# "For Country, or for Yale?"

## By Charlotte Juergens

*Charlotte E. J. Juergens is a junior studying History at Yale University. Outside of Yale, Charlotte explores historical and commemorative themes through documentary filmmaking and archival research. She wrote this paper during the fall semester of 2014 for a seminar on the history of Yale and America. Charlotte found inspiration for this paper from the underutilized wealth of archival resources on the subject available in the Sterling Memorial Library at Yale. Charlotte would like to thank Professor Jay Gitlin for his guidance with this assignment and for a fascinating semester of historical investigation.*

*The hardwood floors have been shorn of their carpets and left bare, to be dusted each morning by the occupants. Comfortable single beds have been replaced by the well-known GI double decker. In the dining hall, instead of eating from china dishes, the soldier finds himself consuming his meal from the standard Army trays, so familiar to reception center camps. And we find that even in the insignificant butt can, familiarity lining the walls at numerous bases, has found its way to Berkeley College, Yale.*[1]

Member of the ASTP boarding in Berkeley College

Along with the presidency of Yale, Charles Seymour inherited the dismal legacy of the Great Depression. Not only was Yale short on funds in 1939, but also the effects of Depression-era cutbacks had begun to show: Yale's cherished concepts of small classes and individual attention were in grave danger.[2] Seymour committed himself to reviving Yale's academic community by strengthening the liberal arts. After all, the liberal arts had been an essential aspect of Yale's identity since its founding—its original 1701 charter had called for a school "wherein Youth may be instructed in the Arts and Sciences."[3] Yet, America's participation in World War II shifted Yale's focus to the second foundational principle outlined in its charter: the university's obligation to prepare its students for "Publick employment both in Church and Civil State."[4] Seymour stressed the university's obligation to support America's war effort in all ways possible. In the coming years, his twin commitments of protecting Yale's liberal arts and maximizing its civic character appeared increasingly

---

[1] Brooks Mather Kelley, *Yale: A History,* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999, 402; Ralph Thompson, "The Aristocrats The Excuse," *New York Times,* 14 July 1938.
[2] Kelley, *Yale, A History,* 395.
[3] Judith Schiff, "A Brief History of Yale," *Yale University Library,* http://guides.library.yale.edu/yalehistory (accessed 2 Dec 2014).
[4] Ibid.

incompatible. Seymour's ultimate prioritization of the latter commitment set him at odds with Yale's liberal arts faculty such as George W. Pierson, who saw the massive new military role on campus as a threat to the liberal arts. Seymour's choice to prioritize Yale's national identity over its academic one began the university's fundamental shift from a community of scholars to a national brand.

The outbreak of WWII corresponded with an internal reassessment of Yale's identity. "We know in outline what we want our University to be," observed Robert D. Heinl Jr. in the April 1937 *Yale Literary Magazine,* "But the task of balancing every factor and evaluating every force which will affect the precise structure of 1954's Yale remains to be done. It has been entrusted to efficient and meticulous Charles Seymour… it will again be time to storm new positions."[5] Seymour shared Heinl's view that the university had reached the edge of a developmental burst. He readied himself for the presidential task of resuscitating Yale's academic life.[6] Seymour's reevaluation resulted in renewed commitment to Yale's character as a community of scholars, which had suffered from the school's Depression-era financial woes. Seymour outlined a strategy centered around two features: recruiting a larger faculty and strengthening the liberal arts. Yale's new dean William C. DeVane (who would go on to be a key figure in creating Yale's Directed Studies program in 1946) also supported the liberal arts.[7] The two worked together to add sixteen new professors to the faculty from 1938-39 and skillfully obtained funding for those salaries from the Corporation and a gift from Edward S. Harkness.[8]

Despite Seymour's promises and initial motions to bolster the liberal arts, the school's continued money troubles stymied Seymour's efforts to institute substantial changes. This stagnancy troubled Seymour, for he understood the importance of strengthening not only the faculty, but the "aspects of learning which without protection run the danger of death."[9] Seymour knew that liberal arts "may attract merely a handful of students and to the general public they may appear quite without value," but he felt that classical philology, linguistics, Semitic languages and other fields "without any apparent relation to any so-called "useful" application… represent scholarly effort which it is the university's duty to foster simply for their own sake, and because without them the heritage of human experience is impoverished."[10] Seymour's professed prioritization

---

[5] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 394.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid., 409.
[8] Ibid., 395.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid.

of the liberal arts tapped into an old notion of a Yale education, which had originated in the 1701 charter and had been promoted by the university throughout the subsequent decades. The nationally-read Yale Report of 1828 by Yale's Faculty Committee articulated a defense of the liberal arts, arguing for their relevance in modern life and usefulness in building mental discipline and strong character in young people.[11] Seymour resolved to perpetuate the legacy of the 1828 report but worried that he lacked the means to do so.

The outbreak of WWII in Europe introduced a new set of complications to the already precarious endeavor of revitalizing Yale. Seymour considered the looming prospect of American involvement in the war and asserted that, "For the immediate future and… for years to come, we must all of us, students and professors, recognize that whatever demands the necessities of national defense lay upon us; they are paramount."[12] By 1940, Seymour began forming ties between the university and the war effort, approving measures to take in wives and children from Oxford to keep them safe from bombings and linking the 39th General Army Hospital with the Yale School of Medicine.[13] New patriotic tasks began to upstage Seymour's academic priorities. Later that year, a member of Seymour's Committee on Educational Planning noted that "Yale's prestige as a teaching institution has been achieved and is being maintained at the expense of her reputation as a body of productive scholars."[14] Simultaneously with the start of WWII, Yale developed new concerns as a national patriotic institution and as national competitive educational brand, both of which would prove to have corrosive effects on Yale's identity as an intimate intellectual community.

Some Yalies clashed with their president's beliefs about the just nature of the war and the role that Yale ought to play in it. Their resistance began as an expression of general anti-military sentiment. The *Yale Alumni Weekly* observed that war was "distinctly unpopular with the present college generation"— a sentiment held by underclassmen such as Kingman Brewster, Jr. (Yale College class of 1941 and future president of the university), who helped to organize a "Committee to Defend America First."[15] The antiwar contingent of Yale's student body participated in a

---

[11] Yale University, "1828 Report by Faculty Committee," http://www.yale.edu/about/documents/specialdocuments/Historical_Documents/1828_curriculum.pdf (accessed 12 Dec 2014).
[12] Kelley, *Yale, A History,* 395.
[13] Ibid., 396.
[14] Ibid., 395.
[15] Geoffrey Kabaservice, *The Guardians: Kingman Brewster, His Circle, and the Rise of the Liberal Establishment,* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2004; Kelly, 396.

"Peace Week," supported a nationwide demonstration against the war, and signed a non-interventionist petition protesting use of convoys.[16] One Yale group called the "American Peace Committee" used the Yale mailing system to circulate postcards among the student body with messages like, "Americans: We are fighting a war for Communism, British Imperialism, and the Roosevelts. Russia will turn on us when we are too weak to fight. We must ask for peace now. Write your Congressman and demand Peace."[17] Yale protestors perceived a potential military infringement upon the nation's interests; they did not yet anticipate a national infringement upon their school's identity.

In the months leading up to Pearl Harbor, over a hundred members of Yale's faculty left the school for governmental positions related to the war effort and, according to the November 1941 *Yale Alumni Magazine*, some of Yale's seniors were "gaunt, unshaven, and hollow-eyed" over the preemptive institution of the draft in 1940.[18] The draft created tension not only among Yale students, but among its faculty as well. Four professors joined with 236 non-Yale educators, religious leaders, businessmen and professional workers to sign a declaration against conscription, "which flatly stated that peace-time drafting of manpower 'smacks of totalitarianism'."[19] Yet Seymour articulated the opposite argument in his 1939-40 report to the Yale alumni, stating that "The universities… are the most keenly alive to the spiritual values that disappear in a totalitarian system; to them is entrusted the guidance of the youth of the land whose lot it is to defend and carry on the American tradition. This is a responsibility that has fallen upon our scholars and which we cannot evade."[20] Despite Seymour's belief in the vital role of education in American life, he felt it would be his patriotic duty to support the draft and encourage Yalies to set aside their studies to serve their

---

[16] "Non-Interventionists Send Capitol Letter Protesting Use of Convoys," *Yale Daily News,* 26 May 1941, *"Americans United" and "American Peace Committee,"* box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Kelly, 395.

[17] "Unknown Group Flays FDR and British; Warns Soviet Russia "Will Turn on Us," *Yale Daily News,* 23 Jul 1942, *"Americans United" and "American Peace Committee,"* box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[18] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 397.

[19] "Selective Service & Petitions," *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941,* box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[20] "Report of the President of Yale University to the Alumni," *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941,* box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

nation at war. Even before America entered the conflict, WWII had instigated the beginnings of a rift between Yale's professors and its president that would continue to widen over the coming months.

America's declarations of war on Japan and Germany in December 1941 violently disrupted Seymour's endeavor to reinvigorate Yale's identity as a community of scholars. In *Yale: A History*, Brooks Mather Kelly notes, "Since Seymour believed that "the justification of a university is to be found in the service which it gives to the nation," university planning shifted to how Yale could help the government."[21] Patriotic service constituted a key part of Yale's original creed (as delineated by the 1703 charter) and over the centuries, service had become became nearly as deeply-rooted an aspect of Yale's character as had the liberal arts. WWII pitted Yale's twin foundational principles—instructing students in the liberal arts and preparing them for civic life— against each other. Seymour believed that during time of war, "long range [academic] values," must be "subordinated to the immediate demand from the battle front."[22] For the first time in Yale history, the school's commitment to its duty as a national institution appeared at odds with its existence as an intimate congregation of scholars.

At this point, the Yale administration began converting its students into soldiers. The Committee on Student Preparation for War Service made a concentrated effort to combat student discontent regarding the war effort, allocating funds to various individuals, the Yale Co-Op, the Yale Daily News and the Office of Education for this purpose.[23] The administration distributed a bulletin informing Yalies of their options with the armed services and encouraging enlistment.[24] Despite the proliferation of antiwar sentiment at Yale, many Yalies rallied in support of the war, and many others enlisted to fight in it.[25] The WWII Correspondence between Christine J. Northrop (first master's wife of Silliman College) and 328 Silliman men in the armed services affords a view into the lives of numerous Yalies in the classes of 1941-45 who were buoyant with patriotic enthusiasm. Omar "Shorty" Simonds was among those who

---

[21] Kelly, *Yale, A History*, 395.
[22] Ibid., 397.
[23] Marcus Robbins to Edgar S. Furniss, 23 March 1942, *Student Preparations for War Service*, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[24] "Bulletin of Yale University: Student Opportunities for War Service," 15 July 1942, *Student Preparations for War Service*, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[25] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 395.

quickly enlisted, missing graduation to leave directly for flight school.[26] "My flight instructor is a peach, and flying has gone pretty rapidly for me, thanks to my C.A.A. at Yale and driving one summer," wrote Shorty. "And how wonderful it was to hear that Yale beat Dartmoth. How I would like to have seen that."[27] Some of the younger boys left too, jovially discarding their last years of liberal arts education. Knowledge was now to be sought in the Italian skies, the Pacific, the Normandy hedgerows.[28]

Yale faced a disturbing drop in undergraduate numbers and, as Kelly notes, "Seymour pursued the military for replacements."[29] In this way, Yale's relationship with the army began to expand and intensify. In December 1941, in response to Yale's reports of its nearly empty campus, the Army requested use of Yale facilities for an aviation technical training school. Yale assented and, as Kelly writes, was soon "well on its way to becoming little more than a military base… So Yale converted to war… By February three thousand cadets, officers, and instructors had taken over most of the Old Campus, Silliman College, and the Law School.[30] The military had begun to sew the seeds of Yale's new and debilitating level of dependency on the nation.

In 1942, Seymour instituted a new "Yale Plan" for war service, which included "an all year 'round twelve months' basis, compulsory physical training of all students and academic preparation at a stepped-up tempo with the inclusion of military courses in addition to the major course of study" for every Yale student.[31] Seymour's requirement that professors teach year-round (without an increase in pay) prevented them from completing their own research over summer vacations, which Seymour dismissed as "intellectual play-time."[32] "This is tough," Seymour admitted,

---

[26] Omar "Shorty" Simonds to Christine J. Northrop, 10 June 1942, box 1 folder 1, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Kelly, 395.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Christine J. Northrop to Carl V. Hansen, 16 Jan 1943, box 1, folder 4, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Address Book & Correspondence Record, Christine J. Northrop, box 6, folder 40, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[29] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 397.
[30] Ibid., 398-99.
[31] "Yale Goes All-Out for the War," 3 Sep 1942, *Yale at War,* box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[32] "Yale University News Bureau," 23 Feb 1942.

"I'm sure it's right."[33] Seymour sought a way to fulfill both of Yale's fundamental duties—fostering academic and civic excellence among its students— but the turbulence in Europe rendered a balance between the two nearly impossible.

At this point, alarm amongst the faculty intensified and spread. Professors began to panic when the administration ordered departments to prepare emergency programs in case "the situation of the University is drastically modified by the War," and when dean DeVane noted that "We have, in effect, already taken some steps towards the emergency program."[34] More and more professors wanted out. In response to "isolationist-interventionist hubbub" amongst the Yale faculty, Professor Leonard W. Labaree observed,

> Those who had been in the armed forces during the First World War were better equipped to deal with the services when they arrived on campus— they said, "Well, the Army hasn't changed much, has it?" kept a good-humored attitude about the whole thing and made adjustments readily. Those who were faced with the military services for the first time never could comprehend the red tape and had a more difficult time.[35]

Yet even though the military presence felt familiar to older members of the faculty and though it seemed that the Army hadn't "changed much," its relationship with the University certainly had. The faculty's fears were augmented by the unprecedented nature of the changes occurring at Yale. There were, of course, points of similarity between Yale's WWII experience and its experience with past wars; other wars had also brought moral and physical disruption to college life, high levels of undergraduate enlistment, difficulty in maintaining a sense of academic normalcy, and a greater role for the Yale administration in daily life. Yet before WWII, Yale had never surrendered parts of the campus to the federal government on a rental basis like, and Yale had never seen a major struggle in which the faculty provided a normal course of study for the armed forces.[36]

---

[33] Ibid.
[34] "Yale College— Dean William C. DeVane."
[35] "Interview with Professor Leonard W. Labaree, Chairman of the Department of History," *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941,* box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[36] "Yale in other Wars," *Part 1— Historical Background, Yale in Other Wars,* box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale

The departure en masse of Yale's civilian student population proved draining not only to the university's academic vitality but to its finances as well. Seymour saw that an expanded relationship with the army would generate enough profit to alleviate Yale's financial desperation. In fact, droves of new ASTP and ROTC students meant a fortune to Yale. Kelly describes how, once Yale "became a crowded military post with 8,000 instead of 5,000 students…Treasurer Laurence Tighe found himself in 1943 with what he described to fellow Reeve Schley as an embarrassing surplus that needed careful handling. [37] Yet these financial benefits came with governmental requirements that would alter the meaning of a Yale education. A New York Times article from July 12 1942 decried Yale's new policy of mandatory military training and registration for all students (physically qualified or not), citing a quote by the secretary of the Yale War Council that, "The university is following the concept that students are only loaned to universities in order to prepare them better for duty with the armed forces and industry."[38] Yale became a place where students developed the technological, scientific, political and language skills that created good soldiers for the war effort, rather then the abstract, academic skills that created independent thinkers and leaders for a nation at peace. In exchange for financial benefits, Seymour accepted Yale's new identity as "little more than a military base," as an national institution rather than a community of scholars. Even when Yale ceased to require those benefits, having gained an "embarrassing surplus" of funds, Seymour continued to strengthen the Army presence at the expense of the liberal arts.

The implementation of Seymour's "Yale Plan" for war service caused a climax of consternation among those faculty members dedicated to Yale's identity as a liberal arts institution. Eleven of Yale's preeminent professors— George W. Pierson along with Maynard Mack, Richard B. Sewall, Lewis E. York, George Kubler, Louis L. Martz, James G. Leyburn, Frank McMullan, Thomas C. Mendenhall, John C. Pope and Dan Merriman— drafted a letter to Seymour to voice their concerns.[39] "We do not speak as individuals, or on behalf of individuals," they wrote. "what happens to us as a collective body may be tragic and enduring." Like Seymour in his alumni address earlier that year, these professors asserted that Yale's collective character must be held above the needs of the

---

University Library.

[37] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 404.

[38] "Yale Requires All to Take War Training," 12 July 1942, *The New York Times,* box 5, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[39] Azeezat Adeleke, "What Does DS Really Stand For?" 27 Oct 2013, *The Politic,* Accessed 9 Dec 2014, http://thepolitic.org/what-does-ds-really-stand-for/.

individuals that comprised it. Yet according to Pierson and his colleagues, total subservience of the college to the nation did not imply benefit to that collective interest:

> As teachers and scholars of the several liberal arts, it has daily been becoming plainer to us that the American colleges, and in particular the University to which we are devoted, are failing—and are seemingly willing to fail—in the discharge of their obligation to this country. It is not necessary, known your convictions, to argue the **value** of liberal studies in the spiritual life of individuals, and in the social and political life of democratic states. We all feel that it is as imperative to make wars worth winning as it is to win them; and that the apparent choice between survival of a people and the survival of their intellectual life is generally a false choice… We urge collaboration between Yale and tend the other Universities, in representing the cause of liberal education as an organic element in the commonwealth… We look to those who lead us for a recognition that in the University, no more than in private life, can moral disintegration be avoided if crises are met with the obvious and easy compromises. We are Yale men, all of us, whatever the colleges of our degrees. We have seen that upon her faculties, old and young, the spirit of Yale depends. We do not want to see this spirit grow dim.[40]

Additionally, Pierson wrote an article for the *Yale Alumni Magazine* titled "Democratic War and Our Higher Learning" in which he posed a similar question to the one asked in the letter he co-authored with the other ten faculty members: can the American university president, "unaided, somehow convert the university to the all-out service of the nation *without,* by that very act, destroying its usefulness for future generations?"[41] Pierson and his colleagues urged several courses of action, including the establishment of planned liberal arts sequences within the curricula of soldiers, collaboration with other colleges and universities to strengthen the liberal arts, and the creation of a committee that would study liberal

---

[40] G.W. Pierson, Maynard Mack, Richard B. Sewall, Lewis E. York, George Kubler, Louis L. Martz, James G. Leyburn, Frank McMullan, Thomas C. Mendenhall, John C. Pope and Dan Merriman to Charles Seymour, 10 Dec 1942, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[41] Kelley, *Yale, A History,* 398.

arts ideas and methodology and work with members of the Course of Study Committee to overhaul the Yale Course of Study.[42] These signees approached Seymour not with a lament for a lost-cause, but with an an appeal to logic and morality. Given Seymour's past pro-liberal arts rhetoric and DeVale's inclination towards the humanities, the signees had reason to hope for the success of their suggestions.[43]

Seymour rewarded their hope to a certain degree. His recent demotion of Yale's educational priorities to its patriotic ones did not reflect an antipathy towards the liberal arts. He was, after all, the same man who had once voiced alarm that,

> in spite of…discussion [of preparation for the post-war world], we haven't taken time to begin to learn about the world through which we are now passing. Precedents are being broken, laws and administrative decrees passed, social and psychological forces released so fast that we have no time to study their separate meanings, much less take a whole view of what is happening to us. Whose job is it to discover by careful research these separate meanings, whose job is it to seek that whole view, if not the university's?[44]

Seymour responded to the faculty's letter with an attempt to prove that he had not abandoned his prewar ideals. He promptly created eight new research fellowships for liberal arts students.[45] In his annual report for 1941-42, Seymour announced his intention to defend the liberal arts, that "otherwise it will not profit us to win the war, for we shall have lost the values essential to the national soul."[46] Yet at the same time, Seymour firmly believed in absolute cooperation with the government. In a 1942 address to 1,000 Yale graduates in Woolsey Hall, he declared that,

> Our job is to put the University in a position to help our

---

[42] G.W. Pierson, Maynard Mack, Richard B. Sewall, Lewis E. York, George Kubler, Louis L. Martz, James G. Leyburn, Frank McMullan, Thomas C. Mendenhall, John C. Pope and Dan Merriman to Charles Seymour.
[43] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 409.
[44] Charles Seymour, "Challenge and Opportunity for the College at War," 1942, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[45] "Office of the President," 6 April 1943, *The Faculty* box 5, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[46] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 398.

> government equip and train our armed forces in the shortest possible time. High gear is no longer fast enough. We must all use the over-drive…We, both as individuals and as an institution, must fit into a total plan of a nation in arms. We cannot afford to do what each of us thinks would be wise or smart. We must do what the government wants. I am frequently asked the question: 'How much of Yale will live through this war?' In the circumstance, that question is of relative unimportance, for in these times Yale can think only of the nation and how she as an institution and through her members may serve the nation.[47]

The war years initiated a shift in priorities; in Seymour's eyes, Yale's new national identity had trumped the one that he had vowed to protect before the war. Yale the national institution had superseded Yale the "collegiate school."

Yale's recently refreshed pool of faculty was by now already drained.[48] Professors had departed in a mass exodus that left no department unscathed.[49] Considering Seymour's prewar assertion that increasing Yale's faculty would bolster its identity as a liberal arts institution, the loss of so many professors in the liberal arts to governmental positions proved a heavy blow to that identity. Seymour was aware of the war's destructive impact on Yale's academic life, particularly on its professors. "In the departmental reports the story is always the same," he said. "able men of the younger group called into service, with no adequate replacements available."[50] The appeasement of Yale's professors became a matter of terribly high stakes, and the disturbance of faculty life posed an existential crisis to the school. The war had claimed 13 percent of faculty, 30 percent of young instructors, 43 percent of graduate students and two thirds of the student body.[51] "The loss of our students during wartime is an inevitable sacrifice," Seymour wrote, "but it still remains possible for us through our faculty to maintain our scholarly tradition. If they should die, Yale would cease to be a university."[52] Nervous that faculty discontent would compel

---

[47] "Yale University News Bureau," 23 Feb 1942, *Part 4—Section A— At Yale During the War,* box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[48] Kelley, *Yale, A History,* 397.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid., 397.
[51] "Statistics," 1942, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[52] Kelley, *Yale, A History,* 398.

many to transfer to other institutions, Seymour suggested that each professor be allowed periodic breaks to conduct their own research.[53]

At this point, the military began to infiltrate Yale's residential college system. Kelly notes the repurposing of most residential colleges to accommodate the influx of servicemen, which had raised Yale's population 2,000 men over its average prewar enrollment. One ASTP man living in Berkeley noted that "Built originally for only two men, the spacious three room suites have found themselves crowding six within their doors." Only Jonathan Edwards, Timothy Dwight, and Trumbull remained as housing for the mere 700 civilian undergraduates left on campus. The Army delegated the duty of educating troops to the Yale faculty, who then had little choice but to shelve most of their substantial research projects.[54] In the spring of 1943, the nascent rhythm of Silliman life was jarred by military tattoo. Sophomores and juniors in this brand-new residential college were distributed among the other nine, and 600 trainees in an Army Aviation Ground School Officers program took their places. Unlike Shorty Simonds and his friends, these men did not play baseball in the courtyard. They wore uniforms at graduation instead of caps and gowns.[55]

The negative consequences of the Army presence in Yale's residential colleges must be attributed to the relationship between Yale's administration and the U.S. government rather than the individuals in military programs who studied at Yale during these years. These men appreciated the opportunity to complete their training at Yale and devoted themselves to their work, different though it may have been from Yale's prewar course of study. Like many Yale freshmen, these military students struggled to find a home within Yalie culture and tradition. Like many alumni, they proudly identified as Yalies and looked back on their years spent there with immense nostalgia. One ASTP man who lived in Berkeley reminisced,

---

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid., 401.

[55] Christine J. Northrop to Carl V. Hansen, 16 Jan 1943, box 1, folder 4, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Christine J. Northrop to "Charlie" [surname unknown], 21 May 1944, box 2, folder 18, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Northrop 16 Nov 1943; O.H. (Shorty) Simonds to Christine J. Northrop, 20 Aug 1943, box 1, folder 8, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

> Long after we leave Yale we shall remember everything Berkeley College has given us, its foster members. We will remember the luxurious living quarters, the library, and the common room, in which we spent so many pleasant hours reading, talking, or listening to the radio or piano. We can never forget the meals in the college dining hall, reputed by the New York *Sun* to serve some of the best food offered to the Army. And we can never forget Professor Hemingway, the ever-patient Master, with always a smile for each of his hundreds of foster charges. We can never forget the Friday evening receptions and Sunday afternoon teas in the Master's House which helped to make us feel that we are really a part of Berkeley. As is true with the hundreds of graduates since the college was opened in 1934, and with the thousands who will graduate in years to come, the memories of Berkeley which we take with us when we leave at the end of this month will always linger on.[56]

William "Bill" O'Shea was one of the new Silliman military men. Bill was not part of the aviation training program; the Army had sent him to Yale to learn Japanese. "It was spacious living," he remembers, "We were happy campers. I had a wonderful time. The students educated one another… the Silliman crowd would discuss everything. They'd get together all the time. It was very informal. We'd just sit down, you just talked about things and ideas."[57] Bill's memory suggests that some ASTP students felt that they did receive a liberal arts education of sorts, even with the academic focus on military-related topics. Despite the disruption that the Army represented to Yale's student life, O'Shea felt entirely at home at the school and looked back upon those days with the same sunny nostalgia expressed by Shorty Simonds and the other Silliman men who wrote to Christine Northrop.[58]

Language programs like the one attended by Bill O'Shea followed an intensive approach dictated by the Army, which diverged entirely from Yale's prewar approach to teaching languages. Once the Army began sending soldiers to Yale to learn the Japanese language, the Office of the Commanding General issued frequent memorandums and bulletins to provide Yale and other Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS) with

---

[56] Resident of Berkeley College in the ASTP program, as quoted in Kelly, 402.
[57] William "Bill" O'Shea, in discussion with the writer.
[58] Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library

information on subjects ranging from the nature of Japanese totalitarianism to Japanese food.[59] Yalies attended military lectures, such as one made by Sir George B. Sansom of the British Embassy in Washington, which covered both historical context and modern developments in Japanese Economic structure.[60] The Army sent lists of Japanese military, governmental, commercial and social figures to brief the CATS on key Japanese personalities.[61] A federal committee assembled abstracts of Japanese publications, and then shared them with CATS Directors and Associate Directors.[62] This same level of detail was also provided for ASTP students studying other areas, such as Germany and the Far East. The Army wished to ensure that Yale's Military Instructional Staff would "become thoroughly familiar with these developments, interpolating them into terms of what might be parallel future situations… and using them as a basis for lectures and conferences to be given to the student officers at regular periods throughout the course." [63] The language programs proved to be immensely successful; one group of officers studying Chinese in order to train Chinese groups achieved fluency in the Mandarin dialect by the end of their four-month course.[64] Language students gained skills that would be as useful in times of peace as in times of war.

The thoroughness and effectiveness of the ASTP language

---

[59] Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 26 April 1945, box 1, folder 9, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 22 May 1945, box 1, folder 10, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 25 May 1945, box 1, folder 12, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 27 Jan 1945, box 1, folder 15, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 2 July 1945, box 1, folder 16, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[60] George B. Sansom, "Japan: Economic and Industrial System," lecture for the Civil Affairs Training School, Yale University, New Haven, 11-12 Sep, 1944, box 1, folder 24, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[61] Box 3, folder 88, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[62] Box 2, folders 26-30, 32-37, 43-55, box 3, folders 56-95, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[63] Robert N. Gorman, Washington 25, D.C., 15 Dec 1944, box 1, folder 6, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

[64] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 401.

programs prompted a group of ten Yale linguists to propose to Seymour in early 1944 that the ASTP methods be permanently adopted for elementary language classes. Seymour implemented a slightly-reworked policy modeled off of the linguists's proposal. The main changes to the prewar policy were the creation of an intensive ten-hours-per-week period for beginner students and a shift from a more literary focus on translating great works to a more practical focus on conversational skills.[65] Not only does this method of teaching languages remain in effect at Yale today with few significant changes, but it has become the standard model for American military and government language instruction.[66] Programs like Bill O'Shea's constituted the slim beneficial legacy of Yale's wartime relationship with the Army for its academics.

For Yale's civilian students, the war proved to be an intensely confusing and distracted time. As one student observed, "People keep moving in and out so fast that you're liable to find a complete stranger moving in on you one day… and next find everyone, including your roommate, evacuated from the entry."[67] DeVane observed that "The near approach of the war to our country made steady work seem temporary."[68] Seventeen students in the Class of 1940 failed to graduate, and Dean DeVane observed that "There was some falling off in the general scholarship standing of many of those who did graduate. I suspect that the disturbed condition of the world has something to do with this."[69] Yale's scholarship had taken a definite hit. According to Kelly, the academic year of 1943-44 "marked the peak of Yale's war effort."[70] By May 1944 the undergraduate civilian population had fallen to 565 and the total university civilian student population was only 1,720, but the military cutback had begun, to be followed by a second stage of navy and air force school cutbacks in the fall.[71] To a certain degree, the Army's provision of extra

---

[65] Bernard Spolsky, *Behind the ASTP Myth,* Bar-Ilan University, paper was read at the Annual meeting of the Deseret Linguistic Association held at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, on 3-4 March 1994. A modified version was presented as a plenary address at the 1994 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics at Baltimore, MD, 116-117.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Kelley, *Yale, A History,* 400.
[68] "Yale College— Dean William C. DeVane," *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941,* box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[69] "Report to Press," *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941,* box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[70] Kelley, *Yale, A History,* 402.
[71] Ibid.

men and thereby 3,000 more tuitions than the prewar years financed the recovery of Yale's identity from the violation of these years. DeVane worked with Pierson and other members of the faculty to formulate an entirely new and controversial course of study centered around the liberal arts. Directed Studies was created as part of this project.[72]

The question remains, however, as to what extent and in what direction Yale did manage to recover. Kelly writes of Seymour's view that the university "had justified itself by its service in the national defense" through its preservation of the humanities, heightened morale, creation of new programs of study and teaching methods, and much-needed administrative organization. Moreover, "the Yale experience of the students assigned to us by army and navy has broadened our reputation and our contacts with distant parts of the country."[73] The main benefit Seymour saw as resulting from the Army's presence at Yale was to its reputation as a national institution rather than to its identity as harbor for scholastic development. "Neither government nor industry should be trusted in education," said dean DeVane after the war, but that is exactly what Seymour's administration had permitted.[74]

The intimacy of Stover's Yale was now confined to novels and nostalgia. By September 1946, nine thousand veterans enrolled in Yale on the GI Bill, and as Kelly explains, the school's character became much more institutionalized in order to accommodate them:

> As school opened, students were jammed into the residential colleges: four were housed in what was formerly a two-man suite, three in a one-man suite and two in a single room… two hundred were housed with faculty and alumni about town; some three hundred were temporarily located in the gymnasium until former navy barracks were thrown up on Pierson-Sage Square. The faculty housing problem was even worse… In the college dining halls, where once there had been printed menus at each table, white tablecloths, and meals served by waitresses, there were now cafeteria style lines and metal trays.[75]

---

[72] Box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[73] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 404-405.
[74] William Clyde DeVane, "American Education After the War," *The Yale Review*, Autumn 1943 issue, 35, Box 5, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
[75] Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 405.

The war years saw Yale's permanent transformation from a community of scholars to a national institution— a transition which mirrored a larger American phenomenon of the subjugation of the province to the nation.
This had been a paramount question in the Yale consciousness for over a century, beginning with the publication of the Yale Report of 1828.

Although in some ways, Yale has restored its identity as a liberal arts institution, in others, Yale has never recovered from the tradeoff Seymour made during the war. Yalies today often hear that their school only cares for them in as much as their success will credit its name and feed its national, and international, reputation. The same applies to Yale's relationship with its faculty; Yale now values them for their contribution to the success of its brand, where it once valued them for their contribution to a comparatively provincial, self-contained intellectual asylum. The nation's invasion of Yale during WWII exploded the university's notion of scholarship, success and collegiate character, and by doing so, it altered Yale's approach to student and faculty recruitment. Instead of seeking those who would best suit the traditions of its community, Yale began to seek those who would best promote its name. Although this adjustment of Yale's priorities happily lead to a more diversified population of students and professors, it also lead to the demotion of Yale's liberal arts character below its national reputation. Today's Yale students travel the world through a host of programs bearing the school's name, and Yale speakers appear on television before banners swarming with countless blue and white Yale's. Unlike schools such as St. John's College, which has remained comparatively distant from the national market of luxury-brand educational institutions and continues to prioritize education above reputation, Yale has proudly become one of the most competitive brands in that market. Yale's foundational principles might have shielded it from the growing pressure on all American colleges to embrace branding and enter an elite education market, if Seymour's decisions during WWII hadn't created fissions in the core ethics of Yale's 1701 charter. As WWII generated fundamental changes in countless aspects of the American nation, it permanently altered one of America's most prized institutions. The war instilled in Yale a new national, institutional consciousness that once gained could never be lost.