

6-2017

Chapter 06: A College in Crisis (The Rice Affair), 1933

Jack C. Lane

Rollins College, jlane@rollins.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.rollins.edu/mnscpts>

Recommended Citation

Lane, Jack C., "Chapter 06: A College in Crisis (The Rice Affair), 1933" (2017). *Rollins College: A Centennial History*. 6.
<http://scholarship.rollins.edu/mnscpts/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives and Special Collections at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Rollins College: A Centennial History by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwatson@rollins.edu.

CHAPTER 6

A COLLEGE IN CRISIS (THE RICE AFFAIR), 1933

When Hamilton Holt assumed the presidency of Rollins he found a better qualified faculty than he anticipated. Historian Leland Jenks and chemistry professor Frederick Georgia were outstanding. They enthusiastically embraced Holt's conference plan idea and helped other faculty members adjust to the new changes. Jenks, a PhD from Columbia University in economic history, was an established young scholar who had arrived at Rollins just before Holt. Georgia, a stalwart in implementing the conference plan, would later be instrumental in creating the progressive curriculum. From the beginning Holt assumed the sole responsibility of hiring administrators and professors he believed would be committed to his educational ideas. When vacancies occurred, Holt himself searched for a replacement. A department head would learn about the appointment *after* Holt had hired the new member. Whatever the faculty thought of his methods (many grumbled), within a few years Holt had assembled a stellar group of new faculty. These included Thomas Bailey, a Phi Beta Kappa and a PhD in Philosophy and Psychology from the University of South Carolina who had written controversial works on race orthodoxy in the South; Charles A. Campbell, Dean of the Chapel and sympathetic student counselor and outstanding preacher; Edwin Clark, Phi Beta Kappa from Clark University with a PhD in Sociology from Columbia University; Royal W. France, a professor of Economics who became a kind of socialist in residence during the 1930s; Fred Pattee, a Phi Beta Kappa from Dartmouth author of several books

on American literature; Willard Wattles, Professor of English, Phi Beta Kappa from University of Kansas author of several books of poetry, who became the college's poet-in-residence; and Theodore Dreier, a Harvard Phi Beta Kappa and Professor of Physics. Some of the appointments could be idiosyncratic: Ralph Lounsbury, a lawyer and graduate of Yale University in Holt's class, who turned out to be an excellent teacher and a faculty leader; and Edwin O. Grover, Holt's personal friend, a prolific writer with wide experience in publishing whom Holt named as the world's only Professor of Books. The gem in this collection of "golden personalities," as Holt preferred to call them, was a professor of classics named John A. Rice.

As an accomplished publicist, Holt was convinced that a Rhodes scholar would enhance the college's academic reputation. While on an English holiday In the summer of 1930, Holt dropped by Oxford University to interview John Rice, whose name had been earlier mentioned to him. Characteristically, Holt hired Rice on the spot. A graduate of Tulane University, Rice had taught Greek at the University of Nebraska and Rutgers before accepting a Rhodes scholarship to Oxford University. He father-in-law, Frank Aydelotte, President of Swarthmore College, had recommended Rice to Holt. Typically, Holt made the appointment without thorough investigation, nor did he consult Rollins professors. Had he done more a thorough evaluation, he might have hesitated before hiring the classicist because the brilliant scholar and engaging teacher possessed some unfortunate traits. This superficial assessment of John Rice meant that President Holt knew nothing of these characteristics. In time he would rue that oversight.(1)

Holt attracted these substantial talents to the campus with adequate salary offers, and most often by promoting the college's innovative educational schemes. After they were

hired, they took seriously Holt's headlong drive to build a new and innovative college. Following Holt's lead, they took seriously the college's commitment to the principles of progressive education, not just in the course of study, but throughout the college community. Such principles included recognition of student freedom to develop personally and academically according to their own interests and of faculty participation in flexible governance structure as well. It also implied that the democratic community tolerated, even celebrated, individual faculty and student differences and beliefs.

In terms of community relations, this proved to be the case. There was probably no college or university in the South more liberal and open-minded than Rollins. Holt readily found that he had to walk a fine line between the college's progressive culture and Southern racial prejudice that permeated Central Florida. Still, he leapt at the opportunity to befriend an unknown African American novelist/playwright named Zora Neal Hurston. While not permitting African Americans in the audience, Holt gave his consent for Theater director Robert Wunsch to present on campus a Hurston folklore play with African American actors and dancers. The play was a huge success, but as expected, Holt received criticism from the Winter Park community. Rollins was the first predominantly white institution of higher education to confer an honorary degree upon an African American woman, Mary Bethume Cookman, the President of Cookman College in Daytona. In the 1920s Holt, with faculty and students, chartered a bus to Tallahassee to protest the Florida legislature's decision to pass a law preventing the teaching of evolution in public schools. Holt unflinchingly supported the socialist, activist Royal France despite being almost daily bombarded by local criticism that the college harbored communists. (3)

Thus, in the realm of community social relations, Holt presented the face of a steadfast progressive who would willingly take a stand for his progressive principles. His liberalism would be sorely tested, however, when it came to dealing with the reform ferment that had not subsided on the campus. Many faculty kept pushing for more reforms and, in doing so, ran head on into some of President Holt's sacred cows. In the minds of these young reformers some parts of academic life seemed at variance with the progressive "spirit" of the new Rollins reforms. In the aftermath of the curriculum changes, a group of faculty boldly moved to alter aspects of college life as yet untouched by the reform efforts. In their attempts they consistently came in conflict with the president. Thus, for all its significance as a revitalizing force on the campus, the reform movement also served as a catalyst for conflict, one that would rob the college of its best talents and tarnish the college's national reputation as a progressive institution.

The first trouble erupted in the spring of 1932, when several faculty members criticized the Greek system as unrepresentative of the new Rollins democratic spirit. In response to these complaints, Holt appointed a special committee of faculty to investigate, naming John Rice as chairman, and authorizing the committee to state its objections to the fraternity system. What Holt expected to come from such an effort remains unclear, but what he received was a thorough indictment of college fraternities in general and the Rollins system in particular. The committee members, all of whom were former fraternity pledges, insisted that fraternities did not accord with Rollins's new progressive changes. They "fostered elitism, exclusiveness, snobbishness, superiority, and promoted an unnatural and unhealthy relationship and even social discrimination," the committee flatly declared. The Greek sys-

tem was "undemocratic and therefore out of harmony with Rollins College life." In contradiction to Rollins's educational ideals, the report continued, the fraternities subordinated individuality to the group. "We preach here," the Committee declared, "the gospel of individual development. We then proceed to nullify it by tolerating a fraternity system, which of necessity submerges the individual in the group, which at most produces types not personalities. If it be our serious purpose to produce a fraternity type, let us frankly admit the fact and advertise it accordingly." Additional charges were leveled at the disorganizing tendencies of "Rush," the immaturity of oaths of secrecy and pledges, the division of loyalty between fraternity and college, the distortion of campus politics by the fraternities' clannish interests and the emphasis on social over academic aspects of college life.(2) Holt then asked the fraternities for responses to the report. The committee's criticism hit the organizations like an explosion and spawned an all-out effort at rebuttal. Indignant reactions came pouring into the president's office.(3))

Holt seemed eager to stand above this controversy, serving as a kind of broker between the various factions. Yet there was no doubt he strongly supported the fraternity system because he encouraged its growth in the years since he came to Rollins. Between 1925 and 1932, the college had authorized the establishment of fifteen fraternities and sororities. True, Holt had earlier voiced concern with some of the fraternity excesses, in particular the wild parties during the rush period. Still, he did not anticipate, such a virulent attack on the entire system. In an attempt to appear neutral, Holt named Edwin Grover and Ralph Lounsbury as a committee of two to digest and summarize the two positions. To his surprise, controversy arose even here. Grover and Lounsbury could not agree, and therefore wrote

separate reports. Grover claimed that the student reply satisfactorily answered the committee charges; Lounsbury steadfastly maintained that even in their replies, the fraternities attested to their undemocratic nature. (3) At this point, Holt simply filed the reports away and within a few weeks the fraternity brouhaha died quietly. However, the incident revealed a growing rift between the reformist faculty and the president.(4) The fraternity incident would prove to be a prelude of things to come.

A more serious crisis followed closely on the heels of the fraternity controversy. In the January 1933 faculty meeting, the Curriculum Committee proposed abolishing the two-hour classes and the eight-hour day, arguing that the schedule was "incompatible with the new Rollins plans." If the new curriculum was based on achievement rather than time and if it was designed to "enable the individual to develop in his own way and along the lines of his own interests as fast as his ability will admit," then, the committee argued, the college needed class periods elastic enough to "permit more hours in class, less hours in class or no hours in class." The Curriculum Committee's proposal caught Holt by complete surprise even though the details of it had been clearly outlined in the minutes submitted to him several days earlier. He later admitted he had not read the minutes carefully. He told the faculty he was stunned that they would view the new curriculum as a basis for abolishing his cherished two-hour plan. He failed to see a conflict in the two innovations. The president immediately suggested, and the faculty voted for, a motion to table the resolution until a special faculty meeting could be called to thoroughly discuss the entire matter.(5)

A few days before the special faculty meeting, the president met with Curriculum Committee members at his home to inform them that this effort to make basic changes in the curriculum in effect usurped his authority. He warned the committee that if the resolution

passed either he would resign or a certain group of faculty would have to go. Later, at the special faculty meeting, Holt delivered a long and forceful argument for the conference plan, the two-hour class period and the eight-hour day, arguing that they did not conflict with the new Rollins plan. Following Holt's speech, the faculty voted to table indefinitely the Curriculum Committee's resolution.(6)

A few weeks later, the Curriculum Committee challenged the President's authority in two other areas. On January 18, the Committee, "as a committee and as individuals," protested the administration's practice of holding Tuesday and Wednesday convocations that extend beyond the 10:30 class period. A "convocation of doubtful value," the Committee charged, "disrupted and in fact led some faculty to disband classes." Additionally, the committee chided the administration for permitting students to miss classes to listen to tennis professional Bill Tilden, whose sole purpose was "to advertise an exhibition of tennis professionals." Holt, taken aback by the sharp and condemning tone of the protest, admitted the administration's mistake in infringing on class time but added a poignant retort: "The slur of your phrase concerning tennis professionals implies a motive on the part of the administration that I am sure on reflection you will wish to withdraw."(7)

Clearly the campus was on the brink of turmoil. Many of Holt's golden personalities, caught up in the excitement of this reformist fermentation, were pressuring the administration to make changes they assumed coincided with the high standards and spirit of the new curriculum reforms. They argued that the new Rollins plan implicitly foretold a more democratic community and particularly a more democratic governance of the college. The fraternity controversy, the curriculum proposals and the complaint of over-extended convocations revealed a faculty asserting itself more forcefully into the college governance system.

These were uncharted waters and, unfortunately, Holt had given mixed messages. In the early academic reforms, he involved the faculty with the Conference Plan *after* he presented them with it with as a *fait accompli*. With the new curriculum he allowed the faculty to take the lead, assuming the role of facilitator. Were these new faculty undertakings simply logical extensions of the academic reform and, thus, a way of making a transition from a traditional to a progressive democratic governance system? Or was this faculty assertiveness a kind of insurgency against authority and, therefore, a challenge to presidential leadership? Holt's answer came on February 23, 1933. He fired Professor John Rice, leader of what Holt saw as the "rebel" faction.

It is impossible to separate the personalities of Hamilton Holt and John Rice from the sequence of events that led to Rice's dismissal, his subsequent appeal and the crisis that ensued. Holt held an expansive view of the college presidency not only because this was a time-honored, traditional way of seeing the office. His attitude derived also from the fact that from the time he was hired he was perceived as the only person who could turn around the failing provincial institution. His successes were seen as a Holt creation to such an extent that the phrase "Holt is Rollins and Rollins is Holt" was commonplace saying. Trustees, administrators and faculty happily bowed to his dynamic leadership, and Holt responded by treating individuals with generosity and civility. Holt presented himself as a kind of an enlightened patriarch who desired sweet harmony among the members of the family community he was so painstakingly nurturing. So long as an issue was undecided Holt encouraged the widest possible debate. But once the president had decided the appropriate course, Holt deemed further discussion not only unnecessary but also counter-productive.

Two souls resided in the personality of Hamilton Holt. One soul celebrated openness and was receptive to new and innovative ideas and the other treasured loyalty above all other virtues. The former reflected the twentieth century liberal Holt: honest, broad-minded, forthcoming, openhearted, humorous, generous and kind--a delightful and lovable person. The latter revealed a nineteenth century presidential Holt: possessive, assertive, paternalistic, autocratic and, like most Victorian fathers (and college presidents), demanding complete authority within his realm. Holt vaguely sensed these two souls, as when he once puzzled how the reformers had made a lifelong liberal appear conventionally conservative. In the first decade of his presidency Holt was guided by his progressive soul. John Rice brought to surface Holt's heretofore hidden patriarchal illiberal persona. Better had it remained tucked away because when it emerged, the creature was instrumental in transforming a single faculty dismissal into a raging crisis.

Rice's own personality contributed to and shaped the affair that shook the campus in the spring of 1933. No one doubted Rice was one of Holt's brightest golden personalities. Many of his colleagues at Rollins and a sizable number of students, realizing they were in the presence of a profound mind, sought and enjoyed Rice's company. More frequently, he displayed a sharp biting wit. For example, when the Dean of Academic Affairs of Nebraska asked why he came to that university, he replied, "Dean, I've been trying to figure that out ever since I came here." During formal and informal faculty discussions, Rice consistently raised challenging and interesting questions, and more than often offered plausible answers. Within a year of his appointment, Rice had become a major campus figure, serving on several important committees (chairing some of them), and acting as a kind of catalyst for progressive reform that swept the college shortly after he arrived.

When he wished, Rice could teach a class in a manner many students had never before experienced and would never forget. One day he walked into his classroom and pinned on the wall a calendar pinup of two scantily clad females. After two days, when one student asked about the purpose of the drawings, Rice turned the question on him. "Why, don't you like them?" The student's negative answer launched the class into a two-day profound discussion of the meaning of art. With such Socratic methods, Rice prodded students into deeper thought than many believed themselves capable.(8)

He was probably one of Rollins's most effective teachers, but he was not a prudent man. The college hired him to teach classical languages but his interests were much too eclectic to remain locked in the mechanics of an ancient language. In fact, he rarely taught Greek or Latin languages, preferring instead to roam somewhat aimlessly in the larger fields of Greek art, literature and philosophy. Many students who needed and wanted to learn Latin and Greek left his classes virtually as ignorant of the two languages as when they entered. Rice casually ignored their needs thereby breaking his contract with both the college and the students. He rationalized this questionable behavior by criticizing other professors who did teach their assigned subjects as dull pedagogues wedded to textbooks. Some were probably guilty of these charges, but that hardly justified Rice's teaching methods.

The persona that John Rice most reveled in was that of an iconoclast. His greatest enjoyment came from attacking sacred cows and shattering beliefs of pious, self-righteous people. His favorite target was the Christian religion. Shortly after he arrived, the college held a religious conference on the topic of "The Place of the Church in the Modern World." Leading religious scholars from throughout the country attended. Rice's performance at one of the meetings, set town-gown relations back several years. Rice had refused Holt's invitation to

participate but did agree to attend and ask “thought-provoking” questions. At a session in the Winter Park Congregational Church filled with the town’s citizens, Rice dutifully rose to speak: "I live in Winter Park," he declared, "and I should like to ask a question that has to do with the churches in Winter Park and those of us who live here. The question is: If I should come along Interlachen Avenue tomorrow, Sunday morning, and instead of churches I should find green grass growing, what difference would it make and to whom?" When one indignant preacher jumped to his feet and retorted that the Congregational Church had founded Rollins, Rice noted sarcastically that now he understood to whom it would make a difference, and would someone answer the first part of his question? No one ever did to his satisfaction. The pious never forgot John Rice's performance that day and Holt grew weary of explaining why he continued to retain such a blatant atheist on the Rollins faculty. (9)

A similar Rice incident later shocked both the college and Winter Park community. As the college's sole place of worship nothing could have been more sacred than Knowles Memorial Chapel. Built in 1932, the Chapel was Holt’s pride and joy. Designed by the nationally famous architect Ralph Adams Cram modeled after a Spanish chapel and consistent with the college’s Spanish Mediterranean style, it was Holt’s signature achievement. To show off his crowning triumph, Holt invited dignitaries from across the country and Central Florida for the opening service. John Rice would barely control his wrath as he watched what he described as contrived, non-denominational Protestant service conducted in a chapel more appropriate to a Catholic mass. Harmony, he believed, required a balance between liturgy and the physical form of the building. He later sat in aesthetic agony through the Chapel's first Christmas service that ended with an artificially lighted star glowing in a darkened Chapel. As the audience filed out of the vestibule Rice, in a loud voice, called the

service "obscene." It was the one Rice indiscretion that Hamilton Holt never forgot or forgave.(10)

Often Rice's withering criticisms led to outright meanness. He disrupted faculty gatherings and committee meetings with long, rambling, monotonous harangues. His vicious attacks against a faculty member often went beyond the bounds of human respect. The Dean of the College regularly received complaints from faculty members charging Rice with unwarranted attacks on their character. Rice pursued these attacks on individual faculty members in his classrooms, frequently disparaging individuals by name as "incompetent" or as "old-fashioned pedagogues who were wedded to a book." He verbally attacked one member of the faculty with such vehemence that many expected the incident to erupt into violence.(11)

More seriously, Rice treated some of his students in much the same manner. He attracted a small group of disciples who viewed him as generous with his time and caring with his advice. But many students feared and disliked him intensely. Less capable students or those who found his teaching methods and his spicy language objectionable became a victim of his venom and rancor. He spoke disparagingly of them in class and often badgered them unmercifully. Rice could be incredibly arbitrary. His students appearing before the Board of Admissions to the Upper Division received the most solicitous treatment; but those he disliked could expect a rigorous examination and were, at times, subjected to malicious personal criticism. In his personal relations Rice seemed lacking in that sense of moderation and proportion that the civilization of his own field of study valued so highly. He wrapped those he liked in kindness, but those he disliked were treated with disdain and disrespect.
(12)

If all this were not sufficient for concern, Rice's personal habits grated against a village and college community still guided by cramped Victorian mores. He paid little attention to his personal appearance and, as he once admitted, sometimes looked like a tramp. Many complained of his immodest dress. At a time when men still wore swimsuits covering most of their bodies, Rice often appeared at the college New Smyrna beach house dressed in very brief swim trunks, so skimpy by any standard of the day that he was later accused of parading around in nothing more than a jockstrap. Rice often greeted unexpected visitors at his home in dress considered inadequate by any standards. One professor often repeated a story of his utter embarrassment while escorting a prim female potential donor around the campus. They came upon Rice in his own backyard (Rice lived in college housing) dressed in extremely revealing underwear. Unconcerned, Rice stood for fifteen minutes conversing with them as if fully dressed. To the chagrin and disapproval of the administration and of not a few parents, Rice frankly discussed sex in his class and openly criticized what he called the "prude Victorian" views on the subject. It was rather commonly believed he was "having an affair" with one or more students.(13)

Thus, academically, socially and professionally Rice was an extremely unsettling presence on the Rollins campus. The college community had been moving toward a more liberated educational system but far from one that would tolerate such unorthodox behavior from one of its faculty members. Rice seemed unwilling to moderate that behavior to conform within a socially conventional institution located in a conservative village. In this sense Rice's dismissal was probably inevitable. The ensuing turmoil came not because Holt had insufficient reasons for the firing, but because in a professed democratic environment his methods appeared arbitrary to a large number of the faculty.

In a meeting on February 23, 1933, where Holt fired Rice, the president told him that faculty and students had been coming to him for the past year complaining of Rice's intolerance, his insulting and unethical conduct, his intemperate language and his immodest dress and behavior. Holt concluded this damning review by suggesting that Rice undertake "an old-fashioned religious conversion; that is, get love in your heart and banish hate." Rice protested that he did not hate people, that he would be willing to see the school psychologist, and implied that he would change his ways if Holt would reconsider his decision to fire him. Holt agreed to postpone his decision for a few days, even though he later admitted he had no intention of changing his mind. The postponement proved a fateful one. (14)

News the president intended to but had not finally decided to fire Rice hit the campus like a bombshell, splintering the college into factions. Those who had been deeply hurt by Rice formed the largest group. They pledged their loyalty to the President and strongly encouraged him to remain firm in his determination to fire Rice. Another large group, probably fearful of losing their jobs, faded into the background and quietly watched the whole affair from a safe distance. A smaller but highly vocal faction supported Rice but for a variety of reasons. A number of the students (including campus leaders such as George Barber, editor of the *The Sandspur*, and Nathaniel French, President of the student body) reacted strongly against Rice's dismissal. Many had come to the college because of its progressive reputation and believed that Rice was the leader in progressive experimentation. They aligned themselves with a group of progressive faculty who viewed the Rice dismissal as a serious setback for innovative education. Still another group, of which Ralph Lounsbury and Frederick Georgia were the most important members, worried about the methods employed by Holt. Influenced by the recent democratic developments at Rollins and the national effort of

all faculties in higher education to assume more authority in college governance, they saw the Rice dismissal as arbitrary and unjust in its procedures and potentially threatening to every faculty member who disagreed with administrative policy. Except for the students, no one in these groups was particularly friendly with Rice, although few seemed to hold animosities toward him.(15) For different reasons, every faction elevated the Rice dismissal to a *cause celebre*.

After hearing all sides of the case and after talking with Rice on two separate occasions (one a long meeting at Holt's home that lasted from eight in the evening until midnight), Holt remained convinced that Rice would never conform. The president sent him a formal letter of non-reappointment on March 21. "I have listened to all who care to see me in regard to my decision," Holt explained, "keeping my mind completely open and free from all rancor or personal ties, but I have now come to the final and definite conclusion that I cannot reconsider my decision, and I write to inform you of this fact." He offered Rice the dignity of resignation provided he tendered it by March 23. In the meantime, Holt had sent out letters advertising a teaching vacancy in Greek and Latin. (16)

One such letter was directed to a professional organization of college professors called the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The organization began in 1915 in order to "enhance the security and dignity of the scholar's calling throughout the country." In its first two decades, it concentrated on promoting the principles of academic freedom, faculty involvement in promotion and reappointment decisions and the establishment of a tenure policy. By 1933, having established criteria for these principles, the AAUP had begun the process of persuading universities and college administrations to accept them. Even

though the organization had reached a membership of over 5,000 in more than 200 institutions, it still had persuaded only one-half of the institutions to accept its criteria. During this period, it had conducted institutional investigations and had published in its bulletin the results of these inquiries, placing violators on its list of unacceptable institutions. Few institutions paid heed to such censure, but most felt uncomfortable with being held up to public scrutiny as an institution with serious internal problems. (17)

In late March 1933, almost simultaneously with Holt's advertisement for Rice's vacant position, the AAUP headquarters received information that Rollins College was experiencing tenure problems. The General Secretary, H. W. Tyler informed the Rollins President that the Association had learned "that the particular vacancy in the Department of Classics may be due to dismissal not in accordance with our principles." Holt immediately answered Tyler. Rollins professors, he informed Tyler, were all on one-year appointments. Associate and full professors who served in those ranks for three full years were given "automatic reappointments. In the case of the professor in question, he had not served those three full years."(18)

Holt then turned his attention to another concern. How did he AAUP learn of Rice's dismissal? Concluding that one of Rice's supporters was responsible, Holt began a search for the culprit. At one point, he even interrupted Rice's class to ask him if he had written to the Association. All denied writing the AAUP, but Holt remained convinced that one or more of them had perpetrated what he considered "an act of great disloyalty." In fact, they were telling the truth. Knowledge of the dismissal came to the Association from a source outside the college family. Rice's father-in-law, President Frank Aydelotte of Swarthmore College,

had written Tyler. By this time, a condition of mutual suspicion and distrust hovered like a dark cloud over the campus.(19)

The supporters of Rice may not have written the AAUP but they were determined to keep alive the issue of Rice's dismissal. Students and faculty debated the topic in the classrooms and held community forums where they openly criticized the President. They held almost nightly meetings in Rice's home. No one missed the meaning in the weekly chapel speech by Professor Allan Tory, a Rice supporter, entitled "The Faith that Rebels," where he spoke of the need to struggle against authoritarian decisions. Repeatedly, Holt and other administrators cited this "agitation" as additional justification for Rice's dismissal.(20)

Rice himself brought the situation to a head on April 24 when he informed Holt that he had submitted his case to the AAUP. The news only served to harden the President's resolve. The following day Holt persuaded the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees to issue a statement that laid to rest any lingering doubt as to who governed the college: "Resolved: That the Board of Trustees of Rollins College has sole authority to make all rules and regulations for the conduct of college and to delegate and to revoke such authority.; that the President of Rollins College is the executive representative of the Board of Trustees with full authority to oversee and conduct the affairs of the corporation in the intervals between meetings of the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee."

In a separate statement, the President then decreed: "In view of the above authoritative ruling, I now formally dismiss John Rice for the remainder of the academic year 1932-33 effective this date." Rice, he continued, must remove his personal effects from the campus by noon April 28, 1933. Then he added an ominous caveat: "It is of course obvious that any further agitation for the reinstatement of Professor Rice on the part of any employee of

the college, among each other or with students or outsiders, either individually or in groups, will be an act of disloyalty to Rollins College and must be dealt with summarily." Privately Holt told a friend that if Rice insisted on "appealing to those outside, he must fight the College from the outside."(21)

On the afternoon of the 26th, Holt called to his office thirteen faculty members considered opponents of Rice's dismissal. They included Frederick Georgia, Ralph Lounsbury, Allan Tory, Edward Clark, Royal France, Richard Fuerstein, Cecil Oldum, and Theodore Dreier. Holt explained the "constitutional legitimacy of his authority over tenure" and told them that the Rice case was now closed. The faculty members suggested that Rice deserved an impartial hearing. They requested that Holt invite the AAUP to come down and, to their surprise, Holt agreed. Before he terminated the interview, the President handed each of them a loyalty form to sign. They were dumbfounded. After a long period of silence, Lounsbury spoke: "Look, Hammy," he said in a soft voice, "you don't want to do anything like this. If you take my advice, you'll collect these forms and not let anyone else see them." Holt hesitated, and then quietly went from one member to another collecting the forms. When Dreier and Clarke later requested copies, he refused. Holt also left no copies of the loyalty form in his papers. (22)

A few days later Holt sent a letter to Secretary General Tyler of the AAUP, inviting "representatives to visit Rollins for the purpose of permitting me to place before your Association all the material at my disposal on which we based our decision."(23) Two weeks later, on May 16, an investigative team comprised of Arthur Lovejoy of Johns Hopkins University and Arthur Edwards of the University of Georgia arrived in Winter Park to investigate the Rice dismissal. Lovejoy, an established scholar in philosophy and a founder of the

AAUP, took charge of the investigation, interpreted the findings, and wrote the final report while Edwards remained unobtrusively in the background.(23)

Rice's appeal to the AAUP charged the administration with violating the Association's tenure principles, which provided before dismissal, every professor of associate rank or above should be entitled to have the charges against him stated in writing, to have a fair trial on those charges before a faculty-elected judicial committee and to have the opportunity to face his accusers. Lovejoy was eager to deal with the issue of the absence of a professional tenure policy at the college. When Holt demurred, Lovejoy agreed to leave the issue until after the committee investigated the Rice dismissal. (24)

The investigative hearings took place in the sacristy of the Chapel where Holt (along with Treasurer E. B. Brown and Dean Winslow Anderson) presented evidence against the dismissed professor. Rice was supported by Georgia and Lounsbury. Day after day Holt read letters and signed statements from students and from faculty, staff and townspeople critical of Rice for one reason or another.(25) Altogether, Holt listed a dozen charges against Rice, including claims he failed to teach Latin and Greek languages, he had spent class periods on irrelevant topics of religion and of sex; he punished students who did not hold his ideas; that he influenced students to leave fraternities and sororities; he bullied students who came before the Board of Admissions of Upper Division; he "scoffed" at services in the chapel and criticized the churches of the town; he did not carry out the two-hour plan as scheduled and he was at times "immodest in dress." A final charge contained a blanket accusation that seemed to contradict the college's fundamental progressive mission: Rice "destroyed youthful ideals without inculcating anything equally constructive and commendable in their place." Professors, who were supposed to encourage students to

keep open minds in order to seek their own way, to come to their own conclusions, now were expected to "inculcate" young people with "constructive and commendable ideas." Thus, the Rice Affair had seemingly caused Holt to violate his own basic beliefs.

Rice was initially shocked at the accumulation of condemning evidence Holt presented but then relaxed considerably when he realized that in their particulars they were often distorted, trivial or entirely false. In Rice's mind, Holt's efforts to articulate Rice's pernicious influence on the campus seemed nothing more than disagreements over policy, or petty differences over lifestyles. Did Holt personally look into Rice's teaching of Greek and Latin, asked Lovejoy? Well, no, said Holt, but he had considerable information from students. Did Rice characterize a chapel service as obscene? Rice admitted he had, but for good reason. Form should follow form, Rice argued. "You can't put on a vaudeville show, pink spotlight and start singing with a choirmaster standing with his back to the altar in a Catholic style chapel without incurring the charge of obscenity." Didn't Rice encourage student disloyalty to the college? "My students," Rice replied, "are loyal to Rollins as they want it to be but not necessarily as it is, that is an unwise loyalty." Rice also denied he "dressed immodestly." Did you parade around the beach house in a jockstrap? Holt asked. "No," Rice replied, "I don't own a jock strap." And so it went for several days: Holt reading charges from signed affidavits, Rice either disputing them or trying to explain them away.

Finally, although Holt wanted to avoid the matter, Lovejoy brought the hearings around to the heart of the matter. Did Rollins have a tenure policy, and if so were Rice's rights violated under that policy?(40) Holt answered that, at the request of the faculty several months earlier, the Trustees had issued a policy statement stating: "Until Rollins College achieves a greater measure of financial stability, Trustees find it impossible to establish

permanent standards for tenure of office. Therefore, while it is necessary to continue assistant professor and instructors on the one-year appointment basis, the Trustees are glad to assure professors and associate professors who have served in this rank for three or more years that the policy of the Trustees will be to continue their services without annual notification unless reasonable notice be given to the contrary." Lovejoy reminded Holt that Rice was asked to leave the campus two days after he received his non-reappointment letter. Did Holt consider that "reasonable notice"? Holt replied yes.(26)

Lovejoy and Edwards left on May 24. Several months would elapse before they completed their report, but Holt knew by the manner of Lovejoy's handling of the hearing and by the tenor of his questions and comments that it would criticize Rice's dismissal. Even before the hearings ended, Holt determined that Lovejoy had placed not Rice, but the president and the college on trial. He thought Edwards "a fair investigator," but was convinced that Lovejoy was devious and prejudiced.(44) Holt felt betrayed when Lovejoy handed a "preliminary report" to local newspapers before he left town. It criticized the college's "rules for tenure" as "ill-defined" and found in the Rice's behavior "nothing seriously reflecting upon either the private character or scholarship of Mr. Rice or on his ability as a teacher."(27)

With the investigation completed, Holt now prepared to play out what he called "the fourth act in the great college drama, Rollins versus Rice." He intended to deal with Rice's friends. One by one he called the Rice supporters into his office and asked them all the same question: "Will you give your loyalty and support to reducing the cleavage on the campus and in carrying out policies of the Trustees, the faculty or acts by myself or any others in authority even though you may intellectually differ with them?" Those who replied affirmatively found their positions secure. Those resisted were dismissed. Allan Tory, an

English historian and Oxford graduate, told Holt he would work to repair campus rifts, but would refuse to be a "yes man." Despite a previous verbal contract, a promotion to Associate Professor and appointment as a faculty representative to a prestigious International Club, Holt fired Tory the following day. The President wanted to fire physics professor Theodore Dreier but hesitated. He was the nephew of Margaret Robbins Dreier, was an influential Trustee. Holt informed Ted Dreier he "could come back next year" but would not be asked to return the following year. Dreier resigned. Professor of history and crew coach Cecil Oldham had resigned earlier for reasons growing out of the Rice affair. Despite Holt's pleading, Robert Wunsch, brilliant associate professor of theater, quit in July. Total casualties, including resignations and dismissals, stood at eight faculty members, all Rice defenders in one form or another. The college had lost one-fourth of its faculty.(28)

Frederick Georgia and Ralph Lounsbury presented Holt with special problems. An important force in Holt's rebuilding program, chairman of several major committees and organizer of the curriculum conference, Georgia had held his professorship for over seven years and seemed protected certainly from dismissal. Lounsbury had completed three years as professor and had only recently (March 11) received a letter from Holt stating "though professors who have held a professional rank three or more years need not be notified of their reappointment I am writing you this personal note for I hope you will continue at Rollins where you have made an enviable reputation for yourself."(29) In a letter to his Dean, Holt frankly admitted that, because the college had no case against the two professors on "specific grounds," it must reply on the fact that they "were disturbing elements and we must have harmony." On June 6, the day after commencement, the Executive Committee asked Georgia and Lounsbury to resign with one-half salary. Both men refused, arguing that the

settlement was inconsistent with the policy of due notice. Their contract for 1933-34 must be honored, they said. The Executive Committee voted not to re-employ Georgia and Lounsbury for the following year, and one month later, the Board of Trustees upheld that vote. (30)

Lounsbury's case was perhaps the saddest. The President's closest personal friend since their college days at Yale, a political and economic conservative, Lounsbury seemed curiously out of place among the liberal and progressive supporters of John Rice. Yet, he sympathized with their professional educational goals, saw much inflexibility in the two-hour classes but most of all believed principles should guide a person's life. More than any of the others, he supported Rice not out of sympathy with the eccentric iconoclast but because he thought Rice's dismissal struck a devastating blow against the integrity of the teaching profession. Lounsbury never doubted the administration's authority to fire Rice, but he very strongly questioned Holt's dismissal methods. Try as he might, Lounsbury could not make Holt understand the consistency of his loyalty to Holt and his support of Rice. He had written in mid-March of his concern that Holt saw his efforts to improve policies or methods as evidence of his disloyalty. "I have gone and shall doubtless continue to go upon the supposition that loyalty does not call for mere subserviency or for clothing an honest expression of opinion. College professors who are willing to surrender lightly the thing which is very fundamental to their profession--namely their mental integrity--are not apt to be of any value to Rollins." Two months later when the Rice dismissal became a crisis, Lounsbury vainly tried to clarify his (and "also his colleagues") position in a letter to the president: "I should be sorry if you thought that our opposition to some things and our efforts to help another

had any personal aspect towards you. We have been fighting not Hamilton Holt as an individual and friend but for what we believe to be the integrity of our profession; and may I say that no man who will not fight for that has any business to be in [a profession]" He added a poignantly moving plea: "So Hammy please try to overlook my failings and believe that whatever I have of head and heart is devoted to even a bigger and better Rollins. If the roads by which we seek that result seem now and then divergent, I know that we are both trying to attain that goal and I beg you to believe it too."(31) However reasonable and moving his plea, Lounsbury entirely misread the situation. Hamilton Holt was incapable of separating his personal mission from that of the college's. He seems to have completely internalized what other had been saying: "Holt is Rollins and Rollins is Holt."

With hindsight, one can see that the Rice dismissal need not have degenerated into a crisis. Only the president could have prevented it. Even more to the point, as the chief officer of the college, it was his responsibility and his alone to make certain Rice's dismissal did not turn into an explosive situation.(32) He had only to turn the Rice problem over to an appropriate faculty committee, to charge it with conducting hearings and to use its findings simply as recommendations. Given Rice's behavior, the committee undoubtedly would have recommended dismissal. But even if it had not, the president could still have acted independently, certainly with no more unfavorable consequences. Many faculty members and at least one trustee had suggested this solution. Professors Tory and Edwin Clark thought such a committee would create "a new morale and hope for the future."(32) The most perceptive advice along these lines came from Board of Trustees member Margaret Drier Robbins. A childhood friend of the President, a liberal reformer and a militant leader of the wom-

en's labor movement in the 1920s, Margaret Robbins tried in several letters and with a personal visit to divert Holt from a collision course with his faculty. She begged Holt to elect a faculty committee to consider the discipline and even dismissal of Rice. In that way, she sagaciously contended, rather than Holt's shouldering the entire burden, the faculty would bear with him responsibility for that decision. Wasn't such an effort simply an extension of "your own liberal policies? My dear Hamilton Holt," she pleaded, "why not add this jewel to your immortal crown?" Holt never answered her questions.(33)

As a college president, Holt was much more conventional than Mrs. Robbins supposed. With prodding from the AAUP, a few institutions had established systems giving the faculty a greater role in college governance, but in the overwhelming majority of colleges, employer-employee concepts still characterized president-faculty relationships. Few presidents held more strongly to this attitude than Hamilton Holt, who consistently described his efforts at Rollins in business terms. Like businesses, his two-hour class system would place education on an eight-hour day; students must be responsible in attending classes in the same way as workers were responsible for showing up at work. Holt regarded *The Independent* reporters and Rollins professors in much the same way. He respected their professionalism, many were close friends, but in the final analysis he was their boss. As president he held the authority of a conventional employer who could personally hire and fire employees. When, in the midst of the Rice affair, some faculty questioned that authority, he promptly persuaded the Trustees to issue an interpretation that provided him with unlimited authority in matters of faculty discipline and dismissal: "Subject to the approval of the Trustees it is the duty of the President to appoint or dismiss all employees of the college including the faculty," read the Trustee minutes.

Holt bluntly stated his personal management style in a letter to the Southern Association of Colleges explaining why he had dismissed the Rice supporters: "It is fundamental of [the] employee's duty that he should yield obedience to all reasonable rules, orders or instructions of the employer." More to the point when asked why he would not allow a faculty review committee, Holt replied, "When you fire a cook you don't go out and get a committee of neighbors to tell you what to do." (34) In Holt's mind, cooks and professors were on the same level when it came to the presidential authority.

Holt found others than Margaret Robbins on the Board of Trustees with more supportive advice. Successful businessmen John Goss and Milton Warner, Holt's classmates at Yale, and William O'Neal, a local Trustee, all interpreted the Rice affair as a power struggle between a group of liberal dissident faculty and the president. They advised Holt to stand firm in his authority, or else he would lose complete control of the college governance. Throughout the crisis, Goss, who was especially influential, wrote long pages of advice that Holt followed almost to the letter. At one time or another, Goss advised Holt to "go at this Rice matter firmly, decisively, and without hesitation;" "to get the Rice supporters together and make them pledge themselves to be loyal. After the AAUP hearings, Goss counseled Holt "to clean the decks just as quickly as possible of all disloyalty and of all disintegrating influences personal or otherwise that have surrounded this Rice problem." Holt was so receptive to Goss's advice that more than once he repeated word for word an odd aphorism that the Trustee said guided him in his business affairs: "When principle and right conflict, throw away your principles and do what is right."(35)

By the beginning of the new school year in September 1933, the Rice affair had receded beneath the surface of Rollins's community life. An uneasy peace had returned to

the campus. The Rice affair resurfaced, however, in November, when the AAUP published Lovejoy's report in its bulletin. The report conceded that Rice "had unquestionably much disturbed the harmony of the local community," had "fallen into some serious errors of judgment and some of taste." Still, it concluded, Rice's dismissal "eliminated from the faculty a teacher who appears on the one hand to have done more than any other to provoke questioning, discussion and the spirit of critical inquiry and on the other to have aimed with exceptional success at constructive results both in thought and character."(36)

The Lovejoy report accused Holt of exceeding his authority, of autocratically interpreting the college bylaws, of demanding excessive personal fealty, and of expecting more harmony and likemindedness than should be found in the college. It further accused him of hypocritically proclaiming liberal ideals but of practicing the opposite. The report specifically noted the mass dismissals subsequent to the Lovejoy hearings, citing them as evidence of the President's "autocratic powers contrary to academic customs and principles of this profession and not sanctioned by the college charter or bylaws." The association placed Rollins on its ineligible list indicating to its members that the college had violated AAUP principles of academic freedom and tenure.(37)

Maddened by Lovejoy's report, Holt refused to let the matter drop. In December, he and the Executive Committee published a response entitled, "Rollins College versus The American Association of University Professors," charging the Committee of Inquiry with "attempted coercion if not bribery; [with] misrepresentation if not defamation of character of bias; and [with] prejudice if not malice and suppression of evidence." The report further lashed out at "the small body of willful men who controlled the Association in the year 1932-33." It also belittled the organization which approved "the attack of a prejudiced and hostile

investigator." The college then distributed several thousand copies of the report to college and university administrations throughout the country. Afterward, the administration finally allowed the Rice affair to rest. In February 1934, Holt wrote a friend with some relief that "the storm through which our academic ship of state passed is now over and we are now in calm waters."(38)

The Rice affair produced another and more positive outcome. When Rice, Georgia, Lounsbury and Dreier gathered during the summer to consider the future, they were drawn to the idea of putting in practice what they had been preaching. Why not start their own college, one of them suggested. With the nation in the midst of a deep economic depression the idea at first had seemed absurdly naive, but they agreed to explore the possibilities. By August, they had found a ready-made campus, the Baptist Summer Retreat in Black Mountain, North Carolina, and enough funds to make a beginning. In September 1932, four of the dismissed Rollins faculty members opened Black Mountain College, destined to become in the next decade one of the nation's most exciting and significant progressive experiments in American higher education. Rather than resentment, Black Mountain College evoked considerable pride from the Rollins community. Many sensed an affinity with its efforts, believing correctly that Rollins had provided the educational spawning grounds for the experiment. The Rice affair thus seemed to be ending on a much more pleasant note than the President's strident reply to the AAUP report.

The struggle left behind two unfortunate casualties. The first was Ralph Lounsbury who died unexpectedly in 1933 of heart failure. Previous attacks had led him into what he thought were the peaceful confines of academe. More than a few of his colleagues at Black Moun-

tain believed that his row with Holt and his subsequent dismissal had contributed to Lounsbury's untimely death. The second casualty was the incipient progressive educational reforms begun with such high optimism in 1930. The college did not abandon its progressive posture, but the Rice affair had diverted the community's energy into an unproductive struggle that substantially smothered a fledgling spirit of reform. Moreover, the John Rice took with him the North Carolina imaginative progressive ideas that within limits could have been developed at Rollins. It is true that the radical communal educational experiments attempted at Black Mountain could never have happened at Rollins (and perhaps no other place than its rural isolated location). It is true as well that the city of Winter Park would not have tolerated the Bohemian behavior of the many students and faculty who populated Black Mountain. The loss of Rice and seven other faculty members robbed the college individuals who could have taken the institution to even greater progressive heights. As Holt indicated in the aftermath of the Rice affair, by 1934 the academic ship of state had receded from the stormy seas of conflict, into the more calming waters of academic conventionalism. Unfortunately, the secure haven into which Holt had anchored his vessel shielded it as well from the excitement, the adventure, and the promise of the turbulent seas of innovative education.

The final and ironic chapter of the Rice episode was written several years later in 1938. In that year Black Mountain College refused to reappoint John Rice on grounds similar to those that had led to his dismissal at Rollins. That same year the Rollins Board of Trustees adopted the AAUP statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure. In December 1938 the Association removed Rollins from the unapproved list.(39)

NOTES

1. Jenks left Rollins in 1930 for Wellesley College and later achieved scholarly recognition for his book, *Our Cuban Colony: A Study in Sugar* (1972)
For Rice's background and his own description of how he was hired see John Rice, *I Came Out Of the Eighteenth Century* (1942). Holt's version, not significantly different from Rice's, may be found Holt Memorandum on the Rice Affair, May 1933.
2. Holt to Rice, March 16, 1932; Rice to Holt, March 18, 1932; "Report of the Committee on the Fraternity System," March 1932.
3. Memorandum from the President to the Fraternities, March 26, 1932. See Maurice O'Sullivan and Jack C. Lane "Zora Neale Hurston at Rollins College," in *Zora in Florida*, edited by Steve Gassman and Kathryn Seidel. (1991) for Hurston's long relationship with Rollins and the Rollins faculty.
4. Grover to Holt, April 10, 1932; Lounsbury to Holt, April 10, 1932.
5. Curriculum Committee Report, January, 1933; Faculty Minutes, January 1933.
6. Holt to Howard Bailey, January 22, 1933; Faculty Minutes, January 1933; Curriculum Committee Report.
7. Curriculum Committee to President Holt, January 18, 1933; Holt to Curriculum Committee, January 19, 1933.
8. Rice, *Eighteenth Century*, 306-08; Martin Duberman, *Black Mountain College* (1972), 3.
9. Rice, *Eighteenth Century*, 301.
10. Duberman, 4.
11. Willard Wattles to Holt, March 10, 1933; Dean Anderson's Memorandum on John Rice to President Holt, March 1933.
12. *Ibid.*, where Anderson cites student and faculty complaints against Rice.
13. Interview by author with Rhea Smith; Carol Hemingway Gardner to author, February 10, 1979; Dean Anderson's Memo.
14. Holt's Memorandum on Rice Affair.
15. For example see Wattles to Holt, March 10, 1933.
16. Holt to Rice, March 21, 1933.

17. Holt to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) March 1933.
18. Tyler to Holt, April 8, 1933; Holt to Tyler, April 18, 1933.
19. Interview by author with Theodore Dreier; Statement by Arthur Lovejoy, "Rollins College Report," *Bulletin of the AAUP* 19, No. 7 (November 1933). Rice, "Eighteenth Century, 306.
20. Tory's speech printed in *Sandspur*, April 8, 1933. Wattles warned Holt of the agitation in a letter on April 10, 1933. See also Winslow Anderson's Report on the Rice Affair.
21. Rice to Holt, April 21, 1933; Executive Committee, Trustee Minutes, April 22, 1933; Holt to Rice, April 22, 1933; Holt to Asa Jennings April 27, 1933.
22. Rice, *Eighteenth Century*, 307. Interview by author with Theodore Dreier.
23. Holt to AAUP, May 6, 1933; Holt Memo on the Rice Affair, May 1933. In Lovejoy Holt had a formidable adversary. To say that Arthur Lovejoy was an "established scholar" is something of an understatement. At the time he was America's foremost intellect who had written the seminal study in the history of ideas entitled *The Great Chain of Being* (1936). The book has since become a major classic. Lovejoy was also a passionate defender of faculty free speech. In 1901 he resigned from Sanford University when the administration fired a professor over a disagreement with a trustee. The faculty at Harvard wanted to hire Lovejoy but the president vetoed his appointment on the grounds that he was a trouble-maker. He was later hired at Columbia University.
24. Printed in AAUP, "Report on Rollins College," Appendix A, 439.
25. I have reconstructed the following discussion of the hearings from hand written notes kept by E. B. Brown, Holt Papers; from Rice, *Eighteenth Century*; from Holt Memo on the Rice Affair and from the AAUP, "Report on Rollins College."
26. AAUP, "Report on Rollins College," 423; Trustee Minutes, February, 1932; Notes kept by E.B. Brown on the Rice Hearings.
27. Holt to Beard, May 24, 1933; *Orlando Sentinel*, May 25, 1933; AAUP, "Report on Rollins College," 439.
28. Memorandum on Conference with Rice Followers, June 2-5, 1933.
29. *Ibid.*
30. Holt to Lounsbury, March 11, 1933; Trustee Minutes, June 1933; Holt to Anderson, June 21, 1933.
31. Lounsbury to Holt, March 16, 1933; May 7, 1933.

32. Holt to Beard, May 24, 1933.

33. Margaret Dreier Robbins to Holt, May 24, 1933. Margaret Drier was one of the college's most intriguing members of the Board of Trustees. As a former president of the Women's Trade Union League, she was its most unconventional as well. It must have been a bit awkward for a Board consisting of mostly conservative businessmen to sit at the table with someone who had organized strikes, perhaps against one of their own corporations. She was also married to Raymond Robbins who was on speaking terms with Lenin and Trotsky of the Soviet Union. Margaret and Raymond owned a home in Brooksville, Florida called Chensegut which they offered to donate to Rollins in their wills, but Holt turned it down. It is now a historic home run by the University of South Florida.

Robbins resigned from the Board in September, 1933. In the resignation letter she reiterated her long "abiding friendship with Holt. "For your progressive ideas in education," she continued, "and the spirit of freedom and comradeship in teaching for both students and professors that you pioneered, I have keen sympathy and admiration. But with the policy of faculty dismissal I find myself in settled opposition. Under these circumstances, I send you my resignation." Robbins to Holt, September, 1933.

34. Trustee Minutes, April 1933; Report of the Southern Association of Colleges [no date], copy in Holt Papers; Holt's testimony Before the AAUP Hearings, copy in Holt Papers. Holt's use of the term "drama" reinforces the perception that he saw the Rice affair as pure theater and envisioned himself as collegiate King Lear defending his kingdom from a family assault. Reading all the documents and letters left me with the impression that Holt enjoyed every minute of his stage performance.

35. John Goss to Holt, May 15, 1933; Holt to Goss, May 26, 1933.

36. AAUP, "Report on Rollins College, 427.

37. *Ibid.* 429.

38. Printed in *Bulletin* 29 (December 1933).

39. Duberman, *Black Mountain*, 152; *Trustee Minutes*, April 1938.

A decade after his dismissal, Rice wrote a memoir that included a chapter on his experiences at Rollins. Holt purchased a copy and carefully annotated virtually every page indicating where he thought Rice lied about many incidents. Holt's copy is located in the Rollins Archives.

Today, over sixty years after its founding, interest in Black Mountain College as a quintessential experiment in progressive education has reached the level of a kind of cottage industry, generating scholarly articles, conferences and workshops almost every year. In all this assiduous attention, the place of Rollins College in the origins of Black Mountain College has been relegated to one of derision: a conservative college dismissed four brilliant progressive professors who took their theories to North Carolina and started a new innovative institution.

Still, a strong case can be made that the open, receptive venue at Rollins College was one of the few places where progressive ideas were given the freedom to germinate. The first Black Mountain curriculum of Junior and Senior Divisions with entrance into the Senior Division dependent not on number of courses but on passing oral and comprehensive exams was lifted directly from the Rollins progressive curriculum of 1933. Rollins faculty and students were fully prepared to accept many of the far-reaching programs introduced in the first years of Black Mountain. Even though he initiated the progressive educational reform movement at Rollins, ironically it was President Hamilton Holt, not the faculty members, who brought sweeping progressive reforms to a halt. Nevertheless, it may be said, without Rollins there would have been no Black Mountain College. Ironically, Holt's imperious resistance to radical progressive reforms was responsible for the conditions that led to the creation of those reforms elsewhere. Holt seemed to take pride in Rollins's role in Black Mountain's success, as long as such experiments occurred some other place.