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Introduction

The effect of two world wars has been devastating. Across the globe, social, commercial, political, and even ecclesiastical practices were disrupted or severed. In some cases, a completely new order emerged to replace or supplant an older one. Day-to-day life was disquieting, chaotic, and frequently miserable. Yet, while the wars brought profound changes, normal conditions resumed in a remarkably short period of time once the hostilities ended. Convinced that “might makes right,” man may ultimately annihilate himself, but he managed to survive the two world wars. American geography, in fact, survived better than most realize.

In this paper I endeavor to show how the field of geography responded to World War II in terms of disciplinary growth. By detailing the development of an autonomous Department of Geography at Northwestern University, I hope to demonstrate how geographers reacted to post-war conditions and how the discipline may have profited from the war experience. Due to an intensified public awareness of geography and geographers following World War II, geography courses and departments grew at unprecedented and unpredictable rates. By focusing on the circumstances at Northwestern, I intend to portray what may have been the typical scenario across America at the time. Acknowledging that unique circumstances can be noted for individual college campuses following the war, I contend that, in general, Northwestern's experience was the norm rather than the exception.

Wartime and Post-war Geography

At the close of the war, many academic departments in the United States experienced a tremendous period of growth. Thousands of service veterans opted to resume their education while college and university campuses prepared for a huge increase of “experienced” students. A substantial number of college-bound students were returning from foreign lands and government service. They were no longer “straight off the farms and out of the backwoods” but were now older, better informed, feverishly curious, and eager to learn more about the exotic places they had just visited, the captivating new peoples they had seen, and the new world which was being promised and redrawn. The colleges and universities across the nation were asked to quench their thirst for knowledge and to attend to their broadened horizons. Johnston notes that:

...there was a need for educated personnel, and the universities received unprecedented demands for their graduates to serve the new needs of society. Education expanded rapidly. The existing universities and colleges grew and many more were founded. Science and social-science departments expanded to meet the need for more students.

American geographers were no less influenced by the war than most other academic and professional people. A large percentage of those within or just entering the profession were called into active service to act as advisors or to train for combat positions. World War II witnessed a large number of trained geographers either being shipped off to Washington or stationed at home to train and serve in other capacities.

During the late 1930s, some 40 geographers were in Washington, D.C.; by 1943 there were some
300 geographers employed there. The demand for geographers was, moreover, heightened across the country when an opportunity to introduce geography into college and university offerings through an enlarged Army Specialized Training Program presented itself.

Geography was one field of learning that literally gained recognition and a degree of status during the war years. The war created an immediate need to know something of foreign places, and geographers were called upon to fill that need. In the end, the discipline achieved broad public acknowledgement, even if some were to claim that its practitioners were poorly prepared.4

More than most disciplines, geography became a subject of great interest and intrigue following the war. Wartime experience and the news media had created a fascination for foreign names and unknown peoples. An expanding news and information service heightened an awareness that the earth would be hereafter considered in global terms and that educated people could no longer think of themselves as separate from peoples in other countries and on other continents. The world was seemingly shrinking and a greater interest in other countries and distinctive cultures prevailed. In the words of one commentator, Guadalcanal became “as familiar a name in American history as Bunker Hill or Yorktown.”5 Moreover, new political boundaries were being drawn and large numbers of people were forced to realize the geographic consequences of nationalism and differing ideologies; boundaries changed and peoples’ lives changed. It was a period of transition for geography, where the needed spark was finally at hand that would ignite a discipline into everyday consciousness: departments of geography burgeoned at unprecedented rates to incorporate public interest. Reflecting on this post-war period, Stone recalls that:6

Geography’s inheritance from its overall World War II experience was great. The discipline ‘came of age.’ Its practitioners were tested at strategic and tactical levels in both domestic and foreign situations and were found capable of meeting a frightening variety of requirements . . . on the academic side the demand for geography right after the war sometimes could hardly be met. Administrators saw the field’s significance in the training programs, returning veterans wished to know more about where they had been, and the overall effect of a global war . . . led to the formation of areal institutes and the rapid expansion of departmental offerings.

In contrast to the war years, when academic life seemed to stand still and many of the best minds were called to serve in their respective capacities,7 the period following the war was characterized by growth, optimism, and excitement. It was a time of re-evaluation and self-criticism.8 The final chapter on this period and its influence on education has yet to be written. While the immediate results of the war on the education process were distasteful, the eventual effects were beneficial — at least for geography.9

Several years were of course needed to “pick up the pieces,” but after those few years had passed, geography and geographers in America came to occupy a special position in university and college programs. Students could not be trained fast enough whereas the older practitioners suddenly found themselves with a large congregation of anxious neophytes eager to assume the role of practicing geographers. It was a period of expansion and pragmatic accommodation:10

Those of us who went flocking back to the campus found ourselves part of a great mob that was inundating the halls of ivy. Those who had completed their work before the war returned to teaching posts. The younger ones picked up programs that had been abruptly halted, or cultivated new interests that had been stimulated by their wartime experiences. Those were the days of the original G.I. Bill, and the campus was awash with students. . . Those might well have been the golden days of higher education in the United States, but at the time we were too frenzied, too overcrowded, too harried to have time to think about it.

Geographers appeared to sense the growing excitement for a new world order at once and were quick to adapt their memories of the places they saw and the new data they were trained to manipulate to fit the changing needs at home. Geographers seemed to bring a special sort of enthusiasm back to the college halls because their experience in the war was first-hand and direct: As regional advisors they were intimately involved with the war machine. Hart continues:11

Geography faculty brought the lessons of their wartime experience back to their classrooms and curricula. They stressed regional geography, because they had learned that organized knowledge about places was important. Students liked regional courses, because such courses were relevant both to their own wartime experiences and to the task of reconstructing a war-torn world.

Geography was in its heyday. No longer an obscure unknown field of learning, geography was now in the academic limelight. Geographers were not only recognized, but they had “achieved a larger measure
of popular acclaim and official recognition than . . . been able to achieve at any time in the development of the science in . . . the United States. 12 There was, moreover, an enhanced cognizance that geographers had a significant contribution to make to peacetime efforts as well, 13 and that any effort, whether in peace or in war, would surpass whatever had been achieved by geographers during the first world war. 14

G. Donald Hudson: Northwestern's “Father” of Geography

Almost at once, G. Donald Hudson sensed the role academic geographers would come to play in post-war American education. Hudson anticipated geography’s peacetime expansion and was essentially responsible for the establishment of an autonomous Department of Geography at Northwestern University in 1945. Beginning with the school year 1919-20 and continuing until 1945, geography and geology shared personnel, quarters, and title in the then Department of Geology and Geography at Northwestern. 15 But it was Hudson alone who appears to have initiated, pushed for, and eventually achieved the separation of the two earth sciences on the Evanston campus. As head of Geography at Northwestern, Hudson has been characterized as someone who was “a combination Friend, Father, Intellectual, and God!” 16 and it is clear from extant archival records that Hudson indeed served in all four capacities while at Northwestern. The remainder of this paper is therefore given over to a brief look at Hudson’s pre-Northwestern career and a perusal of archival documentation in an attempt to illuminate his influence in creating an independent Department of Geography at Northwestern immediately following the close of World War II. Northwestern is cited here as a microcosm of a situation occurring throughout America, on every major university and college campus in the post-1945 period.

George Donald Hudson was born in Osaka, Japan, in 1897. Educated in the American Midwest, Hudson earned his baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degrees from the University of Chicago in 1925, 1926, and 1933, respectively. He served for three years (1926-29) as the “Director” of the Middle School, American University in Beirut, Syria, spent a short while as a “Dean” of Blackburn College in Carlinville, Illinois, and then moved north to Whitewater, Wisconsin, where he was hired, in 1933, as “Professor of Geography” in the then State Teachers College. The following year Hudson left Whitewa-

ter to assume the position of “Principal Geographer” for the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) where he remained until 1939; Hudson’s title had now changed to “Chief of the Land Planning Division.” 17

During the school year 1939/40, Hudson was hired by Northwestern as “Professor of Geology and Geography” but was, in reality, the only geographer in the eight-member department. In addition to Hudson, the “geography” side of the binomial department included William Edwards Powers who taught “Weather and Climate,” and “Physiography of the United States,” and Harold Bernard Ward, who taught “Economic Geography of Europe,” “The Geographic Transformation of Europe,” and “Asia — The Continent of Economic and Environmental Extremes.” Powers was also in charge of “Glacial Geology” and “Topographic Mapping,” two courses designed to fit either a geology or a geography specialization. The remainder of the offerings in the department were on the “geology” side which accounted for nearly two-thirds of the available courses. 18

The Department of Geology and Geography offered three “fields of concentration” — geology, geography, and the teaching of earth science — and Hudson’s duties were directed toward the middle specialty, never summoned upon to give courses on the geology side of the department. 19 His first courses at Northwestern bore the following titles: “Nature’s Role in Human Affairs;” “Geographic Assets and Liabilities of World Regions;” “Geographic Interpretation of Modern Life in North America;” “Natural Background to South American Economy;” and “Seminar in Land Problems in the United States.” The latter named course was apparently created at Hudson’s request and was based on his experience at the TVA. 20 From the course description we gain an insight into Hudson’s “specialty” as a geographer: 21

The purpose of this course is to develop an understanding of (a) current problems of land utilization in the United States, (b) objectives of land and regional planning programs designed to meet these problems, (c) methods of research and effectuation employed in these programs, and (d) the role of applied geography in land use planning.

Over the next four years little change was evident on the surface of the joint department. Several courses were dropped, while several others were added or substituted. The overall balance of the department remained constant however. In 1944 Hudson was inactive with respect to teaching duties:
His commitment as "Acting Co-ordinator of the Navy V-12 Program" consumed the larger part of his time that year. In consequence, numerous geography courses were omitted for the school year 1944/45, leaving Powers and Ward to carry the bulk of the teaching load. But Hudson's work with the Navy V-12 Program was not the only matter on his mind. A glimpse at the archival record at Northwestern indicates that during this time and for some time prior to 1944, Hudson's sights were set on geography's post-war position. He was concerned to draw attention to the new role geography was playing during the war; he was further moved to inform the Northwestern administrators that geography would occupy a preeminent position in university curricula once the war was over. In the final analysis, he was convincing and successful in conveying both messages.

On April 9, 1942, in a curious letter written to John Stark (Chairman of the Department of Geology and Geography), Hudson vented his frustration over the issue of the obligation of scientists to the war effort. Responding to an article in the Bulletin of the A.A.A.S. asking whether professional scientists were doing their duty in helping the nation through the emergency, Hudson stated his views of military preparedness and the role the academic community should play in determining specific requirements for "pre-training course." Angered by the fact that male students were not required to take courses which would help ready them for war conditions, Hudson made his opinions plain by singling out map interpretation and meteorology as prerequisites to national defense.

There is no question in my mind, and I am sure there is none in the minds of many faculty men, that every male student that we will enroll during the next two years who is physically fit will serve some sort of military service. There has been repeated mention in the press and from authorized sources on the radio that of all the fields in which the armed forces of this country need preliminary training map interpretation takes first rank. Meteorology is only second in importance. Is this not reason enough to make the taking of these courses a requirement? We owe it to the men, though they may not realize it. We owe it to the national effort, men in charge of it have expressed themselves. I take this position regardless of the fact that there are some who, with regard to their selfish academic interests, will undoubtedly accuse me of attempting to promote the fields in which I happen to be interested.

In effect, Hudson was monitoring a growing public awareness of geography's heightened role during the war years. Fortunately for the discipline, there were forward-looking geographers like Hudson helping to familiarize students with the applied war-related nature of geography. These "pre-training courses" were, for many, their initial exposure to college-level geography and their first introduction to an awareness of a field of learning that would remain with them throughout the duration of the war.

Interest in geography had been increasing for some time at Northwestern. In 1940 an anonymous donor gave John Stark fifty dollars to establish "The William H. Haas Lectures," in honor of W.H. Haas, long-time professor in the Geology and Geography Department. According to Stark:

The terms of the gift are flexible but the donor has stated that it may be repeated in subsequent years, and that he hopes that it may be increased by similar gifts by other friends to Professor Haas. The purpose is to supply the University with the stimulus resulting from one or two popular and technical lectures in the field of Geography, emphasizing especially its human aspects.

Concomitant with the Haas Lectures was a growing awareness of the rising popularity of geography courses within the Department of Geology and Geography at Northwestern. In an undated and unsigned memo to the President of the University — but a memo written prior to 1942 — the anticipated future needs of the joint department were itemized: The hiring of one senior and one junior geologist at their respective pay scales; "general assistance" in the form of "assistants," and "help" for the Geology-Geography Library; and, better housing arrangements. This was the first indication that geography was being considered distinct from geology. The memo continued:

The raising of the level of geographic work to a high graduate level is not now contemplated. In order, however, to implement a movement in that similar direction without undertaking it as yet on an auspicious scale: One junior geographer at $3,500 (asst. to assoc. professorial rank).

followed by this single telling sentence

Geography must in the long run look toward independent organization.

To acquire departmental independence, however, would necessitate initiative and drive on the part of one of the members of the then combined department; an autonomous Department of Geography would never result without that needed push and commitment.
Hudson was indeed the man with the drive and the initiative. In an impassioned letter to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts in December 1943, Hudson finally made his feelings explicit, pointing to both the situation at Northwestern and the mounting wave of interest in geography across the continent. In this candid letter, quoted at some length here, Hudson articulated his plans for an independent Department of Geography and outlined the steps which must be taken to institute such a move:27

Geography has always occupied a subordinate position among the other fields of learning at Northwestern — far out of line with its relative importance. On the national scene, geography at Northwestern has always played in the buss league — far out of line with Northwestern’s position among the nation’s great universities. Now is the time to decide whether or not this situation is to continue. World War II has increased public interest in geography, has brought about new developments in geography, has brought about new developments in other subjects that have had an impact on geography, and has drawn the contributions of geography for the first time to the attention of men in many types of work. New trends in educational thought, both related and unrelated to World War II, are appearing . . . I believe that the situation at Northwestern with respect to geography can not be allowed to continue. The University can not afford to disregard its responsibilities and opportunities in this field, and can not afford to continue in a position of apoloogy with respect to it. Therefore, I propose the early establishment of a Department of Geography that is staffed, equipped, and housed in a fashion appropriate to the work it should do and the position it should occupy here and among the other university departments of geography. The Department of Geography should be prepared to offer instruction on the undergraduate level serving the College of Liberal Arts, School of Journalism, School of Commerce, School of Education, and Technological Institute. It should offer pre-professional training in geography and should carry professional training to the Ph.D. level. Its primary relationship should be with the College of Liberal Arts. The immediate minimum staff requirements of the Department are eight men. Geography now has the equivalent of two men. Appropriate equipment includes the creation of a map library with an initial minimum outlay of $10,000 for maps alone. The immediate problem of housing is one of space and physical facilities. The physical location of the Department is of itself unimportant.

Hudson closed his epistle by calling the dean’s attention to a recent article by Bowman28 directed toward the present status of geography in America, and he enclosed a copy of the short article with his letter.

The December 30 letter apparently found the dean in a receptive mood because Hudson, in a follow-up letter one week later, went on to clarify matters in what reads as an obvious response to the dean’s queries concerning the true needs and immediate relevance in establishing a new department. Hudson made his position very clear:29

The Department of Geography I have proposed can be established only after the war is over. First, there is no space now available for it on campus. Second, the top notch men I have in mind are in the military service, are serving in emergency war-time organizations, or are concerned with Army and Navy training programs in other institutions. Although these circumstances prevent putting decisions immediately into effect, they must not be allowed to delay the decisions themselves. We should be ready to act if the war were over tomorrow. The problem of space alone demands this policy. In addition is the equally pressing problem of staff. Key men are already moving into permanent university posts or are making commitments to that end.

Later, in the same letter (in a bold and somewhat optimistic view of geography’s potential at Northwestern) he proposed a plan to establish not only an autonomous department but one preeminent amongst geography departments across the continent. In this fashion Hudson remarked:30

There is not now in this country, nor was there in the year immediately preceding the war, a real center of geographic teaching and research. The department I have proposed would constitute such a center. Such a department is appropriate to my conception of Northwestern and to Northwestern’s geographic position, and relationship to the Chicago area.

As grandiose as Hudson’s aspirations seem to have been,31 the dean was ostensibly impressed. Later that year inquiries were sent throughout the Midwest in search of possible additions to the prospective department. Information was solicited regarding the possible employment of, amongst others, such noteworthy geographers as Ralph H. Brown, Richard Hartshorne, and Glenn T. Trewartha.32 However, circumstances unique to all three men prevented Northwestern from adding the services of any of these three to the anticipated Geography Department.
A Department is Born

While a separate Department of Geography — one freed entirely from any administrative ties with geology — did not become a reality until the 1945/46 school year, archival documents reveal that the decision was agreed to in principle a year prior to the actual breakup. Apparently, there were numerous conversations between Hudson and Dean Hibbard about matters germane to geography during the Fall term, 1944. In response to those conversations, Hudson wrote to Hibbard asking that the dean's understanding of these exchanges be committed to writing. With respect to the situation in geography, Hudson related his version of these conversations to elicit a response from Hibbard:

it is the desire of the College to see established at the earliest feasible date a Department of Geography comparable to departments of geography that occupied leading positions in that field prior to the war. It is recognized that the desired goal cannot be achieved immediately partly because few men of the quality we seek are currently available due to their service in military and other emergency organizations and partly because there are urgent needs in other parts of the College. It is recognized, however, that the mere establishment of a Department of Geography and the increased demands made upon geography by the Bachelor of Arts Program will necessitate giving that subject special attention with respect to staff and equipment. A concrete and detailed plan for a Department of Geography which reaches into the year 1948-49 is now being drawn by Mr. Powers and myself.

The dean's reply was in the affirmative but he cautioned that although he agreed with Hudson's interpretation of their conversations "this commitment toward an ultimate department segregated from geology has not yet been approved as a policy by the University Administration." This seemed to satisfy Hudson for a short while because there appears to have been no further discussion of the issue for almost two months. One senses that Hudson was a keen observer of the campus mood and administrative temperament and that he was relying on his own judgement of the dean's ability to negotiate matters to fruition. But after six weeks had passed and no decision had been reached, Hudson again initiated discourse on geography's future at Northwestern. On January 2, in a joint letter signed by Hudson and Powers (but penned by Hudson), the two men refreshed the dean's memory:

Last year we submitted a plan for a department of geography toward which we believe we should move. Because so many qualified men were obligated to wartime duties, we were able to appoint only one of the two for whom budget allowances were made. The establishing of a department was postponed. We believe that further postponement is neither necessary nor wise. The program for a department as submitted here translates part of the original plan into a plan of action covering the next four years.

The two co-authors of this note stipulated that the future department be staffed by Hudson, Powers, Ward, Edward Espenshade, and four additional positions to be filled later — "one professor, one associate professor, one assistant professor, and one instructor."

The dean was now frustrated and eager for a quick resolve of the matter. Hudson had convinced him that an administrative division of the Department of Geology and Geography was in order. Enthusiastic to see the affair reach some conclusion, Dean Hibbard wrote that same day to Dean Fagg:

Mr. Hudson is anxious to settle the question as to the possible separation of geography from the Department of Geology and Geography. This is a question which has been much discussed for a good many years and has several points in its favor. I write to recommend the separation. I believe further that, with the growing importance of geography in post-war education, we should have another man in the field this next year. If an addition can be approved at this time, it will mean that the department will consist of Mr. Hudson, Mr. Powers, Mr. Espenshade, Mr. Ward, and an additional man. I should like to recommend that this additional man be provided and that the rank at this time should should not be determined, we would be left free to choose a man in any of the three upper ranks.

Fagg too, was enthusiastic about the proposed division and brought the matter to the attention of the university president. Two weeks later, acting on the recommendations of the two deans, the president raised the issue of geography's autonomy at the January 17, 1945 meeting of the Board of Trustees where his motion — "that the Department of Geology and Geography in the College of Liberal Arts be reconstituted as two departments, to be known as the Department of Geology and the Department of Geography; and that the personnel of the Department of Geology and Geography now concerned chiefly with geography be transferred to the new Department of Geography" — was approved by the Executive Committee that same day. After several years of discussion, a Department of Geography, completely separate and no longer affiliated with the Department of Geology, was at last
son's energy and perseverance had finally triumphed. Geography at Northwestern had taken the step many other departments of geography had already taken or would soon take on other campuses across America. The war, with its associated concern for far-away places and technical training and intelligence gathering, had brought geography to the forefront of public attention. Northwestern, like many other similar institutions responded by augmenting their commitment to a geographic education. Some departments would choose in fact to remain allied with geology, but the trend was toward detached associations and independent administrative status.

Hudson was placed in charge of the new Department of Geography and Arthur Howland was appointed chairman of the new Department of Geology. The initial separation appears to have been profitable for both disciplines. Prior to the division there were four graduate students in the combined Department of Geology and Geography. The first year they were administered independently, however, geology alone had three graduate students, whereas geography, as further testimony to its expanding post-war popularity, could already boast of six graduate students. Howland and Hudson obviously worked well together and their respective departments and personalities fostered cordial relations between them. Relations between the two disciplines may have cooled somewhat over the years, but the 1945 partition appears to have been propitious for both departments. Today, the Department of Geography at Northwestern University is still independent and still flourishing.

Final Comments
This short paper has attempted to shed light on the post-war public acceptance and disciplinary growth of geography as a popular and viable field of learning. To that end, I have focused on the situation at Northwestern and the influence of G. Donald Hudson in achieving respectability for geography. Northwestern, however, was used only as an example, in the hope that others concerned with the history of American geography will investigate and publish findings which tell the story at different colleges and universities. Since there is little at present with which to compare the above results, I am tentatively suggesting that the Northwestern example is typical of what transpired at other institutions during the same period. Differing personnel and personalities, distinctive and unique for their respective campuses and situations, of course caused other faculties to realize different alternatives — e.g. the addition of geography courses where none or few previously existed; an expansion of an already-established department of geography; or the adoption of new interdisciplinary programs utilizing the newly-demonstrated skills of geographers following World War II. Yet, I would maintain that, as a general rule, a greater interest in geography was prevalent on the majority of American campuses of higher education and that respective post-war curricula reflect this popularity. As Stone aptly pointed out,

World War II was the best thing that has happened to geography since the birth of Strabo.

This narrative is one of very few to document how geography’s World War II expansion and evolution achieved reality. It is to be hoped that other interested geographers will supply additional studies relating to the overall disciplinary growth of post-1945 geography in the United State. The specific mechanisms responsible for geography’s post-war development are part of an unwritten chapter in the history of American geography.
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