At the end of 1947 the department had come to one of the low points in its history, perhaps the lowest point. Its faculty ranks had been decimated and the surviving senior members were obviously unfit to provide effective leadership. Under these circumstances it was indeed fortunate both that a man with Aydelotte's qualities was available for the chairmanship and that a majority of his colleagues firmly supported the principles of departmental management he proposed to put in place. The revolutionary action of December 12 established the principle that as a self-governing body all members of the department would participate actively in the determination of departmental policy and decisions. Aydelotte's role was to define the functions of the chairman in the new dispensation. Much of what he did came to constitute enduring precedents which shaped the character of the department for half a century to come. There was nothing in self-government as such which guaranteed a continuing pursuit of academic excellence. This was to be Aydelotte's legacy. He combined a respect for democratic self-government with stubborn determination not to compromise with academic excellence. In making faculty appointments exhaustive searches involving careful appraisal of published and unpublished research were to be supplemented by extensive inquiries among teachers and colleagues and interviews of candidates. The results of these investigations were to be reviewed by the entire department which assumed ultimate responsibility for the decisions reached. In the earlier years of his chairmanship Aydelotte himself took charge of these searches. His expectations were high. He proposed to build a department to compare with the best. Arthur Schlesinger had had similar expectations, but had departed; Aydelotte remained, and with dogged determination was able to fix principles and practices that have survived.
The response of the university administration was mixed. President Hancher had no great expectations for the university and was apparently indifferent. The Provost, Harvey Davis, openly ridiculed Aydelotte, who, he sneered, always wanted to appoint Jesus Christ, and when He would not come Aydelotte insisted on one of the twelve Disciples. The Liberal Arts Dean, Dewey Stuit, however, was generally supportive. A psychologist and a member of what was at that time the most distinguished department in the college, Stuit knew that the academic standing of a university is determined by the quality of its faculty. He distinguished between research and teaching departments and was prepared to support history as a research department, approving lower teaching loads in recognition of the research effort.

The major problem was lack of money. In spite of the influx of students following World War II the university did not share in the prosperity of the post-War period. In 1948-49, Aydelotte's first year as chairman, the departmental instructional budget was $96,610 for 27 faculty lines, including 13 instructors and a maximum salary of $6,730. In the following year, the budget fell to $84,061 for 25 lines; and in 1950-51 it fell again to $73,411 for 27 lines. It was not until 1955-56 that the departmental budget recovered its 1948-49 position. Nevertheless, Aydelotte was determined not only to fill vacant lines but to begin the process of enlarging the department with appointments in fields not previously offered by scholarly specialists.

Critics of the departmental revolution contended that an elected chairman would be too weak to control the factions that would inevitably arise. Reflecting back on Root's experience Aydelotte responded that he felt stronger than a designated head of department precisely because he enjoyed the support of a majority of his colleagues, and that if he failed to have such support he would resign. When the Liberal
Arts faculty in 1950, undoubtedly stimulated by events in the history department, adopted a Manual of Rules and Regulations, in effect a constitution for the college, it provided for a departmental choice of chairman or head. Some preferred to retain their headships but eventually every department chose a chairman (later "chair"). Dean Stuit said that it made no difference to him whether departments preferred a chairman or a head since their powers were the same. But experience was to show that it made a great difference to the departments; those choosing chairmen invariably developed an active sense of individual participation in departmental affairs, while those preferring heads were content to leave to him or her the management of affairs.

The prediction of factionalism was to be quickly tested. The precipitating occasion was disagreement over the award of graduate fellowships, but behind that was a struggle for power. Stuart Hoyt, who had managed the choice of Aydelotte as chairman, apparently expected to be the power behind the chair. When Aydelotte demonstrated his independence Hoyt was frustrated. He expected that his colleagues would accept his recommendations for fellowships for his graduate students, and when a majority chose to be guided by tangible evidences of the record which favored other candidates Hoyt became embittered. He organized a faction consisting of Thornton, Livingston, Mosse and himself. The majority supported Aydelotte, and for two or three years relations in the department were strained. The faction dissolved when Thornton died and Hoyt and Mosse departed. Since the mid-1950s the department has been happily free of factionalism. Devotion to the principle of rational evaluation of academic merit has enabled faculty members to subordinate personal feelings of attachment to students to acceptance in good spirit of the judgments of colleagues.

The original action of 1947 stipulating that the chair-
man would be ineligible to succeed himself was wisely disregarded, and Aydelotte served until 1958 and again from 1966 to 1969, during which time the principles which were to govern the department were firmly established. No other individual who has served as chair has consented to accept more than one term, the office apparently being perceived as an honor but not as a source of power to be coveted. Outsiders have sometimes erroneously assumed that the department maintained the principle of rotation. This would have been a mistake, since some individuals although excellent teachers and scholars would not in the judgment of their colleagues be successful administrators.

Four new assistant professors were appointed in 1948. Charles Gibson came from Yale in Latin American history; Nicholas Riasanovsky from Oxford and Harvard in Russian history; Ralph Greenlaw from Princeton in French history; and J. Frank Gilliam from Yale with a joint appointment with Classics in Greek and Roman history. Three of these proved to be eminently successful appointments. Gibson was just publishing his master's thesis on The Inca Concept of Sovereignty, and in the following seventeen years in the department he would publish The Tovar Calendar (1951), Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century (1952), The Colonial Period in Latin American History (1958), a bibliographical guide for the AHA's Service Center for Teachers of History, and The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule (1964). Spain in America, published in 1966, the year following his departure for Michigan, represented work done at Iowa. All of Gibson's work focused on the Spanish conquest and on the subsequent political and cultural interactions and adaptations of European and native peoples. It represented a major contribution to the understanding of a great theme in the history of the Americas.

Nicholas Riasanovsky inaugurated the study of Russian history at Iowa. During his ten years here before going to Berkeley he published Russia and the West in the Teaching of...
the Slavophiles (1952), and wrote Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia (1959). (He also made an abortive attempt to organize a departmental cheering section for athletic contests. "After all, it's what they do well here.")

Before coming to Iowa, Frank Gilliam had worked with Rostovtzeff on the excavations at Dura Europas. His papers on the Roman army based on papyri discovered at Dura established his international reputation and led eventually to a professorship at the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study.

The success of these appointments understandably gave Aydelotte great confidence in his judgment of the merits of candidates. He came to pride himself on his ability to detect the quality of young scholars at the outset of their careers, often identifying potential before seeing written work by such criteria as conversation and careful questioning of advisers. But he was not always successful. Greenlaw found himself unable to conform to expectations and sought employment elsewhere. James E. Rochan, who came from Yale in American history with high expectations shortly left the profession. David Hamilton, a Chinese historian who impressed Aydelotte with his articulate conversation proved to have writers' block and did nothing. On the other hand, Allan Bogue, who was reserved and shy, left a strongly negative impression on Aydelotte, and it was only with great reluctance that he eventually yielded to the united insistence of his colleagues and agreed to offer Bogue an appointment.

It must be added, however, that he quickly came to recognize Bogue's great merit and became one of his strongest admirers and supporters. Perhaps the greatest mistake was Aydelotte's determination to get rid of Richard S. Westfall, who was to become the distinguished historian of science.

At the same time that he was busy with the development of departmental policies and the recruitment of faculty
Aydelotte found time to pursue his research. In the early 1950s he was discussing with colleagues the application of quantitative techniques to historical topics. His interest in the British parliament of the 1830s and 1840s provided the material for increasingly sophisticated quantitative analysis of legislative behavior. A series of theoretical papers published in the 1950s and 1960s set forth his views of "behaviorialism" in historical study. He considered it a "sedate, hesitant, circumspect" application of quantitative techniques to certain kinds of data which would permit more accurate statements than those based on impressionistic methods. But he did not hesitate to propound what might be called Aydelotte's Law: "All generalizations are implicitly quantitative." At the same time, he acknowledged the limited applicability of quantitative techniques, making allowance for the legitimate place of story telling.

The work of the colleagues and students who constituted the "Iowa School" of quantitative studies was impressive evidence of the persuasiveness of Aydelotte's work. Most of the schoolmen were in American history. Allan Bogue, who came as assistant professor in 1952, worked on the financing of agriculture in the corn belt. Samuel Hays, who came in the following year, studied ethnic voting patterns in the Midwest. Their graduate students, Robert Sweringa, Joel Silbey, Samuel McSevney, Lowell Soike, and Robert Dykstra applied quantitative techniques to political and social topics in 19th century American history. When Dykstra joined the faculty in 1968 he was the second former doctoral student to do so since Louis Pelzer in 1909. He promoted quantification with evangelical zeal, prophesying that those who failed to employ its techniques would be condemned to functional illiteracy. A graduate course in quantitative techniques was introduced, and prospective appointees were scrutinized for quantitative skills. Dykstra shortly left for the New York State University at Albany, and no appointment specifically for a
quantifier was made. Several faculty members and graduate students persisted in pursuing subjects not susceptible of quantitative treatment, i.e., story telling, and eventually the course in statistical methods was reduced to optional credit for those who might seek it.

Although the department disregarded the injunction of 1947 to limit the chairmanship to a single term, it has in practice achieved this intent by virtue of the general principles that have governed its development. The determination that it should be self-governing naturally reduced the potential of the chair for strong leadership. At the same time, universal devotion to scholarship cast the office in the light of a burden rather than an attractive opportunity. Although Aydelotte initially accepted several terms it was apparent that his increasing absorption in quantitative work encroached on the demands of administration. In any event, the department was ably served by a succession of chairmen and chairs, each of whom declined with thanks my attempts to promote another term: Allan Bogue, Charles Gibson, Alan Spitzer, Sydney James, Laurence Lafore, Charles Hale, John Henneman, Malcolm Rohrbough, Ellis Hawley, Lawrence Gelfand, and Jeffrey Cox.

As recently as 1948, graduate work had been available in only four fields: medieval Europe, modern Europe, England and the British Empire, and American history. The occasional courses in other fields had been restricted to undergraduates and were not taught by specialists in those fields. The determination to enlarge the department by adding new fields for specialized courses and graduate work went hand in hand with the strengthening of the fields traditionally offered. Insofar as the department had an overall plan it was expansion. Allan Bogue once remarked that the department could not realistically expect to become stronger unless it became larger. But owing to the perennial lack of funds expansion was to be
a slow process extending over five decades. The slow pace of growth is apparent in the tenure-track statistics at ten-year intervals (not counting TAs or visitors):

- 1920 -- 9
- 1930 -- 11
- 1940 -- 13
- 1950 -- 12
- 1960 -- 14
- 1970 -- 22
- 1980 -- 26
- 1990 -- 29

Given the location of the university and the interests of many of its students it was inevitable that a major emphasis of the department should focus on American history. The work in recent American history inaugurated by Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., was carried on by George Mowry, Samuel Hays, Christopher Lasch, and Ellis Hawley. Hawley's research on Herbert Hoover's efforts to regulate the national economy through associations of business interests won national attention. In the history of the West, another strong field, Louis Pelzer was followed by Allan Bogue, Malcolm Rohrbough, and Robert Dykstra. W.T. Root's work in colonial history was continued by Sydney James, whose excellent studies of colonial Rhode Island were cut short by his untimely death. The study of American intellectual history which I inaugurated was carried on with great distinction by Stephen Pyne and Kenneth Cmiel. Lawrence Gelfand introduced work in diplomatic history, and Shelton Stromquist in labor history. Linda Kerber's pioneering work on women in the Federal era inaugurated studies which led to her election as President of the Organization of American Historians, the first Iowa historian to be so honored since Louis Pelzer. Beyond the United States, the department has a strong tradition of work in medieval history, with such scholars as George Cuttino, Stuart Hoyt, Giles Constable, Donald Sutherland, John Henne man, Catherine Tachau, and Constance Berman. English history has been another strong field, with Harry Plum, George Mosse, Aydelotte, Laurence Lafore, Henry Horwitz, and Jeffrey Cox.
French history has been ably represented by Gordon Andrews, Alan Spitzer, Ralph Giesey, and Sarah Hanley. In Russian history the work of Riasanovsky has been carried on by Patrick Alston, Arthur Mendel, Jaroslaw Pelenski, and Steven Hoch. David Schoenbaum introduced a new field of military history, and Mitchell Ash in history of science. The study of Latin American history inaugurated by Gibson was carried on by Charles Hale and Kathleen Higgins. Hale's work on the history of Mexican liberalism was honored by the Mexican government. Hsin-Pao Chang was the first appointee in Asian history. Following his death the field was subdivided into Chinese history, with David Hamilton and David Arkush; Japanese history with Stephen Large and Stephen Vlastos; and Indian history with Paul Greenough.

The study of history is unique among the subjects offered by the university in that it deals with the chronological dimension rather than a single subject matter. Historians deal with a wide range of subjects several of which relate to the work of other departments. A historian may have closer professional relationships to the faculty in another department than to his or her own colleagues. Wherever a discipline has an interest in its own historical dimension the basis exists for an interdisciplinary program. Beginning with the American Studies program organized by Norman Foerster in the 1940s, a number of such interdisciplinary programs have appeared: Latin American Studies, Asian Studies, Women's Studies, Global Studies, Legal Studies, the History of Medicine, the Center for International and Comparative Studies, and the Program in the Rhetoric of Inquiry.

Wherever the relationship has been particularly close joint appointments have been made. In 1916, Bessie Pierce was jointly appointed in history and education. That relationship lasted until 1949, when John Haefner was judged to lack the scholarly qualifications for a tenure appointment.
This experience underscored the principle that to be successful the participating programs must share the same scholarly expectations. A more successful joint arrangement was made with Classics, where Frank Gilliam and Jonathan Goldstein have established an enduring relationship. The same has been true of the School of Religion, with the successive appointments of Sidney Mead and Dwight Bozeman. In African-American Studies, Wilson Moses, Jonathan Walton, and Michael Harris fashioned a firm relationship with that program. With English literature the collaboration was less successful. Rosalie Colie, a brilliant scholar and lively personality, came in 1963 with a joint appointment in English. She was outspoken in her criticism of standards in that department. Members of the department were not prepared for critical inspection and were outraged and terrified. They proposed that Colie be transferred wholly to history. The historians informed the dean that they would be honored and delighted to have her full-time in history, but Colie, regrettably, chose to leave the university. Later, the English department requested that Laurence Lefore offer a course in English history suitable to the needs of its students. He introduced such a course only to find that English students did not elect it. More rewarding relationships were established with the joint appointment of Donald McCloskey in Economics and of Susan Lawrence in Medicine. Donald Sutherland's distinguished work in early English legal history led to a joint appointment in Law, which, however, was not perpetuated following his untimely death. In the 1960s and 1970s, interest in quantification resulted in close informal relationships with political scientists, economists, and sociologists but did not lead to joint appointments.

Joint appointees often found that they were carrying heavy burdens when each of their departments imposed the same range of duties on them that were imposed on full-time members. Six joint appointees addressed this problem in 1972.
in a report which proposed a number of ways in which relief might be obtained. But they found no easy solution to the problem.

In evaluating the credentials of candidates for faculty or student appointments the department never took into account the political or ideological commitments of candidates. Their historical work—was always the sole object of interest. In a premature burst of progressive enthusiasm Arthur Schlesinger edited for the university *Great Charters of Americanism* (1919) containing the Covenant of the League of Nations, only to see that document rejected by the U.S. Senate. President Jessup withdrew the publication but protected Schlesinger from local isolationists who would fire him. Later, in the 1950s, timid administrators who feared congressional anti-communist inquisitors were rumored to keep a blacklist of scholars to be denied appointments. When the department proposed to offer an appointment to Ray Ginger, author of a biography of Eugene V. Debs the socialist, it was informed by the dean that President Hancher vetoed the proposal because of Ginger's alleged radical connections. On the other hand, no administrative objection was raised to a proposed offer of appointment to Staughton Lynd, a more widely known radical. Lynd declined the offer. Nor was there any objection by the Bowen administration to the appointment of Sydney James, an acknowledged former communist. The matter was never discussed in the department. James, who was an excellent scholar, proved to be a tower of strength, and whatever his political orientation it had no discernible effect on the high professional standards he always maintained.

The modern scholar who identifies with a dispersed group of professionals may be essentially a nomad with little sense of attachment to a particular place of employment, especially when that place has a long history of transient comings and goings. Schlesinger's efforts to build a feeling of regional community with permanently located historians of Iowa colleges
and universities inevitably foundered on this fact. The annual historical conferences for Iowa college and school teachers which had initially been so successful gradually lost their appeal. As social studies replaced historical courses school teachers found discussion of historical topics less appealing. The department itself lost its enthusiasm for the conferences, attendance declined, and the final conference was held in 1975. An annual fall conference of Iowa historians hosted in turn by one of the college or university history departments continued to meet, although few members of the Iowa department attended in recent years. Another of Schlesinger's innovations, however, the departmental Newsletter, continued to flourish, growing annually with the reported professional and personal activities of faculty and graduates.

What history should the undergraduate study? In the early years when the university was small and the history courses offered were few in number the question was answered automatically by what the university was able to offer: a half term of ancient history and one term each of medieval and modern Europe, the democracies of Europe, the constitutional history of England, and American history. One term of history (in a three-term year) was required of all students in the classical and philosophical programs. The emerging pattern was clear: ancient Greece and Rome followed by medieval and modern Europe, with special attention to English history as the source of American history.

William R. Perkins, Iowa's first professionally trained historian, made the pattern explicit in 1890. The object of the history program was to present the courses "in logical and chronological sequence." English history, then required of all students in the classical and philosophical programs, was "of the highest importance to the correct understanding of American history." In the same year, an important distinction was drawn between distribution and concentration. Ori-
originally, the curriculum required the student to distribute his or her efforts among the subjects believed to be of the greatest importance: Greek, Latin, math, English, and a modern foreign language. These requirements were to be satisfied largely in the underclass years, leaving the upperclass years for electives. Then, in 1890, the faculty announced that students could if they wished concentrate their electives on work in a single department, thus making possible what was in effect a voluntary major. So far as an elective major in history was concerned, the department announced in 1899 that "in arranging the courses in history in the university, the attempt has been made to present the entire field of historical study with reference to logical and chronological sequence, so that no period shall be neglected and each period be treated in the light of what goes before and what comes after." This notion of history as an interrelated fabric to be studied as a whole would soon break down under the weight of departmental autonomy and professional specialization.

The previous developments were made explicit in 1905 with the formal adoption of the departmental major. The required college courses were reduced to two years of English and one of a foreign language. (Military training was mandatory for all males.) The curriculum grew rapidly, with new history courses on the Jews, the Protestant revolution, the French revolution, the era of Napoleon, and the history of Germany. One further introduction of those years should be noted. With the organization of the Graduate College in 1900, departments offered courses for undergraduates and graduate students exclusively as well as combined courses for both groups. These combined courses, mixing undergraduates with graduate students, came to occupy a major place in the work of the faculty and had the effect over the years of inhibiting the development of a distinctive undergraduate
educational experience. Decades would pass before the Liberal Arts faculty would begin to realize that more must be done explicitly for undergraduates.

Disciplinary autonomy and specialization reigned supreme at Iowa until World War II, when the campus, or a portion of it, was swept by the general education movement. A new Liberal Arts dean, Harry Newburn, an educationist, was determined to establish a core of subject matter to which all undergraduates should be exposed. His principal supporter in the faculty was Norman Foerster of English, whose role was to preach the values of general education while protecting the two-year required work in English as the subject best suited to inculcating those values. The faculty was deeply divided between humanists who advocated general education courses and natural and social scientists who favored introductory departmental courses. The history faculty, perhaps preoccupied with its own internal problems, took no active part in the acrimonious debates. The humanists' proposal that a course in Western Civilization be made a part of the core requirement remained one of the obstacles to reaching agreement. The fire-eating sociologist Edward Byron Reuter circulated a memo contemptuously dismissing history as a useless pile of facts. A compromise was finally reached by which it was agreed to make history an option in a group of subjects called the "historical-cultural area." Newburn supported this arrangement, leading to a break with Foerster, who resigned from the university in a huff. President Hancher reported to the regents that little had in fact been changed.

For the history department, however, the introduction of core courses represented substantial change. Prior to 1944 it had offered several courses "primarily" for undergraduates, including Modern Europe, but nothing comparable to the new two-semester Western Civ core course. With George Mosse as lecturer this course proved to be immensely popular,
enrolling 830 in the Fall semester of 1949-50, many more than enrolled in all the other historical-cultural courses in art, music, and religion. All of these courses dealt primarily with the western experience, thus preserving the traditional collegiate focus on western civilization. Eventually, however, after the department had added specialists in Asian history to its staff it proposed Asian Civilization as an option in the core area, thus abandoning its traditional conception of the study of history as focused on the West. The new point of view as expressed in the department self-study of 1985 was that in meeting GER requirements students should be exposed to cultures and times far different from their own. The late-twentieth century preoccupation with diversity thus became an option to the traditional search for identity through historical continuity. Further evidence of the uncertainty of the historians about the large picture was offered by the increasing difficulty of staffing the Western Civ course. For several years the course was offered by visiting lecturers, leading the External Reviewers of 1995 to recommend that it be either strengthened or abandoned.

In recent decades it was generally agreed both by members of the department and outside observers that the undergraduate history program was relatively neglected. The strong emphasis on scholarship resulted naturally in faculty preoccupation with the training of graduate students in research methods, and in the fostering of close personal associations with graduate students. No comparable relationships were available to undergraduate majors who were assigned arbitrarily to advisers. There were occasional complaints that advisers were unavailable or uninterested.

Awareness of these deficiencies resulted in efforts to strengthen the undergraduate program for history majors. Honors seminars had since the 1960s served the interests of a small number of students; more recently, colloquia for all history majors provided opportunity for guided reading,

From the beginning, an important component of the history program had been the preparation of students for history teaching in the schools. Bessie Pierce, who held a joint appointment in history and education (1916-1929), had laid a strong foundation for teacher education. She was succeeded by Howard Anderson and John Haefner. For reasons previously indicated Haefner was transferred to the College of Education and the history department relinquished any control over the pedagogical component of the history teacher program.

A major effort in 1979 to revise and strengthen the Liberal Arts College general education requirement resulted in the "Ryan Committee Report." This report noted that the values of historical study could be inculcated by the respective disciplines represented in the college curriculum if each discipline paid more attention to its own historical development. Aside from the fact that the disciplines were actually moving in the opposite direction Ellis Hawley pointed out that it would still be necessary for general historical study to lay a foundation for more specialized subjects and integrate them into a larger whole. But in order to do this it would be necessary for history to get a firmer grip on its own general education program.

Graduate enrollment in history fluctuated over the years, with little apparent correlation with employment opportunities in college teaching. A master's degree with thesis was taken for granted as a necessary preliminary to doctoral study. Four fields of study (later three) were required in preparation for comprehensive doctoral examinations, after successful completion of which work was begun on the dissertation. Most doctoral students held teaching
assistantships, and many sought employment elsewhere before completing the program. The result was that a program which in theory could be completed in four years came on average to consume over eleven, the longest "time to degree" among history departments in the CIC universities. Only after much soul searching as well as criticism among administrators and reviewers did the faculty concede that measures should be taken to shorten the elapsed time to degree. It was pointed out that some fields of specialization legitimately required more time for mastery than others, and that allowance should be made for this in drafting regulations. Rather than attempt to make such distinctions, however, the department in 1992 stipulated that dissertations must be completed within five years of passage of comprehensives, and that further annual extensions would be granted only on presentation of evidence of progress. It remained to be seen how effective a stimulus this would prove to be.

The time-to-degree problem was only a tangible aspect of the distinct change in graduate student attitudes that has occurred since World War II. Traditionally, students accepted a subordinate status as probationers preparing for future adult roles. This undoubtedly served as a stimulus to complete degree requirements promptly. More recently, and especially since the campus rebellions of the Vietnam era, students have become increasingly impatient with a subordinate status. As time-to-degree has lengthened they have come to think of themselves as adults and to demand the right to function in adult roles. Student efforts to maintain an active Phi Alpha Theta chapter failed because the faculty refused to assume the active sponsorship necessary to assure continuity. But a more informal Graduate History Society served as a vehicle for the presentation of proposals for student involvement in departmental functions. Beginning in 1970, the GHS offered a series of proposals for student
participation in faculty appointment and promotion decisions. These proposals did not seem to have arisen out of specific complaints, but rather from a general sense of right. As a petition of 1973 put it, the faculty and the GHS ought to be a single body of scholars enjoying the same rights and privileges. But student complaints soon began to be heard: ideology and schools of thought needed to be considered, and fear of outmoded instruction was voiced. The department faculty had no difficulty in agreeing that students should be informed and consulted about appointments and promotions, but a majority voted to reject a proposal to give student representatives voting rights. A student was appointed to serve without vote on each search committee, and two representatives of the GHS were designated observers at regular department meetings. When in 1991 a proposal was renewed to grant a vote to student participants in search committees the department voted to table the matter. It was clearly a troubling issue for many faculty members.

A related subject affecting graduate students was the matter of their preparation for teaching as well as their training for research. Arthur Schlesinger in the 1920s introduced work in pedagogics as a regular part of graduate training. The course in the teaching of history in college which he offered was continued by W.T. Root until 1943 when it was abandoned. The theory of the department (unarticulated) now is that the college teacher needs to know the subject but may otherwise be left to discover the teaching methods most congenial and effective.

Ironically, more attention was being paid to preparing graduate students for teaching careers in the earlier years when TAs were not used than later when they were used in large numbers. Following the adoption of the core course program eight part-time TAs were appointed in 1947-48 to conduct sections of Western Civ. The professor in charge briefed
them on the subject matter but otherwise left them to their own pedagogical devices. Over the years, TAs came to prize their independence. Forgetting that teaching is a public function they objected strenuously to visitation, and yielded grudgingly as pressure mounted from student and employer complaints. Following the Vietnam era uprising, the Problems in Human History (later "Issues") courses taught independently by graduate students came under increasing criticism for lack of faculty supervision. For two decades the department struggled inconclusively with the matter of supervision of instruction in these courses. In 1970, a proposed course 10.200 "Supervised Teaching" was referred to a committee which reported that no one favored it. Six years later, in response to demands by employers for evidence of teaching competence a motion to require a supervisor's visit each semester underwent a series of modifications ending in a requirement that student evaluations be kept only if the TA requested it. In the 1980s, the college's Educational Policy Committee expressed its concern, but on three occasions the department refused to require visitation of classes. It was not until 1993 that the department yielded to the inevitable and unanimously decreed that the class of each new TA be visited by a faculty member who would report an evaluation to the department.

In recent years the department has been criticized by reviewers for what has been perceived to be too rapid promotion to senior ranks, resulting in a disproportionate number of full professors. Whatever the merits of this complaint it should be noted that rapid faculty turnover has been a major feature of the department's history, resulting in an understandable desire to anticipate and if possible fend off "hostile takeovers." Because of the department's success in identifying capable younger scholars it has suffered continuing losses of faculty to more attractive opportunities else-
where. Aydelotte once remarked with some annoyance that other institutions need not bother with laborious searches for able younger historians; they had only to look to see who was at Iowa. Between 1950 and 1980 the number of tenure-track faculty increased from 12 to 26. In the same period there were 34 resignations, an average of more than one per year. Since 1980, the situation has improved substantially, thanks to higher salaries and increased university funding of leaves of absence for research.

By curtailing faculty losses the department has been able to improve the continuity of its programs. An increasing number of faculty members have continued to serve until retirement. Harry Plum was the first in the history of the department to retire, in 1940. The number of departures was such that in the forty-year period between 1940 and 1980 there were only five more retirements. In the following fifteen years there were six retirements and four resignations. The effects of the elimination of mandatory retirement on account of age remain to be seen, although evidence is appearing that many active scholars will choose retirement as soon as financial circumstances permit.

In the early years the faculty were teachers; if some of them happened also to be scholars that was their business. There were no sabbaticals, and the occasional leave of absence was financed by the individual. Following World War II, when research and publication finally became a formal part of a faculty member's duties it was obvious that the university must do more to support research. External funding was available for medicine and the sciences, but only in token amounts for the arts and humanities. It was appropriate that initiative should come from a member of the history department where the expectation of research had long been taken for granted. As a member of the Graduate Council I proposed in 1958 that a Faculty Research Council be estab-
lished, and in 1963 that U of I Foundation funds be used to support a modest program of Old Gold Summer Research grants. The award of twelve of these grants was the first step toward university involvement in direct support of research and creative work in the arts and sciences. President Bowen was determined to build on these modest beginnings, and appointed me chairman of a committee to propose a more ambitious program. We recommended that semester leaves of absence for worthy research projects be funded from appropriated funds, to be awarded in the order of frequency of 100 per semester. The regents and legislature agreed to support this program. While these recommendations could not be immediately funded in full they remained an objective toward which the university has continued to move. University support of research has undoubtedly made continuing membership in the history department more attractive to scholars.

The impact of affirmative action on the department was substantial. While there was no tradition of discrimination the fact remained that after Colie's departure in 1967 there were no women in the department and there had never been a black historian or instruction in African-American history. Because of the department's longstanding practice of appointing the best available candidates the coming of affirmative action policies appeared to present a potential conflict with the need for women and minority appointees. The matter was earnestly discussed in department meetings. Fortunately, this proved to be more a matter of theory than of practice. Women and minority members had been preparing for careers as historians in sufficient numbers so that when the department was confronted with the requirement to conform to affirmative action criteria it was able to appoint individuals who were eminently qualified in terms of the department's most rigorous expectations. In the twenty-five years following the introduction of affirmative-action policies in 1968
eleven women joined the department in tenure track positions, and three African-Americans served successively as joint appointees with African-American Studies.

The heart of the reforms of 1947 was the principle that the department should be a self-governing body. Sometimes referred to as government by Committee of the Whole, the principle has had lasting effects not only on the conduct of business but on several basic characteristics of the department. By insisting on inclusiveness -- attendance at department meetings eventually became mandatory -- the department insured that junior members would not only be privy to but active participants in the formation of policy. Newcomers observed at first hand how business was being done, and benefited from exposure to the wisdom of the elders -- the Spitzers and the Jameses. Strangely enough, self-government confirmed the strength of inertia and discouraged radical experimentation. There have been no significant changes in departmental policies in the past half-century. It has also inhibited the emergence of aggressive and potentially innovative leadership. The firm initiatives often taken by Aydelotte would not have been tolerated in his successors. The tradition has molded the office of Chair by reducing it to the status of office manager. As the burden of administrative routine has grown it is no wonder that none of Aydelotte's successors sought another term.

Government by Committee of the Whole also inhibited the emergence of other decision making forces such as standing committees. Determination to recruit the best available scholars, once an oddity in this university, has long been the objective of the department to the extent that skill in teaching the introductory courses has not been an appreciable factor in faculty recruitment. Exclusive preoccupation with scholarship received full expression in Sydney James's recommendation that when making appointments the department
should seek the best available scholar regardless of field. It also seems clear that its form of government has been a significant factor in the department's inability to formulate long-range plans. This is most apparent in the frequent changes in the priority order for introducing new fields, and indeed in the inability to think beyond the next appointment. As a department member remarked to an external reviewer, whatever the shortcomings of its practices the department is a welcome haven for scholars; by implication, why change it? Eventually, the need to grow, if realized, will come into conflict with government by Committee of the Whole.

In the final analysis one can afford to look critically at the history of the department because of its growing strength. Its achievements more than balance its shortcomings. It might be said that the university began to catch up with the department in 1987 when it adopted a Strategic Plan designed to achieve the status of a top-ten public university. Since this had in effect been the department's objective for many years a close inspection of the department's experience might suggest how to do it.