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Abstract and Keywords
This chapter outlines a brief history of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst from its creation to the present. Over the years, the State of Massachusetts has meddled in the University's organizational structure and often been stingy in providing financial support. But the State has never interfered in the intellectual activity taking place within the University.
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As is no doubt the case with many public institutions of higher learning, state-level politics has played a major role in the history of the University of Massachusetts.\(^1\) The University began its life as Massachusetts Agricultural College in Amherst toward the end of 1867. The political climate in which that College came into existence was heavily influenced by Jacksonian democracy—the idea that all citizens (not just the wealthy) should have equal political power—and the reform activity (such as the efforts to eliminate restrictions on voting rights) that came with it. One of the targets of the reformers was education. The instruction provided by the private colleges at the time, that is, the classical college curriculum based on the study of philosophy, theology, natural history, mathematics, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, seemed neither appropriate nor relevant for the purpose of enabling the children of farmers and mechanics to take their place in American society. To achieve the latter, a more utilitarian type of education was needed, one that imparted knowledge of the more practical arts and sciences. That education would require a curriculum that would also include such potentially useful subjects as political economy (in the sense employed when economics was emerging as a separate discipline—recall p. 1), geography, American history, French, and Spanish. Although some private institutions had begun to add instruction in several of these areas, it was not nearly enough. After all, the private institutions catered to the social elite, and the cost of the education they provided was more than most families could afford.

In the forty or so years before the creation of Massachusetts Agricultural College, and in response to pressures coming from various groups, a number of proposals were made for organizing and founding in Massachusetts public institutions of higher learning that would concentrate on instruction in the more practical fields. Some proposed institutions were to offer programs that focused primarily on agriculture; others were to provide a more general curriculum. But although prior to 1867 the Massachusetts legislature issued two charters for agricultural institutions, no public money was allocated for this purpose, and the efforts to establish the schools failed.
It was not until the Morrill Act was passed by Congress and signed by President Abraham Lincoln on July 2 of 1862 that public money became available to support public higher education in Massachusetts. The Act gave to each state 30,000 acres of federal land for each congressman from that state. This land was to be sold to provide the funding for at least one college in the state that would emphasize (not to the exclusion of other scientific and classical subjects) agriculture and the mechanical arts. The institutions formed under the Morrill Act became known as land-grant colleges. The Massachusetts legislature responded to the Morrill Act and the growing public pressure for public higher education by issuing a charter to create Massachusetts Agricultural College on April 28, (p.29) 1863. The legislation was signed by Governor John A. Andrew the following day, and a Board of Trustees was assigned the task of establishing the college.

Massachusetts Agricultural College had financial difficulties right from the very beginning. Although it did receive funding through the Morrill Act for the purchase of land, and a modest annual income from a trust fund also created under the Morrill Act, those monies were hardly sufficient. The legislature had required that the community in which the College was to be located should be responsible for covering the expense of constructing the buildings. The state would not commit itself to firm financial support, although it did provide two loans before the College opened in the fall of 1867.

Five Massachusetts towns vied to become the seat of the new institution: Lexington, Springfield, Chicopee, Northampton, and Amherst. Amherst was chosen by the Board of Trustees for at least three reasons: (1) the nationally known and very active Hampshire County Agricultural Society was centered in Amherst and was already facilitating considerable interaction between agriculturalists and educators; (2) Amherst was far enough away from urban centers that the experience of students in attendance would be purely agricultural (interaction with the local farm community was anticipated) and not influenced by city life; and (3) housing in Amherst and the libraries and museums of Amherst College were nearby and accessible.

Land for both the campus and a farm was purchased from six Amherst land-owners in October of 1864. The Town of Amherst raised the necessary money for the buildings through taxation.
and private subscription. After a prolonged dispute within the Board over the campus layout, over which the first president of the College, Henry F. French, resigned, construction was well underway. A (p.30) curriculum involving agriculture and horticulture (which were to be based on the natural sciences), mathematics, English grammar, modern languages, and the social sciences was approved. A faculty of four, consisting of William S. Clarke (botany and horticulture), Levi Stockbridge (farm superintendent), Henry H. Goodell (rhetoric and modern languages), and Ebenezer S. Snell (mathematics), was hired. Massachusetts Agricultural College opened its doors to 36 male students on October 2, 1867, with Clark, in addition to his professorial duties, as its third president. Late arrivals expanded the class to 56. That first class graduated with Bachelor of Science degrees in July of 1871.

A typical day for the incoming class consisted of mornings with three lectures and recitations, and an afternoon of labor on the farm. Saturday afternoon was set aside for recreation and scientific excursions, and Sunday was reserved for required attendance at church and a Bible class. Academic subjects were not covered in great depth due to the limited time available. And the many demands placed on the faculty deprived them of the time necessary to expand and deepen their intellectual capabilities and offerings—although some significant experimental discoveries that benefited Massachusetts agriculture were made.

Political activism among students at the University of Massachusetts dates to the first class that entered Massachusetts Agricultural College. On two occasions during the course of its four-year tenure the student body went on strike. In one instance, when the heat of the day rose to 100°F in the shade, the class refused to march to the Amherst College chapel. In the other, it protested against the manual-labor requirement. The latter incident led to a heated confrontation between the students and President Clark that was eventually resolved by a compromise in which manual labor would be limited to “educational lines.” (p.31)

During the fifteen years after the entry of its first class, Massachusetts Agricultural College struggled to survive. Educators, still largely sympathetic to the classical curriculum, were dismissive of the new applied approach to science, and they accused the school of having low standards. Farmers
were not convinced that academic study was the best way to learn the techniques of farming and farm management. The state legislature, which was expecting the College to be self-supporting, became critical when that proved to be impossible. The state did provide funding for new construction, and it did, however grudgingly, eventually cover the College's debts. However, it remained firm in its unwillingness to commit itself to annual support for the purpose of meeting operating expenses.

These were difficult times for the College. Revenues from the trust fund created by the Morrill Act were shrinking. A library, and more classrooms and laboratory equipment were desperately needed. Enrollments began to decline in the early 1870s, reaching the point at which the incoming class numbered less than twenty students in 1875. Many potential enrollees could not afford the $1,000 four-year tuition, and money was not available for scholarships. In addition, charges of mismanagement, misuse of funds, poor student food, and lax disciplining of students were leveled against the College.

By 1880 the tide had begun to turn. A proposal by Governor Thomas Talbot to close Massachusetts Agricultural College as a public institution and give it to Amherst College was dropped. The College began to receive recognition for the successful experimental work it had done during the 1870s that had made significant contributions to Massachusetts agriculture, and money to fund an experimental station on campus was appropriated by the legislature in 1882. Some additional money for new buildings and scholarships was also provided. At last, the state had committed itself to public (p. 32) support of Massachusetts Agricultural College. New staff was hired and enrollments began to grow. The future of the college was now reasonably secure.

In 1886, Henry H. Goodell, a professor on the original faculty of Massachusetts Agricultural College, was appointed as its president. He remained in that position for nineteen years until 1905. Under his leadership, the College advanced. More new buildings were added, and classroom and laboratory facilities improved. The faculty and student populations continued to expand, and a second Morrill Act, passed by Congress in 1890, provided additional financial support. Although twenty-three years behind the times, the first woman was admitted in 1892. The first Master's degrees were
awarded in 1896, and the first Doctor of Philosophy degree in 1902. Goodell himself was personally responsible for transforming the library, with an enormous increase in its collection of books and journals to over 23,000 volumes.

Another student strike shook the campus in 1905. It was provoked by a classroom disturbance that led to the year-long suspension of three seniors. The senior class as a whole apologized to the professor involved. But when the faculty refused to shorten the suspensions, the entire senior class went home. The suspended students were then reinstated, and everyone returned in time to finish up and graduate on schedule.

By 1890, Massachusetts (along with the entire country) was undergoing a rather rapid change from a rural to an urban society. The student body reflected this trend in pushing for less emphasis on and association with agriculture, and for more opportunities that would be characteristic of a college of arts and sciences.

The decade following Goodell’s presidency was also one of growth and change. The physical facilities on campus were improved and expanded. The student body became more cosmopolitan and (p.33) the requirement of manual labor was dropped. The administrative staff was restructured and enlarged. By 1916 the faculty numbered over 70, some 275 courses were offered, and the student population had more than doubled to nearly 600 undergraduate and 50 graduate enrollees. The faculty itself was organized into 23 departmental units with the latter grouped in 5 divisions. These were science, horticulture and landscape gardening, agriculture, humanities, and rural social science. Rural social science, which was new to Massachusetts Agricultural College, included agricultural economics, education, and rural sociology. An agricultural extension unit, which encompassed all pursuits outside of those related directly to degree programs, was also added. A number of activities already present on campus, such as the offering of short winter courses, were placed in the extension unit. A summer school was added to it in 1907 and agricultural clubs for boys and girls in Hampshire County were established in 1908. But in spite of the movement toward industrialization and urbanization in Massachusetts and American society and the pressures that arose from it, the College remained focused
almost exclusively on agriculture. The introduction of wider educational possibilities in liberal arts and sciences was still some years away.

It is not surprising that World War I had a profound impact on Massachusetts Agricultural College. The school year was shortened to permit students more time to work on farms that were producing food for the war effort. Student enrollments plummeted as young men entered the armed forces. The size of the faculty declined for the same reason. And a Reserve Officers Training Corps unit was established on campus at the end of 1917.

The College recovered quickly after the war, but the seeds for change had been planted. World War I had brought women into industry, agriculture, and the military in significant numbers. This, (p.34) in turn, led to a considerable advancement in the recognition of women’s rights, including the right, if desired, to a college education. Although women had been admitted to Massachusetts Agricultural College since 1892, their numbers as of the fall of 1917 added up to a grand total of 30. But by 1920, this number would double, and there would be a dormitory on campus that could house up to 100 women. In addition, special programs would be introduced and designed specifically for them.

But the most significant change in store for the College was the profound transformation of its relationship to the State of Massachusetts. In legislative sessions of 1918 and 1919, the College’s charter was terminated, and the College was merged with the state bureaucracy under the direction of the commissioner of education. A new budget system was introduced that deprived the College of the financial flexibility needed to meet unusual circumstances. It was also required to return all revenues it received (from tuition and the sale of products) to the state treasury. The only funds that could be spent were those appropriated in the rigid categories defined by the legislature. Moreover, state controls over salaries, titles, and duties, among other things, were imposed. Perhaps most damaging of all, appropriations for salaries and maintenance failed to increase as needed, and requests for new buildings were, but for two exceptions, largely ignored.
The consequences of the combination of budgetary stringency and the imposition of state controls were devastating. With better-paying positions available elsewhere, faculty and staff turnover became a serious problem. Between 1918 and 1923 about half of the key personnel on campus left and had to be replaced. By 1920, departures had wiped out all social-science faculty, although, for a brief period thereafter, courses in history and government were taught by an assistant professor. But from 1922 to 1924, no courses in social science were offered. The greatest loss, however, was the resignation of president Kenyon L. Butterfield, whose outstanding leadership was to a considerable extent responsible for the College's substantial growth and development between 1906 (when he assumed the presidency) and 1916. Butterfield, citing the imposition of state controls, left to become president of Michigan State College in 1924.

Toward the end of the 1920s, the forces that were pushing to transform Massachusetts Agricultural College into a more liberal-arts-directed state college or university were gaining momentum. There were increased demands for admission by the general public, and the state's industrial centers, presumably desiring graduates who were trained for positions in industry, were pressing for the establishment of a university. Student urgings for more liberal-arts types of opportunities became more aggressive and took the form of agitating for the creation of an arts degree program. Among the students’ efforts was a successful enlistment of the support of the alumni. In November of 1930 the trustees were also persuaded to join the chorus. A bill to rename the College (without any provision for redefining its educational purpose or orientation) passed the legislature and was signed by Governor Joseph B. Ely on March 26, 1931. Massachusetts Agricultural College had become Massachusetts State College.

By 1931, the student population had grown to 760, of which 210 were women. But with the primary aim of servicing agricultural needs remaining intact, there had been little alteration in the College's organization and educational programs since Butterfield's departure in 1924. The main exception was the creation of a new division of social science and the movement within that division to more general approaches in some disciplines and away from what had
become the traditional focus of those disciplines on matters that related to agriculture. (p.36)

In spite of the difficulties imposed by the Great Depression, more substantial changes occurred over the next eight years. As of 1933, the student population stood at 1,220. However, because there was no more room on campus in dormitories, and because there was no money for expansion, a moratorium on growth of the student population was declared for several years. Although the College had been resisting and was continuing to resist a hasty rush toward liberal arts, it still permitted movement in that direction by starting the process of establishing single departments for each of the disciplines in the social-science division. The agricultural economics courses in that division were moved into the division of agriculture, and a new Department of Economics in the division of social science was established in 1935. Initially, the Economics Department consisted of, and was headed by, Alexander E. Cance. But shortly after its creation it was expanded to three with the hiring of Phillip L. Gamble and Russell C. Larcom. Gamble became head of the Department in 1942.

By 1938 the pressures to offer a Bachelor of Arts degree could no longer be resisted and the awarding of it was approved by the trustees. At the same time, the social science division was renamed the Division of Liberal Arts. With some money becoming available from the Federal government, the number of students was permitted to rise to 1,500. A private initiative made possible the addition of two new dormitories in the early 1940s. But in spite of the expanding demands for admission by the citizens of Massachusetts, and in spite of the increasing need to upgrade and add new facilities, the state remained unwilling to provide the funding required for either purpose.

The decision to award a Bachelor of Arts degree did not quell the interest in turning Massachusetts State College into a university. Momentum in this direction began to build in 1940. Enrollments (p.37) were creeping up (another moratorium on growth was imposed when the student population passed 1,700) and an increasing number of qualified students had to be denied admission. Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine had already decided to convert their land-grant colleges into universities. The College’s alumni led the transformation-into-university movement in Massachusetts. With a concerted
effort, they gained the support of the president, the trustees, and the students. But as late as the summer of 1941 at the end of the legislative session of that year, the legislature would not acquiesce. Before the next legislative session could begin and permit the issue to be raised again, the country was at war, and attention was turned to other matters.

As with the World War I, the coming of World War II led to the exodus of male students and faculty from the university and into the armed forces. By 1944 student enrollments had dropped to 725, of which 600 were women. But at the war's end, with the passage of the so-called G.I. Bill that provided financial aid for higher education to all those desiring it who had served in the country's armed forces, the demand for college education all across the country became massive. Like many other colleges and universities, Massachusetts State College, with a facility that was barely adequate for 1,700 students, was ill prepared for the onslaught.

To handle the influx of students, buildings from army and navy training centers were moved to campus. The Federal Public Housing Authority erected others. The state allocated funds for still more. And, using the buildings that were already there, a temporary branch of Massachusetts State College was opened at Fort Devens northwest of Boston. The branch was intended as a two-year college whose graduates would, should they wish, continue for two more years as juniors and seniors at the College in Amherst. It remained in operation for three academic years. (p.38)

During the same period, the pressure to turn Massachusetts State College into a university re-emerged. In addition to the large numbers desiring admission, the technological advances during the war, among other factors, led to a demand for programs in engineering, business administration, and teacher training. Political support for the change was increasing, and student activism that included the lobbying of state politicians was considerable. On May 6, 1947, Governor Robert A. Bradford signed the bill, passed by the legislature, which converted the College into the University of Massachusetts.

In 1947, the University of Massachusetts was a university in name only. Much needed to be done to transform it into an institution that would be worthy of its new identity. To achieve that goal, a more appropriate organizational structure,
considerably enlarged and improved physical facilities, an expanded and extended curriculum, and a substantial increase in the number of faculty (among other things) were all necessary. By the early 1960s, considerable progress had been made. The legislature had given the University complete authority over appointments and personnel actions, and sufficient flexibility over the salaries of new appointees to enable it to compete successfully for accomplished scholars. (University revenues from tuition, however, still had to be turned over to the state.) The financial and business operations of the University had been reorganized and largely freed from state supervision, and the position of provost had been created. The liberal arts and sciences had been combined into one school (the College of Arts and Sciences), and agriculture and horticulture into another (the Stockbridge School of Agriculture). Separate schools of home economics, engineering, business administration (as distinct from the Department of Economics, which had, in part, been teaching business courses up until then), education, nursing, and physical education had been established. With the state finally cooperating in the provision of funds, building activity had been extensive. The student body had grown to 6,500 and the size of the faculty to 580.

The years 1945–1970 have been referred to as the golden age for American universities. That twenty-five-year span saw a continual and more or less uninterrupted expansion fueled by both massive demand for student admissions and the national research effort to catch up to Soviet space exploration after the successful launch of their Sputnik I in 1957. By the end of the period, enrollments at the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts had soared to almost 18,000 and faculty size had almost doubled to about 1,000. At long last, the University seemed to have joined the community of full-fledged, land-grant, public universities scattered across the country. Along with research service for the general public and nondegree instruction, it offered a considerable number of strong graduate-degree programs and was engaged in a variety of significant research activities—both of which were built on a large undergraduate base. A Boston campus for commuting students who could not afford a residential college education was approved by the state legislature in 1964 and opened fifteen months later in September of 1965. Also in 1964, a decision to establish a medical school in Worcester
was made by the University's trustees. Toward the end of the
decade, the University trustees introduced an improved
organizational structure in which each campus would (p.40)
be autonomous and headed by a chancellor. A president would
oversee the entire system, setting budget priorities,
determining general policies, engaging in overall planning,
and representing the University to the state and other
constituencies. An office for the president was opened near
the state house (some distance from the Boston campus) in the
fall of 1970.

It was during the 1960s that the University moved to establish
the major graduate-program and research credentials already
described. This was part of president John W. Lederle's
attempt to raise the prestige of the University of
Massachusetts to a level comparable to that of the best private
institutions. Thirty-four new PhD programs were added, the
hiring of new faculty focused on research-oriented scholars,
and the older faculty who, over the years, had mostly taught
classes and eschewed research, were encouraged to engage in
research projects.

Also during the 1960s, two political constituencies arose that
attempted to impose restraint on the University's expansion
program. First, the growth of the University of Massachusetts
was seen as a threat by the private colleges and universities in
the state—especially those who traditionally drew large
numbers of their students from the pool of Massachusetts's
high school students. These institutions banded together to
try, by restricting the ability of the University of
Massachusetts to expand, to prevent it from drawing too
heavily on that pool. Secondly, the state colleges that were
independent of the University of Massachusetts and a newly
created network of community colleges all competed with the
University for limited financial support from the legislature. In
spite of these efforts, University expansion and development in
the 1960s was robust. Indeed, by 1970 a consolidation of
academic programs generally encountered at the traditional
university level, along with a faculty of considerable quality to
match, had been achieved, and a (p.41) more secure
foundation had been laid for progress and for managing the
difficulties that lay ahead.
Those difficulties were not long in coming. For example, since the mid 1970s, serious budget problems have re-emerged. University budget requests have been frequently and significantly cut by the legislature. There have been freezes on hiring and salary increases, budgetary recisions on funds previously allocated by the state, deferred maintenance of physical facilities, early retirement programs, and general attrition as faculty found more congenial financial and academic environments elsewhere. Between 1987 and 2004, the number of tenured faculty on the Amherst campus declined by 243 or 25 percent, and the number of faculty in tenure tracks declined by 37 or 15 percent.  

There have been other interferences as well. For example, on the tenth of June in 1980, without any public discussion or review by interested parties, the legislature passed and Governor Edward J. King subsequently signed a budget bill that contained a section reorganizing the entire public higher education system in Massachusetts under a Board of Regents. In an editorial the next day, the Boston Globe reacted, in part, as follows: The reorganization “. . . involved deals and ‘understandings’ and pressures that had very little to do with the quality of this state's public higher-education system . . .” and “It will be no surprise if the . . . reorganization . . . does not work; it will be a miracle if it does.” In July of 1991, Governor William F. Weld signed legislation that incorporated the University of Lowell and Southeastern Massachusetts University (at Dartmouth) into the now five-campus University of Massachusetts system. And the Board of Regents was replaced with a less powerful Higher Education Coordinating Council to oversee the performance of public higher education in Massachusetts.

A plausible explanation of why the University of Massachusetts has been so severely buffeted on budgetary and other matters throughout its history by the winds of state politics has been provided by Ronald Story:  

The problem, he says, is partly one of ideology.
The rhetoric of democracy and opportunity, of joined hands and helping hands, has underlain every phase of University prosperity. . . . And the reality has mostly matched the rhetoric. In 1910, two-thirds of the students were from farming or wage-earning families; in 1930, 80 percent worked to pay their bills, and in 1990 three-quarters still did. The citizenry, however, . . . [has lacked] faith in government, in opportunity, in generosity of spirit, in democratic initiative—even, it sometimes seems, in the possibility of a culture held in common or, indeed, in the efficacy of informed reason itself. In such circumstances an institution predicated on public purpose, democratic aspiration, and the life of the mind is bound to have rough sledding. The results are evident not only at the University of Massachusetts but at universities, public and private, throughout the country.

However, there are differences between other states like California and Michigan, say, and Massachusetts. One of them is that the public universities in those states have been providing for over 100 years large-scale, high-quality education that has benefited tens of thousands of California and Michigan opinion makers. Because legislators and the public generally give money only for undergraduate education and not for research, a massive political constituency sympathetic to public education has been available to support public universities in those states for a long time. Moreover, in many midwestern states, public universities have provided considerable service and research support to their relatively large agricultural communities, which have, in turn, significantly added to those universities’ political constituencies. Those states generally do not have large numbers of private institutions competing for students with the public universities. However, the University of Massachusetts has only begun to establish its own constituency relatively recently—toward the end of the 1960s. The agricultural community in Massachusetts is comparatively quite small and, despite the help it has received from the University, is not large enough to have the same political effect as agricultural communities in the Midwest. Furthermore, there are many private and public colleges and universities in Massachusetts which, because they compete with the University for students, would prefer to keep the University of Massachusetts small. Thus the University’s political constituency has not yet become big enough and strong enough to overcome public apathy and pressures from the private institutions and the state and community colleges, and to insulate significantly the University from the vagaries of state politics.
Regardless, for whatever reason or reasons, as the foregoing brief historical survey shows, with the exception of a period of approximately twenty-eight years after World War II and in spite of several earlier intervals of growth, the state of Massachusetts has not been especially kind to the institution made up of the University and its precursors. It has meddled with the institution's organizational structure in a number of ways and sometimes subjected it to ill-thought-out political whims. Only reluctantly and after many protracted efforts did it give up state control over such things as faculty appointments, salaries, and duties. The financial support it has provided over the years has been, at best, lukewarm, and often downright stingy. Such miserliness has frequently caused episodes of considerable retrenchment and deterioration of the quality of the institution and its faculty, and it also has prevented the institution from reaching its full potential. And after each retrenchment episode, a costly process of rebuilding had to be undertaken.

Still, the tampering notwithstanding, the one thing that the state has not done is to interfere significantly in the intellectual activity in which the University, and the colleges before it, have engaged. In the grand tradition of Massachusetts liberalism, faculty have been mostly free to pursue their intellectual endeavors in the absence of any censorship pressure by the state. Specifically, in spite of the considerable fear across the United States of Communism and the Soviet Union that was exacerbated by the McCarthy era investigations of Communists in the U.S. government and which lasted into the 1970s and early 1980s, and in spite of the intellectual ties to Marxism that were clearly present, there was never a hint of disapproval or condemnation directed toward the (radical) political economy program or the (radical) faculty of the Economics Department on the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts.\(^6\) This has certainly not been true elsewhere. For example, in 1978 the Department of Government on the College Park campus of the University of Maryland enthusiastically endorsed the hiring of Bertell Ollman, a distinguished Marxist political scientist from another university, as Department chairman. This appointment was approved by the University's provost and chancellor. But the state's acting governor and several state legislators threatened to cut the University's budget if the appointment
were confirmed. The president of the University caved in to the pressure and vetoed the appointment.\(^7\) (p.46)

Notes:

(2.) The award of tenure could now be based on an evaluation of a faculty member's performance. Previously, faculty members, as part of the state bureaucracy, were classified as civil servants and, as such, were automatically granted tenure upon completion of the requisite number of years in their positions.


(4.) From a “Fact Sheet” prepared by the Office of Institutional Research, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.


(6.) Another example of this absence of state interference in the University's scholarly affairs during the fear-of-Communism period was the acquisition of W.E.B. DuBois's papers for the University's library. DuBois was among the most prominent and influential black scholars of the twentieth century. But he was also an acknowledged Communist who, by the time of his death in 1963, had surrendered his American citizenship to become a citizen of Ghana. Negotiations for DuBois's papers began at the end of 1971 with DuBois's wife, and the papers came to the library in 1973. Twenty-one years later in October of 1994, the University's Board of Trustees voted to name the University's main library in DuBois's honor.