

[Back to Volume Eleven Contents](#)

The Rollins College Inquiry of 1933 and the AAUP's Struggle for Shared Governance at Small Colleges

Jack C. Lane

Abstract

This essay explores a moment in AAUP history—May 1933—when the Association sent Arthur O. Lovejoy, its acclaimed founder and leader to investigate an incident at Rollins College in Winter Park, Florida. The AAUP dispatched its most esteemed representative to this relatively obscure college, I argue, because it saw an opportunity to confront one of the most intractable obstacles it faced: the proprietary governance practices of small college administrations, a hierarchical tradition that led most of them to implacably oppose AAUP principles. This was especially true of college administrations' refusal to countenance shared faculty governance, a principle the AAUP had come to consider essential to the implementation of and preservation of academic freedom and tenure.

After years of negotiation with two major higher education associations, the AAUP issued its long-awaited guidelines on shared academic governance. The 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* spurred existing growth in the number of academic institutions with participatory governance systems.¹ In the past decades however, mounting pressures from multiple sources have led to serious criticism of this way of administering colleges and universities. Many argue that shared governance has proved too cumbersome to meet future twenty-first-century challenges. Top-down decision-making processes, it is alleged, are necessary to make academic institutions more “flexible” and “nimble, more capable of responding rapidly to unanticipated changes in higher education.

The coronavirus pandemic has brought this trend into stark focus. Administrators, particularly those at liberal arts colleges, have been forced to make unilateral decisions concerning, among other things, the size of the faculty and the future academic direction of their institutions. The sudden upheaval, which sent the faculty off campus, has led to administrators making consequential decisions affecting academic affairs, including the future of tenure positions. All this with little or no faculty participation. The threat to shared governance could accelerate and has possibly increased already.²

When immediate problems such as these seem overwhelming, it may be beneficial for academics to pause and to recall how deeply rooted in AAUP history the struggle for faculty participation in academic affairs has been. It could be especially useful to reflect on a point in time when that struggle hung in the balance. Often a single past event can serve as a window on the difficult problems the AAUP encountered, particularly in its efforts to build support for shared academic governance. This essay explores one of those moments.

In May 1933, the AAUP initiated an inquiry into the abrupt dismissal of a senior faculty member at Rollins College in Winter Park, Florida. The president of the college at the time was Hamilton Holt, a nationally known editor, educator, and internationalist; the dismissed faculty member was John Rice, who, along with other dismissed Rollins professors, would go on to establish Black Mountain College, the highly acclaimed progressive experimental school. At the professor's request and with the approval of the college president, the Association sent two AAUP representatives to conduct an inquiry into the issues involved in the dismissal.³

As evidence of how seriously the Association took this incident, it sent its most prestigious representative, Arthur O. Lovejoy, to head the inquiry. A distinguished philosopher and scholar from Johns Hopkins University, Lovejoy had led a group of professors in the long process of creating an association that would represent the emerging professionalism of the American professoriate. By establishing the expertise and integrity of the academic profession and by providing guidelines for its practices, Lovejoy and his colleagues sought to bring the American professoriate into line with other learned professions, such as medicine and law.⁴

The appointment of such an iconic figure as Lovejoy to investigate a firing at a small college in a relatively obscure location strongly suggests that the Association saw an opportunity to confront head-on one of the most intractable obstacles it faced: the resistance of small college administrations to AAUP principles, particularly the principle of shared governance. For the most part, college presidents and boards of trustees were still guided by a governing system that had changed little since the early nineteenth century. Authority and responsibility for college policy rested solely in the hands of the trustees and the president. Although college teaching was proclaimed a calling rather than a job, in terms of college governance, most

administrations treated the faculty as employees. Interference by an outside organization such as the AAUP was viewed in the same light as labor union intrusion. No institution was more wedded to this traditional form of governance than Rollins College.

Several factors specific to Rollins apparently influenced the AAUP decision to investigate the Rice dismissal. President Holt was a nationally known progressive who in the past ten years had led Rollins College in fashioning pedagogical and curriculum reforms based on John Dewey's progressive education theories.⁵ By 1933, Rollins was considered one of the leading innovative progressive colleges in the nation. What's more, Holt had also established a reputation as an outspoken advocate of academic freedom. The college was located in a conservative town and an illiberal county, so Holt had to deal with frequent criticism that he was harboring radical leftist professors. He never wavered in his support for the right of professors to express publicly their political and social views.⁶ Over the years Holt had consistently encouraged the participation of both faculty and students in progressive reforms. Surely, here was one small college that would be open to AAUP principles of academic freedom and tenure and even shared governance. If a visiting committee could convince the president and trustees that the Association's principles were compatible with the college's progressive reforms, then the Rollins case could serve as a model for cooperation between the AAUP and small colleges nationwide.

However, all was not visible on the surface. Not until Lovejoy and his colleague Austin S. Edwards arrived did they discover that, despite his reputation as a devoted progressive, President Holt was staunchly committed to the traditional hierarchical form of college governance. Holt personally recruited and engaged professors without informing the departments. For example, he appointed a colleague from the publishing world and created a new department for him. When a lawyer wrote Holt to say that he would like to join the faculty as an economist, Holt interviewed him in New York and hired him on the spot. Deciding the college needed a classicist, he traveled to Oxford University looking for a Rhodes scholar to fill the position. With very little vetting he hired John Rice, a hasty decision he later came to regret.⁷

Additionally, Holt asserted sway over the college's academic affairs. Holt began making changes immediately after his arrival in the early summer of 1925 and when the faculty returned in September they were informed the administration had instituted new pedagogical reforms. The lecture system, they were told, had been abolished and replaced with a new pedagogy: the faculty would serve as "facilitators," guiding students rather than lecturing to them. Several years later, Holt took a leading role in the 1931–32 curricular changes that gave Rollins its reputation as an innovative progressive college. As a key figure in all the college's life, Rollins came to be identified with the president's personality, so much so that Holt naturally assumed a strong sense of ownership toward an institution in which he had invested so much time and effort. He

completely internalized the oft quoted catchphrase, “Rollins is Holt and Holt is Rollins.” He was universally extolled as “Mr. Rollins College.” Any effort to make academic changes without the approval of the president would be (and was) considered an act of personal disloyalty.⁸

Moreover, Holt’s experience as former owner and editor of an influential magazine (*The Independent*) predisposed him to a corporate governing style. From this perspective, the college was governed like a commercial magazine with the trustees serving as an editorial board and the president as chief executive. Holt consistently described his efforts at Rollins in business terms. He thought the college should operate, like businesses, on an eight-hour day; students should be responsible for attending classes in the same way as employees were responsible for showing up at work. He candidly disclosed his business management style in a letter to the Southern Association of Colleges: “It is fundamental of [the] employee’s duty that he should yield obedience to all reasonable rules, orders or instructions of the employer.” More to the point, when asked why he would not sanction a faculty committee to review John Rice’s behavior, Holt replied, “When you fire a cook you don’t go out and get a committee of neighbors to tell you what to do.”⁹

For the first few years of his administration, Holt managed to steer a harmonious ship, but by 1933 all was not well aboard the Rollins vessel. The turmoil resulting from Rice’s dismissal—that is, faculty resistance to the way Holt fired Rice—was the culmination of a growing disagreement between the faculty and the president over the prerogatives of faculty in areas affecting academic life. Assuming (as Lovejoy would do) that the progressive academic reforms instituted at Rollins indicated the president’s embrace of a more democratic participatory community, the faculty steadily began asserting its role in academic policy. A faculty committee proposed abolishing the Greek system as incompatible with the progressive academic reforms. Holt bristled at and then rejected the attempt to dismantle a social system he himself had encouraged. Then another committee protested the administration’s practice of holding chapel convocations “of doubtful value” that extended beyond the 10:30 class period. The same committee chided the administration for permitting students to miss classes in order to listen to tennis star Bill Tilden, whose sole purpose was “to advertise an exhibition of tennis professionals.” Holt, taken aback by the sharp and accusatory tone of these protests, admitted the administration’s mistake in infringing on class time but added a pointed retort: “The slur of your phrase concerning tennis professionals implies a motive on the part of the administration that I am sure on reflection you will wish to withdraw.”¹⁰

More serious confrontations followed. A curriculum committee proposed abolishing the two-hour class structure that Holt had so proudly created when he arrived. The committee argued that the schedule was “incompatible with the new Rollins plans.” If the new curriculum was based on achievement rather than time, and if it was designed to “enable the individual to develop in his own way and along the lines of his own

interests as fast as his ability will admit,” then, the committee argued, the college needed class periods elastic enough to “permit more hours in class, less hours in class or no hours in class.” Holt vehemently rejected not only the attempt to abolish his “Two-Hour Plan” but also the idea of faculty entitlement to make such a change. Efforts to make basic alterations in the curriculum without his approval, he declared, in effect usurped his authority. “If there is as much as fifty percent disagreement between me and any member of the faculty on fundamental matters,” he warned, “either [the faculty member] or I should go.” No faculty member doubted what the outcome would be in such a situation. Following Holt’s threat, a majority of the faculty voted to table the resolution.¹¹

For the Rollins community, these were uncharted waters. Were these faculty efforts simply a logical extension of an academic reform that foretold a more democratic community and therefore welcomed a shared governance system? Or was this faculty assertiveness a rebellious challenge to Holt’s presidential authority? Holt’s response to these questions came on February 23, 1933. He fired Professor John Rice, leader of what the president called the “rebel faction.” The precipitous dismissal (Rice was ordered to leave the campus within a week) led to the AAUP inquiry.

Shortly after their arrival in May 1933, Lovejoy and Edwards discovered that traditional academic freedom in terms of tolerating the social and political views of faculty members was not an issue at Rollins College. As noted above, President Holt gave virtually unlimited scope to faculty in this realm and often provided support and protection to professors whatever their political views. Lovejoy then concluded that the firing of Rice was rooted in a more serious underlying issue: the president could not tolerate faculty assertion of jurisdiction over academic policy. Holt, Lovejoy determined, looked upon the proposed curriculum revisions to be a rebellion with the outspoken Rice as its leader. The dismissal of Rice was therefore intended to send a message to those other “rebels” who supported Rice unequivocally on this point. The board of trustees issued a statement that laid to rest any lingering doubt about who governed Rollins College: “Resolved: That the Board of Trustees of Rollins College has *sole* authority to make *all* rules and regulations for the conduct of the college and to delegate such authority to the President of the College to oversee and conduct the affairs of the corporation.”¹²

The conviction of the AAUP committee of inquiry regarding the administration’s resistance to shared governance was reinforced when it learned that Holt had from the beginning refused to allow a faculty committee to deal with the charges against Rice. Some faculty tried to convince the president that their opposition to his firing of Rice came not from admiration for the iconoclastic professor but from the method the president employed. Professor Ralph Lounsbury, a former classmate of Holt’s at Yale, pleaded with the Rollins president: “I have gone and shall doubtless continue to go upon the supposition that loyalty does not

call for mere subservience or for clothing an honest expression of opinion. College professors who are willing to surrender lightly the thing which is very fundamental to their profession—namely their professional integrity—are not apt to be of any value to the college.” Trustee Margaret Drier Robbins, the social reformer and former director of the Women’s Trade Union League, made a similar plea. She begged Holt to elect a faculty committee to consider the discipline and even dismissal of Rice. Wasn’t such an effort simply an extension of “your own liberal policies?” she asked Holt.¹³

All appeals for faculty participation fell on deaf ears because Holt and the trustees refused to abandon the long-established practice of sole and complete authority over all college matters. Several members of the board of trustees consistently advised Holt to stand firm in his authority, or else he would lose complete control of college governance. At one time or another, they counseled Holt to “go at this Rice matter firmly, decisively, and without hesitation get the Rice supporters together and make them pledge themselves to be loyal.” After the AAUP hearings, they told Holt “to clear the decks just as quickly as possible of all disloyalty and of all disintegrating influences personal or otherwise that have surrounded this Rice problem.”¹⁴

To Lovejoy and Edwards, the Rollins case demonstrated why faculty participation in academic governance needed to be made an essential aspect of academic governance. The principle of academic freedom, in this sense, embraced more than the right of faculty members to freely express their personal beliefs and views; it also included the right to disagree, without retribution, with policy that affected college academic life. As Lovejoy and Edwards explained in their report to the AAUP, one aspect of academic freedom included protection against “infringements on theological, political, economic and social thought;” the other, equally important, was protection against infringement on “educational” thought. The inquiry determined that the Rollins administration’s rejection of the “prerogative of [its] faculty members to exercise professional responsibilities in educational matters” and to have the freedom from repercussions when expressing their views was therefore an “infringement of academic freedom.” The Rollins case, the AAUP committee implied, made clearly visible the symbiotic relationship between academic freedom and shared governance.¹⁵

After ten days of hearings, Lovejoy and Edwards had failed to bring Holt around to the AAUP’s principles. Before Lovejoy and Edwards submitted their report, they learned that faculty members considered a part of the Rice “rebellion” were summoned to the president’s office and ordered to sign a pledge of loyalty to the college and to agree that the president had full authority over all college matters. All refused. Later they were either fired or forced to resign. This purge of faculty members for opposing administration policy clearly shaped the critical final report. It acknowledged that Rice had “disturbed the harmony of the community” (although it suggested many of the charges were “petty differences common in small communities”) but went

on to criticize Rice's firing as a blatant violation of the principle of due process. They especially condemned the dismissal of eleven faculty members "because of their expression in faculty gatherings and in conversation with President Holt . . . of disagreement with certain views of the president on college policy . . . and their intention of continuing to advocate for AAUP principles on academic freedom," including those considered "educational" freedoms. The committee particularly indicated its concern with the president's autocratic style of governance, which required "excessive demand for fealty to the head of the institution as distinct from the loyalty to its educational aims and principles." The "autocratic" style, Lovejoy and Edwards wrote, seemed particularly at odds with "the spirit of cooperation in an educational experiment ostensibly characteristic of the College." The AAUP published Lovejoy and Edwards's critical report in its December 1933 *Bulletin* and in the same issue announced that Rollins College faculty members would no longer be eligible for membership in the AAUP.¹⁶

Given the censorious thrust of Lovejoy and Edwards's report, the AAUP's rebuke of the Rollins administration seemed somewhat tepid. Nevertheless, the president, enraged by the report and the entire investigation, lashed out aggressively. He wrote, published, and distributed to all "sister" colleges a twenty-seven-page pamphlet in which he characterized the AAUP report as biased, prejudiced, and replete with errors. "The experiences of Rollins College," Holt declared, should be a concern of "all Colleges and Universities of the country" because the episode showed how an investigation could disrupt the "amicable relations which should exist between College and professors."¹⁷

Most of Holt's account relitigated the details of the Rice dismissal. However, the thrust of Holt's text directly attacked the AAUP's legitimacy. According to Holt, the AAUP had no legitimate power "to interfere with the government of the college as the college may deem fit for its own interests." Nor did it have the authority to "punish by publication a college that does not adopt forms of government advocated by the Association." The Association and its methods, he warned the other college presidents, were a serious threat to all college administrations. The chairman of the Rollins board of trustees sent Holt's response pamphlet to the AAUP and demanded the Association publish it in the next annual report. The chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, S. S. Mitchell, sent a reply to the trustee. Mitchell told the trustee that while he agreed with Lovejoy and Edwards that Rice was a disruptive member of the faculty, the committee found "grave fault with the procedures in his dismissal." They were, he said, "brutal methods for which there seemed no justification." Moreover, he noted, "nothing in your statement affords any explanation of the subsequent faculty dismissals." Mitchell then chastised the college administration for publicly distributing the details of Lovejoy and Edwards's investigation. It was, he declared, "an ungenerous

and vindictive pursuit of a dismissed professor whose opportunity to earn a living for him and his family has probably been seriously injured.”¹⁸

Mitchell’s letter could not have thrilled Holt, yet he still had his supporters. Replies from over numerous college presidents—uniformly praising Holt for his implacable stance against the AAUP—poured into the president’s office. One suggested that Holt sue the AAUP for defamation. These supportive letters indicate that many college administrators were still fully committed to the governing creed issued in 1915 by the Association of American Colleges. Colleges, it stated flatly, should be governed as “businesses where the president and trustees function as heads and directors like any other corporation.” Insofar as small colleges were concerned, the AAUP’s objective of shared governance as a foundation for academic freedom and tenure seemed a distant dream.¹⁹

Even so, in the years immediately following the Rollins inquiry, the AAUP began to make progress. After over a decade of negotiation with the Association of American Colleges, the two organizations agreed on a “restatement” of the AAUP’s original principles along with a list of clarifying “interpretations.” Hamilton Holt received an early copy of the *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* in late 1938, and shortly afterward wrote the following letter to the general secretary: “Having considered the proposed rules concerning Academic Freedom and Tenure and set forth by the representatives of the Association of American Colleges and tentatively agreed upon in October 1938, I am happy to inform you that on December 2, at a meeting of the Board of Trustees the following resolution was adopted: BE IT RESOLVED that we agree to the rules, principles and practices therein set forth and will accept the revised AAUP guidelines.”²⁰

Apparently as a way of trying to soften this obvious capitulation, the Rollins trustee resolution insinuated that the 1940 “revised guidelines” had altered previous AAUP statements when in fact the AAUP called it a “restatement” of the earlier one issued in 1925. In its essentials, the 1940 statement was the same as the one the Rollins administration had vehemently rejected five years earlier. However, the trustee resolution was sufficient for the AAUP. Secretary General Ralph Himstead wrote Holt in January that he and the Council had recommended that “Rollins College be removed from the list of censured administrations and the annual meeting voted this removal by unanimous vote.” A notice in the February 1939 *AAUP Bulletin* formally announced the college’s removal. Although the issue of shared governance was not specifically spelled out the 1940 statement, it did strongly propose that the faculty be involved in any faculty removal procedures. Holt must have known that in accepting the 1940 *Statement* he was agreeing as well to a more active faculty participation in the college’s academic life.²¹

Neither the trustee minutes nor Holt's correspondence provide any insight into why the Rollins administration did an about face on AAUP principles. Five years earlier President Holt had described the AAUP as an association directed by a "small body of willful men," a group that had tried to impose its views of governance on his college. Now it was an organization with which he was "in full agreement." To further convince the Association of his conversion, Holt stated he "would use his utmost endeavor as president of Rollins College to live up not only the spirit but the letter of the principles laid down by the joint agreements." Later he claimed there had never been a great disagreement between the college administration and the Association. It was, he said, probably "due to what Stuart Chase has called the tyranny of words." Perhaps, but Holt's retreat from his earlier position may have been the recognition that his national distribution of the somewhat intemperate pamphlet had the effect contrary to his intentions. A letter from a university professor alerted Holt to this possibility. The professor wrote the president that he deserved "the thanks of all interested in education for so clearly demonstrating the great value of the AAUP as an upholder of right standards in academic life." The irony of this statement was surely not lost on the former magazine editor.²²

As this essay on a moment in the AAUP's past has revealed, the Association's effort to establish the principle of faculty participation at small colleges (and to some extent in all institutions of higher education) has been historically difficult and often bitterly contentious. Even after the 1940 statement, it would be several decades before the AAUP made serious inroads into colleges (and universities). Administrations in colleges and universities, which have willingly accepted the principles of academic freedom and tenure, have been, for many of the reasons explored in this essay, reluctant to accept the principle of shared governance.²³ If, as Lovejoy and his colleagues believed, shared governance was essential to the preservation of the AAUP's twin principles, and if, as many today believe, shared governance has outlived its usefulness and is now even more questionable because of the COVID-19 pandemic, can the principles of academic freedom and tenure be far behind? After decades of effort, often in the face of harsh criticism and opposition, AAUP leaders were able pass on to the present generation of faculty a participatory system of college governance. The question is, to paraphrase Ben Franklin, can today's and future generations keep it?

Jack C. Lane is Alexander Weddell Professor of American History, emeritus, at Rollins College, where he served as college historian and taught for over thirty years.

Notes

1. The statement was “jointly formulated” by the AAUP, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). The definitive history of the AAUP is Hans-Joerg Tiede, *University Reform: The Founding of the American Association of University Professors* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015).
2. For the history of shared academic governance in the United States, see Larry Gerber, *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalism and the Modern University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014). For a recent discussion on COVID-19 and academic shared academic governance, see AAUP, “Principles of Academic Shared Governance during the COVID-19 Pandemic,” AAUP Updates, June 29, 2020, <https://www.aaup.org/news/principles-academic-governance-during-covid-19-pandemic>.
3. Frank Aydelotte, president of Swarthmore College, a strong supporter of AAUP principles and brother-in-law of John Rice, had first alerted the AAUP office of Rice’s firing. Katherine Chaddock Reynolds, *Visions and Vanities: John Andrew Rice of Black Mountain College* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998); John Andrew Rice, *I Came Out of the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Harper, 1942). For all future references to Rollins College history, see Jack C. Lane, *Rollins College Centennial History: A Story of Perseverance, 1885–1985* (Winter Park, FL: Story Farm, 2017). The Rice investigation is discussed in chapter 6.

Today, over sixty years after its founding, interest in Black Mountain College as a quintessential experiment in progressive education has become a cottage industry, generating scholarly articles, conferences, and workshops almost every year. The University of North Carolina Asheville holds an annual Black Mountain College conference and publishes the *Black Mountain Studies Journal*.

Amid all this assiduous attention, the role of Rollins College in the origins of Black Mountain College has been derided: a conservative college dismissed four brilliant progressive professors who took their theories to North Carolina and started a new innovative institution. In fact, Rollins proved to be the seedbed of the Black Mountain experiment.

4. In addition to founding the AAUP and serving as its first leader, Lovejoy was one of America’s foremost intellects, having written a seminal study in the history of ideas, *The Great Chain of Being* (1936). A passionate defender of faculty free speech, Lovejoy resigned from Stanford University in 1901 when the administration fired a professor over a disagreement with a trustee. The faculty at Harvard wanted to hire Lovejoy, but the president vetoed his appointment on the grounds that he was a troublemaker. In 1933 (and from 1910 to 1938), he was professor of philosophy at Johns Hopkins University. Daniel J. Wilson, *Arthur O. Lovejoy and the Quest for Intelligibility* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).

5. This discussion of academic reforms at Rollins is taken from Lane, *History*, 127–158.

In 1931, Holt organized a nationally publicized conference of leading university and college educators to discuss the viability of progressive principles in higher education and convinced the aging John Dewey to head it. The results of the conference formed the basis for the new Rollins curriculum. Lane, *History*, 150–153. For an analysis of the conference see Jack C. Lane, “The Rollins Conference of 1932 and the Search For a Progressive Liberal Education,” *Liberal Education* (Winter 1984), 297–395.

6. One of those “radical” faculty members was Professor Royal France. France was widely known throughout Florida for his political activism (he was president of the Florida Socialist Party) and for his vocal opposition to the segregation system and of police brutality against African Americans. He purposely flouted southern sensibilities and mores by refusing to call African Americans by their first names (using Mr. and Mrs. instead), by frequently attending Sunday services at one of the churches in the African American section of Winter Park, and by often entertaining Eatonville’s noted African American writer, Zora Neale Hurston, in his home. He later resigned from Rollins, moved to Washington and used his legal skills to defend those persecuted by HUAC. For a discussion and

-
- analysis of France's life, see Jack C. Lane, "Royal France: Crusader for Civil Liberties," Rollins College Scholarship Online, https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_facpub/116.
7. Lane, *History*, 160–161.
 8. *Ibid.*, 186.
 9. *Ibid.*, 188. Holt made the "cook" comment to the Lovejoy Inquiry. Testimony in the Holt Papers.
 10. *Ibid.*, 166–67.
 11. *Ibid.*, 166; *Quotation in Holt to Curriculum Committee, January 19, 1933*. Holt Papers.
 12. *Ibid.*, 188. Copy of Trustee Resolution in Holt Papers.
 13. *Ibid.*, 185–87. When Holt refused her request, Margaret Robbins wrote Holt: "For your progressive ideas in education and the spirit of comradeship in teaching for both students and professors that you pioneered, I have keen sympathy and admiration. But the policy of dismissal, I find myself in settled opposition. Under the circumstances, I send my resignation [from the Board of Trustees]." Her nephew Theodore Drier was a professor at Rollins. He resigned over the Rice dismissal and later played a key role in the founding and success of Black Mountain College. For a summary of Robbins' intriguing life see Lane, *History*, Chapter 6, footnote 34.
 14. Lane, *History*, 188.
 15. "Academic Freedom and Tenure: Rollins College Report," *Bulletin of the AAUP*. Vol. 19 (November 1933), 416–439. *Quotation*, 421.
 16. *Ibid.*, 419, 421.
 17. *Rollins College Bulletin*, "Rollins College vs the American Association of University Professors," Vol. XXIX, December 1933.
 18. For the Rollins trustee demand that the AAUP print Holt's pamphlet see S.A. Mitchell, Chairman Committee A to H. W. Caldwell, Chairman Rollins Executive Committee, December 5, 1933. Holt Papers.
 19. Letters from presidents in Holt Papers.
 20. *AAUP Bulletin*, Vol. 25 (Feb. 1939.), *AAUP, Reports and Publications*, "The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure." Holt to Ralph Himstead, December 9, 1938. Himstead to Holt, January 3, 1939.
 21. *Bulletin of AAUP*. Vol. 35 (Feb., 1939) 6.
 22. Holt to Himstead, December 15, 1938 Letter from Duke professor in Holt Papers. For an example of national coverage of the Rice inquiry see "Rumpus at Rollins," *Time*, Vol 21, June 10, 1933.
 23. Larry Gerber, "College and University Governance," *AAUP Reports and Publications* (January–February, 2015); Arthur O. Lovejoy and Austin S. Edwards, "Academic Freedom and Tenure: Rollins College Report," *AAUP Bulletin* 19 (November 1933): 6; and Hans-Joerg Tiede, *University Reform: The Founding of the American Association of University Professors* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 29.