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Professor of Mathematics and Modern Languages, Western Reserve Eclectic Institute, Hiram, Ohio, 1851-1859.

(From an Ambertype circa 1860 loaned by Miss Emma J. Scott.)
"The only exclusive sign of a thorough knowledge is the power of teaching."—Aristotle.

"But teach high thoughts and amiable words, And courtesies and desire of fame, And love of truth and all that makes a man."

—Tennyson.

"Norman Dunshee was a notable teacher—in fact he was one of the finest teachers, if not the finest, I ever had. I learned my Greek under his guidance in the years 1887 and 1888. My recollections of the man—of his astonishing ability and inspiring character—are among my treasured memories."

Those generous words were addressed to me by Dr. Louis B. Wilson, director of the Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research of the University of Minnesota, on learning that I was a member of the instructional staff of Drake University.³ His expressions were uttered with such fine feeling that they excited my curiosity to learn more about Norman Dunshee, and especially his influence in the formative days of Drake, in which institution he was professor of ancient languages—Greek, Hebrew and Latin—from September 20, 1881, to the day of his death, July 15, 1890.

Some time later, I addressed Dr. Wilson a letter asking if I might quote his words about Professor Dunshee and he sent me the following letter:

³The occasion was a luncheon at the Des Moines Club tendered Dr. Louis B. Wilson by Dr. Walter L. Bierring of Des Moines. Circa, November, 1924.
Professor Dunshee tutored me in Greek about three times a week for about a year during 1887 and 1888. I was at the time principal of the Julia Ward Howe School in South Des Moines. He was a very great inspiration to me. While he insisted with meticulous care on the accuracy of construction and renderings of translation, he went much further in inspiring one to study Greek history, conditions of Greek life and the best of Greek literature. While his tutoring was good, his talks, running far beyond the teaching hour, were vastly better. Confidentially, I have never quite gotten over my astonishment at finding such a scholarly gentleman of the old school buried in what seemed to me at the time a raw overgrown village. Breaking association with him was one of my deepest regrets when I left Des Moines in the fall of 1888 to teach in St. Paul, Minnesota.2

My desire to learn more of the life and work of Drake’s first professor of the classic languages was not lessened by the terms of Dr. Wilson’s letter and his gracious consent to make public use of it, and the following pages are the result.

Records of Professor Dunshee’s life of a documentary character, after his departure from Hiram, Ohio, in 1859, are very few. He left no diary or journal, so far as known. Few letters, either to or from him, have been preserved. He cared nothing for public mention of himself or doings. He practiced none of the tricks of the modern art of “publicity” by which he “kept himself conspicuously before the public.” Moreover, it was rare, if I may trust the personal recollections of familiars which I have been able to assemble, for him to enlarge upon his personal experiences or achievements in private conversation. He was interested almost wholly in his books, in his studies, and in the marvels of nature, of the earth and the heavens, and not in his own doings as objective subjects for discussion.

I

Norman Dunshee came of Scotch stock that sojourned for a time in northeastern Ireland before coming to New England in the eighteenth century. His grandfather, Robert Dunshee, settled in or near Walpole, New Hampshire, thence removing about 1790 to Bristol, Vermont. There his son William, the father of Norman, was born and reared. He was a member of a Vermont regiment in the war of 1812. In 1820 William Dunshee and his

---

2Dr. Louis B. Wilson to F. L. Herriott (MS), dated at Rochester, Minnesota, January 11, 1926.
wife, Lorain Turner, felt the urge that was then impelling so many New Englanders to seek homes in the West; and they, with their two children, emigrated to that noted tract known as the “Western Reserve” in northeastern Ohio. They settled on a farm near the town of Bedford in the southeastern corner of Cuyahoga County, some fifteen or more miles from Cleveland.

Norman Dunshee was born on January 24, 1822. He was the third of eight children, having three brothers and four sisters. Until he reached his seventeenth year his schooling was meager, having but little of what was then called common school training. But what he did receive inspired him with an earnest desire and a definite purpose to secure more. His parents had the Scotch traditions, and like all good New Englanders, gave him as much schooling as their slender means permitted.

In 1839 Norman Dunshee was sent to what was then known as the Bissell Academy, or Twinsburg Institute, located in Summit County, ten miles or so to the east of Bedford. There he experienced the good fortune to come under the beneficent influence of a forceful teacher, the founder, a graduate of Yale College, Rev. Samuel Bissell, who proved to be an inspiring instructor who stirred the imaginations of his students and aroused their ambition and energies. Like the Dominie in Drumtoochy he had an “unerring scent for a lad o’ pairts” and a keen eye that could “detect a scholar in the egg,” and could prophesy “Latinity” in his promising lads.

Two years in the academy at Twinsburg under Mr. Bissell convinced Norman Dunshee and his parents that he had the
“pairts” for a scholar. His ambition was aroused to secure if possible a college education. But the family’s meager resources in those pioneer days created a “dour” perplexity. The rule of Drumtochty, however, prevailed in the Dunshee household: “... if Domsie approved a lad, then his brothers and sisters would give their wages and the family would live on skim milk and oat cake to let him have his chance.” Robert Dunshee, his elder brother, because he was strong and his sturdy strength was much needed on the farm, put aside his hopes and plans and joined with the family in aiding the ambition of his capable younger brother.

II

In the fall of 1841 Norman Dunshee entered the freshman class of Western Reserve College, then located at Hudson in the central portion of Summit County, a few miles south and west of Twinsburg. He found himself in a class of seventeen. For the next four years he pursued the course of studies then prescribed in what the cynical learned Quid Nuncs of these days of extra-curricular activities would call the “cast-iron curriculum” wherein the ancient classics and the so-called “humanities”—namely, Greek, Latin, and mathematics—tyrannized novitiates in their freshman and sophomore years, with some diversions in the junior and senior years in logic, philosophy and theology. It was a drastic discipline for ambitious young collegians to master those stern and stiff subjects. Few then scouted their beneficence in preparation for life or flouted the wisdom of enforcing their acquisition for they were almost universally held to be basic requirements in a liberal culture and essential to success.

At Western Reserve College young Dunshee again came under the influence and direction of Yale men. One might say with truth that the institution was an offshoot of Yale College, both general and specific reasons warranting the assumption. It was established in the heart of the “Connecticut Reserve” as the Western Reserve was not infrequently called; and its faculty

---

4The specific assertions above concerning the history of the Dunshee family rest upon data obtained from a genealogical record (MS), prepared by Dr. E. C. Scott, son-in-law of Professor Dunshee, now in the possession of his daughter, Miss Emma Scott, registrar of Drake University since 1917.

5In 1882 Western Reserve College was removed to Cleveland and called Adelbert College. Later it was given the name of Western Reserve University, Adelbert College being devoted to liberal arts.
NORMAN DUNSHEE

consisted chiefly of Yale alumni. Needless to say the young man came into an academic atmosphere and environment that encouraged high ideals and started him in right lines of scholastic endeavor.

All of his teachers immediately discovered that the young man from Bedford was a very interesting type of student. In each subject pursued he seemed to be especially interested and, moreover, he was at once apt and earnest, alert and effective in both study and exposition, his mind easily discerning and grasping the basic facts and primary principles in the subjects canvassed. His mental alertness and agility in learning, however, were manifest in modes that indicated a marked character. He was very mild and modest in manner and demonstration—in fact he seemed backward to the point of meekness and timidity. There was no ostentation. He was not of the sort that always has a hand waving aloft to indicate that he can recite or “tell the class what is what.” But his meekness and reticence did not mean uncertainty of knowledge or judgment, or fluttering perplexity in recitation. He knew his conjugations and declensions, paradigms and formulae, and could differentiate the aorist tense in Greek from a handsaw, or a triangle.

During his four years in college Norman Dunshee devoted more time to Greek and Latin, French and German than to other subjects. But one instructor, however, another Yale man, Elias Loomis, professor of mathematics, exerted a marked influence upon the young man from the Twinsburg Academy. Professor Loomis was then rapidly gaining a national reputation for his researches in the field of astronomy. In fact his fame was spreading abroad because of the importance of his reports of his investigations. It was not long before Professor Loomis was interested in young Dunshee’s ability in mathematics; and it was not difficult to lure him into the class in astronomy.

He was soon fascinated with the kaleidoscopic phenomena in the vault of the heavens. Ever after, although his major work in his daily routine might be instruction in mathematics or in the classics, Norman Dunshee’s fondest diversion from the common round of everyday tasks was observations of the movements of the stars in their orbits and the relations of the constellations
to our solar system. The vast spaciousness and the magnificent
certainties or regularities of stellar phenomena entranced him.

Astronomy so enthralled his mind and heart in his evening
hours that his students often found him making calculations of
the movements of stars, or the angle of vision for locating certain
planets or stars by very simple but correct procedure. Lacking
all of the necessary instruments he would set stakes in the ground,
some short and some longer, set with reference to some particular
star, and then prone on the ground he would make his observa-
tions as to distance, direction or rate of movement of the star
in which he was interested. Often in his talks to the faculties
and students of Oskaloosa College, Abingdon College, and Drake
University at chapel or assemblies the marvels of the heavens
would be the theme of his discourse and his words would be
luminous with the glow of his thoughts as his mind in imagina-
tion swept the vast reaches of the stellar spaces. For him the
Psalmist proclaimed both the law and gospel: “The heavens
declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handi-
work.”

III

On account of a plentiful lack of funds young Dunshee could
not attend his classes regularly at Western Reserve College. He
had to stay out for the major part of two academic years to earn
money to carry on. He engaged in teaching for the most part
and in some part in working on his father’s farm or for neighbors.

Such unavoidable diversion from his class work did not, how-
ever, dissipate his scholastic interests or lessen his concentration
in attaining his academic goal posts. He was little given to
dawdling or to spending his time and energies in social affairs,
such as games, picnics or sports. Apparently he avoided most
of such ordinary human byplay, not because he deemed himself
above such, but he simply was not interested, and his diffident
nature also held him back from taking a constant or prominent
part in the boisterous play of his companions in his hours free
from the exactions of the day’s work.

He made arrangements with his instructors at Western Re-

---

6 Gov. George W. Clarke to F. L Herrriott. (MS) letter dated at Adel, Iowa,
December 28, 1884. Gov. Clarke was student in Professor Dunshee’s classes at
Oskaloosa College during 1876-77.
serve College to carry on with his class work in absentia. He had made such a substantial reputation for definite, reliable and solid work as a student that permission was readily granted. He was the type of student who is persistent in his scholastic work outside of the classroom or lecture hall and does not need the constant spur of the supervising instructor to incite him to work. He pursued his assignments with steady progress and attended at intervals to Hudson to take his examinations. Despite his handicap, he kept abreast of his classmates in residence, completed his class requirements and graduated with them at the commencement of 1845.

IV

A very definite, and indeed notable, sign of the high appraisal of Norman Dunshee’s academic work at Western Reserve College was indicated by the members of the faculty a few years after his graduation.

In 1847 the Yale Chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society (Alpha of Connecticut)—the third chapter to be authorized by the famous first honorary scholastic fraternity at William and Mary College of Virginia—granted a charter to Western Reserve College. It was the first chapter to be sanctioned west of the Appalachian Mountains. Its charter members were five Yale alumni, namely President George E. Peirce ('16), and Professors Elijah P. Barrows ('26), Henry N. Day ('28), Samuel St. John ('34), Nathan P. Seymour ('34), and James Mooney ('38).

After the organization of a chapter the first important function is the selection and election of the first, or as the parlance of the fraternity would phrase it, the “foundation” members. Both the academic and the lay public look upon those initial elections as the most distinctive honors awarded by the fraternity. The charter members canvassed the graduates of thirteen classes from 1834 to 1847. They announced and elected some twenty-six of the alumni—one each from five classes, three from each of three classes, and five each from the three classes of 1844, 1845 and 1846. Among those selected for the class of 1845 was Norman Dunshee.⁷

⁷Among his confreres in that list of foundation members were a number who achieved distinction in academic circles, in physical science and in public affairs: Samuel B. Axtell ('44), governor of New Mexico; Charles W. Clapp ('44), pro-
It is not certain whether Norman Dunshee's purpose in seeking a collegiate education was a career in the Christian ministry or in teaching. His graduate work in theology suggests that the Christian ministry was his first objective and controlling desire. But preaching and teaching were so interrelated—in fact in the philosophy of the religious group to which he belonged they were part and parcel of life's educational processes—were corollaries. Certain it is that in his college days he was a "student preacher" who during much of the time filled a pulpit on Sunday, and anon conducted evangelistic meetings, namely "protracted meetings" or revivals.

His people were members of a religious brotherhood known as Disciples of Christ, resulting in the beginning from a schism or split in the old Presbyterian church of southwestern Pennsylvania, led by Alexander Campbell and his father, Thomas, because of their dislike of and disbelief as to the beneficence of the formalism of the Old Presbyterian creed. Their secession was not unlike the movement in the old Episcopal church of

fessor of rhetoric and English literature at Iowa College (now Grinnell College), 1864-71; George Hoadly ('44), professor of law, Cincinnati Law School, 1864-87, and governor of Ohio; Darius Lyman, Jr. ('29), professor of English language and literature, Ohio University, 1856-53, and literary editor Century Magazine; John S. Newberry ('46), professor of geology and natural history, Columbia University, 1857-66, geologist and paleontologist School of Mines, *ibid.*, 1866-90; Halbert E. Paine, member of Thirty-ninth, Fortieth and Forty-first Congresses; William D. Sanders ('45), professor of English literature, etc., Illinois College, 1854-69, and founder of Illinois Conservatory of Music, *ibid.* Norman Dunshee was in a goodly company of scholars who were also men of achievement in the world of affairs.*

It is not inappropriate here to mention sundry facts that have a sentimental bearing upon the life of the subject of the narrative. It was in Norman Dunshee's alma mater, Western Reserve University, at Cleveland, on September 12, 1922, that the Triennial Council of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa voted a charter for the establishment of a Chapter at Drake in whose service Norman Dunshee spent the last years of his life. Further, anticipating the narrative somewhat, his wife, Calista O. Carleton, on her maternal line goes back to the clan of Elisha Parmelee of Connecticut, a graduate of William and Mary College, class of 1778, to whom the Alpha Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa of Virginia granted the charter for both the chapters of Harvard and Yale.** Finally, four of Norman Dunshee's grandchildren—three granddaughters and a grandson—received golden keys from the Drake chapter for their superior scholastic work; and one, Norman Dunshee Scott (1916), was one of Iowa's Rhodes Scholars at Oxford between 1916 and 1920; and on Oxford's *imprimatur* the words "With Distinction" were engrossed thereon. Incidentally in physical features, as well as in mental abilities, the latter resembles his grandairie. He has been for some years in charge of one of the most important divisions of chemical research of the DuPont company at their plant at Niagara Falls.

*Voorhees: Phi Beta Kappa General Catalog, p. 733.

**Voorhees, op. cit., pp. 257, 787.

[Professor Horrill, an Alumnus of Grinnell College, and a member of its Beta Chapter, was Drake's Correspondent, who marshalled the evidence of Drake's scholastic standards and the achievements of her Alumni and presented it to the Triennial Council at Cleveland that resulted in favorable action of Drake's application.—E. R. H., Editor of ANNALS.]
England which led to the establishment of the Methodist Episcopal church in England and in this country.

The year following his graduation Mr. Dunshee taught school and in the fall of 1846 he re-entered Western Reserve College, registering for work in the theological department and for the next two years pursued courses in Hebrew, homiletics, Old and New Testament, obtaining his Master of Arts degree at the conclusion of his work in 1848. In the fall of that year he was asked by his former principal, Rev. Bissell, to come back to Twinsburg Academy as an instructor, and for the next three years he was on the teaching staff of that institution. Here he steadily enhanced his reputation as a scholar and as an effective teacher of both mathematics and languages. This fact was signalized and proclaimed on October 14, 1851, when the trustees of the recently organized Western Reserve Eclectic Institute located at Hiram, in Portage County, about fifteen miles east of Twinsburg, on the recommendation of the principal, A. S. Hayden, elected Norman Dunshee professor of mathematics and modern languages.

As Dunshee's career from that time forward increases in public activity and interest, the beginnings of the institution at Hiram, where he taught for the ensuing eight years, and the character of his associates in that collegiate community, become a matter of no little significance in interpreting his character, his career and his experiences.

VI

The promoters and founders of Western Reserve Eclectic Institute were all members of the church of the Disciples. Several considerations or objectives controlled their efforts in seeking to establish the institution. They deemed education in the broad cultural sense of the term essential to an effective ministry in their church; they considered it of marked advantage "to the cause of Christ" to have "a school for qualifying preachers of the gospel for their duties." Thus Section 1 of their articles of incorporation, adopted May 7, 1850, concludes with the injunc-

8Among his instructors were Laures P. Hickok in theology; Elijah P. Barrows in sacred literature; Henry N. Day in homiletics; and Nathan P. Seymour in Greek and Latin. Each achieved distinction in later years.
tion that the funds of the institution shall only be used for 

... the instruction of the youth of both sexes in the various branches of literature and science, especially of moral science as based on the facts and precepts of the Holy Scriptures.10

That language should be borne in mind in appraising later developments.

Another consideration turned about the slavery question. The Institute was established in 1850 and that was the year of the culmination of the excitement in the country over the rights of slaveholders under the Constitution and the passage of the celebrated Clay Compromise containing the sections known as the Fugitive Slave Law, clothing Federal officers with the right to apprehend and return fugitive slaves to their owners.

The majority of the leaders in the movement to establish the Eclectic Institute at Hiram consisted of strong antislavery men. They were residents of the Connecticut or Western Reserve, which was notably antagonistic to slavery. It was the district made famous in Congress and the nation by Joshua R. Giddings, whose flaming words in opposition to the claims of slave owners so stirred Congress. Further, Alexander Campbell, president of Bethany College, located in the panhandle of the Old Dominion, had so far countenanced slavery as to counsel his faculty to submit to the commands of the Constitution and the Fugitive Slave Law, and this course at Bethany alienated many in northeast Ohio. Hence, as one of the first students of Hiram informs us in his Reminiscences, the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute was founded because the friends of abolitionism distrusted the proslavery sentiments that seemed to dominate at Bethany College.11

Another base fact in the developments to be related was the location and size of the town of Hiram. It was distant twelve miles from a railroad. Its population was roundabout 1,200. The

11Fuller, Reminiscences of James A. Garfield, p. 29. Garfield was so disturbed by the favorable attitude towards slavery manifested at Bethany College that he decided to go to Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts. See extract from a letter of Garfield's (addressee not stated) reproduced in Whitley Reid's Ohio in War, Vol. I, p. 741, in which he gives as his second reason for not going to Bethany "2nd, Bethany leans too heavily towards slavery."
faculty and students of the Institute constituted the major portion of the population. Discussion of any moot question—be it academic, economic, political, social, or theological—which aroused any feeling pro or con caused the same sort of commotion that usually prevails within family circles when dissension disturbs their peace. Feeling is wont to well up. It is intense and energetic in expression, anon explosive. The disputants are so closely connected and each and sundry are simultaneously taking part. Coolness and clearness of vision and comprehension, caution and charity of judgment and equitable consideration seldom control council and decisions.

The foregoing facts constitute the base line for estimating the controversies which soon raged within Hiram's Academia in the latter half of that decade of the "Fatal Fifties."

VII

Norman Dunshee found himself at Hiram instructing an interesting group of ambitious young aspirants for knowledge and classic culture—among them Misses Almeda A. Booth, Calista

College, he was always outspoken in expressing his personal dislike of slavery as an institution, as was his notable father, Thomas Campbell, before him. As editor of The Millennial Harbinger, a monthly publication of the Disciples, he frankly declared that ideally he would like to see slavery disappear, but he was unqualifiedly opposed to any drastic measures that smacked of or squinted towards abolition or confiscation of the property rights of the owners of slaves. He favored, as Henry Clay of Kentucky had steadily urged, emancipation with compensation of the owners and the colonization of the freedmen in Africa, as the American Colonization Society advocated. See Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. I, pp. 494-501; Vol. II, pp. 566-69.

In current discussion and political propaganda affecting slavery Alexander Campbell both before and following the Mexican War declared openly that slavery was a part of the constitutional order of the land and radical agitation against it among churchmen and educators was therefore not in order. Against the belligerent churchmen who were so active in disturbing the peace in opposition to the institution he countered with copious citations from the Old and New Testaments showing that churchmen could not question the righteousness of the relations of masters and slaves. Therefore, members of the Christian churches should carefully refrain from advocating abolition, or conniving at the escape of slaves, or encouraging any seditious programs to arouse Negroes to revolt. See Millennial Harbinger, Series III, Vol. II, pp. 258, 259, 259.

In view of Garfield's adverse attitude towards Alexander Campbell's position and the course of Bethany College towards slavery in 1854, and his decision to go to Williams College in consequence it is pertinent to observe that Garfield and the Board of Trustees of Hiram's Eclectic Institute took precisely the same position on slavery that Campbell did in their controversy with Norman Dunshee in 1859. See Sections X, XI, XII, post.
O. Carleton, Lucretia Rudolph, and Messrs. Corydon E. Fuller, Burke A. Hinsdale, James A. Garfield, and Charles D. Wilber—all of those then made the college community and later the public at large aware of their abilities and strong characters. They were alert, earnest, enthusiastic students, driven by a religious zeal to acquire the best and the most that was worth while in the classic lore of the world; and who pushed themselves and their instructors with their feverish effort.  

In physical appearance Norman Dunshee must have been a young man of note, if we can trust the ambrotypes taken during his sojourn in Hiram. He was slender and tall—nearly six feet in height. His head was well formed and proportioned and covered with a shock of reddish hair. His face was broad, his lower jaw firm and pronounced, his mouth large and lips firm, his forehead high and broad and eyes blue-grey and with a keen piercing look. The one which forms the frontispiece was taken about 1859 or 1860 when he left Hiram, and the other which forms one of the group comprising the Board of Education was taken sometime in his first years in Hiram. Although instruction in mathematics and French and German constituted his daily class load, Dunshee’s familiarity with Greek  

12According to all accounts, Miss Almeda A. Booth was a young woman of remarkable mental ability, attractive personality and pre-eminently successful as a teacher. She exerted a potent influence upon the inner circle at Hiram. Garfield’s Memorial Address at Hiram on June 22, 1876, when he was then near the height of his fame as a national leader, expressed his appreciation of her life and character in superlative terms. He asserts without reservation that her abilities and achievement were superior to Margaret Fuller’s in range, strength and accomplishment. The address was reprinted and its dedication read: “To the thousands of men and women whose generous ambition was awakened, whose early culture was guided, and whose lives have been made nobler, by the thoroughness of her instruction, by the wisdom of her counsel, by the faithfulness of her friendship, and the purity of her life, this tribute to the memory of Almeda A. Booth is affectionately dedicated.”—Works of Garfield, pp. 290-319. Miss Booth became one of the instructors at Hiram.  

Mr. Corydon E. Fuller was for many years a resident of Des Moines, Iowa, and was prominent in business and church circles. He was one of the original trustees of Drake University. He was one of the organizers of the Iowa Loan and Trust Company that for many years was a conspicuously successful banking institution. His Reminiscences of Garfield and the many letters of Garfield to Fuller constitute the chief source of information about Garfield’s career at Hiram outside of the latter’s diary. From 1881 to 1887 Mr. Fuller was a trustee and also treasurer of Drake University.  

Mr. Charles D. Wilber was one of the first four instructors at the Eclectic Institute, being professor of natural science. He accompanied Garfield to Williams College in 1854. He was slender and short and Garfield was six feet and sturdy. The two attracted no little attention at Williams. Being from the “wild west” their New England fellow students at the outset looked askance at them. A classmate, S. P. Hubbell, thus wrote of them: “... their position at first was a very isolated and peculiar one, and which was enhanced by a whisper that soon circulated among the students that they were Campbellites. Now what that meant, or what tenets the sect held, nobody seemed to know, but it was supposed to mean something awful,” quoted in Smith’s Life of James A. Garfield, I, p. 81.
and Latin and Hebrew caused him either to be drafted or allured into teaching his ardent and admiring pupils Greek and Latin. Apparently all of this extra curricular activity was for pure love of study and teaching those who were equally in love with his subjects.

The amount and character of Dunshee’s teaching at Hiram, the efficiency of his instruction, the range of his learning and side lights upon his nature and character may best be shown by excerpts from letters, diaries and memoranda of his students at Hiram, some of whom were later colleagues of his in Hiram’s teaching staff.

In his Reminiscences of President Garfield Corydon E. Fuller records, after thirty-five years, his recollections of Professor Dunshee’s work at Hiram:

Professor Dunshee was teacher of both Greek and Latin; he also had occasional students in Hebrew, German and French. Drake University now (1886) has the advantage of his profound scholarship, which even thirty years ago was recognized by all competent to judge.\(^{13}\)

\[\ldots\] Norman Dunshee was the peer in scholarship of the ablest professors in the best colleges of New England.\(^{14}\)

In his historical sketch of the career of the Institute and in his volume on Garfield, Mr. Burke A. Hinsdale, who was professor of history and president at Hiram from 1870 to 1882, and later professor of teaching in the University of Michigan from 1886 to his death in 1900, gives us the following characterization of Dunshee:

[He was] by far the first scholar in the early Hiram group; and all things considered perhaps the most learned man who ever taught on the hill.\(^{15}\)

On his arrival at Hiram in August, 1851, Mr. Garfield took up his studies. \ldots\ To Dunshee he probably recited more than to all the rest put together. Garfield always appreciated and respected his Hiram teachers. \ldots^{16}

Garfield himself has told of the strenuous days of study practiced by some of the group mentioned above. In his memorial address upon the “Life and Character of Miss Almeda A. Booth” delivered at Hiram, June 22, 1876, he tells in some detail of the

\(^{13}\) Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

\(^{14}\) *ibid.*, p. 127.

\(^{15}\) Hinsdale, *The Eclectic Institute*, p. 11.

\(^{16}\) Hinsdale, *President Garfield and Education*, p. 27.
various studies in Greek and Latin which they pursued under the tutorship of Professor Dunshee. For two years they studied together. Xenophon’s Anabasis was first compassed. Then

During the winter and spring terms of 1853 she read Xenophon’s Memorabilia entire, reciting to Professor Dunshee. In the summer vacation of 1853, twelve of the more advanced students engaged Professor Dunshee as the tutor for one month. John Harmit, H. W. Everest, Philip Burns, C. C. Foote, Miss Booth and myself were of the number. A literary society was formed, in which all took part. During those four weeks, besides taking an active part in the literary exercises of the society, Miss Booth read thoroughly, and for the first time, the Pastorals of Virgil—that is, the Georgics and the Bucolics entire—and the first six of Homer’s Iliad, accompanied by a thorough drill in the Latin or Greek grammar at each recitation.

During the fall term of 1853 she read one hundred pages of Heroditus and about the same amount of Livy. During that term Professors Dunshee and Hull and Miss Booth and I met at her room two evenings of each week, to make a joint translation of the book of Romans. Professor Dunshee contributed his studies of the German commentators De Wette and Tholuck; our work was more thorough than rapid, for I find this entry in my diary for December 15, 1853: “Translation Society sat three hours at Miss Booth’s room, and agreed upon the translation of three verses.”

During the winter term of 1853–54, she continued to read Livy, and also read the whole of Demosthenes’ On the Crown. During the spring term of 1854–5 she read the Germania and Agrícola of Tacitus and a portion of Hesiod.

Enough, perhaps, has been offered to demonstrate the solid grounds for Norman Dunshee’s reputation for extensive, thoroughgoing and profound scholarship and effective instruction in the subjects which he essayed to teach. But I offer the observation of one more commentator, namely, the author of the first notable biography of President Garfield, Dr. Theodore C. Smith, professor of history in Williams College, published by the Yale Press in 1925. Noting the developments in the beginnings and course of Garfield’s academic work at Hiram he says:

By the winter term of 1852–53 Garfield had about exhausted the resources of the Eclectic except in the classics. In order to continue his Latin and Greek under Norman Dunshee, a teacher who had a considerably deeper scholarship than most of his colleagues, he assumed the

functions of teacher, and took charge of the introductory classes in arithmetic, grammar, and Greek.\(^{18}\)

Garfield's assumption of the elementary classes last named was no doubt due to their desire to relieve Professor Dunshee of the drudgery and burden of his daily class load in order that he might do the advanced work in Greek and Latin.

Two minor notations in Green's *History* indicate that Professor Dunshee's activities and horizon were not confined to the classroom at Hiram. It would appear that he was an acceptable preacher and not a little sought after as an effective public speaker, or perhaps better, as a lecturer. He quotes from a memorandum of Mr. J. H. Rhodes (one of the "Board of Education" of five to be mentioned later) in reference to the efforts to secure the religious conversion of students in the Institute, written September 27, 1857:

... the school (by which is meant the teachers) is doing for the religious interests of the school and society. Brother Everest up to this time has spoken twice, Brother Garfield twice, and Brother Dunshee several times.\(^{19}\)

Referring to the notable success of the Philomathean Society organized September 1, 1852, in which Corydon Fuller, Philip Burns, James A. Garfield and Charles D. Wilber were members, Mr. Green says:

The most brilliant period in the history of this society was the winter of 1853-54. Its meetings were public and all who cared to do so attended. Such subjects as secular history, church history, prophecy, phrenology, geology, and logic and rhetoric, were discussed in twenty-minute lectures, by James A. Garfield, H. W. Everest, ... , Norman Dunshee. ...

Orris C. Atwater considered it "the most brilliant society ever gathered on the Hill." Mr. Henry M. James says, "It was supported by ... a very remarkable body of men."

B. A. Hinsdale says: "... Night after night I climbed the east hill, sometimes in rain and darkness, to hear those wonderful debates and lectures."\(^{20}\)

In view of subsequent events to be narrated later the following excerpt from Hinsdale's biography of Garfield prepared for the Republican National Committee for use in the presidential campaign of 1880 is interesting:

\(^{18}\)Smith, op. cit., p. 58.

\(^{19}\)Green, op. cit., p. 112.

\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. 61.
Garfield’s associates [in the Eclectic Institute] were able and effective teachers and esteemed by their pupils.\textsuperscript{21}

All accounts and recollections agree that Norman Dunshee was a lucid, forceful lecturer and preacher, setting forth his sentiments and views on any subject in hand in concise, convincing English, with earnestness rather than eloquence, although fine feelings and alert imagination often stirred his hearers more deeply than the orotund tones and theatrical demonstration of more eloquent and spectacular speakers.

In a letter to her classmate, Corydon Fuller, written at Mantua, Ohio, under date of June 24, 1855, Miss Booth gives us a hint of the impression her instructor in Greek and Latin made upon his students, and others who came in working relations with him:

I was at Hiram Thursday to their Exhibition. It was down in the corner under the apple trees. . . . And Bro. Munnell was there, looking as earnest and determined as ever; and Norman, too. Time deals kindly with him; his lank face has assumed fuller proportions, and he looks more noble.\textsuperscript{22}

The latter observation, coming from one of such force of character and marked reserve as Miss Booth, was no idle remark or transient feeling. It imparted a feeling significant of something more than respect for the character of her guide in the study of the classics; indeed we may suspect that it approximates reverence for his character and mind and heart.

Some of the tributes quoted were expressions when life was naught but a glorious adventure for them, and their hearts were young, and idealism held their lives in thrall. Some were expressed after the lapse of years, when the actors had removed from the stage of action and were cool judgments winnowed from the memories of the years. They should be noted for they are important in measuring the course of some of them when clashing interests split the happy circle of students and teachers asunder in bitter dissension and acrimonious contention.

VIII

An episode that occurred at the first Lyceum inaugurated at Hiram by the Women’s Olive Branch Literary Society in 1852

\textsuperscript{22}Fuller, op. cit., pp. 194-95; quoted in Green, op. cit., pp. 111-12.
may have some significance. It indicates the influence of Miss Booth, and also her appreciation of her instructor in the classics.

A paragraph from the Memorial of the society’s reunion in 1877 gives us an outline of it:

An incident occurred at this Lyceum which shows the authority of Miss Booth over the young ladies. Some one reported that Mr. Dunshee had said, “Women have no souls.” This report was made the text of an article called “Mohammedanism in Hiram.” The editor of the paper began to read this piece, which had been smuggled into its pages. The audience had listened long enough to perceive the direction of the thought, when Miss Booth arose from her seat, took the paper from the young lady’s hand, saying, “This article has never been submitted to the inspection of the proper authority. Its reading can proceed no further.”

The alleged remark of the Professor of Mathematics may have been a facetious fling of a student who sought thus to have some fun at the expense of a very reserved, stoical or timid professor arising out of developments then in progress, to be referred to later. Or the cynical observation may have been made by him in repartee in the give-and-take of the camaraderie of the inner circle with which she was associated. That it should have been recorded in the memoranda of the reunion of the members of the Olive Branch a quarter of a century after the incident occurred is suggestive. Despite his diffidence and serious demeanor he may have had a lively sense of humor and anon indulged it. Further, the students apparently were much aware of him and his influence in the student life and signified it by that sort of facetiousness.

But the use of the alleged remark may have had another explanation. Mr. Dunshee, ad interim, had found that his heart and soul were not exclusively fascinated by the variations in the inflections of Greek words, or by the length of the roots or stems of Latin derivatives; and for a time, we may suspect that even

... the Glory that was Greece
And the grandeur that was Rome

did not hold his entire attention or engage his energies in all his waking hours. For he found himself distracted in a very human sort of way.

Among his associates of the teaching staff, and mayhap a

---

member of some of his advanced classes, was a young lady of vivacious personality, possessed of an alert, keen mind, with a witty tongue, and with a marked sense of the dramatic in the ordinary round of life. Moreover she had a pair of flashing brown eyes, one, in the words of Milton,

... whose bright eyes
Rain influence.

and their influence, e'er he was aware of it, began to affect him seriously. The young lady was the instructor in the primary department, Miss Calista O. Carleton, of Sullivan, Ohio. She had in her veins the blood of the clan of Elisha Parmelee and of Horace Mann and Will Carleton, the poet.

Miss Carleton from the outset at Hiram was one of the forceful members of the inner circle of the Institute. She had dramatic ability that won applause. In those first years the older students annually composed original dramatic productions which they called "colloquies" and presented them publicly in the course of the spring term. They were based usually upon some notable historic incident in Greek, Roman, Hebrew or medieval history, each student contributing more or less to the production. They were deemed the most noteworthy events of the year save commencement. Of Miss Carleton's part in the Colloquy of 1852 Mr. Fuller recorded in his Journal under date of June 25: "Miss Calista O. Carleton surpassed all the ladies and James Garfield did nobly."24 Among her papers are a number of poems which indicate that she had a facile pen and an eye for poetic form.

A cluster of facts should be noted and kept in mind in the ensuing narrative for they have no little significance in the course of events. Professor Dunshee boarded and roomed for two years at the home of Mr. Zeb Rudolph, one of the trustees of the Institute. He was also the father of Miss Lucretia Rudolph, who later became Mrs. James A. Garfield. Mrs. Bruce A. Hinsdale (nee Mary E. Turner) was a cousin of Mr. Dunshee.25 There was a close friendship between Misses Carleton and Rudolph and Miss Almeda A. Booth. All three were at Oberlin together, and Miss Carleton and Miss Rudolph were roommates. Professor

24 Fuller, op. cit., p. 56.
Dunshee and Miss Carleton were married on August 10, 1853, in Hiram. James A. Garfield and Miss Rudolph were married November 11, 1858.

The close relationships of those first years constituted a notable fact in the painful controversies which divided and wracked the peaceful community of Hiram in the years 1857 to 1859, and probably they give us the explanation of much of the bitterness that spoiled their lives and obliterated their happy memories of their first days together.

IX

We come now to what was probably the most painful experience in the quiet life of Norman Dunshee."

Beginning in 1855 and increasing during the ensuing two years there developed discontent with Principal Hayden's administration of the Eclectic Institute. He was by predisposition and experience a preacher rather than an executive. But his earnest pioneer work in establishing the Institute, and faithful devotion to its welfare created much sympathy for him. Controversy waxed. Much bitterness disturbed counsel. The contention reached a climax in 1857 with the retirement of the principal.

Garfield's success at Williams College led to his being asked to return to Hiram after his graduation in 1856 as a teacher. His many admirers soon started a movement to make him president. Two of his colleagues, Harvey W. Everest and Norman

26 For the facts in the narrative in Sections IX-XVII I am under heavy obligations to the following named persons:

To Hon. James R. Garfield, attorney of Cleveland, for permission to examine his father's correspondence and papers deposited in the Library of Congress—his permission graciously given in full view of my statement of general concurrence with the views of Messrs. T. C. Smith and R. G. Caldwell in their respective biographies of President Garfield; to Dr. Herbert Putnam and his assistants in the Library of Congress for courtesies and aid promptly given as many times in the past; to Dr. Theodore C. Smith, professor of history in Williams College for permission to cite and quote from his Life and Letters of James Abram Garfield, and to his publishers, The Yale Press; to Hon. Robert G. Caldwell, sometime professor of history in Rice Institute, Houston, Texas, now minister to the Court of Portugal at Lisbon, for permission to cite and quote from his James A. Garfield, Party Chief (American Political Series, Allan Nevins, editor), and to his publishers, Dodd, Mead and Co., New York City; and to Professor Harold E. Davis of the Department of History of Hiram College for many courtesies and valuable aid generously given.

27 The high esteem in which Harvey W. Everest was held by that little coterie of students and teachers working with Norman Dunshee in those early days is suggested in the following extract from a letter of Miss Booth to Corydon Fuller, written at Oberlin, April 13, 1835: "Harvey Everest is teaching an academy in Shalersville and is very popular. He is a noble fellow." Fuller, op. cit., p. 186.

Mr. Everest after graduating from Oberlin (1861) was Garfield's successor as principal of Hiram for two years, 1862-64. When he resigned to accept the presidency of Eureka College in Illinois the trustees of Hiram passed a resolution in which they spoke in strong terms of laudation, among other things saying
Dunshee, opposed the retirement of the principal and the advancement of Garfield. They charged him with “plotting to get the principalship.” Various considerations may have constrained their attitude and actions. Garfield was less than twenty-five years of age, and he had but recently been a pupil of the elder man. Some suspected him of “advanced views” on religion. The conservatives of the community favored Dunshee’s elevation because of his just reputation as a scholar and his “safe” notions on theological matters.

Another serious matter divided friends. The slavery question was splitting the heavens. Garfield, although he had plunged into the political campaign of 1856, advocating the election of Fremont for president, was far from being an abolitionist of the Garrisonian type or Giddings species. Dunshee seems to have been rather pronounced in his views. But there were a number of conservatives on the Board of Trustees who regarded abolitionism as “red radicalism,” just as today communism is so regarded by the property owning classes. Of this, however, more later.

The trustees avoided a decisive settlement and compromised. They put the academic administration in charge of what they called a “Board of Education” consisting of Garfield, Dunshee, Everest, Rhodes and Miss Booth. Garfield was elected chairman by them and thus became virtually the executive head. The animosity in the community naturally affected the members of that board. At the end of the academic year Garfield was made president and the Board of Education ceased.

Dr. Robert G. Caldwell, professor of history in Rice Institute, asserts that the “natural choice of a successor” to Principal Hayden “would have given the appointment to Professor Norman Dunshee, a sound classical scholar”; and the election of

that he “was one of the ablest teachers of this Institute.” Green, op. cit., pp. 135-56. He was thereafter successively president of Butler University in Indianapolis, 1881-82; of Garfield University, Hutchinson, Kansas, 1886-90. He was called to the presidency of Drake's College of Letters and Science in 1888, but he felt that he owed his energies to Garfield University then struggling against financial distress. He came to Drake in 1897 and for two years as dean of the Bible College. Ill health cut short his work, and death came on May 29, 1900. He was buried in Woodland Cemetery, Des Moines, near by Norman Dunshee's grave. Had he come to Drake in 1888, there is reason to believe that he would have succeeded Chancellor George T. Carpentor as the executive head of Drake.

28Smith, op. cit., p. 129.
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Garfield was a "bitter blow to the disappointed Dunshee." These assertions may be natural inferences from the records, but I venture to question the probability of their entire verity.

The admirers of Professor Dunshee naturally would have urged his appointment as a matter of personal friendship, but would the majority of them have deemed him naturally fitted for such an executive position with its endless clutter of detail and urgent executive decisions involving increasing clusters of aggravating human complications? We may doubt it.

Professor Dunshee was a scholastic of the old-time sort. He was interested primarily in his books, heedless of many of the prosaic matters that affect, and anon determine, success in administration. He was modest and reticent to a point that suggested timidity, although he was a clear-cut thinker, definite and precise. Moreover, he was intense in his feelings and if he felt strongly he spoke out strongly in those days—not always a prudent thing to do, for an executive. He might have succeeded as the chairman of a company of scholars within cloistered halls; but had he been selected he would have failed sadly amidst the inertia on one side and on the other the everlasting clash of human interests and the ceaseless muss of things.

Dunshee must have been fully aware of his lack of the essentials for an executive. He did not have an energetic, aggressive nature or the decisive character that makes the successful executive. Nothing in his life after leaving Hiram suggests that he had any ambitions in administrative lines. If he suffered any grievous disappointment at the elevation of Garfield it must have been for the collateral reasons already mentioned that impelled his admirers to push him for the place.

The trustees were eminently justified in their choice of Garfield. He was strong on the academic side. He was amazingly active in the religious work. He was a vigorous debater and constantly in demand as a public speaker. There was little basis for comparison of the two men, if the general or promotional interests of the Institute were chiefly to be considered, as they manifestly were just then of pressing concern.\(^20\)

\(^{20}\)Caldwell, op. cit., p. 42.

\(^{30}\)Miss Booth in the letter to Corydon Fuller already cited (p. ante) says June 24, 1833, "It has been a hard year for the Eclectic; the unfavorable
But the serpent had entered the garden of Hiram's Academia. The dissension produced by Garfield's elevation in 1857 did not cease. Personal irritation persisted. Friction continued and spread. Religious contention smoldered and flared. The slavery question was rending the heavens and aggravated the heat and rancor of discussion of both academic and public questions. The old-time camaraderie and harmony which made their first years at Hiram so full of happy memories were wrecked.

The local discontent in the community and the irritation affecting those within the faculty circle soon found vent. Minor and even trivial things precipitated the final collisions. Dunshee and Everest assailed Garfield on two fronts. In one case he was too liberal, being tolerant of what the conservatives decried. From another angle he was attacked because he was too conservative and countenanced, what his idealistic critics denounced as an iniquitous institution.

In the fore part of 1859 gossip and rumor had it that the students contrary to rules were indulging in games, presumably cards, etc. Garfield addressed the students, "condemning very stoutly all games of chance, but in very guarded terms permitting chess." As he himself was very fond of chess, his cynical critics instantly charged him with equivocation and hedging. The community was aroused by a local notable, Mr. Symonds Ryder, a member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute and its treasurer, who, Garfield wrote Rhodes, raised "bloody murder about it. Norman [Dunshee] and Harvey [Everest] go in with them and are as unreasonable and incorrigible as bulls."32

While the slavery question was the major cause of friction, suspicion of Garfield's orthodoxy was clearly a minor cause of
high potential that entered into the complexes of the controversy. It is not feasible to state positively what part such suspicions had in causing the upheaval, but we may presume that they were no inconsiderable factors. A letter of Mr. Rhodes to Garfield, dated at Williams College, March 3, 1859, just as the controversy at Hiram was approaching its crisis, creates various and vast suspicions. Rhodes had just heard some preachers, presumably Disciples, whose sermons disgusted him, and he writes in the confidence that he is addressing one in full sympathy with his views: "I sicken at the thought of the wretched imbecility there is in the church. I hope you realize this and that your liberality is making fogies shake and shiver. A new crop of men is coming up in these latter days and you do well to inaugurate Beecherism."

To what extent Garfield had allowed his liberal views to affect his evangelistic work in the various pulpits roundabout Hiram and in his chapel talks to the students, we cannot say. But one thing is certain. If Rhodes's views reflected Garfield's, and such feelings colored or tinctured Garfield's doctrinal expressions on religion in his sermons and chapel talks, then something more than sheet lightning illuminated Hiram's horizons. Heresy hunters were excessively alert in those days and if he displayed any such notions as Rhodes admitted and urged there would have been war, and mercy and tolerance would not govern counsel, nor hold their tongues. Green's History, as will be shown, affords us substantial grounds for suspecting that Garfield's orthodoxy was deemed dubious. Many scouted his loyalty to the faith of the Fathers and his acceptance of the strict or literal inspiration of the Bible. "Beecherism" was anathema to the orthodox.

---

32 Garfield Papers, Library of Congress. We may presume that Rhodes was writing to one in sympathy with his increasing liberal views. Among the three reasons that constrained Garfield to choose Williams College rather than Bethany, the third is instructive in the premises: "3rd. I am a son of Disciple parents, am one myself, and have had but little acquaintance with people of other views; and, having always lived in the West, I think it will make me more liberal both in my religious and general views and sentiments, to go into a new circle, where I shall be under new influences." The foregoing is taken from a portion of a letter of Garfield's printed by Whitelaw Reid in his Ohio in the War (Ed. 1868), Vol. I, p. 741. It is undated and the addressee is not given.

33 Anxiety about Principal Garfield's religious views and tendencies clearly possess Isaac Errett when he met him at Cleveland on August 29, 1859. He suspected that he was "turning from the exclusively academic and religious pursuits to the field of politics"; and his daughter who was present recalled,
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Games of chance and the authority of theological dogmas, however, paled into insignificance compared with the public distress over the slavery question which had the public at large, and especially the people of Ohio, by the ears during the fifties. It was in March, 1857, that the national Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, handed down its famous decision in Dred Scott in which the majority of that court held invalid the Missouri Compromise, and all state laws in contravention of the rights of Southern slaveholders, saying among other expressions that the Negro “had no rights that the white man was bound to respect.” The opponents of slavery in the North were amazed, for the court’s ruling seemed to open the entire country to the spread of slavery ad libitum. The heavens blazed and roared with violent discussion.

The Dred Scott case shocked the community at Hiram just as the internal troubles within the academic circle were coming to their first focus in connection with the retirement of Principal Hayden. Naturally the students and faculty were aroused with the country by the slavery issue. Dunshee and Everest were greatly stirred by the problems involved in the public controversy and outspoken in opposition to the enforcement of the rights of slaveholders; and they clashed with Garfield in dealing practically with the subject. Garfield did not deem it wise or right to let the controversy disturb the administration of the Institute and apparently frowned upon allowing formal discussion of the subject or official action. In view of Garfield’s ardent support on the stump in 1856 of Fremont’s election to the presidency his course as the executive chief of Hiram is interesting.

It is explicable on two assumptions. First, he had begun in 1856 the study of the law, and he may have come to appreciate that the commands of the law and the decisions of the high court of the land were binding on the consciences of the faculty and students no less than on the common citizenry. Second, serious minded citizens were becoming alarmed at the dangerous drifts

for his biographer, her father’s “earnest entreaty and brotherly solicitude.” Lamar, Memoirs of Isaac Errett, Vol. I, p. 207. See also Section XV post.
in the agitation produced by the slavery question, and they were apparently in the majority on the Board of Trustees of Hiram Eclectic Institute. They regarded the incessant agitation of the subject a menace to the constitutional order of the land. The belligerent discussion of the slavery question within the academic circle either by the faculty or the students they viewed with the same disfavor that latter-day owners of property and the captains of modern industry look upon the propaganda of socialists and communists within our colleges and universities. The two facts just indicated afford us the probable explanation of Garfield's conservatism anent the burning issue of those trying days.

The idealists, Dunshee and Everest, however, could not see eye to eye with Garfield, the realist, who was charged with the practical problem of securing the public support of the institution, paying salaries and holding the clientele of the institution to continuous support of the institution which would bring in both financial income and paying students in numbers sufficient to meet current bills. Events made the situation a perfect aggravation for all concerned. The idealists heard of and saw things happening all about them, near and far, that aroused saints to action. The practical realist had no delusions about the dangers and disturbances that would ensue, should the ardent idealists insist on drastic action against law and order.

XII

In a letter to Garfield at Williams College, November 13, 1865, Dunshee after referring to matters of immediate local interest, indicated his feelings on the slavery question. He referred to the covert and open opposition of Bethany College to "everything that has aspired to be a college in the North, but events have just transpired there that will startle our Northern brethren from their inaction and doughface servility." They have stripped Bethany of all its disguise. . . ." He then relates the unhappy experiences of two Hiram student preachers who that fall had occupied the pulpit at Bethany and because of their expressions about slavery were subjected to harsh treatment.

24A "Doughface"—an epithet applied by abolitionists, or radical opponents of slavery, to Northern politicians who yielded undue compliance to the demands of Southern leaders in the controversies over slavery.
Mr. A. B. Way classed slavery with war and intemperance; and immediately threats of personal violence disturbed his friends and his peace. Some time later Mr. Philip Burns occupied the same pulpit. Recalling the former's experiences he made no general mention of slavery, save in a reference to England's emancipation of the slaves in her possessions in the West Indies. But as his sermon was on "Liberty in Christ," that was enough. All sorts of disorderly commotion ensued, raucous noises, stamping on the floor, etc. About fifty walked out under the lead of a "Missouri preacher." They started a petty pandemonium outside, hammering on the floor from the basement, breaking windows, etc. A committee escorted Mrs. Burns to safety, but another committee made plans to seize her husband and give him a ducking in a nearby stream. Some Northern students, however, by skillful tactics managed to prevent the realization of their plans, by getting him safely to his boarding place. A crowd or mob followed him there and was on the point of invading the place to run him out of the town or inflict other more effective punishment that would deter other indiscreet persons from discussing the pros and cons of slavery in pulpits or other public places, when a civil officer fortunately appeared and "persuaded" the bellicose patriots from molesting Mr. Burns further. Professor Dunsbee then says:

There were other disgraceful proceedings which I will not relate. But what seems to me most disgraceful of all is the position taken by the faculty, very mildly rebuking the mob spirit but throwing the blame and censure upon the abused and insulted students of the North. They even said they thought Burns and Way should ask pardon of the Southerners for insulting them, and even characterized in a public address the Northern students as low specimens of Northern humanity, and ordered them insolently away to their studies, and to cease making disturbance. They intended thus to compel them to submission. But our Northern boys had too much spirit to be thus broken down and immediately five left for [home]. Would you think it? the next day this [same] Faculty fawningly begged the others to remain [and] assured them that all should go on right, hoped they would not withdraw rashly. . . . in vain, next day brought away five and next week will bring away three [more] and more expect to leave at Christmas. . . . Write, give us your thoughts. . . .

What Garfield wrote in reply we do not know. We do know
that he, too, was alienated in 1854 by the pronounced proslavery feeling at Bethany and went to Williams College in consequence. The facts given in Dunshee's letter leave one somewhat perplexed if we are to apply law and logic to the situation. Bethany was situated, not in Ohio, a free state, but in Virginia where slavery was legally existent. Slaveholders naturally regarded aggressive abolitionists precisely as we nowadays regard communists. For Northern idealistic student preachers to come among them and, from college platforms or pulpits, to assail their basic institution was asking a good deal of patience of human nature.

Legal and ethical proprieties aside, it is quite clear what Professor Dunshee thought of the conduct of the faculty of Bethany. He deemed it pusillanimous, or outrageous. If they deemed slavery wrong, then they were cowards and had not the blood of martyrs in their veins. On the other hand, if they approved slavery and stood for such modes of defense as the students and the Missouri preacher sanctioned in dealing with Messrs. Way and Burns, then contempt and scorn were the only feelings he had for them.

Slavery was not a hypothetical question for dull or vague discussion in a class room; nor was it a problem remote in distant space, or contingent in future time. It crowded consciousness and pricked consciences right at their very doors. Virginia and Kentucky flanked Ohio on her eastern and southern sides. Their fugitive slaves were constantly speeding in terror along her underground railways desperately seeking their freedom in Canada. Their appeals for aid and comfort and protection could not be resisted by the sympathetic folk of the first free state of the Northwest Territory who enjoyed exemption from slavery under the benign provisions of the celebrated Ordinance of 1787. Moreover, Professor Dunshee's hostility to slavery was not lessened by the fact that he was born in Joshua R. Giddings' famous congressional district, who for twenty consecutive years had denounced slavery on the floor of Congress with the hearty approval of his constituents. Hiram was situated in that district. It is not an irrelevant or immaterial fact that a member of the
Giddings family circle, Miss Sarah Udall, was head of the Primary Department at Hiram from 1853 to 1856.\(^{35}\)

The friction over slavery was finally inflamed to fever heat by events near at hand. Oberlin, sixty miles to the west of Hiram, was famous—or notorious—as a rendezvous of abolitionists, or at least of persons who were constantly aiding fugitive slaves to escape from their owners, and in all ways were thwarting the execution of writs of recovery by the Federal officers operating under the Fugitive Slave Law.

Oberlin was sending with no little noisy demonstration, companies of emigrants to "Bleeding Kansas" to save that territory for "Freedom." For years Oberlin had admitted Negroes to her college classrooms on an equality with whites. Great mass meetings had denounced the outrages at Lawrence, Kansas, and the assault on Senator Sumner of Massachusetts by Congressman Brooks of South Carolina in the national Senate chamber. John Brown's father was a member of the Board of Trustees of Oberlin; and three of the Negro students were among the killed of Brown's followers in the attack on Harper's Ferry in October, 1859. Finally just as the intramural contention was culminating at Hiram all of the Western Reserve was thrown into a blaze over the capture of a Negro boy, in September, 1858. From that time until the midsummer of 1859 the public was violently agitated by the arrest, arraignment, trials, conviction and punishments of the "Oberlin-Wellington rescuers."\(^{36}\)

It is not strange that Dunshee and his ardent antislavery confreres in the Hiram circle should feel that the brethren within their Academia were not doing their just share in the holy war and that Oberlin was "stealing all the glory."

The heat and acrimony of the controversy over slavery within the circle at Hiram must have been intense to cause Garfield to use the language he did, May 3, 1859, in a letter to Isaac Errett of the Board of Trustees. After speaking of the financial needs of the Institute, and the efforts to raise funds, and mentioning\(^{37}\)

\(^{35}\)Green, op. cit., pp. 87-88.

the approaching meeting of the trustees "in about ten days," he says:

There has been an attempt to throw the abolition stench around us, and I have resisted successfully, though not without bringing down upon me the small thunder of a few rampant ones. While I stay here the school shall never be given up to an overheated and brainless faction. I know you can sympathize with me. I have the misfortune to be in bad odor with the two extremes of view, but I think it will come out alright.\(^{364}\)

That language—"abolition stench" and "brainless faction"—is pretty strong, about as strong as the extremists at either end of the battle lines could have used. He does not designate any of the fomentors of the agitation, or refer to the immediate occasion for such harsh language; but in view of pending developments we may infer that Dunshee must have been foremost among the "rampant ones" and the troubles of the Oberlin-Wellington rescuers constituted the *casus belli*.

XIII

In view of the sharp differences between Dunshee and Garfield as to the course the Institute should take in dealing with slavery, and its incessant problems, the alleged attitude of Garfield towards the reported presence of two fugitive slaves in Tiffany Hall in the winter of 1857-58, as recorded by Mr. Green, is interesting and perplexing.

The affair was an elaborate "fake" perpetrated by some fun-loving students to add to the distractions of authorities. Two boys with faces effectively blacked with charcoal, and apparently famished for lack of food, and fleeing from pursuing masters, were brought to the room of two Mumford brothers in Tiffany Hall and instantly accorded protection and fed. The brothers were preparing to aid them further on their way to Canada when "two officers of the government and their posse" appeared on the scene, arrested them, and proceeded to take the brothers Mumford and the "slaves" to the nearest place of confinement, presumably the county town, namely Ravenna.

Word of the seizure, of course, soon got abroad and reached the authorities of the Institute. There was a hue and cry. The

culprits and victims scattered in all directions. Green informs us that Garfield started for "the center of the disturbance with a grim determination that no slave shall ever be returned to slavery from Hiram Hill." He realized very soon that the whole thing was a student hoax; and there was tremendous denunciation and disgust. At an assembly the students were severely lectured. Two of the culprits, the ring leaders, were dismissed. Mr. Green concludes the account of the comedy with the assertion: "While the affair was only intended for 'fun,' it had a serious effect on the future politics of some of the students, and especially did it impress Mr. Garfield with the sense of hatred toward slavery and love of liberty as nothing before ever had. This fact I had from Mr. Garfield himself."

Mr. Green's narrative (in a footnote) in view of the exhibits of Messrs. Smith and Caldwell already given, strikes one as decidedly dubious, if not fanciful. Two or three queries force themselves forward.

First: Were the authorities at Hiram disappointed when they found that the charcoal blacks were student pranksters and not bona fide fugitive slaves for whom they could stage a spectacular rescue, and thus divide glory and honors with Oberlin, their rival in a righteous war on the iniquitous institution of the South? Or were the Principal and his confreres chiefly chagrined and disgusted because the rascally students had effectively "made monkeys" of the learned professors and the Principal of the Institute? We are confronted by a nicely balanced question in psychic probabilities.

Second: If Mr. Green correctly reports Garfield's feelings and expressions our curiosity becomes pronounced on another score. He certainly did not manifest such feelings or opinions in his clash with Dunshee who, as Professor Caldwell asserts, was aflame with antislavery zeal to emulate Oberlin in aiding slaves to escape and in every way frowning upon slavery. He kept them effectually suppressed for what we may call political reasons or considerations. He concurred with the conservative members of the Board of Trustees who insisted that the faculty and the students of Hiram should not engage in efforts to settle the slavery question, or violate the law in thwarting the efforts
of slave owners to recover their fugitive slaves. If Garfield actually told Hiram's historian what is accredited to him we seriously suspect that it was a post bellum utterance after Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation and that ecstatic emotionalism confused his memories somewhat. It does not square with his actions and attitude in 1859.37

XIV

Suddenly out of a clear sky Professor Dunshee was struck with a bolt that amazed him and his many friends. At the meeting of the Board of Trustees on May 11, 1859, without the slightest hint or preliminary warning, he was dropped from the teaching staff, or more accurately, he was not re-employed—the members of the staff then being employed for annual periods. The proceeding was cruel, and—considering first his notable services in Hiram and, second, the fact that the members of the board were all "brothers" in a Christian brotherhood—heartless. The ruthlessness of the action produced an instant outcry from his many friends, and the community was split again into warring factions. Protests greeted the board. A petition asking for his reinstatement circulated. The board, however, had adjourned and his friends, as we shall see, while they did not succeed in the efforts, forced matters to an interesting focus.

Garfield's relations to that drastic action are complicated. The bitter recrimination it engendered concentrated on his head. He felt the fury of the charges of connivance hurled at him by Dunshee and his friends. Dunshee accused his former pupil of forwarding his ouster because of his (Dunshee's) radical antislavery views. Garfield, on May 14, wrote Mr. Rhodes, who succeeded Dunshee: "This move was made by the trustees without plotting or connivance. I not only did not directly counsel it but did not expect it." In a letter to his friend Harmon Austin of the trustees, he flouted the truth of Dunshee's claim that he "was a martyr to the cause of antislavery! . . . The hot element in town catch at this theory eagerly and consider me the prince of slaveholders and plotters."38

But Garfield, as Professor Caldwell points out, was neither

---

37Green, op. cit., pp. 155-56.
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candid nor correct, for he had forgotten a letter of his, under date of April 7, to Rhodes, then at Williams College, urging him to come back to Hiram on his graduation in June: "If you should do this I think that the trustees would dispense with D. soon. . . ." Another fact enhances the justice of the suspicions of Garfield entertained at the time by Dunshee and his champions. It was Garfield's close friend and ardent champion in the Board of Trustees, Harmon Austin, who introduced the resolution declining to re-employ Norman Dunshee.39

In a letter dated May 2, written at West Troy, New York, apparently in reply to Garfield's of April 7, Rhodes expressly declares his unwillingness to be a party to putting any one out to make a place for himself. He indicated his wish to be associated with the Hiram staff, but he did not see how he could be added without reducing salaries. He further stated that if the trustees could offer him a place of the rank that "Norman fills" he would "quite likely accept." But there is no hint or lurking implication in his letter that he was maneuvering for Dunshee's place.

On May 21 he relates parts of a letter to him from Dunshee who, with no suspicion, apparently, that Rhodes might be under consideration for his place, wrote him with much heat that Garfield had acted an "unfair and dishonorable part" in relation to the trustees' action, and he asserted that only a "fraction of the board" were active in the matter. He further alleged that one, Howe (Lowe?) several times proposed to Garfield a compromise but he "would give no ear to his pleadings but demanded the immediate expulsion of himself" (Dunshee). In the following sentence it is not quite clear whether he is suggesting that the position is open to Rhodes.40

Dunshee's allegation that but a fraction of the Board of Trustees took part in the hostile action against him appears to have been well founded. The minutes of the board state that only six members were present, five voting for the action taken and one against it. The cryptic language of the record for May 11 is instructive:

40Garfield Papers, op. cit.
That we must secure the services of James A. Garfield, J. H. Rhodes, H. W. Everest and Miss Almeda Booth to the school for the coming year.


Noes: Symonds Ryder.41

According to the articles of incorporation of the Institute the membership of the original board was twelve in number. There was less than a quorum present that day.42 Among those joining in the hostile action was the father-in-law of the principal of the institute. Dunshee's information or suspicion seems to have had antecedent probability for a base.

The harsh action of the board astonished Rhodes. "I was surprised" he says "beyond measure." In view of letters he received from Garfield and Mr. Udall, president of the board, Rhodes hesitates: "... immediately there rose to my mind an apprehension that this movement would create a public impression of foul play..." Then, further on, he says: "This movement I never anticipated. I never thought when I wrote you my last that Norman's place would be vacated. I had a slight suspicion that he might leave... But this movement surprises me and to some degree makes my position a disagreeable one... Before I go I shall require from the board some statement, definite and authoritative, which shall exempt you and others from blame in this affair..."

In a letter, June 2, Rhodes informs Garfield that Dunshee had asked for the return of his letter, for some reason not given. He sends a copy, however, to Garfield, but his conscience pricks him for he pencils on the margin not to let Dunshee know about it. Dunshee's request for the return of his letter suggests that he may have felt that he had allowed his feelings to put his charges either unfairly or too vigorously. Neither the original nor the copy seem to be available.43

We are left in more or less of a quandary. The trustees, we must presume, were probably aroused out of the ordinary by both general reasons and particular irritation. The immediate fact...
producing the disturbance or precipitating the adverse action affecting Dunshee is not quite clear. Garfield's part is not obvious nor easily inferred from the evidence extant; but he concurred with the board's action and felt so strongly that he refused to ask or to suggest leniency or reconsideration. Either the local conditions or the personal animosities were inflamed to fever heat, and were deemed intolerable, hence the drastic action.

Contemporary with the progress of the controversy "on the Hill" events were happening at Cleveland and Columbus that added heat and fury to the contention within the precincts of Hiram. On April 15 the United States marshal arrested Simeon Bushnell and Charles Langston, reputed ringleaders of the two hundred "Oberlin-Wellington rescuers," and committed them to the custody of the sheriff of Cuyahoga County. The friends of human freedom on May 17 secured from Justice Scott of the Supreme Court of Ohio writs of habeas corpus commanding said sheriff to bring the bodies of the two prisoners before the Supreme Court at Columbus on May 25.

At the conclusion of the hearing the court, speaking through Chief Justice Joseph R. Swan, refused to discharge the prisoners, holding that the national statutes of 1793 and of 1850 providing for the return of fugitive slaves to their masters were binding upon law officers and the courts of the states comprising the Federal Union. Justices Scott and Peck concurred. Two judges dissented, Brinkerhoff and Sutliff, contending that Congress had no jurisdiction, they insisting that the civil rights of slaveholders and the enforcement of any criminal statutes incident thereto were among the rights reserved to the states.44

Judge Swan's ruling, as may easily be imagined, produced a violent reaction in the state at large. The Republican State Convention met on June 2. In the platform adopted the delegates demanded the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law. They refused to renominate Judge Swan to succeed himself.45

It would appear that whatever the merits of the controversies

44 Ex Parte Bushnell, 9 Ohio Sup. Court Reports, pp. 72-83.
at Hiram as to Dunshee's activities and views anent the abolition of slavery or the duty of academicians to enter the political arena in aggressive opposition to the rights of slaveholders seeking to recover their fugitive property, the Republican party of Ohio, and the voters of the state generally agreed with Hiram's Professor of Mathematics and Modern Languages rather than with the Principal and the members of the Board of Trustees of the Eclectic Institute on the matters in issue.

XVI

The board's action on May 11 produced an instant surge of protest that did not subside. It became so serious that it compelled the members to take notice of a petition asking for Professor Dunshee's reinstatement. The board met again on June 8 and the record of the minutes contains the following entries:

Resolved that a note given to Norman Dunshee, for seventy-five 45/100 dollars, dated June 18, 1857, for balance due him, at that time, on salary as teacher, be paid as soon as funds be had from the treasury. Carried.

The following report of Committee on Petition to reinstate Norman Dunshee was presented, accepted and adopted.

Report of Committee

Whereas, Prof. Norman Dunshee desires to be released from his position as teacher in the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute, a position that he has occupied with much honor and credit to himself for the past eight years; and,

Whereas, he is about to leave us for other fields of labor;

We, the trustees of said Institute, take pleasure in recommending him as a man of high moral worth, a thorough scholar, and a competent teacher; and we hope that wherever his lot may be cast, his presence will rejoice many hearts, as his departure, from this place makes sad.

The following resolution was moved and carried:

Resolved, That whereas, a report has been circulated in certain localities that the action of the trustees of the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute have been influenced, in certain cases, by the "question of slavery";

Therefore, [it is]

Resolved, that we deny that the "question of slavery," or any political question, has at all influenced the action of the trustees in any case.

Whoever drafted those resolutions must have been familiar with Voltaire's cynical quip that "Men use thought only as au-
tority for their injustice and employ speech only to conceal their thoughts.” If those resolutions meant anything we are con-
strained to infer that love and harmony animated all and sundry
within the precincts of the Eclectic Institute, and sweet peace
occupied the seats of authority, and Norman Dunshee had asked
to leave, or rather had notified the authorities that he was leaving
on his own desire and initiative.

The contradiction or divergence between the action of May 11
and the pronouncements of June 8 and the disclosures of the
correspondence of the chief dramatis personae leaves us in an
aggravating quandary. The explanations do not explain. The
more one studies them the more confused one becomes.

Dunshee's work at Hiram had been a distinguished success.
It had brought "honor" to himself and distinction to Hiram. He
was a Christian gentleman; “a man of high moral worth, a thor-
ough scholar, and a competent teacher”; clearly he was “a gentle-
man and a scholar” without reproach. So there was no reason
on the scholastic side for dropping him. There is no intimation
whatever that his religious views or conduct as a man was in
question.

Moreover, Norman Dunshee had not resigned. Further, he had
not been dismissed. There was no contractual relations between
him and the Board of Trustees (save for the note for salary due
due him) after commencement, 1859. He was free to go. The board
was free to act or not to act. The action of the trustees on May
11 whereby all of his colleagues were re-employed and Dun-
shee's name was left out of the resolution, was, we are virtually
asked to presume, a mere accident, a clerical oversight, a chance
bit of unplanned negligence. We are left in the fogs of
doubt when we seek explanations in the maxims of Chance. One
of Voltaire's spiritual successors, Anatole France, views the no-
tion of Chance in the affairs of men with cynical contempt:
“Chance is perhaps the pseudonym of God when he does not
want to sign.”

As for the slavery question, members of the board we are to
believe were not even aware of the existence of any friction
affecting them on account of that irrepressible problem. The
heavens might be split with the thunders of bitter contention
anent the vexatious subject, but they dwelt in Hiram far from the madding crowd that foregather in city streets. They lived in the quiet recesses of Academia 'neath the dry white light of reason, unafraid, undisturbed, uninfluenced. Garfield's letters, already cited and quoted, referring to the "abolition stench" and the "brainless faction" were written in a state of delusion or hallucination.

Nota bene, the signers of the petition presented to the trustees asking for Dunshee's reinstatement on the Institute's teaching staff ran counter to his express wishes, and therefore embarrassed him. Hence the board's assertion that Professor Dunshee's departure made every one of the members "sad"; but alas, nothing could be done to prevent his going, as he so desired. Hence all that the trustees could do was naught else than to wish him bon voyage.

One can discern one solid fact in the resolutions of the trustees of June 8, to-wit, that the trustees were in arrears to Professor Dunshee for a part of his salary for the academic year of 1856-57. This may have been one of the awkward facts in the premises. Further, it prompts the inquiry whether the financial troubles of the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute were not a material part of the complex of inexplicables that induced the board to agree to the mysterious action of May 11, 1859. Hiram's historian, Mr. Green, informs us that the financial deficit of the Institute on June 17, 1857, was $5,517.95. Income did not increase during the next two years because of the general industrial depression following the financial crash of 1857 which was inaugurated in Ohio. The financial needs were urgent, and caused no little anxiety. But if they coerced the members of the board we find ourselves again in confusion.

If the financial deficit was the condition provoking the action of May 11, why did the trustees exclude the name of the teacher who had taught each of his colleagues re-employed—Messrs. Everest and Garfield and Miss Booth, and his successor Rhodes—the one who had been notably successful in his teaching, the one who was "by far the first scholar in the early Hiram group," as Hinsdale assured the public in his semicentennial address in 1900, "and all things considered the most learned man who ever
taught on the Hill." Wise business men, as a rule, do not throw away one of their best "drawing cards." We shall see that if popularity or worth is to be measured by numbers of students in attendance Professor Dunshee was possibly more important than most or all of his colleagues.

If the trustees were not guilty of an impudent euphemism in their resolution telling how "sad" they were in the departure of the Professor of Mathematics and Modern Languages, it seems clear that Norman Dunshee had no part in starting the petition asking for his reinstatement. Further, when he realized the attitude and course of the parties to the action of May 11 his indignation and sense of injustice caused him not only to dissent from the purpose of his friends seeking his retention but to repel it. Continuance in the institution under such circumstances of discord would be intolerable to any one of character or sensibility. The most painful part of the situation to him and Mrs. Dunshee were the aloofness and hostility of Garfield which, in view of their former relations as teacher and student, made normal working relations, to say nothing of pleasurable, almost impossible. Thus his self-respect repelled the program of his fighting friends. Hence his announcement that he intended leaving. The trustees, with the acrobatic agility and avidity of country crossroads politicians and curbstone statesmen, saw their chance, whirled, turned the trick and passed that resolution which asserted that they greatly regretted his departure, which made them "sad." Such tergiversation is common in caucuses of worldly folk in their struggles for partisan gains, but it is not deemed appropriate within the inner circles of Christian brotherhoods.

Following any of the ordinary leads the inquirer in search of the basic, controlling consideration determining that strange action on May 11, soon feels himself either against a blank wall or at the end of a blind alley or stranded in mud bank and fog. As one ponders the resolution of June 8 one is reminded of an inquiry of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, to his Queen Mother anent the play he was presenting in the hall of the castle at Elsinore for the instruction of the King and his consort:

Hamlet. Madam, how like you this play?
Queen. The Lady protests too much, methinks.
If Garfield had substantial academic or administrative reasons for dismissing Dunshee, or severing him from the teaching staff, he boggled his case by the course he pursued. If the board felt, or he felt, that dissension anent slavery or religion, and the backbiting within the academic circle at Hiram had become pernicious, this state of affairs would have been solid ground for notice to him that such contention must cease, or measures would have to be enforced to put a stop to the divisive strife. Common humanity, to say nothing of Christianity, enjoined such consideration. But no one apparently had forewarned or counseled with Dunshee.

Even if Garfield as principal felt a hesitancy in conferring with his old instructor and indicating his discontent with his course, he might have sent some one to him to give him a hint that his persistence in criticism would issue in drastic action. But apparently he shrank from so doing, and his denials of personal effort in sanction of Dunshee's ouster in view of the letter to Rhodes cast a shadow on his course. The situation, it must be conceded, was trying.

It is not at all unlikely that the contention had become so rancorous—abolitionism, "higher criticism" and personal animosities producing the most violent feelings—that the Board of Trustees had sufficient reasons for a peremptory notice that such must cease upon pain of drastic action if there was not compliance. But this procedure was not followed. The chief criticism lodged against Garfield was not, as his friend Austin assumed, that the board had no right to act as they did, for they did have. Men under the old Common Law had a right to beat their wives, but few wise men ever dared exercise that right save under great and dire provocation. It was the ruthlessness and heartlessness of the action that friends of Dunshee protested and the friends of Garfield regretted.

Professor Smith sums up the matter fairly when he concludes his exposition of the clash at Hiram:

No one can help feeling that in this case the ousted teacher deserved sympathy for his treatment, whatever may have been the justification from an educational point of view. For Garfield it had the unfortunate
result of leaving a permanent evil impression among certain circles in Hiram, for, regardless of any denial he might make, the belief remained that he had plotted with the trustees to remove an antislavery teacher because of his beliefs.⁴⁶

XVIII

Among the flarebacks of the controversies just summarized were some harsh comments by Garfield on Dunshee's teaching. In his defense of the trustee's action, and in retort to Dunshee's charges, he declared that Dunshee's teaching had become "stolid" and "wooden." In proof of Professor Smith's assertion that bitterness lingered long in the memories of Hiram folk, President Hinsdale in an address at Hiram at 1876, in his high tribute to Dunshee's scholarship already quoted, adds, with queer not to say questionable taste, "but he was not an inspiring teacher. Even Homer sometimes nods and Dunshee also nodded when teaching Homer." A quarter of a century later Mr. F. H. Green in his History of Hiram College prepared in view of the semi-centennial of the college in 1900, quotes Hinsdale's entire comment.⁴⁷

Such animadversions, on general principles, should not be revived. Had they remained embalmed in Garfield's aging letters in the Library of Congress they would not be. But the latest notable biography of President Garfield in dealing with the justice of the controversies at Hiram between 1857-59 has given them distinction and nation-wide publicity. Rejoinder and refutation, therefore, are within the equities of the case; and such may prove both interesting and instructive.

Garfield's unkind criticisms can be understood, and partially condoned, for he was between pillar and post; but why Hinsdale and Green, in cold blood, twenty, and fifty years after, each in connection with festal occasions when ordinary folk mention and laud the agreeable and the best and forget the sorry facts in memory, should have flung those ungracious comments at audiences in which many of Dunshee's friends were present, seems rather strange. Professor Dunshee was alive when Hinsdale uttered his comments. The latter was a pupil of Dunshee. He was also an admirer and ardent partisan of Garfield; this fact

⁴⁶Smith, op. cit., p. 131. ⁴⁷Green, op. cit., p. 40.
may explain but it does not justify. Garfield was more consid-
erate in 1876. In his memorial address in memory of Miss Booth he refers to Professor Dunshee without adverse comment.

If we examine Garfield’s assertion critically we may well be puzzled. Was it a mere statement of fact of general acceptance, or was he venting his resentment because of the furious attacks upon him for his treatment of Dunshee? Anger and excitement usually befog memory and pervert judgment.

A teacher who arouses enthusiasm in all of his students all of the time is a *rara avis* indeed. The average teacher, be he in college or university, who is ordinarily effective, is seldom brilliant or inspiring. Further, the major portion of students will deem a teacher uninteresting if he is not dramatic, facetious or “smart” in exposition, and especially if he exacts much detailed work in reports and holds them strictly to account for their recitations and returns—such an one is a bore, a grad grind, a stick, and his teaching stolid and wooden.

Tell it not in Gath, but if we may believe one tenth of what we hear or read in these halcyon days few students in our “higher institutions of learning” are interested in any real scholastic effort and substantial studies, be they of the classics or literature or the physical sciences, no matter how learned and capable the instructor may be. Athletics, dances, movies, parades, pep meetings, picnics, rushing, and other extra curricular activities in these days appear to energize and enthrall their minds and control their waking hours.48

Was Garfield’s assertion about Dunshee an aspersion or not? It seems to me that there is no antecedent probability of its justice. Dunshee had been teaching at Hiram a little more than eight years. He was in his prime, being but little more than thirty-seven years old. All accounts concur that he was a thoroughgoing scholar, and widely and profoundly learned. The most earnest and enthusiastic students, such as Miss Booth and Gar-

48Innumerable articles, brochures, books might be cited in which the writers deplore the developments and drifts in modern education referred to above; e. g., see Ludvig Lewisohn on “The Business of Education”; Bernard De Voto on “The Co-Eds: God Bless Them”; and Robert Littell on “Pigskin Preferred”; reprinted in *Contemporary Thought* (1929), edited by members of the faculty of Washington University at St. Louis, namely by R. B. Taft, J. F. McDermott, and D. O. Jensen.
field, besought his guidance in extraordinary studies, out of the regular routine. If they had not been thoroughly satisfied would they and ten others have persisted in vacation time and in the hot summer months in their studies under him? When Garfield (who recited to Dunshee, Hinsdale informs us, more than to all his other instructors combined) registered at Williams College, he was so well prepared that he was told that he could have graduated in one year had he chosen to do so. 49

One explanation of Professor Dunshee’s alleged decline in teaching ability, put forth by his contemporary critics at Hiram, according to tradition as reported to me by a correspondent, is that he was kept awake at night by the insistent exactions of his infant children, hence his lack of energy in his teaching. This was the fact, we may infer, in the background of Hinsdale’s reference to Homer nodding. If such was a material fact in causing the action of the board it excites curiosity. Did it signify much human consideration on the part of the members of the board and of “the administration” if his rest was thus disturbed? A fortiori would not ordinary Christian charity and forbearance—especially among those at Hiram who professed such militant Christianity—have barred such ruthless action even from their thoughts? To the prosaic minds of worldly mortals such an explanation, or justification, appears to be an excuse ex post facto, one trumped up to give substance to their defense. It does not seem to have enough weight to constitute the causa causans.

Dunshee’s eight years at Hiram, we may presume, enhanced his teaching ability. But he probably did not change his method of teaching; very few teachers do change their modus operandi save, perhaps, to hold their tongues more in check. He was quiet and earnest; he loved his subject and cared only for its elementals, its beauties, and but little for “publicity” and “selling himself” to the public—to use the hackneyed jargon of today.

That some did not enjoy his work and extoll him is not material, for the same charge can be lodged against nine out of ten teachers, if not all teachers. That he was not a teacher who

49Garfield told his classmate, Corydon E. Fuller, that President Hopkins of Williams College informed him that he (Garfield) could have registered for the senior year with his preparation had at Hiram. Fuller, op. cit., pp. 129-30.
made a great stir within his class room has no substance, for such is not the chief desideratum in the good teachers. That he was not always the “talk of the town” because of his outside activities as Garfield himself was, is no less immaterial and irrelevant, for hundreds of the finest teachers our colleges have would suffer the same adverse criticism Garfield and Hinsdale inflicted on Dunshee.

In a later section I shall submit various and sundry exhibits that will indicate that Norman Dunshee in his later years was regarded as an inspiring teacher by scores of students who attended his classes; and the evidence suggests that the comments of Garfield—repeated by Hinsdale and Green—were the flotsam and jetsam of a bitter controversy that had no relevancy to his teaching ability or achievement as a teacher.

[To be concluded]

AGUE IN IOWA

“Such was the sickness here (Van Buren County, Iowa Territory) . . . that there was scarcely any business done in any stores of this place, except at the drug stores and the groceries. Religious meetings on the Sabbath were suspended for want of hearers, all of whom were sick, or engaged in taking care of the sick. Our physicians say that some of their patients died for want of proper care and nursing. A sufficient number of persons in health could not be found to take care of them.”

Quoted as a letter from R. Bond, M. D., August 25, 1845, to the American Bible Society; printed as footnote to an article on the Oregon trail in No. 94 of the Columbia Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. It is indicated that the illness in the Mississippi valley had much to do with the migration to Oregon.