

What the Lens of Philanthropy Might Bring to the History of U.S. Higher Education

Andrea Walton

Indiana University Bloomington

OVER FIFTY YEARS AGO, Merle Curti sought to open up the academic study of philanthropy—the phenomenon of voluntary giving for public purposes—or what historians and reformers have commonly called “neighborliness,” “beneficence,” or simply, as translated from the Greek word *philanthropia*, “love of humankind.”¹ Curti believed this understudied subject would be a fruitful new area for study by scholars in the humanities and the social sciences. Steeped in intellectual and social history, and a nationally recognized pioneer in the interdisciplinary field of American Studies, Curti identified philanthropy as “one of the major aspects of and keys to American social and cultural development.” To his mind, philanthropy was the “index” and “agent” of culture—a phenomenon discernible over the entire span of U.S. history, dating back to colonial times with European antecedents; it gave shape and substance to what Curti, reflecting the language of his day, called the country’s “national character.”²²

The 1950s-style exceptionalism embedded in Curti’s language is dated, but Curti’s emphasis on philanthropic action as an integral and understudied part of U.S. history, and the value he saw in

encouraging academic, interdisciplinary study of so pervasive a phenomenon remains instructive. In two pioneering and still useful articles appearing in the late 1950s—on the heels of Curti’s service as chair for a 1956 Russell Sage Foundation-sponsored conference (held in Princeton, New Jersey) on the state of scholarship on philanthropy—Curti underscored the need for interdisciplinary inquiry in order to understand a phenomenon as complex and multi-faceted as philanthropy. Further, he sketched a roadmap for encouraging scholars to bring questions about the charitable impulse to the rising fields of social history, the history of education, and American Studies.³

More so than perhaps any other scholar of his day, Curti was uniquely qualified to chair what has become known as the Princeton Conference and to help in subsequent university-based efforts, backed with Ford Foundation money, to interest a number of senior and junior scholars in the academic study of philanthropy. Having written his dissertation on the peace crusades, Curti had long been intrigued by the prominent role of voluntary action as an aspect of democracy. Moreover, he was one of the country’s foremost and most versatile historians, known for sweeping studies of social action and intellectual and educational thought and tradition. Further, along with Vernon Carstensen, Curti produced an acclaimed two-volume history of the University of Wisconsin in 1949 (where Curti was a professor from 1942 to his retirement in 1968).⁴ Curti’s intellectual bent and the insights derived from various history projects led him to define philanthropy broadly—beyond financial largesse to include volunteerism as well as humanitarian social movements—and to gravitate toward studying the intersection of philanthropy and education as a means of more deeply understanding U.S. history, especially through investigation of the development and character of institutions of higher learning.

The test of Curti’s belief in the salient and, from his vantage point, salutatory role of philanthropy in shaping cultural and intellectual development—and his assertion that the history of higher education provided the most apt lens for capturing and illuminating this distinctive phenomenon—came in his *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education* (1965), which he co-wrote with his student Roderick Nash.⁵ The volume offered the first overview of the role and impact of private giving to U.S. institutions of

higher learning since Jesse Brundage Sears's pioneering 1919 dissertation, written under Paul Monroe at Teachers College, Columbia University.⁶ In looking at the contributions of private gifts and foundation grantmaking in the building of campuses, the strengthening of the professoriate, the cultivating and disseminating of new knowledge, and the shaping of the educational trajectory of certain marginalized or excluded student populations (notably women and African Americans), Curti and Nash's study differed in its approach and preoccupations from major surveys of higher education published in this period by noted historians. Scholars such as Richard Hofstadter and Walter Metzger, John Brubacher and Willis Rudy, and Frederick Rudolph had just published anthologies or were drafting what would become the dominant narratives about the development, scope, and character of U.S. higher education.⁷ Their frameworks emphasized the power of the faculty and administration, on one hand, and the expansion, democratization, and pre-eminence of U.S. higher education, thanks largely to federal involvement in the post-war decades, on the other. With the noteworthy exception of Rudolph's 1962 classic, *The American College and University*, which included a chapter titled "Financing the Colleges," these texts had remarkably little to say about the tradition of private support that had been integral to developments in higher education's structure, character, and diversity.⁸

The academic study of philanthropy as a subfield in U.S. history did not materialize as Curti and his colleagues at the Princeton Conference envisioned and that Curti tried to nurture, with Ford Foundation support, through the Wisconsin's Philanthropy Project he led in the 1950s.⁹ Until relatively recently, the 1980s or so, writings about philanthropy, though plentiful, were an uneven lot—generally penned by insiders (often celebratory reminiscences or house histories rather than systematic or analytical studies) or rather polarized and polarizing. In fact, writing in 1972, foundation expert Waldemar Nielsen described the literature as "the ill-informed screeds of the Old Right at one extreme, the New Left on the other, and the neo-Know-Nothings like George Wallace in between."¹⁰ In addition, scholars hoping to open up the field were constrained by having only limited access to the types of archival records needed to explore the motivations and dynamics of philanthropic giving, and lacked relevant theoretical literature to anchor studies. Research interest in the field

may even have been dampened by a concern that the pull of purse strings would color discourse or constrain critical examination.¹¹

Whereas the academic context in Curti's day was not propitious for efforts to promote a university-based study of philanthropy, the opposite was true for the other area of research considered in this essay—the university study of higher education, including histories in the field. Since the 1950s, the body of historical writings on colleges and universities—a specialization in the history of education—has grown considerably, reflecting the needs and interests of the rising applied field of higher education studies and the nation's growing number of colleges and universities—major recipients of both government funding and philanthropic largesse. The historical literature on U.S. institutions of higher learning is broad, capturing the founding of institutions, marking anniversaries and presidencies, tracing the rise of departments and disciplines, and examining questions of access, among other topics. Though extensive, and experiencing a number of noteworthy strands of revisionism since the 1970s—efforts to be discussed in this essay—the body of historical literature on higher education remains somewhat amorphous, compartmentalized, and perhaps even insular; more likely to be concerned with institutional issues than offering a coherent, penetrating view of higher education in U.S. society. Most relevant here, writings on higher education have had, with notable exceptions and despite the salient role of educational philanthropy in higher education since colonial times, relatively little to say about philanthropy, compared to the role of governmental funding. The literature on colleges and universities is largely guided by traditional professional concerns and political emphases—the agency of education reformers, the power of the faculty, and the impact of government policy and funding on access and research.¹²

Although the history of philanthropy and the history of higher education as specialties have developed along different paths since Curti's day and have been distanced from each other in terms of their audiences and concerns, the seeds of change—political and intellectual currents that would open possibilities for cross-fertilization or useful dialogue between these two fields (as I explore here)—were planted in response to what, in retrospect, were pivotal events of the 1960s and 1970s. These decades saw both the foundation world and universities, privileged institutions in democratic society, subjected to scrutiny, deeper analysis, and critique.

In Curti's day, foundations faced McCarthy-esque-congressional investigations into their ideological underpinnings and funding patterns, and were still lumbering toward a sense of their shared interests and history. The critique of foundations in the late 1960s led to the Tax Reform Act of 1969, and, in turn, to a large scale self-study of nonprofits, which was bankrolled by John D. Rockefeller III—the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, known more commonly as the Filer Commission (1973-1975).¹³ The changing political landscape underscored for practitioners in nonprofits, voluntary organizations, and foundations the importance of documenting and promoting the understanding of the scope and distinctive contributions of nonprofit and voluntary action as part of the country's history and democratic traditions.

The concern with respect to higher education was bifurcated, as historian of higher education Douglas Sloan noted.¹⁴ On one hand, some critics saw the university as an institution that had become far too homogenous, while others argued that higher education had become fragmented and served government interests rather than offered a cohesive vision to serve students and the larger society. Campus unrest and critique of the university helped fuel interest in lessons from the past that pointed to the experience of a wider range of students and professors, including diverse conceptions of the curriculum and of higher education's relationship to its local community and to society more generally.

Since the 1970s and 1980s, then, both areas of study—philanthropy and higher education—have benefited from an infusion of new intellectual questions and been confronted with new political realities that merit scholarly investigation. A new generation of scholars, likewise benefiting from larger currents of U.S. historical writing and producing studies that rethink old assumptions and frameworks, has begun to build an alternative to the architecture of older studies in the history of higher education. For its part, the study of philanthropy, which failed to take root back in the 1950s, has emerged as an academic field. The 1980s saw new scholarship and a range of perspectives on the subject appear, from a critical view of philanthropy as cultural imperialism, to studies tapping newly accessible archives and oral histories to capture the ideas and personalities that guided the grantmaking of major foundations that profoundly shaped fields of study, research paradigms, and

the national discourse in higher education.¹⁵ Generally housed in research centers and most recently its first professional school, the new field of philanthropic studies has gained visibility and legitimacy thanks to growing interest in civil society, nonprofits, and patronage.¹⁶ Scholars of religion, psychology, education, sociology, history, and fields such as nonprofit management and education have deepened our understanding of giving—through the study of altruism, charity, benevolence, prosocial behavior, the politics of knowledge, community-based change, and other topics. An efflorescence of new scholarship by researchers working within philanthropic studies has aimed to improve practice, broadened our definition of what counts as philanthropy, and sought to learn more about diverse cultures and traditions of giving. This development is especially timely as U.S. institutions, whether public or private, are becoming more dependent on private money—a reality that brings both opportunities and pressures—and direct more attention to cultivating the civic engagement of students.¹⁷

Unlike in the 1950s, academic study of philanthropy has taken root in the academy—as more archives have become available, books, articles, and handbooks have appeared, and professional societies and research centers to support scholarship have formed.¹⁸ In short, the time seems ripe to reconsider the intersection of philanthropy and higher education that captured Curti's imagination. If this task is undertaken, what might the lens of philanthropy bring to the study of the history of higher education?

This essay, exploratory in nature, considers this question in relation to the case of U.S. higher education, which took its shape and form thanks to both public and private means and, in contrast to developments in many other national settings, took root and expanded in the absence of a ministry of education or national university. Drawing on both recent research in the history of education and philanthropic studies, the essay takes as its springboard Curti and Nash's long-ago assertion that "philanthropy has been one of the major aspects of and keys to American social and cultural development"¹⁹ and sees the study of philanthropy—whether the giving of time or money—as central rather than tangential to understanding the development of higher education in the United States.

In the discussion that follows, I point to a number of areas or topics of keen interest to revisionist-minded historians of higher education

where the growing literature on the history of philanthropy might provide a useful cross-fertilization and help sharpen and further the revisionist thrust in historical writing on higher education. The discussion touches upon efforts to situate the story of higher education more squarely within U.S. history by exploring multi-layered connections between higher education and its context, considering the influences of various external forces, including the experiences of diverse social groups, and extending our studies into the post-World War II years, for instance. By helping us to enlarge our understanding of the power, variety, and influence of philanthropy in higher education's rise and development beyond the familiar tales of founding gifts or the work of large foundations, the lens of philanthropy might help to sharpen and advance promising currents of revisionism in the history of higher education. The insights garnered might help historians of higher education in their ongoing efforts to achieve a narrative that is ever-more attentive to the complexity of the past and to larger issues in society, more inclusive of the voices of diverse actors, and more willing to look beyond the artificial boundaries of a national story—to think in more global terms within the higher education landscape and ties between higher education and society.

Situating Colleges and Universities in Community and Context

In response to broader currents of historical writing, scholars in philanthropic studies and historians of higher education have tried to move beyond the genre of the insider's history or house history—whether of a university or a private foundation, for instance—to think more about the interactions of institutions and their environs. A consideration of the varied and enduring philanthropic ties between community and campus—notably, interactions between recipients and donors, whether individuals or foundations—can add a new dimension to at least two thought-provoking strands of revisionism in historical studies of higher education—the first regarding efforts to rethink the traditional historiography that privileges university history over collegiate history and focuses on the rise of the research university, and the second regarding efforts to reconsider the influences and relevance of religion to higher education in the United States.

College and Community

In the early 1970s, an intellectual challenge to the university-centric history of U.S. higher education that had shaped thinking in the field since the 1950s came with a flurry of thought-provoking articles written by a group of young scholars who had observed the turmoil on campuses and sought to bring historical perspective to bear on discussions of what was commonly described as the “crisis” in the academy. Notable among this group of revisionists were Douglas Sloan, James Axtell, James McLachlan, David Potts, Natalie Naylor, and David Allmendinger.²⁰ As a group, this new generation of scholars underscored that the conventional narrative of higher education’s development (i.e., the caricature of the “old-time” college and the story of retrogression told by Hofstadter and Metzger in their 1955 classic two-volume history of the development of the American higher education) reduced matters to a simplistic “morality play” between backward-looking college defenders and forward-looking university proponents.²¹ Revisionists argued that the characterization of nineteenth-century colleges as retrograde, albeit commonly echoed, was based on a false and unfair comparison between the college and university—two different types of institutions, with different missions—that the conventional focus on university building eclipsed and devalued the continued contributions of colleges to the higher education landscape. Standard accounts, revisionists argued, presented a whiggish view of higher education’s rise and development that belied the experiences in communities across the country. Colleges not only continued to exist in the “age of the university,” but were often (pace the view of university critics of the college) intellectually engaging and innovative places of teaching and learning, and were committed to character building, to reflecting the values of their local communities, and to serving those same communities.

University and Society

At the same time as this revisionist push to reconsider collegiate history came from early career scholars, a number of senior historians, notably Lawrence Stone and his colleagues at Princeton University’s Shelby Davis seminar, hoped to galvanize interest in

a more contextualized history of universities (much as Harvard's Bernard Bailyn had called for a fundamental reconceptualizing of the study of education in the colonial era).²² Stone and his colleagues became interested in bringing the methods and insights of social history to an examination of the ties between higher education and society and sought to understand better such relationships through international and comparative insights. "Few fields are today more ripe for the application of modern research strategies and tactics, and few offer greater promise of rich intellectual rewards, than the history of education," Stone wrote optimistically in his introduction to *The University in Society* in 1974.²³

Curiously, even though revisionist insights into higher education history did not generate the intense and at times volatile debates that engaged historians of schooling in the U.S. during the 1970s, the critique was provocative and has, albeit slowly, borne fruit.²⁴ It was in fact a leading historian of university building, Roger Geiger, who galvanized research on the topic and developed a new conceptual understanding and appreciation of the nineteenth-century college as a vibrant, multi-purpose institution.²⁵

Along complementary lines, historians of women's education have opened new vistas on the history of higher education by asking not only how women gained access to male-dominated institutions, but also where and how women have been educated and ways in which women have provided leadership in educational institution building. The resulting literature on normal schools, institutes, seminaries, and academies—stitutions that have held little prestige in the traditional narrative, but where many women studied and which dotted the nineteenth-century landscape of "higher learning"—has begun to change the conventional approach to writing and teaching about the history of higher education.²⁶ This more textured, and more complete, view of the array of institutions where numbers of people were educated and how these institutions reflected and connected in various ways to the surrounding environs provides insight into local markets at work, but, most relevant here, welcomes and can be enriched by the study of innovation, and even eccentricity, on the part of local donors, loyal alums, voluntary and community associations, religious organizations, and regional philanthropy in shaping the striking diversity of campus cultures in the landscape of U.S. higher education.

The lens of philanthropy can be a useful tool in illuminating the consequential ties between college and community that are of interest to historians, and indeed to contemporary educators and observers of higher education. The framework of philanthropy as a social relation—as best articulated by Susan Ostrander and Paul Schervish—can help guide historians of higher education in moving beyond a commonly held view of focusing on the donor’s gift and vision in unilateral terms.²⁷ In conceptualizing philanthropy as a social relationship, fueled by a range of motivations and with a range of outcomes, historians can better capture the ways philanthropy not only funded, but also shaped and reshaped higher education. In this light, the growing pursuit and infusion of private wealth in higher education, even at public institutions, over the decades has had an impact on the work and evolving professionalism of the campus fundraiser or agent, increased the time and energy presidents devote to soliciting donations and cultivating ties with potential benefactors, and even shaped the volunteerism and fundraising efforts of generations of college students. Lessons about higher education’s historic role in fostering civic engagement and, further, how campus-community work became a *de facto* part of the curriculum are found in the archives and publications of college student organizations that partnered with nonprofit groups in local college towns or nationwide (such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, YMCA/YWCA, or American Association of University Women).²⁸ But, importantly, in addition to shedding light on the power that philanthropic traditions and donor-recipient ties have exerted on campus administration and student culture, the history of educational philanthropy also offers cautionary lessons that resonate in some modern-day controversies over gifts about the moral dimensions of the philanthropic relationship between donors and recipients. One recalls that Baptist leaders debated whether the noble ends they hoped to achieve justified accepting “tainted money” from oil tycoon John D. Rockefeller.²⁹

Perhaps the clearest, and potentially most powerful, way the lens of philanthropy can sharpen, underscore the relevance of, and enrich our understanding of the history of higher education relates to the core issue of access—including the ways groups have gained opportunity, as well as the patterns of exclusion that have been salient even as higher education expanded and became a more

prominent and integral part of American life.³⁰ History offers many examples of philanthropic action and generosity helping to broaden financial or legal access for groups that had been marginalized or excluded, but the historical record also shows that the same impulse could be harnessed to different ends. In studying the ties between philanthropy and campus, then, we gain insight into how higher education both reflected and helped to shape the values and norms of the larger society. This can shed light on the role private giving played in extending opportunity, but also on instances of a profound disconnect between the democratic promise and rhetoric of higher education and reality on campuses.³¹

A Broader Angle of Vision: Beyond Foundation History

The area of philanthropic history that has attracted substantial and growing interest among historians of education since the 1980s has been the role of large-scale foundations. This specialized literature has focused on three important yet disparate areas of concern: the history of the intervention of white Northern foundations in black education after the Civil War, the role of well-endowed national foundations in underwriting disciplinary advances (especially in the social sciences), and the power of private initiative in driving standardization. As such, bringing attention to the dynamics and impact of philanthropy has shed new light on the politics of access and the “politics of knowledge,” and helps us better understand how educational philanthropy’s cross-institutional influence—what historian John Thelin has identified as the “horizontal history” of private initiatives—helped connect campus to campus and to standardize and shape the character of U.S. higher education. The role of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the establishment of teacher pensions by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT), or Abraham Flexner’s 1910 medical report aiming to standardize training and cultivate rigor in the field is exceedingly important to understand, especially since there was no strong federal presence to bring standardization or coherence to higher education.³²

Foundation involvement in black education, in standardizing higher education, and in shaping policy discussions about education, merits further historical study, in part because of the continued influence of

foundations in national discussions about higher education—whether about access and college completion rates or the need to foster civic engagement and to reinvigorate the liberal arts experience. While we need more historical awareness of the motivating force and impact of foundation policy and patronage on higher education, especially in an era of large-scale efforts by the Gates Foundation or the Lumina Foundation, for instance, it is important to underscore that philanthropic action in higher education has been far more varied than this high history of big foundations depicts. College and university archives, alumni/ae publications, and local community archives capture how profoundly donors—individuals of great wealth, but also participants of subscription drives, alums, college boosters, and members of the community—have shaped the distinctive character of campus and curriculum as they have exercised their moral imagination in support of alma mater or hometown institution.

Campus histories and the narratives that draw upon them generally acknowledge the importance of a founding bequest or, later, a large transformative gift—one, for example, that might help a college become a university or adopt co-education—but there is potential to develop this aspect of our historical accounts. Drawing upon the literature on philanthropic studies, historians might look beyond foundation involvement and the founding bequest to instead trace the philanthropic connections between campus and community over time. It is useful, especially given contemporary concerns, to extend the analysis beyond the dollar amounts of private giving that have been integral to institutional stability to also probe the nature of the relationship between donors and recipients—the “giving and the getting”—that introduced both parties to the needs and perceptions of the other and shaped the terms and nature of individual gifts.³³ It is worth underscoring that the philanthropic influences came not only from specific gifts, but also from social movements—such as abolitionism in the nineteenth century and the push for civil rights or gender equity in the twentieth century—that have left their imprint on campuses. This history lends persuasiveness to Curti’s assertion about the salience of philanthropy in shaping our intellectual and cultural institutions and higher education as the most crystalline example of philanthropy’s sway in the U.S. context. Further, we can move beyond the types of campuses or cluster of institutions most often studied, moving beyond the familiar examples of elite black

institutions like Fisk or Howard, for instance, thereby unraveling the commonly held portrayal of historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) as a monolithic group (a view that is woefully inattentive to the vast and salient differences among them), to instead explore the range of minority-serving institutions. Indeed, in exploring the ties of philanthropy, we might gain new perspectives on the circumstances shaping the diversity of organizations, missions, and specializations that has distinguished U.S. higher education.

Reconsidering the Influence of Religion and Diverse Religious Institutions

If greater attention to the contributions of local donors and the philanthropic actions of communities can add to efforts to rethink college and university development, looking to literature on the strong traditions of faith-inspired philanthropy and the historic connections among education, religion, and philanthropy in the U.S. setting can aid revisionist efforts to recover the depth and complexity of the religious influences that have shaped higher educational institutions. Religious philanthropy was at the heart of college founding in the colonial era and the later expansion of colleges across the frontier, forging important ties between the college and the religious and civic communities served.

The colonial era provides numerous examples of gifts and bequests to support orthodoxy and college building, but also early instances of a gift being used not to support the status quo, but, rather, to instigate institutional change—in this case, religious tolerance. Consider the funding of a chair in divinity at Harvard by Thomas Hollis, a Baptist. Hollis did not insist on the appointment of a Baptist scholar, but he did hope through the terms of his gift to open the possibility that a scholarly man of *any* religious belief, including in adult baptism, as followed by Baptists, might hold the chair.

What might the philanthropic lens bring to the study of the religious roots of higher education and to revisionist perspectives on secularization? Much as the mindset of historians writing in the 1950s and 1960s led to a university-centric view of higher education's past, the era's embrace of the ethos of science and its emphasis on the objective and the secular parsed consideration of religious inspiration and sentiment from discussions of university building. Even

though it was not uncommon well into the late nineteenth century for reformers to affirm an intimate connection among religion, education, and philanthropic action and, indeed, many educational thinkers saw no division between faith and knowledge, historians transcribed these modern divisions and sensibilities into their depictions of the past. Until a recent resurgence of interest in matters of faith and spirituality among higher educators and historians, the role of religion in higher education has been viewed mainly within a 1950s-inspired interpretative framework of “secularization as progress,” with this shift attributed to the intentional efforts of university leaders and discipline-builders who valued the methods and culture of science.³⁴ Perhaps the most convincing alternative to this dominant narrative of purposeful secularization is found in Julie Reuben’s *The Making of the Modern University* (1996), which asserted that men like Harvard’s Charles Eliot and Johns Hopkins’s Daniel Coit Gilman actually hoped to wed faith and science, but failed to find a suitable avenue for pursuing this goal and embracing moral education in the rising university.³⁵

No doubt there are examples embedded in the history of various campuses of philanthropy exerting pressures toward secularization as part of efforts to modernize and standardize education. Perhaps the best-known example of this phenomenon is how the requirements for participation in the Carnegie pension program compelled a number of institutions to cease their denominational affiliation—an example of the horizontal history Thelin has described.³⁶ But the story of philanthropy’s role in both secularization and the preservation of religious values has yet to be probed adequately. Consider, for example, the case of Butler University in Indianapolis, Indiana, which was founded by the Disciples of Christ in 1847 as Northwest Christian University. By the time the small Disciples institution had changed its name in 1855 to honor benefactor and administrator Ovid Butler, this cornerstone of Disciples education, located in the state’s capital city, was on its way to viewing itself more as an urban institution than a religious institution. Members of the state’s prominent Irwin Sweeney Miller family negotiated the separation of the School of Religion from Butler and used this enterprise to create the core of a new ecumenical seminary, Christian Theological Seminary, in 1924.³⁷

One can hardly understand the spread of higher education across the American frontier or the resilience of the denominational college

without acknowledging the influence of deep-rooted philanthropic traditions within Christianity.³⁸ The church-led subscription and the practice of tithing figured prominently in the founding and support for colleges, as did the power of various social movements and networks, such as the engagement of missionary associations.³⁹ For example, Mary Lyon fundraised tirelessly to establish her seminary for women in South Hadley, Massachusetts, whose leaders then went on, as a testament of their missionary zeal, to establish “little Mount Holyokes” in other parts of the globe.⁴⁰ Lyon’s institution building efforts illustrate the abiding connections among philanthropy, religion, and education that are noteworthy for their role in the founding of colleges, seminaries, and academies in the U.S. and for enabling women well before the franchise to contribute to the public sphere through their philanthropic activities.⁴¹

Tapping the rich literature on religious philanthropy that has appeared in recent decades can help scholars of higher education consider the role of theological education in the development of higher education as well as to look beyond the familiar focus on Protestant higher education to incorporate the history of Catholic academies, seminaries, colleges, and universities dating back to the early 1600s in this country. Such threads of history help connect the story of immigration to the founding of educational institutions—Notre Dame, Georgetown, and Dillard, for instance—and illuminate a gendered story capturing the status and contributions of teaching nuns, across regions in what would become the United States.⁴² Like Catholic institutions, those serving Jewish student populations, such as Yeshiva College and Stern College for Women, are rarely considered in the narrative. It is important to underscore that, just as colleges continued to exist in the “age of the university,” religious communities have continued to nurture and support networks of higher education institutions that provide communities with an alternative that is consonant with their values and traditions and benefactors have provided for refugee students and scholars.⁴³

Reconsidering the Experience and Contributions of Social Groups

Perhaps the most dramatic contribution that the lens of philanthropy—defined broadly, to include the giving of time and

money—can bring to historical study of colleges and universities is in helping to integrate the diverse perspectives, experiences, and contributions of a wider, and more historically accurate, range of individuals. This is especially true of the history of women and members of underrepresented racial and ethnic groups, whose stories and voices are not “heard” in standard historical accounts of the rise and development of higher education.

To be sure, histories of philanthropy had until recently, much like the traditional literature on higher education, focused on the predominantly white, well-endowed institutions of the U.S. Northeast and on donations from dominant social groups to broaden access to education for underserved students. Merle Curti and Roderick Nash’s *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education* (1965), for instance, building on earlier pioneering work by Jesse Sears, focused on women’s fights to obtain collegiate study and professional education alongside men as well as the expansion of schooling and higher education for “freedmen” in the South after the Civil War. However, the story told emphasized the benefaction of the likes of Matthew Vassar or Henry and Pauline Durant, whose gifts provided for the needs of women as well as for their own moral conscience, and the funding by Northern philanthropists, the likes of Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, to educate freedmen and women. Reflecting broader social assumptions and biases of the time, Curti and Nash celebrated the benevolence of donors to women’s education and black colleges, but left the power dynamics of the philanthropic relationship relatively unexamined. They wrote admiringly of the actions and motivations of donors and of the institutions they built and, inaccurately, saw these groups merely as passive recipients of benevolence.

In the past thirty years, though, the assumptions embedded in this historical interpretation have been challenged, and, correspondingly, there has been a push to enlarge what has been a relatively narrow mindset about philanthropic traditions and actors within the world of practice. At issue has been greater discussion and examination of the motivations of philanthropists, the impact of gifts on recipients, the interactions between givers and receivers, and the need to recognize the diversity of philanthropic traditions and ways of giving among groups whose contributions have not been recognized in the mainstream narrative. This revisionist orientation seeks not only to

probe the politics of grantmaking by large endowed foundations, but also to recognize the influence of individuals, whose contributions represent the lion's share of giving in the U.S. each year, and to capture more fully the wide range of initiatives within ethnic communities, communities of color, women's networks, and groups organized to support social change philanthropy.⁴⁴

How might we rethink the celebratory underpinnings of Curti and Nash's account, given the new scholarship that shows how profits derived from businesses connected to the slave trade were used to fund many of our country's leading institutions of higher education?⁴⁵ Or, what might the history of higher education and philanthropy look like if we shifted the angle of vision to consider the agency of historically marginalized groups, if we considered how they supported higher education on their own terms? Consider, for example, the literature on black education and philanthropy. James D. Anderson's pathbreaking *The Education of Blacks in the South* (1988) debunked the old narrative that portrayed the intervention of white, Northern philanthropists in education for African Americans as unquestioningly altruistic, benevolent, and salutatory.⁴⁶ This portrait of benevolence had been based on the memoirs of missionaries as well as house histories of certain foundations that invested heavily in Southern education and remembrances of their officers. Anderson provided a scathing alternative to this celebratory narrative, questioning the motivations of donors, critiquing the rationale and impact of the widespread promotion of industrial education, and affirming instances where a liberal arts education was instituted. But Anderson's revisionist view also rethought the paternalist structure of the existing narrative about philanthropy and black education. By looking at tax records and community histories, Anderson was able to capture the agency of African Americans and their willingness to double-tax themselves to provide education for their sons and daughters—in a sense inverting the portrait of African Americans as passive recipients of generosity to a vision of black self-help and philanthropic initiative that used education as its fulcrum.

Now, nearly thirty years after its publication, Anderson's work continues to be influential and has inspired a new generation of scholars—working in philanthropic studies, U.S. history, African American studies, and the history of education—who have offered well-researched revisionist accounts of black education that capture

the politics of private funding, but also the agency and resistance of blacks. Emmett Carson, Marybeth Gasman, Tyrone Freeman, and others have underscored the misperceptions and silences about African American contributions and traditions in the literature, have challenged old portraits of African Americans as passive recipients at the mercy of the motives and plans of white donors, and have illuminated the philanthropic underpinnings of culturally based modes of self-help.⁴⁷ This new literature on black philanthropy holds the potential to drive new understandings of education after the Civil War and to rethink the history of HBCUs as exceedingly diverse and distinctive products largely of the philanthropic impulse and an integral part of the story of U.S. educational philanthropy.

Frameworks for understanding women in education and in philanthropy have similarly shifted the view of the woman philanthropist from the stereotype of a “lady bountiful” to a more complex view of the varied motivations for women’s philanthropy, differences among women, challenges women exerted to oppression, and types of power women gained through their philanthropic engagements.⁴⁸ Much as the efflorescence of literature on women’s higher education that appeared in the 1990s began to challenge the dominant narrative and recognize that gender “bends” the history of higher education, a consideration of the power and politics of women’s volunteerism in support of campuses as well as financial support of higher education reveals many instances—across era and region—of women providing educational opportunities to other women and advancing higher learning more generally.⁴⁹ Philanthropy became an avenue for women to build institutions to meet gender-specific needs and forge opportunities denied to them on account of their gender. One thinks of institution builders Mary Bethune and Charlotte Hawkins, for instance, or the fundraising drives to found Barnard College or Pembroke as coordinates to established men’s colleges. Using the example of Bryn Mawr College, Mary Ann Dzuback has shown how a generous bequest enabled Bryn Mawr, a women’s liberal arts college, to establish graduate-level training in the social sciences.⁵⁰

The lens of philanthropy can shift the story of women from the story of admission to men’s educational institutions to women’s active roles contributing to institution building. For example, YWCA leader and patron Grace Hoadley Dodge and folklorist Elsie Clews

Parsons were able to cross boundaries and participate in institution and discipline building. Other universities offer examples as well where women developed a sustained philanthropic relationship to campus with a goal of broadening women's opportunities—Phoebe Hearst at the University of California, Berkeley; Katharine McCormick at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Ethel Sturges Dummer and Helen Culver at the University of Chicago; Flora Stone Mather at Western Reserve University (which later federated with Case Institute of Technology) in Cleveland, Ohio; or of Mary Garrett's efforts through strategic donations and advocacy to open the benefits of a Johns Hopkins medical education to women.⁵¹ In exploring the ideal of philanthropy as service and donations directed to race-uplift, historians interested in higher education have captured the stories of women like Madam C. J. Walker, who promoted education in beauty culture as a form of self-help and donated to HBCUs in the South as well.⁵²

Like the story of donors, the history of student-driven organizations and voluntary activities—whether religious or secular—helps illuminate the traditions of philanthropy that have helped to shape campus culture. Significantly more work needs to be done in this area, however. Scholars of social settlement history or the campus have pointed to ways philanthropic work became part of the formal and informal curriculum and preparation for life.⁵³ Scholars of African American philanthropy have told the story of sororities taking seriously the responsibility of serving their campuses, local schools, and the surrounding communities, thereby adding a new dimension to a historical literature on higher education that has generally, and quite curiously, had little to say about students.⁵⁴

To date, most study of women's educational philanthropy has focused on the nineteenth or early twentieth century. But what happened after the vote had been secured, legal access had been won, and professions were more open to women? What happened in the women's philanthropic work to address racial barriers in education after the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954? The philanthropic lens holds great potential for studying the decades when women's higher education participation was high and numbers of college-degree holding women looked to voluntary organizing to help broaden women's opportunities for public involvement. For example, how has the modern women's movement shaped women's

continuing education or women's centers or the creation of new knowledge in women's studies? What about philanthropy by and for women in more recent times—for example, the women who funded rape awareness centers? The story of women's push for equity is told not only in the history of equity-oriented government mandates, but also in this variegated web of feminist-driven volunteerism and giving.

Extending the Time Line and Reconsidering Post-World War II Reform

As archival records related to foundations and donor-recipient interactions become increasingly available, scholars interested in the sway of philanthropy are deepening and enlarging our perspectives on post-war educational history. It is heartening that two recent anthologies in the field have included documents related to philanthropy, but more work in this direction is needed.⁵⁵ The literature emerging on the World War II era has generally focused on government policy and action, and looked to the G.I. Bill and the Truman Commission, seeing these as milestones in the story of access to higher education.

Is it accurate to focus on philanthropy in the nineteenth century, through the role of the great university builders, but then shift the focus so narrowly to the federal government after WWII? The focus on government action has eclipsed the powerful role of foundations in standardizing higher education, promoting testing and notions of meritocracy, as well as the role of voluntary associations in developing national discourse on educational issues. Indeed, the history of philanthropy complicates the story of post-war era. Whereas the government rose to be the major funder of higher education, private action and funding often anticipated areas of need, identified problems and enabled research, shaped the discourse around educational issues, and provided money for experimentation. For example, private donors and nonprofit groups—some run by predominantly white institutions and some run by communities of color—provided the seed funding and organizing efforts for a number of early talent identification programs and access programs to recruit under-represented groups into higher education.⁵⁶

Well before Title IX, donors and foundations directed giving toward dismantling gender inequalities and broadening opportunities

for women. Some of these initiatives were local—for instance, the volunteerism and gifts that funded women’s centers and crisis programs. Others, notably foundation-funded broad-scale efforts, sought to transform learning spaces and the curriculum.⁵⁷

Perhaps one of the areas most ripe for further research is how the lens of philanthropy can help scholars understand and situate the history of U.S. higher education in transnational terms. Today, universities go abroad—to provide technical assistance, offer institutional models, and establish their own branch campuses—and in doing so often solidify ties with international alums. Such relationships extending beyond campus and country have a long history. The phenomenon of educational philanthropy that has been a distinctive part of U.S. educational history was transplanted to what became the U.S. with colonial founders and strengthened by fundraising trips abroad. Later, philanthropically funded models of education were exported—a handmaiden to empire and technical assistance—and U.S. philanthropic foundations extended funding to scholars and institutions in other national settings.⁵⁸ Following the money is crucial, but so is examining philanthropic relationships. Institutions of higher learning and their scholars have been involved in providing donated expertise and technical assistance whose interaction with recipient institutions and scholarly communities and lasting impact merits historical examination.

Conclusion

This essay has explored areas of historical interest where U.S. higher education’s history can be considered anew and with greater verisimilitude by considering the philanthropic dynamics at play. The examples discussed are not exhaustive, but are meant to provide a starting point for thinking about fruitful synergies and intersections of philanthropic history and higher education history. A push to bring the philanthropy to the study of higher education history aligns with efforts to galvanize studies of higher education that, moving beyond the particularity of an individual campus, are more keenly connected to larger issues in U.S. history and society—a goal that scholars like Merle Curti, Lawrence Stone, or the younger generation of revisionists in the 1970s embraced and which contemporary historians have moved forward.⁵⁹

Early efforts by historians to write about various dimensions of philanthropy's relationship to higher education—Sears (1922) or Curti and Nash (1965)—are still useful to scholars, but these studies are bounded and limited by their own times. Our classics in educational philanthropy and the history of philanthropy, though still a source of inspiration, are in need of revision. David Hammack's reflection on Robert Bremner's pioneering contributions, notably, Bremner's *American Philanthropy*, which owed much in its inspiration to Curti's efforts to build a field of scholarship, are instructive:

It should not be surprising that the standard Robert Bremner set with *American Philanthropy* in 1960 (a standard based significantly on Boorstin, 1953; Curti, 1951, 1958; and Schlesinger, 1944, 1950) now looks quite dated in method and assumptions. We must tell a larger, more complex story, a story based on adequate social and economic data, a story conveyed in words of ambiguous and contested meaning, a story characterized by conflict over religion as well as over race, class, and gender, an interrupted, discontinuous story.⁶⁰

Given that both historical writing on philanthropy and history writing on higher education are experiencing a period of re-invigoration, and the influence of donors and foundations is being felt more keenly (in an era of dwindling state appropriations and new “venture” philanthropy), the time is ripe for scholars working in education and philanthropic studies to produce new studies that bring the insights of social science and history writing to bear and help produce a new narrative that moves beyond the work of Robert Bremner, Merle Curti, and Roderick Nash, when they identified the philanthropic impulses that gave rise and character to our colleges and universities.⁶¹

As we rewrite narratives of both history of higher education and the history of philanthropy, and most especially their intersection, we might better understand an arena where private action has been extraordinarily salient and has continued to be influential in shaping discourse and funding innovation even as government expenditure has eclipsed private dollars. Most important, we will achieve a more accurate and inclusive perspective on the rise and development of our institutions of higher education and the ties between higher education and the larger society.

Notes

I wish to thank my doctoral students, Lyndsay Cowles and Elijah C. Howe, for reading the essay and to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions.

1. For a discussion of the changing meaning of the word, see Merle Curti, “The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research,” *American Historical Review* 62, no. 2 (January 1957): 352-363. For interest in historical perspectives on the ties between benefaction and higher education, see Shelley Strickland, “Partners in Writing and Rewriting History: Philanthropy and Higher Education,” *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 7, no. 2 (June 2007): 104-116; and Andrea Walton, “Introduction,” in the Hauser Center’s Philanthropy Classics Electronic Reprint of *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education*, Merle Curti and Roderick Nash (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1965; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).

2. Curti’s interest in the imprint of voluntary action on U.S. history can be traced back to his doctoral study of peace crusades. Curti’s dissertation, written at Harvard under Arthur Schlesinger, was later published as *The American Peace Crusade* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1929). For quote, see Curti, “The History of American Philanthropy,” 352; Curti draws on Arthur M. Schlesinger’s discussion of the “philanthropic streak” in “American Philanthropy and the National Character,” *American Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (Winter 1958): 420-437, quote at 422.

3. See Curti, “The History of American Philanthropy” and “American Philanthropy and the National Character.” For an overview of the foundation-sponsored conference from which Curti’s interest in the scholarly study of philanthropy grew, see Frances A. Huehls, “Introduction,” in the Hauser Center’s Philanthropy Classics Electronic Reprint of Margaret W. Otto, *Report of the Princeton Conference on the History of Philanthropy in the United States* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1956; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

4. Merle E. Curti and Vernon R. Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin, A History, 1848-1925* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949), esp. Chapter 21, “Getting and Spending,” 580-607. It is worth noting that Curti’s scholarship reflected his deep involvement and leadership in the new interdisciplinary field of American Studies, which had taken root with Rockefeller funding. See E. David Cronon, “Merle Curti: An Appraisal and Bibliography of His Writings,” *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 54, no. 2 (Winter 1970-1971): 119-135; and Allen F. Davis, “Memorial to Merle E. Curti,” *American Studies Association Newsletter* (June 1996). For a historical overview of relevant Rockefeller funding, see The Rockefeller Foundation, “A Digital History – Culture – History,” <<https://rockfound.rockarch.org/history>>.

5. Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1965).

6. Jesse Brundage Sears, *Philanthropy in the History of American Higher Education* (Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Education, 1922; New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publications, 1990). Paul Monroe is best known as editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopedia of Education* (five volumes, appearing in 1910-1913), which included informative entries on educational endowments and bequests in support of higher education.
7. Richard Hofstadter and Walter Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1955); John Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition: An American History, 1636-1956* (New York: Harper, 1958); Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Vintage Books, 1962).
8. Rudolph, 177-200.
9. Peter Dobkin Hall, "Teaching and Research on Philanthropy, Voluntarism, and Nonprofit Organizations: A Case Study of Academic Innovation," *Teachers College Record* 93, no. 3 (Spring 1992): 403-435.
10. Waldemar A. Nielsen, *The Big Foundations: A Twentieth-Century Fund Study* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), ix.
11. Hall, 403-435; and Peter Dobkin Hall, "The Work of Many Hands: A Response to Stanley N. Katz on the Origins of the 'Serious' Study of Philanthropy," *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 28, no. 4 (December 1999): 522-534.
12. See Andrea Walton, "Rethinking Boundaries: The History of Women, Philanthropy, and Higher Education," *History of Higher Education Annual*, 20 (2000): 29-57; Andrea Walton, "Women and Philanthropy in Education, A Problem of Conceptions," in *Women and Philanthropy in Education*, ed. Andrea Walton (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005), 1-38; and Andrea Walton and Marybeth Gasman, eds., *Philanthropy, Volunteerism, and Fundraising in Higher Education* (Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing and the Association for the Study of Higher Education [ASHE], 2008).
13. A discussion of the events leading up to the Tax Relief Act is found in Eleanor L. Brilliant, *The United Way: Dilemmas of Organized Charity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).
14. Douglas Sloan, "Harmony, Chaos, and Consensus: The American College Curriculum," *Teachers College Record* 73, no. 2 (December 1971): 221-251.
15. For example, the range of interpretative stances in Robert F. Arnove, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 1980); Ellen Condiffe Lagemann, *Private Power for the Public Good: A History of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983); Robert H. Bremner, *American Philanthropy* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1960, second ed. 1988); Ellen Condiffe Lagemann, ed. *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1999); and Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie, *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
16. See Stanley N. Katz, "Where Did the Serious Study of Philanthropy Come From, Anyway?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 28, no. 1 (March 1999): 74-82; and Hall, "The Work of Many Hands."

17. Charles M. Vest, "Industry, Philanthropy, and Universities: The Roles and Influences of the Private Sector in Higher Education – Research and Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.12.06," Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley (September 2006): 1-18; Andrea Walton, "Teaching Philanthropy in the History of Higher Education: Values and the Public Good," *Journal of College and Character* 4, no. 6 (September 2003).

18. In recent years, major archival holdings related to the history of philanthropy have become available at the Rockefeller Archive Center (which houses the Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Ford Foundation Archives, Russell Sage Foundation Archives, Commonwealth Fund, and others); Columbia University (Carnegie Corporation of New York Archives and Oral History Project); the Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (Philanthropic Studies Archives); Yale University (Milbank Memorial Fund Archives); the New York Public Library Manuscript and Archives Division (Aaron Diamond Foundation and the New York Foundation); the Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture (Phelps-Stokes Fund); Fisk University (Julius Rosenwald Fund); the Library of Congress (Andrew Carnegie Papers); and through the archives of many colleges, universities, and individual foundations.

19. Curti, "The History of American Philanthropy," 352.

20. Sloan, "Harmony, Chaos, and Consensus"; James Axtell, "The Death of the Liberal Arts College," *History of Education Quarterly* 11, no. 4 (Winter 1971): 339-352; James McLachlan, "The American College in the Nineteenth Century: Toward a Reappraisal, *Teachers College Record* 80, no. 2 (December 1978): 287-306; Natalie A. Naylor, "The Ante-Bellum College Movement: A Reappraisal of Tewksbury's *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities*," *History of Education Quarterly* 13, no. 3 (Autumn 1973): 261-274; and Natalie A. Naylor, "'Holding High the Standard': The Influence of the American Education Society in Ante-Bellum Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 24, no. 4 (Winter 1984): 479-497; David B. Potts, "'College Enthusiasm!' as Public Response," *Harvard Education Review* 47, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 28-42; David B. Potts, "American Colleges in the Nineteenth Century: From Localism to Denominationalism," *History of Education Quarterly* 11, no. 4 (Winter 1971): 363-380. For an overview, see Robert T. Blackburn and Clifton F. Conrad, "The New Revisionists and the History of U.S. Higher Education," *Higher Education* 15, no. 3-4 (1986): 211-230.

21. Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom*.

22. Lawrence Stone, ed., *The University in Society* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974).

23. Ibid., 3.

24. W. Bruce Leslie, *Gentlemen and Scholars College and Community in the "Age of the University," 1865-1917* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992); David Potts, *Wesleyan University, 1831-1910: Collegiate Enterprise in New England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992).

25. Roger L. Geiger, ed., *The American College in the Nineteenth Century* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002); Roger L. Geiger, *The History of American Higher Education: Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014).

26. For example, see *ibid.* Kim Tolley and Nancy Beadie, “Reappraisals of the Academy Movement: Introduction,” *History of Education Quarterly* 41, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 216-224. Greater attention is still needed to incorporate the experiences of historically black colleges and universities, and their students, into this current of revisionism. See the introduction in *Higher Education for African Americans before the Civil Rights Era, 1900-1964*, ed. Marybeth Gasman and Roger L. Geiger (New York: Transaction Publishers, 2012), 1-16.

27. Susan A. Ostrander and Paul G. Schervish, “Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as Social Relation,” *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*, ed. Jon Van Till (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990), 67-98.

28. Marybeth Gasman, Dorsey Spencer, and Cecilia Orphan, “‘Building Bridges, Not Fences’: A History of Civic Engagement at Private Black Colleges and Universities, 1944–1965,” *History of Education Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (August 2015): 346-379.

29. See Washington Gladden, “Tainted Money,” in *Philanthropy, Volunteerism, and Fundraising in Higher Education*, ed. Andrea Walton and Marybeth Gasman (Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing and the Association for the Study of Higher Education [ASHE], 2008), 20-23.

30. Jerome Karabel, *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2005).

31. Walton, “Teaching Philanthropy in the History of Higher Education.”

32. Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1989). For a discussion of “horizontal history,” see John R. Thelin, “Horizontal History and Higher Education,” in *The History of U.S. Higher Education: Methods for Understanding the Past*, ed. Marybeth Gasman (New York: Routledge, 2010): 71-83. See also its application in John Thelin and Richard R. Trollinger, *Philanthropy and American Higher Education* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). For standardization, see Thelin and Trollinger, *Philanthropy and American Higher Education*; Lagemann, *Private Power for the Public Good*; and Geiger, *The History of American Higher Education*.

33. Ostrander and Schervish, “Giving and Getting.”

34. See Frances A. Goodale, ed., *The Literature of Philanthropy* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1893). Linda Eisenmann, “Reclaiming Religion: New Historiographic Challenges in the Relationship of Religion and American Higher Education,” *History of Education Quarterly* 39, no. 3 (Autumn 1999): 295-306.

35. Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996); George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Douglas Sloan, *Faith and Knowledge: Mainline Protestantism and American Higher Education* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994).

36. Thelin, “Horizontal History.”

37. Andrea Walton, “‘Strength to Reason and Warmth to Feel’: A Portrait of Clementine Miller Tangeman (1905-1996), Philanthropist and Educator” (Center for the Study of American Culture and Education, New York University, Working paper, 1998), 11-12.
38. Henry Allen Moe, “Notes on the Origin of Philanthropy in Christendom,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 105, no. 2 (April 1961): 141.
39. Ronald E. Butchart, “Mission Matters: Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, and the Schooling of Southern Blacks, 1861-1917,” *History of Education Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 1-17.
40. Amanda Porterfield, *Mary Lyon and the Mount Holyoke Missionaries* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).
41. Goodale, *The Literature on Philanthropy*; Walton, *Women and Philanthropy in Education*.
42. Tracy Schier and Cynthia Russett, eds. *Catholic Women’s Colleges in America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).
43. Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research* (New York: Free Press, 1986).
44. See *Giving USA 2014: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2013, 59th Annual Issue* (Chicago, IL: Giving USA Foundation, 2014).
45. See Craig Steven Wilder, *Ebony and Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America’s Universities* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013) and the 2006 final report of the Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice that guided efforts to acknowledge and memorialize the institution’s ties to slavery, available at <https://www.brown.edu/Research/Slavery_Justice/>.
46. James D. Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).
47. See Douglas J. Simpson and William J. Hull, “Educational Philanthropy: An Instrument of Qualified Change,” *The Journal of Negro Education* 76, no. 3, “Celebrating the Legacy of ‘The Journal’: 75 Years of Facilitating Excellence in Black Education” (Summer 2007): 230-239. See Emmett D. Carson, *A Hand Up: Black Philanthropy and Self-Help in America* (Washington, DC : Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies Press, 1993); Marybeth Gasman and Katherine V. Sedgwick, eds., *Uplifting a People: African American Philanthropy and Education* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005); and Tyrone McKinley Freeman, “Beyond Hegemony: Reappraising the History of Philanthropy and African-American Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century,” *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 10, no. 3 (December 2010): 148-165.
48. Kathleen D. McCarthy, ed., *Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy, and Power* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990).
49. Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, “Does Gender Bend the History of Higher Education?” *American Literary History* 7, no. 2, “Special Issue on the History of Women and Education” (Summer 1995): 344-349.
50. Mary Ann Dzuback, “Women and Social Science Research at Bryn Mawr College, 1915-40,” *History of Education Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (Winter 1993): 579-608.

51. For a discussion of women's philanthropy at Columbia University and other institutions of higher education, see Walton, "Rethinking Boundaries" and idem, "Women and Philanthropy in Education."
52. Tyrone McKinley Freeman, "Gospel of Giving: The Philanthropy of Madam C. J. Walker, 1867-1919" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University-Purdue University, 2014).
53. See David P. Setran, *The College "Y": Student Religion in the Era of Secularization* (New York: Palgrave, 2003) and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's "Campus Y – History," <<https://campusy.unc.edu/about/history/>>. For social settlement work, see Julia Garbus, "Service-Learning, 1902," *College English* 64, no. 5 (May 2002): 547-565.
54. See Marybeth Gasman, "Sisters in Service: African American Sororities and Philanthropic Support of Education," in *Women and Philanthropy in Education*, ed. Andrea Walton (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005), 194-213.
55. Thomas Bender and Wilson Smith, eds., *American Higher Education Transformed, 1940-2005: Documenting the National Discourse* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008). John R. Thelin, ed., *Essential Documents in the History of American Higher Education* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014).
56. See, for example, Linda M. Perkins, "The First Black Talent Identification Program: The National Scholarship and Service Fund for Negro Students, 1947-1968," in *Higher Education for African Americans before the Civil Rights Era, 1900-1964*, ed. Marybeth Gasman and Roger L. Geiger (New York: Transaction Publishers, 2012), 173-197.
57. Mariam K. Chamberlain and Allison Bernstein, "Philanthropy and the Emergence of Women's Studies," *Teachers College Record* 93, no. 3 (Spring 1992): 556-568.
58. Arnove, *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism*.
59. Geiger, *The History of American Higher Education*; Paul H. Mattingly, James D. Anderson, Robert Church, Emmett Curran, and Marilyn Tobias, "Renegotiating the Historical Narrative: The Case of American Higher Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 577-596.
60. David C. Hammack, "Robert Bremner and the Study of Philanthropy in the United States: Four Appraisals," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (September 2003): 439-449.
61. Curti and Nash, *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education*; Bremner, *American Philanthropy*.