More than sixty men served as members of the Board of Regents during the eighteen years that appointment to the Board was primarily the responsibility of the legislature. Few were re-elected. Almost a third of the regents lived in Madison. Travel was difficult in those days and until the late 1850's no provision was made for paying regents either mileage or per diem. This explains the rapid gravitation of control into the hands of Madison men and the frequent complaints during the early years that the University was merely a Dane County or Madison high school. Over half the regents for this period had come originally from the Middle Atlantic states, mostly from New York. Almost as many came from New England. Only six were of foreign birth. Of the various professions and occupations on the Board during these years, lawyers were best represented. More than half of the members had practiced law at one time or another. Some had been or were teachers; some were businessmen. Although Wisconsin was primarily an agricultural state and would continue to be one for a number of years, only four members of the Board in the period up to 1866 had ever been farmers. Over half had gone to a college or seminary; three had attended the University of Wisconsin. Three had had experience in helping to found a college or two. Of the thirty-seven whose political affiliation could be deter-

1 It should be borne in mind that not all appointments were made by the legislature. The governor made occasional interim appointments which the legislature permitted to stand.
mined, twenty-three were Republicans. Almost all the regents held political offices in the local, state, or national government. Although the Board did not lack distinguished men and its collective action was always of considerable importance, relatively few of the members in the early period distinguished themselves in conspicuous service to the University.²

The first Board of Regents launched the institution but thereafter, when there was a chancellor, relied on him for leadership. University business affairs were handled principally by the executive committee, the building committee, and special committees on which the chancellor and resident regents figured prominently. The Board concerned itself largely with approving or rejecting policies recommended by the chancellor or the committees, or with placing the official stamp of approval on action. Only once did the Board attempt to deal directly with a broad problem of educational policy: in 1858 it attempted a reorganization of the University.

The first few meetings were well attended, but for a number of years afterward the Board struggled along with a bare quorum, usually with seven or eight members.³ In the late 1850's the Board adopted a resolution asking for the resignation of members who failed to attend two consecutive meetings. Attendance at meetings continued to be poor.

At the first meeting attended by Chancellor Lathrop, the Board voted to incorporate into its bylaws the rule that all appointments of professors should be made by the Board on the nomination of the chancellor. Two years later the Board further clarified the chancellor's duties by specifying that he should report from time to time on the condition of the University and make such recommendations to the regents as he considered necessary and expedient. His power to nominate candidates for faculty positions was reaffirmed. The chancellor was formally made a member of the executive committee and given power to convene the committee for special meetings; and, with the secretary of the Board, he was given responsibility for ex-

² This paragraph rests upon an analysis of the Board of Regents, 1848–66, prepared by Estelle Fisher. The paper is on file in the Archives of the University of Wisconsin.
ecturing "all conveyances, diplomas, and contracts." The chancellor was assured of the "faithful cooperation and support of every member of the several Faculties" and empowered to convene meetings of the faculty, then composed of two members besides himself; to call for their individual or collective advice; and to enlist concurring action and assistance "in all matters touching the discipline, the course of study, and the order of the Institution." The chancellor, with the advice and consent of the faculty, was authorized to draw up and execute rules and regulations necessary for the government of the institution. The Board offered guidance in words which suggest Chancellor Lathrop's prose style and attitude. "The immediate government of the University shall be administered kindly but firmly, with a view to the conservation and improvement of what is valuable in character, to the formation of habits of self government and diligent study, to the reformation of the offender, and to the maintenance of sound discipline, and a high standard of scholarship and deportment in the Institution." 4

During Lathrop's administration the actions of the Board made it clear that the chancellor must formulate and execute policy. This position was explicitly stated to Barnard. In 1860, the president pro tem of the Board, Louis P. Harvey, then the secretary of state and soon to be governor of Wisconsin, wrote to Barnard about the relationship of the chancellor to the Board. "It is . . . the desire of the members of the board that the Chancellor assume decisively the responsibility of recommending such changes in the Faculty, and in the management of the institution, as he deems will best promote the usefulness of the university." While pledging the cooperation of the Board, Harvey continued: "But I want respectfully to urge that you do not hesitate to lead off for any and every measure you desire adopted." 5 No statement could have made clearer the stand of the Board on the matter of responsibility for developing and determining the policies of the University.

5 L. P. Harvey to Barnard, June 29, 1860, in the Barnard Manuscripts, New York University.
After Barnard resigned, early in 1861, the Board named John W. Sterling dean of the faculty, giving him the responsibility for directing internal affairs of the University. Control of the institution then rested largely with the executive committee of the Board and the dean, but this committee was so hampered by lack of money that it had little opportunity to form educational policy.

Horace A. Tenney, one-time curator, land agent, librarian, and regent, in a brief, unpublished history of the University, charged that the Board of Regents in the 1850's was often hostile toward the University. This charge was also made by an investigating committee of the legislature in 1857. But there is little evidence to support these contentions. Occasional members were not entirely friendly. In 1855, Samuel L. Rose, two days after being elected a member of the Board of Regents, denounced the University as spendthrift. Later the same year, Alexander Gray, secretary of state and ex officio member of the Board, offered a resolution which, if adopted in its original form, would have closed the University. But for the most part the record of the conduct of the Board, though it suggests indifference from time to time, hardly supports the charge that even a substantial minority was actively hostile to the University.

Governor Dewey, a Democrat, in naming the first Board, had selected an equal number of Whigs and Democrats. This balance was not long maintained. In 1851 the legislature selected four new regents to replace those whose terms had expired. Of these four one was a Democrat and three were Whigs; the Democrat was re-elected and the Whigs were replaced with Democrats. In 1853 and again in 1855 Democrats received most of the appointments, partly because the Whig Party was dying and the Republican Party had not yet attained full strength.6

The Board of Regents was not free from the mounting and unconcealed partisanship which stained all offices of the state government in the middle 1850's. In 1855 one of the regents, Charles Dunn, introduced a resolution condemning Professor O.

---

6 *Milwaukee Sentinel and Gazette*, March 8, 1851, p. 2; March 19, 1855, p. 2; February 1, 1859, p. 2.
M. Conover for attending a meeting held to denounce the governor for removing the state geologist from office. The resolution was discussed, laid on the table, and a week later withdrawn by the author. Although the overt act of censuring a member of the faculty for participating in a political meeting was not carried through, the threat remained.

Whether political regularity constituted, in the middle of the 1850's, one of the prerequisites for appointment to the faculty cannot now be determined. There is no doubt that this was assumed by many people. John P. Fuchs, professor of modern languages and literature, ascribed both his first appointment and his resignation to political pressure. Yet in 1859 the legislature elected two Democrats and three Republicans to positions on the Board, and was commended for being nonpartisan. Fuchs, writing to Conover in April, 1859, felt that the political excitement of the middle fifties had begun to subside, and that it had now become the earnest desire of all parties not to allow the University to be influenced any longer by political changes.

In the handling of all immediate problems the executive committee of the Board, made up of the chancellor and Madison members, spoke with authority and finality. The committee met each month, or oftener if necessary. It devoted the larger part of its time to examining bills, authorizing payment, and discussing and directing repairs and improvements on the buildings and grounds. It was the executive committee that approved Lathrop's plan to combine utility and beauty by planting a thou-

---

1 Records of the Board of Regents, Vol. B, pp. 78, 81, February 3, 10, 1855.
2 Fuchs to O. M. Conover, April 6, 1859, in the Conover Papers, in the State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Milwaukee Sentinel, February 1, 3, 1859. In his letter to Conover, written after Conover's dismissal from the faculty and subsequent election to the Board of Regents, Fuchs recalled that he had received his appointment when the University was under Democratic political influence "and no one could expect to receive an appointment at that Institution, unless he belonged to that political party which had a majority in the Board of Regents. The Democrats being then in power, and myself being, at that time, a Democrat, I obtained the Professorship of Modern Languages through the favor of some prominent members of that political organization. This took place shortly before the late presidential campaign." Fuchs then left the Democratic Party because of its attitude on slavery and joined the Republican Party. The men to whom he owed his appointment remained Democrats, and Fuchs was criticized for having changed parties to get the job. He therefore resigned. At the time of Fuchs's resignation he was bitterly denounced by the Weekly Argus and Democrat, a Democratic paper in Madison, in its issue of September 9, 1856.
sand fruit trees on the campus. As custodian of the grounds, the executive committee adopted various resolutions for the protection of both grounds and buildings. Although it succeeded in getting the campus fenced at an early date, the committee did not please the entire Board of Regents. In 1861, the Board directed the committee "to give orders and enforce them, that hereafter no person whatever shall be allowed to pasture any cows, horses or other animals in the University grounds, or allow any other use of said grounds than is legitimate and proper to the purpose of the Institution, during any season of the year." The animal exclusion act was not strictly enforced. James L. High, a student at the University from 1860 to 1864, recalled that Professor Read’s "ancient and venerable cream-colored horse" grazed on the campus during these years.9

The allotment of space in new buildings and the fixing of prices for room and board were functions of the executive committee. When South Hall was occupied in 1855 the executive committee directed that Professor Sterling and the chancellor should arrange all details. Sterling "and lady" were granted free board and room in return for managing the boarding establishment which was opened that year. Board rates for the faculty members, then called college officers, living in South Hall were fixed at $3 a week for each member of the family over five years of age, and $1.50 for each servant. Students were to be permitted residence in the hall only after depositing the sum of $25 for the thirteen-week term.10 They were to pay their proportionate share of the expenses of the boarding hall, but not more than $2 a week.

Trivial matters often came before the committee. The chancellor asked and received permission in 1855 to purchase a book, and the next year to buy lithograph portraits of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun for University use. Professors, and even the chancellor, wanting to be absent during the school term, had to get permission from the executive committee. Thus Lathrop, when invited to serve on the Board of Visitors to West Point, first


secured the consent of the committee; and when the new professor of agriculture, S. P. Lathrop, wanted to attend the National Cattle Show at Springfield, Ohio, as the official representative of the State of Wisconsin, the committee gave its permission provided the chancellor would agree.\textsuperscript{11}

The executive committee approved plans for commencement exercises, arranged for the use of the Baptist Church or the city hall, and hired the brass band. The committee accepted resignations from departing members of the faculty, supervised the preparatory department, authorized expenditures for advertising the University in various newspapers and journals, and performed many other managerial, supervisory, and custodial functions.

Although the full Board of Regents approved the plans for the three buildings constructed during the 1850's, the responsibility for obtaining the plans and for supervising construction was given to a building committee, of which the chancellor was a prominent member. Lathrop had insisted in his inaugural address that University buildings should be designed to suit the purpose for which they were intended. In the construction of North and South Halls his recommendation was followed. In their plain rectangular form, simple lines, lack of ornament, and rigid adherence to utility these two structures are unique among a host of University buildings whose varying and sometimes terrifying designs show at very least an unstable and sometimes capricious architectural taste.

In 1857, before beginning construction of the "Central University Edifice" [Bascom Hall] the Board of Regents formulated Lathrop's recommendation into a declaration of policy to guide the building committee. "Due regard should be had in the design, adapted to architectural proportion, beauty, and the peculiarity of the Site. The building should fit the ground, and be in harmony with its Surroundings. Only so much should be expended in ornament as will produce a pleasing and proper effect, obtainable without great cost, and not be inconsistent with the fact that the edifice is for practical use and not mere show. In a

\textsuperscript{11} *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 39, 53, 55, May 1, 1851, October 23, 1854, July 26, 1855, February 12, 1856.
word, it should be plain, substantial, comfortable, and exactly adapted to the purpose for which it is designed, and for no other." Perhaps the formulation of a policy calling for simplicity, appropriateness, and utility in University buildings of itself spelled the end of such a policy. At any rate, the building committee, reporting before the end of 1857, declared that the new central edifice was a "model of architecture, imposing and massive." The completed structure, with its curved portico and its large and small domes, could hardly be said to have attained simplicity. Generations of students testified that it was not comfortable. Yet in comparison with Science Hall, for example, the building was austere simplicity itself.

With the completion of the central building, the building committee went out of existence until the 1870's when legislative appropriations made further construction possible.

During the ten years that he served as chancellor, John Hiram Lathrop was the pivotal force in the University. His relation to the Board of Regents has been traced in other connections, so little need be said here except in summary. One has only to compare his reports and requests to the Board of Regents with the actions formally taken by them to see how effective he was. In fact, the annual report of the chancellor to the regents often became the substance of the regents' report to the governor. Lathrop seldom consulted the members of the faculty formally on the course of study, program, buildings, organization, or any of the other problems on which he advised the Board of Regents. Carr, Conover, and Kürsteiner, after 1858, charged that Lathrop was dictatorial and autocratic. Lathrop's actions as chancellor

---


24 At the time of Lathrop's resignation as chancellor, Conover insisted that Professor Read was his only staunch supporter. In writing to J. R. Brigham shortly after he had been dismissed from the faculty, Conover declared that it had been charged that he "could not work 'harmonously' with the Chancellor—in fact had rather abused the poor man." Conover acknowledged that he had
led Carl Schurz to remark that it was an anomaly that in Prussia, an autocratic state, the universities were organized on democratic principles, but that in the United States they were not. Yet few evidences of overt opposition to Lathrop’s alleged despotism appear in the records before the failure of Kürsteiner and Conover to attain re-election to the faculty in 1858.

From the beginning of his administration until the end, Lathrop championed state-supported education. He envisioned a unified state-supported system to extend from elementary schools through academies and high schools to the University. The University was to be the heart of the whole educational system. Whatever his shortcomings, and however far his vision exceeded his grasp, these things Lathrop foresaw and advocated. He never tired of advancing the idea that the University should serve the interests of all the people, as he conceived those interests.

Lathrop never had grave difficulties with the Board of Regents, but he never managed to convert many people beyond had occasion to rebuke both the chancellor and his wife for what seemed to him “unworthy and intolerable conduct,” and continued, “According to the Chancellor’s statement I made a ‘brutal attack’ upon him in Faculty meeting last winter—when I felt it to be my duty to intimate to him in what seemed to me appropriate but very distinct and decided terms my want of admiration of his disingenuousness in his dealings with the Faculty.” It was also charged “that I had been endeavoring for some time past to oust the Chancellor from his position—which was not quite as true as it ought to have been.” Conover felt that if the right men were placed on the Board the next year, Lathrop would probably withdraw entirely from the University, and Professor Read, too. Professor Carr had written Horace A. Tenney several weeks earlier that when he had charged that “the faculty will bear witness to the manner and spirit in which every suggestion of reform has been met, and the unwillingness with which their suggestions have been received,” he had had the chancellor in mind. Lathrop, he declared, did not represent the faculty before the Board. Conover to Brigham, August 10, 1858, in the Brigham papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Carr to H. A. Tenney, July 19, 1858, in the Tenney Papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Lathrop himself wrote to Brigham: “In the Chancellorship, I have assumed the responsibilities of administration, and have taken and used the powers necessary to the discharge of these responsibilities. I expect my successor to do the same thing; and to leave me, as professor, to the quiet and uninterrupted discharge of the duties of my department. The principle is simple, efficacious, and peace-preserving.” Lathrop to Brigham, August 30, 1858, in the Brigham Papers.

Undated letter of Kürsteiner to Conover, enclosing translation of a paper prepared by Carl Schurz, in the Conover Papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

his immediate circle. His writing and speaking, his delicate suggestions, his motion by indirection, his unwillingness to state his demands positively and in language which invited no misunderstanding, helped to keep him from exerting a powerful influence in Wisconsin's educational development. His weakness was not of ideas, for he sponsored plans and projects which were later popular; but he lacked the aggressiveness of a great educational leader. His failure cannot be ascribed entirely to hostility on the part of the legislature. He was simply incapable of the force necessary to prevail upon the legislature (not one penny was contributed to the University during Lathrop's administration), or else he could not impress legislators with the importance of his ideas. Lyman Draper, as secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and, for two years, superintendent of public instruction, succeeded in the 1850's in getting from the legislature grants of money for projects intrinsically more novel than state support of higher education. 16 Unlike Draper, Lathrop was politically impotent; he could conceive a program, but he could not marshal his forces to carry it through the legislature. His great deficiency was ineffectiveness.

Yet he was well liked. When he submitted his resignation as chancellor in 1858, he was promptly elected professor with only one vote registered against him, named vice-chancellor until his successor should be appointed, and authorized to correspond with Henry Barnard to persuade him to accept the post. Lathrop remained at the University as acting chancellor until the summer of 1859, when he was again invited to take the presidency of Indiana University. This time he accepted immediately and submitted his resignation to Wisconsin in August, 1859. Lathrop remained at Indiana for one year and then returned to the University of Missouri as a professor. Shortly thereafter, he again became president of that university and held the position until his death in 1866. 17

16 Draper secured funds from the legislature to help support the Historical Society and in 1859 persuaded the legislature to pass a bill providing that ten per cent of the income from the School Fund and the proceeds of a special state tax of one-tenth of a mill on property be devoted to "establishing and replenishing town school libraries." Patzer, Public Education in Wisconsin, 442.
17 Minutes of the Executive Committee, Vol. A, p. 91, August 20, 1859; Jonas Viles and others, The University of Missouri: A Centennial History (Columbia,
This gentle, reserved, cultivated, idealistic, stubborn, despotic man returned to Madison in June, 1862, to deliver the annual address before the literary societies of the University. The reporter of one of the Madison newspapers remarked that one of the striking features of the alumni dinner was the “frequent manifestation of deep and warm attachment with which ex-Chancellor Lathrop seems to have bound to himself to [sic] every student connected with the University during his tenure of the office.” Lathrop stayed on in Madison to deliver the address at the Fourth of July celebration held at Capitol Square.  

There was no suggestion of remembered bitterness in anything Lathrop said or did. In public he was warmly acclaimed. But even though the Board was then officially searching for a chancellor, Lathrop was not invited back.

The Board of Regents had been willing to give Lathrop their support; to his successor, Henry Barnard, they virtually promised to abdicate. When Barnard was approached for the chancellorship, he was, after Horace Mann, America’s leading educator, and his reputation already spanned the continent. Although his positive influence upon the University came to no more than a mark made on water, his two-year connection with education in the state of Wisconsin deserves attention. These years tell how anxiously men sought a leader who would translate their vague and hopeful ideas into realities. The wooing of Henry Barnard was begun almost simultaneously by Lathrop and Draper in July, 1858; but neither, apparently, had knowledge of what the other was doing. The Board of Normal School Regents was also in touch with Barnard. In July, the Board of Regents of the University elected Barnard to

---

1939), 110. Lathrop’s resignation was presented to the executive committee on August 20, 1859, placed on file, and accepted by the Board the following January.  

18 Wisconsin Daily State Journal, June 26, July 5, 1862.  

the chancellorship. The Board of Normal School Regents agreed to appoint him its general agent. Lathrop was directed to write him urging his acceptance. This Lathrop dutifully did early in August. Draper wrote a day later confiding to Barnard his fear that Lathrop would “not so conduct his correspondence with you as to lead you to think he really wishes you to accept.” In the next months, other members of the Board, including Pickard and Castleman, and one of the Normal School regents wrote urging Barnard to accept the appointment. Late in August, Barnard informed the secretary of the University regents that he would “visit Madison early in October, for the purpose of an interview with the Board, and of personal observation generally.” If it appeared that he would be more useful in Wisconsin than elsewhere, he could see no reason why he should not “accept the office which the Regents have tendered me.” Barnard warned, however, that he was troubled by poor health and disturbed by fears that he might not be able to devote his full energy to the task.20

To the Board of Normal School Regents, he wrote: “I will not disguise... that my acceptance of the Chancellorship of the State University, depends on the prospect of my being useful as a laborer in the great field of popular education, and your letter points out a way in which I can co-operate with others in the most effectual way of advancing the education of the State, viz; by improving the qualifications of all the teachers.”21

After visiting Madison, Barnard returned to Hartford. In November he was still undecided. To Draper he wrote: “My own mind is made up in the affirmative—but I am requested by parties here to give them a hearing, before I say ‘yes.’ If I felt sure of the policy of the legislature in reference to the Nor. Ins. Funds & of the actions of the Regents of that Fund, I should say ‘yes,’ ‘yes,’ ‘yes’.” Shortly thereafter Barnard notified Lathrop that he would accept the appointment and in January, 1859, he

20 Weekly Argus and Democrat, July 6, 1858, p. 1; September 21, 1858, p. 1; Records of the Board of Regents, Vol. B, p. 188, July 29, 1858; Lathrop to Barnard, August 2, 1858; Draper to Barnard, August 3, 1858; draft of a letter from Barnard to J. D. Ruggles, secretary of the Board of Regents, August 24, 1858; all in the Barnard Manuscripts, New York University.
21 Quoted in the Weekly Argus and Democrat, September 21, 1858.
officially notified the Board of Regents. Barnard then promised that he would arrive in Madison about February 1, and announced his intention "to know but one object—the faithful discharge of such duties as may be entrusted to me in connection with the system of Public Instruction in Wisconsin."22

News of Barnard's acceptance was greeted with enthusiasm by the public and educational press. The *Wisconsin Journal of Education* expressed the hope that with Barnard's appointment the University would "become in reality a part of our system of education, and be entitled to a larger share of the sympathies of the people." If the new chancellor received the support of the regents and legislature, the *Journal* predicted, Wisconsin would have as "head of a complete system of education, a genuine, live University." Lyman C. Draper, superintendent of public instruction, proclaimed in his annual report that Barnard's election was "the most important event that has ever occurred in our educational history,—if not, indeed, the most important, in view of its probable consequences, that has ever transpired in the history of the State."23

Lathrop meanwhile advised Barnard what he should say in his inaugural address. The ceremony was to take place early in January. Lathrop counseled that the legislature of 1859 was made up of new but "I doubt not well meaning men." Barnard should propose measures "designed to put the system of public instruction, including the University, on the best footing." Assuring Barnard that "the mind of Wisconsin is that you are the man to do the work," Lathrop warned that there would be malcontents. The malcontents could be rendered powerless if there were established the "abiding sentiment that the legislature have discharged their whole responsibility in the management of the University when they have taken care to make up the Board of Regents of intelligent and pure men. While I hold

22 Barnard to Draper, November 15, 1858, in Draper Correspondence, State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Lathrop to Barnard, November 26, 1858, in the Barnard Manuscripts, New York University; Records of the Board of Regents, Vol. B, p. 214, January 19, 1859. Barnard's letter of acceptance was dated January 12, 1859.
that the legislature should secure the interest against absurd or corrupt administration, this obviously cannot be done by making the University administration a subject of ordinary legislation. The board of trust must be trusted to do their appropriate work subject to good general laws and a wholesome responsibility. Agitators have learned to go 'crop lots' to the legislature. This is our open side. I call your attention to it that it may be well guarded. It will be in your power to do it." Draper added his pleas to those of Lathrop that Barnard come to Madison in order to be at hand for the session of the legislature to give advice on common school and other educational legislation.

The inauguration of the new chancellor was postponed from January to February. The affair was planned to rival the ceremony for Lathrop. One of the speakers for the day was to be the governor. An attack of pneumonia detained Barnard in Hartford late in January and again postponed the inaugural. In January Lathrop wrote to Barnard warning that "disorganizing influences are likely to awaken into activity which might have been kept in a quiet slumber, by your presence and by the initiation of measures looking to valuable and definite educational results." The legislature would elect four regents and the chancellor should be present to give his advice.

When it definitely appeared that Barnard would not arrive before the legislature completed its session, the attitude of his correspondents turned from one of expectation to regret and even reproach. Draper wrote sadly, "Unless you are able to reach here soon, I shall conclude that our common School Educational matters will be thrown a year behind." He wrote again that if Barnard arrived even a few days before the adjournment of the legislature, something might still be gained. This sentiment was echoed two weeks later by Lathrop. So insistent had the letter writers become that Barnard, not a modest man, wrote that he feared Draper and other friends entertained "too fa-

24 Lathrop to Barnard, December 29, 1858, in the Barnard Manuscripts, New York University.
25 Draper to Barnard, January 22, 28, 1859, in the Barnard Manuscripts.
26 Mrs. Barnard to Draper, February 1, 1859, in the Draper Correspondence, State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
27 Lathrop to Barnard, January 28, 1859, in the Barnard Manuscripts.
favorable ideas of my power to be useful.” Yet he was pleased that so much should seem to hinge upon his action, and he pleaded: “Only bear with me till I fairly get into the traces. I love to work, & am quite disposed to work for the cause in Wisconsin. I believe we can accomplish something permanently and extensively useful if we can get the confidence of the Legislature & the people.”

On March 1, Draper reported that Lathrop had continued on as chancellor pro tem—“this is displeasing to some, who would be glad to see you here at the helm. Our old chancellor has lost what limited influence he formerly had—after all his efforts against Ex-Prof. Conover for Regent. . . . I only mention this as a fact.” But even though Barnard had not yet come to Wisconsin, the legislature had appointed him to a commission which would revise the school laws. “You see, my dear sir, in this, a renewed expression of the unbounded confidence of our people in you. I hope you will be able to advise & help in this matter if you are spared.”

Wisconsin people were not alone in their unreserved confidence in Barnard. A teacher in Illinois, C. S. Hovey, wrote to Barnard saying he must succeed in Wisconsin. “On your success hangs the success of ‘the new order of things’ not only in Wisconsin, but over the border. We of Illinois have watched with no little interest the movements at the North in selecting the man to stand at the helm. We are content.”

Barnard finally arrived in Madison late in May, 1859, and met with the Board in June. On July 27 the inauguration took place and shortly thereafter Barnard was away again. He had addressed the regents at the special meeting on June 22, 1859. The regents expected from the great man a plan. What they got was a declaration that Barnard proposed to act with and for

---

28 Draper to Barnard, February 5, and to Mrs. Barnard, February 14, 1859, and Lathrop to Barnard, February 26, 1859; Barnard to Draper, January 14, 1859, in the Draper Correspondence, State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

29 Draper to Barnard, March 1 and 21, and C. S. Hovey to Barnard, June 25, 1859, in the Barnard Manuscripts, New York University. The legislature in 1859 adopted a joint resolution appointing Barnard, Draper, and Josiah L. Pickard “to make such revision of the school laws of this state as they may deem expedient, and report the same to the Governor in time to be submitted by him to the next legislature for its consideration.” General Laws, 1859, p. 248.
them and would resign when his interests failed to coincide with theirs. His recommendations, none of large proportions, included the proposals that preparatory work should be turned over to the Madison High School, that the normal department of the University should be developed, that practical instruction should be offered in science as applied to individual and public health, agriculture, and other industrial pursuits, and that the ordinances of the Board should be revised to accomplish these ends. He questioned the wisdom of having spent so much money for dormitories, but urged that best use be made of them; he recommended that steps be taken to protect the great beauty of the grounds. He reminded the regents, perhaps half in apology for having had nothing to offer in the way of a general plan for the University, that when he took this post he had "expressly stipulated, that I was to be relieved from all instructional duty in the classes of the University and was to be at liberty to cooperate with the Board of Regents of Normal Schools, as their agent, and with the teachers and friends of common schools." On July 26, the day before his inaugural, Barnard presented, in lieu of a plan, a report by Lathrop, written before he left for Bloomington, reviewing the occurrences of the past year. A mountain of expectation had been built up; none of the hopes were fulfilled. But the Board, in good faith, proposed to dismiss the entire faculty. This was to give Barnard complete freedom in reorganizing the institution. Barnard was invited to prepare recommendations for a full reorganization.

After his inauguration and several months in Madison, Barnard wrote to Daniel C. Gilman, saying there were no more hindrances than he had anticipated and added: "I wish you was here to share the excitement.... The facilities for laying the foundations of a great work are even greater than I anticipated, & in about three years time I hope, if my health holds out, to see some fruits of my labors in this University." Barnard did organize teachers' institutes and arranged with the Madison High School to provide normal training; but his only contribu-

29 Barnard to Gilman, October 29, 1859, in the Barnard Manuscripts, New York University.
tion to the University was the employment of David Boswell Reid as professor of physiology and hygiene and director of the museum of practical science. He was unable to attend the regular meeting of the Board in January, 1860, because of the death of one of his children. When he arrived in February, neither he nor the Board had any plan. He presented his resignation that summer instead of the general plan of reorganization that the Board had asked for. Although the Board rejected Barnard’s resignation, in their formal report of 1860 the regents felt called upon to explain and in part to justify themselves. Barnard’s health had been bad, but unless he should be able to take active control of the institution soon, the Board would be compelled to accept his resignation and search for a new chancellor. In January, 1861, on a motion of Horace A. Tenney, the Board did accept the resignation. Never more than a phantom chancellor, he was yet revered by almost everyone. Though he made no original proposals, and his innovations lasted no longer than his term of office, the Board, the faculty, and the educators in the state seemed ready to deliver the entire educational system into his hands. Barnard’s bad health, his unwillingness to give up his multifarious activities, and the desperate financial condition of the University brought his tenuous tenure to an end.

Although the acceptance of his resignation by the Board was accompanied by a motion of regret, and most of the newspapers and educational journals also expressed regret, Barnard’s brief connection with the University soon became the subject of bitterness. In 1865 the faculty, in recommending that a chancellor be employed, could not resist a jibe at Barnard and the Board and urged that someone not too big for the place be hired. Horace Tenney, who as a member of the Board had moved the acceptance of Barnard’s resignation in 1861, later denounced Barnard bitterly as a fake and a fraud. “A more wretched impostor, dead-beat and humbug, probably never swindled a literary institution under pretense of being a great educator. . . . Of his connection with the University it is due to truth to say, that he did not even rise to the dignity of a total

---

22 See the Wisconsin Journal of Education, series 1, vol. 5, pp. 308-311 (March, 1861) for a summary of the newspaper comment on Barnard’s resignation.
failure." In 1867 James D. Butler wrote Barnard that his career had been bitterly derided at an alumni banquet. Ten years later, James High, '64, called Barnard an "ornamental chancellor." 33

The bitterness that followed Barnard's departure was perhaps inevitable. He was hotly pursued and flattered into accepting the position. Having indicated that he would accept, he himself seemed to think he would find time to work for Wisconsin and do a "great work." Members of the Board of Regents, educators, even the legislature itself, promised Barnard again and again that all he had to do was lead; they would follow. But their expectations and high hopes for great educational leadership from Barnard were never realized. That the Wisconsin experience rankled in Barnard's memory is clear. Writing to Draper in 1876, he declared, "If my health had not broken down, with the hold I had already got on the teachers, & the movers in local school movements, we would have done a great work in that state." Twenty years later, when President Charles Kendall Adams called upon him, Barnard insisted that he would have accomplished much if his health had permitted him to continue. 34

LATHROP had urged Barnard to have Daniel Read, Lathrop's most stalwart supporter, named assistant president during Barnard's absence from the campus. But the Board of Regents made John Sterling dean of the faculty. Sterling, the senior member of the faculty, was virtually head of the University after Lathrop left, but not until the acceptance of Barnard's resignation was he officially listed as dean. In 1865, at the request of the faculty, his title was changed to vice-chancellor. 35

33 H. A. Tenney, manuscript History of the University, in the Papers of the Board of Regents; Butler to Barnard, April 12, 1867, in the Barnard Manuscripts; High, A Great Chancellor, 232.
34 Reuben G. Thwaites, The University of Wisconsin (Madison, 1899), 74 n.
35 Lathrop to Barnard, November 26, 1858, in the Barnard Manuscripts; Regents' Annual Report, 1860-61, p. 29; 1864-65, p. 23. Lathrop was apparently closer to Read than to any other member of the faculty. In 1859 or 1860 he urged Read's appointment to the post of president of the University of Missouri, an office Lathrop had held before coming to Wisconsin and which he again accepted in
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Thus from the time of Lathrop's departure in 1859 until the arrival of Paul Chadbourne in 1867, John Sterling was the administrative officer of the University. Besides teaching mathematics and such other subjects as necessity required, Sterling performed many tasks: he met with the Board of Regents and with the executive committee; he looked after the buildings and the grounds; he corresponded with prospective students; he assembled the catalogue for printing; he interviewed new students; he collected tuitions; he showed new students to their rooms; he sold them secondhand furniture; he helped to examine and classify them when they entered the University; and he kept the records. While Barnard was still chancellor, Sterling wrote him saying he was having the buildings cleaned and the walls whitewashed "at as little expense as possible." Others, like Professor Butler, might worry about a leak in the roof, or that the lightning rods had blown down, or that the fire insurance had run out, but Sterling arranged to have these matters taken care of "at as little expense as possible." 38

The Board, assured of his frugality and his devotion to the interest of the University, seldom refused his requests. He would, they assumed, never ask for more than was needed. He was not anxious for personal power, nor was he an experimenter. He was content to keep the University operating on a modest scale.

His devotion to the University must at times have been tried, as when one of the literary societies asked him to make frames for pictures to hang in its hall or when members of another society turned over to him for safekeeping all the funds in their treasury, expecting him to be their banker. Although there is no record that Sterling ever refused to perform these many and various tasks, his communications to the Board occasionally sug-

1865. After Lathrop's death Read was made president of Missouri. Jonas Viles and others, The University of Missouri, 111.

The report of the faculty containing the recommendation that the title of vice-chancellor was more appropriate than that of dean was signed by Sterling, but it was read to the Board by Daniel Read. The Board agreed to the change, but the next year the legislature abolished the office of chancellor.

38Sterling to Barnard, August 30, 1859, and Butler to Barnard, May 27, 1860, in the Barnard Manuscripts, New York University.
gest his feeling that too much was being expected of him. In January, 1861, he complained to the Board that he had too much to do, that during the administration of Barnard he had shouldered the whole responsibility for administering the University. He had accepted this responsibility only because of "the peculiar circumstances of the University," but now he wanted to be relieved. In June of the same year, certain that he would receive no additional salary for serving as dean of the faculty, Sterling repeated his request to be relieved of the office and responsibility. "Since the position as it seems, is regarded by the Board as one of honor merely, and as the undersigned has enjoyed the honor now two years, he desires that it should be shared by his Colleagues. Unless therefore the Board see their way clear to appoint a Chancellor the undersigned respectfully requests that some other member be appointed as Dean of the faculty." 37

The Board paid no attention to his complaint, and he continued to carry the administrative responsibility without extra pay. He continued to grumble from time to time that the burden was too much and that someone else should be selected; but since he did the job well enough and since he was devoted, conscientious, and upright, the Board of Regents—since they had no money with which to employ a new chancellor—found no reason to change. Apparently no serious thought was given to making Sterling chancellor, although the thought must have occurred to him as it did to some of the alumni. 38

In 1866, after the legislature had provided for the reorganization of the University and the Board had begun a search for a president, Sterling wrote to the executive committee refusing to serve longer as executive head. For lack of a quorum, no action was taken. 39 But early the next year Chadbourne was elected

38 In an address before the alumni in 1877 James L. High declared that he had "sometimes thought when our regents were searching New England colleges for a fit person to be called to the presidential chair, that they would have done but a simple act of justice, equally creditable to themselves and to the university, in bestowing its highest official dignity upon one who, by his unquestioned fitness, not less than his long years of efficient service, had fairly earned the honor." A Great Chancellor, 233.
president of the University. Somewhat later Sterling was made vice-president; he was the only member of the old faculty retained after the reorganization of 1867.

The faculty was formally organized on September 22, 1851, with the chancellor, Professor Sterling, and a tutor, Obadiah M. Conover, present. Weekly meetings were held thereafter for a great many years. The minutes, except for the period between 1861–64 for which Daniel Read lost the records, were regularly, if not fully, kept.

There is little evidence that the early faculty ever concerned itself much with the course of study, except when a question of adding, substituting, or modifying a requirement came up for discussion. Debate, if any, was never recorded. There is no record of an expression of educational philosophy or of the conflict between science and the classics. Although these men were not untouched by the problems which agitated higher education in the middle of the nineteenth century, their secretary apparently did not consider discussions of these matters important enough to record. The course of study and the organization of the University, it appears, were responsibilities of the chancellor and the regents. During the interregnum, when the faculty might have changed the organization, it did nothing. Nor is there much evidence of direct communication between the faculty and the regents. The chancellor spoke for the faculty, although periodically he transmitted reports of its members to the regents. Sometimes the regents acted upon faculty suggestions. Doubtless some professors attempted to influence members of the Board who lived in Madison, but neither the records of the Board nor of the faculty suggest that, even in the early days, there was much direct formal contact between faculty and regents.

The foremost concern of the faculty was with those problems created by bringing boys together for the purpose of education. It is indicative of the faculty's interest and preoccupation that at the first meeting, on September 22, 1851, Lathrop, Sterling, and Conover agreed that the hours of study and recitations should
be as follows: from six to seven and nine to twelve in the morning; from two to five in the afternoon; and seven to nine in the evening. It was also agreed that the study rooms should be visited by a faculty member at least once in the forenoon and once in the afternoon and once between seven and nine in the evening. Apparently visitations between six and seven in the morning were considered unnecessary. At the second meeting, Chancellor Lathrop presented for approval a plan for keeping a record of scholarship and deportment; it was a plan which Lathrop had employed while he was president of the University of Missouri. And a similar plan had been adopted at the State University of Iowa in 1860.

Based upon the assumption that each student was innocent until proved guilty, the plan provided that at the beginning of the term every student was credited with one hundred points in scholarship and in deportment. On the side of scholarship, for every crime or lapse from grace as reckoned in the faculty decalogue, students were debited from one to fifty points. A student was debited one point for failing to recite, for absence from recitation without excuse, for failure to prepare an assigned composition or declamation; for "special failures" he could lose from one to nine points. There was "for a perfect recitation, in whole and in part; no debit." In 1852 the rules were emended to provide a debit of five points for absence from an examination. Each officer of the University was to keep a record and to report debits at the weekly Friday-evening faculty meeting. The chancellor kept a great book in which he recorded the debits. At the close of each term the number of debits was subtracted from the one hundred credits originally given, and the balance, if any, was recorded in the permanent record book, which was also kept by the chancellor.

The rules governing deportment were somewhat more exacting. Here too a student started at the beginning of the term with a credit of one hundred. Absence without excuse from daily prayers, declamation, or recitation cost two points; unexcused tardiness cost one point. Absence from the study room without

---

*Minutes of the Meetings of the Faculty, vol. 1, p. 1, September 22, 1851; Viles and others, *University of Missouri*, p. 41.*
The University in 1897
excuse cost one point; causing "disorder" cost one or more points. In 1852 "personal violence" was proscribed and penalized fifty points; absence from an examination cost ten points. The same year a penalty of five points was established for any student who entered a saloon or barroom in the village of Madison or vicinity. All other misdemeanors were debited at the discretion of the faculty. Lapses in deportment, like those in scholarship, were reported weekly to the chancellor, totaled at the end of the term, and entered in the permanent record.

The student who accumulated twenty-five debits in a term was given a warning, and the chancellor notified his parents. Fifty and seventy-five debits brought further notifications and warnings. The rule provided that the student who lost all his credits should be "separated from the institution" for one term or longer, at the discretion of the faculty. The system of values embraced within this code is revealing: fighting was considered five times more serious than missing an examination and ten times as bad as visiting a saloon; missing a recitation was more a crime in deportment than in scholarship; and the penalty for missing an examination was twice as severe in deportment as in scholarship, suggesting that regularity and promptness were more esteemed than diligence in studies.

The records of the faculty are crowded with trivial cases of misconduct and consequent punishments. There are occasional melancholy entries to the effect that so-and-so exhausted his credits and his father was invited to withdraw him from the University. Drinking, disorderly conduct, fighting, absences from examinations, stealing books, forging excuses, and many other misdemeanors came before the faculty. The crimes were solemnly considered and the offenders sometimes brought before the faculty for questioning. Sometimes a member of the faculty was designated to consult the culprit. Often a report would come back of confession, repentance, and high resolve to do better. In 1864, a student was charged with assaulting another, and Sterling was appointed to investigate. When he reported that the aggressor "manifested proper feelings," regretted his conduct, was willing to repair the property damage, and had already apologized to the boy whom he had attacked, the faculty
permitted him to remain in school and debited him only twenty-five points. In 1865 seven young men were charged with having attended the German theater in Madison. The faculty dismissed one permanently, three were dismissed for the remainder of the term, and the other three were permitted to remain in school although publicly reprimanded and placed on good behavior. The faculty rarely took punitive measures against a student for academic failure, although in 1859 a student who had failed in an examination of Demosthenes was required to make up his deficiency during the summer if he intended to continue with his class.\(^4\)

Records show that though the faculty had great interest in maintaining discipline, they were quick to defend the students against any attack from outside. In 1861 Sterling admitted that there was gossip about their deportment and scholarship but branded it “as false and slanderous; and we affirm that in deportment and scholarship the students of the Wisconsin University will bear favorable comparison with those of any similar institution in the land.”\(^2\)

The practice of holding a daily chapel meeting was adopted early in the history of the University, and attendance of all students and faculty members was required. In 1857 the faculty asked further that the chancellor “invite the resident clergy of Madison and others at his discretion to conduct religious services in the College Chapel on Sabbath afternoons.” Two years later the faculty’s “Committee on Chaplaincy” recommended the appointment of a University chaplain and nominated Professor Butler for the post. The chaplain was to be responsible for religious exercises each morning and for arranging the religious lectures each Sabbath afternoon. His duties were to be considered equivalent to one recitation.\(^3\) Butler was chaplain until after the Civil War.

The faculty as a group showed little inclination to challenge the authority of either the chancellor or the Board of Regents,

\(^4\) Minutes of the Faculty, vol. 1, pp. 2, 3–4, 66, 114, 118, 119, October 6, 1851, July 25, 1859, April 13, 15, 1864, February 6, 1865.
\(^3\) Minutes of the Faculty, vol. 1, pp. 52, 68, September 28, 1857, September 20, 1859.
although on one occasion they disapproved of a proposal by the chancellor and were supported by the executive committee. They did combine in 1865 in bringing charges against one of their colleagues, Professor Ezra Carr, for "dereliction of duty." But although the executive committee and the Board investigated, nothing came of it.

The teaching of the faculty had little to distinguish it from that in academies and colleges throughout the land during this period. In 1856 students, even those of regular college standing, met for daily recitations from textbooks, and their study hours were prescribed by the faculty. By the time of the Civil War the faculty permitted some freedom among the college students, although preparatory students were expected, even if not living in the dormitories, to spend six hours a day in recitation or in study hall under the supervision of the tutor. Moreover, although the professors were ostensibly responsible for instruction in clearly defined if somewhat numerous disciplines, specialization was achieved largely in the catalogue. Most of the professors taught what had to be taught, few managing to stay entirely within the fields assigned to them. Most of them taught in the preparatory department. In 1856 the schedule shows that the chancellor, who occupied the chair of civil politics and ethics, heard a sophomore class in Latin, two recitations from the preparatory class in Vergil and the Latin reader, and the seniors in a course in political economy. Daniel Read taught "mental philosophy and active powers" to juniors and seniors, rhetoric to sophomores, and each year was supposed to offer a course of lectures in didactics. Sterling's teaching day was filled with teaching mathematics to the juniors, sophomores, and freshmen and arithmetic to the preparatory classes. Professor Conover taught Latin to the seniors, Latin and Greek to freshmen, and two classes in English grammar. Fuchs taught German to the juniors and French to the sophomores. Augustus Ledyard Smith, tutor, taught all the preparatory classes except those handled by the chancellor, and by Conover and Sterling. The other faculty member, Professor Carr, was not teaching that term.45

44 Minutes of the Faculty, vol. 1, p. 121, May 14, 1865.
Few of the men who served on the early faculty attained greatness as teachers or scholars, although an abundant sentimental literature attests their popularity. The quality of Sterling's instruction will be discussed in another chapter. Of the others, most had at least adequate preparation. Obadiah M. Conover, appointed tutor in 1850 and professor of ancient languages in 1852, was born at Dayton, Ohio, in 1825. He graduated from Princeton at the age of nineteen, taught school near Lexington, Kentucky, and later at the Dayton Academy. He studied law and later returned to Princeton Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1849. Shortly thereafter he came to Madison and published several issues of a literary and educational monthly called The Northwestern Journal. Few comments on his teaching remain, but we have his own bitter complaints about the admission of ill-prepared students to his classes. He was not re-elected in 1858. For several years thereafter he assisted in the management of the Madison High School and the preparatory department of the University. In 1864 he became supreme court reporter and continued in this post until his death in 1884.\textsuperscript{46} An occasional poet, a classicist, a conservative, and a Republican, Conover was a man of scholarly taste and good training.

James Davie Butler was elected professor in Conover's place. Few men who served on the early faculty, not even the chancellor, had wider experience than Butler. Born at Rutland, Vermont, in 1815, he went to Wesleyan Seminary at Wilbraham, Massachusetts; to Middlebury College, Vermont; and to Yale Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1840. Shortly thereafter he made his first trip to Europe, where he visited several German universities, apparently supporting himself in part by writing articles for the New York Observer. He returned to the United States in late 1843, lectured on his European travels, and divided his time between teaching and preaching. In 1854 he accepted a position as professor of Greek at Wabash College. He expressed some reluctance about coming to Madison. He feared that the classics would be sacrificed to science, but he left Wabash without distress since his salary there was

\textsuperscript{46} State Journal (Madison), April 29, 1884, p. 1.
not being paid. He was not re-elected in 1867, but he continued thereafter to make his home in Madison.

Butler never wrote a book, but from his pen poured an almost endless stream of articles and slight monographs. He contributed more than two hundred articles to the Nation, and contributed irregularly to newspapers in New York, Boston, Cincinnati, and Chicago. Reuben Gold Thwaites described him as the perennially gentle scholar who went through life "quite undisturbed by a concern for material cares." He wrote on literature, art, history, antiquities, numismatics, philology, travel, pedagogics, religion, and philosophy. A scholar by taste and temperament, Butler complained to Barnard of his loneliness in Madison: "None of my associates here are of scholarly habits." Later the same year he alluded to this again, saying that although he had been unanimously re-elected to his position, he regretted the "lack of literary associates here—the absence of professional enthusiasm in our faculty." But even his protest was gentle. "The next generation," he told Barnard, "may see a good institution here,—but I shall be in the tombs of the Capulets." As it turned out, however, he lived until 1905, until after President Van Hise had been inaugurated. Although never a conspicuously popular teacher—his subject may have had something to do with that—Butler enjoyed wide popularity as a lecturer, preacher, and writer. His touches of sly humor were often embedded in the complex prose of which he was a master. He was not above twitting the regents when they sought to admonish him for neglecting to submit his annual report in 1863. He responded, "Tempted into tasting a bit of roast pig two days ago, I paid for it by such a cholera as to make me neglect my usual report. I was further beguiled into this sin of omission by fears that my humble and recondite labors were unnoticed by you. Henceforth however I shall go on my way exultant in my discovery that you, Gentlemen, like Divine Providence, while administering matters the most vast, yet find nothing too minute for your inspection." 

* Butler to Barnard, August 4, 1858, in the Barnard Manuscripts, New York University.
* Reuben G. Thwaites, "Memorial Address: James Davie Butler," in the Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters (Madison, Wis-
Butler helped and encouraged many students and maintained a lifelong correspondence with many. One of these was John Muir. In an autobiographical sketch, Muir recalled that it was Butler who was responsible for his first appearance in print. Pyre remembered Butler in his old age for the "circumstantial plenitude of his prayers," his "prodigious habit of hiving quaint and curious tid-bits of forgotten lore which he unloaded at odd times" and his "big voice" which "sounded against the library hush, preternaturally so."  

Ezra Carr shared with Butler the affection of John Muir, but beyond that there was little in common between Carr and Butler or the rest of the small faculty. Born at Stephentown, Rensselaer County, New York, in 1819, Carr had graduated from the Polytechnic School in Troy and received the degree of doctor of medicine from Castleton College in Vermont, where he taught chemistry and natural history before coming to Wisconsin in 1856. At Wisconsin he taught agriculture, chemistry, and natural history and served on the committee of the State Geological Survey. For one year he was a member of the Board of Regents but, when forced to choose between his professorship and his regentship, he resigned from the Board.  

In 1867 he was not re-elected to the faculty. He moved to California where for six years he occupied the post of professor of agriculture in the newly opened University of California. Later he served as superintendent of public instruction in California. He wrote on agriculture and chemistry and prepared a book on *The Patrons of Husbandry on the Pacific Coast,* a chapter of which he based on Lathrop's lectures in political economy.  

While he was at Wisconsin he was vigorous in pushing the claims of his department, tactless in relations with his colleagues, and often contemptuous of what he considered the ineffective disciplines they represented. Although he talked much about
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50 *Daily Argus and Democrat* (Madison), July 29, 1858, p. 2.  
51 Manuscript biography, prepared by the Writers Project of the Works Progress Administration, in the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
laboratory work, his teaching consisted largely of lectures. Students remembered these for his use of demonstrations, particularly for his aplomb in accepting the failure of an experiment. He would tell the class what was going to happen; and if it did not, he was undisturbed. Carr announced in the catalogue that in his department, "the recitation of the student consists in his giving a lecture illustrated with experiments and demonstrations on the same subject and after the manner of the Professor, thus not only requiring an intimate knowledge of the subject discussed but at the same time the faculty of communicating his knowledge." The examining committee in 1861 found Carr's method "somewhat novel" but "in the highest degree advantageous," although they felt there was not sufficient opportunity for laboratory experimentations. John Muir wrote appreciatively about him: "I shall not forget the Doctor, who first laid before me the great book of Nature, and though I have taken so little from his hand, he has at least shown me where those mines of priceless knowledge lie and how to reach them."

During his eleven years at Wisconsin, Carr was engaged in many disputes with his colleagues, with members of the Board, and with politicians. Even his leaving was accompanied by an uproar because, it was charged, he tried to take with him geological collections which belonged to the University. He had sold his collection to the University in 1856. The Board of Regents, unable to determine whether the items Carr claimed were his or the University's, offered him twenty-five dollars for his interest in the collection. Carr indignantly refused. The solution is not on record but the connection of Ezra Carr, the fractious one, with the University of Wisconsin terminated in 1867. On leaving, he sweetly offered the regents his "active sympathies and cooperation."

Daniel Read came to the University in 1856, in the same year as Carr. Except for the chancellor, he was at the time the oldest man on the faculty. Born at Marietta, Ohio, in 1805, educated

---


in a local academy, and graduated from the University of Ohio in 1824, he had taught political economy at the University of Ohio and ancient languages at Indiana University.

In 1850 he had been a delegate to the Indiana constitutional convention, an experience from which he never fully recovered. In the years that followed at both Indiana and Wisconsin, he told successive classes about his activities as a constitution-maker. One of his students at Wisconsin recalled, after sixty years, that the students “listened with keen interest to the well-told narrative of his experiences.” A pious, conservative, courtly man, an admirer and supporter of Lathrop, he taught courses in his own department and, upon Lathrop’s departure, took over some of the classes the chancellor had conducted. And, although it was not required of him, he taught for a time “Evidences of Christianity.” He resigned in 1867 and accepted the presidency of the University of Missouri. He held this position for the remainder of his active career.54

Of the others who taught in the early period, little need be said. John P. Fuchs, first professor of modern languages and subsequently re-elected to the position, was born in Dutch Guiana in 1823 of German parentage, trained in Dutch and German universities, and received a medical degree at the age of twenty-five. He came to America in 1849 and to Wisconsin in 1854 and that year became teacher of French and German at the University. He resigned and went to Milwaukee to teach in the schools there, and then returned to the University after the dismissal of Pickard. He served until 1867 when the Chadbournre reorganization shook him out. He then moved to Chicago and there practiced medicine until his death in 1878.55 He wrote little, but Carl Schurz considered him a good scholar. Burr W. Jones remembered him as a man devoted to literature, an inveterate pipe-smoker, and so near-sighted that he was never

54 Jones, “Reminiscences of Nine Decades,” op. cit., 159; Records of the Board of Regents, Vol. B, p. 133, July 21, 1857; Viles, University of Missouri, 110 ff.; Madison Democrat, October 6, 1878, p. 2. James Butler described Read as the “oldest and largest man” on the old faculty, as more conservative than Sterling, and as one whose teaching from the first to the last “ran in the same groove.” According to Butler, he even taught students how to pray. James D. Butler, “An Early Decade of Wisconsin University,” in The Badger, 1890 (Madison, 1889), 85.
55 Thwaites, University of Wisconsin, 65 n.
able to discover which students were absent from his classes.

Professor Kürsteiner, who replaced Fuchs, was chiefly noted for having founded a choir. "I think," he wrote to the regents, "it necessary and very appropriate that a young man ought to try to cultivate his voice, not only to raise it in praise of his Creator and for the enjoyment of his fellow beings, but also for his advancement and progress."

Although the Board and faculty appreciated the choir, Kürsteiner was forced out in 1858, and his place given to Joseph C. Pickard. Pickard, the brother of the regent, Josiah, was for two years professor of modern languages. He had been trained at Bowdoin and in a theological seminary. After he left Wisconsin he taught English at the University of Illinois.

David Boswell Reid, who served as professor of physiology and hygiene and director of the museum of practical science from 1859 to 1860, was a native of Scotland. He had received his medical degree from the University of Edinburgh in 1830 and remained on the staff there for several years. In Edinburgh he developed the "first systematic plan of ventilation ever carried out in any public building." Engaged for a time in a project to "ventilate the houses of Parliament," he had quarreled with the builders and, in 1855, had come to the United States to lecture. His work on ventilation brought him to the attention of Henry Barnard, who, in 1859, secured his appointment to the faculty of the University of Wisconsin. He remained at Madison only one year, apparently unappreciated by his colleagues. His dismissal in 1860 by the Board was a grave breach of the contract Barnard had made with him. The examining committee in 1860, however, was impressed by his teaching. "The students presented some excellent drawings prepared by themselves, of different structures, showing several modes of ventilation, and the arrangement of rooms for convenience and comfort. Their examination indicated a good acquaince [sic] with the general principles of physiology, as applied to the useful arts."

Such was the early faculty, better trained in theology than in other disciplines. It is with them that Lathrop planned a University which would offer a practical and utilitarian education. In their interests and training can be found, in large part, an explanation of the failure of the University to take more than a tentative step in the direction of implementing the grand plans of the chancellor and the Board. Conover, Sterling, and Butler were trained in divinity schools. Read, although not trained in theology, was by taste and temperament one of them. Small wonder, then, that in the years when these men guarded the springs of learning at the University, its offerings were those of the traditional colleges, weakened perhaps by the lack of a coalescing principle.