The Committee of Fifty and the Growth of the American Research University

The Harvard community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citable link</td>
<td><a href="http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:33797274">http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:33797274</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Use</td>
<td>This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <a href="http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA">http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee of Fifty and the Growth of the American Research University

Melissa Dolan

A Thesis in the Field of History
for the Degree of Master of Liberal Arts in Extension Studies

Harvard University
March 2016
Abstract

The Committee of Fifty for the Investigation of the Liquor Problem formed in 1893 to address the growing issue of alcohol in American life. Comprised of prominent businessmen, university leaders, and religious figures, the Committee hoped to provide guidance to American citizens through the results of a ten-year long scientific investigation of alcohol in its relation to economics, physiology, law, and ethics. Because academic leaders such as Charles W. Eliot, Daniel Coit Gilman, Seth Low, William H. Welch, and Henry P. Bowditch were consumed with the process of transforming their institutions into research universities and distinguishing themselves from the crowd of denominational liberal arts colleges, what would have motivated them to commit themselves to an extensive, time-consuming exploration of temperance issues? The work that follows will demonstrate that the university leaders on the Committee dominated its agenda and actions. The Committee of Fifty for the Investigation of the Liquor Problem was not about liquor; it was a vehicle to advance the goals of the university leaders in their efforts to become reputable research universities.

The story of the Committee of Fifty is rarely told in historical scholarship because the Committee’s publications failed to influence the public debate on temperance. Any histories that do exist analyze the Committee’s completed publications or its public battle against the Scientific Temperance Instruction provided in the nation’s primary and secondary schools. The chapters that follow tell a different story. This is an administrative history of the Committee’s internal workings, told by examining its
meeting minutes and other behind-the-scenes communications. By analyzing the group from this perspective, a pattern of actions emerges that demonstrates university leaders’ use of the Committee as a new type of fundraising tool to support scientific research, as a platform to demonstrate the value of a medical education, and as an authority to influence secondary school reform. The university leaders’ actions demonstrate that they anticipated the changes that would transform the American research university in the coming decades.
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Introduction

The Committee of Fifty for the Investigation of the Liquor Problem formed in 1893 and consisted of prominent businessmen, philanthropists, clergy, and university educators.¹ Members included university presidents such as Seth Low and Charles W. Eliot, professors and scientists such as Henry P. Bowditch and Wilbur O. Atwater, businessmen such as banker Jacob H. Schiff and insurance company president Jacob L. Greene, and religious leaders such as Washington Gladden and Samuel W. Dike. The self-appointed group hoped to assemble facts and contribute an unbiased perspective on alcohol issues in order to inform policy and action on the volatile societal concern. In a statement of purpose, Committee Secretary Francis G. Peabody wrote that the committee was “not a new movement in temperance agitation or reform. It is simply an organization for research.”²

To do this work, the Committee split into subgroups focused on various aspects of the “liquor problem.” This included subcommittees on the legislative aspects, the economic aspects, the ethical aspects, and the physiological aspects. Additionally, the group formed an executive board and a subcommittee to track Committee income and spending. Over the course of a twelve-year period from 1893 to 1905, the Committee met seventeen times. Additionally, subcommittees also held meetings. Each subcommittee conducted investigations, assembled reports on their specific subject matter, and

---

¹ See complete list of Committee members in Appendix A.

² Francis G. Peabody to Friends of the Committee of Fifty, 27 March 1897, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.
published the material when their work was completed. The Legislative report was published in 1897, the Economic report was published in 1899, the report on Substitutes from the Saloon from the Ethical Committee was published in 1901, and the Physiological report was published in 1903. Finally, in 1905, the Committee published a unifying summary of the investigations that included an introduction from Peabody. By the time the Committee of Fifty’s work had been completed, the group had spent over $21,000, or, in 2015 dollars, $574,350. Though the Committee had aimed to unite the various forces surrounding the issues related to alcohol in America, there is little evidence that it had much of a cultural impact at the time.

The actions of the Committee’s members over this twelve-year period reveal that its academic leaders strongly influenced the Committee’s direction and used it to pursue their own educational ambitions. These university presidents and professors were working to differentiate their institutions from the small, denominational colleges that they once were themselves and that they felt had overpopulated the landscape of higher education throughout the country. These leaders wanted to assert the role of research as an essential element of a university’s service to society, standardize the foundation of medical education in the United States through specific scientific disciplines, and reform the secondary schools to improve the quality of admitted students to their own institutions. On this point, the Committee was most well-known for its public opposition to the Scientific Temperance Instruction that scores of primary and secondary school students received, and this battle will be addressed in chapter III. However, this was only

---

one part of the Committee of Fifty’s larger role in the history of education. Ultimately, through the academic leaders’ pursuit of funding and public support to fuel its investigations, these men anticipated the factors that would be necessary to support modern research later in the twentieth century.

Because the Committee of Fifty’s research ultimately failed to influence temperance reform in the early twentieth century, it is not often the subject of historical research. The Committee of Fifty most frequently appears in historical accounts of its battle against Scientific Temperance Instruction, also known as S.T.I.\(^4\) Beyond this context, some historical research has examined the motives of the Committee’s corporate members.\(^5\) In both cases, historians drew conclusions based on the Committee’s published reports, Mary H. Hunt’s public responses, and personal letters exchanged between Committee members such as Henry W. Farnam, Wilbur O. Atwater, and Henry P. Bowditch. The research presented in the following chapters, on the other hand, provides an administrative history of the Committee of Fifty. An examination of the Committee minutes clarifies the amount and the nature of each member’s involvement. They demonstrate that corporate leaders actually played a small role on the Committee. In fact, corporate leaders, when involved, were at times hindered by academic leaders or simply used for the benefit of academic leaders’ agendas.

\(^4\) For an example, see Jonathan Zimmerman, *Distilling Democracy: Alcohol Education in America’s Public Schools, 1880-1925* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1999).

The majority of academic men that joined or were considered for the Committee of Fifty worked for a select group of institutions. Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Brown, University of Pennsylvania, and Dartmouth all had representatives on the roster or the invitation list at one point or another. These institutions had deep roots in American culture and had formed in the colonial era before the American Revolution. They “shared the same broad sense of dual purpose… namely, educating civic leaders and preparing a learned clergy.” President Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins once praised these schools as “nurseries of virtue, intelligence, liberality, and patriotism…The influences of academic culture may be distinctly traced in the formation of the Constitution of the United States.”

Although these institutions were the country’s oldest, they were not the only ones. In the decades after the Revolution, “a mania for founding colleges raged on uncontrolled.” For instance, “Between 1782 and 1802, nineteen colleges were established, more than twice as many as had been chartered in the preceding century and a half.” By 1860, 240 colleges were up and running. Of those, “far and away the most

---


active founders of colleges...were various religious denominations.” Gilman believed that, “Most of these colleges are inadequately endowed, and consequently the instruction which many of them offer is of a very secondary character...some of them have little more than a name, a charter, and a bias.”

For a number of years, particularly before the Civil War, the elite institutions that Gilman saw as distinct from the rest of the group did share their inclination toward religious bias. Most schools—colonial colleges included—had religious affiliations; ministers dominated many boards of trustees and filled presidential roles. Additionally, college courses tended to be presented through a Christian lens, and educators believed in teaching all branches of knowledge with equal emphasis.

However, changes were taking place in American society. The growing needs and technological developments of an increasingly industrialized economy, the increasing secularization and decreasing influence of religious influence in American culture, and the growing appeal of the European university model were some observed trends. Additionally, “the growth in surplus capital potentially available for institution-building

11 Lucas, Education, 119.
12 Gilman, “Education in America,” 216.
14 Reuben, Modern University, 22.
15 Lucas, Education, 142.
from the accumulated fortunes of industrial entrepreneurs, railroad tycoons, and business magnates\(^\text{16}\) encouraged the possibilities associated with reform.

These emerging changes in society led some educators to begin questioning the usefulness of the educational approach seen across the country in the first half of the nineteenth century. Harvard educators such as George Ticknor and Josiah Quincy had a hand in promoting reform ideas, given that the institution had always considered itself to be “both universal and useful to the community.”\(^\text{17}\) Ticknor, who joined Harvard as a professor of language and literature in 1819 after four years studying in Europe, suggested that Harvard expand its curriculum, organize students by ability instead of class year, and organize the faculty into departments based on their subjects.\(^\text{18}\) Quincy, who served as Harvard’ president from 1829-1845, did not like the trend toward abundance of colleges, instead arguing that the country should generously support a few advanced institutions. This structure, he believed, would meet the interests of society; additionally, these institutions would be “great seminaries of learning…whence intellectual light and heat should radiate for the use and comfort of the whole land.”\(^\text{19}\) As the nineteenth century progressed, this desire to be crucial to the needs of American society would only grow. Consequently, Harvard as well as some of its colonial counterparts

led a process of academic development that, to varying degrees, characterized the colleges of the Northeast after the 1820s…The Northeast had been distinguished

\(^{16}\) Lucas, *Education*, 142.


\(^{19}\) Reuben, *Modern University*, 27.
since early colonial times for its high general level of education. With fewer than one-third of the colleges, the Northeast contained more than half of the nation’s schools of medicine, law, and theology. Moreover the eastern colleges actively sought to propagate this model.\textsuperscript{20}

This was the state of affairs for eastern institutions as the country emerged from civil war, and a new generation of visionary academic leaders emerged, including Charles W. Eliot at Harvard, Daniel Coit Gilman at Johns Hopkins, and later, Seth Low at Columbia.

When Charles W. Eliot took the helm at Harvard in 1869, he had big plans for the institution, although an emphasis on research was not necessarily one of them.\textsuperscript{21} Eliot’s determination to create a premier research institution came with the arrival of Johns Hopkins to the educational scene in the 1870s, which led Eliot to realize he was going to need to compete for top professors.\textsuperscript{22} Johns Hopkins, as a new institution, was untethered to traditions or religious influence and was considered revolutionary with its strong emphasis on research and graduate studies.\textsuperscript{23} Despite the generous endowment provided by its benefactor to found the institution, Johns Hopkins, like other ambitious universities, struggled to keep pace financially, partly because it experienced a fiscal crisis in the late 1880s.\textsuperscript{24} In 1893, the year the Committee of Fifty formed, Johns Hopkins


\textsuperscript{22} Geiger, \textit{History}, 322.

\textsuperscript{23} Geiger, \textit{History}, 325.

\textsuperscript{24} Geiger, \textit{History}, 325.
would have a whole new project to support: the opening of the Johns Hopkins Medical School, run by William H. Welch.

Welch promoted standards for medical education that emphasized certain disciplines, which was a relatively new idea in higher education. According to Roger Geiger, the division of academia into disciplines only solidified in the late 1880s and early 1890s, and this, along with “the ascendancy of the research ideal clearly marked a transformation that would engulf the entirety of American higher education.”

Examining the structure of the Committee of Fifty in this context, the influence of academic leaders can be seen in the division of the Committee into subcommittees based on academic disciplines. Additionally, this clear demarcation of disciplines would, ideally, showcase the importance of each not just to the world of education but to American culture as well. Committee of Fifty professors such as Welch, Henry P. Bowditch, and Russell H. Chittenden spent a significant amount of their time promoting their disciplines in order to secure funding and promote the growth of a standardized medical curriculum. For example, Welch told an audience at Yale in 1888 that,

> If the general public better understood the rapid advances of medicine and of surgery during the last half century and clearly appreciated the far reaching importance for the preservation of health and the relief of disease of subjects which in all departments of medicine now engage attention, I believe that there would be no lack of means for the best medical education and for the prosecution of medical investigations in this country.

25 Geiger, History, 337.

26 William H. Welch, “Some of the Advantages of the Union of Medical School and University: An Address Delivered at Yale, June 26, 1888,” New Englander and Yale Review 49, no. 222 (September 1888): 155, http://ebooks.library.cornell.edu/cgi/t/text/pageviewer-idx?c=nwng;cc=nwng;g=moagrp;xc=1;q1=william%20h.%20welch;rgn=full%20text;view=image;seq=0155;idno=nwng0049-3;node=nwng0049-3%3A1.
Additionally, Chittenden published an article in the New York Medical Journal on the eve of the Committee’s formation in 1893 that extensively made the case for the place of physiological chemistry in the medical school curriculum. Addressing critics who might “say, perhaps, that no medical student can afford to spend such an amount of time on a subject only indirectly connected with medicine,” Chittenden argued that “no medical school at the present day can afford to be without such a course of study if it hopes to rank with the leading institutions of the land, or aims to provide instruction of the highest and fullest type.”

As for Bowditch, he had established the first teaching laboratory for the discipline of physiology in the United States—albeit a humble one initially. However, by the mid-1880s, the laboratory had attracted talented students and was generating dozens of papers to be published in scientific journals. Bowditch “hoped that by drawing attention to the laboratory facilities in this way, he would inspire a larger number of workers to pursue physiological investigations.” Beyond the confines of the laboratory, Bowditch was also a founding member of the American Physiological Society and helped establish the *American Journal of Physiology* in 1898. He is also described as an entrepreneur.

---


28 Chittenden, “Physiological Chemistry,” 373.


30 Laszlo, “Future,” 82.
because he was an active and successful fund-raiser, which resulted in many new
facilities on the Harvard campus in the 1880s through the early 1900s.

As university presidents and professors supported this new emphasis on research
and the development of scientific disciplines that would support medical education, they
were also actively distancing themselves from their denominational roots. In the 1850s,
Columbia had “famously refused to appoint the country’s finest chemist because he was
Unitarian.”31 During Seth Low’s tenure at Columbia, however, the president
“downplayed Columbia’s relationship with the Episcopalians, emphasizing instead the
religious diversity of the university’s board of trustees and its freedom from ‘sectarian
control.’”32 One of the ways he downplayed religious influence was by ending
compulsory attendance for chapel in 1891.33 Eliot’s tenure at Harvard also saw some
changes in religious requirements for students. He attempted to end compulsory chapel
within the first few years of his presidency, but fifteen years passed before Francis G.
Peabody took over chapel services in 1886 and convinced the board of overseers to move
toward voluntary prayer.34 Beyond chapel and prayer, though, Eliot made his views on
the tension between religion and scientific progress abundantly clear. In an 1883 essay
titled “On the Education of Ministers,” which he directed specifically at Protestant clergy,
he felt the rise of scientific inquiry led to the fall of religious influence. He also bluntly

31 Geiger, History, 350.

32 Reuben, Modern University, 86.

33 Gerald Kurland, Seth Low: The Reformer in an Urban and Industrial Age (New
&source=gbs_navlinks_s.

34 Reuben, Modern University, 121.
stated, “It is the electric light of science which has made white and transparent the whole temple of learning…These remarks imply that ministers, as a class…are peculiarly liable to be deficient in intellectual candor; and that is what I, in common with millions of thoughtful men, really think.”

He went on to add that, “No other profession is under such terrible stress of temptation to intellectual dishonesty as the clerical profession is.”

In short, Eliot did not have a positive view of Protestant clergy.

Though university leaders focused a large amount of attention on reforming the academic activities within the walls of their institution, they also considered the external factors that would improve the standard of education they provided. One significant area of focus for leaders such as Eliot and Low was the reform of the secondary school curriculum. Eliot had sought to influence secondary school reform in a number of ways. One strategy was using “college admission policy as a way of elevating and standardizing American secondary education.”

Another strategy was leading the National Education Association’s Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies. Eliot was selected to lead by Nicholas Murray Butler, president of the N.E.A., and Seth Low’s successor at Columbia in 1901. The Committee’s report, published in the same year that the

---


Committee of Fifty formed in 1893, “argued, to the consternation of the classicists, for a common curriculum, including modern foreign languages and scientific studies, as opposed to one dominated by…classic subjects.” Seth Low was also involved in secondary school reform. Even before he took on the role of university president, he reformed the public schools in Brooklyn when he served as mayor of that city. Later, in 1899, he hosted educational leaders at Columbia to create a college entrance examination board. Therefore, when William M. Sloane, Jacob L. Greene, and the Ethical subcommittee brought concerns about the quality scientific instruction presented in a program known as Scientific Temperance Instruction to the attention of the Committee, the Committee took action.

The Committee steered a deeper investigation of the secondary school instruction out of the grasp of the clergy-heavy Ethical subcommittee into the hands of the Physiological subcommittee. They also added Wilbur O. Atwater and his new scientific innovation, the Calorimeter, to their roster. As their scientific investigations intensified, so did their battle with the woman in charge of Scientific Temperance Instruction, Mary H. Hunt. Hunt was the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union’s national superintendent for Scientific Temperance Instruction. The W.C.T.U. was an organization that was founded in Ohio in 1874 and had amassed hundreds of thousands of followers to become...

---


the most influential political action group by the end of the 1800s.\textsuperscript{41} Hunt’s fervent interest in temperance stemmed from her exposure to influential religious leaders at a young age. A direct descendent of pilgrim Edward Winslow, Hunt grew up immersed in the preaching of the “legendary minister and temperance leader Lyman Beecher.”\textsuperscript{42}

Within the W.C.T.U., Hunt amassed her own army of loyal supporters. In her work for the organization, Hunt “enlisted the union’s battalions in an assault on the nation’s school boards… By 1901, when the population of the entire nation was still less than eighty million, compulsory temperance education was… in the thrice-weekly lessons of twenty-two million American children and teenagers.”\textsuperscript{43} Even Frances Willard, head of the W.C.T.U., sought to weaken the influence of S.T.I. in the classroom.\textsuperscript{44} Through some of her incredulous claims about the dangers of alcohol, such as the assertion that “when alcohol passes down the throat, it burns off the skin”\textsuperscript{45} Hunt was both an easy target as well as a formidable opponent for the Committee of Fifty.

In order to support all of its extensive investigations, the Committee of Fifty needed financial support, and it was not easy to obtain. This was a problem the Committee shared with all researchers around this time—and also most likely a motivating factor for their participation on the Committee—because if the beginning of


\textsuperscript{42} Zimmerman, \textit{Democracy}, 16-17.

\textsuperscript{43} Okrent, \textit{Last Call}, 20.

\textsuperscript{44} Zimmerman, \textit{Democracy}, 33.

\textsuperscript{45} Okrent, \textit{Last Call}, 21.
the 1890s was a turning point in the efforts of the universities to distinguish themselves from the crowd of liberal arts colleges, the universities were still fledgling in many ways. Even Harvard’s endowment, which grew from seven million dollars to thirteen million dollars in the 1890s, “scarcely matched its burgeoning needs.”46 Because universities had not yet demonstrated they had the full means to support research, “it was not yet evident that science was or ought to be entirely beholden to universities.”47 The federal government, in fact, spent millions of dollars on scientific research that would provide practical results for Americans and government interests.48

The first twenty years of the twentieth century seemed to be “sort[ing] out the relative responsibilities of different sectors in the nation’s research system.”49 Overlap between academia and government roles was not common and decreased after 1900.50

However, the Committee of Fifty provided an intersection of these overlapping interests when it added Wesleyan Professor Wilbur O. Atwater to its ranks. When the Committee invited Atwater to join its ranks in 1895, he brought with him his significant connections to the Department of Agriculture through his role as the head of the Office of Experiment Stations, and therefore, potential access to funds from the United States Treasury.

In 1903, Daniel Coit Gilman, speaking in his role as the first president of the


47 Geiger, Knowledge, 58.

48 Geiger Knowledge, 59.

49 Geiger Knowledge, 58.

50 Geiger Knowledge, 60.
Carnegie Institute, praised the involvement of the federal government in science as a condition “favourable to the advancement of science among us.”

The Committee of Fifty sought every avenue for financial support that it could garner. The formation of the Committee itself lent credence to this mindset by bringing together academic leaders and prominent business leaders who had reputations for giving, particularly to institutions of higher learning. After all, Committee members must have taken note the year before the Committee formed, when the research-oriented University of Chicago opened its doors thanks to a substantial contribution from John D. Rockefeller. In an era when elite northeastern universities experienced competition from peer institutions and were looking for every opportunity to expand the reach and stature own universities in American society, the Committee of Fifty began its work.

---

Chapter I

Members and Money: Assessing Committee Composition and Resources

The Committee of Fifty met seventeen times in the course of its existence, and most meetings took place at the United Charities Building on Fourth Avenue and 22nd Street in New York City. Using the roll call from the fourteen meeting minutes that exist, average attendees per meeting was twenty. Attendance dropped off sharply by 1899, with all subsequent meetings ranging from twelve to fourteen participants.

The Committee of Fifty expanded from an earlier group known as the Sociological Group. The Sociological Group was a group of eighteen men from the world of religion, education, business, and politics, who met on occasion in New York City during the late 1880s to discuss current social questions such as labor reform and city government. In 1889, they started to contribute articles on these topics to Century Magazine. By the 1890s, temperance issues arose during group discussions. In an 1893 letter from Harvard professor Francis G. Peabody to potential new group members, he explained,

52 See complete list of Sociological Group members in Appendix B.

53 Charles W. Eliot, “A Study of American Liquor Laws,” Atlantic Monthly 79 (February 1897): 177, http://ebooks.library.cornell.edu/cgi/t/text/pageviewer-idx?c=atla;g=moagrp;xc=1;q1=charles%20w.%20eliot;rgn=full%20text;view=image;cc=atla;seq=0183;idno=atla0079-2;node=atla0079-2%3A4.
In the course of our deliberations, and more recently through a request from without our membership, the subject of intemperance in alcoholic drinks has come before us, and we have considered the possibility of securing a thorough and scientific study of the question in its relation to poverty, health, crime and national life.  

In expanding the Sociological Group into the Committee of Fifty, Peabody and Samuel W. Dike sent a letter to a selected group of men on February 9, 1893 to attend their next meeting in April of 1893 to discuss the issues related to temperance. Twenty men attended the meeting and became the first members of the Committee of Fifty to Investigate the Liquor Problem. An additional ten were unable to attend but expressed a desire to be there. Of those ten, only three did not eventually join the Committee: President James B. Angell of University of Michigan, federal court judge Nathaniel Shipman of Hartford, and Methodist Episcopal Bishop as well as educational reformer John H. Vincent of Buffalo. At the April meeting, the Committee took shape. The original members of the Physiological subcommittee were John S. Billings, Francis A.  

54 Francis G. Peabody and Samuel W. Dike to potential Committee of Fifty members, 9 February 1893, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.  

55 Francis G. Peabody and Samuel W. Dike to potential Committee of Fifty members, 9 February 1893, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.  


57 The remaining seven who joined were: Richard T. Ely, Henry P. Bowditch, Walter Elliot, Washington Gladden, James MacAlister, John J. McCook, and Carroll D. Wright.  

58 Francis G. Peabody, Samuel W. Dike, and Charles Dudley Warner to potential Committee members, 29 April 1893, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.  

59 For biographical information on Committee members, see Appendix D.
Walker, and Russell H. Chittenden. The Legislative subcommittee included Charles W. Eliot, Seth Low, and Frederick H. Wines. The Ethical group had Reverend Henry C. Potter, Reverend Theodore T. Munger, and William E. Dodge. Peabody, Dike, and Charles Dudley Warner were appointed to a subcommittee to complete the membership of the group.\(^{60}\)


\(^{60}\) William Chauncy Langdon to Committee of Fifty, 1 May 1893, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.


\(^{62}\) An * indicates that the individual did not join the Committee.
It is notable to see whom the Committee attempted to recruit to its ranks. The majority of those who declined were significant leaders in business, education, medicine, and government. Curry, for instance, was elected the administrator of the Peabody Fund to support southern education efforts.\textsuperscript{63} S. Weir Mitchell was considered a pioneer in the field of physiology.\textsuperscript{64} A.G Warner’s presence would have brought another elite university into the group, as would James B. Angell. Phelps would have reinforced Yale’s presence with a representative from the law school. Vanderbilt, Hill, and Thomson all came from the railroad industry. Marshall Field donated the land for University of Chicago and, in the year the Committee of Fifty formed, gave one million dollars for a museum to be built for the Chicago World’s Fair.\textsuperscript{65} When the Committee nominated Provost Charles C. Harrison of University of Pennsylvania to join the Committee in 1897, he would have brought not only more academic leadership with him, but also a generous philanthropic history,\textsuperscript{66} contributing hundreds of thousands of dollars to his institution and raising millions more.\textsuperscript{67}

The financial possibilities of those who did join the Committee of Fifty were also strong, starting with the group’s leadership. Low came from a wealthy family, had

\textsuperscript{63} Dictionary of American Biography, s.v. “Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry.” Additionally, Curry was affiliated with Committee of Fifty member Robert C. Ogden. Ogden was president of the Southern Education Board, and Curry was made supervising director.


\textsuperscript{65} Leading American Businesses, s.v. “Marshall Field.”

\textsuperscript{66} Harrison did not end up joining the Committee.

\textsuperscript{67} Dictionary of American Biography, s.v. “Charles Custis Harrison.”
numerous philanthropic interests, and enjoyed social connections with the most prominent people in New York. William E. Dodge was the son of a temperance advocate but also from a family that had contributed over a million dollars to Columbia University in the 1890s and first decade of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{68} W. Bayard Cutting, who served on the Board of Trustees at Columbia, came from family wealth generated by the railroad business. In 1913, Cutting’s family had the means to contribute a $200,000 gift to Columbia in his memory.\textsuperscript{69} Professor Henry Farnam of Yale came from the family of a railroad magnate who had made generous financial contributions to Yale. Robert Curtis Ogden was a Philadelphia merchant but also promoted educational causes in the South; he was a trustee at the Hampton Institute and later served on the General Education Board.\textsuperscript{70} Jacob Schiff was a wealthy New York banker who served as Chairman of the Semitic Committee at Harvard and contributed thousands of dollars to establish the Semitic museum there in 1889.\textsuperscript{71}

While the Committee had mostly taken shape by 1894, some more names had been proposed at the April 7, 1894 meeting.\textsuperscript{72} Four other university presidents appeared on the list: William Jewett Tucker, the new president of Dartmouth, Jacob Gould

\textsuperscript{68} Geiger, \textit{Knowledge}, 52.


\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Dictionary of American Biography}, s.v. “Robert Curtis Ogden.”


\textsuperscript{72} “Names Proposed for Committee at Meeting of April 5\textsuperscript{th} [sic], 1894,” John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.
Schurman, the new president of Cornell,\textsuperscript{73} President Merrill E. Gates of Amherst College,\textsuperscript{74} and Henry Wade Rogers of Northwestern University.\textsuperscript{75} It is unclear from the Billings papers whether any of these men made it past the proposal process.\textsuperscript{76}

Though the Committee was still adding to its list of members into 1894, they settled on a Committee Chairman in late 1893. On October 21, Peabody wrote to Low informing him he had been selected leader of the Committee. Peabody wrote,

you were unanimously and very cordially selected as the permanent President of the Committee. I hope there may be no doubt of your willingness to serve us in this way. The meeting was hopeful, but much depends upon your leadership. I have no reason to believe that your duties will be very burdensome.\textsuperscript{77}

The process of selecting a chairman may not have been as cordial as Peabody indicated, however. In a letter sent to Low on November 6, Peabody wrote,

I trust that you will, for the present at least, permit your name to stand as President of our Committee of Fifty. The withdrawal of Mr. Cutting does not represent the sentiment of the Committee and I have asked Mr. Dodge to speak with you about it. There was at our meeting a serious expression of sympathy and no other person has declined to serve. I shall transmit to you within a few days the minutes of the meeting and the reports presented to it.\textsuperscript{78}

This letter appears to indicate that Cutting had an issue with Low’s selection as leader and may have even temporarily withdrawn from the Committee. It is unclear what the

\textsuperscript{73} Schurman had been proposed by Charles A. Briggs and Samuel W. Dike.

\textsuperscript{74} Gates had been proposed by William E. Dodge.

\textsuperscript{75} Rogers was also proposed by Dike.

\textsuperscript{76} Another university president was nominated for the Committee in 1897 after the death of M.I.T. president Francis Walker. Provost Charles C. Harrison of University of Pennsylvania appears not to have accepted his nomination to the Committee.

\textsuperscript{77} Francis G. Peabody to Seth Low, 21 October 1893, Seth Low Papers, Columbia University.

\textsuperscript{78} Peabody to Low, 6 November 1893, Seth Low Papers, Columbia University.
issue would be; Low and Cutting had a working relationship. Cutting was a member of the Board of Trustees at Columbia. Additionally, his brother R. Fulton Cutting supported Low when he ran for political office. Nonetheless, Cutting’s actions may have given Low pause before accepting the job. Eventually, Low wrote Peabody on November 20 indicating his acceptance of the position. Low’s acceptance was not without hesitation. Though he believed “that the inquiries proposed ought to be made, and that if they are carried through to success the results may be most important” he also would “regret my connection with the matter unless the members of the Committee are all prepared to do their utmost to make our investigations successful.”

At least one future Committee member was influenced by Low’s leadership. When Charles Eliot wrote to James Carter to request his presence on the Committee and on the Legislative subcommittee, Carter noted Low’s presence in his response. After explaining at much length how he was most likely too busy to take on more work, Carter then shifted tone, stating, “when I see Mr. Low—whose ordinary duties are so burdensome—willing to undertake new labors, I am still less inclined to withhold any assistance I may give.”

Though the Committee worked in groups, it is important to look at the composition of this group on an individual level. Peabody, in a letter to “friends” of the Committee seeking financial support, stated, “It will be seen that [Committee members]

79 Kurland, Seth Low, 178.

80 Seth Low to Francis G. Peabody, 20 November 1893, as reprinted in Francis G. Peabody to Committee of Fifty, December 1893, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.

represent very varied occupations, interests, religious connections, and parts of the country.”

Charles Dudley Warner asserted in a February 1897 Harper’s article that, “In its composition the committee represents most of the religious denominations, many of the universities and schools of technical learning, active business men, and specialists in many departments.” However, the Committee was not as representative as it claimed. In terms of representing “many” universities, forty percent of the Committee members received at least one degree, whether it was an undergraduate, law, or theology degree, from Harvard, Yale, Princeton, or Columbia. Two others received degrees from Johns Hopkins, bringing the total number to twenty-two members receiving degrees from five American schools. Beyond attending some of these schools, many committee members were also associated with them in other capacities. Nine Committee members had attended Harvard; Peabody, Eliot, Bowditch, and Charles J. Bonaparte still played active roles in the community. Walker had taught at Yale’s Sheffield Scientific while Gilman served as its director for a time. Billings helped design the Johns Hopkins Hospital and recommended William Welch for a faculty position there. Sloane taught at Princeton until Low recruited him to Columbia in 1896. Henry C. Potter served on the Board of Trustees at Columbia during Low’s tenure. Schiff financed Harvard’s Semitic Museum, founded in 1889. Gladden and Potter were invited by Eliot to lecture at Harvard.

---

82 Francis G. Peabody to Friends of the Committee of Fifty, 27 March 1897, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.


84 Bonaparte served as Chair of the Board of Overseers in the 1890s.
Many of the university leaders on the Committee also had specific views on the type of university that had value in America. Daniel Coit Gilman’s disapproval of the proliferation of schools throughout the nineteenth century led to him to reiterate the ideas of Cornell president Andrew White, who “urged that there should be concentration upon a few strong universities, not multiplication of projects.”85 While this is not how the history of American education played out, Gilman looked for opportunities to concentrate attention, resources, and influence on that limited group of universities. For example, Johns Hopkins would be a founding member of the Association of American Universities (A.A.U.) by the start of the twentieth century, along with Harvard, Columbia, the University of California, and the University of Chicago. The A.A.U. was formed in 1900 to explore “matters of common interest relating to graduate study.”86 Headed in the first year by Eliot, the A.A.U. had been formed by invitation-only membership and gave itself the power to represent “the leading American universities.”87 Committee of Fifty member Father Thomas Conaty represented Catholic University at the first meeting of the A.A.U. The association was described by one-time University of Chicago president Robert


86 Association of American Universities, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the First and Second Annual Conferences, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1901), 7, https://books.google.com/books?id=_EU9AAAYAAJ&pg=RA1-PA12&dq=proceedings+of+the+first+conference+of+the+association+of+american+universities&source=bl&ots=T2Mb6gCBzV&sign=ZAoijFU74v_Jdpgiz5PTVd5r9g9E&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiQueO0v7nJAhWIuB4KHBlzAAEQ6AEIHDAA#v=onepage&q=proceedings%20of%20the%20first%20conference%20of%20the%20association%20of%20american%20universities&f=false.

87 Association of American Universities, Proceedings, 11.
Maynard Hutchins as an organization consisting of “those which are willing to admit that they are the best.”

Ideas about exclusivity were not limited to university presidents, however. Bowditch, Chittenden, and Welch were founding members of the American Physiological Society, which was “restrictive” in its guidelines for entry. According to historian Toby A. Appel, “The APS was a by-product of an era of deep dissension in the medical community between the research-oriented elite, primarily associated with northeastern medical schools, and the rank and file of small-town medical practitioners.” The members of the Committee of Fifty that also served on the APS sought opportunities to distinguish themselves as members of an elite group.

How well did the Committee represent American religious denominations? The Committee included a wide range of religious affiliations. Denominations represented by three or more religious leaders on the Committee included Catholics, Episcopalians, and Congregationalists. Also represented by at least one religious leader were

---


90 Appel, “Biological and Medical Societies,” 158.

91 Because not all committee members’ religious affiliations and degree of involvement with those affiliations are known, they are not counted toward the ratio of religious representation on the committee. For example, Charles W. Eliot was a Unitarian, Jacob H. Schiff was Jewish, and E.B. Andrews had been a Baptist minister in Massachusetts before pursuing educational leadership.

92 Catholics, Episcopalians, and Congregationalists were the 1st, 9th, and 10th largest religious denominations in the country. US Department of the Interior, *Report on*
Presbyterians, Methodists, Jews, Unitarians, and even the Society for Ethical Culture,\(^93\) which was included in the 1890 census as having 1,064 members. While the Committee had two percent of its committee representing the Society for Ethical Culture—which represented .005 percent of the American population—and two percent representing Unitarians—which represented .3 percent of the American population—it had no representation for Baptists. According to the 1890 census, transmitted to the Department of the Interior by Labor Commissioner and Committee member Carroll D. Wright, Baptists were the third largest denomination in the country at the time, and they had also experienced the largest amount of growth of any denomination in the years between 1880 and 1890.\(^94\) They were also one of the primary religious affiliations covering the southeastern corner of the United States, and they tended to be strong supporters of temperance. The census split the religion into three categories: “colored” Baptists, numbering 1,348,989, southern Baptists, numbering 1,280,066, and northern Baptists, numbering 800,025.\(^95\) Additionally, while the Committee did have one Methodist member, that member was one of 3,420,330 Methodists in the country, of which one third resided in the South.\(^96\) Therefore, on a Committee aiming to provide

\(^93\) Presbyterians, Methodists, Jews, and Unitarians were ranked 7\(^{th}\), 2\(^{nd}\), 32\(^{nd}\), 34\(^{th}\), respectively, in size of denomination.


unbiased facts regarding temperance, they avoided the voices that would speak most in support of it. The Committee would never be described as a “Methodist Heaven,” which is what W.C.T.U. president Frances Willard termed Evanston, Illinois, when she moved there with her parents as a teenager.97 Furthermore, the Committee had prominent members that held minority viewpoints; Eliot, for instance, was in the minority at meetings of citizens in Cambridge when discussing temperance.98

Additionally, the Committee had very few members living in the South. William Preston Johnston, president of Tulane, lived in Louisiana, Henry Hitchcock lived in St. Louis, and T.F. Gailor lived in Tennessee. Only six other committee members lived anywhere other than northeast of Washington, D.C. Gladden and Jones lived in Ohio, Ely and Janssen lived in Wisconsin, and Wines was based in Illinois. Nineteen committee members lived in New York, an additional eight hailed from Massachusetts, seven from Connecticut, and the remaining group members lived in Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maryland, and Washington, D.C.

Therefore, a group that purported to have a diverse group of opinions to influence the cultural dialogue around temperance issues was geographically centered in New York and New England, omitted representation for the third largest religion in the country while having fourteen percent of its members represent the Protestant Episcopal denomination, and incorporated only those men that held positions of leadership in select

97 Okrent, Last Call, 17.

education, business, religion, and government agencies. The Committee of Fifty was an exclusive group, and it was made even more so when one examines not just who made up the committee but who had primary influence over its direction.

The group wanted to “unite” and provide a “consensus” on temperance issues. News articles of the time period portrayed a group of individuals with equal influence on the perspectives put forward by the Committee. Similarly, Houghton Mifflin, the company that published the Committee’s work, wrote a 1903 letter advertising the work and included the statement, “The Committee of Fifty…includes among its members Pres. Charles W. Eliot, Hon. Seth Low, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Prof. Felix Adler, Prof. Richard T. Ely, Rev. Henry C. Potter, and John Graham Brooks.” However, men did not have equal influence on the Committee, and clout in society did not necessarily equate to clout on the Committee. For example, Richard T. Ely, though mentioned in the Houghton Mifflin promotional material, did very little work for the Committee. He attended one meeting and was hardly mentioned in the published work.

---


101 He was listed in a paragraph of “thanks” for others beyond the subcommittee who contributed a small portion of work. Additionally, Ely wrote a letter to Seth Low in 1904 that requested financial support for a study he was working on for the American Bureau of Industrial Research. Ely’s first sentence stated, “The interest you showed in the labor problem when we prepared our article for the Century Magazine entitled, Program for Labor Reform, leads me to hope you will be interested in some investigations which I have begun.” This article was published in 1890, when the two men worked together on the Sociological Group. If Ely had been significantly involved in the work of the
To demonstrate that academic leaders steered the majority of the Committee’s work, it is important to explain how influence will be determined. Influence has been determined based on a combination of factors: member’s attendance at meetings, member’s role in meetings as detailed in the meeting minutes, member’s financial contributions to the Committee’s work, member’s amount of money received to complete work, member’s role in subcommittee research and publication, member’s title, and member’s other efforts that were revealed in personal letters or other sources.

Most influential members appear in more than one of these categories. For example, J.F. Jones had a solid track record in attending meetings yet appears to have had little influence in the direction of the committee. Aside from his listing as a member of the Economic committee in their public volume, his name did not appear next to any specific work, and he also never appeared in the meeting minutes. Furthermore, none of the four people he recommended for the committee became members, whereas John Billings’ recommendation rate was two out of four and William Dodge’s rate was five out of thirteen. Similarly, Col. Jacob Greene was a prominent businessman who chaired a subcommittee and was involved in the work of the Committee, yet his ideas were frequently overruled.

Charles Eliot, on the other hand, helped raise significant sums of money, chaired a subcommittee, served on the executive committee, and sought to influence the direction of the committee behind the scenes as revealed through Committee of Fifty, one might suspect that he would have referred to it in this letter.

102 “Names Proposed for Committee At Meeting of April 5th, 1894,” John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.

103 These frustrations will be explained in chapter III within an exploration of the Ethical Subcommittee’s role.
personal letters. The ensuing chapters will examine Committee meeting minutes, letters, and other evidence that will further illustrate the level of involvement and influence of individual Committee members. To see a breakdown of Committee attendance and financial contributions, refer to Appendix E.

While attendance at meetings did not automatically translate into influence, and lack of strong attendance did not always mean that a member was completely disengaged from the work, some general sense of a Committee member’s investment can be gleaned from attendance records. Some members, such as Chittenden, Atwater, Billings, and Welch, gave no money, but as members of the Physiological subcommittee, they were beneficiaries of a large portion of the Committee’s funding.

When sociologist Harry Gene Levine summarized John J. Rumbarger’s research, he wrote that Rumbarger “argued that corporate capitalists in the early 20th century were especially concerned with minimizing competition among themselves, maintaining social, political, and economic order, and with stabilizing, disciplining, and rationalizing the labor force.” 104 In making his case, Rumbarger stated that, “The composition of the Committee of Fifty leaves little or no doubt about the seriousness of the eastern corporate community in the matter of the political control of liquor.” 105 He then went on to name some of the Committee’s biggest business names, including John Converse, Greene, Dodge, and Schiff. 106 He also described Bonaparte, who would later serve as Secretary of

105 Rumbarger, Profits, 89.
106 Rumbarger, Profits, 89.
the Navy and United States Attorney General, as an influential Committee member.\footnote{Rumbarger, \textit{Profits}, 110.}

Corporate interests overlapped with academic interests and cannot be eliminated as part of the Committee’s agenda. After all, the university leaders on the Committee were producing the next generation of corporate elite in their institutions, and prominent economists such as Farnam were heavily attentive to the state of the economy in the country. However, most of the Committee’s corporate members appear to have little or no involvement in its work. Converse joined late, never appears to have been assigned to a subcommittee, and gave a total of $50 to the group’s efforts.\footnote{$50 \text{ converts to } $1,367 \text{ in 2015.}$} Schiff requested that Cutting take over for him as Chair of the Finance Committee in 1894, and in November of 1895 tried to resign from the Committee. The Committee tabled his resignation but he never attended another meeting, suggesting that the Committee tabled the resignation to keep a big name on the Committee. Bonaparte joined the Committee late and never attended a meeting; he was assigned to the Legislative subcommittee, but only after the majority of its work had been completed. Rumbarger was correct about the influence of Dodge; he was involved in the group, giving both time and money. He may have been invested in issues of temperance because his father was a temperance leader. Nonetheless, his family was also heavily interested in the academic growth of institutions such as Columbia.

Given the Committee’s impressive roster and its focus on a topical issue, the press took notice. A few stories emerged in publications not long after the Committee started taking shape. One story appeared in the \textit{Tennessee State Board of Health Bulletin} in
1893, which was reprinted from an article printed in the *Medical and Surgical Examiner*; the article had a number of incorrect statements related to the current members of the Committee. However, all people named in the article had at least been considered and invited to join the group.

At the April 7, 1894 meeting, the Committee dealt with the issue of publicity. The Ethical subcommittee proposed that the group make a public declaration of its goals. The meeting minutes do not state why this was proposed, but it could have been an effort to control the information printed about the Committee of Fifty with the hopes of more accurate facts. The Committee then voted to create a special Committee of Five, which included Low, Eliot, Billings, Potter, and Wright, to prepare a statement of the constitution and objects of the group. At the next meeting on November 16, 1894, the topic of publicity was again discussed; this time, the question was referred to the Committee of Five, and they were expected to come up with a general statement of purpose for each subcommittee to include in any publications. In the Physiological subcommittee report, Billings referred to concerns about the level of publicity when he stated that he had 2,500 surveys to send out to workers, “but it has been thought best to defer the sending of them out until it should be known whether it is the wish of the Committee of Fifty that its proposed work be made public.” Though no official

---

109 Minutes of the Committee of Fifty for the Investigation of the Liquor Problem, 7 April 1894, Papers of John S. Billings, New York Public Library (hereafter cited as Minutes, Committee of Fifty).

110 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 16 November 1894.

decision seems to have been made by the Committee by this point, new articles reporting on the Committee’s formation and actions continued to appear in the press. However, these articles were far more accurate in their reporting of Committee members and general goals of the group.\footnote{For example, see “Drinking and Its Effects: A Movement to Get at the Facts” \textit{New York Tribune}, December 20, 1894, 13, http://search.proquest.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/docview/573990587/CBBBACB7DE974933PQ/1?accountid=113.}

When Eliot distributed preliminary copies of the Legislative report, he repeatedly expressed the importance of keeping the results of his investigation private. In a letter sent to all Committee members, Eliot urged, “I beg you to take every needed precaution to secure the enclosed pamphlet from premature publication. At present it is for confidential use by members of the Committee of Fifty only.”\footnote{Charles W. Eliot to Committee of Fifty, 23 December 1895, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.} In addition, at the top of the next meeting’s committee minutes in January of 1896, Peabody attached a note stating, “By request of the Chairman of the Legislative Committee I call the attention of the members of the Committee of Fifty to the fact that… it is important that all copies of this report now in the hands of the Committee of Fifty be destroyed or kept from publicity.”\footnote{Addendum to 10 January 1896 meeting minutes by Francis G. Peabody on 21 January 1896, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.}

At the November 9, 1896 meeting, the Committee voted to release a statement of the Committee’s work to the press “in the interest of replenishing the treasury.”\footnote{Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 16 November 1896.} This casual comment on the Committee’s financial status belied a significant reality for the
An overview of the group’s funding will provide a helpful context to frame the details of each subcommittee’s investigations in the coming chapters.

Overview of Funding

The Committee of Fifty reported spending $21,529.35 over the course of its existence. The Physiological subcommittee received $7,100 dollars\(^{116}\) to complete its investigations, the Legislative subcommittee received $6,945 dollars, the Economic subcommittee received $4,550, and the Substitutes for the Saloon received $404.36.\(^{117}\) While Peabody did not report on the finances of the Ethical subcommittee, meeting minutes indicated that the group received approximately $1,000 in its early stages before being denied further funding.\(^{118}\)

A large portion of the funding was raised early in the Committee’s work. Between January and October of 1894, the Committee brought in $8,100. All but one of the gifts during this time period were $500 contributions.\(^{119}\) Some of these donors were Committee members, such as Jacob H. Schiff, William E. Dodge, Robert C. Ogden, and Seth Low. One gift was provided by Cornelius Vanderbilt, who was invited to be on the Committee but never joined the group. J.P. Morgan also provided $500. A number of other non-committee members also contributed. In December of 1894 and in early 1895, Charles Eliot raised an additional $2,100 in Boston, mostly through $50 and $100

\(^{116}\) $7,100 converts to $194,185 in 2015. $404 converts to $11,049.


\(^{118}\) The subcommittee received $300 at the April 16, 1894 meeting and $700 at the November 16, 1894 meeting.

\(^{119}\) $500 converts to $13,675 in 2015.
contributions from friends. Robert Ogden collected small contributions of $10, $25, and $50 gifts from July to October of 1894 that totaled $445. Then, between April and November of 1896, Seth Low, the Farnam Family, Jacob L. Greene, Francis G. Peabody, William E. Dodge, and Jacob Schiff gave an additional $3,700. By the end of 1896, the Committee had raised $14,345, or two-thirds of the Committee’s eventual stated total, through contributions from Committee members as well as outside individuals.\textsuperscript{120}

The Legislative subcommittee had completed most of its work by the end of 1896, so their allotted funds had already been spent. Eliot, Low, and Carter commissioned John Koren and Frederick Wines to complete most of the subcommittee’s work. Therefore, the bulk of that budget paid for their labor. Additionally, $3,000 had been allotted for the Physiological group by April 16, 1894. In November of 1894, the Physiological group received an additional $750. In January of 1896, the Economic subcommittee received $2,000. In November of 1896, the Economic subcommittee reported that some of the scope of their study would be taken up, and paid for, by the United States Department of Labor. Nonetheless, they also used Koren for part of their research and received an additional $2,000 in February of 1897 to pay for his services. At this point, the Committee’s funds were nearly depleted. At the February 27, 1897 meeting, the Committee determined that Peabody should write to potential donors in an effort to

\textsuperscript{120} “Treasurer’s Statement of Receipts, Appropriations, and Disbursements,” January 1894-February 1897, John S. Billings Papers. New York Public Library.
obtain more funds. In the meantime, the Economic subcommittee reported “self-supported” funding that the Committee never declared as part of the $21,000 total.

In August of 1897, some Committee members met informally while at their vacation homes in Maine to address a number of Committee-related issues. Low, Eliot, Gilman, Peabody, and Dodge were invited to this meeting. At this meeting,

the members of the Committee of Fifty there present were of the opinion that the work of the Committee, however valuable it has been in its various parts, has not proceeded with a sufficiently clear definition of its general score or end; and that this indefiniteness of scheme now greatly increases the difficulty of obtaining further money.

They proposed the possibility of raising $5,000 per year for three years, or, as they pointed out, $100 per Committee member per year. At the full Committee meeting in November, this proposal was accepted; the Committee empowered the Finance subcommittee to circulate a subscription paper and report on its level of success at the next meeting.

In a March 1898 Treasurer’s report, Dodge updated the Committee on the effort to raise further funds. The Committee had only raised an additional $3,250. He stated that, “I fear there is an impression among our friends that although the result of the

121 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 27 February 1897.


123 The letter this informal group sent out did not confirm who actually attended the meeting. However, a letter from Peabody to Low before the meeting occurred demonstrates the list of invitees.

124 Francis G. Peabody to Committee of Fifty, 1 October 1897, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.

125 For a full explanation of the agenda from this meeting, see Appendix F.
scientific investigation may have value, no practical end will be served…I do not know where further subscriptions can be obtained and I think the matter should be looked at very seriously by the Committee.”

The October 1898 Treasurer’s report recorded an additional $1,000 of income. In spring of 1899, $250 trickled into the account, and in 1900, Robert Ogden provided $250 in support of Professor Atwater’s experiments.

It is unclear how much the Committee of Fifty raised through other means during its time in existence. For example, John Shaw Billings acquired $250 from the Bache Fund, and Bowditch obtained similar funding from the Elizabeth Thompson Fund to support Physiological subcommittee work. These funds were not included in the Treasurers’ Reports. Additionally, the group requested $5,000 through an agricultural appropriations bill in the United States Senate in 1899. It is therefore possible that additional funds were acquired that they did not report. While the Physiological subcommittee continued its work until 1903, the Committee of Fifty did not meet from May of 1900 until February of 1904, so it does not appear that further Treasurers’ reports exist.

---

126 “Treasurer’s Statement,” 31 March 1898, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.

127 “Minutes of Meeting of Sub-Committee on the Physiological and Pathological Effects of Alcohol at Middletown, Conn., June 14-16, 1896,” John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.

128 U.S. Congress, Senate, Alcohol and Alcoholic Beverages, Senate Report no. 1498, 55th Congress, 3d sess.
Chapter II

Self-Funded and Efficient: The Case of the Legislative and Economic Subcommittees

The Legislative and Economic subcommittees completed their work smoothly without much interference from the larger Committee. The Legislative subcommittee, headed by Charles W. Eliot, moved swiftly by raising funds quickly and publishing first, in 1897. The Economic subcommittee’s work was delayed by two years while it waited for a government study with overlapping interests to take shape; however, once the group members began the work, they completed it efficiently. The group’s 1899 report was the Committee of Fifty’s second publication.

Findings of the Legislative Subcommittee

The “Liquor Problem in its Legislative Aspects” was published in 1897, and a summary of the report, written by Charles W. Eliot, was published in 1905. The summary provided an overview of key findings for the most significant issues related to alcohol legislation. The subcommittee commissioned Frederick H. Wines and John Koren to examine alcohol laws in eight geographically and demographically varied locations around the country: Massachusetts, South Carolina, Maine, Iowa, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Missouri, and Indiana.

The results of these investigations led the Legislative subcommittee to conclude that outright prohibition of alcohol was an unsuccessful approach to controlling its
effects. In the investigation summary, Eliot wrote, “prohibitory legislation has failed to exclude intoxicants completely even from districts where public sentiment has been favorable.” Additionally, prohibitory laws led to corruption at every level of local governance from the lower courts to the police force. Laws that prohibited alcohol sales altogether “stimulates to the utmost the resistance of the liquor-dealers and their supporters.”

The Legislative subcommittee endorsed an approach known as “local option.” While the approach to local option varied depending on the state, the basic idea behind this approach was that the law should carry out the will of the people in a particular community. In Massachusetts, “a vote is taken every year at the regular election in every city and town on the question, Shall licenses be granted? and the determination by the majority of voters lasts one year.” Eliot reasoned that the strength of local option rested in the fact that the same public sentiment determining whether or not a community would issue liquor licenses was also “at the back” of the officials who administered that system.

---


While the Legislative subcommittee supported the existence of liquor licenses if communities chose to allow saloons, it also felt that proper oversight of licensing boards was critical to avoid corruption. Because “licenses are large money-prizes, and whoever awards many of them year after year is more liable to the suspicion of yielding to improper influences,” communities should avoid using judges to grant or deny licenses. The subcommittee summary endorsed a Massachusetts law creating mayor-appointed license commissioners to serve staggered six-year terms with one commissioner retiring every two years.

Ultimately, the Legislative subcommittee concluded that no one specific set of legislative guidelines could be endorsed as the one successful approach to the promotion of temperance. Eliot wrote, “That law is best which is best administered.” Most legislative approaches had strengths and weaknesses, but “illicit selling assumes large proportions only when communities pursued prohibitory legislation.

Actions of the Legislative Subcommittee

Eliot’s Legislative Committee completed their investigations swiftly. The subcommittee was formed at the first meeting in April of 1893. Original members included Eliot, Low, and Wines. These members chose a subject that future Committee of

---

137 Eliot, “Legislative Aspects,” 64.
Fifty member Atwater referred to as a “storm center.”\textsuperscript{138} Eliot presented a preliminary plan of action for his subcommittee’s investigation at the October 20, 1893 meeting. The subcommittee intended to compare and contrast communities with varying levels of temperance law such as total prohibition, high license, and low license laws. The subcommittee defined high license as “license with indirect limitation of the number of licenses by high fees” and low license as “license with direct limitation either by statute or by the discretionary power of the licensing authority.”\textsuperscript{139} Some of the data looked at the number of arrests due to drunkenness, the number of arrests due to violence, and the number of cases of insanity traceable to drunkenness. The subcommittee also wanted to examine the system of licensing boards, which often included high levels of subjectivity and therefore were easily susceptible to abuse and corruption. Eliot explained that this would “be a contribution to pure politics as well as temperance.”\textsuperscript{140} It was a topic Low stated strong opinions about in the late 1880s as mayor of Brooklyn, when he asserted excise boards were “not right nor just” and were “useless and abominable.”\textsuperscript{141}

The final topic the subcommittee wanted to explore was examining the results of experiments by communities such as Evanston, Illinois, Colorado Springs, Colorado, and

\textsuperscript{138} Atwater wrote this in the “Suggestions for Summary of Report of Physiological Sub-Committee.” He said, “While one storm center of the liquor question is in its legislative aspects, the key to the whole situation is in the physiology of the subject.” Atwater to Billings, 31 March 1904, Billings Papers, New York Public Library.


Oberlin, Ohio to completely exclude the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors.

After recommending Frederick Wines to complete the statistical investigation, Eliot concluded by saying, “The inquiries mentioned in this report are by no means original suggestions. Some of them have already been made for limited areas or special communities”¹⁴² but that it would be a useful public to offer some conclusive evidence regarding their effectiveness.

At the April 7, 1894 meeting, James C. Carter was officially added to the Committee of Fifty and added to the Legislative subcommittee. Additionally, “The report of the Committee on Legislation was presented by Pres. Eliot, and after discussion by Fr. Conaty, Dr. Bowditch, Col. Wright, Dr. Gould, and Dr. Billings, this report was accepted and ordered to be printed.”¹⁴³ Four thousand dollars was then appropriated for Legislative subcommittee work. In his report, Eliot recommended John Koren as an additional investigator alongside Wines. At the November 16, 1894 meeting, Eliot presented an update on Koren and Wines’ inquiries. Eliot believed that within nine months, Wines and Koren would complete six of their ten reports and exhaust the four thousand dollar budget that had been allotted.¹⁴⁴ He therefore requested an additional two thousand dollars. As Eliot’s subcommittee would be the first to publish, Eliot would also face the task of figuring out the plan of action for publication. He asserted that,


¹⁴³ Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 7 April 1894.

¹⁴⁴ “Report of the Committee on the Legislative Aspects of the Liquor Problem,” 16 November 1894, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library. It was also pointed out that Koren and Wines paid their own expenses.
It is a difficult question how to deal with the reports thus prepared. To print them in full will involve considerable expense, for they will undoubtedly contain together at least 1200 pages of manuscript beside many diagrams and tables, and a few maps. It would be possible for the Sub-Committee to prepare a summary of facts established and conclusions reached; but unless the reports of the experts are printed, the Committee of Fifty will lack the evidence upon which the conclusions of the Sub-Committee are based.145

Eliot then recommended this question be tabled until the spring meeting.

At the November 15, 1895 meeting, it was voted that the summary and conclusions of the Legislative subcommittee be printed and privately distributed to the entire Committee of Fifty.146 Additionally, the Ethical subcommittee requested that both the Physiological and Legislative subcommittees “concern themselves at the earliest possible moment with the subject of instruction in temperance in the Public Schools in conjunction with the inquiry of Prof. Sloane.”147 Despite the request, there is no evidence in any meeting minutes that the Legislative subcommittee ever became involved with the S.T.I. investigation. The last event relating to the Legislative subcommittee at this meeting was the nomination of Charles J. Bonaparte to become a member of the Committee of Fifty. His name was officially added to the list of members on January 10, 1896.

In the January 10, 1896 meeting minutes, Peabody included his prefatory note regarding Eliot’s request for strict confidentiality when handling the draft of the


146 Eliot followed up this distribution of the report with a letter pleading Committee members to “take every needed precaution to secure the enclosed pamphlet from premature publication.” Charles W. Eliot to Committee of Fifty, 23 September 1895, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.

147 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 15 November 1895.
investigation. At the meeting itself, it was voted that publication of Legislative report be approved and that the Executive Committee would be in charge of determining the form and manner of that publication. Additionally, the Legislative subcommittee requested that the report be referred back to the whole Committee, and the Committee recommended “that the paragraph concerning tendencies of future legislation be stricken out.” 148

The following June, the Committee of Fifty meeting was cancelled. Instead, each subcommittee sent a report of updates. Eliot reported that the subcommittee “began negotiations with publishers for the publication of the original reports to the Sub-Committee, with the report of the Sub-Committee to the full Committee.” In other words, they wanted to publish Koren and Wines’ reports as well as Eliot’s report. Eliot provided a lengthy, detailed explanation of the process of finding a publisher, finally concluding that, “the Sub-Committee, being impressed with the advice given by experts in the publishing business, finally entered into negotiations with Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., to prepare…a volume of convenient size to be sold at a low price.” 149 At the November 19, 1896 meeting, one that Peabody told Committee members he expected would most likely last the whole day, the Legislative subcommittee did not appear in the meeting minutes. The February 27, 1897 meeting minutes also do not refer to the Legislative subcommittee; additionally no Legislative subcommittee members were at the meeting. In advance of the November 19, 1897 meeting, Eliot provided updates in a Legislative subcommittee report. He stated that the full subcommittee report had been published by Houghton Mifflin, explaining that,

148 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 10 January 1896.
The publishers advertised it in magazines and in newspapers to a reasonable extent, and sent circulars to people who presumably would be interested in it, especially in the States whose laws have been investigated. In about eight months, up to October 21st, 1897, 1339 copies were sold, and to August 1st, 203 copies had been given away to members of the Committee of Fifty, Editors, and so forth. The Sub-Committee receive a royalty of 12 1/2 cents per copy sold. The abridging of the manuscript reports of Mssrs. Wines and Koren cost $200; but the publishers, under whose direction the reduction was made, allowed the Sub-Committee $110 towards this cost in the form of payment for an article in the Atlantic Monthly of December, 1896...The publishers anticipate a continued demand for the book during the coming winter, while liquor laws are under discussion in local legislatures.150

Eliot completed his report by stating that the Legislative subcommittee had not taken on any fresh work in over a year. On March 26, 1898, Eliot reported that the Legislative Aspects of the Drink problem “continues to have a moderate sale. Between August 1, 1897, and February 1, 1898, 426 copies were sold. The number of copies sold prior to August 1, 1897, was 1235. There have been sold in all 1661 copies, and there have been given away 210.”151 In preparation for the November 18, 1898 meeting, Eliot reported that the first edition of the Legislative Aspects book had been exhausted and that the second edition with updates from Koren’s New York inquiry had been issued. Eliot stated,

The first edition consisted of 1988 copies, of which 213 were given away and 1775 were sold. Copies of the second edition have been sent to the members of the Committee of Fifty, and to twenty-three persons in Boston and the vicinity who, in the winter of 1894-1895, contributed $2125 toward the work of this Sub-Committee. The publishers take note of all public discussions on the subject, and


expect to sell the second edition, gradually, in different parts of the country wherever questions of new liquor legislation are agitated.\textsuperscript{152}

If 1,7775 copies of the first edition were sold, then the Committee would have received $221.87 in royalties. After Eliot provided this information, the Legislative subcommittee almost ceases to appear in meeting minutes. The only exception to this was a copy of a letter included in the November 17, 1899 minutes. The letter was written by John Koren and addressed to Eliot. Referring to Eliot’s legislative report, Koren wrote,

\begin{quote}
It may interest you to learn that this first volume of your Committee is still attracting attention abroad…You may be aware of the extensive use made of our reports by the authors of the English publication The Temperance Problem and Social Reform, of which five editions have been brought out within a year. Mr. Sherwell, one of the authors, lately told me about the very considerable attention paid to the studies of the committee in England, the discussions it has given rise to, etc. Even from far away in Finland I have received an appreciative review of the book. Trusting that these items may not be wholly uninteresting to you.\textsuperscript{153}
\end{quote}

Considering the university presidents’ desire to improve their academic reputation in relation to that of Europe, this would have made Eliot happy.

Although “The Liquor Problem in its Legislative Aspects” might have been circulating through Europe, and even though Eliot provided extensive details into the publication process, he put a more positive spin on book sales than Houghton Mifflin did. In 1900, Eliot wrote Houghton Mifflin requesting that they spend some money to advertise “The Liquor Problem.” Houghton Mifflin responded, “we think we shall be inclined to comply with your wish, although our confidence in increasing the sale of the

\textsuperscript{152} “Report of the Legislative Subcommittee,” 18 November 1898, John S. Billings Papers.

\textsuperscript{153} Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 17 November 1899.
book in this way is not so strong as we wish it were.”

Between February and August of 1900, the book had sold a total of twenty-one copies. Houghton Mifflin sent Eliot a royalty check for $2.62. In 1903, the book had slightly more success; after selling thirty-four copies, Houghton Mifflin sent a royalty check for $4.25.

Findings of the Economic Subcommittee

“The Economic Aspects of the Liquor Problem” was published in 1899, and the summary of its findings, written by Henry W. Farnam, was published in 1905. Farnam concluded his subcommittee’s summary by saying, “economic forces are already working in the direction of moderation which need but be stimulated and directed to become effective allies of the moral agencies which are attacking the evils of the liquor habit.” Farnam supported this claim with the finding that employers sought stricter rules on alcohol consumption because rapid technological advances led to the need for more sobriety among equipment operators. Employees, for their part, saw the value in alcohol moderation as unions became more common. Unions needed temperate leaders,


155 Accounting Receipt, 31 August 1900, Charles W. Eliot Papers, Harvard University.

156 Accounting Receipt, 31 August 1903, Charles W. Eliot Papers, Harvard University.


and individual union members did not want their contributions to support the alcohol habits of other workers.159

The Economic subcommittee also considered the role of the liquor industry in the production of wealth. In its early stages, the Economic subcommittee divided some aspects of its investigation with the United States Department of Labor. The Department of Labor examined the wealth created from producing and selling alcohol. This study determined that 364,000 people were employed by the liquor industry, and if each of those people had a family of four dependents, then 1,800,000 Americans depended on the production and sale of alcohol. This, the report stated, equaled the combined population of Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.160

Nonetheless, the Economic subcommittee’s investigation also examined the role of the liquor industry in the destruction of wealth by scrutinizing the industry’s relation to crime and poverty. The subcommittee hired statistician John Koren to examine the relationship between alcohol and poverty through different demographics such as sex, class, race, and nationality. While Koren’s findings revealed that men comprised the majority of people who ended up in almshouses due to problems with alcohol, twice as many women than men ended up in poverty due to the alcohol issues of others. Farnam’s summary concluded, “The picture which these figures call up of the lives of women ruined by intemperance of their husbands or fathers is too significant to need any

159 Farnam, “Economic Aspects,” 130.

comment.” Additionally, the Economic subcommittee’s investigations concluded that while,

the poverty which comes under the notice of the charity organization societies can be traced to liquor in some 25 per cent of all the cases, and that in almshouses the percentage is 37, we are inevitably led to the belief that, while much poverty may be due to the faults of society, more than a quarter of it in our country is due very directly and obviously to a very prominent fault of the individual.162

While the subcommittee did not feel it was able to identify as direct a correlation between alcohol and crime as it did between alcohol and poverty, it nonetheless presented a number of statistics about crime, finding “considerable differences in the showing made by different nationalities.”163 Through this immense collection of data, the Economic subcommittee hoped to succeed in the course of time, in making the conditions under which we live better. The progress in sanitary conditions and in the treatment of disease, made through scientific investigation, ought certainly to encourage us in attempting to further a moral reform by similar means.164

Actions of the Economic Subcommittee

When the Sociological Group met in April 1893 and transformed into the Committee of Fifty, it also laid out the general plan for subcommittees. The Economic subcommittee did not appear in the original plan (the Physiological, Ethical, and Legislative aspects took shape as well as a committee to complete the Committee). The

164 Farnam, “Economic Aspects,” 89.
subcommittee first appeared in the meeting minutes of October 20, 1893, when it was proposed that a subcommittee “on the Relations of the Liquor Problem to Economic Conditions, Poverty, and Crime” be formed. The temporary chairman of the Committee of Fifty, Carroll D. Wright, appointed five members to the Economic subcommittee: Francis A. Walker, who served as chairman, E.B. Andrews, Z.R. Brockway, Henry Farnam, who served as the group’s secretary\textsuperscript{165} and Wright himself. The subcommittee laid out an extensive list of topics.\textsuperscript{166} They planned to investigate the relations of the liquor problem: to the securing of employment, in its relations to different occupations (for example, does night work or overwork increase the problem?), in its relations to irregularity of employment, in its relations to the efficient use of machinery (and whether stress related to operating machinery affects liquor consumption), in its relations to workingmen’s budgets, in its relations to comforts and luxuries (how far is the liquor habit counteracted by comforts such as good cooking?), in its relations to sanitary conditions, in its relations to pauperism and crime, in its relations to the habits of different nationalities (amended to include black citizens in the South), and in its relations to North American Indians. Additionally they wanted to assess the fiscal importance of the liquor interest for state and national taxation as well as examine the extent of the people and money involved in the liquor business.

\textsuperscript{165} The Economic subcommittee was the only subcommittee to designate a secretary.

\textsuperscript{166} This list of plans was not included in the Billings papers collection. However at the January 10, 1896 meeting, Walker made a statement to the Committee saying, “It will be remembered that the report this subcommittee made, in December, 1893, outlined the topics which it was thought desirable to undertake” and then listed the topics. Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 10 January 1896.
Not much happened for the Economic subcommittee during the next two years. At the April 7, 1894 meeting, Wright presented the Economic subcommittee report in the absence of Walker, and “a statement was made as to the prospects of investigation by the National Government of the Drink Problem.” The Economic subcommittee was then allotted $400 toward their work. At the November 16, 1894 meeting, Walker presented a report of the Economic subcommittee, and Wright presented a “supplementary” report. Near the end of the meeting, Farnam presented a bibliography of the Liquor Problem in Relation to Economic Conditions of Poverty and Crime. Again, no report was attached to the meeting minutes as other subcommittees had done. The Economic subcommittee did not appear in November 15, 1895 meeting minutes.

At the January 10, 1896 meeting, Francis Walker explained the lack of productivity from the Economic subcommittee. He stated,

The apparent idleness during nearly two years has been due to the fact that, inasmuch as an investigation such as they outlined can best by undertaken by governmental authority, they deemed it inexpedient and wasteful to spend the money of the committee in a piece of work which would be…imperiled if done by them. They are very glad to be able to report than Congress has now at last authorized the Department of Labor to undertake this investigation, and that Colonel Wright, the Chief of the Department, has made his plans for its execution.\footnote{Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 10 January 1896.}

Now that it was clear which parts of the investigation could be pursued by the Department of Labor— the first six topics plus the last two relating to taxation and the extent of the liquor business— the Economic subcommittee would explore the questions relating to comforts and luxuries, sanitary conditions, pauperism, crime, the habits of nationalities, and the impact on North American Indians. There was one topic— sanitary conditions—that would be explored by both groups, and the Committee of Fifty’s private
work would supplement the government work. In order to complete this work, the subcommittee presented two plans. Much of their work “may be investigated for [the subcommittee] by the officers of the organized charity associations and of the college settlements, with little expense to the committee.” Most of the remaining work would require an expert, which Walker estimated would cost the Committee approximately $2,000. After Walker’s presentation, the Committee voted to grant the $2,000 appropriation.

The Economic subcommittee’s June 1896 report provided an update on their work. They decided to hire John Koren “who had done very satisfactory work for the Committee on Legislative Aspects.” Koren also happened to be married to Carroll Wright’s niece since 1894 and had been hired by the U.S. Department of Labor to go to Europe in 1891 and 1893 to study the Gothenburg System of liquor control. Koren began by tackling the question exploring to what extent alcohol had been the cause of pauperism and destitution. He currently had the cooperation of at least twenty-seven charity organizations across the country. According to the report, “The method of investigation to be carried out by them is that of case counting.” On the question of luxuries and comforts, the subcommittee had sought correspondence with university and social settlements in cities across the country; fifteen had to that point agreed to work with the committee. The final update centered on “The Relations of the Liquor Problem to the Colored Population of the South.” It was reported that this investigation had not

168 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 10 January 1896.


progressed far yet but “about sixty communications have been received on the subject from various influential people in the south.” The report ended with the conclusion that “The committee do not expect to obtain any results for at least a year, but they have already gone far enough and received sufficient encouragement to believe that their work will be valuable, and they hope that it will not be allowed to suffer for lack of funds.”

At the November 9, 1896 meeting, Economic subcommittee member E.B. Andrews submitted his resignation, which was “accepted with regret.”\(^{171}\) Richard Gilder and John Graham Brooks were invited to join the Committee and assigned to the Economic subcommittee. Additionally, Walker called attention also to the governmental inquiry directed by Colonel Wright, an inquiry arranged with no official relation to the work of the Committee of Fifty, but fortunately authorized by Congress at the same time and making it possible for the Economic Committee to limit greatly its range of research.\(^{172}\)

After Walker made this statement, Farnam presented a summary of the work completed since June. Further underscoring the connections between the Committee and the Department of Labor, Farnam specified that Koren worked on subcommittee investigations until June 1. Then, “During the month of June he did not work for the committee but was engaged in an investigation for the Department of Labor in Washington. He resumed work for the committee in July.”\(^{173}\) Farnam went on to report that they now had thirty-eight charity organizations cooperating with their inquiry and that “Only two of the societies appealed to have thus far declined to assist the committee for other reasons than their inability to do so, namely those of Boston and

\(^{171}\) Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 9 November 1896.

\(^{172}\) Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 9 November 1896.

\(^{173}\) Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 9 November 1896.
Philadelphia...New York is still in doubt.” The subcommittee would also now begin its inquiry into the relationship between alcohol and crime. Committee member Z.R. Brockway, who had “hitherto been prevented by stress of work from taking part in the meetings of the sub-committee, has shown a great interest in this part of the investigation.” It is possible that Brockway’s stress of work related to being investigated by the State Board of Charities in 1894 for his management of the Elmira State Reformatory, though it is suggested this was a partisan attack.\textsuperscript{174} Farnam also included an update from Koren, who stated that,

\begin{quote}
The amount of co-operation secured by the committee indicates in some measure the degree of interest, not to say enthusiasm its plans have awakened even in distant places. The manner in which our not inconsiderable requests are received, and the many expressions of delight at the committee having undertaken this work, are, to say the least, encouraging.
\end{quote}

For the work of the Department of Labor, Wright also reported to Farnam

\begin{quote}
the pleasing statement that both the liquor interests and the temperance interests are viewing his canvas with confidence. The liquor interests take the ground that many statements as to the cost of the liquor traffic and kindred subjects made by temperance writers and speakers have been exaggerations and this investigation will show the truth. On the other hand temperance writers feel that it is desirable to substitute for statements, necessarily conjectural figures based on official authority.
\end{quote}

The Committee of Fifty set out to collect facts that would “contribute in any degree to a more rational and comprehensive union of the forces in American life which make for sobriety, self-control, good citizenship, and social responsibility.”\textsuperscript{175} Therefore, it was logical that this news would appeal to them in their efforts. At the conclusion of the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{174} Dictionary of American Biography, s.v. “Zebulon Reed Brockway.”
\textsuperscript{175} Peabody, “Introduction,” 11.
\end{flushright}
subcommittee’s updates, it was stated that Koren would need to be retained for at least another year, which would require an additional $2,000 appropriation.

At the start of the February 27, 1897 meeting, Farnam announced that Francis Walker died suddenly on January 5. After providing a tribute to Walker for his “eminence as an economist, his long experience as an administrator, his skill as a statistician, and his unfailing tact,”176 the Committee returned to work by providing $2,000 “lately procured through Professor Farnam” for the subcommittee work. Later in the meeting, Farnam presented updates on the subcommittee inquiries, whose momentum continued while Koren toured numerous states. However, Farnam concluded,

> We have…exhausted our appropriation…Although our request for an appropriation was not granted at the last meeting, the secretary [Dodge] felt justified in personally assuming responsibility for Mr. Koren’s salary until the present meeting of the general committee, since to stop short now would practically amount to throwing away all the money…spent on this work.

The subcommittee pleaded for $2,000, which they considered “imperatively needed by this committee.” As the report concluded, Farnam reported that Wright’s Department of Labor inquiries were progressing “satisfactorily” and that Wright would replace Walker as chair of the subcommittee.

In its report for the November 11, 1897 meeting, the Economic subcommittee reported that they could begin tabulating the reports they had been collecting and would hire F.I. Sanford of the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor for “this more mechanical part of the investigation.”177 They then went on to state that,

> The kind of work undertaken by this committee is necessarily slow and costly…[however] It certainly will be the most comprehensive and extended

176 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 27 February 1897.

177 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 11 November 1897.
investigation ever undertaken into one of the important causes of poverty and of crime, and whether it confirms or modifies conclusions based upon partial statistics in the past, it cannot fail to be valuable.

After giving a brief update on the Department of Labor work, the subcommittee speculated that their work would be completed within a year. In all its updates, the Economic subcommittee did not provide many previews of its findings. Other groups, such as the Physiological subcommittee, were more open with their research. Most updates explain how the data collection was progressing, but they either did not know where the evidence would point them or did not say.

Additionally, even though the Economic subcommittee was producing information on business and industry, it did not appear that much of the funding for this group came from the businessmen without academic connections on the Committee. Most support seemed to come from the Farnam family or William E. Dodge, who provided a $750 loan to cover Koren’s salary. This further underscores that most of the Committee’s efforts were driven by academicians such as Farnam, who would write the summary of the final report and believed it to be the most comprehensive investigation of its kind ever undertaken.

Only a brief update was provided for the Economic subcommittee at the November 1897 meeting. In advance of the April 22, 1898 meeting, the subcommittee submitted a report on its progress. The report stated that the subcommittee had been self-supporting financially since the last report; additionally, the Department of Labor work was completed and would be published soon. In preparation for the November 1898 meeting, the subcommittee reported that it continued to self-support, making no demands on the treasurer. Additionally, they were working on publishing arrangements through
conversations with Francis G. Peabody as well as Houghton Mifflin, and “it is expected that they will consent to publish the report in a form similar to that adopted for the report of the Legislative Sub-Committee, and on similar terms.”

At the November 18, 1898 meeting, the Economic subcommittee presented a draft of its report, and the Committee voted, “that the draft be accepted as showing the general scope of the report and that the Sub-Committee be allowed to secure by correspondence the assent of the general Committee to the report in its final form.”

The subcommittee received twenty-six letters “either assenting to the report without qualifications or suggesting modifications in some matters of detail…and the sub-committee felt justified in assuming that the Committee had endorsed its report.” The subcommittee also provided details of their deal with Houghton Mifflin. Houghton Mifflin had started to tighten the restrictions on Committee of Fifty publications. The report stated,

The terms of this contract differ slightly from those made with the Legislative Sub-Committee. In the case of the earlier volume, the committee received a royalty of ten percent on all sales; in the case of the present volume no royalty is to be paid until the first cost has been met, when the committee will receive 50 per cent. In view of the fact that this volume contains about 90 pages of tabular matter, which adds materially to the expense of manufacture, the publishers were unwilling to pay a royalty until they had secured themselves against loss, and the arrangement seems fair to both parties.

---
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At the May 10, 1899 meeting, Farnam presented a history of the Economic subcommittee’s work from the first meeting of the Committee of Fifty until the present. Farnam was also Acting Secretary of the Committee during this time, as Peabody was in Europe, so he provided a detailed account of his own presentation. One notable fact revealed that while Committee publications such as Peabody’s introduction to the Summary of Reports in 1905 reported that the Economic subcommittee was allotted $4,550 by the Committee of Fifty Treasury, the group raised an additional $4,966. Therefore, the total money used for the Economic subcommittee investigation (not including the portion completed by the Department of Labor) totaled $9,366. This was the only subcommittee that reported additional income beyond what appeared on Treasurer’s Reports. The Physiological subcommittee, for instance, accumulated additional funds but it is only briefly and informally alluded to in subcommittee meeting minutes and letters between members. By the November 17, 1899 meeting, Carroll Wright reported that the “Economic Aspects of the Liquor Problem” had been published.

Conclusion

The work of the Legislative and Economic subcommittees revealed the grassroots nature of the Committee’s fundraising attempts. Eliot used his local Boston connections to secure a portion of the necessary funding. The Economic subcommittee relied on the generosity of wealthy donors, such as the Dodge and Farnam families, to sustain its work. The Committee also seemed to use influential names strategically, placing Charles J. Bonaparte on the Legislative subcommittee to add some clout to its work, even though he was added after most of the work had been completed. Additionally, the Economic
subcommittee coordinated with the federal government in a manner that eased the financial burden of the research. These fundraising techniques had been seen before on an individual scale; what is notable is the way the Committee of Fifty brought these strategies together under the umbrella of one collective organization.

Beyond their efforts to raise money, the men on these subcommittees revealed some of the group’s ambitions. The Economic subcommittee was aware that the scale of its investigations was unprecedented. While the Legislative subcommittee refrained from grand statements about the scale of its report, Eliot went to great lengths to keep it confidential until its release, which underlined his belief in its potential significance. For all their efforts, their work was ultimately disregarded. Publishing sales were modest even in “storm centers” dealing with licensing decisions. Nonetheless, sociologist Harry Gene Levine pointed out how the Committee’s legislative recommendations predicted the alcohol control policy that would be developed in the years following Prohibition.182

Another notable feature of these two subcommittees is the way they completed their work without significant interference from the larger Committee of Fifty. Eliot’s legislative group met no resistance whatsoever. The Economic subcommittee experienced a few challenges to the completion of its work but none that expressed concern about the contents of the investigations. The delay in the start of the Economic subcommittee’s work hindered their ability to access Committee of Fifty funds because by 1896, the Committee had started to experience some financial challenges. However, the Committee allowed the Economic subcommittee’s work to move forward when Farnam provided the funds. Additionally, Dodge provided crucial financial assistance to keep the work going,

which was an action unique to the Economic subcommittee’s work. This lack of internal roadblocks within the organization is notable because the same could not be said for the work of the Ethical subcommittee that will be detailed in the next chapter.
Chapter III

A Study In Contrasts: The Case of the Ethical and Physiological Subcommittees

The trajectories of the Ethical and Physiological subcommittees’ investigations intersect and then diverge dramatically. This intersection sheds significant light on the influence and agenda of the Committee of Fifty’s academic leaders. The Ethical and Physiological subcommittees differed in one significant way from the Economic and Legislative subcommittees. While the members of the Economic and Legislative groups financially self-supported by one means or another, the Physiological and Ethical groups relied heavily on the coffers of the larger Committee to fund them. Neither group had members that brought a significant amount of money into the Committee. The Committee’s decisions regarding funding for these two subcommittees revealed a significant amount about the priorities and agenda of those with power in the Committee of Fifty.

When the Committee of Fifty published its summary of reports in 1905, the Ethical subcommittee’s report was published in an incomplete state. While other subcommittee summaries averaged thirty-six pages in length, the Ethical subcommittee summary was just over five pages. The report stated the summary’s abbreviated length was due to the death of Jacob L. Greene in 1905.\textsuperscript{183} However, the incompletion of the

report belies a deeper power struggle over the scope of the Ethical subcommittee’s work and the investigation of S.T.I.

While the Legislative and Economic subcommittees experienced a relatively smooth and short process for completing their investigations, the Ethical subcommittee experienced significant roadblocks to progress. At the same time, the Physiological subcommittee was by far the most active and involved subcommittee on the Committee of Fifty. Their group’s momentum was almost opposite that of the Committee as a whole. The Committee of Fifty started strong, raising thousands of dollars quickly and having its highest participation rates at the start. The Physiological subcommittee was active from the beginning and received significant appropriations, but the work that gained them the most attention—Atwater’s calorimeter experiments and Bowditch’s S.T.I. investigations—did not even begin until 1896 when the larger Committee began showing signs of funding and attendance issues. Despite an attendance decline from the Committee as a whole in later years, physiological subcommittee members such as Bowditch, Atwater, and Billings maintained high rates of attendance. As the Committee’s work as a whole experienced roadblocks to the completion of their investigations, university leaders acted to remove those roadblocks as much as possible for the Physiological subcommittee, paving new ways to fund their work.

Findings of the Ethical Subcommittee and Substitutes for the Saloon

The Ethical subcommittee never published an independent report, and “The death of Mr. Greene, March, 1905, has prevented the amplification of his special report”\textsuperscript{184} in

\textsuperscript{184} Greene, “Ethical Aspects,” 137.
the 1905 Summary of Investigations. In the abbreviated summary, Greene wrote that each of the other subcommittee investigations concludes “in a problem whose ethical significance is too obvious for discussion: a question of right use and abuse; of means of remedy and control; of individual and collective responsibility.”

In his summary Greene wrote a significant amount about human nature. He wrote, “the whole strength of the liquor traffic lies in the weakness of human nature on its social side, and it is on the structural social unit—the family—that retribution falls most crushingly.” He also pointed out how alcohol questions were “local problems” because they varied depending on the demographics of the population, the location of the community in an urban or rural setting, and other factors. Therefore, it would be impossible to “dogmatize with universal acceptance.” Instead, Greene asserted, the role of the Committee of Fifty would be to provide local citizens with a body of facts that they could determine how to apply to their own local situations. Ultimately, Greene’s summary briefly touched upon the other subcommittee reports and included some general statements about good and evil as well as the role of the individual within a society.

The “Substitutes for the Saloon report was published in 1901, and Raymond Calkins wrote the 1905 summary. The report sought to reconcile the fact that “the saloon stands at the same time for the source of the city’s crime and the centre of much of its

---
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social life.” The subcommittee investigated potential social alternatives that could provide similar benefits without the criminal side effects communities experienced from the sale and consumption of alcohol.

The saloon report asserted that a key legislative reform should be “the removal of the element of profit from the sale of liquor.” Citing the Norwegian system as a model, the subcommittee envisioned a social center in which “The barkeeper has no personal interest in his sales; on the contrary, his salary is dependent on his observance of the conditions under which liquor shall be sold.” The subcommittee also advocated for private philanthropic individuals to contribute to social outlets centered on non-alcohol based on endeavors such as gymnasiums, public parks, and clubs that catered to boys who might otherwise be pulled toward the influence of saloons.

The subcommittee also promoted the creation of laws that would support sanitary reform. Calkins argued, “houses should be provided with at least the elementary conditions of sanitation, privacy, air, and space. Yet these are denied to thousands of working people in our cities, who seek in a saloon what they should find in the house.” Beyond sanitary reform, the subcommittee emphasized the role of night-schools, public

---
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lectures, reading rooms, free public libraries, and other educational offerings as means to improve economic conditions and reduce dependency on saloons.\textsuperscript{194}

\textbf{Actions of The Ethical Subcommittee and Substitutes for the Saloon}

The Ethical subcommittee was introduced at the April 1893 meeting when the Sociological Group became the Committee of Fifty. The original members of the Ethical subcommittee were Bishop Henry C. Potter, Reverend Theodore T. Munger, and William E. Dodge. In preparation for the October 20, 1893 meeting, the subcommittee submitted a lengthy report attempting to define the scope of its investigations. The report began with the statement,

\begin{quote}
Your Committee finds itself at the outset embarrassed by the general and far-reaching character of the terms which define its scope. It is limited to the ethical aspects of the subject; but as Intemperance is hardly to be regarded in any other light than an evil, any aspect of it involves morals.\textsuperscript{195}
\end{quote}

The list of topics to be covered is too lengthy to repeat here; however, a sampling of the Ethical subcommittee’s investigative approach provides a sense of its tone:

\begin{quote}
“It is because we have on hand an unqualified and immeasurable evil that we are applying science to its solution; but it should be kept in mind that even passionate feeling is compatible with scientific examination; and that it stops short of being scientific if it holds feeling and moral sense in check.”

“The evil should be considered in its relation to the solidarity of society…It affects all in a peculiar degree. The reasons for both should be pointed out. Hence, what are the rights of society? and what methods of dealing with the evil are thus suggested.”

“A thorough examination of the theories of Dr. Rainsford and the Bishop of Chester in respect to the saloon, not only with a view to the possible usefulness of

\textsuperscript{194} Calkins, “Substitutes,” 179-181.

these theories, but also to ascertaining if they do or do not involve moral questions of a fundamental and, therefore, imperative character.”

“Should conflict with the evil be one of compromise and concession in order to make partial gains, or one of uncompromising hostility without the use of half-way measures?”

“It would be well to discuss the use of intoxicating liquors in view of the liability of creating ‘the appetite.’ The question runs into pathology; but so far as it indicates danger, What is duty?”

“An inquiry into the ethical aspects of the liquor problem would require a careful study of the various temperance movements in the country with a view to finding out the…purpose in them, and discovering their weakness or strength, and their results. 1. The early movement against distilleries in 1820-30. 2. The Washingtonians movement from 1840-50. 3. The anti-saloon crusade, beginning in Ohio. 4. The Evangelistic Temperance Revival now relevant.”

At the January 6, 1894 meeting, the membership of the Ethical subcommittee expanded to include professor Felix Adler, Brown president E.B. Andrews, Reverend Samuel W. Dike, Father A.P. Doyle, President Daniel Coit Gilman, Reverend Washington Gladden, Rabbi Gustav Gottheil, Jacob L. Greene, Reverend William R. Huntington, Reverend Alexander Mackay-Smith, Professor Francis G. Peabody, Professor William M. Sloane, and Charles Dudley Warner. At the April 7, 1894 meeting, Munger reported that Greene was elected chairman of the subcommittee. Additionally, the subcommittee’s report, presented partially by Munger and partially by Dike, was returned to the subcommittee for further consideration. The Ethical subcommittee also suggested that the Committee of Fifty make a public declaration of its purposes. Out of this suggestion came the Committee of Five— Low, Billings, Eliot, Potter, and Wright— to prepare a statement.
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On August 29th, 1894, Eliot sent Low a letter regarding the scope of the Ethical subcommittee. This letter revealed that Low had discussed the matter with Greene, and that Eliot agreed entirely with Low’s sentiments expressed in the letter. Eliot then went on to write:

I have to recognize that there is a certain historical fitness in attempting to present the ethical aspects, because the Committee of Fifty grew out of the Sociological Group, in which, as you know, ministers were a large element. When I first joined the Committee of Fifty I noticed the preponderance of this element, and endeavored to get another kind of man into the Committee. The result was to give the work of the Committee a scientific aspect. There were added a number of physiologists and political economists who took hold of the work with strong interest. However, the ministers side was also strengthened by adding Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, and Methodists, and Dr. Felix Adler. You remember that we have had a sort of preliminary report from the Sub-Committee on the Ethical Aspects, a report which laid out an enormous field of work. It seems to me that it is for the Committee of Fifty in open meeting to limit the work of the Sub-Committee on the Ethical Aspects. Is there not some field which they could safely cultivate? Could they not deal with this aspect of the matter?—for forty years the attention of the people has been directed to compelling temperance reform by legislation. One result has been that the means of inducing individual men and women to be temperate have been neglected. The legislation has done a deal of harm both direct and indirect, and the proper work on human character and conduct has been neglected. Is there not something here which the Sub-Committee on Ethical Aspects could deal with?197

Eliot’s suggestion in the letter to Low never surfaced in Committee meeting minutes.

Instead, at the November 16, 1894 meeting, Greene presented a resolution stating that,

The committee begs to suggest that there is a field of inquiry which it is necessary to explore, in order to a comprehensive scientific treatment of the Drink Question in the totality of its present status. The facts lying in that field are ethical in character. They include all the existing methods of Temperance work...including instruction in schools, churches, and the incidental literature and methods of the various Temperance Societies, the social and family life and customs, the employments and recreations of the people.198

197 Charles W. Eliot to Seth Low, 29 August 1894, Seth Low Papers, Columbia University Library.

198 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 16 November 1894.
This was the first appearance suggesting an examination of temperance instruction in schools. The meeting minutes then reported that after a lengthy discussion aiming to determine “the accurate definition of the province of the Ethical Committee, this resolution was laid on the table.” At the November 15, 1895 meeting, Greene “reported the progress of the inquiry by [professor William M. Sloane] as to instruction in Public Schools, and the investigation of [Francis G. Peabody and Samuel W. Dike], and a request was presented in behalf of the Ethical Committee” that the Physiological and Legislative subcommittees get involved in the inquiry regarding temperance teaching in public schools. No response to the resolution was mentioned in the meeting minutes. At the same meeting, Peabody presented a report on “Substitutes for the Saloon in the City of Boston” and the Committee voted to print confidential copies of the report for Committee members to view. At the January 10, 1896 meeting, Peabody again presented on the Substitutes for the Saloon and it was voted “That the question of publication of this report be referred to the Executive Committee, with power.”

In lieu of a June 1896 meeting, the subcommittees submitted their updates. Greene wrote that he was pleased to report Sloane would have a presentation on his S.T.I. investigation prepared for the following meeting. Greene also reminded the Committee of his request to get the Physiological and Legislative subcommittees involved in the
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investigation by examining “State Enactments” of the instruction. Additionally, Dr. Dike was preparing a study of “Drink and the Home” which should be ready by the fall.

At the November 9, 1896 meeting, E.B. Andrews of the Ethical and Economic subcommittees resigned. Walter A. Wyckoff presented Professor Sloane’s investigation on temperance instruction. Wyckoff was a lecturer in sociology and a colleague of Sloane’s at Princeton. After the Committee discussed the report, “it was voted: -- That the hearty thanks of the Committee of Fifty be offered to Mr. Wyckoff, and that his report be referred to the Ethical Committee, with power to print.” After taking a lunch break, the Ethical subcommittee continued presentations. Gilman presented a paper “on the influence of the alcohol habit on the capacity for work” which was referred to the Physiological subcommittee for consideration. Dike presented a report on the Provisions made by Churches and by Temperance and other Publication Societies for instruction in Temperance within the Home itself, together with opinions of certain Professors of Ethics regarding the work practicable in the home in this direction; and this report was accepted and referred to the Ethical Committee.

At the February 27, 1897 meeting, Greene provided an update calling for confidentiality with regard to Wyckoff’s presentation. He believed it would be “inexpedient” to make public any part of the investigation until it was fully completed. Greene seemed to be choosing his words carefully when he said,
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Resolved, that while this Sub-Committee is deeply impressed with the present evidence of inadequacy and inaccuracy in the prevailing methods of temperance instruction in the public schools, it is also of the opinion that the action of the Committee of Fifty should be not primarily critical and condemnatory but positive and constructive.\textsuperscript{206}

Greene recognized that the Committee’s work could be headed toward controversy.

Additionally, he suggested that,

[T]his Sub-Committee urges upon the attention of the Physiological Sub-Committee the preparation of a practical and popular statement of the action and effect of alcohol. Resolved, that in case the Physiological Sub-Committee accept the foregoing recommendation, the chairman of the Ethical Sub-Committee may, upon the approval of the Committee of Fifty, call upon the members of that Sub-Committee to assist in raising the sum necessary for the purposes of its own investigation.\textsuperscript{207}

This proposal was discussed by Atwater, Billings, Conaty, Dike, Dodge, and Hartwell. Then it was voted that the recommendations be adopted and approved by the Committee of Fifty. Finally, the Ethical subcommittee picked up a new member through a request from Greene: Father Conaty.

In preparation for the November 1897 meeting, the Ethical subcommittee reported the facts of how it got a late start compared to other subcommittees and struggled to identify a clear scope of investigation. Greene reported that the subcommittee’s work fell in two main directions, which were “to ascertain and set forth the ethical significance of the facts as finally found by the investigating committees, and to deal with the educational elements of the matter. The former task must await the final reports of the
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subcommittees.” Greene then reminded the Committee of the proposals set forth and adopted at the prior meeting for a plan of action in relation to the S.T.I. inquiry. He hinted at a person he wanted to hire to conduct the investigation though he did not provide a name, and Greene stated that “his work will include a much more radical and scientific treatment of the matter than is indicated in the report [made at the last meeting.]” This is an interesting statement; it is possible that Greene was addressing criticism or concerns from other Committee members regarding the quality of the investigation’s scientific approach. The last item the Subcommittee addressed was the progress of a report by Dr. Hartwell on amusements as related to the drink problem.

Greene followed up the subcommittee report with a letter to all Committee of Fifty members. This three-page letter detailed the Ethical subcommittee’s desire to employ J.M. Rice, editor of Forum, to complete the investigation on S.T.I. and explained Rice’s proposed methods of investigation. At the November 19, 1897 meeting, Greene reiterated the sentiments in the letter and stated, “It is earnestly hoped that the importance of this work may so impress the members of the Committee that they may actively undertake to secure the necessary contributions and at the earliest practicable moment.” After Warner further described the proposed research and its cost, “The proposal of the Ethical Committee was discussed and criticized from various points of view.”
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view by President Eliot, Professor Bowditch, President MacAlister, and Mr. Dodge, and finally laid on the table"\textsuperscript{212} until later in the meeting. When the Committee returned to the discussion, Dodge, Gould, Hartwell, and Munger weighed in. Then “it was voted: -- That the question of proceeding in the investigation proposed in the circular of the Ethical Committee be referred back to the Ethical Committee for further consideration by them of ways and means.”\textsuperscript{213}

The meeting minutes did not specify the contents of Eliot, Bowditch, MacAlister, and Dodge’s critiques, but it is possible that one issue was Greene’s choice of J.M. Rice to head the investigation. Rice was an outsider in research circles.\textsuperscript{214} In the 1890s, when the Committee of Fifty was in the midst of their investigations, Rice’s peers did not acknowledge his research on education.\textsuperscript{215} Beyond his outsider status, the Committee of Fifty might not have appreciated the way he delivered his message. The Committee of Fifty wanted to present themselves as impartial; Charles Dudley Warner’s 1897 editorial in Harper’s Monthly magazine stated, “any publications of results [the committee] might authorize will be accepted as genuine. In short, the object of the committee is to present a mass of facts to the American people, that they may understand the problem we have to deal with, and attack in a sober, practical, and scientific manner.”\textsuperscript{216} By contrast, the
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publications Rice presented to the American people in the early 1890s were far from sober; historian Lawrence Cremin described him as “opinionated” and his writing style as “pungent.”217 While newspapers responded to Rice’s series of articles with some sympathy and citizens expressed outrage at the weaknesses Rice exposed, the response of the professional press “ranged from chilling disdain to near-hysteria.”218 Boston’s *The Journal of Education*, for instance, described that Rice had “demonstrated beyond cavil that he is merely a sensational critic,”219 and other journals described Rice as a “carping journalist…[and] an intellectual snob who had completely missed the point of American public education” with his “radical” work.220

One other strike against J.M. Rice, beyond his outsider status, may have been competition. Alongside Rice’s popular and much-discussed series of articles in *Forum* was Charles Eliot’s “Wherein Popular Education Has Failed,”221 though that did not receive the attention or provoke the discussions that Rice’s exposé did. Historian and Eliot biographer Hugh Hawkins stated that, “Eliot believed himself the first in America to use the phrase ‘the New Education’” and while “No one man launched the Progressive

---


Era in American education,” Eliot was an active participant and may have considered himself a leader.\textsuperscript{222} He may not have appreciated the competition.

Later in the meeting, Dike reported on the completion of his report, and it was referred to the Ethical Committee with power to print. Then,

Dr. Gould urged upon the attention of the Ethical Committee the opportunity of extending their researches by inquiry into possible social substitutes for the Saloon; President Eliot and Dr. MacAlister supported this…and it was voted:--

That the Ethical Committee be advised to take into consideration further inquiries into possible social substitutes for the saloon.\textsuperscript{223}

This meeting had a lot of ups and downs for the Ethical subcommittee. One significant door closed on them and another door opened, though it does not seem to be an opportunity Greene was asking for or seeking.

He alluded to this in the status report for the following meeting. He stated that after his proposal was rejected, “there does not seem to be very much in the whole work [of the subcommittee] as it now stands to inspire any considerable further contributions. I cannot see that the situation either calls for or permits any special activity on the part of the Ethical Sub-Committee.”\textsuperscript{224} It is interesting to note that Greene did not mention the Substitutes for the Saloon work recommended and approved at the end of the last meeting.
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At the April 22, 1898 meeting (in which Greene was absent), the state of the Ethical subcommittee was debated extensively:

Discussion was renewed on the financial condition and the general problem of the work of the Committee of Fifty, and especially on the province and future of the Ethical Committee; and after prolonged consideration it was moved by Bishop Potter that the Ethical Committee be discharged. Dr. Gould moved as a substitute that the title of the Sub-Committee be changed to read ‘The Sub-Committee on the Social Aspects of the Drink Problem.’ The substitute motion was defeated: 9-12.

Finally, Potter proposed a suggestion that a sub-committee of the Ethical subcommittee be assigned to investigate the substitutes for the saloon. Potter proposed that the sub-committee include Peabody, Gould, Warner, and Sloane. The resolution was approved.

The new subcommittee on saloons put themselves immediately to work. On October 1, 1898, they sent a letter to all Committee members. The lengthy letter explained the basis for investigation: the belief that people do not frequent saloons simply for alcohol but also due to the desire for social interaction, and a desire to consider developing an alternative for the alcohol-based saloon. This new subcommittee would extend Peabody’s earlier investigation on saloon substitutes beyond the city of Boston; now, as then, they would employ Rev. Raymond Calkins to do the research. The end of the letter included a request for help from the rest of the Committee of Fifty; specifically,
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they wanted Committee members to submit names of people or social agencies they personally knew that could contribute research in support of the investigation.\footnote{E.R.L. Gould, Francis G. Peabody, William M. Sloane, and Charles Dudley Warner to Committee of Fifty, 1 October 1898, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.}

If the Substitutes for the Saloon subcommittee thought they might get more support from the Committee of Fifty than the Ethical subcommittee received, they were wrong. On January 25, 1899, the Substitutes subcommittee sent another letter stating,

During the month of October last, the enclosed letter and schedules were sent to each member of the Committee of Fifty. The simple request was made by the Special Sub-Committee on Substitutes for the Saloon that the object of their inquiry should receive the attention of members of the Committee of Fifty, and such assistance as they might be able to offer. Somewhat to the surprise of your Sub-Committee, barely half a dozen replies have to far been received.\footnote{E.R.L. Gould, Francis G. Peabody, William M. Sloane, and Charles Dudley Warner to Committee of Fifty, 25 January 1899, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.}

Prior to the April 1899 meeting, Gould provided an update regarding the investigations of the subcommittee. They had enlisted the help of a number of people around the country including professors from Stanford, Johns Hopkins, and University of Pennsylvania as well as the Head of the Brooklyn Board of Charities and a representative from the Kingsley House.\footnote{“Report of the Special Subcommittee on Substitutes for the Saloon,” 14 April 1899, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.} At the April 1899 meeting, Gould reported on the results of the investigation as to whether a non-alcoholic “temperance bar” could sustain itself; it was found “not favorable to the success of such experiments.”\footnote{Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 28 April 1899.} At the November 17, 1899 meeting, Gould provided updates on the plans for publication of his subcommittee’s
report. Additionally, he stated, “It is believed that this volume will be of direct and serious usefulness to any person who may desire to establish such substitutional recreation under any special conditions in the country.”

At the April 18, 1900 meeting, a summary of the Substitutes for the Saloon subcommittee was presented. The summary pointed out that,

the purpose of our inquiry…is less technical and academic than has been the greater part of the work of the Committee of Fifty. It is intended to collect such evidence concerning enterprises actually undertaken as substitutes for the saloon, and to present in such a form the advantages and limitations of each scheme, that persons wishing to enter on work of a similar character may find judicious direction based on positive experience.

The report then went on to detail the layout for chapters and topics of the subcommittee’s pending publication, which included topics such as “The Saloon as a Social Center,” “Legislation and Substitution,” “Clubs of the People,” “Clubs for the People” and “The Lunch Room and the Coffee House,” among others. The report also listed the state of funding for the subcommittee’s work. They had received approximately $1,000 for their work in addition to $595 that was a balance conveyed from the Ethical subcommittee’s appropriations.

In the same meeting minutes, a letter from Jacob Greene in his role as Ethical subcommittee chair was printed. Greene wanted to convey that he was awaiting the results of the Physiological subcommittee report and urged it to be printed as soon as possible due to the urgency of enacting secondary school reform. A month later, Billings sent Greene a letter detailing the ethical conclusions of the Physiological subcommittee,

---
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concluding that, “It does not seem desirable to attempt to give systematic instruction to children under twelve years of age on the subject of alcohol or of alcoholic beverages.”

At the April 27, 1900 meeting, the Committee appropriated $700 to the Substitutes for the Saloon to conclude their work. Additionally, it was expected that once the Physiological subcommittee and the Substitutes subcommittee concluded their work, the Ethical subcommittee would provide commentary on them and that would conclude the work of the Committee of Fifty.

At the February 10, 1904 meeting, it was acknowledged that Dodge had passed away and Greene would take his place as Treasurer. At the June 6, 1905 meeting, the death of Greene was announced. Despite the letters between Greene and the Physiological subcommittee in 1900, the summary of the Ethical Aspects of the Liquor Problem did not include any mention of the Ethical subcommittee’s conclusions related to Scientific Temperance Instruction.

Findings of the Physiological Subcommittee

“The Physiological Aspects of the Liquor Problem” was published in 1903, and John S. Billings wrote its summary for publication in 1905. This investigation examined the effects of alcohol on the human body. The investigators concluded that alcohol, taken in moderation, did not have a significant negative effect on systems such as gastric
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digestion, and it produced nutritional effects similar to those produced by starches and fats in typical foods.\textsuperscript{234}

One of the most notable—and controversial—conclusions of the Physiological subcommittee’s report was the declaration that alcohol was a food, not a poison. Recognizing that alcohol could have devastating effects on the human body if consumed in large quantities, the subcommittee asserted, “If all substances known to be injurious in large doses are to be entirely given up on the assumption that small doses are also injurious, then all condiments and spices must be removed from our tables.”\textsuperscript{235} The subcommittee’s conclusion directly contradicted the assertions presented in Scientific Temperance Instruction, which the report referred to as “unscientific and undesirable.”\textsuperscript{236}

The Physiological subcommittee identified a number of aspects of S.T.I. that should be removed from the school curriculum. For instance, the subcommittee recommended that primary school students should not be taught about alcohol.\textsuperscript{237} Additionally, the report recommended that temperance instruction should not be an isolated topic but “should be a part of some elementary instruction in physiology and hygiene, and all that is really useful and desirable can be given in a brief time, equivalent
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to a few lessons, following the lessons on food.”

The report conveyed the opinion that secondary school students should be taught that while alcoholic beverages are food, “they are a very imperfect and expensive kind of food, and are seldom used for food purposes; that they are not needed by young and healthy persons, and are dangerous to them insofar as they tend to create a habit.”

Altogether, the Physiological subcommittee had a specific set of guidelines for what should and should not be taught in the secondary schools and how much time should be set aside for it.

**Actions of the Physiological Subcommittee**

The Physiological subcommittee was formed at the April 5, 1893 meeting. Its first members were John Shaw Billings, Francis A. Walker, and Russell H. Chittenden. While the Legislative and Ethical subcommittee submitted reports to the group detailing their work at the October 20, 1893 meeting, the Physiological subcommittee did not provide a report. They appeared in the minutes of the January 6, 1894 meeting, and their report to the group shows expanded membership in their subcommittee with Bowditch and Welch now part of the group.

The original scope of the group’s work included research by Chittenden looking at the influence of pure ethyl alcohol on the chemical processes of digestion, a study “on the cause of sudden death produced by the ingestion of a large amount of alcoholic
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drink
to be pursued by Bowditch, an investigation of alcohol’s influence on one’s susceptibility to infectious diseases to be explored by non-Committee member Dr. Ernst, an investigation by non-Committee member Dr. Hodge relating to alcohol’s influence on living nerve cells and their ability to recover from fatigue, research by Welch on the pathological effects produced by alcoholic drinks, research by non-Committee members Minot and Hodge examining the influence of alcohol on animals such as guinea pigs, a bibliography of published works on the effects of alcohol assembled by Billings, and finally, “the preparation and issue of a scheme for a collective investigation to be made in large hospitals, and in asylums for the insane, upon the condition of the brain, stomach, liver, and other organs as found by post mortem examinations and histological research in person who have been addicted to the use of alcoholic drinks, as compared with those who have not been so addicted.”

In the report attached to the November 16, 1894 meeting, the subcommittee detailed some of the questions it sought to answer, such as, “To what extent does each alcoholic drink…produce disease and shorten life in the United States, or in certain localities in the United States?” and “Is the regular consumption of a moderate quantity of wine, beer or whiskey conducive to the maintenance of health and the working power
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in any class of men? If so, what class, and what is the average quantity that is thus useful?"²⁴³ The report specified that most questions would be investigated through the collection of statistical data; the laboratory investigations would address the question “What are the particular forms of disease which each class of alcoholic drinks specifically tends to produce…?"²⁴⁴ For those investigations involving statistical data, a number of groups would be surveyed. One group was men above forty who were “engaged in mental work of a high class.”²⁴⁵ Another survey would seek patient information from leading physicians around the country. A third survey would seek the input of large hospitals throughout the country. The final survey would seek data from asylums and might “be assigned to the American Medico-Psychological Association, which is composed mainly of superintendents of asylums for the insane.”²⁴⁶

At the November 15, 1895 meeting, Wilbur O. Atwater’s name first surfaced as a possible addition to the Committee. A few months earlier, in August of 1895, he had given a speech in Chautauqua, New York, criticizing Scientific Temperance Instruction. On September 23, 1895, Mary H. Hunt sent Atwater a letter questioning his critiques and


requesting him to point out specific errors in S.T.I. textbooks. She wrote that the “promulgation of the truth, and only the truth” was sought by S.T.I. supporters and that her letter to him “is not written in any sense in a controversial spirit, but only with a desire to help secure the correction of any errors, if such there are, that can be proven as such, in the teaching of this question that is now being given in the public schools.”

Atwater responded a few weeks later with an eleven-page letter. In it, he explained that,

I called attention to the unfortunate fact that much of what is found in the physiologies approved by the temperance organizations…is out of harmony with and often directly opposed to the teachings of science…I tried to put the whole upon the ground, so well expressed in your letter, of the need of [the truth].

So began the battle over truth as defined by science between Atwater and Hunt.

A few months later, at the January 10, 1896 meeting, Atwater was voted onto the Committee. No meeting took place in June 1896, as Francis G. Peabody reported that there was no pressing business for the Committee. In lieu of a meeting, each subcommittee provided a report updating the progress of its work. The Physiological subcommittee’s report focused on the animal experiments under the supervision of William Welch. The researchers had “made use thus far of 85 rabbits. Most of the animals were fed on absolute alcohol diluted with water, some with whiskey, beer, and wine… There are now under observation six rabbits which have received alcohol for over
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a year… These rabbits appear to be in good health.” Additional experiments were conducted in the lab of Dr. A.C. Abbott at the University of Pennsylvania to determine the effects of “acute intoxication” and alcoholism. At the end of the report, a note was added announcing that the details of the experiments would be presented at the Association of American Physicians meeting in Washington, D.C. and published in the *Journal of Experimental Medicine*.

Even though the Committee did not meet in June, the Physiological subcommittee met from June 14-16 at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut—Atwater’s institution. Billings, Atwater, Bowditch, Chittenden, and Hodge were in attendance. At this meeting, “Plans for a report of the Subcommittee and for future work were discussed informally.” Billings announced that Houghton Mifflin would publish the subcommittee’s work. In the meeting minutes, two notable experiments were added to the Physiological subcommittee’s list of investigations. Atwater would study the “metabolism of alcohol and its influences on metabolism of other food, body tissue, etc.” He would also look at “Alcohol and alcoholic beverages as food.” Additionally, Bowditch and Hodge would explore the questions, “What is taught by the most reputable physiologists and hygienists in different parts of the world today?” and “What is taught by the public schools, Sunday schools and other agencies for popular instruction and
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what is the nature of the so-called ‘Scientific temperance instruction’ in the United States? Though the subcommittee mentioned these experiments in their own subcommittee notes, they had not yet mentioned their exploration of these topics to the larger Committee of Fifty.

During their time at Wesleyan, Atwater reviewed the plans for his investigations. Despite a lack of funding, the meeting minutes stated,

The desirability of continuing the experiments under Prof. Atwater’s direction was urged and it was agreed that the effort should be made to raise $1000 to be used for the purpose during the coming academic year. Dr. Billings thought that $250 might be secured from the fund of the Committee of Fifty, and hoped that a like amount might be secured from the Bache fund. Dr. Bowditch thought that the same amount might be obtained from the Elizabeth Thompson fund…In the belief that the whole sum would thus be found it was decided that preparations should be made for carrying on the inquiry.

This excerpt is notable for a few reasons. Billings, Atwater, Bowditch, and Chittenden “hoped” that money “might” be available and decided to move forward. In other words, they forged ahead, confident that money would be found. Additionally, it reveals that these individual professors were coming together to support each other’s research. They were pooling their resources. The Elizabeth Thompson fund had a board of trustees that determined grants after receiving applications. Conveniently, Bowditch was chairman of the board. The Bache fund was granted through the National Academy of Sciences;

---
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Billings was treasurer of the organization and a frequent receiver of Bache funding. In order to make money available for Atwater’s research, Billings actually gave away some of his own funding.  

At the November 9, 1896, the Committee officially voted Atwater as a member of the physiological subcommittee. At this same meeting, Walter A. Wyckoff of Princeton presented on behalf of Professor William M. Sloane of the Ethical subcommittee regarding S.T.I. in the public schools. It is interesting to note that Bowditch had already started his S.T.I. investigations before this presentation. However, Bowditch would not report on his own investigation regarding the teaching of physiology in public schools until the February 27, 1897 meeting. At the November meeting, the Physiological subcommittee provided some updates on the rabbit experiments and also provided details on further investigations using monkeys, cats, and dogs.

At the November 19, 1897 meeting, subcommittees were required to write reports detailing results of past work and future plans for investigations. Each subcommittee chair was supposed to “provide an indication of the limits within which, in his judgment, the work of his subcommittee might be profitably confined.” The Physiological subcommittee provided updates on its animal experiments and reported newly published

\[\text{stable/i300391.}\]


\(^{258}\) This requirement stemmed from the informal meeting in Maine in which Low, Gilman, Eliot, Peabody, and Dodge expressed concern over the larger-than-expected scope and length of Committee investigations.

\(^{259}\) Francis G. Peabody to John S. Billings, 1 October 1897, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.
articles by Chittenden in the *American Journal of Medical Sciences* and Hodge in *Popular Science Monthly*. The report stated that Chittenden’s experiments were “nearly completed” and Welch’s would “be brought to a close during the coming winter.”\(^\text{260}\)

However, the investigations by Atwater and Bowditch appear to have no clear timetable. Atwater’s “investigation upon the question by what extent is Alcohol consumed in the living body, thereby acting as a force producer and a food” was, simply stated, “in progress.”\(^\text{261}\) Additionally, summaries were being prepared regarding the teachings of physiology; however, no specific timetable was provided.

Atwater’s investigation used a device known as a calorimeter that he had recently invented with a colleague at Wesleyan. One article stated that, “His methods are in some respects original. He coils a man up in a box for days at a time and analyzes his food and the air he breathes, and then makes a chemical investigation of his excretions, even examining the expired air to insure accuracy in his conclusions.”\(^\text{262}\) Another article described the box as “a small chamber with metal walls, 7 feet long, 4 feet wide and 6 1/2 feet high. In it are a folding bed, table, chair and stationary bicycle for experiments in muscular work. There are also arrangements for heating, lighting and passing in food and


\(^{262}\) “Facts Relating to Alcohol as Food,” *The State* (Columbia, South Carolina) 4 April 1899, http://infoweb.newsbank.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/iw-search/we/ HistArchive/HistArchive?d_viewref=doc&p_docnum=-1&p_nbid=Q42G4DXAMTQ0Dk5MTE2MC4zMTcyNzE6MToxNDoxMjguMTA4LjE0OS41Mg&f_docref=v2:11210D30DA68B248@WHNPX-112D2D19CD9497D0@2414749-112D2D19DB696138@0&p_docref=v2:11210D30DA68B248@WHNPX-112D2D19CD9497D0@2414749-112D2D1A1299BFD0@2.
drink. The subject lives in entire comfort.” Historian Jonathan Zimmerman referred to Atwater’s “stunning technological wizardry” as the “key arrow in the subcommittee’s arsenal” against Mary H. Hunt and her S.T.I. forces.

For the April 22, 1898 meeting, the physiological subcommittee report detailed some new experts that subcommittee members wanted to consult. The subcommittee sought to have Professor John J. Abell of Johns Hopkins University elected to be a member of the Advisory Committee to the subcommittee so that Welch could talk with him about the effects of alcohol as a stimulant. Welch also sought to consult with Professor William Osler of Johns Hopkins and Professor Adolph Strümpell. Osler was physician-in-chief at Johns Hopkins Hospital and helped transform medical education by promoting a hands-on educational approach. Strümpell was director of the Medical Clinique at University of Erlangen in Germany. Furthermore, he requested permission to discuss the subject with the Association of American Physicians. On behalf of the subcommittee’s work, Billings requested an additional $1,500 despite the Committee’s recent financial challenges as reviewed at the prior meeting. At the next meeting in November of 1898, Billings reported on what subcommittee members shared about their
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findings at the International Physiological Congress held in England the prior summer. The report stated, “Very much remains to be done, but, thus far, the results of careful experiments show that alcohol, so taken, is oxidized within the body, and so supplies energy, like common articles of food and that it is physiologically incorrect to designate it as a poison.”\(^\text{267}\) This would prove to be an important finding in the subcommittee’s battle with Mary H. Hunt.

On February 13, 1899, Atwater wrote to Bowditch detailing an attempt by Committee members to lobby Congress for $5,000. They sought the funds through an amendment to a pending agricultural appropriations bill. Low and Gilman were actively lobbying Iowa senator William B. Allison, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in support of the bill. Atwater wanted Bowditch to send letters in support of the bill as well. For his part, Atwater had written letters in support of money for “investigations upon the physiological action and nutritive value of alcohol and alcoholic beverages…it seems to me this measure is very wise and will meet with the heartiest approval of a very large body of the most influential people of the country.”\(^\text{268}\) Atwater was used to getting funding through similar means through his role as head of the United States Department of Agriculture Office of Experiment Stations. This office was created after Congress passed the Hatch Act, which provided federal funding for experiment


\(^{268}\) Wilbur O. Atwater to Henry P. Bowditch, 13 February 1899, Papers of the Scientific Temperance Federation, University of Michigan Library.
Atwater liked the means with which the $5,000 from Congress might be attained because

the appropriation is requested, not by the Committee of Fifty, but by the Senators who cite the work of the Committee as a strong argument in favor of the appropriation…That is to say, the whole plan would bring the money just where we want it without putting the Committee of Fifty in the attitude of asking any favors from Congress.

The April 22, 1898 meeting seemed to show an expanding investigation of the subcommittee’s work as well as a desire to receive more funding. It is possible this latest push to raise funds stemmed from these efforts.

The report written in preparation for the next Committee of Fifty meeting on April 28, 1899 was brief. It reiterated Atwater’s findings about the body’s treatment of alcohol as a food. He also reported on the 5,000 surveys that the subcommittee had received from Dr. Blumer’s investigation two years earlier about patients in asylums. For Welch’s experiments, “definite results cannot yet be reported,” and a summary of views from leading physiology professors regarding textbooks is “in course of preparation.”

At the meeting itself, Billings shared a number of aspects of ongoing investigations; Dr. Hodge’s experiments on animals would “probably” conclude in the fall, Dr. Abel would “probably” complete his experiments in the fall as well, Dr. Welch’s investigation would, as might be guessed, “probably” be done around the same time.

---


270 Wilbur O. Atwater to Henry P. Bowditch, 13 February 1899, Papers of the Scientific Temperance Federation, University of Michigan Library.

The Physiological subcommittee work dominated the meeting minutes for November 17, 1899. After Bowditch updated the Committee on each researcher’s investigations, “Discussion ensued concerning various aspects of this report, especially with regard to the adulteration both of drink and of food.”272 Not long after, Atwater gave a thorough presentation on his findings. In his conclusion, Atwater reflected on the responses his findings received among temperance workers and others. Placing the work of the subcommittee in a historical context, he stated,

“It is the old story of the undermining of an old faith and the shifting to a new form. The present position of physiology with reference to the alcohol question is like that of geology a generation ago with reference to the creation of the world, or like that of much current theology with reference to the higher biblical criticism of today.”273

Atwater saw the subcommittee’s work as important and momentous. He also perceived that, “The beginnings of an educational movement are manifesting themselves in [various] parts of the country, the purpose of which is to promote reform in the teaching in the public schools.”274 Atwater believed that “the educational effect alone of this renewed discussion will repay all the labor and expense to which the Committee of Fifty has been put.”275 It is unclear what Atwater’s reasoning was in this statement of value for the Committee’s work. However, it is clear that he felt the impact of the investigations would be significant. He emphasized this point in a note to the physiological subcommittee as well, stating, “This forcing of misrepresentation into the

272 Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 17 November 1899.
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schools under the guise of science and making it the basis of moral reform through education is the most serious part of the whole business. If it had not been for that I should not have made the experiments or done the other work I have with the Committee of Fifty.”\footnote{Undated memo by Wilbur O. Atwater to the Physiological subcommittee, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.} Despite Atwater’s strong statements, Billings wrote in a letter to Bowditch in early 1900 that, “Atwater is very much afraid of Mrs. Hunt and thinks that it would be wiser not to fully declare that alcohol is a food without getting in some limitations.”\footnote{John S. Billings to Henry P. Bowditch 9 February 1900, Papers of the Scientific Temperance Federation, University of Michigan Library.}  

Around the time of Atwater’s presentation to the subcommittee, a number of newspapers actively began reporting on his findings. The \textit{New York Tribune} and The \textit{State} of South Carolina, for instance, wrote that the Committee’s investigation into the nutritive value of alcohol “has wrought marked changes of opinion in the medical profession as to the effects of alcohol on the human mechanism.”\footnote{“Is Alcohol Really Food?” \textit{New York Tribune}, 26 Mar 1899, http://search.proquest.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/docview/574584156/5410B2711F0A42F7PQ/1?accountid=11311.} The \textit{Dallas Morning News} reported that at a meeting of the Middletown Scientific Association, Atwater “startled his hearers at the meeting when he declared that alcohol in moderation was a food” and his statements had “aroused all temperance people.”\footnote{Alcohol Is Food,” \textit{Dallas Morning News}, 24 June 1899.} In response, Dr. I. Oppenheimer was quoted as saying that Atwater’s statements were “a crime and menace
to the future welfare of society and mankind."\textsuperscript{280} Mary H. Hunt made sure to respond to Atwater’s statements as well. Writing a letter to the editor in\textit{The New York Tribune}, she attacked his definition of the term “poison” when she said, “Professor Atwater’s definition of a poison, if a definition it may be called, differs essentially from that which appears in such standard authorities as medical dictionaries, encyclopedias, and the writings of eminent medical men. The instruction concerning alcohol as a poison…used in the public schools is based on these standard definitions.”\textsuperscript{281}

As public dialogue increased, the Committee met one more time in 1900, at which point a few more Physiological subcommittee updates were provided. One new detail was introduced. Billings explained that,

the Committee had obtained a report on the sale of various bitters, pick-me-ups and so-called temperance drinks in New England…It would seem that over 300,000 bottles of Ayer’s Sarsaparilla are sold annually in Massachusetts, and as this contains 21 percent of alcohol by weight and 26 percent by volume, it is clear that many people in Massachusetts are taking alcohol pretty freely, without, perhaps, being aware of it.\textsuperscript{282}

After stating this information, the minutes immediately shifted to individual researchers’ work. Billings believed that the subcommittee’s report would be ready for publication by the summer of the same year. The Committee then did not meet again until 1904.

Despite the lull in Committee meetings, the members of the Physiological subcommittee were busy at work. In April of 1900, Ethical subcommittee chair Jacob Greene wrote to Peabody that the Committee should print Bowditch’s report on S.T.I.,

\textsuperscript{280} Alcohol Is Food,”\textit{Dallas Morning News}, 24 June 1899.


\textsuperscript{282} Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 27 April 1900.
as early as practicable, for distribution to the members of the Committee. It seems
the more important that this should be done because this report makes it clear that
one of the most serious duties the Committee of Fifty will have to perform when
its material is complete is the reformation of the present instruction given as to the
use and effects of Alcohol, by whatever means they may be able to assist to that
end.\textsuperscript{283}

It was these efforts that the Committee and, in particular, the Physiological
subcommittee, focused on in the ensuing years. The subcommittee monitored legislation
battles at the state level relating to temperance physiology in public schools and provided
support to opponents of S.T.I. when they could. For example, Atwater wrote a letter to
Bowditch on March 30, 1901 detailing a proposed bill in front of the Connecticut state
legislature. In the letter, Atwater requested permission for W.B. Ferguson, superintendent
of the Middletown schools, to quote from Bowditch’s first draft of his “Present
Instruction in the Physiological Action of Alcohol” report during the legislative hearings.
Atwater stated,

\begin{quote}
I have shown [Ferguson] my copy of your first draft…Let me ask, if occasion
should call for it, would you feel free to authorize him to make these statements
without telling the source?…[T]he teachers and the moderate temperance people
would be greatly helped by the evidence Mr. Ferguson thus desires to cite.\textsuperscript{284}
\end{quote}

Additionally, teachers in New York reported in 1903 that they had received advance
copies of the Physiological subcommittee report to assist them in opposing S.T.I. in their
state.\textsuperscript{285} For a Committee that went to great lengths to secure confidentiality, particularly

\textsuperscript{283} Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 27 April 1900.

\textsuperscript{284} Wilbur O. Atwater to Henry P. Bowditch, 30 March 1901, Papers of the
Scientific Temperance Federation, University of Michigan Library.

\textsuperscript{285} New York State Science Teachers Association, \textit{Proceedings of the 8th Annual
Conference Held at Syracuse High School December 28-30, 1903} (New York: University
ILAAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA615&lpg=PA615&dq=chittenden+committee+of+fifty&
when the topic was most controversial, it is interesting to note how willing they were to pass along unfinished material before the date of publication. The Committee’s involvement with state teachers’ organizations did not go unaddressed by Hunt. After Atwater addressed the New York State Science Teachers’ Association on December 28, 1902, Hunt again wrote a letter to the editor dismissing Atwater as “only a chemist” out of step with knowledgeable specialists of physiology and pathology such as Henry F. Hewes of Harvard Medical School and H. Newell Martin of Johns Hopkins.286

While sending investigation results to teachers’ groups was one way for the subcommittee to convey its views, another strategy was to address teachers at association meetings. For example, Charles W. Eliot addressed the Connecticut State Teachers’ Association on October 17, 1902. While he did not mention the Committee of Fifty’s battle with Mary H. Hunt, he did condemn the S.T.I. presence in public schools. He asserted that, “In an attempt to use the schools as a means of promoting total abstinence from intoxicating drinks a grave injury has been done to the teaching of all the sciences in the schools.”287 The W.C.T.U. convention held in Portland, Maine, a few days later


produced a resolution responding to Eliot’s statements. The resolution declared “that we respectfully differ from the statement of [President Eliot]…and remind the public that the teaching on this subject in our public schools has the approval of men of acknowledged eminence in science and has never been proved false.”

Eliot was also monitoring S.T.I. legislative developments in Massachusetts. A letter from George Wells Fitz revealed some of Eliot’s interest. Fitz was appointed Assistant Professor of Physiology and Hygiene and Medical Visitor at Harvard in 1894. He was involved in legislative battles attempting to minimize Mary H. Hunt’s influence in Massachusetts, although his performance in that effort appears to have been a factor that, according to his letter to Eliot, “seemed to you to render my reappointment questionable.” In defending his work, Fitz stated,

As regards my influence upon the teaching of physiology any hygiene in the secondary schools, I beg to remind you that the teaching of these subjects in the schools has been dominated by the W.C.T.U. and especially by Mrs. Hunt…That this influence has made impossible any rational instruction upon these subjects must be well known to you. That the present probably successful attempt to prevent a still greater degradation of the character of this instruction has been made possible, in part at least, by the work which I have done during the past five years, is also undoubtedly known to you.

---
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This letter is notable. First of all, Eliot and Fitz are discussing the issue of S.T.I. in the context of their roles at Harvard—Fitz’s actions as an assistant professor and Eliot’s concern as president of the University. This demonstrates that Eliot saw S.T.I. as a concern of the university in particular, not just as a concern of the Committee of Fifty. Additionally, Fitz pointed out that he had been working against S.T.I. “during the past five years,” establishing that Harvard as an institution had shown concern over S.T.I. even before Professor William M. Sloane had given his presentation on it to the Committee in November 1896 and Bowditch had picked it up as an investigation as a member of the physiological subcommittee. Therefore, while the Committee does not appear to have started with the direct goal of addressing S.T.I., evidence suggests that a university president like Eliot would have seen the Committee as a tool to address a university concern.

While the Committee stayed actively involved in monitoring state-level temperance education battles, they were also busy at work revising their investigations before publication. As they did this, they considered voice and audience. First, they wanted to make sure they spoke in one unified voice. In a memo to accompany Billings’ suggestions related to the subcommittee’s conclusions in 1904, Atwater seconded a suggestion by Billings that,

[I]t will be best for the committee to confirm the conclusions of the individual reporters. In view of the importance of the subject and the not infrequent unfairness of public discussion, it seems to me very desirable that we make it clear that we are a unit so far as regards the general and more important

\[292\] George W. Fitz to Charles W. Eliot, 4 April 1899, Charles W. Eliot Papers, Harvard University Library.
statements and conclusions, though there are minor details in which we should differ.  

This decision was strategic for two reasons. First, the subcommittee was trying to anticipate the attacks of S.T.I. supporters. They had already experienced attempts to split the Committee of Fifty’s allegiances. In 1902, Committee members received a thorough letter from the New York State Central Committee on Scientific Temperance Instruction in Public Schools, consisting of clergy from a range of Christian denominations, detailing what they felt were deep flaws in Atwater’s investigation. The group ended their letter with the question,

[Are you prepared to unite with Prof. Atwater in PROMULGATING for popular reading and quoting as proved and accepted such statements?...Though members of your Committee may be guarded in the forthcoming volume by a general disavowal of indorsement [sic] of any of the contents, is it not true that in the public mind to publish is to indorse, and that your name will be the weight of the axhead to drive in the cutting edge?]

Second, beyond this issue, Atwater also felt that it would help strengthen the case for state-level teachers that were leaning on the Committee of Fifty’s work to support their own attempts to improve secondary school curriculum.

This consideration of audiences that would benefit from the report was another piece of the discussion among subcommittee members. One audience was secondary school teachers. However, the subcommittee also wanted to influence American experts. In 1900, Atwater sent a letter to Bowditch explaining that he reached out to a colleague,

293 Memorandum by Wilbur O. Atwater to Henry P. Bowditch, 31 March 1904, Papers of the Scientific Temperance Federation, University of Michigan Library.

294 New York State Central Committee on Scientific Temperance Instruction in Public Schools to Committee of Fifty, 15 March 1902, John S. Billings Papers, New York Public Library.
Professor W.N. Rice, to provide some feedback on Bowditch’s report. In justifying this decision, Atwater explained that Rice

belongs to that great body of influential people who love the truth first of all, and are intensely in earnest for moral reform. It is the men of that class who can help most in bringing about the change we want to see. My judgment is that in framing our reports, we shall do well to consider what will influence them.  

While subcommittee members knew a large body of national experts could help their cause, they were also interested in international influence. For example, in Billings’ subcommittee report for the November 1898 meeting, he noted that, “At the International Physiological Congress, held at Cambridge, England last summer, the following statement, presenting the views of the leading physiologists [that alcohol is a food, not a poison], was agreed to by a considerable number of the professors present.”

While trying to sway national and international experts, however, the Committee was simultaneously trying to appeal to the average American citizen. Atwater argued that, “the statements [in the summary of the Physiological subcommittee report] should be so plain that the ordinary, intelligent man will understand them, so concise that he will not tire in reading them.” He reiterated this point in his feedback on Chittenden’s report, stating that his work should have “enough of simple explanations of terms so that

---
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people who know little physiology could understand them.”

Could the attempt to reach so many different constituencies partially have led to the group’s failure to have much influence in the end regarding S.T.I.? Were they trying to do too much?

When it came to publishing their finished product, they almost did not have an audience at all. The Committee experienced significant resistance from their publisher Houghton Mifflin. Contract negotiations reveal an extended back-and-forth between Committee members and the publishing company. At one point, Eliot expressed relief in a letter to Dodge that he was “glad to know that they had not definitely declined to publish the new report.”

Billings met Dodge in New York City on November 5, 1901, to tell him

Dr. Bowditch’s latest report as to the views of Houghton Mifflin. Mr. Dodge asked what probably would be the amount required as a guarantee fund and Dr. Billings said he thought it would be about $1,200. Mr. Dodge said he thought he and Mr. Low would be willing to furnish a guarantee for that amount. Dr. Billings said, ‘Then shall we go directly on with the work?’ Mr. Dodge said, ‘All right.’

Yet again, Dodge was willing to personally prop up an aspect of the Committee’s work with his own funding, and Low contributed as well. On November 22, 1901, Houghton Mifflin wrote Bowditch that, “in all frankness we think that in view of its great cost, the deficit would inevitably be much in excess of the [guarantee] amount indicated if the work is issued in the same form and at the same price as the previous volumes of the

---
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Ultimately, the Committee was able to work out a solution to its negotiations with Houghton Mifflin. Unlike contracts for other subcommittee work that were listed under the name of the relevant subcommittee chair, the Physiological subcommittee contract was under the ownership of the entire Committee of Fifty. After the deaths of Low and Eliot, the “Physiological Aspects of the Liquor Problem” became property of Harvard and Columbia Universities.

After the “Physiological Aspects of the Liquor Problem” was published, public debate continued. Hunt, for instance, responded with a forty-one page document titled, “Reply to the Physiological Subcommittee of the Committee of Fifty” attacking the Committee’s findings and providing her own list of scientific experts to support her views. In the end, the Committee of Fifty turned a spotlight on Mary H. Hunt but “Scientific Temperance emerged essentially unscathed from its turn-of-the-century turmoil” and only faded away after Hunt’s death.

---
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Conclusion

The stories of the Physiological and Ethical subcommittees reveal much about the motivations—and the influence—of the academic leaders on the Committee of Fifty. These leaders actively put up roadblocks to the Ethical subcommittee’s pursuit of S.T.I. and removed roadblocks for the Physiological subcommittee. In so doing, they enacted their vision of a non-sectarian Committee in the same way they envisioned their non-sectarian universities by minimizing religion’s influence on scientific investigation. The secular scientific investigation targeted a university priority: secondary school reform. When the Committee’s financial troubles threatened that investigation, the academic leaders pursued additional avenues for funding. They lobbied Congress, despite wanting to steer clear of politicians whenever possible, as Eliot conveyed in a letter to Frederick Wines in 1902. Additionally, they solicited the members of the Committee as a result of their “informal” meeting in Maine. Showing the limits of their influence, that solicitation resulted in only a few donations of $4,000 dollars, falling far short of their goal of $10,000. That the Physiological subcommittee plowed ahead with its work without deference to the Committee of Fifty’s requests and stated financial difficulties—and that the Committee of Fifty enabled this approach—indicates typical behavior of
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eminent university researchers as well as a significant amount of influence of academic leaders on the direction of the Committee.

Beyond funding, academic leaders’ influence seeped into many other aspects of the Ethical and Physiological subcommittees’ work. When the Ethical subcommittee was on the brink of dissolution, the Substitutes of the Saloon group that came into being gave three influential academic leaders from the Ethical subcommittee a voice: Harvard professor Francis G. Peabody, Johns Hopkins lecturer E.R.L. Gould, and Columbia professor William M. Sloane. Institutional leaders such as Charles W. Eliot and James MacAlister at Drexel had actively advocated for this, as detailed in the Committee minutes. A sociological investigation given the platform of an official publication of the respected Committee of Fifty could not have hurt the discipline of sociology at a key moment of growth. Peabody was a strong advocate of sociology; he was viewed by future sociologists at Harvard as the founder of the department even though it did not receive official sanction from the university until the 1930s. As a Unitarian, Peabody believed the religion was “a rational, ethicized derivative of Christianity with a strong social
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309 Eliot’s own father, Samuel, who had been treasurer of Harvard from 1842 to 1853, knew the challenges of managing groups of scientists. In 1849, he expressed frustration of managing personalities, such as Louis Agassiz, by saying, “I cannot lay down rules precise enough to hold these heedless professors, who seem to think they have a rich college, & a richer founder to spend for them as much as they want.” Howard S. Miller, Dollars for Research: Science and Its Patrons in Nineteenth-Century America (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1970), 81.

emphasis.” Eliot, a Unitarian himself, “wholeheartedly shared Peabody’s views on religion and social science” and “Harvard became one of the first schools to offer course work in sociology.” On November 10, 1896, a day after a meeting of the Committee of Fifty, Peabody wrote a letter to Eliot explaining that faculty had been advocating for a department of sociology at Harvard since 1892. According to historian Lawrence T. Nichols, Peabody’s letter “suggests that [he was] concerned about the danger of being surpassed by the University of Chicago,” a school emerging as a pioneer in the field. Daniel Coit Gilman was also a promoter of sociology. During his time at Johns Hopkins, Gilman “praised sociology because of its ‘practical’ applications…[and] thought of the social sciences as distinguished by ‘their service to the individual and their service to the state.’” This new investigation would have helped promote the work of Gilman’s lecturer at Johns Hopkins, E.R.L. Gould.

The Physiological subcommittee also advanced their disciplines. These professors were accustomed to advocating on their own behalf to raise funding to support their research. Additionally, they were pioneers in forming organizations of like-minded eminent researchers to advance their fields and advance within their fields. The Committee of Fifty provided a new community of elite researchers with whom they could collaborate and advance their work. When the Physiological subcommittee met at

---
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Wesleyan, for instance, Atwater presented his pioneering work with the calorimeter. The subcommittee voted to move forward with his research and then brought their collective financial resources to bear to make his investigations a reality.

Meanwhile, the Ethical subcommittee contributed a significant amount of work throughout the process, from suggesting an extensive investigative scope early on to bringing S.T.I. to the attention of the Committee and organizing an investigation to be pursued by Joseph Mayer Rice. Nonetheless, they were unsupportively sent back to consider “ways and means” for their investigations and had very little to show for their work when “The Liquor Problem: A Summary of Investigations Conducted by the Committee of Fifty 1893-1903” was published in 1905. Eliot, Low, and other university leaders had succeeded in minimizing the voice of the majority of the Committee’s religious leaders. As much as the Committee touted its diverse representation of “physiologists and economists, men of academic life, men of affairs, and members of most diverse religious communions [who] could unite,” the experience of the Ethical subcommittee provides no evidence of such unity.

---

Conclusion

While Francis G. Peabody articulated lofty aspirations for the impact of the Committee of Fifty’s investigations in his 1905 summary introduction, “sectarian controversies” only deepened and pro-temperance forces marched on toward a Constitutional amendment in the second decade of the twentieth century. Aside from some appearances in bibliographies of both pro-liquor and anti-liquor forces, the Committee’s work was overlooked by the American population. Charles W. Eliot himself acknowledged in a letter to Wines that the Committee’s work was “seriously hampered” by a lack of money and members with busy lives. In its efforts to settle the debate on temperance, the Committee of Fifty failed.

Most historical scholarship on the Committee of Fifty focuses on its battle with Mary H. Hunt and Scientific Temperance Instruction. This is the case with Jonathan Zimmerman’s Distilling Democracy: Alcohol Education in America’s Public Schools, 1880-1925, which detailed the Committee of Fifty as one chapter of the story of S.T.I. John J. Rumbarger sought to shift the Committee of Fifty’s historical relevance away from the temperance movement; he examined how the group’s corporate elite used temperance to advance its own business agenda. Sociologist Harry Gene Levine built on Rumbarger’s work by arguing the Committee of Fifty’s corporate elite foresaw long-term

---


successful alcohol policy for the country. This work, however, equated societal clout with Committee clout, and this proved inaccurate in many ways. Beyond this historical research, the Committee of Fifty seems to be not much more than a two-page item in Anti-Saloon League materials such as the *Standard Encyclopedia of the Alcohol Problem*. All of these histories overlook the Committee of Fifty’s proper role in history.

Francis G. Peabody had declared early on in the Committee’s statement of purpose that it was “not a new movement in temperance agitation or reform. It is simply an organization for research.”319 In order to fully understand the historical impact of the Committee of Fifty, the group should be examined through the lens of its role as a research organization. This places the Committee’s relevance into the historical scholarship of higher education. While the Committee’s battle with S.T.I. is notable, the Committee’s level of success in that battle is not a reliable gauge of the Committee’s overall level of success or historical relevance.

Whether or not the Committee succeeded in shutting down S.T.I., its attack on the curriculum would have accomplished two goals of these university leaders. First, a change in scientific instruction would lead to better-prepared students admitted to the universities. Second, an attack on temperance, which was embraced by a significant number of denominational liberal arts colleges throughout the country, would further distinguish these elite northeastern institutions. If Charles W. Eliot read the articles within which he appeared, he would have known this. In 1889, a few years before the Committee formed, an article in *Christian Cynosure* detailed the informal polling results of one hundred college presidents on the issue of prohibition. The author was Charles

---
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Albert Blanchard, the president of Wheaton College in Illinois. Blanchard published the thirty-six replies he received from colleges such as Trinity, Bowdoin, Northwestern, and Emory. He reported, “It is encouraging to see that the gentlemen who have replied are almost without exception in favor of total abstinence and legal prohibition.”320 Eliot, of course, was that exception. Additionally, “A very few say that they disapprove the instruction called for by law in our common schools”321 and again, Eliot held the minority opinion. When Eliot’s Committee of Fifty fought a public war against S.T.I. years later, he would have deepened the distinction between his institution and the others mentioned in the article. Considering that Eliot spent much of his time seeking such distinctions, it is logical that this would have been his goal far more than participating in temperance reform for its own sake.

The Committee’s actions from 1893 to 1905 should be viewed as deliberate attempts by university leaders to establish the role of the modern university in American society. Through their actions, these leaders anticipated the needs of the modern research university that only solidified decades latter and foresaw the mechanisms that would be successful in supporting them.

Historian Roger Geiger described how leaders of research universities went through “a process of trial, error, and imitation”322 as they sought a successful and consistent organizational fundraising structure to support their institutions. No established

---


organizational structure yet existed for these efforts. Additionally, it was not until 1890 that the tide in philanthropic donations shifted from theology to medical education, and it was not until 1910 that “research-minded medical schools became the most attractive single area for major university gifts.” According to Geiger, “One of the few strong conclusions emerging from an analysis of nineteenth-century philanthropy [for research universities] is that it was overwhelmingly local in character.” Department leaders often raised funding themselves through local connections. This was certainly true for Harvard professor Henry P. Bowditch, who led two major fundraising initiatives for Harvard Medical School in the 1870s and the late 1890s by tapping into the resources of the Boston Brahmins. For the second campaign, in which Bowditch and other professors raised three million dollars [convert to today’s money] to build a new campus, they found success through a strategy that had not been used before. They “strove desperately to persuade a skeptical public that it was in the public’s own interest to provide for modern medical schools.” In so doing, historian Kenneth M. Ludmerer
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argued that Bowditch did for Harvard what fellow Committee of Fifty member and medical education pioneer William H. Welch would later do for Johns Hopkins.329

University professors and presidents facilitated other forms of giving on a smaller scale as well. A reference to research needs in the annual report of the president or other university publication might wield $250 toward magnetism research, for instance, or four gifts totaling $1,850 to support the purchase of lab equipment.330 Additionally, professors sought money from funds for scientific research, such as the Bache Fund and the Elizabeth Thompson fund. These funds often distributed grants in $250 or $500 increments. These two funds were revolutionary in their roles as financial supporters of scientific research. The Bache Fund, which started in 1867, joined the Smithsonian Institution and the Rumford Fund as the only research endowments that existed to support scientific research.331 Over the course of its existence, the Bache Fund distributed more than $38,000 in two decades.332 The Elizabeth Thompson Fund,333 endowed in the mid-1880s, was also significant. The precursor to this gift was a $1,000 donation from Thompson for the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), which had up to that point been “penniless throughout its first twenty-five years” despite being the country’s largest scientific organization.334 When Thompson then provided the

330 Geiger, Knowledge, 82.
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334 Miller, Dollars, 127.
money for the fund in her name through the AAAS, she did so without strings attached, giving the Fund’s trustees the rare luxury at the time of freedom from restrictions and donor demands. While the Committee of Fifty was frequently frustrated by its funding issues, the total amount of money they were able to accumulate compared favorably to the size of the Bache and Thompson funds.

There is a small irony in the Physiological committee’s action of using money from the Elizabeth Thompson fund to finance their fight against the W.C.T.U.’s Scientific Temperance Instruction. As Howard S. Miller explained, one of Elizabeth Thompson’s “earliest concerns had been temperance reform, to which cause she contributed not only financial support but a widely circulated statistical tract on drunkenness titled *The Figures of Hell.*” In fact, Thompson was featured in book titled “A Woman of The Century” which included short biographies on notable women—edited by W.C.T.U. president Frances Willard in 1893.

The Committee of Fifty’s structure brought a number of grassroots efforts together for the collective benefit of the group. Eliot raised funds in Boston; Low and others raised money in New York; Farnam contributed a significant sum of family wealth, as did Dodge; researchers supported each other through the connections they had to funds; potential donors from the business world on the Committee of Fifty’s roster were solicited by university presidents in the form of an informal subscription request; and university leaders lobbied Congress on behalf of the researchers. These last two actions eased some of the pressures on the researchers themselves to find funding and freed them up to focus on the investigations. These collective efforts resulted in the
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accumulation of the $21,000 the Committee reported spending, in addition to potentially $10,000 more from personal contributions and government contributions that the Committee did not report. In today’s dollars, they raised $847,850, not including the funds spent by the government to support a portion of the Economic subcommittee’s investigations.

These mechanisms for fundraising that the Committee of Fifty employed would be duplicated by the large research institutions that would form by the time the Committee of Fifty’s work came to a close. Foundations such as the Carnegie Institute of Washington D.C. and the Rockefeller Foundation for Medical Research formed with an eye toward an “organizational revolution”\(^{336}\) for scientists. The Carnegie Institute moved scientists away from the Individualistic approach of the nineteenth century in which “one man can develop and carry forward any line of research” to “the modern idea of cooperation and community of effort” supported by $5,500,000 in trustee expenditures.\(^{337}\)

It is no surprise that in November 1902, during a quiet period in the Committee of Fifty’s work, John Shaw Billings, Daniel Coit Gilman, and Carroll D. Wright were summoned by Andrew Carnegie as he was shaping the Carnegie Institute in Washington, D.C. The three men, along with Abram S. Hewitt, Weir Mitchell, and Elihu Root, formed the Executive Committee for the Institute. Gilman would then be assigned President of the Institute. As the Executive Committee considered the direction the Institute should take, “Two lines of action seemed open: to make a large number of small grants to independent investigators, or to sustain a few large research projects. The latter received

\(^{336}\) Miller, Dollars, 177.
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priority.” Though smaller in scale, the Committee of Fifty was similar in its pursuit of one large, focused research project.

The projects that Carnegie’s wealth supported also duplicated efforts already put forth by the Committee of Fifty. While the Flexner Report, funded by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, revolutionized medical schools, it was not a new argument. The Committee of Fifty was ten years ahead of the Flexner Report in its understanding that organized science could have a beneficial societal impact on medicine.

The introduction to the Flexner Report, written by Carnegie Foundation president Henry Pritchett, acknowledged indebtedness to Dr. William H. Welch for his assistance with the report.338 Flexner argued that, “admission to a really modern medical school must at the very least depend on a competent knowledge of chemistry, biology, and physics.”339 Of the one hundred fifty-five medical schools in the country at the time, only sixteen required two years of college work before admission that would provide these fundamentals. Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and Yale fell into this category; Columbia was expected to join this elite group within two years.340 Once a student entered medical school with this foundation, the first year curriculum must include anatomy and physiology, which also encompassed biochemistry. In the second year, students would
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need pharmacology, pathology, bacteriology, and physical diagnosis.\textsuperscript{341} It is no coincidence that the universities and the subjects highlighted in the Flexner Report were also the ones showcased in the structure of the Committee of Fifty. However, it was only after the Flexner Report was released, not the findings of the Committee of Fifty, that philanthropic organizations turned their attention toward financially supporting the medical school profession.\textsuperscript{342}

Sociologist Harry Gene Levine argued that the Committee of Fifty’s work outlined the alcohol policy that would eventually be adopted in the years following Prohibition.\textsuperscript{343} Though he and John J. Rumbarger placed the impetus for the group’s wisdom on its corporate motivations as opposed to its academic ones, the group nonetheless foresaw much of what was to come in the middle of the twentieth century in multiple areas. Beyond predicting alcohol control policy that would be more successful than Prohibition, these men foresaw the needs of the modern research university. Though messy and unsuccessful at times in their efforts, they oversaw a transitional phase in the development of organized fundraising on a mass scale to support ambitious research, often seeking outside funds from business and government. They also represent an early, unsuccessful attempt to accomplish what Abraham Flexner was able to do a few years after the group’s summary of investigations was published. Motivated to assert the value of a standardized medical education for the benefit of society, the Committee of Fifty

\begin{itemize}
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used a growing social concern as a vehicle to advertise the usefulness of scientific disciplines. Furthermore, they sought to improve the quality of the secondary school curriculum to have better-prepared students entering their universities. Despite the group’s failures, its efforts were a small but important step in the march toward medical school reform and the transformation of research universities into the institutions they became by the middle of the twentieth century.
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Felix Adler
Adler was a professor, activist, and author. He founded the Ethical Culture movement, which focused on social justice and promoted free kindergarten as well as other initiatives. In 1885, Adler and others founded the Tenement House Building Company. In 1902, he held the chair of political and social economics at Columbia University, where he had graduated in 1870.344
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Elisha B. Andrews
Andrews was the president of Brown University from 1889-1898. Prior to his time in education, he had been an ordained minister at the First Baptist Church in Beverley, MA. Andrews resigned from the Committee of Fifty in 1896, and his resignation was accepted “with regret.” It is unclear why he resigned, though it could have coincided with a period of turmoil in his tenure at Brown. He had come under pressure from the trustees to resign; during this administrative battle, prominent educators such as Gilman and Eliot advocated strongly on his behalf. In 1898, he became the superintendent of schools in Chicago.345
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Edward G. Andrews
Andrews was a Methodist Bishop. While his duties took him many places including Washington, D.C., he lived in New York City in the years that overlapped with the Committee of Fifty. He was known to be more open than others in his church to modern theological beliefs.346
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Wilbur O. Atwater
Atwater joined the Committee of Fifty in 1896 to fill the vacancy left by John T. Janssen. He was considered a pioneer in agricultural chemistry. After attending Wesleyan, he studied in Europe. He eventually returned to Wesleyan to teach and remained there for over thirty years. In 1892, he began work on the Atwater-Rosa calorimeter, which led to a number of scientific advances including the use of tables providing caloric values for food. When the Carnegie Institution sponsored his work, he began studying the relationship between diet, labor power, and the health of nations. 347
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John Shaw Billings
Dr. Billings ran the Library of the Surgeon General’s Office for thirty years from 1865-1895 and created the National Library of Medicine. Prior to that time, he served in the United States army during the Civil War and organized Army hospitals in Washington, D.C. This earned him a reputation in the field of hospital organization, and he served as the medical advisor to the board of trustees for the design of Johns Hopkins hospital. (Additionally, he recommended Committee of Fifty member William H. Welch for the faculty there.) Upon retiring from the Surgeon General’s library, he became a professor of hygiene at University of Pennsylvania. He also served as the first director of the New York Public Library. 348
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G. Alder Blumer
Blumer was the superintendent of the State Insane Asylum in Utica, N.Y. He resigned from the Committee of Fifty in 1897.
Meetings Attended: 2/10
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Charles J. Bonaparte
Bonaparte graduated from Harvard University and Harvard Law School. Upon completion of his education, he moved to Baltimore to practice law and also became involved in civic reform. Additionally, he served as Chairman of Committee of the Overseers of Harvard for a number of years in the 1890s. He joined the Committee of Fifty in 1897 to fill the vacancy left by the death of William Chauncy Langdon. In 1905, he became Secretary of the Navy and later served as United States Attorney General. He was the grand-nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte. On the Committee of Fifty, Bonaparte was assigned to the Legislative group after the bulk of the work had been completed.349
Meetings Attended: 0/10
Money Contributed: $0

Henry P. Bowditch
Bowditch was a Harvard professor of physiology. After studying in Leipzig, Germany, he was recruited by Charles W. Eliot to join the Harvard faculty. From 1883-1893, he was dean of the Harvard medical faculty. He established the American Journal of Physiology, was known as a pioneer in laboratory instruction and brought his field the field of physiology to prominence in the medical curriculum at Harvard.350
Meetings Attended: 14/15
Money Contributed: $100

Charles A. Briggs
Briggs was a Presbyterian minister and taught languages at Union Theological Seminary. He gave a lecture and expressed views that were unpopular among conservative ministers in the Church, and he was found guilty of heresy in 1892. He later became an ordained minister of the Episcopal church (ordained by Committee of Fifty member Henry C. Potter) and continued to teach at the Seminary, as it became non-denominational during his tenure there. Briggs was a member of the Sociological Group.351
Meetings Attended: 8/15
Money Contributed: $0


John Graham Brooks
Brooks was added to the Committee of Fifty in 1896 in place of E.B. Andrews. He was a sociologist and reformer who graduated from Harvard Divinity School to join the Unitarian ministry. In 1891, he left the church, moved to Cambridge, MA, and dedicated his professional efforts to studying labor issues. In 1893, he published a study for the Department of Labor that examined the social security legislative program in Germany.352
Meetings Attended: 1/9
Money Contributed: $0

Z.R. Brockway
Z.R. Brockway was the Superintendent for the Elmira State Reformatory in New York from 1876-1900. In 1894, the State Board of Charities investigated his management of the reformatory, though it is suggested that this was a partisan attack, and he kept his job. He believed in indeterminate sentencing for criminals; the New York Legislature took his recommendation for no minimum sentencing but did maintain maximum sentencing laws.353
Meetings Attended: 0/15
Money Contributed: $0

James C. Carter
Carter embarked on a distinguished law career in New York after graduating from Harvard. He argued cases in front of the Supreme Court, such as the Income Tax Case in 1895, served as the president of the American Bar Association in 1894-1895, and was interested in municipal reform. He was a founder of the National Municipal League and served as its president for nine years.354
Meetings Attended: 3/15
Money Contributed: $500

Russell H. Chittenden
Chittenden graduated from the Sheffield Scientific School at Yale with a concentration in chemistry. After graduating, he studied in Germany under the influence of physiologist Wilhelm Kühne. He returned to teach at Yale in the early 1880s and was appointed to a new professorship of physiological chemistry. In 1898, Chittenden was appointed director of Sheffield Scientific School, which grew significantly under his leadership.355
Meetings Attended: 8/15
Money Contributed: $0

**Thomas Conaty**
Conaty was a Catholic minister who served at Sacred Heart in Worcester, MA until 1897. He was then appointed Rector of the Catholic University of Washington, which was an original member of the Association of American Universities in 1900. He was also president of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union from 1888-1890.356
Meetings Attended: 3/15
Money Contributed: $0

**John Converse**
Converse was president of Baldwin Locomotive Works in Pennsylvania. He was known to take an interest in educational pursuits, such as making donations to his alma mater, University of Vermont, and advocating for universities to play a large role in society through extension schools and specialized courses that prepared students for professional life. He also served as the president of the trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. Converse joined the committee in 1898.357
Meetings Attended: 0/8
Money Contributed: $50

**William Bayard Cutting**
Cutting was a lawyer, bank director, and philanthropist from a prominent New York family. He graduated Columbia in 1869 and Columbia Law School in 1871. He and his brother, R. Fulton Cutting, had a law practice together. His philanthropic work focused on civic reform and charitable institutions. He was also a trustee of Columbia University during Seth Low’s tenure.358
Meetings Attended: 1/15
Money Contributed: $1,250359

---


359 This number includes donations given by other members of the Cutting family as well.
Samuel W. Dike
Dike was a Congregational minister and a social reformer. During the 1890s, he served on the National League for the Protection of the Family, which sought to limit divorce. He was a member of the Sociological Group.\textsuperscript{360}
Meetings Attended: 14/15
Money Contributed: $0

William E. Dodge
Dodge worked for Phelps Dodge Corporation, which was focused on copper mining. His father, William E. Dodge, Sr., ran the corporation and also directed the American Temperance Union. The younger Dodge was also involved in philanthropic endeavors.\textsuperscript{361}
Meetings Attended: 13/15
Money Contributed: $3,250\textsuperscript{362}

Alexander P. Doyle
Doyle was a Catholic priest in New York. He was general secretary of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union from 1894-1904. Doyle worked with fellow Committee of Fifty member Father Walter Elliot in establishing the Apostolic Mission House in 1902.\textsuperscript{363}
Meetings Attended: 8/15
Money Contributed: $0

\textsuperscript{360} Michael McGerr, \textit{A Fierce Discontent: The Rise and Fall of the Progressive Movement in America, 1870-1920} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 91.


\textsuperscript{362} This number includes contributions made by Dodge family members.

Charles William Eliot
Eliot graduated from Harvard in 1853 with a background of chemistry and mineralogy. In 1858 he became an assistant professor of mathematics and chemistry at Harvard. After he failed to get tenure at Harvard, he left the institution and was appointed a professor of chemistry at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He also spent time studying the European educational system. In 1869, he returned to Harvard to serve as its president, a post he held for forty years. During his tenure, he greatly expanded the institution and was a leading educational reformer. He introduced the elective system and strengthened the graduate programs, among many other endeavors.\textsuperscript{364}
Meetings Attended: 9/15
Money Contributed: $1,950\textsuperscript{365}

Walter Elliot
Elliot was a member of the Roman Catholic Paulist Fathers in New York. He worked with fellow Committee of Fifty member A.P. Doyle to establish the Apostolic Mission House in 1902.\textsuperscript{366}
Meetings Attended: 0/15
Money Contributed: $0

Richard T. Ely
Ely was an influential economist and professor. After graduating from Columbia College, he studied in Germany, and upon returning to the United States took a position at Johns Hopkins University. He is most well-known, however, for his thirty-year tenure at University of Wisconsin, starting in 1891, where he brought national acclaim to the school’s economics department. During his career, he published many books and articles that influenced social reform. He was also brought before the Board of Regents at University of Wisconsin due to accusations that he was a socialist, but he was cleared in a decision that was considered a success for academic freedom. Despite his clout and reputation as well as his active involvement with the Sociological Group, there is little evidence that he played a role in the Committee of Fifty’s work.\textsuperscript{367}
Meetings Attended: 1/15
Money Contributed: $0


\textsuperscript{365} Eliot himself appears to have contributed only $100. A list of donors in the January 1894-February 1897 Treasurers’ statement, however, was attributed to Eliot.


Henry W. Farnam
Farnam was a professor of economics at Yale (where he also graduated). He spent three years studying in German universities before accepting a professorship opportunity at Sheffield Scientific School—a position vacated by fellow Committee of Fifty member Francis A. Walker in 1880 when he left to assume the presidency of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He came from a wealthy background and was involved in a number of charitable activities. He also had a strong interest in civil service reform.  
Meetings Attended: 13/15
Money Contributed: $2,750

Thomas F. Gailor
Gailor was an Episcopal minister and was a professor of ecclesiastical history at the University of the South in Sewanee, Tennessee.  
Meetings Attended: 0/15
Money Contributed: $0

Richard W. Gilder
Gilder was added to the Committee of Fifty in 1896. He was the editor of the Century magazine. In 1894, he served as Chair of the Tenement House Committee in New York. His home was a central location for many writers, politicians, and other prominent members of society.  
Meetings Attended: 2/9
Money Contributed: $0

\[\text{\textsuperscript{368} Dictionary of American Biography. s.v. “Henry Walcott Farnam.”}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{369} This number includes contributions by other members of the Farnam family as well, such as a $2,000 contribution from Farnam’s mother.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{370} Dictionary of American Biography. s.v. “Thomas Frank Gailor.”}\]
Daniel Coit Gilman
Gilman was the first president of Johns Hopkins University. He is viewed as a pioneer in university reform during the second half of the nineteenth century. After graduating from Yale, Gilman traveled to Europe and studied the university system there. He then returned to Yale to take a position of leadership in the Sheffield Scientific School and serve on Sheffield’s board of directors. At Yale, he became a strong advocate for scientific research and instruction. After briefly serving as president of the University of California, Gilman was chosen to lead Johns Hopkins. At times during his professional career, Gilman also served on state boards of education and helped create a public high school in New Haven, Connecticut. In 1902, Andrew Carnegie chose him to lead the newly formed Carnegie Institution, which set out to support scientific research on a large scale.¹³⁷²
Meetings Attended: 4/15
Money Contributed: $0

Washington Gladden
Gladden was a Congregational minister in Columbus, Ohio. He was considered a pioneer of the Social Gospel and a vocal advocate for liberal Protestantism. He believed it was important to adapt theology to the new scientific developments related to Darwinism, and he was involved in the settlement house movement. He was also a member of the Sociological Group.¹³⁷⁴
Meetings Attended: 0/15
Money Contributed: $0

E.R.L. Gould
Gould was an economist and a university lecturer. He received his Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins in 1886 and completed research in Europe from 1887-1902 for the United States Department of Labor. While in Europe, he also engaged in research for his well-known report The Gothenburg System of Liquor Traffic and promoted The Gothenburg system for the United States. He lectured at Johns Hopkins from 1892-1897 and Columbia in 1901-1902. He also led reform movements in New York City and helped to elect Seth Low as mayor of the city in 1901.¹³⁷⁵
Meetings Attended: 10/15
Money Contributed: $0

Gustav Gottheil


¹³⁷³ This does not include money he may have directed the Committee’s way through his lobbying of Senator William B. Allison as detailed in chapter III.


Gottheil was the rabbi of Temple Emanu-El in New York. He was known to build bridges between groups. For instance, he was respected by Orthodox Jews despite his liberal perspective on Judaism, and he had good relationships with Christian religious leaders.\footnote{Dictionary of American Biography. s.v. “Gustav Gottheil.”}

Meetings Attended: 1/15
Money Contributed: $0

**Jacob L. Greene**

Greene served as the president of Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company for twenty-seven years until his death in 1905. He was known to take a fiscally conservative approach to insurance. Prior to his insurance career, he served as General George Armstrong Custer’s assistant adjutant general during and after the Civil War, and the two were friends. Additionally, Greene had a background in law, having practiced in Michigan before the war.\footnote{Bill Ryan, “General Custer in the Corporate Archives,” *New York Times*, April 14, 1996, http://www.nytimes.com/1996/04/14/nyregion/general-custer-in-the-corporate-archives.html.}

Meetings Attended: 8/15
Money Contributed: $200

**Edward M. Hartwell**

Hartwell was the Director of Physical Training in Boston from 1890-1897. Prior to this, he was recruited in 1882 by fellow Committee of Fifty member Daniel Coit Gilman to serve as Instructor of Physical Culture at the Johns Hopkins University. This is also where he earned his Ph.D. in biology.\footnote{Roberta J. Park, “Edward M. Hartwell and Physical Training at The Johns Hopkins University,” *Journal of Sport History* 14, no. 1 (Spring, 1987): 108-119, http://library.la84.org/SportsLibrary/JSH/JSH1987/JSH1401/jsh1401h.pdf.}

Meetings Attended: 8/15
Money Contributed: $0
**Henry Hitchcock**

Hitchcock was a lawyer in St. Louis, Missouri. He was the first dean of St. Louis Law School, now known as the Washington University School of Law. In 1889-1890, he was president of the American Bar Association. Before and during the Civil War, he was opposed to the extension of slavery and actively fought against secession efforts by his state. Later, he served on General William Tecumseh Sherman’s staff as a legal adviser.\(^{379}\)

Meetings Attended: 1/15
Money Contributed: $200

**William R. Huntington**

Huntington was an Episcopal Minister at the Grace Chapel in New York. He was known as a progressive leader and worked on revising the Book of Common Prayer. He promoted inclusivity and sought to minimize the divisions between Christian denominations.\(^{380}\)

Meetings Attended: 6/15
Money Contributed: $0

**John T. Janssen**

Janssen was the chief of police in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, according to Committee of Fifty records. He has the distinction of being the only member of the committee to be removed from it due to attendance issues. Aside from never attending meetings, he must not have replied to meeting invitations, which is the expectation that Peabody laid out for Committee members. He was replaced by W.O. Atwater.\(^{381}\)

Meetings Attended: 0/6
Money Contributed: $0

**William Preston Johnston**

Johnston was the president of Tulane University from 1884 until his death in 1899. Prior to that, he started in education at the request of General Robert E. Lee offered him the chair of history and English literature at Washington and Lee University.\(^{382}\)

Meetings Attended: 0/15
Money Contributed: $0

---


\(^{381}\) Minutes, Committee of Fifty, 10 January 1896.

J.F. Jones
Jones was a professor of biology at Marietta College and has degrees from Harvard University.  
Meetings Attended: 9/15
Money Contributed: $0

William Chauncy Langdon
Langdon was an Episcopal clergyman. He was the original secretary for the Committee of Fifty, but his health prohibited him from participating in the work of the Committee. He died in 1895. Despite his minor role with the Committee, his presence is notable because he helped organize the original Sociological Group.
Meetings Attended: 0/5
Money Contributed: $0

Seth Low
Low graduated from Columbia in 1870 and, after briefly pursuing studies in law, joined his father’s successful merchant business. From 1881-1885, he served as mayor of Brooklyn. In 1889, he became president of Columbia College and oversaw the school’s transformation into a major university. In 1901, he was elected mayor of New York. Low was a member of the Sociological Group.
Meetings Attended: 10/15
Money Contributed: $1,500

---


385 Encyclopædia Britannica Online, s. v. “Seth Low.”

386 Attendance records pertain to the fifteen meetings for which meeting minutes exist within the Billings Papers. There were no meeting minutes in the Billings Papers for May 1895 though that meeting did occur.
James MacAlister
MacAlister was a progressive educator who reorganized the Philadelphia school system in the 1880s. In 1891, he became president of the Drexel Institute of Art, Science and Industry. He also served as a trustee at the University of Pennsylvania and lectured at Johns Hopkins.  
Meetings Attended: 9/15  
Money Contributed: $100

Alexander Mackay-Smith
Smith was an Episcopal priest at St. John’s Church in Washington, D.C. from 1893-1902. Close to the White House, St. John’s is known as “the Church of the Presidents.”
Meetings Attended: 3/15  
Money Contributed: $0

John J. McCook
McCook was a Protestant Episcopal clergyman and Latin instructor at Trinity College in Connecticut. He also published a number of articles in publications such as *Forum* and the *Journal of Social Science* on topics such as the saloon.
Meetings Attended: 1/15  
Money Contributed: $0

---


Richard F. Grimmett, *St. John’s Church, Lafayette Square: The History and Heritage of the Church of the Presidents, Washington, DC* (Minneapolis: Mill City Press, 2009), 159, https://books.google.com/books?id=qKQKhVMFUAwC&pg=PR2&lpg=PR2&dq=%E2%80%9CSt.+John%27s+Church,+Lafayette+Square:+The+History+and+Heritage+of+the+Church+of+the+Presidents,+Washington,+DC%E2%80%9D&source=bl&ots=OJDfgyxt&sig=PCd55L9M6x1Du5Gp-8bVx6YdeCo&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjd-Onw377JAhVMcj4KHbloAk0Q6AEILTAD#v=onepage&q=%E2%80%9CSt.%20John's%20Church%2C%20Lafayette%20Square%3A%20The%20History%20and%20Heritage%20of%20the%20Church%20of%20the%20Presidents%2C%20Washington%2C%20DC%E2%80%9D&f=false.

Theodore T. Munger
Munger was a Congregational clergyman. He graduated from Yale in 1851 and Yale Divinity School in 1855. He served a number of churches in New England and was the minister at United Church in New Haven, CT from 1885-1910, spanning the years he was on the Committee of Fifty. He was influenced by the New Theology. He also served on the Sociological Group.  
Meetings Attended: 9/15  
Money Contributed: $100

Robert C. Ogden
Ogden was a businessman with an active interest in supporting educational programs, particularly in the South. He ran John Wanamaker’s retail business in Pennsylvania until 1893 when he moved to New York and worked to grow the business there. In the early 1900s, Ogden ran the Southern Education Board. He served as a trustee of Tuskegee Institute and was a director of Union Theological Seminary.  
Meetings Attended: 3/15  
Money Contributed: $1,695

Francis G. Peabody
Peabody was a Unitarian clergyman and professor of theology at Harvard University. He was also educated at Harvard as well as its Divinity School. In 1872-1873, he spent the year in Germany, and his theological perspective was significantly influenced by this experience. Throughout his career, he focused on social and ethical issues. During his time at Harvard, he oversaw the transition away from compulsory chapel service. Peabody was a member of the Sociological Group.  
Meetings Attended: 13/15  
Money Contributed: $200

---


392 This number includes donations he was responsible for soliciting as indicated in the January 1894-February 1897 Treasurers’ Statement.

**Henry C. Potter**

Potter was a Protestant Episcopal bishop in New York. He served on the Board of Trustees at Columbia and closed the dedication ceremonies for Seth Low’s new Columbia University campus with a benediction. In 1899, he also ordained fellow Committee of Fifty member Charles A. Briggs, the controversial clergyman who had been found guilty of heresy from the Presbyterian church. Potter was a member of the Sociological Group.394

Meetings Attended: 6/15
Money Contributed: $0

**William S. Rainsford**

Rainsford was an Episcopal clergyman. He supported social reform, was attuned to the issues in the labor movement, and supported reforming saloons as opposed to shutting them down entirely. His theological views shifted over time from more conservative to more liberal.395

Meetings Attended: 3/15
Money Contributed: $100

**Jacob H. Schiff**

Schiff was a prominent banker and businessman, joining the private banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb, and Company in 1875. In 1897, he and E.H. Harriman took over the Union Pacific Railroad. Beyond business endeavors, Schiff established a number of Jewish philanthropic organizations including hospitals and settlement houses.396

Meetings Attended: 2/15
Money Contributed: $1,000

**Charles W. Shields**

Shields was an Episcopal clergyman and a professor at Princeton from 1865 until 1903. He was a professor in the harmony of science and religion. In 1898, he was ordained deacon of the Protestant Episcopalian church. Shields was a member of the Sociological Group.397

Meetings Attended: 6/15
Money Contributed: $0

---


396 *Encyclopedia of World Biography*. s.v. “Jacob Henry Schiff.”

**William M. Sloane**
Sloane was a professor of history. He taught at Princeton starting in 1877. Then, in 1896, he left Princeton to accept the Seth Low Professorship of history at Columbia, his alma mater, and taught there for twenty years until he retired. He was a member of the Sociological Group. 398
Meetings Attended: 7/15
Money Contributed: $0

**Francis A. Walker**
Walker was president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1881-1897. Prior to that, he was a professor of political economy and history in the Sheffield Scientific School at Yale. He contributed influential ideas into economic debates. Walker died in 1897 while still a member of the Committee of Fifty. 399
Meetings Attended: 4/8
Money Contributed: $0

**Charles Dudley Warner**
Warner was a writer and editor. From 1884-1898, he was a contributing editor of *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine*. He also served as president of the American Social Science Association. He counted Mark Twain and William Dean Howells among his friends. Warner was a member of the Sociological Group. 401
Meetings Attended: 8/15
Money Contributed: $200

---


400 If a member joined the committee late or left the committee early, it will be reflected in the fraction. Walker died in 1897; therefore he attended four of the eight meetings he could have attended.

William H. Welch
Welch was a professor of pathology at the Johns Hopkins Hospital and Medical School starting in 1884. In 1893, he was appointed dean of the medical faculty at the medical school and became well-known as a leader of medical education reforms. He graduated from Yale with a background in the Classics, only later developing an interest in science. He studied physiology, pathology, and bacteriology in Europe before returning to the United States to become a pioneer in these fields of science.\textsuperscript{402}
Meetings Attended: 8/15
Money Contributed: $0

David A. Wells
Wells was an economist. He graduated from Lawrence Scientific School at Harvard in 1851 and published some scientific work such as \textit{Wells's Principles and Applications of Chemistry} and \textit{Wells's First Principles of Geology}. After publishing an economic pamphlet known as \textit{Our Burden and Our Strength} in 1864, he was appointed special commissioner of the revenue for the United States Government. When the Bureau of Statistics was established, he designated fellow Committee of Fifty member Francis A. Walker to lead it.\textsuperscript{403}
Meetings Attended: 1/8
Money Contributed: $0

Frederick H. Wines
Wines was a statistician and social reformer. He graduated from the theological school at Princeton in 1865 and ordained as a Presbyterian minister. He was appointed secretary of the Illinois State Board of Public Charities in 1869 and served for nearly twenty-four years (1869-1892 and 1896-1898). He was very interested in crime and prison reform.\textsuperscript{404}
Meetings Attended: 1/15
Money Contributed: $0

Peter M. Wise
Wise was the president of the State Commission in Lunacy in New York. He was added to the Committee of Fifty list in 1897.
Meetings Attended: 1/8
Money Contributed: $0

\textsuperscript{402} \textit{Encyclopedia of World Biography}. s.v. “William Henry Welch.”

\textsuperscript{403} \textit{Dictionary of American Biography}. s.v. “David Ames Wells.”

\textsuperscript{404} \textit{Dictionary of American Biography}. s.v. “Frederick Howard Wines.”
Carroll D. Wright

Carroll D. Wright was the Commissioner of the United States Department of Labor for twenty years, starting in 1885. Prior to that, he ran the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, starting in 1873, and was encouraged in his career by fellow Committee of Fifty member Francis A. Walker. In his work, he tried to bring reconciliation to the conflicting interests of employers and laborers. He was president of the American Statistical Association from 1897-1909, wrote a number of publications such as *The Industrial Evolution of the United States* (1895), was a professor of statistics and social economics at what is now George Washington University, and was selected as the first president of Clark College in Worcester, MA, which was affiliated with Clark University. Wright became chair of the Economic committee after the death of Walker.\(^{405}\)

Meetings Attended: 9/15
Money Contributed: $0

\(^{405}\) *Dictionary of American Biography*. s.v. “Carroll Davidson Wright.”
Appendix D
Chart of Committee Members Organized by Attendance Rates

The following chart provides a starting point to examine Committee influence. It details the percentage of meetings each member attended and how much money they helped bring in to the Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Meeting Attendance (%)</th>
<th>Money Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowditch, Henry P.</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dike, Samuel W.</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge, William E.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnam, Henry W.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$2,750(^{406})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody, Francis G.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings, John Shaw</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$0(^{407})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{406}\) This total does not include thousands of dollars that the Farnam family donated without acknowledgement in the Treasurer’s Reports to keep the Economic Subcommittee investigations afloat.

\(^{407}\) Though Treasury reports show no gifts from Billings, there is documented evidence that he arranged for Atwater to receive $250 from the Bache Fund. This and any similar type of funding source did not appear in the Treasury reports and does not appear to have been included in official totals budgeted for each subcommittee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low, Seth</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$1,500\textsuperscript{408}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould, E.R.L.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwater, Wilbur O.</td>
<td>60%\textsuperscript{409}</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot, Charles W.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAlister, James</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munger, Theodore T.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, J.F.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Carroll D.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Jacob L.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Charles Dudley</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs, Charles A.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden, Russell H.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle, Alexander P.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwell, Edward M.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch, William H.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloane, William M.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler, Felix</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington, William R.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter, Henry C.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields, Charles W.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumer, G. Alder</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Elisha B.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman, Daniel Coit</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Francis A.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden, Robert C.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, James C.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainsford, William S.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{408} This is the amount directly attributed to Seth Low. On an 1897 Treasurers’ report detailing three years’ worth of contributions to the Committee, however, there is a list of donors that mirrored the list of primary donors for Columbia University’s new campus. The Committee of Fifty contributions list included Oswald Ottendorfer, Samuel D. Babcock, D. Willis James, J.P. Morgan, and Cornelius Vanderbilt. The contributions from this group to the Committee of Fifty added up to $3,000. Additionally, D. Willis James made another $500 contribution in March of 1898, which would put Low’s contributions closer to $5,000. The source for the list of primary donors for Columbia’s new campus is *A History of Columbia University, 1754-1904* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1904), 157, https://archive.org/stream/ahistorycolumbi00unkngoog#page/n10(mode=2up).

\textsuperscript{409} Atwater missed the first six meetings because he was not yet part of the Committee. However, once on the Committee, he attended the following nine in a row. Therefore, his attendance percentage is slightly lower than his involvement indicates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Edward G.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaty, Thomas</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay-Smith, Alexander</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, David A.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilder, Richard W.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiff, Jacob H.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise, Peter M.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, John Graham</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting, William Bayard</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchcock, Henry</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely, Richard T.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottheil, Gustav</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCook, John J.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines, Frederick H.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse, John</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaparte, Charles J.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockway, Z.R.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot, Walter</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gailor, Thomas F.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladden, Washington</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janssen, John T.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, William Preston</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon, William Chauncy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

The Informal Meeting in Maine on August 21, 1897

Some members of the Committee of Fifty took it upon themselves to meet informally at the location of their summer homes to discuss matters of the Committee. While letters to the Committee of Fifty regarding this meeting do not name the members who participated in this informal gathering, a letter from Peabody to Low reveals the invitation list (Low, Eliot, Gilman, Peabody, and Dodge). The results of the meeting, namely, a list of proposals for the Committee to consider, were sent to the larger Committee of Fifty by Peabody ahead of the November 1897 meeting. Below is a list of the proposals and the response of the Committee to each suggestion.

1. That the next meeting of the Committee of Fifty be held on Friday, November 19th, in New York City.

2. That the Committee meet in future twice a year, at fixed dates, to be determined at the next meeting. (Voted that this suggestion be adopted)

3. That the Autumn Meeting of each year be held in New York City and the Spring Meeting elsewhere (Boston, New Haven, Baltimore). (Voted that meeting be held in New York City unless otherwise called by Executive Committee)

4. That the term of life for the Committee of Fifty be understood to be, approximately, three years from the present time: a term permitting the

---
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completion of work to be now arranged, but not permitting the beginning of prolonged and new research. (Voted that consideration of this be delayed until next meeting)

5. That at the next meeting we consider the possibility of obtaining from the members and friends of the Committee of Fifty a subscription of $5000.00 a year for three years, or an average of $100.00 a year for each member of the Committee. This suggestion is not to be interpreted as a demand for subscription, where service already has been so generous and unremunerated, but merely as an amount which would give us for a reasonable time a tolerably adequate income. (Voted that Finance Committee be empowered to prepare and circulate with the cooperation of the Secretary, a subscription paper, and report on their success at the next meeting)

6. That the chairman of each sub-committee be requested to send to the Secretary of the Committee of Fifty, not less than one month before the meeting of Nov. 19th, a detailed statement of the past work and future plans of his sub-committee, together with an indication of the limits within which, in his judgment, the work of his sub-committee might be profitably confined, and that these statements from different sub-committees be printed and put in the hands of all members of the Committee of Fifty for their consideration before the meeting of Nov. 19th. (Needs no further consideration, as it took place already)
7. That, at the meeting of November 19th, the scope and end of our researches be made a special subject of discussion—whether, for instance, it is to be anticipated that any summary of results can be in the end set forth as the judgment of the Committee of Fifty, or whether the aim of the committee will have been reached through the publication of its special papers. (Discussed but delayed until future meetings—see next section for lengthier exploration of this topic)

8. That for the purpose of this fundamental discussion it is important that the next meeting shall be fully attended, and that members of the Committee of Fifty be asked to arrange their plans for the autumn, if possible, with reference to attendance at this meeting. (23 of 50 attended the November 1897 meeting).
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