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PIONEERING SOCIOLOGY ON "THE LAST FRONTIER"

The University of Arizona
The University of Arizona

Chapter 1
1885-1899

The development of sociology at The University of Arizona has been irregular and, at times, uncertain of its survival. Small's analogy of acorns is, however, suggestive. Some acorns, he says, are devoured by swine, some are left to rot in the ground. But the few that take root in the soil are bound to grow into sturdy oaks. The development of sociology in The University of Arizona was no exception.

It is the purpose of this paper to trace the development of sociology at The University of Arizona from its beginning and to suggest reasons, factual and hypothetical, which retarded its development for a half-century.

The attempt to find explanations for these variations led far afield in a search for related factors which, directly or indirectly, influenced the course of its development. There were, for example, the developmental problems of Arizona and the University during the territorial days, the land-grant act and its relation to the policies of administrators, the prestige of the classical curriculum, the relatively late development of the social sciences, the fluctuations in the economy of the nation and the state, the vested interests of
the natural sciences and their claims on limited budgets, and, finally, the changes in students' interests. Some of the particulars related to sociology will be cited in the discussion which follows.

The Act of the Territorial Legislature authorizing the establishment of a university in Tucson in 1885 was a constructive and bold venture by the rugged pioneers who constituted the 13th Territorial Legislature. At the time, Arizona was still an open frontier; much has been written about the life in the territorial days with its Indian wars and the hardships of pioneering in a hostile physical environment. The early growth of the University was severely restricted by its frontier environment.

In 1880 Arizona had a population of 40,440 persons in its 113,909 square miles of territory, an average density of .35 per square mile. Population was increasing but not until 1900 did Arizona reach a density of 1.1 per square mile. There were few towns and cities, of which Tucson was the largest, with a population of 7,000 in 1880, while Phoenix had only 1,708. Financially the territory was poor, with a total assessed value of all property of $23,206,919 in 1886.¹

By 1885 there was no adequate system of public schools and there was no high school in the whole territory. Efforts of Governor Stafford to establish a system of public schools throughout the territory were only partially successful for two reasons—a shortage of funds and teachers.²
It is noteworthy that the legislature, confronted with this problem in 1885, proceeded to promote a system of higher education by establishing a normal school in Tempe to train teachers, and a university in Tucson.

When the University, with a faculty of six members, opened its doors to register students in 1891 there were four college and twenty-eight preparatory students enrolled. Inasmuch as there were few students in the territory qualified for college work, the Preparatory School (1891-1915) had an important role in the development of the University. For some years the faculty had a dual teaching role and the University, so-called, was a pioneering institution, located on a desert tract of 40 acres with one building to house the students, some of its faculty, and to conduct its operations. With limited resources as well as students, the first concern was to set up a practical curriculum adapted to the needs of the territory and in accordance with the Morrill Act under which the University became a land-grant university.

The Morrill Act was defined specifically as "an Act donating Public Lands to the several States and Territories for the benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts." Since agriculture and mining were the two main industries in the territory, the organization of the University, at its opening, consisted of the Preparatory School and the Departments of Mining, Agriculture, and the Agricultural Experiment Station.
The Morrill Act was based on the equalitarian doctrines of the 18th and 19th centuries and was designed to provide an opportunity for a higher education for all classes on the same basis as that provided for professional groups. The agitations of the Grangers and other farmer movements led to subsequent acts providing for the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and a comprehensive system of agricultural extension and vocational education. Not only were farm boys entitled to go to their state university and study the science of agriculture but the benefits of research and experimentation were made available to every farm family by the Agricultural Extension Service operating under the supervision of the University and its Agricultural Experimental Station. The land-grant college could not, however, limit its curricula to the Colleges of Mines and Agriculture and hope to become a real university.

The second catalogue for 1892-93 projected a more extensive organization of four colleges and their subdivisions of "Schools" and Departments. The following outline indicates the Colleges and Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. College of Agriculture</td>
<td>1. Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. College of Mines</td>
<td>1. School of Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. College of Natural Science
1. Chemistry
2. Physics
3. Biology
4. Geology and Mineralogy

IV. College of Letters
1. English Literature
2. Modern Languages
3. Ancient Languages
4. History and Civics

V. Preparatory School
Regular Course

VI. School of Art
1. School of Music
2. School of Painting
3. School of Elocution

VII. School of Business
1. Bookkeeping
2. Dictation
3. Telegraphy
4. Photography

Obviously missing in this outline is a College of Social Science comparable to the College of Natural Science. This was not, however, an oversight. In a point of time the Social Science Movement was still in the early stage of its development, and in 1892, the place of the social sciences in the curriculum was uncertain, with the exception of history.

A casual analysis of this outline indicates a projection of vocational courses into the traditional liberal arts curriculum and the issue of progressive and utilitarian ideas of education versus the classical curriculum and its "cultural courses." Was it culture for its own sake or culture for service? Of what value were courses
in Greek history, Elizabethan literature or Latin to cowboys who would ride the ranges after they left college? Such questions had ready answers if they were raised. Latin was of value for its mental discipline, if nothing else.

Thus the School of Ancient Languages was set up in the 1902-03 catalogue although there was no student demand for ancient languages. In the traditional curricula, however, no student escaped Latin on the preparatory or college levels as a requirement for the A.B. degree.

The conflict between these views of education was already resolved in The University Bill passed by the thirteenth legislature creating a university to be located in Tucson. Otherwise, the institution might have been designated a College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, striving to become a university in later years as the history of land-grant colleges in other states indicates. Nothing indicates more clearly the blending of the classical and the Morrill Act conceptions of higher education than the official seal of the University of Arizona, which symbolizes the direction the University was taking.

Arizona, being geographically isolated, was primarily concerned with the problem of building a state out of its semi-arid territory. The social protest and the social reform movements which arose in the wake of the agricultural and industrial revolutions following the Civil War had little, if any, impact on the frontiers
of Arizona. The Social Science Movement, which had its early development in the same period, was concerned with the social problems and social dislocations associated with urbanization and industrialization. The Sociological Movement in the United States, likewise, had its setting in the populous areas of the nation, where the leading centers of learning were located. Instead of joining with the reformers and muckrakers of the eighties and nineties, sociologists wanted to develop "a science of society" as a rational approach to the problems of a changing social order.

Comte, Spencer and Ward had published their comprehensive systems and had, at least, familiarized the academic world with the terms and claims of sociology. The introduction of sociology into the college curricula was, however, met with variable degrees of skepticism and opposition. As yet, it had no academic pedigree to give it prestige, and its claim to be a scientific discipline aroused the antagonism of other academic disciplines. By the turn of the century it was still, primarily, a prophet crying in the social and academic wilderness. The fact that it was being established in increasing numbers of colleges and universities, in one form or another, "indicates that it was supplying a need."

By the turn of the century, the University of Arizona was still a small institution with 21 instructors and 161 students. Of these, there were 29 classified as college and 132 as preparatory students. One-half of the total enrollment consisted of special and beginning students in the Preparatory School.
Nevertheless, the legislative committee appointed by the Governor to visit the University was "delighted and amazed at the marvelous progress that has been made." The Chairman of the Committee, reporting to the Legislature in 1903, said:

"Your Committee, Mr. President, desires to call the special attention of this legislative body to the importance and magnitude of the University. . . . Although young in years, this institution has grown to magnificent proportions. . . ."

Such faith was destined, in time, "to remove mountains" that lay in the path of a small frontier school seeking to become a great university; but not without doubts and misgivings, at times.

The most persistent difficulty confronting the University over the years was the annual problem of securing adequate appropriations from the Legislature to provide for the diversified needs of a growing institution. This involved decisions by the Administration and the Legislature of how much and for what.

The building of a sound economy in the state was a paramount consideration, and the operating of the land-grant university was committed to the development of the applied sciences from the beginning. The development of agriculture, mining and engineering and, later, business and industry were essential to the growth of the state. Thus the "natural sciences" were expanded as applied sciences. In the liberal arts tradition every student was required to have a laboratory science as a part of a liberal education. In a land-grant university
it became a requirement for the development of all of the applied sciences. Chemistry became soil chemistry, food chemistry, bio-chemistry, et cetera.

Thus, agriculture, mining and mechanical arts, with their extensive elaboration of applied sciences, became an integral and important part of the academic establishment from the beginning of the University. Legislators could be persuaded that appropriations for staff, buildings, laboratories and equipment were necessary for such applied sciences whereas other requests for increased appropriations had no comparable claims of necessity.

The College of Agriculture, for example, was provided with federal funds to conduct its research, experimentation and extension. Such funds did not, however, provide for the necessary buildings, equipment and experimental farms. These had to be provided out of state funds. It is noteworthy that the first State Legislature in 1913 appropriated $70,000 for the maintenance and operation of the University for the ensuing year and $252,800 for the construction of the Agricultural Building and Auditorium over a two-year period and supplements to Federal appropriations. 7

The capital outlays for new buildings on the campus is suggestive. In addition to the Old Main building, the erection of Science Hall in 1909 (now the Liberal Arts Annex), the Agricultural Building in 1915, the Mines and Engineering and the Mechanical Arts
buildings in 1917-1918 provided for the offices, class rooms, and laboratories needed by the University at that time. These buildings, designed primarily for Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts, were not only the central nucleus of a growing campus but they were central in the thinking of the legislators who appropriated funds for their construction and equipment. By contrast, the Liberal Arts building was not erected until 1949. In the meantime, its staff found offices and classrooms in spaces not preempted by the needs of science, agriculture, mines, engineering and the mechanical arts.

This utilitarian approach in making investments in higher education was based upon the needs of the state to develop its resources and to provide public facilities and services which imposed heavy financial burdens in a period of rapid transition from a frontier economy to a modernized state with a high degree of mechanization and specialization. The agricultural, industrial, and technological revolutions which had made their impact on other parts of the nation after the Civil War, made their impact on Arizona after its admission into the Union in 1912. The disposition of the legislature to provide for the practical utilitarian needs of its economy left the state ill-prepared to meet the unexpected social problems and the need for social services as its population increased.

These changes had implications for the progress of sociology which is the sole objective to be pursued in what follows.
Chapter 2
1900-1914

The first mention of sociology at The University of Arizona was made in a news item in a student publication in 1900. The item is of interest as an illustration of the nebulous idea of sociology that existed in the minds of many at that time. The need of early sociologists to define the field of sociology and to justify its inclusion in the curricula of colleges and universities is apparent in the description of this course.

The news item states:

The sociology class after a thorough investigation upon the financial condition of Cuba, have found that usury laws, while protecting, to some extent, the embarrassed conditions of the borrower, would tend to prohibit a free flow of capital to that island. So confident are they that their decision is the correct one that they are thinking of sending a communication to Governor General Wood, stating their conclusion, knowing that their efforts in this direction would be appreciated.

In a letter addressed to the "President of the University of Arizona"9 William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago, indicated a proposed visit of Albion W. Small, who had never been west of Denver, to acquaint himself with educational conditions in the West. Harper offered to have Small visit The University of
Arizona for a day or two and, perhaps, to speak to the students and faculty. Small had made a similar trip through the South and had reported great interest in education in general, and in the development of sociology at the University of Chicago, in particular.

There is no record available of President Parker's reply to President Harper's offer and there is no record that Dr. Small visited the campus. It is notable, however, the F. Yale Adams, who was Head of the Department of History, Political Economy and Pedagogy was offering a course under the title of sociology at that time, which he describes as follows:

The first part of this course is a study of the elementary principles of political economy, which is followed by a course in sociology, which takes up the discussion of many practical topics with original investigations and a thesis. This course is given in alternate years. I instructed a class of four, five times a week from January to June.

This was, apparently, the course referred to above.

In Tolman's report on courses in sociology in 1901, the following statement was made by Professor Adams on sociology at The University of Arizona:

Sociology is taught incidentally in connection with work in history, political science and pedagogy. It is probable that courses in sociology will be offered as soon as the number of students demands it.
F. Yale Adams succeeded President Parker in 1901, as the fourth president of the University of Arizona. He entered St. Lawrence University with the Class of 1888. He made Phi Beta Kappa and graduated with a special award in mathematics. He then got his M.A. Degree in history. He served as the principal of a high school and a grammar school in St. Johnsville, New York, and as an instructor in the Preparatory School at West Point Military Academy. He also served as a Lt. Colonel on the Governor's staff in New York. 12

President Adams came to the University in 1897 as Professor of Ancient and Modern Languages. Because of his experience at West Point he was also made the Commandant of Cadets at the University of Arizona. On account of the ill health of his wife he returned to her home in New York in 1899. Following her death he returned to the University and became the Head of the Department of History, Political Economy and Pedagogy. He served as President 1901-03.

The brief term of Adams' presidency had more than passing interest for the development of sociology. There is nothing in the records to indicate that he had any training in sociology. There are various indications, however, that he had an awareness of the growing interest in sociology in colleges and universities throughout the United States. His social interest, as a historian, is stated in the following description in the catalogue for 1900-1901:
In the work in history, emphasis is placed on the social and political development, the relation of cause and effect and the unity of history.

The most obvious indication of President Adams' interest in sociology was the appointment in 1902 of Benjamin Franklin Stacey as Instructor in Science and Philosophy. Stacey received his A.B. and B.D. degrees at Lombard University in 1896 and 1898, respectively. He was registered as a graduate student at The University of Arizona and received the M.A. Degree in 1903. The University of Arizona Monthly, a student publication, states: "B. F. Stacey comes to us from Lombard University with three years of graduate work at the University of Chicago." 

Lombard University was a small college maintained by the Universalist Church. Tolman's report on courses offered in sociology in 1901 indicates seventeen courses offered at Lombard, including such advanced courses as "Pre-Comtean Sociology," "Types of Sociological Theory," "Sociology of Religion," "The Associative Process," etc.

There is nothing in the record to indicate what specific courses in sociology, if any, Professor Stacey had at Lombard and The University of Chicago. There is only a news item in the students' paper that he ever attended the University of Chicago. Since his residence was in Chicago, he may have continued his studies at the University of Chicago in the interim period 1898-1901 before coming to The University of Arizona.
The assumption is warranted, however, from such references as are available, that Professor Stacey had a broad liberal education in philosophy, religion, theology, education, and science. In the 1902-03 Catalogue his official title was given as an Instructor in Science and Philosophy. In the 1903-04 Catalogue he was scheduled to teach four courses in philosophy, namely psychology, pedagogy, logic, and ethics, in addition to courses in sociology.

A significant development in sociology appeared in the Catalogue for 1902-03. Four courses in sociology were listed in the Department of History, Political Science and Philosophy, of which President Adams was the Head. This expansion in sociology in 1902 put sociology ahead of other related social sciences. There were no courses offered in archaeology, anthropology, political science, and only one in psychology—which was really a course in pedagogy. In terms of semester courses, history had twelve courses, economics four, philosophy and psychology five, and sociology had four semester courses.

The courses and texts in sociology were as follows:

Sociology 1 — Elements of Sociology. Text, Fairbanks, *Introduction to Sociology.*

Sociology 2 — Charities and Crime. Text, Warner's *American Charities* "as the guide."

Sociology 3 — Public Opinion. "For Advanced Students." No text was given. The Description follows: "Study of growth and
guidance of public opinion. The psychology of fashions and fads, epidemics, crowds or mobs, and the functions of public opinion in the guidance of national life."

Sociology 4 — The Family

"Study of domestic institutions in lower and higher civilizations. Study of social ethics, legal, industrial, educational, and religious problems of the family." Text, Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage.*

These courses were open to juniors and seniors and were given in alternate years. University enrollments for 1902-03 were small. In the upper-division and graduate registrations, there were only four graduate, eight senior, and eight junior students. Thus, with only twenty students eligible to take courses in sociology, the classes were small.

The development of sociology is rather difficult to trace in the early catalogues because departments were not clearly differentiated, who taught particular courses was not given, and the courses sometimes appeared under different labels. The Department of History, Political Economy and Pedagogy, or, as it appeared later, The Department of History, Political Science and Philosophy, included all that was given in the social sciences. Political science was more specifically a course in economics; sociology was sometimes labeled
as a course in economics, and the course in psychology was
designed for teachers and was, perhaps, more specifically a course
in educational psychology. A course in philosophy under the title
of evolution was using as references, among others, Spencer's
Principles of Sociology and Bagehot's Physics and Politics. This
course, which appeared in the 1905-06 catalogue, was dropped in the
1907-08 catalogue.

There is no ambiguity, however, about sociology in the
1902-03 catalogue. It was made a separate division in the Department
of History, Political Economy and Pedagogy, with President Adams as
the Head of the Department. A blank space under "Sociology" indicates
an instructor was to be secured. In the 1903-04 catalogue this
blank space was filled by Professor Stacey. Unofficially, this
Division was called the Department of Sociology by students.

In many ways this development was remarkable in its time
and place. Here, in a hostile environment that harbored its cacti
and rattlesnakes, the University had the nucleus of a department in
sociology that was not duplicated in such great centers of learning
as Johns Hopkins, Princeton, Harvard, and Cornell. The course on
Public Opinion was essentially a course in collective behavior repre-
senting primarily the influence of LeBon and Tarde. Only a few
universities offered such a course. William Lowe Bryen at Indiana
University was giving a course in social psychology using Tarde's
Social Laws and Baldwin's Mental Development. Northwestern had a course
along similar lines and Columbia had a course on The Group Mind. Chicago,
however, had a course in Public Opinion given by Professor Vincent.
This identifies the source of Stacey's preparation for such a course at the University of Arizona. By comparing the course descriptions of Stacey's courses in Charities and Corrections, Public Opinion and The Family with similar courses at the University of Chicago, it becomes evident that Stacey not only was a graduate student at Chicago during the period 1898-1901, but that he took work with Vincent and Henderson. It is a reasonable assumption that he had some of Dewey's courses in philosophy, ethics, and pedagogy; and he may have gotten a slant on social psychology from Thomas and Mead. He could not have spent several years in that environment without knowing something of Small's pregnant ideas of sociology as a social science and its place in the curriculum of colleges and universities.

In a letter dated January 28, 1902, to the President of Carnegie Institute regarding an application of Stacey for appointment as a "Research Assistant in Ethnology," President Adams said:

He is a most worthy young man with all of the characteristics of a scholar, and with a broad general education that will keep him from narrowness. He has already done work along this line at the University of Chicago and I have on file personal letters speaking in the highest terms, written directly by his professor.

It may now be stated, in summary, and with a reasonable degree of certainty, that Professor Stacey came to The University of Arizona in 1902 with several years of graduate study at the University of Chicago. While no record of his studies is available, it is obvious he had taken work in the Department of Sociology which offered the most advanced graduate program in sociology in the United States.
He was apparently persuasive and, with the approval of President Adams, succeeded in establishing an ambitious program in sociology, considering the time and circumstances. As a new subject in the curriculum he apparently maintained his classes in competition with the older, traditional, and required courses. He had good rapport with students—too good, in fact, as the following details of his record indicate.

Professor Stacey's "connection with the University was severed April, 1904." In his Annual Report President Babcock refers to a serious disturbance involving some older students and younger preparatory students. Disciplinary action was taken against some of the students and "one instructor was dismissed for cause."

The circumstances leading up to this action deserve more than a passing mention. There was some dissatisfaction among students concerning the Board's action leading to the resignation of President Adams and the choice of President Babcock as his successor. President Babcock may have been informed of this and made an agreement with the Board, dated August 5, 1903, giving him full and free direction and control of the educational policy and administration, including all appointments and dismissals. All communications between the faculty and regents were to pass through his hands.

Students had been accustomed to taking unwarranted liberties in the past and more rigid discipline was, no doubt, called for.
President Babcock was, personally, more formal in his relations with the students and the staff and held higher standards and expectations than students were accustomed to. He may have expected too much of the sons of the rugged pioneers whose standards of decorum had been conditioned by life on the old frontier.

Whatever the reasons for the opposition of the students to President Babcock, a critical situation arose on the campus in April, 1904. Students took to the streets, paraded downtown and, in the early morning hours, hung President Babcock in effigy on the campus. The faculty's standing committee on discipline was asked to investigate and, upon its report and its recommendations, disciplinary action was taken.

Professor Stacey was involved in this uprising and, according to the Chairman of the Committee on Discipline, he was a ring leader. Upon the recommendation of the committee, Stacey was immediately dismissed.*

In a news item in the Arizona Monthly, the following comment, representing students' opinion, appeared:

The new Department of Sociology, under Professor Stacey, has proven to be very successful. Professor Stacey has studied his subject for many years and has been a steady contributor to several prominent magazines of the day. We are indeed fortunate in having with us a man of his stamp.

---

*I am indebted to G.E.P. Smith, Chairman of the Committee on Discipline, for this information. In an interview, January 8, 1967, he gave useful details of the situation at that time. Although he is now ninety-three years of age, his memory is good and his identification of Stacey as a leader was positive.
Two months later Professor Stacey left the campus and the so-called Department of Sociology disappeared in the catalogue. What was left of sociology reappeared as two courses in economics, taught by Professor Ruthrauff, A.B., Wittenberg College.

In a letter to an applicant for a position, dated May 17, 1905, President Babcock replied:

We shall make no change in our Department of History this year, and we do not attempt very much in the line of sociology. Sociology is a little under a cloud here just now, for the reason that the man I dismissed from the faculty last spring was primarily a sociologist, or perhaps more accurately speaking, a sociological pathologist of too practical a mind. Details will have to be omitted. So we indulge in the luxury of sociology every other year.

A clash of personalities was apparent in the conflict between Professor Stacey and President Babcock. If this were a sufficient explanation of what happened, President Babcock could have dismissed Professor Stacey and replaced him with another sociologist. For reasons which can only be inferred, Professor Stacey was replaced with an instructor in history and economics who had little, if any, training in sociology.

One obvious factor in the situation was the limited college enrollments, especially on the upper-division and graduate levels. College enrollments of 76, 68, 49, 63, 73, 70, 92, 119, respectively, for the years 1903-1910 indicate the sharp decline in enrollments following the campus uprising in 1904 and the slow increase in the
years following. With a faculty of 22 and 49 college students, and only one student getting a degree in 1905, it looked as if President Babcock and the future of the University were "under a cloud" as well as sociology. Although President Babcock had the full support of the Board in his administration, he was confronted with some difficult decisions.

Some retrenchment was logical: why sociology and not history or ancient languages? Perhaps inadvertently President Babcock revealed an underlying reason when he said, "We indulge the luxury of sociology every other year."

Ever since sociology made its debut as an academic discipline, its place in the curriculum was a matter of controversy. As early as 1859 Spencer criticized historians by asserting: "That which constitutes history, properly so-called, is in great part omitted from works on this subject. ... The thing it really concerns us to know is the natural history of society."

The pretensions of sociologists as advocates of a new social science were denied with equal vigor by other social scientists who resisted the claims of sociology to its rightful place in the curriculum. Forty-five years after Spencer made his criticism of historians the issue came to a head in the New Orleans' Meeting of social scientists, December 29-31, 1903. This was a joint meeting between economists, historians and sociologists, which convinced sociologists of the need of forming their own association. This took place in 1905. The issues
of this controversy have been amply documented elsewhere in sociological writings. An article in the American Historical Review brings the conflict between the historians and sociologists into sharp focus.23

Sociologists claimed history is unscientific, if not meaningless. Historians answered that facts are facts, even if no sound generalizations are drawn from them. Professor Burr, from Cornell, read a paper in which he asserted that one of the chief values of history lies in the pleasure it gives to the historian. Ward charged "that sociology is a science and history is not. Sociology is based on a train of causation; history on a train of facts." History he declared to be an agreeable occupation and a pleasant pasttime.

Giddings read a paper followed by Small. Small charged that historians have not, as yet, found a social viewpoint, regardless of their claims. They spend all their time indexing dreary, profitless details about inconsequential folk; in developing their technical skills for the discovery of insignificant objects; in learning so much how to investigate that they have forgotten what is worth investigation. Professors West of Minnesota, Burr of Cornell, and Emerton of Harvard were in accord with other historians. Professor West replied:

"Sociologists say bring me your facts and we will tell you what they mean. But there will be no such quaint division of labor. So far as history can be explained, the historian means to explain it himself, and he feels as competent as anyone who does not study it."
If this last remark was aimed at Small, it was wide of its mark. Small had spent two years as a student in Germany, where he was influenced by social historians with a new approach, and he had taught history and economics for seven years at Colby College. In this atmosphere of charges and counter charges, relations were strained and sociologists decided to form their own association in 1905.

President Babcock attended this meeting at New Orleans and, as a historian with a Ph.D. degree from Harvard, he must have observed this academic controversy between the social sciences at Harvard. In the period 1891-1902 the "debate at Harvard centered largely on the question whether sociology had a right to be considered a social science at all, and whether its academic claims rested on its alliance with theoretical economics or on its own methodology and its own conclusions." Harvard had no outstanding leadership to develop a sociological approach and sociology remained under economics.

The period of the eighties and nineties was one of change and social unrest. A consideration of social problems was inevitable even at Harvard. This emerged in the Harvard Divinity School in the Department of Social Ethics under Francis Peabody. That students were interested in a new look at society is indicated by the popularity of Peabody's courses and the fact that "his outlook fit and shaped the tone of campus life during the Progressive era." Thus while Harvard debated the right of sociology to be considered a social science,
Columbia, and particularly Chicago, established strong departments and "sociology at Harvard atrophied." Not until 1931 did sociology become a separate department at Harvard.

There is no attempt, at this point, to assess the relative merits of claims in this controversy. It was a continuing, and often heated, debate for years after the New Orleans meeting.26

There is no way of knowing to what extent partisanship may have been a factor in the decision to eliminate courses in sociology at The University of Arizona. President Babcock wore the mantle of his office and authority with dignity and decorum. The fact remains, however, that his decision was a set-back for sociology, from which it did not soon recover. A comparison of the combined credit units offered in history and economics shows an increase from 24 to 49 for the period from 1904-1910. During this same period there was a decrease for sociology from 8 to 2 units.

President Babcock's list of publications indicates nothing of theoretical significance which would soften the criticisms of Ward and Small.27

Following the dismissal of Professor Stacey, the appointment of W. M. Ruthrauff, with an A.B. degree from Wittenberg College, as an Instructor in History and Economics left sociology in the hands of a college graduate with little, if any, sociology. According to Tolman's report, Wittenberg offered only one course in sociology. In his report
to the Board of Regents for 1906, President Babcock reported the resignation of Ruthrauff as an Instructor of History and Economics and added the following comment: "Part of his work I have undertaken; the courses in sociology have been temporarily discontinued."28

F. O. Smith, B.S. 1905 and M.A. 1907 at Northwestern, was the successor of Ruthrauff as an Instructor in History and Economics. He took over the two courses in sociology which had been taught by Ruthrauff.

Henry A. E. Chandler, B.S. 1905, at Northwestern, was appointed in 1908 as an Assistant Professor of History and Economics and as Principal of the Preparatory School. He replaced F. O. Smith. By 1910 he was relieved of the principalship of the Preparatory School and became Head of the Department of Economics. His title and rank was changed to Professor of Economics and History.

Thus in three successive appointments instructors in history and economics were selected who had no apparent training in sociology. With no leadership, sociology at the University of Arizona, as at Harvard, "atrophied."

From such facts as are available, it seems reasonable to assume that President Babcock had no interest in promoting sociology and that his ideas of the relations of the social sciences had their roots in the underlying issue that was being fought out on the academic frontiers of such great institutions as the University of Chicago and Harvard University. It is very probable that Professor Stacey's
opposition to President Babcock had its roots in the same controversy. Having been a student at Chicago for several years, he may have been overly eager in his promotion of his sociological interest. In an act of indiscretion he gave the more conservative President an opportunity to assert his authority and initiate changes in the trend of future developments.

The next president, Arthur H. Wilde (1911-14), got his Ph.D. at Harvard in 1901. He was also a historian, with Medieval History as his Major. He taught history at Northwestern but soon became involved in administrative work and, in 1904, took the principalship of Northwestern University Academy. His success in wiping out debts and increasing enrollments in that institution, and his previous experiences as the registrar and assistant to the president of Northwestern was the kind of experience needed at The University of Arizona at the time.²⁹

President Wilde's outlook was conservative and no radical changes in curricula were made. Trends in the social sciences previously determined continued with increasing emphasis on history, economics, and business.

There were outside factors related to this. In 1912 Arizona ceased to be a territory and the Roosevelt Dam was opened. Population was increasing and the prospects for the state were never brighter. As the land-grant university of the state, its obligation to provide relevant education and services to the state was apparent.
Professor Chandler rose to this challenge by initiating a four-year curriculum leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Commerce. Seven specialized fields were given for majors—accounting, merchandising, finance, general business, secretarial training, commercial teaching, business administration and law. This was the nucleus of what was to become the School of Business and Public Administration some thirty years later.

Sociology under Chandler's supervision (1908-1915) was, however, expendable for two apparent reasons. First, his time and interests were devoted mainly to establishing a strong Department of Economics and a four-year program for the B.S. in Commerce degree which was approved in 1912. Even with the help of Dr. Hubbard, Chandler was listed in the catalogue as teaching fifteen courses in history, economics, business and sociology. Nevertheless, he was expanding the department and undertaking to teach new courses, such as American Politics and Municipal Problems which, more properly, belonged elsewhere. Second, Chandler had no apparent training in sociology, and by frequent changes there was no continuity or consistency in the courses offered.

After Professor Stacey's dismissal, sociology was "temporarily discontinued." Two courses, "given in alternate years," remained in the catalogue as Sociology 1 (Introduction to Sociology) and Sociology 2 (Charities and Crime). In 1908-09 Chandler dropped Charities and Crime and substituted Socialism and Social Reform as Sociology 2. A new course, Sociology 3, Social Problems Today, was added. This was given once in 1910-11 and then discontinued.
When Chandler became Head of the Department of Economics in 1910 the two courses, Sociology 1 and Sociology 2, were listed as Economics 7 (Introduction to Sociology) and Economics 8 (Socialism and Social Reform). This was essentially a historical course. This was changed to "American Politics" in 1912-13.

By giving courses in alternate years, or by omitting them when they should have been given, sociology remained in the catalogue but was rarely given during the period 1905-1915. Presumably, Professor Ruthrauff offered Soc. 1 and Soc. 2 in 1906-1907. They were "omitted" in 1907-08, 1908-09; then changed to Econ. 7 and 8, they were "omitted" again in 1909-10, 1910-11, 1912-13. By 1913-14 Professor Chandler had dropped Economics 7 (Introduction to Society) and had substituted a course in Sociology and Social Reform. The catalogue description follows:

An introduction to the study of society—and social problems including: principles of social evolution; the social function of the home and family; the problem of the dependent, defective, and delinquent; modern methods of social service and scientific reform. Open to all college students.

By changes, deletions, omissions, and lowering standards, sociology by 1915 was left with one course, which justified the criticism frequently made that sociology was a hodge-podge.
Chapter 3

1915-1930

The selection of Rufus Von Kleinsmid as its eighth president, 1914-22, marked the beginning of an important period in the growth and expansion of the University. The Preparatory School, which had been the source of discontent for some years because of the dual teaching and administrative roles it imposed upon some of the faculty, was discontinued in 1914. A reorganization plan suggested by President Wilde was put into effect in 1915. Three colleges with their respective deans were set up: namely, the Colleges of Agriculture, Mines and Engineering, and Letters, Arts and Sciences. Departments within these colleges were being more clearly differentiated and their educational programs were being matured and expanded. Thus, by 1915 the pioneering stages of the University had come to an end and the dream of its founders in 1885 was taking on the new dimensions of a real university.

President Von Kleinsmid was an able administrator and a good public relations man. He never missed an opportunity to tell students and people throughout the state of the greater Arizona that lay ahead. He soon won general support for his administration and his policies. Student enrollments doubled during the first year of his administration and rose from 308 to 1369 during the period 1915-1922. As President and Professor of Psychology and Education, Von Kleinsmid proceeded with a reorganization, creating a Department of
Education offering 16 courses, and a Department of Philosophy and Psychology offering 18 courses. The thoroughness with which these changes and additions were made is indicated by the fact that they remained several decades without much alteration.

Other social sciences such as history, economics and business administration had previously established good programs. Archaeology, which had previously offered two courses in the Department of History, became The Department of Archaeology in 1916, with an offering of 4 courses. By 1915 only anthropology, political science and sociology remained behind in the development of the social sciences. Anthropology had, as yet, no courses listed in the catalogue; and political science, having been confused with political economy, had no identity as such. Sociology barely survived, after making a significant beginning in 1902. It remained, with one course in the Department of Social Science, which included economics, sociology and business administration.

Professor Chandler took a sabbatical leave in 1915 and did not return. He came to the University in 1908 as an Assistant Professor in History and Economics and became Professor of Social Science in 1914. He added Dr. Hubbard to his staff in 1912 as Instructor of History and Economics. Professor Chandler's main effort was given to the expansion of economics and business administration, although he was still scheduled to teach two courses in history in 1914.

Dr. E. J. Brown succeeded Professor Chandler and was appointed as Head of the Department of Social Science in 1916. His staff consisted
of himself and Dr. Hubbard, whose major interest was history. Dr. Hubbard soon gave his full time to history and new staff members were added in economics and business administration as student enrollments increased. Thus, for the first time, the ties between sociology and history ended and the future of sociology depended on its relations with economics and business administration, in the Department of Social Science.

Dr. Brown was, by training at the University of Illinois, specialized in economics and business administration. He was, however, interested in sociology, and took the legacy in sociology left by Professor Chandler and soon began to expand it. He expanded the Introduction to a year course, raised it to the junior level and made it a required course for the B.S. in Commerce Degree. New courses in sociology were added as enrollments increased.

By 1921-22 the Department had a staff of six members and one vacancy. There were, then, four courses in sociology, consisting of The Introduction to Sociology, The Care of Dependent s and Delinquents, Social Reform and Rural Sociology. I was secured to fill the vacancy and to relieve Dr. Brown who had taught these courses.

I arrived in Tucson with my wife and infant daughter late in August of 1922 and settled down for the beginning of the Fall Semester. I received a cordial welcome from Dr. Brown and Dean Lockwood at the first faculty meeting of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences.
My teaching schedule consisted of the four courses in sociology a section or two in economics and the course in labor problems. I was to be relieved of the courses in economics as soon as the enrollments in sociology required my full time. At that time, the prospects were full of promise, barring unforeseen changes. One of these changes, which had unexpected implications for sociology, was the resignation of President Von Kleinsmid and the selection of Dr. Marvin as his successor.

Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin became President 1922-1927. The statement at his first meeting with the faculty that he intended to make no dismissals the first month was an indication of things to come. Later he requested approval of the Board of Regents to reduce departments from forty-nine to twenty-eight and "questioned the reappointment of some dozen members of the faculty." The reorganization was proposed in the interests of economy and efficiency and "without any sacrifice to standards." It did, however, create a state of fear and tension on the campus which was investigated by the American Association of University Professors and, in time, led to an investigation by the Board of Regents of the charges against President Marvin made by members of the faculty and the Tucson Ministerial Association. The details of this controversy, which had repercussions throughout the state, are documented elsewhere.

It was customary in the early twenties to conduct the summer session in Flagstaff. Dr. Brown and I spent the summer of 1923 in Flagstaff teaching a few courses in economics and sociology. Upon our
return, we found two courses in sociology had been deleted from the new catalogue issued during the summer. No explanation was made to Dr. Brown or to me concerning the reasons for this action. President Marvin had similarly eliminated two departments without explanation and, since the Board of Regents had approved his plans for reorganization, President Marvin exercised his authority in some cases without consultation with Deans and Department Heads.

I was informed later that President Marvin "had nothing against me" but his action forced me to shift my major teaching interests into economics and the prospect of a full-time job in sociology was postponed indefinitely. Inasmuch as I was the only trained sociologist in the state, my contacts and associations became centered primarily in the staff of Economics and Business Administration. Our relations were harmonious and, in some ways, profitable to me. This, however, prevented any specialization in sociology. Thus Sociology, after having made such a significant beginning in 1902-04, was—after twenty years—set back to a token offering of two courses. In the meantime other social sciences had become firmly established in the curriculum of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences.

It is not within the province of this review to explore the probable reasons for President Marvin's deletion of half of the courses in sociology. There are, however, some correlations which suggest possible connections with the specific courses deleted.
The care of dependents and delinquents was not considered a pressing issue in this isolated frontier with its sparse population. It was different in the industrial areas of the North and East where the rise of cities, of slums, and the influx of immigrants had become acute problems. Here, at least, the problems of the poor and the delinquent had not become acute by 1920 and such a course was expendable in "the interests of economy." The second course in Social Reform was, unfortunately, misnamed. It was a course in social problems, using Wolfe's Readings in Social Problems as a text. The major problems of population, "the woman problem," the race problem, marriage and divorce, were considered from the different points of view of different authors.

The title "Social Reform," however, had become very unpopular during the period of the First World War. The fear and hysteria that became widespread concerning our large alien population, the growing unrest among laborers represented by such groups as Anarchists, Wobblies, Syndicalists, Socialists and Communists—these, especially after the Russian Revolution in 1917—became subjects of public concern.

Arizona did not escape this fear because its copper mines employed some Mexican Aliens and Wobblies. The "Bisbee Deportations" of 1917 indicates the action of vigilantes to rid the community of subversive elements. In a social survey conducted by the Bureau of Mines, the following statement of the purposes of the Loyalty League reflects the state of mind existing among citizens of Bisbee at that time.
The Loyalty League is an organization to loyally stand for our country in the pending world crisis; to promote patriotic and militant spirit among our people; to exterminate the I.W.W., to curb the treacherous alien; to fight disloyalty, anarchy and treason; to preserve order; to protect life, liberty, and property; and to see to it that every law-abiding inhabitant of the community is unmolested by threat, epithet, taunt or espionage in the enjoyment of his right to pursue his own lawful course, to uphold conservation of food and to try to abate the high cost of living.\(^6\)

These fears did not subside with the end of the war. A postwar depression, labor strikes, threats of general strikes in key industries, mounting unrest, etc., led to many other attempts to control subversive elements. Laymen often confused social reformers who were committed to some panacea or dogma with sociologists who were committed to a scientific study of society.

Whatever reasons President Marvin may have had, the time was not opportune to request additional courses in sociology. Tensions on the campus increased until President Marvin resigned. Dr. Byron Cummings became the Acting President, February 1, 1927, and continued in that office until June, 1928. An effort was made during this period to reestablish something of the former course on The Care of Dependents and Delinquents under a different title. Thus, a two-unit course in Social Adjustment was added, making a total of nine units, with Principles being given as a 2-2 year course.

Homer Leroy Shantz became the next president, 1928-1936. An uneasy peace had been restored on the campus under Dr. Cummings, and Dr. Shantz took up the duties of his office with the general approval.
of the faculty and the Board of Regents. He was a botanist of distinction from the University of Illinois and was interested in the conservation of wildlife and natural resources, as well as the science of agriculture, which was becoming increasingly important in the state. Unexpected problems arose shortly. It was a boom and bust period economically, ending in the stock market crash of 1929 and the Great Depression which followed.

I was given a sabbatical leave to go to Stanford University from June, 1928, to August, 1929. My courses were turned over to a young graduate student by the name of Robert Petingill. Before leaving, some modifications had been made by changing the Introduction from a 4-unit upper-division to a 3-unit lower-division course. A new 2-2 unit course, Social Evolution and Social Progress, was added. The 1929-30 Catalogue thus listed 14 units of sociology under the label of economics. Eight of these units were given in alternate years.

Thus, by 1930, sociology at The University of Arizona remained in a relatively weak and subordinate position. The related social sciences had experienced a period of uninterrupted growth and were firmly established in the curriculum. Sociology, having suffered several serious reversals, lagged behind.

Elsewhere in colleges and universities, sociology had made significant advances as an academic discipline. The earlier controversy whether sociology should have a place in the curriculum had subsided and no college curriculum was considered complete without
some sociology. It often appeared under different names and in different departments, but its impact was indicated indirectly by the multiplication of courses in social ethics, social biology, social psychology, social aspects of education, social work, etc. The subordinate position of sociology in relation to history or economics was a matter of time. Harvard, with its reluctance to accept sociology as a social science, reversed its policy in 1931 and established an independent Department of Sociology, forty years after William Rainy Harper had established such a department at the University of Chicago. The wisdom of President Harper soon became apparent in the leadership and contributions for which the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago has been known.

The wide differences in the development of sociology in such comparable, privately supported and endowed universities as Chicago, Harvard, and Stanford, indicate, among other things, the important role of administrators in determining policies and projecting new developments versus the established curricula. Publicly supported universities and land-grant colleges are, however, subject to other considerations which may limit the administration and, indirectly, determine its course of action. This was the situation confronting President Shantz in his administration, 1928-1936.
The period 1931-33 and thereafter was one of great stress for the University and its faculty. As the depression deepened the University was obliged to adjust its work to the realities of the situation.

President Shantz had set up a ten-year building program which came to a halt, 1930-1934, for lack of funds. Legislative cuts in appropriations for the University by 1933 led to administrative policies of eliminating all non-essentials in academic courses and reducing costs of essentials to "the lowest margin consistent with safety." Colleges and departments were requested to review and to consolidate or eliminate wherever possible. \(^1\) The faculty was requested to take a voluntary cut in salaries and the State was finally obliged to make payments of salaries in warrants. These were not generally accepted by merchants, by tax collectors, by mortgage holders and by some banks. In some cases they were accepted at a high discount.

Although there was some increase in student enrollments, the faculty decreased from 182 in 1930 to 166 in 1933. \(^2\)

Under these circumstances, the growth of the University almost came to a standstill. Within its limitations there were, however, some important changes, largely unanticipated and unannounced.

President Shantz had an interest in developing a comprehensive graduate program in the Department of Botany which was approved and
listed in the catalogue before the depression had become critical. The program didn't materialize as he had hoped for a lack of staff and students. A significant change in students' interests had been taking place in the twenties and thirties. The tide of student enrollments was flowing toward the social sciences.

In 1931 the majors taking the A.B. degree in the social sciences were more than four times the number of majors in the physical sciences and seven times the number in 1932. The students taking the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, as one department in the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, exceeded the number taking The Bachelor of Science Degree. This created problems of teaching loads with limited budgets, and the need of expanding curricula for the social sciences, including sociology.

The inevitable questions involved in getting new courses approved were how many additional units would be added to an instructor's teaching load, and what were the expected enrollments. Additions to curricula were necessarily restricted and adjustments between departments based on student enrollments were difficult. Under these conditions, the prospects for sociology were limited. Nevertheless, a number of important changes were made during the period, 1931-35.

During the Marvin years I had been giving three-fourths of my time to teaching economics. By dropping some courses and adding others, by adding sections to the introductory course and giving it each
semester, it was possible to initiate changes without increasing my staff. Thus, by 1931 my time was given to teaching sociology. I had six courses offering 22 units of sociology, of which 12 units were offered in alternate years.

A major in sociology was then approved in 1931 by accepting some courses in related departments. The major consisted of 30 units requiring Economics 1a-b (Principles), Sociology 81 (Introduction), Sociology 181 a-b (Principles) and Sociology 287 a-b (Seminar). Twelve additional upper-division units were required, of which six units could be taken in Psychology (Social Psychology), Economics (Labor Problems), Archaeology (Ethnology), and Philosophy (Ethics).

Another significant step was taken in 1930 by changing the name of the Department of Economics and Business Administration to the Department of Economics, Sociology and Business Administration. Previously, courses in sociology were listed as economics. This was a disadvantage to sociology in meeting group requirements for the A.B. Degree which required 8 units of social science in one subject. Listed in this group requirement were archaeology, economics, education, history, law, philosophy, political science, and psychology. Not until the 1932-33 Catalogue was sociology listed in this group requirement and education and law were eliminated. Furthermore, this recognized sociology as a coordinate division in the department and indicated a plan of organization that was followed for three decades.
The New Deal had unexpected implications for sociology. From its beginning as an academic discipline, the sociology of dependent and delinquent classes and the problems of a changing social order were among the most frequent courses offered. Consideration of these problems was imperative. When it became apparent that the states and local communities were unable to cope with the problems and dislocations of the depression, the Federal Government assumed responsibility and passed the Social Security Act in 1935.

Local communities in Arizona were not equipped with the necessary organization and personnel to administer the comprehensive program thrust upon them by the Social Security Act. An extensive training program was an urgent requirement. It was at this point that sociology assumed responsibility for a training program for students interested in social work.

An important step in this direction was taken in 1934 when the Department of Economics, Sociology and Business Administration became the School of Business and Public Administration. Ten major fields of study were given, including a major in social work. Two degrees were offered, the B.S. in B.A. and the B.S. in P.A.

Sociology now had majors for degrees in sociology and social work. It remained as a coordinate division in the School of Business and Public Administration within the College of Liberal Arts until 1943, when the College of Business and Public Administration was organized.
The new major in social work was destined to take an increasing amount of my time and attention. The urgency for a training program was general, but it was particularly acute for the State of Arizona. There were few trained social workers in the state and, to my knowledge, none with a professional degree. The changing approach from philanthropy and relief to social work, requiring professional training in graduate schools of social work, caught the State of Arizona with an extreme shortage of qualified workers.

The assumption of Federal responsibility involved large sums of money. Standards of administration were necessary and were required under the Social Security Act. Qualified workers were to be chosen on a merit basis. Merit systems had to be set up and administered.

Professor Russel M. Howard had experience in this area and was appointed Chairman of the State Merit Council. A good merit system was established under his administration, but the immediate problem was to secure qualified persons for the key positions in the State and County Boards of Social Security and Welfare. This was unfortunately complicated by an act of the Legislature requiring a year's residence in the State for employment in the system of public welfare.

The transition to this new system with its personnel standards could not be carried out at once. In-service training programs and training institutes were set up for the experienced but non-professional
workers who were retained in the new system. College graduates with some training were in demand for routine jobs. Job opportunities which had been very limited for college students previously were now begging for trained workers. This was putting sociology under increasing pressure. The Pima County Public Welfare Department voluntarily offered to give a course in field work if we would provide the students. A two-semester course was arranged to meet this need. The first semester consisted of a review of the Social Security Act and the principles and procedures of Social Work in public and private agencies. The second semester provided observation and experience under supervision in a social agency to which the student was assigned.

Mrs. Julia Fuller, who was a case supervisor in the Pima County Public Welfare Department, voluntarily undertook this task, on the assumption that it would be mutually beneficial since the Department would profit by the services of the students under its supervision.

Mrs. Fuller was an experienced case worker with a year of graduate professional training. Her course was designed for seniors taking a major in social work. On account of the small number of agencies to which students could be assigned and supervised by qualified persons, the class had to be restricted to the small number of ten or twelve. The students' response was good and the arrangement proved to be a valuable, practical experiment. After several years Mrs. Fuller decided to discontinue this voluntary arrangement and drop the course unless the University saw fit to employ her on a part-time basis. Thus, she became an Instructor on a part-time basis in 1942, with the modest salary of $400 which the President allowed for one-fourth time.
Another turn of events came in 1935 with the appointment of Dr. E. D. Tetreau to the staff of the College of Agriculture Experiment Station and the Department of Agricultural Economics. Rural Sociology, which had survived the Marvin era, had never attracted students from the Agricultural College. At the request of the Department of Agricultural Economics, the course was transferred to that department and a course in Social Problems, deleted by President Marvin in 1923, was restored to sociology. Thus, for a time, we had two sociologists on the campus.

Dr. Tetreau was a rural sociologist and research specialist trained at the University of Wisconsin. In 1914, H. C. Taylor, Head of the Department of Economics at the University of Wisconsin, was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Through his influence a Division of Farm Population and Rural Life was created with C. J. Galpin in charge. Carl Taylor became a part of this Division later.

Through the influence of these men and others, The Purnell Act of 1925 was passed providing the Agricultural Experiment Stations with funds for "such economic and sociological investigations as have for their purpose the development and improvement of the rural home and rural life."

Research in rural sociology grew rapidly with the aid of these funds in most of the land-grant agricultural colleges. A survey in 1930 revealed, however, that 20 of the state colleges had failed to use Purnell funds for social studies and "were using them for agricultural economics."
It was in this connection that I received a letter in 1928 inquiring what use of Purnell funds was being made at The University of Arizona. In an interview with the Dean of the Agricultural College, I reminded him that the Purnell funds were intended for rural life studies, including rural sociology. "What is this rural sociology?" he asked. "When I study a plant and examine its roots under a microscope, I have something tangible I can examine. But what is rural sociology? I'll be damned if I know."

A project to study mottled teeth, which was approved in 1930 and completed in 1931, indicates some of the variable uses to which Purnell funds might be put by administrators who were trained in the physical sciences and "did not take kindly to the inexact and often questionable procedures of sociological research."

There is no intent implied here to minimize the importance of the research in the natural sciences conducted by the Experiment Stations. The obvious intent of the Purnell Act was, however, to add another dimension to rural research. However important the preoccupation with microscopes and narrow specialization may be, the intent was to get some research out of the laboratory into the community where farm families were confronted with problems that could not be studied in a laboratory.

The need of this became abundantly clear at the peak of the depression when severe drought in 1934 and in 1936 put some two
and one-half million farm families on public relief. The F.E.R.A.,
the P.W.A., the C.W.A., and the F.S.A. required studies and research
on a vast scale as a means of determining policies and administering
programs of action. Rural sociologists gave help in making surveys
and, as a result, were appointed as state supervisors of rural research
in 23 states. Thus, the New Deal thrust research into new areas as
a means of "attaining new goals in economic welfare."5

Arizona did not escape the effects of the drought which
seriously affected twenty-seven states during the four-year period
from 1933 to 1936. According to Federal reports the largest relief
expenditures per capita were found in the semi-arid and marginal farm
areas, including Arizona.6 It was in this connection that Dr. Tetreau
was given an appointment with the U.S.D.A., Division of Farm Population
and Rural Life as an analyst and research director for the F.E.R.A.,
1933 to 1935. He then came to The University of Arizona. His
accidental death in 1945 terminated his work and left a vacancy in
the Department of Agricultural Economics which was hard to fill with a
rural sociologist of his recognition. When I asked the Head of the
Department about Dr. Tetreau's replacement, I was informed that a
marketing specialist was needed and that no funds were available for
his replacement. Thus, after ten years, rural sociology failed to
take root in the College of Agriculture and I took the course back into
the Department of Sociology where it remained as a liberal arts course
for sociology majors.
The competition for funds in limited budgets grew with the growth of the University. We had barely risen out of the effects of "the depression" when World War II hit us. Total war required men, food, materials, and services which made new demands upon the University and the State. As a land-grant College of Agriculture in a frontier state, the preoccupation with the technology and science of agriculture was perhaps, inevitable. Again, ever since the Roosevelt Dam provided the Salt River Valley with the means for its growth, the idea of having the College of Agriculture and Experimental Station transferred to Arizona State College was a threat, which was never more serious than in the period of the thirties and forties. The loss of Federal funds would have been disastrous to the University. The obvious answer to this threat was to produce tangible evidence of the desirability to retain the College of Agriculture in the University. The value of its work to the state needs no comment.

While the Purnell Act of 1925 provided funds for research relating to production, it made special provision for investigation in the fields of agricultural economics, home economics and rural sociology. The Administration of the Act was, however, left mainly in the hands of College and Experiment Station officials in the different states. 7

The choice of administrators in the Agricultural College and Experiment Station in 1945 was to continue the specialization in production and marketing. The door was thus closed to rural sociology and its research of the problems of rural population and rural communities in the changing economy of Arizona. 8
The Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture was highly specialized, leaving little, if any, room to include social studies of farm people. The lack of funds was in a sense a plausible explanation for the decision not to replace Dr. Tetreau in 1945. In its historical perspective it is not, however, an explanation for the omission of sociology in the recommended electives for the Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture. Not until 1960 was sociology recognized as a social science in the Group IV required for this degree. Previously, 9 units in two subjects were required from the following: Anthropology, Art, Business Administration, Classics, Education, Foreign Language, History and Political Science, Journalism, Music, Philosophy and Psychology, Speech, and Introduction to Humanities.9

One can hardly infer from this review that the administrators in the College of Agriculture were unaware that sociology was an accepted academic discipline in colleges and universities, and had maintained its professional organization and publications for a half-century.

President Shantz resigned on June 30, 1936. Paul S. Burgess, Dean of the College of Agriculture, took over the presidency until Alfred Atkinson was chosen to become the fourteenth president in 1937. President Atkinson had his M.S. degree at Cornell and his Dr. Sc. from Iowa State College. He had been at Montana State College for thirty-three years and was its president for eighteen years before coming to Arizona. He had won recognition and distinction as an Agronomist. Agriculture had become increasingly important in the state and Dr. Atkinson was well qualified to extend the progress in this area.
Dr. Atkinson was recognized as an able administrator but he inherited some of the problems growing out of the depression, a growing student body, a delayed building program and a reluctant legislature that was besieged annually by three boards to increase budgets to meet the needs of the state colleges and the University. This competitive struggle was reduced to a more systematic control by having one Board of Regents for the three institutions.

The expected expansion of facilities and staff to meet the growing needs of the University was suddenly checked by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and our entrance into World War II.

A change in administration occurred in 1943 when sociology became the Department of Sociology in the College of Business and Public Administration. Since sociology was a one-man proposition with the part-time assistance of Mrs. Fuller, I was confronted with a choice of remaining in the new College of Business and Public Administration or transferring to the College of Liberal Arts. For various reasons the Department of Sociology remained in the College of Business and Public Administration. 10

Increasing pressure was put upon the Department of Sociology during the war years as well as during the depression. Student enrollments, the number of majors, and the number of students getting degrees in the Department were increasing relatively to the numbers in the College of Business and Public Administration and in the University.
Sociology normally enrolled a larger number of women than men and, consequently, had a relatively small decrease in enrollments in comparison with other departments of the University, which suffered severe losses during the war years.\textsuperscript{11} By the end of the war, 1945-1946, the Department of Sociology had an enrollment of 352 students, 70 majors and a total of 16 graduates. By comparison this number of graduates exceeded the number of graduates from the College of Mines and Engineering, equalled the number of graduates from the College of Law, and was only two less than the number of graduates in the School of Home Economics. Comparing departments, only three departments turned out more graduates during the year than Sociology; namely, English, Philosophy and Psychology, and History and Political Science. In terms of staff, courses, and equipment, the Department ranked well nigh to the bottom. This lag was not only relative to other departments in the University but it was relative, also, to departments of sociology in other institutions.\textsuperscript{12}

During the late thirties and the forties, my time was increasingly absorbed as the adviser for students interested in the field of social work. I was also serving on various boards and committees of social agencies in the community. The community and the state were under pressure to develop and improve both public and private welfare and social services and looked to the University for some assistance.
Because of his knowledge of merit systems, pension, and insurance plans for public employees, Professor Howard was instrumental in organizing a merit system, under the City Charter of Tucson, for its public employees.

One of the first tasks was the selection of a Chief of Police. Professor Howard requested Professor Chester Smith of the College of Law to submit questions in criminal law. I was asked to submit questions in Criminology. Together we formulated a written examination which was sent to some 75 applicants from police departments across the country. Five passed the examination and these were asked to come to Tucson for an oral examination. Vollmer of the Berkeley Police Department was called in to conduct the exam. I was a member of the examining committee. In essence this was equivalent to an oral doctor's examination and, from the committee's recommendation of three names, Don Hayes was chosen by the City Council to become the Chief of Police.

The Probation Department of the Juvenile Court was a matter of concern and of agitation for improvement of its staff and its facilities for many years. As a participant observer of the process of getting approval of needed changes through the Superior Court and the Pima County Board of Supervisors, I was getting a first-hand view of policy and decision-making on the county level.

Professor Chester Smith raised an issue over the appointment of the chief probation officer by the judge of the superior court.
without an examination as provided in the law. As a consequence, Judge Hall appointed me to head a committee with C. A. Carson, Principal of the Tucson High School, and Florence Albaugh, Executive Secretary, of the Pima County Board of Public Welfare, to conduct an examination and submit a choice of three candidates from which a Chief Probation Officer would be selected by the court.

With my previous experience in setting up such an examination and with the help of Rachel Maynard, Secretary to Dean Brown, we set up a written examination and sent notices and application forms to key points in the schools of social work and police departments of various cities. The war had depleted the supply of available candidates, but we did secure Ray Johnson, a professionally trained and experienced probation officer from Detroit. This was a first step in what proved to be a long process of change and improvement in that department.

Volunteers were responsible for the administration of important social agencies such as the Red Cross and the Tucson Council of Social Agencies. The growth of the city and of its needs for social services, especially during the war years and after, made it imperative to secure paid and experienced administration for such agencies. Julia Fuller became the Director of the Red Cross, but the Council of Social Agencies had no funds to secure a paid and qualified executive secretary.
The Junior League came forward with an offer to finance the matter for a period of two years. The council then appointed me to head a committee with Julia Fuller and a third member to canvass the field. By that time the qualifications for an executive secretary of a Council of Social Agencies had been pretty clearly defined in the professional standards of the National Council.

As a result of the work by our committee, Ward Stalnaker came to Tucson in 1948, as the first paid and professionally trained executive secretary of the Council of Social Agencies. Our choice proved to be exceptionally good, and the Council, under his leadership, acquired new and increasing significance in the community. He had scarcely been here a week when I reported an inquiry concerning the inclusion of Tucson for census tracts in the 1950 census. He immediately organized a committee to work on the problem which proved to be too involved to be included in the 1950 census. The groundwork was, however, laid and the census tracts were included in the 1960 census.

I have mentioned these choices of three key men to important positions to indicate how the Department of Sociology became involved with social services in the community. Our social work majors were taking positions in various welfare agencies by the late thirties, and this provided additional contacts which established good relations between the department and the social agencies of the community.
Community contacts and services took various forms. I was a university representative to the Council of Social Agencies. For 15 years I was a member of the Home Service Committee of the Red Cross; for ten years, a member of the Advisory Board of the Salvation Army; for six years I was President of the Social Service Exchange; and, for many years, a member of the Pima County Juvenile Association which was concerned primarily with problems of juvenile delinquency and securing adequate facilities and personnel for the probation department. War services made additional demands.

On the academic side, the Department was under increasing pressure to establish a graduate program for professional training in social work.

The process of professionalizing social work was slow in relation to the needs arising out of the depression and the war. Although schools of social work were being organized, they could not meet the great demand for workers with professional degrees. Hence, the job opportunities were good for workers with pre-professional training such as our majors in social work had.

Much confusion and conflict arose out of this situation over standards of education for social work. The American Association of Schools of Social Work was the dominant organization in defining standards for graduate professional study and for the professional degree, Master of Social Work. Gradually, the idea crystallized that there were many services, especially in the public welfare field, that
could be performed efficiently without the professional degree. A rival association, the American Association of Schools of Social Administration, was organized in 1942 for the purpose of determining programs of education not requiring the two-year graduate program for a professional degree. The membership of this association included mainly land-grant colleges and state universities, including The University of Arizona.

We had a good pre-professional curriculum which was approved by the A.A.S.S.W. Our graduates with a major in social work were finding jobs in the state or were going on with graduate work for a professional degree. Very few who left the state for graduate work returned. Job opportunities in other states were better and the State Department of Public Welfare was unable to maintain its personnel, including positions requiring professional degrees. Under these circumstances, private as well as public agencies looked to the University for help.

There was no school of social work within a radius of 500 miles and it was, perhaps, inevitable that demands for a school of social work should arise. I was frequently asked by representatives of social agencies in Tucson, "When are you going to establish a school of social work?"

The Department of Sociology was handicapped by its lack of sufficient staff, courses and funds. For many years, attention of the
administration was called to this without results.\textsuperscript{13} Apparently, outside pressure began to get to the President. In 1943, President Atkinson requested me to submit a report on the need for training in social work. I submitted my report in October 1943.\textsuperscript{14}

In this report, I submitted such data on the needs, schools, and programs as I thought the President might want. Recommendations based on the A.A.S.S.W. standards for a basic one-year graduate program were included.

The American Association of Schools of Social Administration had not, as yet, gotten its plans fully operative, and much work was required to formulate its programs and standards for public welfare services. Dean Brown and I were in agreement that a more practical approach was offered by this association.

The Department found itself in the middle of this controversy over standards between these two rating associations. I had regularly advised students who were interested in a career in social work to go to a professional school when they graduated with an A.B. or a B.S.P.A. degree in social work. The State Department of Social Security and Welfare was, however, anxious to get our graduates with a pre-professional degree because they proved to be more successful with the little experience and training they got in Mrs. Fuller's course than others who did not graduate with a social work major. We were confronted with a practical problem as well as the theoretical problem of maintaining standards of education that would be approved by the rival associations, the American Association of Schools of Social Work and the National Association of Schools of Social Administration.\textsuperscript{15}
During the war years, there were repeated demands upon
the Department for help in securing workers. Some of these demands
were made directly to President Atkinson, as his correspondence with
Dean Brown indicates.16

President Atkinson was a cautious man and made no promises
he could not fulfill within the limited budgets of the war period. I
recall meeting in his office with representatives of the Denver
regional office, the Arizona Social Security and Welfare Board, the
Pima County Board of Public Welfare, Dean Riesen, Dean Brown and
myself. After extended discussion of the needs, President Atkinson
concluded the meeting by saying, "Well, gentlemen, I want to thank
you for coming and presenting these matters and I shall take them under
advisement."

I was in close contact with President Atkinson for some years
on the golf course. We had a regular foursome consisting of Bryan,
McGeorge, Atkinson and myself. We played regularly on Saturday after-
noon. When Dr. Atkinson went out to play golf, he left all his
administrative problems strictly behind in his office. He never talked
shop and never disclosed, even with a hint, or an inquiry, what he
had on his mind about his problems in his office. Nor did he let them
interfere with his game. It was evident, however, in his correspondence
with Dean Brown that Dr. Atkinson was giving consideration to the demands
for an expansion of our training program which were emphasized
regularly in the Annual Reports of the Department since 1943.
At the close of the war, President Atkinson requested each department and college to make a detailed report on post-war needs. Plans had to be made for the boom in enrollments when soldiers returned and normal conditions were established on the campus. These reports were submitted to a committee for study, evaluation, and recommendations.17

Thus, by 1945 sociology had survived the Great Depression and World War II with a number of important gains. It remained, however, as a one-man department with the part-time assistance of Mrs. Fuller and the voluntary assistance of Dr. J.F. Page of Oklahoma, who spent several winters in Tucson and taught two courses as a free-will offering to the Department.
Chapter 5

1946-1957

In the Department's annual report for 1945-1946 attention was again called to the lag in the development of the Department and to its growing needs. Requests were made for fifteen additional courses in sociology and social work, three additional instructors and a capital sum of $2000.00 for library acquisitions. The report of the Committee on the Future Development of the University of Arizona called attention to the retarded development of the Department, its equipment of one small office with inadequate furnishings, its sixty majors and $30.00 for its library fund. It allowed the demands for expansion were reasonable but thought it would probably require a long-time plan.

The Department had been retarded for various reasons for twenty-five years and still found itself caught in a vicious circle at the beginning of the post-war period. Because there were not enough courses for a major within the Department, students were sent to other departments to complete their requirements for a major. Because the Department did not have sufficient staff to add desired courses, other related departments, with more staff and funds, were introducing courses that might preferably have been offered in the Department of Sociology.

A case in point was the proposed addition of three courses in cultural anthropology in 1946. As a result of my recommendations,
these courses were cross-listed and added to the Department of Sociology. To my knowledge, this was the first instance of such a policy of interdepartmental relations in the University. It was particularly advantageous to sociology at that time. Twelve units were added to the curriculum of sociology without requiring joint financing. This automatically increased the course units offered in the Department from 24 to 36 at a time when such expansion was sorely needed for our major in sociology.

Departmental requests for the 1947 budget were discussed by President Atkinson in a meeting of the general faculty in the spring of 1946. Faculty anticipations of increased budgets corresponding with post-war needs and student enrollments were the subject of discussion. The legislature had not made expected increases in its appropriations and, with a detailed analysis of the University's sources of income and probable expenditures, President Atkinson requested the Colleges and Departments to cut their capital outlays, operating expenses and salaries wherever possible. Since the main item of salaries and increases in staff were limited to a given per cent of the budget, departments planning an increase in staff would do so at the risk of having to cut their salaries. Rigid economy down the line was the message to a bitterly disappointed faculty.

The Department of Sociology was already operating on a policy of minimum costs as the comparative increases in student enrollments, the number of majors, and students receiving degrees relative
to its staff and budget indicated, during the period for 1940-1945. Once more it seemed that all the efforts to break through the barriers that held the Department of Sociology back were destined to be fruitless. Contrary to expectations, the Department was given most of its requests—two additional instructors, $2000 for library expenditures and eight additional courses. These, with the cross listing of courses in anthropology, raised the course credits in the Department from 24 to 66 units. The addition of these new courses soon resulted in added enrollments, which doubled by 1948. Majors also increased to 70–47 in sociology and 23 in social work.

For the first time the Department was now able to provide its sociology majors with its own required and elective courses, without requiring economics lab and accepting electives in related departments, which had been used since 1930 to complete a major in sociology. The details of the growth of the Department from 1946-60 are summarized in the Chronology given in the Appendix. No review of the details need be given except in a few cases.

The course in Education for Marriage had become popular in other colleges and universities and students began to clamor for such a course in the University of Arizona. Dr. Johnson, Head of the School of Home Economics, who was giving a course on the family, was willing to offer such a course in the School of Home Economics.
President Atkinson, however, desired more information about the plans followed in other universities and appointed a committee to make such an investigation. This committee, of which I was chairman, included the Dean of Women, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Mary Caldwell and Mr. Picard. The evidence gathered by correspondence pointed to a specialist with professional training and experience in teaching such a course, as well as having a family of his own and a successful marriage.

Such courses were given in different departments in other universities and colleges, but the President and the Academic Council assigned it to the Department of Sociology.

Dr. Klaiss was a logical choice, having worked with Dr. Groves of the University of North Carolina in handling such a course. This became a popular course and accounts, in part, for the large increase in enrollments in the Department in the late forties.

The expansion of courses in social work encountered unexpected difficulties. Professor Lebeaux, with a professional degree in social work from Fordham University and the completion of his residence requirements for his Ph.D. degree at the University of Michigan, was added to the staff in 1947 to teach the approved courses in social work and some courses in sociology.

This plan had to be modified in view of the action of the Legislature in reducing the appropriations for the State Board of Social
Security and Welfare, and the consequent reduction of personnel in the field of public welfare. The conditions of work with excessive case loads, low pay and limited opportunities for advancement without a professional degree, began to have their effects on students' interests in careers in public welfare.

Enrollments in the Department of Sociology were showing a high rate of increase annually during the period 1946-51. The number of majors in sociology and social work were also increasing. The increase in the number of majors in social work was, however, below expectations. By 1950 the distribution of majors in the Department was as follows: Sociology 58; Social Work 29; Graduate 3.

The leveling off of students seeking careers in social work was general rather than local. Schools of Social Work had decreases in their enrollments in the face of growing needs for professionally trained workers. I attended the National Conference of Social Work in Cleveland in 1949 and, again, in San Francisco in 1955, to keep in touch with the situation. The steady decline of enrollments in the post-war period reached a point by 1954 which caused several schools to close, while others were being maintained with difficulty.

The paradoxical situation of growing needs and decreasing enrollments had to be faced and, if possible, solved. A serious look was being taken at the whole question of education and professional standards and policies. A recruiting program was launched on a national scale and the decrease in enrollments in the Schools of Social Work for the period 1946-54 was reversed in the late fifties.
The plan to expand our pre-professional program and, eventually, to develop a five-year integrated program to meet the needs of the state was postponed, for a time, partly because the general trend of student enrollments was unfavorable and, partly, because the job opportunities in public welfare were not sufficiently attractive.

Conditions in the State Department of Social Security and Welfare were not improving. A few political appointments, one as Director of Welfare and another as Chairman of the Merit Council, were unfortunate. The inability to procure personnel made strict adherence to standards under the Merit System difficult. Conditions worsened after 1950 when procedures and standards set up by the Merit System were being ignored and the security and morale of workers under the system were being jeopardized. The failure of the Legislature to make adequate appropriations for operations, low salaries, poor personnel practices, excessive case loads, and the high turnover in personnel indicated a situation that failed to attract students for careers in public welfare in Arizona.

Richard A. Harvill became the sixteenth president of the university in 1951. If the period 1891-1914 was the pioneering stage of the University, the next period of 1915-1950 may be characterized as the building of A University; two World Wars and the Great Depression notwithstanding, the post-war period saw the building of A Great University.
President Harvill rose to the challenge of "the population explosion" and a period of unparalleled growth and expansion followed. This included the growth and expansion of the Department of Sociology and its final separation from the College of Business and Public Administration.

The question of establishing a School of Social Work remained for further study in the fifties. The controversy between the two rating associations (A.A.S.S.W. and N.A.S.S.A.) had been resolved by forming the National Council of Social Work Education. Our pre-professional major was approved in 1953 and listed in the official directory of the council with seventy colleges and universities having undergraduate departments offering courses with social welfare content.

Local representatives of private social agencies and of the American Association of Social Workers pressed their inquiry about establishing a school of social work. I submitted a brief of the costs and problems involved and discussed the situation with representatives of the American Association of Social Workers.²

There was no encouragement for the schools of social work in the discussion of trends at the San Francisco Conference in 1955. The attempt to establish and maintain a two-year graduate school seemed particularly unfavorable at that time and I felt obliged to advise President Harvill that the time was not opportune to establish such a program at the University.
I gave up my official duties in 1957 and had no further responsibility for the programs of education for social work. The Department of Sociology continued the pre-professional major until 1962, when it was taken over by the newly created Department of Public Administration.

In retrospect, sociology was given its initial direction by President Babcock in 1905 by "temporarily discontinuing it," after it had made a significant beginning. After it became divorced from history, it became more directly associated with economics and business administration. The expansion of economics and business administration left sociology in a relatively weak and uncertain position for a decade, 1905-1915.

Fortune is a fickle lady, as Machiavelli observed, and, in 1916, she smiled and sociology fell into more friendly hands when Dr. Brown became the Head of the Department of Social Science. For more than four decades, the fortunes of sociology were subject to his administration. Regardless of the names of the organization under which it existed—Department of Economics, of Social Science, of Economics and Business Administration, or Economics, Sociology and Business and Public Administration or the School of Business and Public Administration or the College of Business and Public Administration—the position of sociology, administratively, remained under the jurisdiction of Dr. Brown.
This unique relation with business administration for more than a half-century was finally changed when the Department of Public Administration was set up in the College of Business and Public Administration and the Department of Sociology reverted to the College of Liberal Arts in 1963.

That sociology should have survived and thrived in the atmosphere of a College of Business Administration can hardly be understood except in its historical context. It would seem a bit odd, otherwise, that a sociologist like myself should have been elected to membership in the commerce honorary society—Beta Gamma Sigma and, later, be elected as its President. There was no exclusion within the college, and as long as sociology remained in the College of Business and Public Administration, its staff was eligible to such membership.

The review of developments during the period 1931-45 indicated a combination of influences that gave sociology an opportunity to venture into new areas. The depression, the Social Security Act, the expansion of the Department of Economics, Sociology and Business Administration into the School of Business and Public Administration and finally into the College of Business and Public Administration enabled sociology to become a department in 1943, with its majors in sociology and social work.

The addition of the major in social work necessitated new demands on the limited budgets under which the University operated.
since 1930. It seems obvious from the review of data given above that the continuing pressure upon Dr. Atkinson to expand the training program in social work was decisive in his decision to expand the staff and curricula in the Department of Sociology in 1947.

This expansion of staff and curricula enabled students, for the first time, to complete a major in Sociology, wholly within the Department. This is reflected in increasing enrollments from 352 to 1392 during the five year period 1945-46--1950-51. This represented a percentage rate of increase above that of the University and of the College of Business and Public Administration. Majors, minors, and students choosing electives came in increasing numbers to sociology as its courses became more available and diversified.

President Shantz must be given credit for quickly recognizing the demands for college students in the field of public administration. His organization of the School of Business and Public Administration in 1935 was an important step, recognizing the new opportunities for public service on the local, state and federal levels, which were initiated by the New Deal and the sweep of social changes associated with it.

It was in this context that the Department of Sociology was drawn into active participation with local and state agencies to meet their needs. Once the practical as well as the theoretical aspects of sociology were officially recognized, the prophecy of Dr. Small was assured of fulfillment. The few acorns that took root in 1902 "were bound to become sturdy oaks."
By 1950 a host of post-war problems, requiring planning far into future, confronted the University. New leadership was needed, the Board and Legislature had to be convinced that heavy outlays for capital expenditures and costs of operation were necessary. A long-delayed building program had to be set into motion. Facilities for research had to be established. Budgets for instruction had to be increased to meet rising costs of living and the increase of student enrollments. Some budget adjustments were long overdue.

The Report of the Committee on the Future Development of the University of Arizona indicated that the cost per student unit for instruction was highly variable in different colleges. The lowest cost of $3.40 occurred in the College of Business and Public Administration, while the costs were twice that amount in the College of Agriculture and Engineering and three times that amount in the Colleges of Law and Mines, based on estimates for 1946-1947.4

A quiet revolution had been taking place during the thirties and forties. Mathematics and the natural sciences had been applied to agriculture and mechanical arts to solve physical needs, but it remained for the social sciences to be applied to solve the needs for public services and leadership in the confusion and disorders of the thirties and forties. What was happening in contemporary civilization became more relevant to students seeking a liberal education than what had happened in ancient civilizations.
The idea that students should have a general education with training for citizenship and public services instigated research in the social behavioral sciences. A Bureau of Research in Business and Public Administration or a Psychological Laboratory became a means of public service as well as a Bureau of Mines or a laboratory for soil chemistry. One-half of the professional schools of social work prior to 1940 were established during the thirties when the need for social-welfare services became urgent.

World War II shattered many old traditions and imposed new responsibilities and opportunities upon educational institutions everywhere. A new look at the whole field of instruction, research and extension became imperative. This was inevitable in Arizona as elsewhere.

The College of Liberal Arts and the College of Business and Public Administration had been having the largest numbers of students for a long time. With the influx of new students in the post-war period, these colleges could no longer be confined within the walls of the old buildings. The new Liberal Arts Building in 1949 and the Business and Public Administration Building in 1951 stand facing the Agricultural and Engineering Buildings as symbols of a new era of growth and expansion. This has pushed the campus far beyond the old stone wall that was built with P.W.A. assistance, during the depression of the thirties, to mark the outer limits of the campus.

This new era is another story which does not come within the scope and purpose of this review.
The Territorial Normal School and Arizona State Teachers College
The Territorial Legislature which took the initial steps in 1885 to establish the University of Arizona to be located in Tucson also appropriated $5,000 to establish "a Normal School for the Territory" to be located in Tempe. The Territorial Normal School, as it was called, opened in 1886 with $3,500 to cover its running expenses for the first two years. With a faculty of one man, who was its principal and teacher, and 33 students, it became "the first institution for advanced education in Arizona."¹

While the Normal School could boast of being the only institution of advanced education within a radius of 1,200 miles, its claim to this distinction rested on a principal who taught all the classes, a wife who provided board and lodging for girls who could not find accommodations elsewhere in Tempe,² and a program that could be considered advanced only in terms of territorial standards and needs. Since there were no preparatory schools, students were admitted on the basis of their age and intelligence, with a minimum age of 16. Teachers were desperately needed in the territory and the training program was adapted to the requirements of the situation with a rare dedication and singleness of purpose.

The institution had its problems and hardships during its initial pioneering period of a quarter of a century. Being centrally
located in the Salt River Valley, it began to take on new dimensions as the population grew and water was brought into the valley to irrigate its fertile soil.

Questions had arisen about the functions of the Territorial Normal School. Was it to train teachers only, as it was originally conceived? Or was it, within the meaning of the Armstrong Act of 1885, also authorized to teach agriculture and the mechanical arts, which were becoming important vocational subjects in the minds of many who saw the potential development of the valley?

Further questions of policy were bound to arise: Was the Normal School designed to train teachers how to teach, or what to teach? Assuming both were relevant, was its emphasis to be put on a good liberal arts education or on methods of teaching particular subjects which students desired to teach? Such questions had no easy or final answers but they became increasingly important in forming policies and determining curricula as conditions changed.

From 1864 to 1885, when the University of Arizona was established, each governor called attention to the founding of a university and the acquisition of federal land grants under the Morrill Act for that purpose. The apparent intent of the Thirteenth Territorial Legislature was to establish a university under the Morrill Act and provide for higher education in agriculture and the mechanical arts as defined in the Act.
The Armstrong Act of 1885 had apparently defined a wider purpose than teacher training and included "instruction in the mechanical arts, in husbandry and agricultural chemistry." Whether it was the intent of the Legislature to include such instruction in the Normal School seems unlikely. It was so interpreted, however, by farmers and others who wanted vocational training in agriculture and the mechanical arts. By 1912 the state had a two-year normal school offering eight courses in agriculture. As population grew, more courses were added. According to the 1919-20 catalogue, there were twelve courses in agriculture; whether this was within the original provisions of the Armstrong Act of 1885 became a source of rivalry between the two state institutions—the Normal School and the University.

The obvious fact that emerged was that the Normal School was seeking to change its status and its image. Its identity as a training school for teachers as conceived by the frontiersmen of the Thirteenth Legislature was no longer an acceptable image, but its new identity was not clearly defined. This is reflected in the different names by which it was known during the period 1885-1957. These follow:

Arizona Territorial Normal School
Territorial Normal School of Arizona
Normal School of Arizona (1900)
Tempe Normal School
Tempe Normal School of Arizona (1903-24)
Tempe State Teachers College (1925)
Arizona State Teachers College (1929)
Arizona State Teachers College at Tempe (1945)
Arizona State University (1958)

Since there were two normal schools in the state, the identity by locality as well as by the type of school became involved and a bit confusing. The two-year normal schools were passing out of the picture, in Arizona as well as elsewhere, and by 1925 the fight for a four-year teacher's college status was won by an act of the Legislature. The victory was not complete, however, because the act authorized the granting only of a Bachelor of Education degree. By 1929 the status of a teacher's college granting the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Education was won. Its status as a teacher's college remained until 1958 when it achieved its final status as a state university.

This transition from a frontier normal school to a state university had its unique aspects which were related to the competitive struggle to get appropriations from the state legislature. In general, however, it represents an evolution of teacher education which was taking place elsewhere throughout the nation. With the expansion of education due to the growing complexities of a changing social order, it became inevitable, by the turn of the century, that a new type of institution should replace the normal schools that had a two-year training program for teachers in the "common schools."

The teacher's college, with a four-year curriculum and the right to grant a degree, arose out of the need for teachers with a higher and more specialized education. Whether this need could be met
preferably by liberal arts colleges and state universities, or whether the teacher's college should expand its curriculum to include a basic liberal arts education and grant the liberal arts degree, became an issue. The opposition to this maintained that the teachers colleges were not equipped with staff, curricula and resources to maintain comparable standards and, consequently, their B.A. degree was an inferior degree. There is no need to expand on this historical evolution of teacher education, except to point out that the issues involved in Arizona led, at times, to heated controversies in the Legislature which was reluctant to grant the necessary appropriations demanded by rival institutions of higher education.

How were the needs for the higher teacher education being provided at the Tempe Normal School and the Tempe State Teachers College, and what recognition was given to sociology in its program of teacher education? This is the problem to be discussed in what follows.
Sociology in Normal Schools

The introduction of sociology into the curricula of normal schools was made by educators who became interested in the subject and began to explore its use in their teaching. It was assumed that teachers would be more successful if they had some knowledge of the communities and the social environment from which their pupils came.

Professor Clow of the Oskosh Normal School in Wisconsin estimated there were forty normal schools by 1911 that had sociology in some form, usually in the area of social problems. A decade later he estimated there were nearly a hundred such institutions offering sociology. There was no consensus among educators, however, either as to the importance of sociology or as to its place in the curriculum.

In this state of flux, the recognition given to sociology in normal schools depended largely upon professional educators who had no professional training in sociology. Professor Clow was convinced that sociology was as important in the social process of education as individual psychology and, if so, it should be made central in the curriculum with psychology or thrown out. The practical issue was, however, whether other subjects such as mathematics, history, geography, economics or civics should make a place for sociology, or whether psychology should yield its position of dominance and become a coordinate subject with sociology in the curriculum.
The choice of alternatives suggested by Professor Clow was not accepted in practice. Sociology crept into the curriculum in various forms, more generally as courses on various social problems, rather than as theoretical courses. Its impact was apparent in such courses as social psychology, social aspects of education and educational sociology. Inasmuch as normal schools existed apart from liberal arts colleges and universities, students had access only to such courses as had been introduced into their curricula. This depended on the role of particular educators who had an interest in sociology and recognized its importance in teacher education.

As the number of students increased, there was a tendency to divide the student body into two groups: those who were destined to teach and those who were not. This resulted in a separation of the curriculum into two parts: theoretical and practical. The theoretical part was taught in the normal schools, while the practical part was taught in the universities.

The normal school was a place where students were prepared to teach in the public schools. They were taught the principles of education, the history of education, the psychology of children, and the methods of teaching. They were also given practical experience in the schools, where they could observe and learn from experienced teachers.

In conclusion, the separation of the normal school from the university was a necessary step in the development of education. It allowed for the specialization of education, and it provided students with the opportunity to learn the practical aspects of teaching. However, it also meant that the theoretical aspects of education were separate and not integrated into the curriculum.

Samuel Blum, A.B., Western College and A.B., Indiana University, replaced Professor New in 1923 and took over the Sociology and History classes. He transferred from the Training School, where he was formerly listed, to the Normal School.
Sociology in Tempe Normal School

The place of sociology in the three state institutions has been variable as comparisons between them will show. At Tempe, the normal school consisted of a two-year program, with a training school which included the grades, and a high school in which students got experience and training in teaching.

Some of the social sciences were strongly entrenched in the normal school curricula from the beginning, notably psychology and pedagogy, history and civics. Not until 1902 was there a Department of History, Civics and Economics. Geography and home economics were also emphasized early in the history of the school.

As the number of students increased, there was expansion of curricula in different directions—history, economics, commerce, agriculture, psychology, pedagogy, and home economics. Except for a course in rural economics using Gillette's *Constructive Rural Sociology* as a text, there was no mention of a course in sociology until 1918, when Sociology and Ethics was introduced by A. L. Fike (A.M., University of California). The course description indicates 1) "the place of education in relation to other social agencies of social welfare and 2) gives an understanding and solution of many perplexing social and ethical problems."

Samuel Burkhard, A.B., Goshen College and A.M. Columbia University, replaced Professor Fike in 1921 and the course in Sociology and Ethics was transferred from the Training School, where it was formerly listed, to the Normal School.
The development of sociology in the Normal School and the State Teachers College at Tempe was primarily due to the influence of Professor Burkhard for a period of thirty years, 1921-51. Dr. Burkhard was a professional educator and was not trained as a professional sociologist. Like Professor Clow, he saw the importance of sociology in training teachers and proceeded to expand courses in sociology. The development of sociology in the State Teachers College is unique in some aspects and can only be understood in terms of the background of Dr. Burkhard.

Like other young men who had a rural orientation, Dr. Burkhard left the farm in Nebraska to get an education. He got a taste of the liberal arts and found it was good. He got his A.B. degree in 1911 and later went to Columbia University Teachers College where he got his M.A. degree. At Columbia, he came under the influence of Kirkpatrick and John Dewey. At Union Theological Seminary, he got social ethics under Dr. Coe. After teaching at the Normal School and Teachers College at Tempe 1921-28, he went back to New York where he got his Ph.D. degree in New York University in 1930. His area of specialization was in industrial arts. He then came back to the Teachers College at Tempe and became the Head of the Department of Education in 1930.

The Normal School became a Teachers College in 1925, with a four-year program leading to the Bachelor of Education degree. It was still primarily a normal school with a faculty of 39, none of whom had
a Ph.D. degree. The right to grant the A.B. degree was granted in 1929. The staff and curricula were expanding but the Training School, "comprising all grades from the kindergarten through junior high school," had 797 students compared with 608 college students in 1929-30.

Dr. Burkhard was, thus, one of the early Ph.D.'s with a thorough education in the liberal arts as well as the industrial arts. His thinking reflects the Judaeo-Christian tradition (the major prophets and Jesus), the Classical tradition (Socrates and Plato), and John Dewey, whose philosophy and its applications made a major contribution to his work as an educator. Dr. Burkhard was a methodical thinker who was intent on seeing the implications and practical applications of the subjects he taught. Although his area of specialization was industrial arts, he never taught that subject at the Normal School. He was originally brought to the Normal School to teach psychology and sociology.

Titles and rank were not clearly defined in the early catalogues. Being a graduate of Columbia University Teachers College, he was given the title of Professor of Education, which he held until his retirement in 1950. His courses, at first, consisted of general psychology, educational psychology, a course in sociology and a few courses in education. Later he introduced a course in social psychology and other courses in sociology which he taught. He gave up general psychology and confined his teaching more specifically to the social aspects of education.
It is interesting to note, in this connection, that he gave up teaching industrial arts to concentrate on the social aspects of education. He did not, however, forget his skill as a craftsman. He set up a small shop in his back yard and got a printing press to keep his four sons off of the streets and to teach them some useful crafts. This proved advantageous later when he developed an Outline of Sociology, which was printed in his shop by his sons. Later, in his period of retirement, he occupied his spare time in woodworking and making old grandfather clocks. He gathered a supply of juniper wood from old trees in Northern Arizona and his skill as a craftsman is indicated by the continuing demand for his clocks.
Sociology in the State Teachers College at Tempe

Although there was a Department of Social Science which included history, civics, economics and business, the course in sociology and ethics had been assigned to Dr. Burkhard and was listed as sociology in the Department of Education. This course became a part of the Standard Teachers Curriculum, given in the sophomore year, and was required of all students taking a Bachelor's degree in Education or Liberal Arts. This was apparently made a part of the Standard Teachers Curriculum when the Teachers College was established in 1925.

The early catalogues were not explicit about the differentiation of departments and who taught particular courses. Instead of cross-listing courses, instructors were, at times, listed in different departments.

Thus, by 1932-33 a Division of Social Studies including history, political science, economics, and sociology appeared in the catalogue with Dr. Wyllys (Ph.D., University of California) as its head. Dr. Burkhard was teaching social psychology in the Department of Psychology, educational sociology in the Department of Education, of which he was head, and Introduction to Sociology in the Division of Social Studies. He was also listed in the Department of Psychology with Professor Grimes as its head.
In the catalogue of 1934-35, sociology is listed in the Department of Education as Education 120, where it remained as a "core" course for the Bachelor of Arts in Education degree. With a college student enrollment of 1,146, Dr. Burkhard handled the large enrollments in sociology by sectioning classes each semester.

The Division of Social Studies, or the Department of Social Studies as it was more commonly referred to, might have been a logical place of organization if there had been agreement and balance in the place given to the various social sciences. It appears, however, that Dr. Wyllys, as Professor of History and Head of the Department, was interested in expanding history and political science. By 1937-38, the Department of Social Studies listed 21 courses in history and 10 in political science. Economics was returned to the Department of Commerce where it had been originally; sociology, consisting of an introduction, was listed in the Department of Education; social psychology was listed in the Department of Psychology; and a course on the family was listed in the Department of Home Economics.

Dr. Wyllys having failed to assume responsibility for any expansion in sociology, Dr. Burkhard took that responsibility in the Department of Education. By 1939-40, he added courses in contemporary social movements, education and social control, current educational problems, and character education.
By 1947-48, there was an expansion in the area of social work. The stated purpose of the Department of Education was not only to acquaint students with human nature, educational subjects, methods of teaching and administration, but also "methods of social reconstruction commensurate with democratic social theory."

The following year, 1948-49, the name of the department was changed to the Department of Education and Sociology. In the subdivision of sociology, the following courses were listed. The numbers over 200 indicated upper-division courses.

120 Sociology
125 Elements of Anthropology
204 Urban Sociology
205 History of Social Welfare
207 The American Indian
215 Community Organization
220 Principles of Criminology
225 Modern Social Problems

The following courses were added in 1950-51:

203 Marriage and the Family
206 Social Anthropology
208 Archaeological Field Methods
212 Introduction to Social Work
Many courses in education were given with a social approach and with a sociological content, as the following course descriptions indicate.

211 History of Education

"The social life, ideas, and institutions that gave direction to Western Civilization. A background for understanding and evaluating present educational and social problems."

216 Educational Sociology

"Study of education in relation to social institutions. Considers methods of gathering data in social research, the family, problems of educational reconstruction, social relationships, and social measurements."

250 Study of Social and Educational Theories

"Designed to give students a perspective of life, enabling them to give excellent professional service to society."

305 Education and Social Control

"A study of human affairs designed to give satisfactory direction to them. Considers social measurement and techniques for carrying on investigations."
Such additional course titles as:

- Youth Organizations and Leadership
- School and Community Relationships
- Character Education
- Educational Research and Scientific Method

indicate their social emphasis.

Dr. Burkhard gave up his position as Head of the Department of Education and Sociology in 1950 and was succeeded by Dr. McGrath (Ph.D, Colorado). Changes in organization were subsequently made. In the 1953-54 catalogue, the thirteen courses in sociology were transferred from the College of Education to the Department of Social Studies with R. K. Wyly as its head. This department then included history, political science and sociology.

By the following year Dr. Wyly subdivided the courses in sociology, making a separate listing of courses in anthropology and archaeology. Sociology remained with eight courses as follows:

- Soc. 120 Introduction
- Soc. 203 Marriage and the Family
- Soc. 204 Urban Sociology
- Soc. 205 History of Welfare
- Soc. 212 Introduction to Social Work
- Soc. 215 Community Organization
- Soc. 220 Criminology
- Soc. 225 Modern Social Problems
It will be noted here that sociology had introduced some courses in social work which were, no doubt, given in response to the demands for workers by the Arizona Board of Social Security and Welfare. This emerged later as a professional school of social work.

At the same time, a classification of courses in the Department of Education resulted in a group of courses under the title of Social Foundations of Education. The following courses were listed in this group:

- Educ. 211 History of Education
- Educ. 216 Educational Sociology
- Educ. 245 History of Education in the United States
- Educ. 305 Education and Social Control
- Educ. 250 Philosophy of Education
- Educ. 306 Character Education
- Educ. 307 Comparative Education
- Educ. 348 Philosophical Foundations of Education
- Educ. 439 Historical and Social Foundations. This was "A study of institutions, human relations and social forces influencing the nature of educational problems current in American society. Significant cultural trends are treated from local, national and international perspectives."

There is no indication in the catalogues of the Teachers College who taught courses in education and/or sociology. Several had the official titles of Assistant Professors in Sociology and Education, but the instructors teaching particular courses were not given. The
degrees held more frequently indicate either a master's or a doctor's degree in education. It is obvious from the records that there was no professionally trained sociologist with a Ph.D. degree in the Department of Education until 1953 when Frederick A. Lindstrom (Ph.D., University of Chicago) was added to the staff as an Assistant Professor of Sociology. Previously, Dr. Glenn Austin (Ph.D., Ohio State University) was added as an Assistant Professor of Sociology, but his title was changed to Assistant Professor of Education. The 1948–49 catalogue lists K. M. Stewart (Ph.D., University of California) and Burnadette Turner (Ph.D., Washington University) as Associate Professors of Sociology and Education. Dr. Stewart is not listed in the Directory of the American Sociological Society, while Dr. Turner is listed as a marriage-family counselor engaged in private practice. She was apparently on the staff for a few years, teaching courses in social work and marriage and the family.

Important changes in organization occurred in the mid-fifties and afterward. The Department of Education became the College of Education. Sociology, which had been transferred to the Department of Social Studies, became an independent Department of Sociology and Anthropology in 1957. The Teachers College became Arizona State University in 1958. Introduction to Sociology, which had been taught as a "core course" by Dr. Burkhard for approximately thirty years, was dropped as a requirement for teacher training and a general social studies course for freshmen and sophomores took its place.
Sociology was not recognized as a major teaching subject. Consequently, a major in general social studies was set up with its emphasis on history, political science, business administration, and geography—but not sociology. Similarly, majors in history or political science allowed for courses in business administration and geography, but not sociology.

Dr. Wylyss remained as the Professor of History and the Head of the Department of Social Studies. Under his administration, the expansion of history and political science is apparent, while sociology was allowed to lag in its development until an independent department, with Dr. Perril as its head, was established. It was, no doubt, a similar situation which led Dr. Burkhard to take his introductory course out of the Department of Social Studies in 1937 and list it as Education 120 in the Department of Education, and to undertake the development of sociology in his department. The failure of Dr. Wylyss to develop an integrated department at that time left the department with 21 courses in history and 10 in political science and no courses in other related social sciences. This unique development of sociology in the Department of Education can be attributed directly to Dr. Burkhard's recognition of its importance in the education of teachers, and the failure of the Department of Social Studies to sponsor its development.

Having given up his position as Head of the Department of Education in 1950, Dr. Burkhard remained a few years as a member of the staff of thirty teachers he had brought together in his administration.
One aspect of his work stands out. He acquired a few basic courses which he continued to teach until his retirement. All his courses, he informed me, were "content courses" rather than "how to do courses." They were liberal in their orientation. Courses such as the History and Philosophy of Education were taught as liberal arts courses in their content and interpretation, in his opinion.

The Introduction to Sociology was based on texts current in the twenties and thirties. Ross, Principles of Sociology, was used and, later, Barnes and Davis, Introduction to Sociology. Dr. Burkhard then developed his own outline, which had substantial references to a diversified list of authors whose texts were used as collateral. As far as I can infer, his course represented an interpretation of social problems and theories in his own frame of reference. Historical sociology, the system builders, and the scientific developments after the twenties were not an integral part of his courses as I understand his work. Nevertheless, his social philosophy, social ethics, social theories, and social observations were presented as a challenge to the thinking of a generation of teachers who sat in his classes.

Comparison of teacher education at Tempe State Teachers College and The University of Arizona shows important differences in the emphasis given to sociology in their respective curricula during the period 1925-1955. This can be attributed, in part, to the fact that the Teachers College had no liberal arts college and had to introduce courses in sociology in the educational curriculum, if such courses were desired.
The plan at the University required two years of study in the Liberal Arts College for admission to the College of Education. Freshmen and sophomores were required to meet certain group requirements which applied to an A.B. degree. In the social science group, a student could elect one of six or more subjects to meet this group requirement. Since sociology was not a teaching major or minor for a teacher's certificate, it was more probable that students would choose social sciences in their freshmen and sophomore years which they expected to teach after completing their junior and senior years in the College of Education. It was, thus, quite possible for a student to graduate with a degree in education without having an introductory course in sociology. History, for example, has always been a popular major for teachers in the social studies. It was possible for a student to meet the lower division requirement in social sciences by taking history and then taking a teaching major in history in the College of Education to acquire more knowledge of the subject. In his senior year he would then get the rounding out of his training by taking methods of teaching history and the required experience of teaching history in a classroom.

After teaching several years, such teachers might wish to improve their background and status by taking graduate work for a Master's degree. Not infrequently, they wanted other social sciences such as anthropology, sociology, or economics. Frequently, they were unable to take courses they wanted because they had no undergraduate
credits in the subject. The result was that they took more courses in education for which they had no need and which they did not want, except that it gave them a Master's degree and, usually, a higher salary.

This sort of narrow specialization has been subjected to extensive criticism in recent years, both by professors of education and academic professors.

Dr. Brubacher, Professor of Education at the University of Michigan, voices the criticism that students intending to teach were woefully deficient in their knowledge of the liberal arts and that professional education had proliferated so many courses that they were thin and overlapping. Furthermore, too many courses on methods were so preoccupied with narrow, practical recommendations that they had no intellectual or theoretical content that presented a challenge to students.

Such criticisms were widespread and led to extensive studies by some of the great foundations—Ford, Carnegie, Peabody—which provided millions of dollars to study the whole problem of teacher education. Suggestions "to redress an imbalance" in teacher education put emphasis on a more liberal education, including the equivalent of a liberal arts degree as a prerequisite to professional training.

President Conant of Harvard, in his study of the problem, suggested that a liberal arts degree should be accepted as a qualification
for teaching, provided a student has demonstrated his ability to teach and is so certified by his college. This would involve drastic changes in a student's preparation and in the procedures of certification for teaching.

Wide differences of opinion exist among educators concerning the content of a liberal arts course and the meaning of a liberal education. In the older traditional view, languages, humanities, mathematics, and the natural sciences were the core curriculum and electives were frowned upon. Liberalizing the curriculum by allowing some electives and admitting the social sciences provided some flexibility and adaptation to the needs of a changing social order. Vocational and professional training were not, however, considered a part of a liberal arts degree. Such courses were not "cultural" and were frowned upon by the devotees of culture for its own sake.

The Twentieth Century, however, had new problems and new needs. The public schools, supported by taxes, were confronted with public demands to justify the great expenditures for public schools with something more tangible than culture for its own sake.

John Dewey became the exponent of new methods and conceptions of education. How to introduce vocational and professional courses into the curriculum and, at the same time, broaden the basis of a liberal education to include the social foundations of education became an issue.
There were wide differences among educators as to what constituted the basic social foundations. Dr. Brubacher indicates that not a few critics bluntly assert that education was not a "discipline," per se, and must draw upon such well-established disciplines as psychology, history, philosophy and sociology. Having no unique method or content of its own, a few institutions like Yale considered returning the social foundations of education—educational psychology, educational philosophy, educational history, and educational sociology—back into "their parent discipline."

Conant, in his extensive study of the problem, had similar ideas of the social foundations of education. "At all events," he says, "a teacher must know something about the processes by which social behavior emerges in groups of children." 13

Considering the preparation of high school teachers in the social studies, Conant points out that a major in history is no guarantee of adequate preparation. "The program must include, at least, economics, geography, and political science, in addition to history, and preferably anthropology and sociology as well."

Such suggestions, if carried out, would give the academic professors much more responsibility in the education of teachers and, perhaps, reduce the tensions that have existed between academic professors and professors of education. That academic professors have not always assumed their full responsibility in this respect was pointed
out by Brubacher in his reference to the suggestion of Yale that the courses composing the social foundations of education should be returned to their "parent academic disciplines." While this was a logical inference based on educators who were not trained in the subject disciplines, the difficulty was that the academic disciplines were not equally or moderately trained in the problems of education.\textsuperscript{14}

Dr. Faris, in an article in the \textit{American Journal of Sociology} in 1928, held that educational sociology had not found itself and its conceptions are extremely varied. He suggested the need for educators and sociologists to work together.\textsuperscript{15} His recommendation is still applicable today and much remains to be done in implementing research and teaching in the area of teacher education and providing materials for teaching sociology in secondary schools.

President Conant recognizes the complexity of the problems involved and concludes, "I have found much to criticise on both sides of the fence that separates faculties of education from those of arts and sciences."\textsuperscript{16}

The concern here with "the great debate on teacher education" and "the quarrel among educators" is of interest only as it relates to the development of sociology and its relation to teacher education in Tempe Teachers College and the University of Arizona.

Differences in the emphasis on sociology and a liberal education have been referred to above. There were apparent differences
in the idea and content of a liberal education. The statement of
the College of Education of the University follows: "The courses
of study are based upon the idea that every teacher and school officer
should have a broad and liberal education." This was provided
primarily by two years of studies in the Liberal Arts College as the
prerequisite to the College of Education. In the statement of courses
in education, the following is given: "All courses in Education are
professional and have a prerequisite of 60 units of college credit." 17

In the 60 units of Liberal Arts credit required for admission to
the College of Education, six units of social science were required, of
which three units of Psychology 1a were required. The other three
units could be taken in five or six other subjects, some of which might
well be chosen as majors or minors in education. The suggested
schedule for the sophomore year provides for electives in major and
minor subjects, thus allowing a student to begin specializing on the
sophomore level. This was not the idea of a liberal education or of
the social foundations of teacher education suggested by Conant and
others in recent studies. As a case in point, Stanford School of
Education has raised its professional training to the graduate level and
has currently no undergraduates among its 575 majors in education. 18

The review of the development of sociology at Tempe Teachers
College and its recognition in teacher education at the University and
at the Teachers College reflects obvious differences between adminis-
trators and their role in determining curricula.
The Biennial Catalogue of the University for 1953-54 and 1954-55 continues to stress the aim of securing a broad liberal education. "A major is to be chosen in the subject which a student desires to teach. A minor is a secondary subject or field which the student plans to teach which must be chosen with the advice of the College of Education."\(^{19}\)

In effect, a major and minor consisting of 40-44 units is chosen in the subjects a student is preparing to teach. Another 20-24 units of required methods courses limits the choice of electives not prescribed in the course of study, except in special cases to be approved by the dean. Since sociology has not usually been a teaching subject in the elementary or secondary schools, the opportunity to elect courses in sociology was restricted.

In contrast, Tempe Teachers College presents the unique case of a Professor of Education making sociology and the social foundations of teacher education an integral part of the curriculum. The title of the Department of Education and Sociology is, per se, an unusual deviation which can be understood only in terms of the educational background and initiative of Dr. Burkhard.

In a sense, the Department of Education and Sociology in the Tempe Teachers College was more specifically an unusual deviation only in the education of teachers in the state of Arizona. Dr. Burkhard was, no doubt, influenced by developments in New York University, where he got his Ph.D. degree.
Currently, New York University, in its College of Education, has one division in its curricula given to the behavioral sciences. One of the areas leading to a Ph.D. degree is educational sociology. The initiative of Dr. Burkhard in introducing and expanding sociology as an integral part of the curricula in the education of teachers remains, however, as a unique development in the program of teacher training in Arizona.
Northern Arizona Normal School was authorized by the Territorial Legislature and the school was opened in 1877. It occupied a five-story building which was built as a reform school but was changed for use by the normal school. It was considered to be the finest public building in the territory during the time territorial Arizona was a territory.

The territory in Mesilla Valley had a sparse population and few schools as elements. The opening of the Normal School in 1874 was subject to these frontier conditions as the organization and structure initiated.

The organization of the school was divided into three divisions: the normal school, the preparatory school and the training school. The normal school had departments of study such as sociology, history and civics, math, mathematics, commercial and physical sciences. English,
Normal School and Teachers College

Northern Arizona Normal School was authorized by the Twentieth Territorial Assembly and the school was opened in 1899. It occupied a five-story building which was built as a reform school but was changed for use by the Normal School. It was considered to be "the finest public building in the territory except the New Territorial Building at Phoenix."

The act set forth, as its object, the following: "The exclusive purpose and objects of the Normal Schools shall be the instruction and training of persons, both male and female, in the theory and art of teaching, and all the various branches that pertain to a good school common education and in all subjects needful to qualify for teaching in the public schools." (Catalogue 1904-5, p. 8).

The territory in northern Arizona had a sparse population and poor schools as elsewhere. The opening of the Normal School in 1899 was subject to these frontier conditions as its organization and curricula indicate.

The organization of the school was divided into three divisions: the Normal School, the Preparatory School, and the Training School. The Normal School had departments of study such as pedagogy, history and civics, music, mathematics, natural and physical science, English,
drawing, geography, physical training, and methods. The Preparatory School was designed for those not prepared for Normal School, and the Training School consisted of the first four grades which were used for teacher training.

Credits were transferred to the Territorial University if a student graduated from the eighth grade, entered the Preparatory School one year and then spent four years in the Normal School.

"Thus with a well integrated course of five years they should be prepared to graduate at the Normal School, and to enter the University and to complete their work there, in at least three years" (Ibid., p. 22).

According to the stated objects of the Normal School, the curriculum could include "All subjects needful to qualify for teaching in the public schools." This was flexible, depending on what was considered "needful" by the administration. Accordingly, courses in sociology were introduced in due time.

In 1908-09, a more clearly defined curriculum which included history, civics and the science of government, psychology, and economics, which was first mentioned as political science in previous catalogues, was established. In the 1913-14 Catalogue, the Department of History lists its courses in a number of group sequences. In one such sequence, to be followed over a three-year period, the following
order was indicated: sociology, economics and industrial history. No description of these courses was given. In the following year, this sequence was given under the label of Industrial History of the United States. The following description indicates the scope of the course:

There is a principle in sociology that declares that everything which every man does is connected with everything which every other man does. The complexity of everyday affairs brought about by this interdependence of the elements of science prompts the offering of the course. Hence, its aim is to stimulate social interest, enlarge human sympathy, develop a love of justice, arouse public spirit, and deepen the sense of civic obligation.

It seems obvious that sociology in some form was considered essential in the training of teachers. According to the catalogues of the Normal School, there was no agreement, however, as to its scope or content. This seems to have been left to the instructors and departments in which it was offered. The chance elements of administrative action and the interest of instructors and departments in promoting sociology, or neglecting it because of a lack of training and interest in the subject, were probable factors in the development of sociology at the Normal School.

In the early stage of its development as an academic discipline, sociology had no assured status as a major subject in the curricula of normal schools. It was taken for granted that a
historian would teach history and, incidentally, a course in sociology, if necessary. This applied to other established departments. It was considered illogical to establish a Department of Sociology that would incidentally teach a few courses in history, economics or geography.

We thus find the courses in sociology being offered in different departments such as history, economics, geography or social studies. There was no consistency or continuity in the development of the subject until it became an independent department with a sociologist as its head.

Perhaps as a matter of necessity, sociology at Northern Arizona Normal School was thus taught by a civil engineer, historians, economists, educators, a psychologist, a dean of men, and a dean of women. For the most part, it was taught by historians and educators who had their degrees in education.

The early catalogues are not always explicit in giving the degrees and titles of instructors; departments and who taught particular courses are not clearly differentiated, and, sometimes, courses in sociology were changed, or dropped and reinstated. Thus, the development of sociology was somewhat irregular. There was, however, a growing emphasis on sociology indicated by the number and types of courses offered as the institution grew in its size and in the size and quality of its staff.
The details of this development are taken from the annual catalogues and can be given best by briefly summarizing them in their chronological order, which follows.
Chronological Summary

1913  Department of History offered a three-year sequence given in the following order: sociology, economics, and industrial history.

1914-15 Department of History continues the same sequence.

1916-17 Geography became a department and took the course in economics which it "considered necessary to an understanding of what goes on in society."

1917-18 A Department of Economics and Sociology was designated and took the course in economics from geography and added a course in sociology, using Hayes' *Introduction to Sociology* "Required of all graduates."

1918-19 The Department of Economics and Sociology offered the same two courses in economics and sociology. Joe Bentel (B.Sc.C.E.) taught these courses.

1919-20 Department of Geography and Sociology had Mr. Bentel teaching a course in geography and a course in educational sociology, using Hayes' *Introduction to Sociology*. A new course in rural sociology was added.

1920-21 Minnie Lints (A.M. Columbia Teachers College) taught the above courses.
1921-22 Educational sociology was taught in the Department of Education by Miss Lintz whose specialty was educational psychology, and tests and measurements. Rural sociology was dropped.

1922-23 The Department of Geography and Sociology was dropped, and sociology was given in the Department of Education. Geography was given in the Department of Science.

1923-24-25 Miss Lintz offered educational sociology and a diversified list of courses in education. Methods and tests and measurements seem to be her specialty. As Head of the Department of Education, she was expanding the curricula in education. The Normal School became a Teachers College in 1925.

1925-26 Miss Lintz added rural sociology, continued educational sociology, and expanded courses in psychology.

1927-28 Miss Lintz became Dean of Women and continued her work in education. Educational Sociology was changed to Principles of Sociology. Rural sociology was dropped. Mr. Tinsley (A.M., Clark University) was added to the staff.

1928-29 A new Department of History and Social Science was established, with sociology as a subdivision offering two courses, namely, "Social Problems" and "Principles of Sociology." Mr. Tinsley was the apparent head of the department.
1929-30 A new Department of Social Science, including history, political science and sociology, was set up with Thomas P. Oakley (Ph.D., Columbia University) as Head of the Department and Professor of Social Science. This department had a staff of three men including Professor Oakley, W. W. Tinsley, who became Dean of Men, and Associate Professor of Social Science, and Andrew Peterson (A.M., University of Utah, and two years in the Columbia School of Law) Assistant Professor of Social Science. History and political science were expanded, but sociology remained with two courses.


1932-33 The title of the Department of Social Science was changed to the Department of Social Studies and archaeology courses were added. Professor Oakley was dropped as head and J. C. Reagan (Ph.D. University of Chicago) became the head.

1933-34 The Department of Social Studies was expanding and included the following number of courses:

- Archaeology—2 courses
- Social Ethics—1 course
- Economics—12 courses
- Political Science—10 courses
- Sociology—6 courses
Since instructors of these courses were not given, there is no way of knowing in what social science members of the staff were specialized.

1935-36 Sociology listed five courses as follows:

45 Introduction
46 Social Problems
47 Social Problems
112 Labor Problems
150 Rural Sociology

A course in historical sociology, offered in the previous year, was dropped. Courses 45, 46, 47 were required under "the general requirements" for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Education.

1937-38 Economics was transferred from the Department of Social Studies to the Department of Economics and Business Administration.

1938-39-40 No changes.

1940-41 Professor Tinsley got his Ph.D. degree at Stanford and was given the title of Professor of History and Head of the Department of History and Social Science (Social Studies). Six courses in anthropology were listed in the department, all taught by Professor McGregor (A.M., University of Arizona).

1941-42 Sociology 47 was dropped and Sociology 155-255, Urban Sociology, was added. The five courses were being taught by Professor Peterson.
1942-43 Department of Social Studies had 12 courses in history all taught by Tinsley, 6 courses in political science and 5 courses in sociology all taught by Peterson.

1944-45 Anthropology was dropped from the catalogue and McGregor was dropped from the faculty. Professor Downum (Ph.D., University of Texas) was added as Associate Professor of History.

1946-47 The Department of Social Studies lists two instructors, Drs. Tinsley and Downum. Peterson, who taught political science and sociology, was no longer on the staff. The department lists 21 courses in history, 6 in political science, and 5 in sociology.

1947-48 J. W. Westover (Ph.D., University of Missouri) was added as an Assistant Professor of Sociology and Political Science.

1949-50 Race and Minority Problems in the United States was added.

1951-52 Rural Sociology and Criminology were dropped. Department of Social Studies now had five courses in sociology—Introduction to Sociology, Social Problems, Urban Sociology, Juvenile Delinquency, and Race and Minority Problems.

1952-53 Professor Westover was on leave. Sociology was reduced to two courses—Introduction and Social Problems. The Department of Social Studies had 20 undergraduate and 8 graduate courses in history, 8 in political science, and 2 elementary courses in sociology.
Dr. Westover was the first person with a higher degree to be given the title of a sociologist. His major concern was, however, the eight courses in political science. His failure to return left the Department of Social Studies in the hands of two historians, Tinsley and Downum. With 34 courses in history and political science, which they had established, they temporarily reduced sociology to a token offering.

1955-56 Edward E. Walker (Ph.D. Stanford) was added as Professor of Sociology and Education. Dr. Walker proceeded to re-establish sociology and the following list of courses were added in sociology.

- 200 Introduction—open to freshmen
- 205 Current Social Problems—open to freshmen
- 320 Rural Sociology
- 335 Social Psychology (Identical with Psych. 335)
- 500 Population and Race
- 510 Crime and Delinquency
- 520 Western Social Institutions
- 550 Educational Sociology
- 600 Seminar in Social Problems
- 600 Seminar in Juvenile Delinquency

1957-58 Dr. Walker added Sociology 550 (History of Social Thought) and Sociology 660 (Social Trends for School Administrators).

Northern Arizona Teachers College became Arizona State College.
1960–61 Sociology added 400 (Introduction to Social Work) and 505 (Public Opinion and Propaganda) and dropped Rural Sociology. Educational Sociology was transferred to the Department of Education. Sociology remained in the Department of Social Studies with 13 courses.

1963–64 The Department of Social Studies expanded and became more specialized. It had ten instructors and included divisions in history, political science, sociology, and police science and administration. Sociology had 21 courses of which 11 were on the undergraduate level and 10 were given for graduate credit. Criminology, penology, deviant behavior, and industrial sociology were added on the undergraduate level. The following graduate courses were given with numbers above 500:

- 505 Public Opinion and Propaganda
- 510 American Social Legislation
- 520 Western Social Institutions
- 550 History of Social Thought
- 600 Studies in Social Thought
- 610 Investigations in Juvenile Delinquency
- 677 Educational Sociology
- 697 Independent Study
- 702 Educational Trends in Educational Leadership
- 703 Social Foundations of Education
1966-67 Out of a staff of 17 members, only 2 were officially listed as sociologists. The rest were listed under social studies, history, political science, etc.

Arizona State College became Northern Arizona University in 1967. W. H. Lyon (Ph.D., University of Missouri), Professor of History, became Chairman of the Department of Social Science. Dr. Walker remained as Professor of Sociology and Education and Chairman of Interdepartmental Relations. Dr. Walker offered two graduate courses in education:

702 Social Trends in Education Leadership
703 Sociological Foundations of Education

The College of Education offered the following:

Educ. 677 Educational Sociology
Soc. Sc. 703 Sociological Foundations of Education
Soc. Sc. 704 Anthropological Foundations of Education
Comparative Summary

The review of the development of sociology in the three institutions of higher education in Arizona reveals a number of similarities and differences. Pioneering sociology in Arizona was subject to the problems and limitations imposed by the old frontier. In broad perspectives, these conditions delayed the development of sociology more than a quarter of a century. Comparatively, sociology had become a well-established academic discipline in most of the colleges and universities by the nineteen twenties. The three institutions in Arizona were giving only five courses in sociology in 1925. Previous attempts at the University to expand its courses in sociology were disappointing and the two normal schools had only introductory courses.

The two teachers colleges, authorized in 1925, began to expand their curricula to meet the increasing demands for more teachers with better training. They had a singleness of purpose in their vocational objectives and recognized sociology as an essential subject and required it in their program of teacher education. This was not the case in the College of Education at the University, where it remained as an elective, given in the College of Liberal Arts.

The contrast, at this point, between the two teachers colleges and the University in making sociology a required or an elective subject in the educating of teachers had significant implications for the development of sociology, particularly in the university.
The classical tradition of a liberal arts education had long since been modified by the admission of vocational subjects into its curriculum and by the organization of pre-professional courses of studies. This was particularly true in a land grant university where the practical applications of knowledge were cultivated as a public service to the state as well as providing a wide range of job opportunities for students who recognized the competitive advantages of a higher education.

Students on the high school level were advised by their teachers and counselors of the areas in which their opportunities for success were most favorable. Students who entered the University with their minds made up were directed to the particular schools and colleges in which they wished to study and to consult the Catalogue for the requirements in the special areas they wished to select as a major. Others, who had no such predetermined vocational interests, were advised to enter the College of Liberal Arts and find their vocational interests later or pursue a liberal arts course in its traditional classical conception. This traditional conception of education had little or no appeal to the great majority of students whose vocational and professional interests had brought them to the University.

Sociology, as a strictly liberal arts subject, had no clearly defined professional status. As a service course, it stood on its claim to have a body of knowledge that pertained to the understanding of human relations. To the vocationally minded students
a frequent question was, What is sociology good for? The query was equally applicable to other liberal arts subjects, but it was particularly relevant to sociology which did not have a long tradition to support it.

It was not until the mid-thirties that sociology acquired a specific vocational basis when it established a major in social work. This link with a vocational interest appealed to many students who had an interest in social problems but had not, as yet, seen the relation between the pure and the applied aspects of sociology as a social science.

The organization of departments of sociology varied widely in the three state institutions although they had one thing in common—their late development compared with other related departments.

At the University sociology did not become a regular department for more than a half-century (1891-1943). The Normal School and Teachers College at Tempe did not establish an independent department of sociology for more than three-quarters of a century (1886-1957). The State Teachers College at Flagstaff still remained without a separate department in 1966, when its status as a University was approved.

The State Teachers College at Flagstaff was a relatively small and younger institution. For a time, its sociology was offered in such
related departments as history, economics, geography and education. It was taught by the available staff which had no sociologists and little, if any, training in sociology. Administrative convenience and necessity apparently determined who taught sociology in the early years of the institution.

A more consistent plan of organization appeared in 1932 when a Department of History and Social Science was set up. In a few years, this became the Department of Social Studies. For more than thirty years, sociology remained in this department with history and political science.

History maintained a dominant position in this relationship. The two key men, Drs. Tinsley and Downum, were historians. The third member of the staff, Professor Peterson, joined the staff as an Assistant Professor of History and Political Science. He, however, taught the courses in sociology, in which his training was apparently limited.

In this set-up, history was expanding, whereas sociology remained with a limited number of courses during a twenty year period, 1930-1950. There were occasional changes in the courses offered, particularly with respect to rural sociology, which was added and dropped repeatedly. There was a consistency and continuity, however, inasmuch as the basic courses in principles and problems were maintained and required, and an approximate average of five courses in sociology was maintained during the period.
In the State Teachers College at Tempe, the position of sociology followed a different pattern. A Department of Social Science, comprising history, civics, economics and business, headed by Professor Murdock, was established when the normal school became a teachers college in 1925. A Division of Social Studies was organized in 1932-33 with Dr. Wyllys as its head. This department included history, political science, economics and sociology. After a few years, economics was returned to the Department of Commerce, and sociology was returned to the Department of Education, where it remained for approximately twenty years and expanded from a single required course in 1930 to thirteen courses in 1950.

In 1954-55, sociology was taken from the Department of Education and returned to the Department of Social Studies which had, in the meantime, been offering courses in history and political science. In 1957 a new Department of Sociology and Anthropology was organized as the status of Arizona State Teachers College at Tempe was about to change to Arizona State University.

The development of sociology at the University of Arizona presents another pattern of organization. After a brief initial period in its association with historians, it was taken over by the Department of Economics and Business Administration in the newly organized College of Liberal Arts.

For approximately a half-century, sociology remained in the Department of Economics and Business Administration, the Department
of Economics, Sociology and Business Administration, the School of Business and Public Administration, and, as a department in the College of Business and Public Administration. This plan of organization was finally ended when the Department of Sociology became two independent departments of public administration and sociology. The Department of Public Administration remained in the College of Business and Public Administration, and the Department of Sociology returned to the College of Liberal Arts in 1963.

What the differences in administrative policies in the three state institution may have had to do with the development of sociology is largely conjectural. The two teachers colleges were limited in their objectives primarily to training teachers for the schools of the state. Their presidents and administrative staffs were educators. This did not, however, limit their ambitions to the stated institutional objectives or prevent them from seeking to change their status as teachers colleges.

The Arizona State University Story is an excellent case history of the growth of an institution led by two able administrators, Presidents Arthur J. Matthews and Grady Gammage. This story of growth from a normal school to a teachers college and to a university over a period of fifty-eight years, under the leadership of two men, provided a continuity in objectives rarely found in state-supported institutions. This emphasis upon growth and expansion was not adverse to sociology.
The expansion of courses in sociology and social work in the Department of Education may not have been in line with the usual objectives of such a department, but it was not contrary to over-all objectives of the teachers college and its president.

The University, by contrast, has had sixteen presidents since its beginning in 1891. They represent a variety of specialized areas by training and experience, such as: the ministry, engineering, the classics, history, psychology and education, business administration, archaeology, botany, soil chemistry, agronomy, law, and economics. The needs of the University were not doubt served by men with such different qualifications, but the growth of sociology was, at times, affected adversely by these administrative changes.

The fact that sociology developed under the diverse conditions and leadership that have been indicated in the history of the three state institutions at least attests to its general acceptance as a social science. The original issue whether sociology had a right to be included in the curriculum had become an irrelevant question. Other practical problems and restrictions, however, remained.

The role of sociology in the two teachers colleges was restricted by the rules adopted in 1936 for the certification of teachers. These rules required, in general, that students spend their junior and senior years in completing their teaching majors and minors, and a major in education. Sociology not being recognized as a teaching major or minor for teachers in the public schools, made little progress under these rules.
The authorization in 1929, allowing the teachers colleges to give the A.B. degree, however, opened the door to an expansion and diversification of their curricula. The growth of sociology can be attributed primarily to the expansion of their liberal arts curricula and the development of their graduate programs.

Departmental organization and leadership were also important variables. Sociology made little progress in the Departments of Social Studies in both institutions. Under the administration of historians who directed the expansion of curricula and staff, sociology had little opportunity to expand in these departments during the period 1930-1950.
Postscript

This study was primarily concerned with the pioneering and development of sociology in the first half of the century, 1900-1950. The second half of the century has only been touched briefly to indicate a few important changes. A further summary will indicate the record to date.

By 1950 the Department of Sociology at the University had a staff of four sociologists. This was the only Department of Sociology in the state and its staff represented the extent of professional sociologists in the state at that time.

By 1967, the Department, under the leadership of Dr. Raymond Bowers, as its Head, had a staff of twenty instructors and a curriculum including 53 regular courses and 10 courses for individual studies. The Department had acquired the entire top floor of the Liberal Arts Building for its offices, laboratories and some of its classrooms. For the first time, it was fully equipped for its work in teaching, research and publications. Its graduate program offered the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees.

Arizona State University had, likewise, established a large department, under the leadership of Thomas Hoult, its Head. It had a staff of sixteen instructors, with a curriculum of 46 courses and 8 seminars, leading to the M.A. degree. It continued to offer some courses in the area of social work, which had been assigned to the Department of Business and Public Administration in the University of Arizona.
Northern Arizona University had established a Department of Sociology with a staff of five instructors. Its curriculum consisted of 16 undergraduate and 13 courses for which graduate credits were allowed, although it offered no graduate degree.

By 1967, sociology was also being offered in Arizona's two private colleges and its five Junior Colleges. Junior Colleges were offering two to four courses, whereas Grand Canyon College was offering eight courses in its Department of Social Studies.

The post-war period of the nineteen fifties and sixties a period of unparalleled growth for the state and its colleges and universities. The provincialism of the old frontier and of the territorial days was gone and the exploration of new social and scientific frontiers only disclosed new areas and problems awaiting further exploration. In this perspective, pioneering sociology in Arizona has not ended; it has only changed its form and direction.
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Chronological Development of Sociology at The University of Arizona 1900-1964

F. A. Conrad

Sources: The University of Arizona Record, 1891-1964
Annual Reports of the Department of Sociology 1943-1956
Miscellaneous sources as indicated in footnotes
The chronological summary of the development of sociology at the University of Arizona was first given in the *Annual Report of the Department for 1955-1956*. This was revised and brought up to 1964 by Dr. R. A. Mulligan in a typewritten copy on "The Development of Sociology at the University of Arizona, 1902-1964." A more detailed study of available sources has made some revisions of Mulligan's summary desirable. The following sequences are based on a re-examination of the early records:

1900  
A course labeled Sociology was given in the Department of History, Political Economy and Pedagogy by F. Yale Adams.

1901-2  
A year's course was listed as "a study of economic and sociologic problems."

1902-3  
A new division under the title of sociology was differentiated from history, political economy, and pedagogy. Four new courses in sociology were listed as follows: Elements, Charities and Crime, The Family, and Public Opinion. No instructor was indicated.

1903-4  
The same courses were listed and Benjamin F. Stacey, Instructor in Science and Philosophy, B.D., A.B., from Lombard College and A.M. from the University of Arizona, taught these courses. Texts used: Fairbanks' *Introduction;* Warner's *American Charities;* Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage."

1904-5  
Stacey was dismissed in April, 1904, and two courses in sociology were dropped from the catalogue, namely, Public Opinion and The
Family. William A. Ruthrauff, A.B., Wittenberg College, Instructor in Economics and History, taught two courses in Sociology given in alternate years—(1) Elements, using Dealy and Ward's text, and (2) Charities and Crime, using Warner's American Charities as the text.

1905-6 Ruthrauff resigned in 1906 and courses in sociology were "temporarily discontinued." Department of Philosophy offered a course in Evolution in which readings in Spencer's Principles of Sociology and Bagehot's Physics and Politics and others were used. This was dropped after two years.

1906-7 Two courses remained in the catalogue but were not given.

1907-8 Frank O. Smith, M.A. (Northwestern) was added as Instructor in History and Economics, and remained only one year. The courses in Elements and Charities and Crime were omitted.

1908-9 Alfred E. Chandler, B.S. (Northwestern) succeeded Smith in 1908. Soc. 2, Charities and Crime, was dropped and Socialism and Social Reform was substituted. Soc. 3, a new course on Social Problems Today, was added, making nine units listed under sociology, but Soc. 1 and 2 were omitted and Soc. 3 was not offered until 1910-11. Thus no courses in sociology were given for two years.

1909-10 Sociology was now listed under Economics as Economics 7, Introduction to Sociology, and Economics 8, Socialism and Social Reform. Instructor, Chandler.

Not given in 1909-10

Not given in 1910-11
1911-12 Economics 7, Introduction, given in alternate years. Economics 8 changed from Socialism and Social Reform to Elements of American Politics. Given in alternate years.

1913-14 Economics 7 and 8 not given.

1913-14 Economics 7, Introduction to Sociology, was changed to Sociology and Social Reform. This was followed by Economics 8, American Politics.

1914-15 The College of Letters, Arts and Sciences established. Economics and sociology were now listed in the Department of Social Sciences under Chandler, who became Professor of Social Science.

1915-16 By now the other social sciences (history, economics, business, psychology, and philosophy, education, and archaeology) were having big advances while sociology remained with a single course, Social Science 7, Sociology and Social Reform, which was a left-over from Chandler's administration, 1908-1915. Chandler took a sabbatical leave and Dr. E.J. Brown (University of Illinois became the Head of the Department of Social Science.

1916-17 Brown expands Social Science 7 to a year course, revises the content and lists it as Social Science 10, Introduction, and Social Science 11, Social Reform, makes Introduction required of juniors for the B.S. in Commerce Degree.

1917-18 Brown continues to teach Social Science 10 and 11.

1918-19 Brown continues teaching Introduction and Social Reform.

1919-20 The same.
1920-21 Two new courses added, namely, Rural Sociology and Dependency and Delinquency. Brown was now teaching four courses in sociology.

1921-22 Brown: Rural Sociology, Sociology, Social Reform, Care of Dependents and Delinquents.

1922-23 The name of the department was changed to Department of Economics. Professor Conrad was secured to teach sociology and relieve Dr. Brown who had taught the courses. Conrad was listed as Assistant Professor of Sociology, A.M., Indiana. Later Ph.D. from Stanford. This was the first listing of an official title as a sociologist in the University.

1923-24 President Marvin deleted two courses—Social Reform and Dependents and Delinquents. Introduction was changed to a 2-2 year course. With Rural Sociology (3) there were now 7 units of sociology taught by Conrad who was assigned sections in Economics 1a-b and the course on Labor Problems.

1924-25 Same as above.

1925-26 Same as above except Principles which had been a 2-2 introductory course was changed to 181a-b. Principles of Sociology (3-3) required for the B.S. in Commerce degree.

1926-27 Same as above. Conrad teaching 9 units of sociology, Labor Problems and sections of Economics 1a-b.

1927-28 Sociology 181a-b was changed to Sociology 81, Introduction to Sociology (3). Two alternating year courses were approved—Soc.
182a-b, Social Adjustment (2-2) to be given 1928-29. Soc.
183a-b, Social Evolution and Social Progress (2-2) given
1929-30. Sociology now had 14 units but they were listed as
economics.

1928-29 Conrad on sabbatical leave at Stanford. Robert Pettengil,
a graduate student, teaches courses in sociology.

1930-31 Department of Economics is listed as the Department of
Economics, Sociology and Business Administration. Sociology,
with 14 units, is listed as a separate division in the Department
indicating a future trend.

1931-32 Advanced course in principles and a seminar were added,
totaling 22 units of work, 12 of which were offered in alternate
years. A major in sociology was now possible by requiring
Economics 1a-b and allowing six units of electives from Economics
105 (Labor Problems), Philosophy 120 (Ethics), Psychology 115
(Social Psychology), and Archaeology (Ethnology).

1934-35 School of Business and Public Administration established in
the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences which became the
College of Liberal Arts in 1935. Public Administration offered
the Bachelor of Science in Public Administration degree with three
majors—government service, foreign service, and social work. By
combining sociology with other related courses, a graduate major
for the M.A. degree in Sociology was established.

1935-36 Rural Sociology was transferred to the College of Agriculture
and given to Dr. Tetreau. A course in Social Problems was
re-established in sociology. The Pima County Board of Public Welfare offered to provide a training course for social work majors and Mrs. Fuller was put in charge of it. After four years, the Board refused to continue the course on a voluntary basis and, in 1940, Sociology 195a-b (Social Legislation) was added and Mrs. Fuller was hired to continue the work.

1943-44 The Department of Sociology was formally set up for the first time in the College of Business and Public Administration, with Professor Conrad as head. The department now offered majors for three degrees, and had 9 courses totaling 30 units of work, 14 of which were offered in alternate years. Only a total of 24 units were available in the department for the A.B. degree.

The following summary indicates the erratic and retarded development of sociology since 1900:

1903 Sociology was listed with 4 courses, totaling 12 units.
1906 Sociology was reduced to 2 courses, totaling 7 units.
1913 Sociology was reduced to 1 course, totaling 3 units.
1920 Sociology was increased to 3 courses, totaling 9 units.
1922 Sociology was increased to 4 courses, totaling 12 units.
1923 Sociology was reduced to 2 courses, totaling 7 units.
1928 Sociology was increased to 4 courses, totaling 14 units.
1931 Sociology was increased to 6 courses, totaling 20 units.
1935 Sociology was increased to 8 courses, totaling 24 units.
1943 Sociology was increased to 9 courses, totaling 30 units.
With a staff consisting of one full-time instructor, one quarter-time instructor and a visiting lecturer voluntarily giving two courses, the department began its work officially in 1943 with forty majors in sociology and social work.

The trends in the next few years were decisive. The comparative record of graduates by departments for the period 1942-46 showed the Department of Sociology with a total of 61. This number was surpassed by only three departments in the University, namely, history and political science, education, and English.

This anomalous situation called for substantial additions in staff, curricula and equipment which were made in the post-war period.

The following summary indicates the major developments:

1946 By arrangement with the Department of Anthropology, 12 units of Cultural Anthropology were added and listed as Sociology 120 (Minority Peoples), Sociology 170a-b (Primitive and Modern Societies), and Sociology 185 (Culture and Personality).

1947 Two men were added to the staff (Lebeaux and Klaiss) and the following courses added: 100 (Education for Marriage), 140 (Child Welfare), 143 (Introduction to Public Welfare), 145 (Case Work),
15 (Community Organization), 153 (Group Work), 191 (Urban Sociology), and 192 (Rural Sociology). Rural Sociology was taken over from the College of Agriculture after the death of Dr. Tetreau. A capital expenditure of $2,000 was secured for additions to the library in the field of social work. Due to the fact that most of the desired books had been taken out of print during the war, a large part of this appropriation reverted to the general fund. Economics la–b was dropped from the major and, for the first time, students were able to complete their major entirely in sociology.

1949  Sociology 195a–b (Social Legislation) was deleted and its contents were merged with courses 143 and 145, with Mrs. Fuller in charge. Sociology 141 (Juvenile Delinquency) was added.

1950  An additional instructor (Hambenne) was added to the staff. Sociology 185 was deleted and Sociology 203 (Cultural Contact and Change) was added. Enrollments had risen to 1,392 and there were approximately 90 students majoring in the department.

1951–55  Following the resignation of Professor Lebeaux, Dr. Mulligan joined the staff in 1953. Various curricular changes were made. Important additions were 185 (Sociology of the Family), 189 (Population Problems), 215 (History of Social Thought), 216 (Contemporary Social Theories), 210 (Individual and Group Psychology), 252 (Social Stratification), 253 (Group Dynamics), 293 (Rural Urban Communities), and 295 (Social Ecology). The social work major was approved and accredited as an undergraduate major by the National Council for Social Work Education.
1957-58  Professor Ralph Ireland (Ph.D. Chicago) appointed Head of the Department of Sociology.

1958-59  In June, 1959, Professor Ireland resigned as Head of the Department.

1959-60  Professor R. A. Mulligan appointed Acting Head of the Department of Sociology.

1960-61  Professor R. A. Mulligan continues as Acting Head.

1961-62  Professor R. A. Mulligan appointed Chairman of the Graduate Committee in Public Administration and continues as Acting Head of Sociology.

1962-63  The courses in social work, law enforcement and correctional administration are transferred from the Department of Sociology to the newly organized Department of Public Administration.

R. A. Mulligan is appointed Head of the new department. Professor Raymond Bowers is appointed Head of the Department of Sociology.

1963-64  The Department of Sociology is transferred to the College of Liberal Arts. A Ph.D. program in sociology is approved and will officially go into effect on July 1, 1964.
Biographical Note

At this point it seems appropriate to indicate the circuitous route I travelled before coming to the University of Arizona. Being a farm boy with two years of teaching in a country school near Wooster, Ohio, I left the farm for good at the age of twenty-one. I had saved $500 from my teaching which I used as a reserve fund to put me through two years of preparatory and four years of college. I landed at Goshen College for the spring term of 1907 and got my A.B. degree in 1912. I worked my way through college and got married in my senior year.

What to do next was decided by a fellowship in sociology at the University of Indiana. This started me on a course of graduate studies that did not stop short of seven years. I never had any assistance from my father and my course of action was conditioned by the necessity of our self-support.

At Indiana, I worked under Dr. Weatherly and had an introduction to social psychology under Dr. Lindley, who later became the President of Kansas University. I was enthusiastic over Weatherly's courses using Ward and Dealy's text in sociology, Warner's *American Charities*, Tylor's *Anthropology*, and Wine's *Punishment and Reformation*. I became interested in social work as a career and would, no doubt, have entered a graduate school of social work if any had been available in 1913 when I got my A.M. degree.
The prospect of going to Boston University School of Theology and financing myself by having a student parish, was urged upon me by the persuasive, outgoing Methodist minister, where we went to church. Three years in Boston had its appeal and we took a three-year detour to Boston University where I got the B.S.T. degree in 1916.

Boston, like Harvard, had its cherished traditions. And, like Harvard, with Peabody captivating students with his courses in social ethics, Boston University followed a similar course by adding Harry F. Ward to its faculty in the School of Theology, in 1913. Ward had formulated the social creed which was adopted by the Methodist Church in 1908 and by the Federal Council of Churches in 1912. These were initial steps, which, in the course of a decade, revolutionized the curricula of divinity schools across the country by orienting their students in the social behavioral sciences. I do not remember much that the orthodox theologians said except a review of Bowne's philosophy which, at that time, was popular in Boston in contrast with what James was teaching at Harvard.

I financed my years at Boston by having a student parish in a small village sixty miles from Boston. I did this also, while attending the University of Chicago where I had a student parish in a suburb adjacent to Cicero. I thus got my practical experience in one of the great social systems with its traditions, dogmas, myths,
symbolism, and rituals, which vary widely in the institutional structure of different denominational bodies. This detour to Boston proved to be valuable in itself but it turned my quest for knowledge in another direction—the University of Chicago.

At Chicago (1918-1920), I came into contact with a group of distinguished men under whom I studied—Small, Faris, Park, Burgess, Grayham Taylor, Edith Abbot (History of Philanthropy), Millis (Labor Problems), Field (Statistics), Hoban (Rural Church), Bedford (Rural Sociology), George Foster (Philosophy of Religion). I audited courses under such men as Shailer Mathews and others who were pioneering in different areas.

I left Chicago in 1920 before completing my work and, of necessity, took a temporary position at the University of Cincinnati for the second semester. I was then offered a position at Lawrence College, a Methodist College in Appleton, Wisconsin. After two years and a doctor’s recommendation for a change of climate for my wife, I made contact with Dr. E. J. Brown through Albert’s Teachers’ Agency and came to the University of Arizona for the fall term in 1922.

To round out my summary of seven years of graduate work at Indiana, Boston, Chicago, and Stanford, I was induced by an offer of a teaching assistant position to transfer my credits from Chicago and finish my work on my thesis and other requirements for the Ph.D. degree at Stanford. I had a sabbatical leave and spent two summers and one
regular session at Stanford 1928-1929. I had been pushed into economics at Lawrence College and again at the University of Arizona. In working out my residence requirements at Stanford, I took a minor in economics and a few courses in sociology.

At Stanford, I studied economics under Drs. Wildman and Haley and audited a course in theory given by Dr. Davenport of Cornell. In sociology, I had several courses under Drs. Beach and Reynolds, and audited a course given by Robert Redfield from Chicago. I completed my residence requirements and took my exams. On account of serious illness of my wife while we were in Palo Alto and for several years following our return, I did not finish my thesis until 1932 when I was given the Ph.D. degree.