To a considerable degree the successes and failures of American geography since 1950 derive from the nature of graduate training in a surprisingly small number of "leadership" departments. Clark University was a powerful force in American geography during the "Atwood years" of the 1920s, '30s, and '40s. My residence at Clark was the period 1940–1942 when I was a student in the Graduate School of Geography following training in geography at the University of Missouri.

The dominant figure in the Clark Graduate School was the president, Wallace W. Atwood. Sr. and, he student or faculty, no one forget that at any time. Atwood's predecessor as Clark's president had been G. Stanley Hall, a psychologist who had developed an outstanding graduate school of psychology and also had found the funds to erect a handsome building in which to house that school. One price that Atwood exacted from Clark's Trustees as a condition of appointment was that the gradu-
ate psychology program would be replaced by a graduate school in geography of which he would be director—along with the presidency.¹

The faculty at Clark was relatively small. Clarence F. Jones offered courses in economic geography and Latin America, and served as Secretary of the Graduate School faculty. As Secretary, he had to do with admissions procedures, financial aid, and graduate student advisement than anyone else. He also directed more theses and dissertations than did any other. Samuel Van Valkenburg taught climatology, political geography, and courses on Europe and Asia. Elmer Eklaw, at one time a favorite student of Ellen Churchill Semple's, offered courses in anthropogeography, soils, and plant geography; he also served as editor of Economic Geography. Wallace Atwood, Jr., the only junior professor, taught most of the physiography and geomorphology through two courses—one on North America and the other on the eastern hemisphere. At times his father stepped in and lectured in these courses. Wallace, Jr., also organized and supervised Clark's famous month-long field course in the Connecticut valley each fall, all the faculty participated in varying degrees, but it was "Wally" who made the field courses consistent successes.²

President Atwood offered a required seminar once weekly, always scheduled late in the afternoon. He frequently brought visitors and invited lecturers to his seminar; Edward Ackerman and Warren Thornthwaite I remember vividly from those sessions. Atwood's seminar did not pursue a single theme. Instead, he presented what (apparently) concerned him at the moment and the subjects ranged from problems in geographic education to geomorphic topics, to discussions of prominent geographers and their contributions, to reviews and soliloquies based on recent articles in the periodical literature. By bits and pieces, Atwood's own methodological and philosophical views emerged but I am certain he did not view the seminar as methodological. Atwood was an articulate, powerful speaker; the sheer power of his presentations and personality generally kept his seminar group in a rapt, subdued state.³ But at times these sessions were unduly long and then the students listened to the clanging bells of the street-cars in front of Atwood Hall with wry amusement.

Insofar as I know, instruction in cartography was not offered at Clark regularly before 1940–41, when Erwin Raisz was invited to divert some of his time from Harvard to Clark on a regular basis. His course was a general one which followed the Raisz text closely. A poor lecturer, Raisz was most effective through his laboratory exercises. Many Clark students recall with gratitude the genial Guy Burnham, draftsman-cartographer for Economic Geography and factotum of the graduate student workroom.⁴ Those who were neophytes in

¹A relatively small private institution, Clark University limited the areas in which it offered graduate degrees in order to support them adequately. In the 1930s and '40s, international relations and history, along with geography, were "support targets." More recently, some fields in the physical and biological sciences have become graduate study areas. The notion of restricting areas of graduate study, and supporting them well, has much to commend it today even to institutions considerably larger than Clark.

²In my opinion, Wallace Atwood, Jr., did not obtain the recognition he deserved for his contributions because he taught in a program dominated by his prestigious father, the President-Director, and was much junior to his faculty colleagues. His doctoral dissertation at Clark had been directed by Clarence F. Jones whose junior colleague he became upon conformal of the degree. His lectures were closely organized and frequently provocative in the problem-oriented sense. His free-wheeling sense of humor pervaded both class and field sessions. He "pushed" for more attention to cartography, and he introduced Clark's first air-photo interpretation and analysis work. During my residence, all the Clark faculty was consistently available to and dedicated to their students, but none more so than "Wally."

³Shortly after our arrival at Clark, my young wife and I noticed that Mrs. Atwood, Sr., sat at the back of the auditoriums—or in the balconies—and took notes whenever President Atwood spoke. We wondered why. After observing this situation repeatedly, we came to the conclusion that she was recording any procedural errors, or "slips," in his presentations. His public lectures were precision performances, closely "orchestrated," and we came to believe that Mrs. Atwood was an important element in their preparation. His ability to construct three-dimensional large-scale landscape sketches on a chalkboard while lecturing—never missing a word, and both hands sketching at the same time—was remarkable and left either a lay or student audience overwhelmed. Despite his many duties, Atwood managed to schedule time with each team of two or three students during the field camp sessions. Frequently he was alone with each team, in the field, for half a day.

⁴The Clark graduate students were "officed" at: desks distributed among the map file cases and bookshelves of the map library, which were arranged to
draftsmanship frequently acquired their initial training on a personal basis from Burnham.

I have been unable to decide what sorts of criteria Clark used for selecting and admitting its students but suspect that reference letters were of overriding importance if transcripts were respectable. I believe that nearly anyone who possessed some college teaching experience was admitted. There were about thirty-five of us in residence in 1940–42, and it was clear enough that we varied as widely in geographical backgrounds as we did in the institutions from which we came—virtually all parts of the country were represented. Most of the students had some sort of background in geomorphology or physiography but, beyond that, there was greater variation than commonality in the prior training of the group. Those with a working background in cartography were few, as were those exposed to field mapping or to basic meteorology, and general statistics was *terra incognita*. Some had good backgrounds in economics, economic history, anthropology, and botany, but more had little or no exposure to these subjects. On the other hand, nearly everyone was grounded in the Huntington-oriented general regional geography of the 1930s, and most had substantive command of the regional geography of one or two continents. Also, most of the students had been through a teacher-training program of some sort, and the near-universal career objective of the group was college teaching.

There was another near-universal trait: we were dirt-poor. Clark had two or three fellowships that paid about $500 plus tuition, and there were some remission-of-tuition grants. Few students had autos. Many were in school on borrowed money. The modern era of competition among graduate departments for students through Federal and local fellowships, teaching and lab assistantships, research assistantships, and the like, had not arrived. We had no “G.I. Bill” to call upon and Federal student-loan programs did not exist. We were pre-World War II graduate students who had grown up during the years of the Great Depression and we expected to “make it” on our own.

The field camp session which initiated the academic year each autumn supplied a medium for developing a student cohesiveness, a camaraderie, that persisted in the workroom after we returned to the campus. The field program was heavily oriented toward recognition and mapping of glacial depositional forms, with secondary attention to rural land utilization and soils. Vegetative cover, transportation, settlement, and urban features received scant attention.

The curriculum was restricted—unusually so by present standards. Most students took most of the courses offered. The regional geomorphologies and Van Valkenburg’s regional climatology (based on Köppen) were, essentially, required; students optioned between Ekblaw’s soils and plant geography courses but nearly always took his anthropogeography; nearly everyone took one or the other of Jones’s Latin American courses and either Europe or Asia from Van Valkenburg but did not miss his political course. These, plus the Raisz offering in cartography and the field sessions were “about it” for two years of residence. There were seminars other than Atwood’s weekly one but most were sporadically organized and scheduled and usually involved critiques of contemporary literature on some common topic. The sole research-oriented seminar in which I was expected to delve into an original problem came under Clarence F. Jones (my mentor for the Ph.D. and my principal reason for going to Clark). In retrospect, I fault Clark considerably for its limited emphasis on research training generally, particularly through problem-oriented seminars for doctoral candidates. The doctoral candidates rarely obtained more
research experience through seminars than did the master's candidates. To my knowledge, my seminar experience was not greatly different from that of students who preceded me at Clark. One has to wonder how the course of American geography might have differed, since World War II, if the Clark of the 1920s and 1930s had been more research-oriented and less teaching-oriented in its doctoral programs.

A lot of talented people went to Clark; the group of which I was a member was loaded with ability.

Perhaps the restricted curriculum was an expression of restrictions in philosophy and outlook that dominated the faculty; I do not know. I am certain, however, that a latter-day form of environmental determinism predominated. Davison geomorphology was the "true word"; there were peneplains everywhere, it seemed, but dynamic equilibrium concepts we did not obtain. Historicism was okay provided its end-product was environmentally couched; we had no course in historical geography as such, but we were expected to be familiar with Ellen Churchill Semple. There was no course or seminar in the history of geographic thought or in geographic methodology. What we obtained in these areas came in bits and pieces from the regionally oriented courses and was slanted. Ratzel we knew much of, for example, but Vidal de la Blache we viewed only in passing as we came to the Geographie Universelle volumes, touted as valuable resources in teaching of regional geography. Richard Hartshorne's methodological articles from Annals had been bound and published by this time as The Nature of Geography; we were not referenced to that volume. Clarence Jones, apparently the only philosophical maverick on the faculty, privately suggested that Hartshorne's work would be much worth my reading. He was the only person at Clark that I recall even mentioning the works of Carl Sauer.

During World War II the Navy had me stateside near major libraries most of the time and I was able to do a lot of reading. I "discovered" Finch, Sauer, Bowman, Max Sorre, Passarge, Brunhes, Schluter, Wellington Jones, and some others, but especially Robert Platt. The works of Sauer, Hartshorne, and Platt became keystones for me.

I was still digesting these postdoctoral reading excursions when the Navy released me. Despite the advice from several friends from graduate days at Clark who urged me in the direction of a large California university which was considering me at the time, I joined the faculty of the University of Georgia in March, 1946, fresh from active duty.

Clarence Jones was the first Ph.D. at Chicago directed by Charles C. Kelby. Jones and Hartshorne had shared an office there during Hartshorne's first year of residence, and that association became the basis for an enduring friendship.