"Purdue has honored me," Elliott told the Purdue University Board of Trustees on Tuesday, May 16, 1922, "I will endeavor to honor Purdue University," With these measured words, he concluded his formal response to the board's unanimous vote and thereby became the sixth president of the University.

Although Elliott was not to assume the office until September 1, 1922, the faculty was assembled in Fowler Hall by 4:00 p.m. that same day to meet the new president on his first visit to the Lafayette community. Professor Stanley Coulter, dean of the School of Science, presided at the gathering and introduced Elliott to the group. Most of the board members were present as was Governor Warren T. McCray, but none of the officials made a speech and the meeting was adjourned almost immediately in order that Elliott could be personally greeted by the various deans, heads of departments, and other members of the faculty.

Elliott remained in Lafayette for only a few days and spent most of his time talking with Dean Coulter, board members Henry W. Marshall and David E. Ross, and others about university affairs as well as about various personal matters related to his moving to the community.

On Friday the student newspaper, The Purdue Exponent, carried his greeting to Purdue students. "The generous welcome of the University," he declared, "has convinced me that I am to be most happy in my new responsibility. Every moment on the campus brings new and inspiring evidences of the distinction of the students of Purdue—their traditions, their loyalty, and their ideals."

That same afternoon Elliott accompanied Marshall to the Purdue-Notre Dame baseball game where Elliott shook hands and talked with several students, pitched the first ball, and stayed for
the entire game. He was relaxed, enjoying himself immensely, and the students were delighted to know that the new president was a baseball fan.

THE SITUATION AT PURDUE

Purdue University in 1922 was widely recognized for its outstanding schools of engineering and agriculture. Nearing its fiftieth year of operation, the university had established itself as a vigorous and growing institution. The enrollment had been steadily increasing since 1900, and the total student population was slightly more than 3,000. Local Purdue historians, Professors William M. Hepburn and Louis M. Sears, writing at that time, noted that the institution was "an educational organism of extraordinary vigor for which the future held abundant promise." It was Indiana's land-grant college, established and located apart from Indiana University at Bloomington.

Unlike the situation in Montana, where the state higher educational institutions had been competitors in every sense, there apparently existed in Indiana at that time a mutual feeling of respect between Indiana University and Purdue. Hepburn and Sears reported that there was a recognition of the essential unity of educational endeavor and there was a determination on the part of each institution to waste no time or strength in opposition to the other's program.

In other respects the new situation was also unlike the one that had existed in Montana six years earlier. The tensions that had been evident among those who were responsible for the control and direction of the University of Montana were apparently not present at Purdue University; nor was the university under any particular pressure from the legislature to reduce spending.

As one member of the Purdue Board of Trustees wrote to Elliott, "in most cases, when a new president comes on a campus to begin his service, he does so handicapped in many ways. Often times it is because his predecessor has been discharged, because of differences in the faculty, or matters of policy in the Board of Trustees. Nothing of the kind exists here. The conditions are as nearly ideal, for the beginning of your work, as can be found any place."

Elliott's predecessor at Purdue, Winthrop E. Stone, had fallen to his death while climbing Mount Eon in the Canadian Rockies on July 17, 1921. Upon learning of Stone's untimely death, Joseph D. Oliver of South Bend, president of Purdue's Board of Trustees,
immediately called Henry W. Marshall of Lafayette, chairman of the executive committee of the board, to look after matters on the campus until action could be taken to handle the day-to-day operation of the university. At a special meeting called for August 4, 1921, the board voted to suspend the rules in order that an office of “Vice President of the University” could be established. Following this action Marshall was named vice president to serve as acting president while the board searched for the new president.

Oliver appointed a committee at that meeting to assemble facts regarding every possible candidate for the presidency. Serving on the committee were, in addition to Oliver, the two other members of the executive committee, Marshall and James W. Noel of Indianapolis, and two alumni members of the board, David E. Ross of Lafayette and Perry H. Crane of Lebanon.

Oliver was the most active of the search committee members, although Marshall and Noel were of considerable assistance. They visited with university presidents in neighboring states and, accompanied by Ross and John A. Hillenbrand, travelled to New York and Washington to discuss possible candidates. The search was finally narrowed to four individuals whose names had been submitted by the General Education Board. After eight months of work, at a regular meeting of the board on April 21, 1922, Marshall moved that Oliver be authorized to invite one of those four, Edward Charles Elliott, to become president of Purdue; he was the only candidate ever presented for a vote and the motion received unanimous approval.

Elliott, of course, had written to a number of his friends in the profession as soon as he had been approached by the Purdue officials. President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University and President Henry S. Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching had both written encouraging letters, but even more favorable was the report from Samuel Capen of the American Council on Education. Capen had been suggested for the position at Purdue but had declined to be considered for personal reasons which he explained to Elliott. Nevertheless he wrote that Purdue was a wonderful institution in spirit, solidity, reputation, and support. It was ready to go at full speed under the direction of a leader who knew where and how to steer it. Capen concluded that an educational renaissance was due in the state of Indiana. “Except for the limitations on the scope of the institution there is nothing better in the United States—at least nothing better has come under my eye,” wrote Capen.
The most direct answer to Elliott's questions, though, came from his old friend Henry Suzzalo of the University of Washington, who wrote, "I think that you ought to accept . . . and I so advise you with all my heart." In a later letter he argued that the Purdue appointment promised to be a better situation for Elliott both personally and professionally, and most of all for the Elliott family.

Suzzalo also suggested that Elliott should have in mind a number of terms which could be agreed upon before he would want to accept the new position. Elliott, of course, had prepared such a list of ten conditions in 1915 at the time he was being considered for the chancellorship in Montana. Since these had been accepted and had proved to be of such value to the chancellor, he was easily disposed to prepare a second list for consideration by the Purdue Board of Trustees in 1922.

His new list, changed and enlarged somewhat, included the following understandings: that his appointment was to be for an indefinite term, unanimously approved by the board and by the principal officers and the members of the staff; moving expenses from Helena to Lafayette (estimated at $1,800) were guaranteed and the salary was to be set at "not less than $12,000" with one month annual vacation; the university was to provide a residence suitable as a home and for meeting the official social requirements of the presidency together with an expense account to cover the cost of such "official entertaining"; all traveling expenses incurred in connection with his duties were to be borne by the university.

Two other items were of particular interest. It was agreed that "the initiative for all nominations for the appointments, and all recommendations for the compensation, promotion, transfer, or dismissial of members of the instructional and scientific staff of the university, and all other employees of the institution, shall rest with the president acting with the advice of the administrative officers immediately concerned." And, second, "the board . . . (has) . . . primary responsibility for the financial and public policies of the university, but the president, with the aid of the faculty, has the responsibility for distinctly educational policies."

Thus, with his friends' recommendations in mind, and his list of fourteen conditions in hand, Elliott met with the board for the first time at the May meeting referred to earlier. At the afternoon session he presented his memorandum outlining the stipulations. Following the discussion, the board accepted all his terms.
except that the salary was to be $10,000, the same as he was receiving in Montana. The dollar item was no deterrent, particularly since he was to be provided with a house, and he eagerly began that work which was to continue for nearly a quarter of a century.

In Elliott's view, the board's willingness to review carefully these considerations, coupled with the fact that the physical demands on the president were not so strenuous, promised him an opportunity for a useful career. In a quiet, purposeful manner, he set out to direct the future growth of Indiana's land-grant institution. He requested that no inaugural ceremony be held, and was quoted as saying that he wanted to avoid the expenditures necessary for such exercises; he preferred to be inaugurated by work rather than display, he said.

The Elliott family moved to Lafayette under somewhat trying circumstances because the university had no “official residence” for its presidents. Mrs. Elliott was concerned about the size of whatever house was selected because of their four children, John (14), Susanne (11), Marion (9), and Ed (7); and because her mother, Mrs. Nowland, was now living with the family.

Mrs. Elliott had been devoted to her parents and had taken the children to the Nowland farm near Spokane almost every summer since her marriage. When her father died in April 1919, her mother, known to the family as “Granny,” moved in with the Elliots (where she made her home until she died in March 1947, on the eve of her 95th birthday).

Nothing could be done to avoid the necessity of a second move at some later date, however, and temporary arrangements were made during the summer for the forty-seven-year-old president and his family to move into a grey stucco house at 500 University Street. Located just north of the Armory, it served as the Elliott home until August 1, 1923.

The board had discussed the matter of building a new home for the president of the university and preliminary plans were made for an official residence to be constructed which would have faced Grant Street, located between the Civil Engineering building and the Purdue Memorial Union. Elliott and Mrs. Elliott, however, were not particularly pleased with the thought of having their residence on campus. Then when the preliminary cost estimates were presented to the board, there was general agreement that the price was too high and that locating the president's house on the campus might interfere with an orderly campus de-
development of classroom buildings. The situation was relieved in April 1923, when the board decided to purchase and refurbish Dr. Guy Levering's residence at 515 South Seventh Street in Lafayette.

More than two miles from the campus and Elliott's office in Fowler Hall, the location presented Elliott with an opportunity to indulge himself daily in his favorite exercise, walking. In Montana he and son John had frequently gone on weekend hikes, sometimes for 10 to 15 miles in rugged mountain country; occasionally the whole family went for much shorter jaunts. In Lafayette he immediately began the practice of walking briskly to and from the campus, spurning the frequent offers of a ride. Not only did he enjoy it, but it was in keeping with his Montana physician's suggestion that he would have less "stomach trouble" if he could schedule a daily walk in the open. The daily ritual soon became a local legend and there probably always will be frequent references to Elliott's erect stride when his personal traits are discussed by those who knew him at Purdue.

THE INAUGURAL YEAR IN INDIANA

During his inaugural year, Elliott carefully limited the number of speaking engagements and spent most of his time learning more about the institution. Just six days after he officially took office, however, Elliott spoke in Indianapolis before a Purdue Alumni Association meeting, outlining some of his ideas concerning the presidency. After pledging himself to serve the people of Indiana, he briefly discussed student life, the physical welfare of students, and the athletic program, then carefully expressed a belief which he had originally phrased for his inaugural address at Montana. He came to use this theme over and over when he addressed various groups in order to provide his listeners with a statement of his acknowledged responsibilities as president of Purdue. He called this paragraph his "Personal Charter," or later, the "Purdue Philosophy" and it appeared in print with slight changes more than a dozen times:

As President of Purdue I will not consider that I have met my responsibilities until the leadership and the citizenship of the state of Indiana, of whatever class or occupation, continue to recognize that this university is their university; that Purdue University is an integral part of the public school system of the State ever working in its own distinctive and assigned fields; that Purdue is a worthy
agency, ever at their disposal for aiding them to meet the needs that determine the happiness, the satisfaction and the ideals of their lives; until there is firmly established among students and teachers and alumni the enduring principle that the daily work of men makes education possible, and that education in turn must make the daily work of men possible and pleasurable.

At that same Indianapolis alumni dinner in the Hotel Lincoln, board member Henry Marshall announced that George Ade, '87, and David Ross, '93, had given 65 acres of land lying northwest of the campus to the university to be used as an athletic field and playground for the students of Purdue. Marshall noted that "the topography of the land is ideal for a beautiful stadium as well as football and baseball fields, tennis courts, and a golf links." The purchase price was forty thousand dollars, and Purdue's Ross-Ade Stadium was soon under construction. Today that valuable property is being used almost exactly as the donors envisioned, as an intercollegiate sports center for the Purdue teams that developed and gained national prominence during the late twenties and the thirties, the so-called "golden age of sports."

The first football game of the 1922 season was with Millikin College, Saturday, October 7. On the preceding night Elliott attended and addressed the pep session. After the band had played, he spoke of the future of Purdue athletics and, with his sleeves rolled, Elliott urged the students to get behind their team and give it "the push that will send it on to victory. In a sense our future in athletics is tied up in tomorrow's game," he said, "and we will not be disappointed."

Elliott's rolled shirt sleeves made a hit with the student body and on the Saturday morning of the game, the Exponent printed an editorial headed "Things That The Pep Session Revealed:"

... we have in President Elliott a colleague, a co-worker, and a fellow booster of Purdue. One who is not afraid to strip off his coat and take the stage in his shirt sleeves, and yell and cheer as much as anyone. He even turned poet for the occasion. President Elliott has done everything in his power to boost athletics and he would even venture to lead a cheer or play end on the team if the occasion demanded it.

At an October 1922 board meeting, Elliott asked for and received permission to engage consultants to develop a campus plan which would provide for the orderly development of the campus, giving special attention to the placement of streets, walkways,
buildings, and landscaping. Subsequently, the Lafayette firm of Nicol, Scholer, and Hoffman was engaged and prepared a campus plan which was approved by the board in April 1924.

In November 1922, it was announced that the university had employed its first comptroller and business manager, W. T. Middlebrook of Griffenhager and Associates, Ltd. With the appointment of Middlebrook, the university began to develop a new accounting system and to operate on a strict budget basis. This led ultimately to the development of a central purchasing office, a continuing inventory of university property, and a host of fiscal controls which put the university on a firm, business-like basis which was to be of immeasurable assistance to the university as it dealt with legislators and legislative committees of the future.

Elliott's first year was an unbelievably busy one. On November 25, 1922, he laid the cornerstone of the Purdue Memorial Union building during Homecoming exercises. In January 1923, he proposed to the board that each staff member be required annually to prepare a "service report form" which would give the administration an opportunity to review the performance of each individual staff member. The board approved without dissent.

He visited alumni groups in Chicago, Detroit, Washington, D.C., Buffalo, Niagara Falls, New York City, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and other lesser cities. At an alumni meeting in Cleveland, two Purdue boosters who met Elliott's train were dismayed at his appearance. He was wearing high-button shoes and a rough textured suit which, although it may have been in style in Helena, had the appearance in Cleveland of being several years old. The two hosts were more than a little disturbed by what they saw. Following the dinner meeting, however, Elliott's stirring speech convinced the group that the new president was a great one. The two alums who had been reluctant to introduce Elliott to their friends, were, by the time the evening was over, eager to be associated with Elliott as members of the host committee.

Elliott worked diligently to get acquainted with the alumni and to learn what they had to say about Purdue. He attended faculty meetings, board meetings, and many of the student gatherings as well as athletic events in order to learn more about the university. His future at Purdue was an exciting challenge, and he was concerned with all aspects of university life. He set out to become closely identified with students, parents and alumni, pro-
professors and administrators, public officials, and the citizenry of the state.

THE SEMI-CENTENNIAL YEAR—1924

Even before Elliott had been elected to the presidency, Purdue officials had started planning for a series of events to mark the fiftieth year of university operation, and the new president (who was also to reach his fiftieth year in 1924) was soon actively engaged in helping to organize and arrange appropriate ceremonies.

Those most involved in the planning, of course, were the four deans, distinguished individuals who were acknowledged leaders in the university: Stanley Coulter, dean of the School of Science and dean of men; Carolyn E. Shoemaker, dean of women; J. H. Skinner, dean of the School of Agriculture; and A. A. Potter, dean of the Schools of Engineering. But the general format and the speakers who were selected indicated that Elliott had directly influenced the arrangements.

The celebration extended over a three day period, May 1-3, 1924, and included addresses by Elliott's long time friends, President E. A. Birge of the University of Wisconsin, President William Oxley Thompson of Ohio State University, and President Henry Suzzalo of the University of Washington. A complete account of the semi-centennial, which was later published, included reprints of the major addresses; the event was to Elliott the outstanding happening of the year.

Elliott presided at various exercises but his major address, "The Pursuit of Power," was delivered before the assemblage on May 3, 1924. It was his most important address of the year and was probably designed to a certain extent to take the place of an inaugural address. In the opening paragraph he noted that in his view, Purdue University owed its life to the belief that labor and learning, intelligence and industry are inseparable in any form of society where men count themselves free. With the founding of that group of American institutions, of which Purdue University is but a single representative, the potential of all education was immeasurably increased for free men and their descendants whose destiny is work.

The problems of Purdue, he said, were primarily problems of the campus, although as an integral part of the public school
system of the state, Purdue had an inescapable responsibility to the public elementary and secondary schools of the state.

He declared that more adequate living accommodations should be provided for the student body and hoped that the university would be able to provide housing facilities under its own control. He indicated that there were social and educational problems which were centered in the college fraternity houses, although several years later wrote that "the fraternities as a whole are genuine educational assets." (But in 1940 after several university-operated residence halls for both men and women had been erected at Purdue, he wrote, "I crave the day when similar physical facilities and educational advantages may be offered to all Purdue students.")

During this talk, he made brief reference to a plan for reorganizing the curricula so that students of ability and persistence could complete work for the degree in three years instead of four; or that students who were obliged to be self-supporting could have the opportunity of completing their work with dignity and success through a period of more than four years. Although Elliott did not make reference to this suggestion again before any large group, he frequently talked and wrote about the importance of providing for individual differences during the months that followed the semi-centennial celebration. He included this item, for example, in his review of the year 1923-1924, his second year as president of Purdue.

During his first two years in office his critical examination of the internal affairs of the university revealed ten problems. Among those problems were the matter of housing of students, student social life, a better and more comprehensive plan of physical education, and the development of ways to provide for individual student differences. For the faculty he hoped for better coordination of instruction, research, and extension, as well as the reorganization of the faculty so as to minimize the demands for administrative service from persons on the teaching and research staff. From the administration he hoped for better scheduling of classes so as to secure more economic utilization of buildings and facilities and he wanted more systematic and better supervision of instruction. Finally, he hoped for a further consolidation of alumni interests with the essential interests of the university.

The largest single problem was that of obtaining financial support commensurate with the enlarging needs of the university, he said.
The University did not create these needs. They have been developed with our evolving civilization. Our people, our agriculture, our industries, our culture, expects more and more from the institution and its workers. The State must do more for the University. The University will always do more for the State.

After two years on the campus, Elliott was setting the pattern of work for his administration. He had outlined some of the immediate goals and was working to set up an administrative organization to handle the problems. By this time, Hepburn and Sears had analyzed the personality of Elliott as

... one of restless energy and force, dynamic in a word, and one that gives assurance of large vision and a will to overcome all obstacles. It is becoming evident to faculty and students, too, that the underlying philosophy of the new executive is individualistic. Personnalties and problems are viewed in their peculiar setting. Humanity is set above administrative regulation. The temptation to classify all cases in terms of ancient ordinances is vigorously resisted.

The students awarded the 1924 "Leather Medal" to Elliott. Then as now, it was presented (annually) to the person who had done the most for the university during the past year. The problems of the campus, though, were no more important than were the problems of the state, and Elliott was soon engaged in an active study of financial affairs.

**EARLY FINANCIAL PROBLEMS**

The year before Elliott was elected to the presidency of Purdue University, the state legislature had made provisions for a 5 mill state tax to support higher education in Indiana; Purdue's share was 2 mills per $100 of taxable property. When Elliott reviewed the work of the legislature of 1923, he acknowledged that the university had been treated as well as could be reasonably expected and was apparently pleased to announced that there was no disposition on the part of the legislature to assume any critical or super-economical attitude.

The tax provided by the legislature of 1921 was continued through 1924, although the annual income of the University was reduced in 1923-1924 because of the reduction of the property valuation of the state. In 1923, however, the legislature did pass a special appropriation for a new heating and power plant which
was needed before any plans could be made for an enlarged physical plant.

As blue prints were being drawn in 1924 for the further expansion of the university, Purdue University and Indiana University, by mutually agreed action, presented budgets to the 1925 legislature based upon the doubling of the 5 mill state tax provided for in 1921; although with the further reduction of the assessed valuation of property in the state, even the proposed 10 mill state tax in 1925 probably would not have resulted in any excessive increase in university income. Elliott and Purdue were hoping for approximately $2,000,000 annually from this source.

But as Elliott later wrote, it was plainly evident, even before the opening of the legislature, that the university “... would be tried by the well-known political ordeal known as ‘economy,’” and as a result of the economy drive, all state tax levies for specific purposes were abolished. In the future all state funds for the university were to be obtained through general appropriation bills, and under this plan the university was to present its case before the legislature every two years. The guarantees of the tax levy had been removed.

Writing in the March 1925, issue of the *Purdue Alumnus*, Elliott noted that a session of the legislature is always a “discouraging experience.” He had campaigned vigorously in Montana for the stability of income afforded by the mill tax and had found that guarantee of funds at Purdue, only to have it abolished by the 1925 legislature.

Appropriations for the biennium were substantially the same as would have been received under the old special levy law, however, and other special appropriations were made for the construction of additional buildings; so Elliott concluded that “... the friends and supporters of the University are entitled to be optimistic for the future. It is perhaps better that the people of the state feel that the University is receiving too little rather than too much.” Elliott announced that he would proceed to inform the people of the state concerning the needs of the university, for he felt that the case for higher education was stronger than it had ever been. “Legislators may come and go,” he wrote, “but Purdue is immortal.”

Although not related to the actions of the legislature regarding Purdue’s financial problem, Elliott announced in July 1925, that Middlebrook had resigned as comptroller to go the University of Minnesota. He was very shortly replaced by R. B. Stewart
who came to Purdue from Albion College where he had worked in a similar position. Stewart was to remain with the university as its chief financial officer throughout Elliott’s tenure and beyond until his retirement in 1961.

OTHER PROBLEMS AT PURDUE

In addition to reviewing the financial problems of the university in his 1924-25 annual report, Elliott also repeated his list of ten “problems of consequence” referred to earlier and added five more. The additions included his request for the establishment of an office within the university for the “continuous, critical study of the internal mechanisms and efficiencies of the institution.” Thus, the Division of Educational Reference was established at the beginning of the 1925-26 academic year largely at Elliott’s insistence. He frequently referred to the agency in later years and obviously favored the kind of “impersonal, cold-blooded, constructive analysis” that he felt the division provided for the university.

Elliott also called for a reconstitution of the graduate work at the university. Although the graduate school was not established until several years later, Elliott was making the first request for the establishment of such a school.

Another problem to which he specifically called attention was the need for some type of retirement plan for all the permanent staff members. At that time, he indicated, only about 20 percent of the staff were eligible to receive the benefits of the Carnegie Retiring Allowance and he felt the development of a more inclusive retirement plan was imperative.

He also pointed to the need for a university editor to supervise the preparation and distribution of the various university publications.

The final problem to which he called particular attention had to do with the handling of large freshmen classes. “Something radically remedial will probably need to be devised before the University will be able to promote the best interests of the individual student and at the same time protect its own standards,” he noted.

Despite these internal problems, however, the financial problem resulting from the legislature’s action in 1925 was still one of the larger problems facing his administration. During the months that followed the legislative session there was much concern among various groups who apparently were pressing for a solution to the problems of finance.
THE STATE SURVEY

As a result of these pressures, in May 1926, Governor Ed Jackson, who had taken office in 1925, announced that a state survey would be made to examine the work and needs of Purdue University, Indiana University, and the two state normal schools. The original memorandum announced that it seemed imperative that all the determining facts relative to the financial needs of the state's universities and normal schools be brought to the surface. A list of nine questions was included in the memorandum for the survey commission to attempt to answer.

A survey staff was appointed which included Elliott's long-time friend, Charles Judd of the University of Chicago, as director; Floyd W. Reeves, professor of education at the University of Kentucky; and others.

When the survey report was completed in December 1926, the nine questions along with three others added by the commission, were answered in such a way as to indicate that the legislature had not provided adequate financial support, and further indicated that more money needed to be made available to the higher schools.

Thus, while the amount of appropriations made by the 1927 legislature was still below the request presented and urged in the university budget; there were certain added financial resources made available to Purdue which were encouraging to Elliott. His review of the 1926-28 biennium contained a reprint of portions of the survey report and concluded that the survey "contributed appreciably to the favorable and constructive attitude which prevailed during the 1927 legislative session."

The 1927 legislature passed an act levying a special 2 mill tax for a building fund which came to be known as the "educational improvement fund" and promised to bring $350,000 annually to Purdue. In addition, the legislature authorized the board of trustees to issue bonds for the purpose of erecting and furnishing student dormitories, an act which Elliott hailed as enabling the university "... to begin the realization of the long discussed plan of providing essential living facilities for students." The authorization was a signal achievement which opened the way for future growth by providing a new kind of financing.

Two years before, at the close of the 1925-26 academic year, Elliott had selected the state survey as one of four items for special mention in his annual report; the actions of the 1927 legislature indicated that he had picked a significant activity.
At the same time (1926), he had written of another event which he thought might "... prove to be the most important event of the University year." The event was the Conference of Industrial Leaders of the state, held at the university on June 1, 1926, under the direction of David E. Ross, then vice president of the board of trustees. The aim of the conference was to center attention upon a program of research for the further development of the industries and of the natural resources of the state. It proved to be the conference that led to the development of an allied corporation which has contributed immeasurably to the growth and development of Purdue University—the Purdue Research Foundation.

THE ALLIED CORPORATIONS

Before an attempt is made to write of the Purdue Research Foundation, however, it may be well to review the origin of the first allied corporation established at Purdue in 1923, the Ross-Ade Foundation. In later years, the Purdue Research Foundation (1930), Better Homes in America (1935), the Purdue Aeronautics Corporation (1942), and others were also incorporated to serve as agencies to stimulate and support certain special activities.

The Ross-Ade Foundation, the first to be established, traced its history back to 1922 when David E. Ross and George Ade, both prominent alumni of Purdue, the former a member of the board of trustees, acquired the tract of land referred to earlier which they proposed to give to the university for a recreational field and a site for an athletic stadium.

Under the existing laws, however, the university could not assume bond issues to develop the tract of land; it would have had to rely on state appropriations or gifts to provide suitable buildings and other facilities for the area. Thus the proposed gift raised a number of problems when consideration was given to the further development of the acreage.

According to several sources, Elliott suggested to the donors that a separate corporation could be established, controlled by the university, which would prevent putting financial obligation on the University itself. The plan met with the approval of the donors and the trustees, and the Ross-Ade Foundation was incorporated on November 26, 1923, under the laws of Indiana with Elliott as president.

By the articles of incorporation the foundation was to promote educational purposes in connection with Purdue University by pro-
viding money for the needs of the university with particular reference to buildings, grounds, or other suitable facilities or equipment for the physical, recreational, or athletic needs of Purdue’s students or to provide educational facilities for the military training of those students.

The foundation has since proved its usefulness many times over. In addition to the Ross-Ade Stadium it has held title to land for an engineering camp, a 4-H center, various farm tracts, land for a group of residence halls, and other properties. But perhaps the Ross-Ade Foundation is most valuable because it was the first of four agencies which were legal devices for accomplishing that which probably could not otherwise have been accomplished.

The second agency to be established, the Purdue Research Foundation, was the one destined to lead the others in practically every respect, and its development is closely related to the organization of the Department of Research Relations with Industry. Elliott was aware that the rapid growth of the university’s engineering schools had brought prominent men in industry to the campus in increasing numbers. As a consequence, industry had become more aware of the potential worth of the university and was asking for university help toward the solution of some of industry’s most troublesome problems. Upon considering these demands for fundamental education and research, the trustees were investigating the possibility of establishing an all-university department which could devote all its time and energies to the development of a better relationship between industry and the university.

David Ross, who had been elected president of the board of trustees in the summer of 1927 to succeed Marshall, (J. D. Oliver had resigned in 1924), was particularly eager to develop a plan for industrial research at Purdue. In April 1926, while he was vice president of the board, he had recommended that a committee be appointed to study the problem, and set out to organize a conference of industrial leaders to be held at Purdue.

The conference on June 1, 1926, was attended by industrial leaders of many states, all guests of David Ross. Elliott’s address before the group of industrialists centered on a proposal to provide an advisory committee which would establish a connecting link between the research laboratories of the university and the problems of Indiana industries. It seemed to Elliott that the industries of the state might well develop a plan for scientific cooperation with the university similar to that developed by the agricul-
tural interests in 1909 when an advisory committee was established for the Purdue Agricultural Experiment Station.

Though no special action was taken either by the board or by the conference group, Elliott and Ross had made it clear that the university was interested in the problems of industry.

During the months both before and after the event, Ross, frequently accompanied by Dean Potter, spent much of his time visiting the principal research laboratories of the country, several universities, and a number of large industrial organizations to try to find out how Purdue could better serve the industries of the state. Almost a year later Ross made an elaborate report to the trustees urging greater attention to the problem. Ross who had retired as vice president and general manager of Ross Gear and Tool Company was eager to devote virtually all of his energies and money to Purdue. According to his biographer, Fred Kelly, "to improve Purdue was more than a chief interest to Dave. It became a consuming passion."4

Later in 1927, Elliott placed before the trustees a plan for the creation of a Department of Research Relations with Industry to become effective May 1, 1928. The board approved Elliott's recommendation on October 12, 1927. The first director of research relations with industry employed by Elliott, G. Stanley Meikle, made an extensive survey of Indiana industrialists in 1928 to determine what procedures should be followed. Industries' doors had been opened for him by the previous visits of Dave Ross and Potter. Elliott, Ross and Meikle concluded that the progressive industrialist was far more interested in having the university intensively develop creative thinkers capable of solving problems than he was in having the university solve the problems.5

When it became apparent that industry would provide financial support for a cooperative effort to find and train individuals with creative ability, the department was able to set its course. The major objectives, as outlined by Elliott, were: (1) the discovery and intensive training of creative thinkers; (2) the use of fundamental research as a joint enterprise in education; (3) the development of more adequate research facilities and of well-trained personnel; (4) the development of a policy which would lead to cordial and sympathetic relationships between industry and the university; and (5) the accumulation of funds necessary to carry on research as an educational function.

Within a very short time after the department was established, however, it became evident that there were many problems asso-
associated with the development of fundamental research that could not easily be handled by the university. Such problems included the assignment, protection, and defense of patentable discoveries; the protection of student and staff members against exploitation; and the safeguarding of venture capital provided by grants, trusts, or outright gifts. Once again the answer seemed to depend upon a separate corporation, controlled by the university, which would prevent putting financial obligation on the university itself. As a result, the Purdue Research Foundation was incorporated on December 30, 1930, by all of the members of the board of trustees and the president of the university. David Ross and board member J. K. Lilly of Indianapolis were the first contributors.

More than a decade later Elliott wrote that the foundation had more than proved the usefulness and the soundness of its basic ideas. In addition to its initial purposes, the agency, according to Elliott, came to serve "...as an instrument for effective two-way communication from the University to the outside world, and from this world to the University. Each gain from this exchange of power."

Two years after the establishment of the Purdue Research Foundation, at the Third Industrial Research Conference, Elliott took the opportunity to develop and elaborate on an idea which he had first expressed seven years earlier in an address before the National Education Association in 1925. His comments, reported below, are typically Elliott in tone and may well have been one of his most significant statements regarding higher education in America.

Political enemies may attempt to undermine, critics may cavil, bigots may bluster, but the cold, indisputable fact remains that higher education, during the quarter of century just passing, has furnished more than ever before the germinal nuclei for the permanency and the potency of the doctrine of human opportunity; and has become a great driving force for the advance of both material and spiritual things.

Our existing organization for higher education represents a process of continual flowering of human destiny through, by, and for opportunity. Whether we pursue the route of sentimental aspiration, or that of stern statistics, we inevitably reach the conclusion that what we, as a people ..., and what we are accomplishing for the cause of civilization, are more directly the products of the services and the skills of our colleges, our universities, and our professional schools, than of any other existing agency or group of
existing agencies. These institutions distinctly . . . embody the best of our American idealism, the firmest of our confidence in the present, and the most stable of our faith in the future. They, above all, have been the means for giving a human reality to ideals.

His talk was entitled “Dollars for Ideals; Ideals for Dividends” and it was Elliott’s judgment, unquestionably, that the Purdue Research Foundation was one of the most important agencies that permitted the university to transmit dollars to ideals and ideals to dividends.

In December 1923, Better Homes in America was incorporated in Delaware with Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, as its first president. Mrs. William Brown Meloney of New York was generally credited with initiating and promoting the organization whose activities were designed to promote and encourage the building and maintenance of better homes throughout America by conducting educational campaigns, research, and programs of every kind to improve the design and construction of homes, their surroundings, decoration, and furnishings and equipment. The influence of Better Homes in America spread throughout the country during the dozen years following 1923. Nearly 5,000 local committees were organized to work in communities with reference to the various aspects of home improvement. Supporting funds were largely obtained from civic-minded benefactors.

In 1932 the national office was moved from Washington, D.C., to New York City, but three years later (1935) Elliott was asked if the organization could be placed under the sponsorship of Purdue University. Elliott believed that Purdue, as a land-grant college, had been established by men who saw in modern science a “limitless power for the promotion of human welfare.” Therefore, anything that the university could do to raise the standard of living of the common people of the nation was well within the responsibility of the university. The concept was approved by the trustees, and in 1935, Better Homes in America was reincorporated under the laws of Indiana, and all the records, books, data, publications, and files were transferred to the new corporation.

The nation was in the throes of the great depression and Elliott, noting that housing was one of the most depressed of all of the industries, reasoned that housing construction offered the most immediate as well as the most long-lasting opportunity for the “re-energizing of the durable goods industries.” At a Homes Conference held at Purdue, Elliott reported that there were “. . .
two million families with annual incomes of $2,500, a large proportion of whom would be prospective purchasers of homes if a well-built 5-room house, complete with adequate land, improvements, and accessories could be acquired for $5,000 or less."

The Purdue Research Foundation served as the agency under which the Purdue Housing Research Program was established, and a number of experimental houses were constructed adjacent to the campus. Within a year these three bedroom homes had been planned and constructed with the cooperation of industry at a unit cost of $5,000 and yet a "decent minimum of quality" had been maintained. David Ross, through the Purdue Research Foundation, had provided some of the funds for this initial venture into the field of housing but additional funds were not readily available. Elliott found it difficult to accept the fact that it was virtually impossible to secure funds for research in this home building activity. "The automobile industry, the electrical industry, even the food industry," he said, "spend many times that amount annually for the improvement of their product. But because the housing business is apparently everybody's business and likewise nobody's responsibility, we continue the processes and practices of the horse and buggy age."

During the next few years it became increasingly apparent that adequate funds would probably not be provided to carry out the rather elaborate plans for housing research. Finally, at a meeting of the board of directors on August 5, 1943, it was voted to suspend the operation of the corporation for the duration of the war. The project was never reactivated.

The Purdue Aeronautics Corporation, another allied corporation, was established in 1942 to further the development of aeronautical engineering and to provide for the more effective utilization of the Purdue University Airport. The airport, owned by the Purdue Research Foundation, had begun its operation in 1930 when Ross purchased more than 100 acres of land and turned it over to the foundation as an airport facility. On the day that government officials visited the site, November 1, 1930, a landing ring and a wind sock were installed and with this act the Purdue University Airport was established. Not until four years later was ground broken for the first hangar.

Elliott had a continuing interest in the airport and in promoting the aeronautics program at Purdue which was evident in a variety of ways. His most publicized act, of course, was that of
naming Amelia Earhart to a newly-created position as consultant in careers for women in 1935.

Shortly after the Purdue Aeronautics Corporation was established, Elliott testified before a senate subcommittee that he thought land-grant colleges could perform the same services to aviation that had been rendered to agriculture indicating that perhaps aviation, in the years to come, was going to be just as important to the nation as agriculture had been in the last two generations. The Purdue Aeronautics Corporation, without question, has had a major role in the development of airport facilities and equipment.

Elliott's interest in these allied corporations extended over the entire term of his presidency; but the pattern for these "legal agencies" was established during his first ten years in office.

THE DECADE—1922-1932

As Elliott neared the end of his first decade at Purdue, he continued to travel over the country visiting alumni groups, encouraging their continued support. Although he had visited virtually every major city in the East and in the Midwest, it was not until 1928 that he made his first extended trip to the Western states.

At about the time he announced his plans to make the trip, several members of the board agreed among themselves that Elliott had more than proved his worth to the university. So at an April board meeting, while Elliott was out of the room, board president Dave Ross led a discussion relative to Elliott's six-year tenure with Purdue, pointing out that three years earlier, in April 1925, they had increased his salary to $12,000. When the president was called back to the meeting, Ross told him that the board had contributed $500 in order that Elliott's portrait could be painted, then said, "It gives me great pleasure to tell you also that by unanimous vote the board has raised your salary to $15,000 effective at the beginning of the next fiscal year."

Although Elliott's exact words were not recorded, the secretary of the board noted in the minutes that "Elliott expressed his deep appreciation for the board's generous recognition of his services, which he could not accept, as he did not think the financial condition of the University justified such an increase at this time."

So Elliott declined the salary increase although he did reluctantly consent to having his portrait painted. (One year later,
however, in April 1929, the board voted unanimously to set Elliott’s salary at $15,000 effective April 1, 1929. This time the item was not a matter for discussion with the president; it was presented to him as an accomplished fact.)

Then on May 22, 1928, Elliott left Lafayette to spend 24 days “lining up” Purdue alumni groups along the West Coast. In 24 days Elliott attended 24 banquets, most of them given by Purdue alumni clubs. Alumni were visited in Chicago, Omaha, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, Spokane, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and elsewhere. For the first time since he had left Helena in 1922, the former chancellor of the University of Montana visited his old headquarters. Taking note of this trip, George Ade, a distinguished Purdue alumnus who was serving as guest editor for *The Purdue Alumnus*, reported that “Purdue has never had a more cheerful emissary or one who sets out on a pilgrimage with a more definite purpose.”

His visitations apparently were most successful, for in September 1928, Lawrence Downs, president of the Illinois Central Railroad and a Purdue graduate, said at the first student convocation of the year that Elliott was “the greatest man the country has produced for such a position. I hope that Dr. Elliott will stay here the rest of his life and that no other school will be able to gobble him up.”

In order to keep in close contact with the alumni, Elliott began writing a one-page feature article for each issue of *The Purdue Alumnus* in October 1929. He called it “The President’s Page”, and continued it for the next five years, finally dropping it as a regular feature in June 1934. During all his years in the presidency, however, he penned at least one message annually to the alumni.

How did they respond? In May 1929, during Gala Week, the alumni presented him with a new Packard sedan to replace the first car he ever owned, a rather delapidated 1919 Hudson Super Six touring car. He proudly drove the Packard until May 1, 1937, at which time he was presented with a second new Packard sedan by the alumni group. His affection for this automobile was such that he kept it until several years after he had retired as president.

Also in the spring of 1929, Elliott received his third honorary degree, a Doctor of Laws, from Columbia University as a feature of Columbia’s 175th anniversary of its founding (his previous honorary degrees having been awarded by DePauw University and Butler University the preceding year). Honored with him at Co-
lumbia in 1929 were three other college presidents who were good friends: Lotus D. Coffman, the University of Minnesota; Walter A. Jessup, the University of Iowa, and Livingston Farrant, Cornell University.

Having gained the rather widespread general respect and support of the alumni and the citizens of the state, Elliott was disposed to present the ever-recurring problems of financial support to the people. So in 1930, in order to get the matter before the graduates of Purdue and others, Elliott prepared an account for the *Purdue Alumnus* in which he attempted to present the heart of the financial problem. For a number of years, he wrote, the appropriations made for the support and physical growth had been far from meeting the needs of the institution. While the enrollment had increased from about 3,000 students in 1924 to more than 4,500 in 1930, the legislative appropriations had not kept pace. According to Elliott the university had “practically exhausted its reserve of supplies and equipment.” He acknowledged that the existing emergency in the affairs of the state at that time dictated an attempt at economy, but the youth of Indiana should have as good an opportunity for education and advancement as that provided by any other state in the Union. Reiterating this theme, he campaigned vigorously during the months preceding the 1931 meeting of the legislature.

Harry G. Leslie, a Purdue graduate who had served as executive secretary of the Purdue Alumni Association from 1924 to 1928, had been elected governor of Indiana and had taken office in January 1929. With the governor’s office and many members of the legislature solidly behind the two state universities, the 1931 legislature eventually approved the budgets as prepared by university officials, and the financial problems for the next biennium were no longer an item of great concern.

During the months that followed, Elliott turned part of his attention to a plan for reviewing the changes and progress that had taken place at Purdue during the decade 1922-1932.

September 30, 1932, was the date marking the end of Purdue’s 58th year of operation, but as Elliott wrote, it represented “something more than merely the time for the official closing of another of the series of annual records. It was the decennial of my own service to the institution. This circumstance naturally resulted in a disposition to review and to evaluate the institutional changes that have taken place during recent years.”
Thus in December 1931, Elliott sent a memorandum to the various administrative officers, announcing that the university planned to publish a review of the decade in the fall of 1932. Of the four deans who had been at Purdue in 1922, three were still distinguished academic leaders: Dean Shoemaker, Dean Skinner, and Dean Potter. But Dean Coulter had retired in 1926, and M. L. Fisher had replaced him as dean of men while R. B. Moore had taken over the responsibilities of dean of the School of Science. Dean Moore died, however, before the close of the decade and H. E. Enders became dean of the school in March 1932.

Among others to whom Elliott turned for facts about the preceding ten years were C. B. Jordan, appointed dean of the new School of Pharmacy in 1924; Mary L. Mathews, named dean of the new School of Home Economics in 1926; R. G. Dukes, first dean of the Graduate School, appointed in 1929; Director G. I. Christie of the Agricultural Experiment Station; Director N. A. Kellogg, Department of Athletics; and, of course, Librarian W. M. Hepburn and University Editor R. W. Babcock. Elliott indicated that the project appealed to him as an exceptional opportunity to assess the events and accomplishments of the immediate past, and perhaps could be used as a background for the planning of the next decade.

The task of digesting and editing the reports from university officials fell to Babcock; the part dealing with financial administration and physical development was assigned to R. B. Stewart, comptroller of the University. The volume, entitled Purdue University, 1922-1932, was published in September 1933. It stands as a valuable historical account of university development during the ten-year period.

Most of the changes described as having taken place had been specifically mentioned by Elliott in his annual reviews of the year, but the following items, for example, were cited again as significant developments:

1. The discontinuance of the three-year course in pharmacy.
2. The establishment of a degree course in physical education.
3. The adoption of a faculty report on the social and moral needs of students.
4. The organization of the graduate work of the university into the Graduate School and the appointment of R. G. Dukes as dean.
5. The development of the Department of Research Relations with Industry and the establishment of the Purdue Research Foundation.

6. The adoption of a long-range campus plan and the inauguration of the physical plant extension program made possible by the "educational improvement fund" established by the 1927 legislature.

7. The reorganization of the control of the Purdue Memorial Union, thus permitting the beginning of the completion of the structure.

8. The opening of Franklin Levering Cary Hall, the new residence hall for men.

An article in the *Purdue Alumnus*, which praised Elliott highly, noted that since 1922 the university had named a comptroller and moved to a budget plan for fiscal administration; that buildings constructed since 1922 represented approximately 60 per cent of the value of all Purdue buildings; the enrollment had gone from about 3,000 students in 1921-22 to approximately 5,500 in 1931-32. The author of the article, staff member T. R. Johnston, wrote, however, that the greatest contribution of the university's dynamic president was to "the new spirit of Purdue."

Some of the faculty members who had been on the campus since 1922 might have recalled with some asperity that six months after Elliott had assumed the presidency, he had written to deans, directors, and department heads noting that in his opinion, "... a number of University departments are at present overstaffed; that some of the members of the instructional staff have inadequate assignments; and that the overhead costs of some departments is entirely too great." He had candidly announced that he would "... approve advancement of salary and rank only to those . . . for whom a demonstrated high quality of work can be exhibited."

And in 1924 he had disturbed some faculty members when he was overheard saying that "... everytime a student fails in his work we should examine closely to discover whether the institution was not responsible."

And again in 1926, Elliott had acted decisively when he learned that a staff member had publicly endorsed a commercial product. An advertisement for a patent medicine headed "Purdue Instructor Takes Firm Stand" had appeared in several Indiana papers. Noting that the advertisement contained a testimonial purporting
to be signed by a member of the instructional staff, Elliott advised
the instructor to “secure the withdrawal of the testimonial” or “re­
linquish his position.” When he notified the board of his actions,
they voted unanimously to “refuse to countenance the name of
the University in connection with any commercial testimonials.”

But faculty members could also recall that Elliott had recom­
manded to the board and secured approval for regulations pro­
viding for leaves of absence (sabbatical leaves) with pay (1923),
significant fee reductions for dependent children of staff mem­
bers (1923), a retirement plan (1926) tied in with the Carnegie
Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching which he was work­
ing to improve, and a plan for group life insurance which pro­
vided sizeable benefits (1929).

And some senior faculty members undoubtedly remembered
that at a convocation held to commemorate the 125th anniver­
sary of the birth of John Purdue on November 1, 1923, Elliott
honored nine staff members who had completed thirty years serv­
vice to Purdue. The following year, he brought together eighteen
staff members who had served 25 years or more and cited them
as members of a mythical “Purdue Twenty-Five Year Club.” When
Librarian Hepburn noted late in 1929 that the group had not been
called together since 1924, the president and Mrs. Elliott promptly
arranged a dinner at the president’s home for 24 staff members
who had 25 or more years of service. (But the “club” was dissolved
at the Founder’s Day dinner in 1933 when Elliott noted that the
numbers were increasing and such a sizeable group could no longer
be singled out for special recognition.)

Faculty, students, and alums were aware that an overall cam­
pus plan had been developed and that there appeared to be a
guaranteed income to the building fund which would permit new
construction; and it was generally known that the deans and
directors had been asked to meet with the president and the board
on several occasions to determine building priorities.

Anyone who was close to the university recognized that the
relationships among board members and the president were ex­
cellent. Although J. D. Oliver and Henry Marshall were no longer
on the board, J. W. Noel, Virginia Meredith, John A. Hillenbrand,
and J. K. Lilly, along with the others, were enthusiastic and highly
responsive to the leadership of board president David Ross and
Elliott. Willing to work long hours, representatives of the board,
starting in 1926, met with board members from the other three
state institutions, for example, when budget requests were being prepared for the legislature.

Many Purdue graduates were also pleased when, at Elliott's suggestion, the faculty adopted the policy of granting honorary degrees to distinguished alumni; the first four of which were awarded on June 15, 1926, to George Ade, John T. McCutcheon, C. H. Robertson, and Chase S. Osborn. Two years later this "new spirit of Purdue" was felt in the community when the board moved to adopt the custom of holding a president's reception each fall for staff members and citizens "to promote social and educational interest in the work and life of the University."

So it seemed appropriate to Elliott and others at the close of ten years service to arrange a special ceremony to be held on May 6, 1932, to celebrate the 63rd anniversary of the founding of Purdue University; and as it turned out, this first Founder's Day Program was also a day of recognition for Elliott.

An alumni committee composed of F. F. Chandler, Burr S. Swezey, Martha Robertson, O. M. Booher, W. A. Knapp, and T. R. Johnston planned the affair. Dr. William Oxley Thompson of Ohio State University, who had been the main speaker at the semi-centennial celebration at Purdue eight years previously, was selected as the speaker of the evening. Chandler was chosen toastmaster while David Ross spoke on behalf of the Board of Trustees and C. R. Clauser, president of the Student Council, spoke on behalf of the student body.

Governor Leslie, along with four hundred faculty members, alumni, townspeople, and friends of the university were guests at a banquet held in the ballroom of the Memorial Union. The big event of the evening was not, as might be expected, the main address (or the telegram from President Herbert Hoover); it was the unveiling of the portrait of President Elliott by James W. Noel, an Indianapolis attorney and board member who presented the painting to the university on behalf of the trustees. The artist, Robert W. Grafton, was a prominent Michigan City painter who had received many similar commissions during those years. The painting now hangs in the foyer of the Edward C. Elliott Hall of Music.

It was a great moment for Elliott, one which afforded him great pleasure throughout his life. "The personal tribute of tonight has given to Mrs. Elliott and to me a new treasure for life's storehouse of precious moments," he said. "After all, what of greater value do we gather through the years than such memories?"
Reviewing his association with Purdue, Elliott said, "Your Purdue has had the best ten years of my life." He noted that nearly one-half of the value of the properties of Purdue had been added during these past ten years; one-half of the 12,000 alumni had received diplomas from him; and fully half of the students who had entered Purdue had entered since 1922. "My best ten years are not, by any measure, the best ten years of Purdue. The true happiness," he said, "is not in the past, nor in the present. The glory of Purdue is in the certainty and the power of its productive future." Using his highly favored alliterative phraseology, he said of his first decade at Purdue, "they have been years filled with adventure—adventures in dreaming and doing; in success and in failure; in prosperity and poverty; in drudgery and in delight; in responsibility and in helplessness; adventures with foes and with friends."

During the months that followed the Founder's Day affair, many articles appeared in various publications lauding Elliott and Purdue. David Ross observed that Elliott "knows and speaks the language of all groups, and is able to apply to their problems the sound judgment and wisdom borne from years of experience." Fritz Ernst, a Purdue grad, said "the alumni think he's a peach. He is very democratic, is a most able educator, and treats the students and alumni like real human beings."

Some time later the editor of the Purdue Alumnus contacted a few of Elliott's friends in the educational world for comments; Henry Suzzalo agreeably responded, "... there are few men in the U. S. who rank with President Elliott in his ability to contribute to every phase of public educational administration from policy making, government and organization to financial management and administrative execution. He is one of the outstanding University executives of the whole country." Suzzalo noted that Elliott had that "... high capacity for enlisting the enthusiastic cooperation of all the human factors which constitute an institution."

Another writer in the Purdue Alumnus described Elliott as having a "medium wiry physique, sharply chiseled features, deeply grooved character lines in his face, piercing eyes, and glossy brown hair. He walks a great deal, his gait is firm and quick. He enjoys smoking and talking with people." Virtually all writers, in one way or another, called attention to his "dynamic energy and tireless working." Some persons referred to him then (and many refer to him now) as a "tall" man, impressed with his erect carriage.
Actually he was perhaps 5' 10" or a little more, but he appeared to be "tall" and his bearing and manner were those of a tall man.

T. R. Johnston described him as "an immense talker" and "an excellent speaker." Using Elliott's own words, Johnston said that his audiences rightfully expected him to be "dignified without being dull, serious but not solemn, forceful yet not fanciful, truthful without too much triteness; to flavor his wisdom with dashes of wit; and to be peppy but not peppery." Appearing frequently before luncheon and dinner groups as a popular speaker, his favorite stance was at the side of the lecturn, both hands plunged deep in his coat pockets, leaning slightly forward, alert, his eyes roving the group making many personal contacts. He demanded attentiveness, and he got it; Elliott loved to speak, and his audiences invariably acclaimed him.

It probably is both fair and accurate to say that Elliott's first decade at Purdue was his greatest. He had succeeded in bringing all elements of the university together to feel the new, enthusiastic, unified "spirit of Purdue."

Among his professional colleagues on the staff perhaps one in twenty was something less than in complete agreement with his methods; among the students at Purdue, perhaps one in two hundred viewed him as something other than a friend of students; while among the citizenry of the state, perhaps only one in two thousand felt something other than respect and admiration for the president.

As Elliott looked back at his ten years at Purdue, he probably also paused with Mrs. Elliott to look at the children's progress. Their youngest son, Ed, who had graduated from Jefferson High School in Lafayette that same spring (1932), was set to enter Purdue in the fall; John, who had never really considered going to Purdue, had graduated from Harvard University three years earlier; Susanne would be a senior at Vassar College the following fall; and Mario had completed her freshman year at Smith College.

They all had had good years at home with "Granny" and their mother and a very busy father. They enjoyed the warmth and depth of devotion that existed between their parents and loved to hear stories about Dad's problems. He occasionally regaled them with accounts of indignities suffered: the time as a student in Germany, for example, when he backed away from a painting in a museum to get a better view and fell over a balcony railing; though not seriously injured, he was highly indignant when the authorities arrested him for trespassing on the lawn below. On
another occasion, while attending a sports dinner, he kept inching his chair backward as he listened to the other speakers until suddenly, to the great consternation and embarrassment of everyone, he and the chair toppled from the platform. To relieve everyone's concern he quipped, “That was the Notre Dame shift!” and the tension dissolved in laughter.

While at home they all had delighted to hear countless exchanges between mother and dad. Marion particularly treasured her father's propensity for coining “new” words as in the phrase, “her Elliottic mood.” Mrs. Elliott would say, “There's no such word, Ned!” using her nickname for the president; but he would reply with conviction, “There is now, my dear!”

The children were pleased when the Elliotts entertained student leaders in their home as they frequently did. Elliott's relationships with students were cordial and always appropriate; his manner toward students was warm and friendly so that he and Mrs. Elliott were rather frequent guests at student affairs until his last years in office, the war years.

His relationships with the faculty during those first ten years and the years that followed were generally excellent, although there were those who fiercely opposed some of his actions and thought of him as a “taskmaster,” a “dictator.” His approach to faculty members and to faculty matters was largely individual and personal; and staff members responded as individuals. As one colleague confided, “You either loved him or you hated him,” but there was always respect for his tremendous abilities and those who “loved” him far out-numbered the others.

Elliott could greet most faculty members by name and usually knew something of the personal background of each. For a time he attempted to have breakfast with every new job applicant and his wife. He boasted that he would never employ a staff member who didn't eat a hearty breakfast; and he wanted to see that the candidate had a healthy wife—one who wouldn't interfere with the man's work. At the same time he was urging the board to provide for higher faculty salaries proclaiming, “Why shouldn't we pay the instructors well? They do the work, don't they?”

He enjoyed his contacts with the staff and occasionally played golf with a foursome which included Professors G. A. Young, head of mechanical engineering; J. L. Cattel, head of modern languages; W. K. Hatt, head of civil engineering; and Jack E. Walters, director of personnel, Schools of Engineering.
Although he was not an accomplished golfer, he was good-natured about his golf scores and proclaimed himself a “duffer.” Never an ardent participant in outdoor sports other than walking, Elliott had sometimes played golf at the Maple Bluff course in Madison, but gave up the game while in Montana.

In that state the most common sports activity was trout fishing and Elliott had enjoyed trips to the Bitterroot and Madison rivers. He and John occasionally went on Saturday fishing expeditions and, from time to time, he went on fishing trips with friends up in the mountains. In Indiana there was no trout fishing, of course, so Elliott renewed his golf game, partly for the exercise, perhaps more for the camaraderie.

His relationships with members of the board of trustees and various state and local officials were highly favorable and, again, were dependent to a large degree on his own personal magnetism. There was warm friendship and mutual respect and admiration between Elliott and board members Ross, Noel, Oliver, Marshall, Lilly, Hillenbrand, and Meredith; the same was true with Governor Leslie, and later with Governors Paul V. McNutt, Clifford M. Townsend, Henry F. Schricker, and many other state officials, legislators, and political leaders.

While it was sometimes said that Elliott was an opportunist in many if not all respects, his purposes always related to “the glory of old Purdue.” When some of the “glory” spilled over to Elliott, he accepted it.

His frequent trips to visit alumni groups particularly during the first ten years paid great dividends. The alumni association flourished as Elliott made an all-out effort to get the support of alumni groups and individuals. Whereas his predecessor, Stone, had been somewhat disinterested in the old grads and, in fact, had alienated some of them, Elliott sought out and made friends with George Ade, John McCutcheon, Lawrence Downs, Russell Gray and many others, some nationally prominent, some who were local Purdue boosters.

In the summer of 1932 following the splendid testimonial dinner, however, the problems which faced Elliott and the university as a result of the depression left little time for the review of records of achievement.

In February of that year, Elliott had written that even though it was not easy to determine the meaning of the nationwide economic disturbances of the past two years, it seemed clear that Purdue would need to re-examine its purposes, its structures,
and its performances. "It is not unreasonable to conclude that the day may not be far distant when the whole enterprise of higher education . . . may be brought to trial under new codes of economy and of social effectiveness."

Elliott noted that while the university had outwardly continued with its usual activities, apparently little affected by the confusion and depression that had dominated and deflated the affairs of the material world, inwardly, the institution was preparing to change some of its plans in the event of "lean" years. Two years later he wrote, "the years that are lean are here."

**THE DEPRESSION YEARS**

From 1932 to 1937 virtually every problem of the university was related to finance and there were no ready solutions to most of them. Many have noted that Elliott was particularly alert to the opportunities for federal support of education, however, and he, together with R. B. Stewart, were highly successful in obtaining funds from such agencies as the Public Works Administration, the Works Progress Administration, and the National Youth Administration. Some writers have indicated that Purdue probably obtained far more than what might have been considered its "fair share" of federal dollars. In 1940 Elliott reported that federal grants during the period 1933-1940 had totaled more than $3,750,000.

At any rate, the president's task during this period was quite different from the duties of the earlier decade and it seemed to Elliott that the period from 1932 through 1940 constituted a "second stage" in his tenure at Purdue. Having firmly established himself as a strong, vigorous leader and a "Purdue man," he was able to act with a unified support that no other president at Purdue had previously enjoyed.

It would appear that Elliott was eminently successful during both periods of the university's history, but it is equally clear that he enjoyed the first decade far more than the next eight years.

During the summer of 1932 a special session of the legislature was called by the governor. The special tax for the "educational improvement fund," passed in 1929, was amended to provide for a three-year moratorium; a 15 per cent reduction in the university's appropriation for operating expenditures was approved and the interest coming from university funds was diverted to the state sinking fund. Thus the total dollar reduction was nearly 30 per cent for the academic year 1932-33.
As a result of these actions the board of trustees met on August 26, 1932, and reduced staff salaries from 10 to 15 per cent, based on the amount of salary the staff member received. Elliott, along with virtually everyone else, had his salary reduced (to $12,750). The board also noted that the legislature had ruled that the trustees could not increase any salary or add any new staff members without the specific approval of the State Budget Committee.

After the close of the special session of the legislature but before the board of trustees could meet to act, Elliott’s mother died on August 15, 1932, in North Platte, Nebraska, two days before her 83rd birthday. The president and Mrs. Elliott were at her bedside. In the next issue of the Purdue Alumnus, Elliott wrote “life is just one hard thing after another.”

In September, 1932, Elliott called a meeting of the presidents, secretaries, and treasurers of all campus organizations including fraternities and sororities. Two hundred students attended the meeting in Fowler Hall where they were asked to begin to plan a new economic policy for Purdue students for the coming year.

In his talk to student leaders Elliott said, “the country is facing a crisis today such as it has not known since the Civil War. All such institutions as Purdue are in very critical situations at present, and it becomes our duty to safeguard those interests that are essential to the University.” He pointed out that there was an increase in the number of students applying for deferment of registration fees and also an increase in the number of demands on the student loan fund. He urged students not to incur heavy debts to remain in school and to cut their expenses to a minimum while at the university. He reported that every member of the university community, students and staff alike, were carrying on their work “under a very critical eye.”

The outside activities of staff members came under scrutiny, for example, when the board of trustees, in December 1933, reviewed the circumstances under which a member of the faculty could be permitted to augment his university salary by performing commercial testing services or consulting with private firms. From the discussions came approval of policies and procedures recommended by the executive committee of the faculty which allowed staff members to accept payment under certain conditions for engaging in consulting work and service testing.

Student enrollment dropped in 1932-1933 for the first time since Elliott had taken office, and the number of students continued to decrease the following year. Not only was there a de-
cline in students but also in appropriation of public money; and other income sources—fees, sales, rent, research grants, athletics—also were decreasing.

The Department of Athletics, for example, under Director Kellogg had been in some financial troubles even with its winning teams since the late 1920's and an alumni contact committee had been established to get the alumni appraised of the problems. By November 1932, Elliott and the board were exasperated over the fact that, despite their many efforts to improve the situation, spending in the athletic department still exceeded the income. Kellogg's salary was reduced and he was given until August 1934, to balance the budget or be terminated. Six months later (May 1933) he resigned in the face of what he thought was an impossible situation. He was succeeded by head football coach Noble E. Kizer.

In an effort to adjust the instruction of students to meet the changing social and economic conditions, Elliott announced that he questioned whether the university should attempt to serve as a custodial institution for those young people who were unable to find jobs and stayed in school merely following the line of least resistance. It seems apparent that he felt that the limited resources of the university should be concentrated upon superior students, "students of growing abilities."

Early in 1933 after he had met with the Committee on Free Schooling at Higher Levels at the "Citizens Conference on the Crisis in Education" held in Washington, D. C., he noted (in The Purdue Alumnus) that a large proportion of trained personnel in the established professions and the leaders in industrial and social life had come from the higher institutions; and furthermore, echoing his own statement made many years earlier, the results of the scientific research carried on by these institutions had been of incalculable worth to the economic life of the nation. When viewed from these two standpoints alone, he wrote, "the general scheme of higher education of the country must be regarded as a principal, productive asset, the conservation and further development of which are matters of permanent concern for the state and the nation."

One month later the 1933 Indiana legislature made a single lump sum appropriation (for the first time in history) and again drastically cut university income. The 1932 special session of the legislature had reduced appropriations 14.9 per cent. The 1933 legislature cut another 6.6 per cent for a total reduction of 21.5
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per cent of the 1931 appropriation. Thus, including the cut resulting from the elimination of the “educational improvement fund,” the total reduction in cost to the state was 35.3 per cent, according to Elliott’s figures.

On top of this “bad news,” only shortly after the 1933 legislative session was concluded, Elliott suffered his second great personal loss when his father died on March 21, 1933, (on his 59th wedding anniversary) at the age of 84 years. After having spent more than 50 years of his life in North Platte, Fred Elliott had made many friends. An editorial in the local paper headed, “Fred Elliott was a Giant Among Men,” noted that “he accepted a humble position for himself and [yet] through hard work and saving” he had given his children the opportunity to move to “positions of trust and responsibility.” While the many expressions of sympathy were heartening, death was especially hard to accept; both parents had died at times when Elliott was already depressed and deeply concerned over the future of the university. But his answer to personal grief was to turn to his work with perhaps greater determination. After his father’s death, however, Elliott told some of his intimate friends about two prized possessions which were linked irrevocably to his parents: a gold-cased Elgin watch which they had given him on his 21st birthday in 1895, and a second gold-cased watch, a Howard, which they gave him on his 50th birthday in 1924. Long after retirement he carried the Howard with pride and affection.

Speaking before a conference of administrative officers from engineering colleges in 1934, Elliott indicated that the times simply dictated new efficiencies. “What is taught, how it is taught, how much is taught, and who does the teaching are old questions that are to receive new answers,” he said. He suggested that all courses could be cut down by leaving out superficial and irrelevant materials. Similarly, a number of nonessential and marginal expenses of the students, could probably be eliminated by careful planning, he observed.

Then there were other ways of being practically helpful to another group, the unemployed graduates. He suggested that superior students be encouraged and assisted toward graduate study while others could be assigned to “scientific busy-work projects.”

Later that year (1934) a study was initiated by his office which proposed to obtain information about the occupational standards of Purdue graduates during the past five years. The work of the
study was done under the direction of Elliott by Frank C. Hockema, newly appointed assistant to the president, and Jack E. Walters.

When this study of occupational standards was published in 1935, there was evidence that of the group of 2,140 graduates from the classes of 1928-1934 who were questioned, more than 90 per cent were employed. And more than two-thirds of those gainfully employed were engaged in activities for which they were specifically trained by the university.

The following year Elliott and Hockema prepared a second report on Purdue graduates entitled *Where They Go and What They Do*. The reports of these studies were especially timely and undoubtedly served the purpose of creating new confidence in the worth of Purdue among the people of Indiana.

Hockema, a professor of industrial engineering, had been moved to his new position when a reorganization of the president's office was occasioned by the retirement of Helen Hand in September 1934. Miss Hand had served as secretary to the president of Purdue since 1913 and her leaving required that new assignments be made; she did continue on a part-time basis, however, working on special projects until her death in 1942. She had been of tremendous help to the president and had been accorded access to confidential matters as no others had.

The questionnaire used in the study mentioned above had asked that each graduate list the three best teachers he had had at Purdue and the three worst, together with reasons for his choice. The answers to these questions were known only to the president and Miss Hand.

Elliott told the faculty what he had done, emphasizing the confidential nature of the results, but he was pleased when several professors were anxious to know how they rated.

Reminiscing, Elliott recalled twenty years later that most of those who came to see him were the best ones; he assumed that the poorer teachers probably didn't care. Elliott told of one young man who felt that he had probably received a lot of criticism and came to see if his suspicions were correct. The file of responses revealed the professor had been attacked severely. He told Elliott that he would resign immediately, but the president advised him to wait until tomorrow before making a final decision.

The next morning the man appeared for another talk and finally was persuaded to stay and work to become a better teacher; the president promised to help. With a great deal of satisfaction
Elliott recalled that the professor had remained at Purdue and eventually received an award for outstanding teaching. Another case involved a professor in engineering who first came to Elliott's attention at one of his meetings with the members of Iron Key on a Sunday morning. The boys complained that the man was sarcastic, ridiculed students, called them incompetent, and so forth. When Elliott confirmed these comments from the questionnaire, he saw the department head, advised him to call in the professor, talk it over, and give him every possible assistance to help him become more effective. The head later reported that the individual had become one of the best teachers in the department.

Elliott insistently urged deans and department heads to work with teachers, supervising, stimulating and helping them to do their best work. At times he pushed for better teaching until he irritated some members of the faculty. “Some of the men on this faculty are noted for never seeing a student,” he would exclaim bitterly; and it sometimes seemed as though he would much prefer to support a student rather than any faculty member in a conflict between the two. Part of his constant drive for better teaching undoubtedly came from his background in professional education, part of it from his genuine interest in student progress, but part of it came from his interest in getting the best out of each individual, student and teacher alike.

Hockema had a reputation as an excellent teacher, was vitally interested in student welfare, and eventually became (with R. B. Stewart) one of the two-man administrative team closest to Elliott.

Elliott's review of the 61st year of the university (1934-1935) made little mention of the effect of the depression, but did list several events which Elliott thought gave "a certain distinction to the year." He mentioned the opening of the new women's residence hall in September 1934, made possible by a grant from the federal Public Works Administration, which provided for the first time "proper housing facilities for 120 women students of the University."

He noted also the granting of direct aid to students by the federal Emergency Relief Administration; the Homes Conference already referred to; the preparation of plans for a new Student Service and Administration Building (later named the Executive Building); and the appointment to the staff of Dr. Lillian M. Gilbreth as professor of industrial engineering, and Miss Amelia Ear-
hart as consultant on careers for women. “These appointments,” he said, “were made with the intention of introducing new forces for the study of one of the most important modern unsolved problems of higher education—the effective education of young women.”

Elliott had for some time been interested in the education of college women. He first saw Miss Earhart at a conference in New York City sponsored by the New York Herald Tribune in September 1934. Elliott was on the program of the Fourth Annual Women’s Conference on Current Problems to speak on “New Frontiers for Youth.” Amelia Earhart followed him on the program, speaking on the future of aeronautics and the part women were to play in the development of that field. She had just completed her notable flight over the Atlantic and her comments were of great interest to Elliott.

That evening Elliott began to mull over the possibilities that could come about if Amelia Earhart and Purdue University could be related in some way. The next day at a luncheon arranged by Elliott, he, Miss Earhart, and her husband, George Palmer Putnam, discussed some possibilities. Elliott later reported that it was at this time that he learned that “her primary interest in life was not in this career of adventure upon which she had embarked, but rather in an effort to find and make some additions to the solution to the problem of careers for women.” She was interested primarily in the education of women in order to qualify them for their place in the world, Elliott observed. He asked her to come to the campus and state her philosophy; she was delighted at the prospect. Within an hour after the luncheon was over, Elliott had made several phone calls, Miss Earhart had rearranged her schedule, and in less than a month Miss Earhart was on the Purdue campus to address faculty members and women students on “Opportunities For Women In Aviation.” She was the guest of three coed activities, the Women’s Self-Governing Association, the Young Women’s Christian Association, and the Women’s Athletic Association. It was the first of a series of visits to the campus, the last of which was to precede her ill-fated flight in the Purdue “Flying Laboratory,” in 1937.

In the spring of 1935, Miss Earhart returned to campus to visit with the Elliott family. President and Mrs. Elliott met her in Fort Wayne on March 22, and she returned to Lafayette with them to discuss what kind of arrangements could be made in order for her to become affiliated with the university. Two and
a half months later, the president announced the appointment of Miss Earhart as a visiting member of the faculty. Well aware of her popularity, Elliott said, “Miss Earhart represents better than any other young woman of this generation the spirit and the courageous skill which may be called the new pioneering.” The following November she took up her duties at the university as consultant on careers for women.

Although she was never on the campus at any one time for more than a few weeks, the days spent at Purdue were busy ones. While on campus for her intermittent visits, she generally stayed in one of the women’s residence halls. According to Putnam, her husband and biographer, Miss Earhart never became quite reconciled to her high-sounding title, but he wrote that “even in the fortuitously shortened period in it she found her job at Purdue University one of the most satisfying adventures in her life.” Both Elliott and Putnam agreed that although the relationship came about quite by chance, it almost seemed foreordained.

Putnam reported that President Elliott asked him what he thought most interested Miss Earhart in the field of research and education beyond immediate academic matters. Putnam said he told Elliott that she was “hankering for a bigger and better plane, not only one in which she could go to far places farther and faster and more safely, but to use as a laboratory for research in aviation education and for technical experimentation.”

Miss Earhart discussed these possibilities with Elliott, Ross, and others, and there was established in the Purdue Research Foundation an Amelia Earhart Fund for Aeronautical Research. Elliott announced that the fund had been established in April, 1936, and that $50,000 had been subscribed. Chief contributors to the fund were David Ross, J. K. Lilly, Vincent Bendix, and others, mostly within the aviation industry. From this growing fund was purchased the $80,000 Lockheed Electra which became known as the Purdue “Flying Laboratory.” After a number of test flights Miss Earhart brought the “Flying Laboratory” to the Purdue University Airport and to other major cities over the country getting various pieces of equipment and support for her projected round-the-world flight. Her last official visit to the university as a coed counselor was in November 1936.

The story of her flight and the tragic end of her career has been told many times. The most notable of these are Putnam’s book, Soaring Wings; Muriel Earhart Morrissey’s Courage Is The Price; Paul L. Briand’s Daughter of the Sky; and Fred Goerner’s
The Search for Amelia Earhart. It was later pointed out that the day that the last radio contact was made with her, July 2, 1937, was the day she was to have appeared at Purdue University to speak on “What Next In The Air.” On the 16th of July, 1937, when apparently all hope had gone, Elliott wired her husband saying, “George, she would not want us to grieve or weep; she would have been a heroine in any age.”

Putnam was undeniably impressed with Elliott even though their association was an occasional one, extending over only a few years. He loved to mingle with celebrities (and near-celebrities) and was especially delighted with opportunities for stimulating conversation. Elliott, of course, was always happy when engaged in good conversation and privately deplored those dinner guests who “only opened their mouths to put food in.” Several years after his visits to Purdue Putnam wrote:

Each year we see lists of the ten best-dressed women, the best-dressed men, the best books, the best plays. Any literate child with a respectable I. Q. knows the standing of Mrs. Harrison Williams and Lucius Beebe. But something ought to be done about those who carry the torch of conversation. My own nominations would include such gracious performers as Leopold Stokowski, Frank Crowninshield, Clare Boothe, Clifton Fadiman, Missy Meloney, President Elliott of Purdue, Helen Reid, Hendrik Willem Van Loon, Gilbert Adrian, and, of course, Royal Cortissoz.

In the spring of 1939, Putnam presented a full-length portrait of Amelia Earhart to Purdue University; Elliott accepted the oil painting for the university to hang in the residence hall where Miss Earhart stayed during her visits to the campus.

Whether her use of the “Flying Laboratory” provided for any significant research in aviation education and/or technical experimentation is a matter for conjecture. There certainly are those who feel that the Purdue Research Foundation squandered literally thousands of dollars without any substantial return. From Elliott’s view, the association was a rewarding one upon which no dollar value could ever be placed. The loss of Amelia Earhart was the nation’s loss, but the legend of Amelia Earhart is a part of the history of Purdue University. While Elliott and everyone else associated with the project had hoped for more, the tragic conclusion was to Elliott another example of the fate that had brought the two together. In December 1937, Elliott went to New York City and presented the maps, log book notes, weather re-
ports, and other data gathered by Miss Earhart to the World Center of Women's Archives. Many other materials relating to Amelia Earhart are in the Purdue University library.

The appointment of Dr. Lillian M. Gilbreth was announced within a short time after Amelia Earhart had accepted her counseling position. Mrs. Gilbreth, famed industrial engineer, author, and widowed mother of twelve children (Cheaper by the Dozen), joined the staff as a professor of industrial engineering in the General Engineering Department (effective September 1935) with the understanding that she would spend four or five two-week periods on campus each year to lecture and consult with students in engineering.

Mrs. Gilbreth maintained her home in Montclair, New Jersey, and continued her consulting work across the nation, but while on campus she stayed in the Women's Residence Hall where she could readily talk with coeds. She later extended her areas of interest at Purdue to include work with students and faculty members in the Schools of Home Economics and Agriculture, studying the place of management in the home and on the farm.

Certainly as well known among engineers as Miss Earhart, Mrs. Gilbreth became a familiar and charming figure on campus, greatly admired by all who came in contact with her. Forever linked with Purdue in the minds of her students, Mrs. Gilbreth later gave to the university the Gilbreth Engineering Library of about 1500 volumes plus many original notes relating to studies in time and motion and fatigue which she and her husband, Frank Gilbreth, made during his lifetime. Named a consultant in careers for women after Miss Earhart's death, Mrs. Gilbreth's appointment was further indication of Elliott's interest in and concern for the education of women in the university; she continued her official connection with Purdue until her retirement in 1948, and has been an occasional visitor since that time.

OUT OF THE DEPRESSION

In a report published to coincide with the opening of the 1937 legislative session, Elliott reported that the appropriation for resident teaching in 1935-1936 had been $1,185,000, an increase of only 12.8 per cent over that appropriated for the 1925-1926 school year. During the same ten-year period the net annual enrollment
of students had risen nearly 45 per cent. He reported that unless more dollars were provided for instructional space, for the replacement of supplies, for the rehabilitation of obsolete equipment, for the acquisition of new machinery and equipment, and for the restoration of the salary reductions made in 1933, the chances of the university maintaining its high place among the technical institutions of the country were indeed small.

The 1937 legislature, influenced to a degree at least by Elliott's review of the situation, provided funds which permitted a general restoration of salaries to the 1932 levels and the board promptly voted to restore Elliott's salary to the $15,000 level where it was to remain until his retirement.

Of greater importance to Elliott, however, was the legislative appropriation of $50,000 for the purpose of establishing a retirement program for faculty and staff. On the recommendation of Elliott and R. B. Stewart, the board immediately voted to complete arrangements with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (an agency established by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) to provide retirement allowances for the university staff. The action was one of the major achievements of his administration and perhaps symbolized the end of the depression for the university.

The legislature also voted to reinstate the mill tax, suspended in 1932, to become effective July 1, 1937. Payments were to begin July 1, 1938. The 1939 legislature eliminated the mill tax, however, and this type of tax levy was never used again during Elliott's presidency to make dollars available for higher education.

In his review of the academic year 1936-1937, Elliott prepared a summary of federal grants and expenditures at Purdue that had been made by the federal government since 1933 in an effort to meet the national economic emergency. The Public Works Administration had expended more than $700,000 toward the construction of five new buildings: two units of the women's residence halls, the Executive Building, a field house and gymnasium for men, and an addition to the Purdue Memorial Union Building. Through the Works Progress Administration more than $413,000 had been spent for an airport hangar, an addition to the Physics Building, tennis courts, roadways, sewers, fences, and sundry campus improvements. And the National Youth Administration had paid almost $202,000 to needy students for work done in various departments of the university.
In later years, Elliott remarked that in the beginning of the National Youth Administration, he was not in favor of the plan to provide student aid. He felt that greater emphasis should have been placed upon aid to students of superior ability instead of basing that aid upon economic circumstances. After nine years of experience with that type of financial help, Elliott said, however, that the NYA had exerted a "most beneficial effect upon our youth, not merely by providing needed financial assistance, . . . but also by maintaining their morale."

During the summer of 1938 the Board of Regents of the University of the Philippines sent one of their members, Manuel A. Roxas (who later became president of the Republic), to the United States to select two leading educators to serve as educational advisors to the Committee on Educational Policy. The board was in the process of reorganizing the administration and instruction of the university.

Roxas, chairman of the committee, talked with Paul Monroe at Teachers College who had made a school study in the Philippines in 1915; with Samuel P. Capen, chancellor of the University of Buffalo; with Lotus D. Coffman, president of the University of Minnesota; and a number of others, including Elliott.

Elliott's name was undoubtedly high on the list partly because of the efforts of Paul V. McNutt, United States Commissioner to the Philippines and former governor of Indiana (1933-37), and partly because of Elliott's reputation as a member of numerous survey teams.

Elliott was reluctant to make the trip he said, until Roxas offered to pay Mrs. Elliott's expenses in order to get her to come along. With that added inducement, he discussed the matter with the board and received approval to take a leave of absence for the first semester of the 1938-39 school year. It was agreed that an administrative committee consisting of Frank C. Hockema; R. B. Stewart; Dean A. A. Potter; and H. J. Reed, acting director of the Agricultural Experiment Station; would handle the affairs of the university.

So on September 12, 1938, the president and Mrs. Elliott left Lafayette to begin their first and only long vacation trip together. Shortly after their steamship, Empress of Canada, docked in the harbor at Manila on October 9, they joined Paul C. Packer, dean of the College of Education at the University of Iowa, who had been selected by Roxas as the second advisor.
During their stay in the Philippines, Packer and Elliott visited every college, school, and unit of the University, interviewing deans and other administrative officials, faculty members, and student leaders. The advisors were pressed for time in which to prepare a series of twenty-seven memoranda and discuss each of these with the committee. A final meeting was held on December 20, 1938, at which time Elliott made an oral summary of the advisors' findings before the board of regents and the President of the Philippines, Manuel L. Quezon. Five days later on Christmas Day, the Elliotts left Manila to return to the United States.

The trip home was a delightful vacation for the Elliotts. They went from Manila to Naples, visited the Riviera and Paris, traveled to England where he visited Ramsgate for the third time, then sailed for home on the maiden westward voyage of the Queen Mary. Arriving in New York on February 10, 1939, Elliott addressed the Purdue Alumni Club of New York City that night. They returned to Lafayette on Sunday, February 12, and were guests at a dinner party given by the Purdue Women's Club the next evening. The events immediately following his return to New York made it abundantly clear that he was back as president of Purdue.

Many "welcome home" dinners were given, but the largest was sponsored by the University Club, when on February 20, 1939, about 600 persons attended a dinner-dance in the Purdue Memorial Union Ballroom. In attendance were eight Indiana college presidents; Herman B Wells of Indiana University, the Reverend John F. O'Hara of Notre Dame, and L. B. Hopkins of Wabash College, among others, were called on to welcome the Elliotts back to Lafayette.

Purdue's greatest period of building during Elliott's presidency began in 1929 and lasted through the depression to 1940. A total of twelve major buildings were constructed plus extensive additions to a number of other buildings. In his report for 1938-1939, Elliott included a table presenting an analysis of the increase in the physical facilities of the university during the decade 1929-1939. "The records show," he wrote, "that the value of the building assets in 1929 was somewhat less than $4 1/2 million. During the decade . . . these assets have been tripled in value."

His review of the next year was devoted to a discussion of "needs yet to be met" on the Purdue campus. Elliott wrote that fifteen years ago he had stated that not less than $10,000,000 was required for the improvement and extension of the physical plant. During the intervening years more than $10,000,000 had been spent
for the construction and equipment of buildings on the campus, but even this amount had not matched the needs of the institution.

He concluded that not less than $5,000,000 was yet needed to provide facilities for the work of the university. He went ahead to itemize the needs carefully under twenty headings. At the end of the next year he was able to announce that contracts had been let for the construction of the final unit of the Electrical Engineering Building and the Duncan High Tension Laboratory, the Physics Building, and a transmitting station for radio station WBAA. Virtually all major construction stopped after these buildings were completed, however, because of the national defense effort.

Reviewing more than the building program at Purdue during Elliott’s term, T. R. Johnston and Helen Hand wrote in *The Archives of Purdue* in 1940:

> Under his dynamic leadership, Purdue has made its greatest progress, far surpassing the development during all of the other regimes. Under his leadership the value of the physical plant has more than quadrupled, . . . many buildings have gone up not only for classroom work but also for living quarters for students and for athletic and other recreational activities. . . . Enrollment has gone from 3,110 to 7,121. . . . The number of people coming . . . for short courses and conferences has risen from three or four thousand a year to well above 40,000. The research program has been expanded greatly. . . . The relationship with the public has been greatly strengthened. . . .

At 65 years of age, Elliott was still vigorously espousing the work of Purdue University and higher education generally. “During the year (1940),” he noted in the annual report, “I find that I attended and spoke at seventy dinners—fifty of these on campus and twenty in other parts of the state and country; I also spoke at fifty other meetings.” Even though he had made what he called an “earnest effort” to cut down on the number of speaking engagements, it still seemed necessary for him to continue strengthening the “relationship with the public” by making personal appearances.

Elliott was a well-known and popular figure in Indiana in 1940 and many people were not particularly surprised when early that year an Associated Press story announced that Frank M. McHale, Democratic party national committeeman and director of Paul V. McNutt’s campaign for the presidential nomination, was spear-
heading a movement to get Elliott to become a candidate for the Democratic Party nomination for governor of Indiana.

The preceding June (1939), McNutt had returned from his post as United States Commissioner to the Philippines and Elliott had been chosen to make the major address at the homecoming celebration in Indianapolis. After he had been named as the official “welcomer,” some people wondered if he were being groomed as a gubernatorial candidate.

Within a few days after the story was released, however, Elliott issued a statement to the local newspaper which said in part, “I have never been and am not now a candidate for any political office whatever.” Alluding to other items concerning his possible candidacy that had appeared in the newspapers following the AP release Elliott wrote, “I hope that there will be no further effort to divert me from the educational things I know how to do, to the political things for which I am not adapted.”

Evidently he also contacted McHale and others in the party for there were no other overt attempts to get Elliott into the political arena until several years later.

Almost a year after his retirement, however, when Elliott was seventy-one years old, several newspapers in the state reported that a number of “leading Democrats in the state” had asked him to become a candidate for the Democratic Party nomination to the United States Senate. Again Elliott declined to enter the race saying, “It is my conclusion that I do not possess the personal or political qualifications for seeking or serving in the office, therefore, I ask that my name not be used.”

Although there may have been some individuals who felt that Elliott would have liked to hold a political office, there is no evidence that he was even willing to consider for more than a moment the possibility of a political career.

Virtually every citizen of the state felt it was appropriate when Indiana University, celebrating the 120th anniversary of its founding, awarded Elliott his sixth honorary degree on May 2, 1940. He had received degrees from Oregon Agricultural College in 1930 and from the University of Nebraska in 1936 in addition to those previously mentioned; and in later years he was similarly honored by Hahneman Medical College and Hospital (1941), University of Pittsburgh (1943), Illinois Institute of Technology (1944), Purdue University (1946), and Temple University (1949). Although he said that there were “too many synthetic doctors pluming themselves in the academic world,” he was, nevertheless, highly pleased when
he was selected to receive an honorary degree. Especially gratifying were those from Columbia, Nebraska, Indiana, and Purdue.

Two days after the ceremonial at Indiana University, Elliott presided at another celebration, the opening of Purdue's new Hall of Music, billed as the largest theatre in the world at that time. It was a grand occasion, a climax to the building program, and Elliott was delighted to add this dedication ceremony "to the many hours of triumph already possessed by Purdue." As R. B. Stewart later recounted, Elliott had "almost single-handedly obtained the federal aid, asked and received a state appropriation, and planned the bond issue to assure construction costs," and he was justifiably proud of the result.

Without knowing that the great auditorium would be called the Edward C. Elliott Hall of Music by future generations, he said, "This Hall of Music, by whatever name it may later be known, is not (solely) a means for diversion. . . ." Speaking at the Gala Week ceremony he said, "Here through the years, unnumbered men, women, and children will come to see, to listen, to think, and thus be made over and higher, little by little, through their seeing and hearing and thinking."

Always interested in student life and student activities, Elliott had been a great fan and an ardent booster of Purdue athletics. During the late twenties and early thirties he had followed Purdue's championship teams in both football and basketball, particularly pleased when their youngest son, Ed, played on three championship basketball teams from 1933-34 through 1935-36 under Coach Ward "Piggy" Lambert. And in 1935 he had established an annual award, "The Elliott Plaque," which was to go to the student residing in Cary Hall who had been most outstanding in intercollegiate athletics. A medal has been presented to each winner and his name has been attached to the plaque which today hangs in Cary Hall.

But in 1940 he involved himself more deeply in athletic affairs than he had ever envisioned possible. Athletic director and head football coach Noble E. Kizer died in June of that year and Elliott was forced to take over as athletic director for several months, naming Allen "Mal" Elward as head football coach and assistant athletic director. Ed felt that his dad enjoyed that particular assignment more than he had expected. He visited regularly with the coaches and football players, stopping by the field almost every evening on his way home. He ate at the training table on a num-
ber of occasions and seemed to develop a special bond with the athletes and members of the athletic staff during that period.

When questioned by a reporter regarding the news that the University of Chicago had dropped out of Big Ten football, Elliott remarked that the action was "courageous and significant" and told the sports writer that it was "within the range of possibilities that the University of Chicago will demonstrate the possibility of conducting a university without football." In the same interview he said, "There have been times that I have wished that we might have colleges and universities without football. This perhaps is a bit too Utopian. Perhaps Chicago will prove that Utopia is possible. But Purdue is not Utopia and intends to continue to play football—and, we hope, good football."

In January 1941 he gave up the post, naming Elward athletic director; the athletic department promptly awarded him a "P" sweater with a star (normally given to the captain of the team) which he accepted and treasured as the years went by.

At the close of the year 1940-1941, it was clear, however, that Elliott and the university were to become more and more concerned with the effect of the National Defense Program on the university. During that year, 33 staff members had withdrawn from the university in order to participate in the National Defense Program, and leaves of absence had been granted to those staff members called to military duty. By the end of the following year, of course, the university had changed from "a defense footing to a war footing." The "second stage" of his Purdue years was over.

THE WAR YEARS

The attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, had its immediate effect on Purdue University and similar institutions all over the nation. One of the first acts of the president of the university was to call a special student convocation for December 15, 1941, in the new Hall of Music. The day was set aside as "Bill of Rights Day," and Elliott talked to the student body regarding the individual's part in the war effort. Intimating that the student's place was in the classroom as he had indicated twenty-five years earlier in Montana during World War I, he presented a list of duties which he called a "Bill of Responsibilities" for Purdue students. "You have the responsibility," he said, "for reducing social activities, for rigid economy in your personal affairs, and for
maintaining your health and physical fitness.” He predicted that the university would make a rapid change to a war-time basis.

Within three weeks after the declaration of war the executive committee of the faculty determined that for the duration of the war, the university would operate on an accelerated teaching schedule of three sixteen-week terms a year, eliminating final exams and vacation periods. When Elliott reported later on the activities of the year 1941-1942, he noted briefly that the university had begun to secure the maximum utilization of all its resources for war purposes. These were times that demanded an organized concentration of effort. By the end of the year he could only write that any report of progress would be sketchy and incomplete.

In January 1942, it was announced that Elliott had been named to serve on a Committee on War-Time Requirements for Specialized Personnel, a subcommittee of the National Resources Planning Board. Six months earlier he had turned down a request from Edward Stettinius to serve as a consultant to the office of production management.

At a second special student convocation in February 1942, he suggested that students remember that while they were not all in uniform or in a training camp in reality, they were at the “Purdue training center” where “the primary business is to prepare you for some meaningful job of the war.” Elliott had firm convictions as to how the college student fitted into the war effort.

He believed in the fundamental principle of selective service, the assignment of every man and woman “according to ability to every job according to its need.” To him this meant that practically all able-bodied and able-minded male students should be directed to the armed forces but that those who were not physically fit for combat should be trained “for scarcity fields of need.” “This is total war,” he wrote, “requiring all of our power of material and men.”

Then, early in 1942, newly appointed War Manpower Commissioner, Paul V. McNutt, asked Elliott to become Chief of the Division of Professional and Technical Employment and Training within the War Manpower Commission. Elliott was eager to accept the assignment. After considerable discussion the board approved his request for a leave of absence and Elliott left for Washington on June 22, 1942, to take over his new job about July 1, 1942.

It was not known at that time how long he would be on leave, but the operation of the university was once again turned over to a committee of Hockema, Stewart, Potter, and Reed (who had
replaced Dean of Agriculture J. H. Skinner after his retirement in June 1939). It was the same group that had served in 1938 when Elliott was in the Philippines.

Unfortunately, only a few weeks after Elliott’s departure, David Ross suffered a massive stroke and was immediately placed in a local hospital, completely incapable of carrying on any of his activities as president of the board. The administrative committee, severely handicapped by this unexpected circumstance, was forced to accept additional responsibilities and Elliott found that he could not divorce himself from the affairs of the university as completely as he had expected. Nevertheless, a commitment had been made, and all the individuals involved were pledged to a total war effort—Elliott’s commitment, however, was to the War Manpower Commission.

Within the division which Elliott directed were four sections: The National Roster, which maintained a classified record of the nation’s scientific and specialized manpower; the Procurement and Assignment Service, which was charged with the allocation of the physicians, surgeons, dentists, and veterinarians for both civilian and armed forces needs; the Engineering Science and Management War Training, a program carried on by more than 200 higher schools; and the section on the Utilization of Colleges and Universities. His primary task was to define ways in which colleges and universities could assist in the war effort.

After having spent a little more than two months with the War Manpower Commission, Elliott suggested that there were at least four ways for colleges, universities, and professional and technical schools to assist the Army, Navy, and the commission in their training programs. He advocated using every available means for promoting the physical fitness of students; taking every effort to make each student feel that he was an active participant in the war effort, recognizing that each student had been detailed to an institution for some form of training required by either the Armed Forces, the war production industries, or some necessary public service; advising and encouraging all students sufficiently able-bodied to enlist; and by developing courses which would make every student “keenly conscious of the nature of the cause that the nation has been called to defend.”

While testifying before the House of Representatives Committee on Military Affairs, Elliott spoke of a number of more specific ideas which he thought would further develop the nation's plan for providing professionally trained men for the armed forces.
The hearing was primarily concerned with the topic “lowering the draft age to eighteen years,” but a number of general questions were asked and Elliott was led into other considerations. He observed that, “this is, above all, first a war of science and that nation that has the scientists with the ability to apply that science to the destructive arts of war and to self-protection is the nation that is best armed.” He thought that the selection of those who were to be educated in the universities might well be left to the local draft boards, but that the advanced training in technical subjects should be done only in the institutions already staffed and equipped to do that work.

Elliott advocated a plan whereby all young men would be inducted to the service according to the Selective Service System, some detailed back to colleges and universities for training, and then some of those trained men could be returned to work in industry or civilian life. Elliott worked closely, of course, with Major General Lewis B. Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, and they served together on many committees.

Elliott’s testimony indicated that he regarded military training as one of the essential parts of higher education in America. When pressed further, Elliott said that he had a “very pronounced prejudice in favor of military training” even for boys under age eighteen who were enrolled in secondary schools. During the next few years, he strongly urged that military training be included in the educational program, even to the extent of having universal military training.

In March 1943, he stated his belief firmly and succinctly, “If the nation is sensible in its foresight, adequate provision will be made for what has come to be called Universal Military Training of our youth.” Still later (1945) he published an article in the American Legion Magazine that was largely devoted to a plea for universal military training. “More than fifty years ago I came under a system of compulsory military training,” he recalled, “and since that long ago Autumn day when I served as a more or less unwilling member of the Cadet Battalion at the University of Nebraska, then under the command of Lt. John J. Pershing of the Tenth United States Cavalry, I have been a supporter of military training as an essential part of American civic education.” On at least three other occasions following the war, Elliott strongly supported universal military training. It appears that his work with the War Manpower Commission merely strengthened
a feeling which had been developing since his student days at the University of Nebraska.

A small group of students at Purdue had found out how he felt three years earlier when a peace organization requested permission to carry out a non-violent demonstration against the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940. They wanted to declare Wednesday, October 16, 1940, (Conscription Registration Day) a day of mourning and planned to wear black arm bands for the occasion. Elliott emphatically denied the organization "the privilege of carrying out this plan," and when the peace group attempted to schedule a public meeting that evening on campus, Elliott saw to it that that event was also cancelled. The board went on record as supporting his decisive stand.

After only four months in Washington, Elliott was impressed with the tremendously difficult task which confronted the nation's schools; the liberal arts colleges, for example, posed an intricate problem.

As Elliott pointed out in later years, "a definite place was easily found in the war training program for all professional schools, such as medicine, dentistry, engineering, etc., and also for various types of vocational schools on the secondary level." But, he continued, this was not so in the case of the liberal arts college. Although the leaders of the liberal arts colleges were eager to do their part in the war effort and be assigned a place in the war training program, not many were added to the program. Elliott had hoped, of course, that plans could be devised which would provide for the most effective utilization of all colleges and universities in the war effort.

The plans that he considered most effective were generally based on the Selective Service scheme, which was designed to pick specific people to work on specific jobs. At a second congressional committee hearing in February 1943, Representative John J. Sparkman pointed out that a great many people were afraid of such a program and referred to it as regimentation. Elliott agreed that such plans were likely to arouse opposition, but he felt that the national emergency demanded immediate action. "We have got to be prepared to give up a large amount of our individual liberty," he said, "in order that we may have some national liberty left after the job is done."

In the spring of 1943, the organization which he directed was operating the entire program involving the training of service
men in higher institutions. The complete story of the effectiveness of the division is not available for study. But clearly there were many problems which had not been solved and some which would never be solved. After nearly a year with the War Manpower Commission, however, Elliott apparently became convinced that he could not continue in that capacity and still carry on his work as president of Purdue University.

On the Purdue campus, even though Elliott had made numerous trips between Washington and Lafayette and had never missed a board meeting, many members of the faculty (and some board members) as well as some of the students felt that Elliott was sorely needed in Lafayette. So in April 1943, he resigned from the commission and returned to full-time duties in the Executive Building.

While Elliott was still readjusting to a university that was quite different from the institution that he had known so well ten months earlier, Purdue lost one of its greatest leaders, David Ross. Without question the death of Ross (on June 28, 1943), was a tremendous shock to Elliott and to the entire university community. He had been elected to the board of trustees the year before Elliott had come to Purdue and had been president of the board since 1927. He was certainly Elliott's closest friend at Purdue and probably his greatest supporter. George Ade referred to the two-man team as Damon and Pythias; and another staff member who had many opportunities to see them work together called Ross "both an apt student and a strong ally" of Elliott.

Ross, like Elliott, has been the subject of hundreds of Purdue-related stories, but his biographer, Fred C. Kelly, has written the only comprehensive life story. Unfortunately, Kelly did not acknowledge that Elliott exerted any considerable influence on Ross and from time to time implies that Elliott was valuable chiefly as an administrative advisor to Ross. It has appeared to most observers, however, that the Elliott-Ross team was just that—a most fortunate combination of talented individuals whose goals for Purdue were nearly identical, whose abilities were commensurate, and whose personalities were almost completely compatible.

For 15 years they had met together with regularity. When both Elliott and Ross were in town they met almost daily, frequently at Ross's office where Elliott stopped on his way to the university, or at Elliott's home in the evening. Even though Ross had been lost as an effective board member for nearly a year, it was not
until his death that Elliott received the full impact of the loss. "This is a sorrowful day for Purdue University," he mourned.

The shock to the university was intensified as a result of two other deaths, Dean Emeritus Stanley Coulter and Professor G. A. Young; all three men were Purdue legends—all died within a three-day period.

Almost immediately, the trustees selected long-time board member James W. Noel to replace Ross as president of the board, and at the request of Elliott, they named Hockema to a new post of executive dean where he quickly assumed additional responsibilities in the President's Office. Noel, however, was destined to serve in that capacity for less than a year; he died in April 1944, and John A. Hillenbrand was elected board president.

Within a few weeks Purdue lost still another strong booster with the passing of George Ade on May 16, 1944. Because he had been so attached to Purdue and to Elliott, members of the family asked Elliott to join two other of Ade's good friends, John T. McCutcheon and Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis, at the funeral where the three men talked informally about Ade as a part of the service. Death was making substantial inroads in the Purdue family.

On the Purdue campus enrollment had reached a peak of 9,002 resident students; thousands were enrolled in the Army Specialized Training Program, the Navy V-12 and V-5 programs, as well as in the Women's Army Corps Officers Training Program, the School For Apprentice Electricians Mates, and others. Professor H. B. Knoll's account of Purdue's contributions to the war effort presents the record of the university's response to the tremendous demands of the war years. The university was geared to the rapid pace of the war-time situation, and the president's responsibilities had increased accordingly.

Elliott found little time to make either written or oral reports to the alumni, to the students, or to the citizens of the state. Restrictions on travel kept him from meeting with various groups over the state as had been his practice and students who were generally assigned to the Purdue campus for only short time periods were not easy for Elliott to reach in the same way that he had worked with pre-war student groups.

Recognizing that the university had undergone a series of traumatic changes, largely as a result of deaths and the war, Elliott made every effort to bring about a renewed unity of purpose among staff and students alike. But it was virtually an impossible
task for many reasons, of course, to restore the old "Spirit of Purdue." There was the rapid turnover in both students and staff, many remaining on campus for no more than a semester; of those who were in classes, many had simply been assigned to Purdue and felt none of the loyalties that were developed in the pre-war groups; and the day by day uncertainties of war provided no stability, no strong sense of purpose for either group.

Administrative changes occurred at an unprecedented rate. Dean Jordan had died in April 1941, and had been replaced by a new dean of the School of Pharmacy, Glenn L. Jenkins, in September of that year. Both Dean Dukes of the Graduate School and Dean of Men M. L. Fisher had retired in June 1942, and had been succeeded by Deans E. C. Young and F. I. Goldsmith.

The situation called for strong, vigorous leadership, yet Purdue had been under the guidance of an administrative committee; perhaps any one person from the administrative group could have performed the role; but the committee and even the board, acting under the temporary leadership of vice-president Noel, were caught in a chain of circumstances.

When the fall term opened in 1943 a student-faculty convocation was called by Elliott which was publicized as a "gripe session." The president minced no words as he told the group that he had been delegated authority by the board (on June 8, 1940) to take all steps to see that the university did its utmost to contribute to the war effort. He said bluntly, "The University as a national institution is committed to omit no effort which would contribute to the furthering of our country’s goal, which is victory. . . . I challenge you to take it.

With his firm, no-nonsense approach to matters, it seemed that the university community was perhaps more willing to accept the unsettled, even hectic, way of life and continue to do what had to be done with a greater degree of acceptance, even though there was never a return during Elliott’s years to the “old Purdue” that he had led so effectively.

As he sought to recapture some of the enthusiasm for the institution that had been so evident among the Purdue grads, Elliott asked the Alumni Association to cooperate with his office in a major effort to reach the alums. A letter of Christmas greetings was sent to graduates who were located in all parts of the world in 1943. The greeting was tremendously well received by most former students and letters of acknowledgment poured in to the Alumni Office. Elliott had touched a responsive chord and
succeeded in stirring up memories of Purdue that had been dormant during the long war years.

Partly as a result of this unexpected and warm response, the Purdue Alumni Scholarship Foundation was established September 1, 1944. Although he had not looked with enthusiasm on the proposal when it was first presented by Corydon H. Hall, an active Purdue alumnus residing in Chicago, it finally seemed that the establishment of the fund was an effective way to channel alumni support to provide assistance to athletes and superior students, and Hall was given the job of developing still another allied corporation.

His personal desire to provide financial aid for students had been documented many times; and there had been an Elliott-established student loan fund, called "The President's Fund," at Purdue since November 1923. At the present time it contains slightly more than $1,000 and is only one of many similar funds; but in 1923, when Elliott established the account with an initial gift of $100, it was one of only a few such funds.

The war years almost completely disrupted Elliott's pattern of communicating with students, staff, and others interested in the university. Even the annual reports, which had carried Elliott's meticulous account of the year's activities, beginning with the year 1942-1943 no longer carried the accustomed "President's Review of the Year." Instead, a new publication was adopted which was more colorful, and was designed to attract a larger group of readers. Elliott contributed an essay on the allied corporations and a brief history of the university to the 1942-1943 report. The following year the annual report carried only his brief statement on enrollment figures, the war toll, and a sketchy outline of plans for the future development of the university.

**RETIREMENT FROM PURDUE**

At a regularly scheduled board meeting on April 20, 1944, Elliott was advised that he should plan to terminate his presidency on June 30, 1945, for in December 1944 he would reach the age of seventy, which was the mandatory retirement age. A two-man committee of the board had been named earlier to begin the search for the seventh president. Although Elliott would probably have been willing to stay on as president until his successor could be found, the final decision was made clear when Hillenbrand announced the date of Elliott's retirement at a special faculty meeting held on December 29, 1944.
During the next six months, many special events were scheduled to honor the retiring president and the newspapers of the state carried articles which praised him highly and recognized the tremendous development of Purdue under his leadership.

The largest single event was a Chamber of Commerce banquet held in the Purdue Memorial Union Building on March 14, 1945. More than 800 guests from all over the nation were assembled to pay tribute to Elliott and Mrs. Elliott, who were accompanied at the banquet by Mrs. Nowland, Mrs. Elliott's 93 year old mother. The speakers included board member William A. Hanley; Chamber of Commerce representative Harry Schultz; student representative Richard Blackhall; alumni representative Burr S. Swezey; and Professor Louis M. Sears, representing the faculty. Preston Calvert and E. B. "Eth" Baugh, executive secretary of the Alumni Association, presided at the gala affair. Many references were made, of course, to Elliott's "dynamic, driving power," and his quick wit.

To many who attended the banquet, the highlight occurred when Professor Sears was finally called on to speak for the faculty. Sears noted that the earlier tributes, "lavish" though they had been, were nonetheless inadequate; but he reminded Elliott, comparing him with Columbus, that "there must have been some sailors on that ship." There was much laughter from the audience but when Elliott's turn came, he pointed out that as "on the voyages of Columbus, his crewmen sometimes mutined, and had been put in irons." While the crowd burst into laughter and applause, Sears slowly shook his head from side to side with a wry smile on his face. It was typical of Elliott to have the last word.

The university had grown in every respect during the twenty-three year period of Elliott's presidency. It is obvious, of course, that it would be impossible to determine how much of the change, if any, could be attributed solely and exclusively to Elliott's leadership. There is considerable evidence that many of the developments were related directly and specifically to the president, while other changes came as a result of actions of students, faculty, the board of trustees, and the legislature working in cooperation with the president; and certainly there were those changes that occurred in spite of the president's actions. Nevertheless, the facts are impressive and those who talked and wrote about Purdue found the occasion of Elliott's retirement a time for comparison.

None of the comparisons that have appeared claim to be completely accurate but, generally speaking, during Elliott's term of office the student enrollment increased from approximately 3,200
to 8,600 students and 20,538 undergraduate and 2,254 advanced degrees were awarded; the number of people employed on the administrative, instructional, and research staffs increased from 456 to 1,247; the number of courses available to students went from 595 to 1,217; the number of major buildings increased from 31 to 59 in 1945; the land acreage available to Purdue increased from 2,784 acres in 1922 to 6,472 acres; and finally, the figure most often quoted, the physical plant value rose from $3,700,000 to $18,700,000 at the time of Elliott's retirement. Without question, in 1945, under Elliott's leadership, Purdue had been through its greatest period of growth in size, in prestige, and in service.

During his presidency the first comptroller had been employed, a new accounting system had been established, a continuing inventory of university property had been started, and the institution had, for the first time, begun to operate on a strict budget basis. During his early years at Purdue a campus plan had been developed; and all of the existing rules and regulations regarding the internal administration of the university had been codified with the publishing of a university code.

The founding of the allied corporations at Purdue was, without question, one of Elliott's major contributions to higher education in America. The pattern for these corporations, which are legal agencies providing financial support to the university, was first established at Purdue and has been widely imitated in higher educational institutions over the country. The Purdue Research Foundation has become the most productive and the most widely known and can be considered "the prototype for the 30 or 40 which exist today." The significance of these foundations is becoming increasingly apparent to those who follow the affairs of colleges and universities.

The present system of residence halls owned and operated by the university had received its major impetus in 1927 when the legislature authorized the board of trustees to issue bonds for the purpose of erecting income producing properties in the form of student dormitories and residence halls. Equally as important was the long, but eventually successful, court battle between the university and local land-owner Phillip A. (Dick) Russell. The test case had begun in 1926 when condemnation proceedings were initiated to determine whether or not the university had the power of eminent domain. Court rulings were appealed and affirmed, injunctions were filed, appraisals were made and appealed, a change of venue was granted, and the second and third condemnation
suits were instituted. Legal proceedings were continued for more than ten years before the Purdue Research Foundation finally was able to contract for the purchase of the land in question. It was not until 1940 that the title was transferred to the university, but the legal questions had been settled, once and for all.

During the twenty-three year period of Elliott's term, many new units had been established to carry on the work of the university: the School of Pharmacy in 1924, the Division of Educational Reference in 1925, the School of Home Economics in 1926, the office of the University Editor in 1927, the Graduate School in 1929, the nation's first university-owned and operated airport in 1930, the Public Safety Institute in 1936, the Joint Highway Research Project in 1937, and the Division of Technical Extension in 1942.

During his administration a retirement plan for faculty members had been established, a plan for sabbatical leaves developed, together with the beginnings of a number of fringe benefits for staff members which included group life insurance, hospitalization insurance, and fee reductions for dependent children.

He had become the great and shining symbol of Purdue to thousands of students and alums who will always have warm and pleasant memories of the university when Elliott was on the scene. "How anyone could have done more than Elliott did to keep Purdue abreast of the times would be difficult to imagine," wrote Knoll in his notable account of the growth of engineering at Purdue, *The Story of Purdue Engineering*, published nearly 20 years after Elliott's retirement.13

Under Elliott old Purdue became a new Purdue, larger, stronger, and more diverse. In spirit it became restless and dynamic, never quite satisfied with the progress it had made. Elliott drove it onward, dominating the scene and always trying to fulfill the ambitious terms of his personal charter for education. Given what he started with and the opportunities he found, the conclusion is inevitable that he compiled a record of extraordinary achievement. Much of what Purdue became owed its existence to his free, adventurous, and unquenchable spirit.

Final action relative to Elliott's retirement from Purdue came on May 10, 1945, when the board took unprecedented action by creating the office of "President Emeritus of Purdue University" then naming Elliott as president emeritus "for and during his natural life." He was provided with an office in the Executive Build-
ing, with secretarial help, and board president John A. Hillenbrand advised Elliott that the Purdue Research Foundation would provide an allowance of $7500 per year (one-half of his annual salary) to be continued during his lifetime without regard for any other retirement income which he might receive.

The matter of selecting a new president was as yet undecided (although they had a promising candidate in mind) and there were at least three persons on the Purdue campus who were eligible for consideration. It was the decision of the board to suspend the rules and create two more new positions, and having done that, they promoted Frank Hockema to vice president and executive dean and R. B. Stewart to vice president and comptroller. Then, by naming Dean Potter acting president, the board made it clear that they were going to bring in as the next president of Purdue a man who had not previously been connected with the university in any way. Elliott was in complete agreement with these actions and was of considerable assistance to the board as they closed out their search for his successor. In August 1945 it was announced that Frederick Lawson Hovde, gifted young scientist-engineer-administrator, had been named as the seventh president of Purdue. He was to assume the office early in January 1946.

The Elliotts, who had been invited to stay in the President's home until it was needed, were asked to surrender the house by November 1, 1946, if possible, in order that it could be renovated before the arrival of the new president. Because Elliott had accepted an assignment to direct a national survey of the pharmacy profession, they decided to move directly to Washington, D.C. from the president's home. They had reached an understanding, however, that when retirement finally came, they would return to Indiana—Lafayette was home. They carefully supervised the inventory of university-owned items in the president's home, and selected and stored virtually all furnishings and personal items and effects before Elliott personally turned over the keys to the university. But even before they were settled in their new apartment at 4701 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., fire swept the warehouse, destroying most of the stored items.

Elliott appeared to accept all of this philosophically, however; it was merely another example of the fate that governed the affairs of men. His retirement, "a passport to oblivion," was merely "the application of the University rule," and the fire "saved somebody a lot of troublesome sorting of the accumulation of the years." He had a new assignment, which is outlined in
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a later chapter, and with characteristic energy he welcomed the new opportunity for work.

During the next ten years as president emeritus, Elliott was active as a speaker, survey leader, author, and educational consultant; but before any attempt is made to review briefly the activities of his retirement years, consideration must be given to several other areas which held Elliott's interest during his years as president of Purdue University. Though not directly connected with his work at the university, these activities focused attention on Elliott as one of the nation's leaders in higher education.

**OTHER INTERESTS**

From almost the very beginning of his career in education, Elliott had been intensely interested in boards of control. At Wisconsin, he had worked with local school boards, suggesting ways of improving these agencies and attempting to point out responsibilities of board members. In later years, it was logical that he become concerned with boards of control in higher institutions. His work in this area represents a major attempt to investigate the work of those who govern the higher educational institutions in America. His publications, which are described in the following pages, have become standard references in the field of higher education.

When he went to Montana, Elliott developed a keen interest in the "principal legal agency" created for the purpose of controlling higher schools. Then in 1927 he was asked by R. A. Kent to prepare a chapter on boards of control for a proposed book to be entitled *Higher Education in America*. With Kent as editor, the book was published in 1930. Twenty-two topics were presented by various authors in an attempt to deal with the objective features of curricula and organization and administration of higher education.

The first section of Elliott's chapter was devoted to a thorough review of the historical development of boards of control in America. After describing the governmental device as it existed generally, he then analyzed and listed the various types of boards and their duties, and proceeded to outline certain standards regarding size of the board, constituency, terms of service, organization, and responsibilities. Elliott thought that a board having from seven to fifteen members, serving relatively long terms (10 years), and subject to gradual replacement had the best chance of becoming an effective organization.
Concerning the membership, he noted that only forceful and forward-looking persons who had been successful in their own fields should become members of the board. And in addition, these persons should have the time to enable them to study and understand the activities and aspirations of the institution which they were to serve.

Although it was the general practice for boards to carry on their work through standing committees, Elliott was not in full agreement with the commonly-established policy. When the work of the board was divided and assigned to special committees, he wrote, the board ceased to function as a whole and only a small section of the membership was involved in certain problems. Some ten years later after working at Purdue with a board which had only one committee, a finance and executive committee, he was of the opinion that the board should sit as a committee of the whole upon all matters. A second weakness of the committee system was that industrious and ambitious committees often failed to observe the “all-important difference between those things which belonged to government and those which fall in the province of administration.”

Elliott observed that boards met too infrequently, generally speaking, so that too large a proportion of their time and energy was given to routine matters, and too little time was given to considering the results of the work of the institution. He concluded his general comments with a list of “inescapable obligations” of a competent board of control and thus formulated for himself, as well as others, what he felt to be the proper relationship among boards of control, principal executive officers of the institution, and faculties and students.

A number of writers had been critical during the previous decade of the make-up of boards of control. Scott Nearing in 1917 had charged that “college and university boards are almost completely dominated by merchants, manufacturers, capitalists, corporation officials, bankers, doctors, lawyers, educators, and ministers.” The following year Veblen’s *The Higher Learning in America* cited examples of businessman supremacy on boards; and in 1923 Upton Sinclair’s *The Goose Step* compared lists of directors of large corporations with lists of college and university trustees. In 1927, the same year that Elliott wrote his essay for Kent, Earl J. McGrath’s study led him to conclude that “the control of higher education in America, both public and private, has been placed
in the hands of a small group of the population, namely financiers and business men.”

In the face of these kinds of charges Elliott suggested to the Carnegie Foundation, also in 1927, that still another study should be made of boards of control which might blunt the attacks to a degree. While the suggestion was generally approved at that time, the plan was not carried out for several years.

Meanwhile, Henry Suzzalo became president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1930, and he and Elliott developed a plan for publishing a work on the legal grounding of higher education, an undertaking indirectly related to boards of control. M. M. Chambers, then a fellow at Ohio State University, was selected to work with Elliott on the project which was not unlike the work Elliott had done in 1906 relating to public school laws. Funds were provided under a series of Carnegie Foundation grants to Purdue University. The product of this initial work for the foundation was *Charters and Basic Laws of Selected American Universities and Colleges*, published in 1934.

The volume contained a collection of charters and certain basic laws of 51 representative American universities, colleges, and technical schools. In addition to constitutional provisions and laws, brief annotations were made of certain significant court decisions. One reviewer wrote that the work served to give the careful reader a comprehensive understanding of the legal basis of higher education in this country—an understanding much needed, it was felt, by the practical administrator as well as the student of the theory of higher education.

The following year (1935) *The Government of Higher Education* by Elliott, Chambers, and W. A. Ashbrook, was published. While this volume was published commercially, Elliott acknowledged the part played by the Carnegie Foundation in financing the original study and credited Suzzalo, Walter Jessup, and Howard J. Savage (all of the Carnegie Foundation) for much assistance. The book was designed by the authors for the special use of trustees in American universities and colleges.

In his preface Elliott wrote that the book was “the outcome of personal convictions developed through a number of years of varied experience, in different parts of the country, with the membership and activities of governing boards of American institutions of higher education.” In his opinion the professional educators had given far too little attention to this matter of control of higher education as it is exercised by lay boards of control.
Recognizing that the AAUP and various individuals at that time were contending that lay boards and trustees should delegate much of their authority to faculty members, Elliott concluded that lay boards were going to continue to exercise control, and therefore, those involved in higher education must learn to live and work with the legally constituted groups of laymen.

*The Government of Higher Education* was prepared as a handbook to be used primarily by board members and was dedicated by Elliott to "the members of the governing boards of American colleges and universities who unselfishly serve as THE SENTINELS OF COMMON SENSE TO GUARD THE GATES OF THE PLACES OF UNCOMMON SENSE." It consisted of 554 questions and answers arranged in twenty-three chapters, almost all of which were concerned with the composition, organization, and functioning of such boards.

The reviews were generally quite favorable. David Spence Hill wrote that the handbook would likely remain the standard manual of reference and guide to laymen interested in higher education. He also suggested that it would be helpful if another manual for trustees, similar to *The Government of Higher Education*, but relating to the boards which control only elementary and secondary education, could be prepared by Elliott, who, he noted, had "run the whole gamut of educational administration in this country."

*The Colleges and The Courts*, published the following year (1936) by the Carnegie Foundation, was the first volume in a series of studies to assemble and classify legal decisions pertaining to higher education. Elliott and Chambers had organized various sections to consider student admission, discipline, suspension, scholarship, diplomas, and degrees; laws affecting the faculty, the president, and other employees; and the separate conditions of state, municipal, and private higher schools, as well as constitutional provisions regarding universities and colleges. Five years later a second compendium in the series was published by the foundation called *The Colleges and The Courts—1936-1940* prepared by Chambers. Elliott's preface to this study lauded Chambers' work and pointed out that this volume dealt with judicial decisions from 1936 to 1940.

Elliott prepared a preface for each of the two ensuing volumes in the series, *The Colleges and The Courts, 1941-1945* and *1946-1950*. Savage later wrote that "college and university administrators and even lawyers have testified to the usefulness and accuracy
of these studies” which were developed by the Elliott-Chambers team.

In 1939 the Carnegie Foundation published *Charters of Philanthropy*, a volume prepared by Elliott and Chambers and litho-printed for private circulation. The purpose of the book was to facilitate study of the legal basis of American foundations. It reproduced trust instruments, corporate charters, and by-laws of twenty-nine foundations, with a brief analytical introduction comparing some of the salient features of those documents. Nine years later the foundation published a second study with the same title, *Charters of Philanthropy*, which Chambers authored. This second volume contained materials similar to the first, without the restricted material which had limited the original circulation.

In addition to his work with the Carnegie Foundation on these publications, Elliott also served effectively as a trustee of the foundation from 1934 to 1945, and as chairman of the board of trustees from 1943-1945. Although Elliott wrote very little about his own work with the board of the foundation, an account of his valuable contributions is included in Savages’ story of the Carnegie Foundation, *The Fruit of An Impulse.*

In 1947, two years after he had retired from the presidency of Purdue, Elliott had an opportunity to review his earlier study of boards of control, and to present his mature conclusions with regard to an effective board of control. The occasion for this review was his address before the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions. Although it had been twenty years since his first study of the government of American higher education institutions had been made, he felt that the passing of the years and the many changes in the extent and goals of higher education had “furnished no basis for any essential changes of the first judgment.”

Noting that there had been some studies which advocated a system for selecting board members so that the membership would represent various interest groups, Elliott concluded that there was no system which had his complete confidence; that there was no wholly dependable procedure. Whatever the method, whether appointment by governors, or election by the people in the case of publicly controlled institutions, or through co-optation, there is no guarantee that the superior individual will be named, he felt.

Concluding his address, he outlined his feelings that effective boards of control were largely the result of the efforts and skills of the internal leadership of the institution. The president and the
faculty, he believed, had the duty of educating the board members with regard to the daily life of the institution.

He had observed many boards of control in action, and it was his conviction that the working effectiveness of a board was largely determined by the working effectiveness of the president of the institution. The president was the activating center of the institution and had the task of training and educating his board. "This may not be difficult," he concluded, but it is "always a delicate undertaking."

Elliott had worked closely with governing boards of higher institutions for nearly thirty years and was well acquainted with the many ramifications of such a "delicate undertaking."

After his initial experiences in Montana with board members, faculty members, and citizens of the state, he reportedly told the governor of that state that a university executive needed "a good, thick skin; a first-class copper-lined stomach; a clear conscience and god-given common sense." But, he concluded, "if you haven't the first two qualities, the last two are as nothing."

As the years went by, Elliott was prompted on a number of occasions to set down his list of presidential qualifications. He was particularly pleased on two occasions at the reception given to his remarks concerning the presidency. His address at the inaugural dinner for President L. B. Hopkins of Wabash College in 1926, for example, was received so well that W. N. Brigance included it in his book, *Classified Speech Models*. Brigance, who attended the ceremony, wrote that the speech held "value as a model to be preserved for study." Elliott was immensely flattered and quite proud that his remarks appeared "between speeches by Mark Twain and Frederick Landis," the latter a U. S. Congressman from Indiana (1903-07) and well known author and columnist.

Then in 1940 at the inaugural dinner for President H. R. Bevis of Ohio State University, Elliott presented his "Decalogue For Presidents" which he hoped would "smooth the long path of service ahead, and give courage for the right; and courage for the wrong when wrong better serves the rights of youth."

His ten pronouncements were as follows:

1. Thou shalt not worship thyself nor thy salary. Neither shalt thou permit thy arteries to be hardened by ambition for higher places.
2. Thou shalt not plume thy plumage in the presence of thy trustees.
3. Thou shalt not covet the scholarship of scholars. Be thou ever mindful that thou art the messenger for and not the master of scholars.

4. Thou shalt multiply and magnify thy powers of limitless patience, resist temptation to speak in public places, and reserve for the silence of thine own study the exercise of thy human right to profane utterance.

5. Thou shalt resolve always to be the welcome companion of students, thereby renewing thine own youth and acquiring the wisdom of life yet to be.

6. Thou shalt not make war on the Fourth Estate. Ever keep in mind the many of your profession who have been torpedoed by printers' type.

7. Thou shalt learn a lesson from the lowly rhinoceros and cultivate a thick impervious epidermis, thereby suffering painlessly the pin pricks and pitchforks of thine enemies and thy critics.

8. Thou shalt not bow down nor worship the idols of pigskins, nor make unto thyself graven images shaped as scoreboards.

9. Thou shalt walk each day not less than five miles alone and out of doors for communion with thy better self.

10. Thou shalt honor thy digestion and preserve the power of thy pancreatic and gastric juices that thy days in office may be long, and filled with the inspirations of well-being. This is the last and the greatest of commandments for wisdom and happiness.

But at the same time Elliott was having fun at the expense of the office of president, he invariably included a serious charge for those who would work with a university president. Practically every address that he made at an inaugural ceremony, from his address at the University of Washington for President Suzzalo in 1916 to his 1955 commencement address (in which he honored Chancellor C. M. Hardin) at the University of Nebraska, included the plea “give this leader full opportunity for exercise of his leadership. Match his courage with your competence, his skill with your sympathy, his power with your patience. Protect him from personal, partisan, political self-seekers that this University may continue to possess an inspired leadership both for men in high and, above all, for men in humble places.”

Elliott said on many occasions, “Effective and inspired leadership demands courage, skill, power, and an inexhaustible supply of sheer physical stamina.” As one reviews his career in higher education, it becomes readily apparent that Elliott possessed those characteristics. His range of interests and activities were prodigious.

While at Purdue, for example, he served as a member of the Board of Visitors for the U. S. Naval Academy in 1935 and 1936; he
was a conciliator in disputes between the United Mine Workers and the Indiana Coal Operators in 1929-1930; he taught during the summer session at Peabody College for Teachers (1930), at Teacher College (1925) and the University of Chicago (1926) having taught at the latter institutions earlier (1907 and 1911, respectively); he was a member of the National Advisory Commission on Education in 1929-1931; he was on the Indiana State Board of Education from 1922 to 1931; and he was a member of the Science Committee of the National Resources Planning Board from 1935 to 1943.

A special project that was particularly satisfying to Elliott was his work in assembling and editing the annual reports of President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University. The volume (published in 1937) was more than a mere tribute to Butler, for Elliott had a firm conviction that the selections from the annual reports would prove serviceable to those "who are yet to wrestle with the intricate issues of higher education." Preparation of the book was no small "extra undertaking."

In addition to the several areas already mentioned and the numerous positions which he held, he also devoted considerable time and effort to still another major activity, surveys in higher education. Elliott had had a significant role in the development of the school survey movement which had its beginning in 1911-1912. Considering his part in the early surveys of secondary schools and state school systems, it is not surprising that Elliott later, when he became an administrator in higher education, was also involved in surveys of higher institutions. The first survey of higher education in which Elliott participated was concerned with the problem of financing the state colleges and universities of the nation. It began at almost the same time that he began his administrative duties at Purdue.

THE EDUCATIONAL FINANCE INQUIRY

Early in 1921 at an N.E.A. Department of Superintendence meeting in Atlantic City, a resolution was introduced calling for a nation-wide inquiry into the cost of public education. As a result of the discussion following this resolution, a committee which included Elliott was named to plan an investigation of the problem of financing public education. In August 1921, the committee met in New York and proposed the Educational Finance Inquiry, a commission to study expenditures at various educational institutions in selected communities. Recognizing the possible value
of such a study, the American Council on Education sought contributions for this purpose and raised $170,000.

The members of the commission were George D. Strayer of Columbia University, chairman; Ellwood P. Cubberley, Stanford University; Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo and a director of the American Council on Education; Elliott, and others. The original purpose of the inquiry was to study the existing programs of public education, the extent to which these were being carried out, and the costs involved. Although the original plan was to have included a study of the financing of higher education, it was impossible for the investigators to get the cooperation of any sizeable group of state higher institutions, thus the major attention of the inquiry was given to the cost of public elementary and secondary schools.

Elliott reported in 1924 that “when it became evident that the state institutions were long on the theory of facts and very short on the delivery of same,” it was necessary to turn to those areas where information could be secured.

In most cases there was not a refusal to give the information, but the inquiry was led to conclude that most institutions simply did not have the financial facts. At Purdue University, for example, as has been noted previously, there was no business office until 1922 when the trustees authorized Elliott to employ the university’s first comptroller of finance to act in the capacity of business manager. In a few instances, Elliott noted, certain higher educational institutions had set up accounting and statistical procedures but even those institutions were very reluctant to make available the details of their financial structure to members of the inquiry staff.

While this situation at first promised to prevent the inquiry from making any fact-finding, constructive studies in the field of higher education, a second project was soon outlined which was to make a contribution to the more effective financial administration of tax-supported higher schools. The project was that of developing a simple, common method for the calculation of annual per-student cost of instruction in higher institutions. On May 23, 1922, the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission finally recommended that an intensive study be made of the detailed institutional costs of the higher schools within a certain geographical area. The original proposal called for such study to be made of the state universities, colleges, and normal schools in Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. But when Elliott moved from Montana to Indiana, the state institutions of Montana and Idaho
were dropped from the study while Purdue University was added to the list.

The completed study was published in 1925 as Volume XIII of a series of publications of the Educational Finance Inquiry, and was titled *Unit Costs of Higher Education*, by E. B. Stevens and Elliott. Stevens was the executive secretary of the University of Washington under Suzzalo and had carried on significant pioneer studies of the finances of the higher schools of that state. He was largely responsible for the technical aspects of the report, while Elliott prepared the introductory chapters and acted in an advisory capacity for the total report.

The report contained a detailed description of a technique for the classification of institutional expenditures and the correlation of these expenditures with students and other services. While the Unit Cost Technique never achieved unanimous support, it continues to receive a qualified recognition. The study made by Elliott and Stevens marks one of the earliest attempts to solve an ever-present financial problem of higher education.

Seven years after the study of unit costs was published for the Educational Finance Inquiry, Elliott became associated with another survey group—this time to study higher education in Georgia. The board of regents there invited L. D. Coffman, president of the University of Minnesota, Elliott, Charles H. Judd, dean of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, George F. Zook, then president of the University of Akron and later president of the American Council on Education, and George A. Works, professor of higher education at the University of Chicago, to carry out an investigation of the university system of that state.

The report, which was completed in 1932, provided an analysis of the system of higher schools and made certain recommendations. It is difficult to determine what part Elliott played in organizing the work of the survey, in executing the study, and in preparing the final report. He briefly mentioned the survey in an article for *The Purdue Alumnus*, indicating that he had spent less than a week in Georgia. R. B. Stewart, however, spent a considerable amount of time and effort on the survey.

In 1935 a committee of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York organized a special survey called the *Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education in the State of New York*.

Elliott was asked to direct that part of the inquiry having to do with higher education and adult education. David S. Hill of
the Carnegie Foundation was employed to carry out the study of higher education while Floyd W. Reeves of the University of Chicago was in charge of the study of adult education in New York. Their task was to determine the extent of the state's obligation for the provision of higher educational opportunities and what type of regulation the state should exercise over public and private institutions.

As a result of the investigations carried out by Hill and Reeves under Elliott's direction, *Higher Education in the State of New York* with Hill and Elliott as the authors was published in 1937. Two years later the Inquiry published Elliott's brief *Summary Memoranda With Reference To Higher Education*. The study of adult education in New York was completed with the publishing of *Adult Education*, by Reeves, Fansler, and Houle in 1938 which included a preface written by Elliott.

While the details connected with the publication of the above reports were still being discussed, however, another opportunity to conduct a university survey was extended to Elliott. This time the University of the Philippines had resolved to seek help in making a thorough study of all its courses, personnel, and equipment in all colleges and departments. This was the survey, referred to earlier, which took Elliott away from Purdue University for five months. Although he and Packer received many accolades from those with whom they had worked in the Philippines, Elliott was never convinced that the work which he and Packer had done would have any lasting effect.

The next several years saw a decline in the number of university surveys, perhaps largely because unsettled conditions in international affairs made long-range planning more or less impractical. Elliott, for example, had been scheduled to return to the Philippines in 1940 but the impending world crisis stopped that.

Immediately following the war, however, certain states authorized investigations of their state systems of public education. Elliott, of course, at the close of the war had just stepped down as president of Purdue University and with his background in the school survey movement, he was one of the first consultants to fill the demand for capable, experienced educators to help carry out the post-war surveys.

In June 1945, a committee of the State Legislature of West Virginia executed a contract with George D. Strayer of Teachers College to employ a staff to conduct a survey of certain phases of public education in that state. Elliott was selected by Strayer to
work in the area of higher education. He was responsible in part for the field work and preparation of that section of the report concerned with West Virginia University. His report was prepared during the month that he was closing out his responsibilities at Purdue University and was finally submitted to the director in September 1945. The final report prepared by Strayer and published by the state late in 1945 contained a section called “Higher Education in West Virginia—the University” which was largely written by Elliott.

Then early the following year, George S. Zook of the American Council on Education asked Elliott to direct a nationwide survey on the pharmacy profession. It was this invitation that led to the Elliott's leaving Lafayette, Indiana, to move to Washington, D.C., where they stayed for more than two years, until July 1948.
NOTES


