,* July 4, 1840; for another account, see the *Ohio Whig,* June 12, 1840, quoted in the Cleveland *Axe,* June 18, 1840.
7. Buffalo *Journal,* June 15, 1840, quoted in *Niles' Register,* July 4, 1840.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ohio Whig,* June 12, 1840, quoted in the Cleveland *Axe,* June 18, 1840.
10. Detroit *Advertiser,* n.d., quoted in the Cleveland *Axe,* June 18, 1840.
11. Cleveland *Axe,* June 25, 1840.
12. *Ibid.,* June 18 and June 25, 1840.
13. *National Intelligencer,* April 3, 1840.
14. Cleveland *Axe,* June 4, 1840.
15. J. Jeffery Auer, "Tom Corwin, 'King of the Stump,'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* (February, 1944), XXX, 50.
16. Washington *Globe,* June 30, 1840.
17. *Ohio Whig,* June 12, 1840, quoted in the Cleveland *Axe,* June 18, 1840.
18. *National Intelligencer,* June 23, 1840.
19. David Dwight Bigger, *Ohio's Silver-Tongued Orator, Life and Speeches of General William H. Gibson,* (1901), 101.
20. Buffalo *Journal,* June 15, 1840, quoted in *Niles' Register,* July 4, 1840.
21. *The Rough-Hewer,* June 4, 1840.
22. Buffalo *Journal,* June 15, 1840, quoted in *Niles' Register,* July 4, 1840.
23. *National Intelligencer,* July 23, 1840.
24. *Ibid.,* July 26, 1840.
25. Buffalo *Journal,* June 15, 1840, quoted in *Niles' Register,* July 4, 1840.
26. "Harrison's Great Speech," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly,* (April, 1908), XVII, 200, 202.
27. *Ohio Whig,* June 12, 1840, quoted in the Cleveland *Axe,* June 18, 1840.
28. "Reported by the Editor of the Detroit *Advertiser*" in *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.;* see also *The Log Cabin,* June 27, 1840.
30. Cleveland *Axe,* April 23, 1840.
31. "Reported by the Editor of the Detroit *Advertiser,*" in *Ibid.,* June 18, 1840; see also *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly,* XVII, 197-207.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *The Log Cabin,* June 27, 1840.
34. *National Intelligencer,* June 23, 1840.
35. *Ohio Whig,* June 12, 1840, quoted in the Cleveland *Axe,* June 18, 1840.
36. "J.M.H." in the *National Intelligencer,* June 26, 1840.
37. Detroit *Advertiser,* n.d., quoted in *Ibid.,* June 23, 1840.
38. Buffalo *Journal,* June 15, 1840, quoted in *Niles' Register,* July 4, 1840.
39. Bigger, *Gibson,* 106-107.
40. Unidentified newspaper quoted in the Washington *Globe,* June 29, 1840.
41. Washington *Globe,* June 29, 1840.
42. *The Rough-Hewer,* August 27, 1840.
43. *Ohio Statesman,* n.d., quoted in the Washington *Globe,* July 20, 1840.
44. Nashville *Spirit of '76,* July 1, 1840.
45. Boston *Atlas,* n.d., quoted in the *National Intelligencer,* November 17, 1840.
46. The *Log Cabin,* November 9, 1840.
47. *National Intelligencer,* November 9, 1840.

The Maumee Power House

River Road, Maumee

By W. Royce Moran

The first power house on the site of the present Edison Club, River Road, Maumee, was built in 1901. It was known as the Detwiler Power House, since George K. Detwiler had obtained the water rights from the State for the development of the site. Water was drawn from the State-owned Miami and Erie Canal and the fall from the canal to the river was utilized to produce electric power. This plant had one generator of 800 horsepower, and the electricity was used to propel the interurban electric cars operated on the Maumee-Perrysburg Belt Line. The plant was not very successful because of the limited amount of water available.

In 1910 a new company was organized to develop the site more fully. This company, named "The Maumee Valley Electric Company," was sponsored by the Ashley family of Toledo, builders of the Ann Arbor Railway. The new company obtained more extensive water rights from the State, which were to be made possible by improvements to the canal, financed by the power company. A channel, seven feet deep, was dredged from the plant site all the way to the recently erected dam across the Maumee River at Grand Rapids, a distance of about 18 miles. A rock bar near Waterville, which impeded the flow of water, was blasted away. The fall of water available for producing power was 62 feet and large pipes, 7½ ft. in diameter, were installed to conduct the water under River Road from the canal level to the power plant. Three water-power generators were installed with a combined capacity of about 3,000 horsepower. Power generated was distributed through the facilities of several small power companies serving Maumee, Perrysburg and the territory up the river as far as Defiance. Eventually, the Maumee power plant and these distribution companies were absorbed into the Defiance Gas and Electric Company, which in turn was bought by The Toledo Edison Company in 1924. Lack of water during periods of drought imperiled the electric supply on numerous occasions and in 1915 stand-by steam-driven generators were installed. The plant continued to operate until the draining of the canal in 1927.

The Maumee Power House, River Road, Maumee

Employees of the Edison Company have converted the old power plant building into a Club house, entrance being through one of the large water pipes extending under the highway.

One piece of equipment, originally installed in the Maumee power plant, continues to provide electricity for the Toledo area. A generator was moved from Maumee to the Auglaize plant of The Toledo Edison Company, south of Defiance, and after extensive alterations was placed in regular operation at that location.

The President's Page

AN EX POST facto law, which together with bills of attainder, are forbidden to be passed by the Federal Government under Section 9, and by the States under Section 10, of Article I of the Federal Constitution, is a retrospective law which imposes a punishment for an act not punishable at the time it was committed, or imposes an additional or greater punishment than was prescribed at the time of the committing of the act.

An ex post facto law relates only to crimes and criminal proceedings, although at least one authority has said, "it was undoubtedly the intention of the framers of the Constitution to make the ex post facto clause apply to civil as well as criminal legislation." However in England the term was applied only to laws concerned with crime long prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and at an early date in this country it was unquestionably settled that the term applied only to laws respecting crimes and their punishments.

Laws concerned with the method of trial of the accused and other modes of criminal practice and procedure do not fall within the meaning of the term, since remedies must always be under the control of the legislature; nor does the term apply to erroneous or inconsistent decisions of the courts, being confined to acts of legislative bodies only.

Retrospective Laws relating to civil matters are designated "Laws impairing the obligation of contracts", and the enactment of such laws is denied to the States by Section 10 of Articles I of the Federal Constitution. It is interesting to note that in the Federal Constitutional Convention Mr. Elbridge Gerry, one of the delegates from Massachusetts, believed that the prohibition against impairing the obligation of contracts should also apply to the Federal Government. He made a motion to that effect, but the motion was lost for lack of a second, and was never acted upon by the Convention.

In the Ordinance of 1787, which was enacted under the Articles of Confederation and which governed the Northwest Territory now occupied by the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, the prohibition against the impairment of the obligation of contracts was

expressed by denying the right to "interfere with or affect private contracts." This phraseology was changed in Section 10 of Article I above mentioned, wherein the States were denied the right to "impair the obligation of contracts." It is said that this change was made by Mr. James Wilson, one of the delegates from Pennsylvania.

It was the intention of the Federal Convention, by grouping with the prohibition, bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts, to prevent the enactment of arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, and tyrannical legislation over existing rights as to both persons and property, which had theretofore occasionally occurred.

Mr. James Madison, in one of his papers in *The Federalist,* says:

> "The sober people of America have seen with regret and indignation that sudden changes and legislative interferences in cases affecting personal rights become jobs in the hands of enterprising and influential speculators, and snares to the more industrious and less informed part of the community."