WALTON HAMILTON,

AMHERST, AND THE BROOKINGS GRADUATE SCHOOL:

INSTITUTIONAL ECONOMICS AND EDUCATION.

Malcolm Rutherford

University of Victoria

(This Draft September 2001)

The research for this paper made extensive use of the Brookings Institution Archives, and the Walton Hamilton papers at the Tarlton Law Library at the University of Texas. I also benefited from access to the Archives of the War Labor Policies Board at the National Archives, College Park, Maryland; the Morris A Copeland and Carter Goodrich papers at the Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University; the Clarence Ayres papers at the Center for American History at the University of Texas; the H. C. Adams and I. Leo Sharfman papers at the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan; the Isador Lubin, Rexford Tugwell, and Mordecai Ezekiel papers at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York, and the Archives of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial at the Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York. My thanks also to the Amherst College Archives and Special Collections for information on course offerings, to my research assistant, Cristobal Young, for biographical research, and to Mark Perlman, Robert Whaples, Sherry Kasper, Roger Backhouse, and Julian Reiss for useful information and comments. Any errors are my responsibility. This research has been supported by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Research Grant (project # 410-99-0465).

1. Introduction

This paper is a small part of a larger project concerning the nature and development of American institutional economics during the interwar period. This project focuses not only on the basic concepts and major economic writings of institutionalists over that period, but also on the network of individuals involved, their students and where their students gained employment, the university departments that were centers for institutionalists, the research organizations and funding agencies that supported their work, their contacts with government and government agencies, and the links between institutionalism and developments in related disciplines. A recurring theme in much of this is the highly contested (and changing) nature of what should count as "good science" within the social sciences (Rutherford 1999; 2000a; 2000b; 2001a; 2001b).

As I have argued elsewhere, Walton Hamilton was one of the leading proponents (if not the leading proponent) of the "institutional approach" to economics during the earlier part of the interwar period (Rutherford 2000a). Hamilton's significance to institutionalism, however, went well beyond his academic writing to include an important pedagogical element. Hamilton was closely involved in two fascinating educational experiments, the first at Amherst College under the presidency of Alexander Meiklejohn, where Hamilton taught between 1916 and 1923, and the second at the Robert Brookings Graduate School which operated from 1923 to 1928. Hamilton was at the center of the RBGS for its entire life.

In both of these cases Hamilton and his colleagues produced a list of graduates that is quite outstanding in terms of their future careers in academics and in government. Of course, not all of these graduates adopted Hamilton's institutionalism, and some even became critics. Nevertheless, quite a few became recognized members of the institutionalist group, while others certainly expressed "liberal" economic and social views in their writing or in their careers. A number were associated with the Research and Statistics Division of the Federal Reserve, and there were several close associations with

Wesley Mitchell and the National Bureau for Economic Research. Many became involved in the New Deal administration, and with various movements for social and institutional reform. Graduates of the RBGS also include well known names in disciplines such as law and political science.

Beyond the careers of the graduates of these programs, the programs themselves are of considerable interest. Hamilton rejected the idea of education as "ritual" and attempted to design programs that would treat education as an "adventure," a genuine intellectual inquiry in which the student could participate (Hamilton 1923). The history of these programs is one of experimentation with both course content and instructional methods. Hamilton’s aims were to "teach the art of handling problems" rather than to instruct established doctrine, and to produce people who could make "contributions to an intelligent direction of social change" (Hamilton 1926). As will be argued below, these educational views are consistent with the nature of Hamilton’s "institutional approach" to economics as a study of the nature and functioning of the "economic order" and as relevant to "the problem of control," as opposed to exercises in "formal value theory" (Hamilton 1919b).

2. Walton Hamilton

Walton Hamilton was born in 1881 in Hiwassee College, Tennessee, the son of an itinerant Methodist minister. He attended the Webb School in Bell Buckle, Tennessee, and between 1901 and 1903 he attended Vanderbilt University. Later, he moved to the University of Texas where he graduated in 1907. He then taught English and the classics in public schools for two years before returning to the University of Texas as an instructor in medieval history and for graduate level work. For some reason, Hamilton chanced to take a seminar in economics from Alvin Johnson. In his autobiography, Johnson remarks that Hamilton was the best student he ever had (Johnson 1952). He encouraged Hamilton to go to the University of Michigan for graduate training in economics, which Hamilton did in 1910. Johnson and Hamilton became, and remained, close friends.

Johnson’s recommendation of Michigan (as opposed to, say, Columbia or Chicago) may seem strange, but at that time the Michigan economics department contained a particularly interesting and diverse faculty, including Fred M. Taylor, Henry Carter Adams, and the sociologist Charles Horton Cooley. Taylor had a reputation for providing a extremely thorough and rigorous training in neoclassical economics, for his insistence on clear thinking, and his generally anti-interventionist views. In contrast, Adams had been profoundly influenced by his exposure to German historicism, was a pioneer in the area of law and economics, and a champion of the role of government in the regulation of industry, facts particularly well displayed in his essay "On the Relation of the State to Industrial Action" (Adams 1887). For Adams, standards and regulations were required to prevent competition from becoming a race to the bottom, and to constrain the market power of monopolies and large corporations. "Corporations assert for themselves most of the rights conferred on individuals by the law of private property, and apply to themselves a social philosophy true only of a society composed of individuals who are industrial competitors" (quoted in Dorfman 1949, p. 170). Adams also established the Statistical Bureau for the Interstate Commerce Commission and became deeply involved in issues of railway accounting and regulation.

Cooley had been a graduate student of John Dewey’s, when Dewey was at Michigan, and he maintained a Deweyan emphasis on society as an organism and on the social construction of mind. Cooley began teaching sociology in 1894, but he remained a part of the Department of Economics (Sociology did not become a separate department at Michigan until 1924). Cooley’s work in the period between 1912 and 1915 is of special interest as it concerned issues of "pecuniary valuation." For Cooley the market, meaning "the system of pecuniary transactions regarded as one organic whole," is to be seen as an institution, as "a vast and complicated social system, rooted in the past, though grown enormously in recent times, wielding incalculable prestige, and, though manned by individuals like other institutions, by no means to be understood from a merely individual point of view" (Cooley 1913). For Cooley the usual treatment of valuation in economics was severely insufficient as it failed to go back of an individual's given wants, "it being assumed, apparently, that these wants spring from the inscrutable depths of the private mind," and not usually recognized that "they are the expressions of institutional development." Individual preferences are "molded by the market;" the market "is a continuous institution in which the individual lives and which is ever forming his ideas" (Cooley 1913). Cooley also regarded public control as a "normal and inseparable part of the economic process" (Dorfman 1949, p. 404).

At Michigan, Hamilton became one of Taylor's teaching assistants charged with making "marginal utility in all its ramifications clear to the sophomores" (Hamilton 1929, p. 183). He also took Taylor's course in theory, courses from Adams when available, and Cooley's seminar. Perhaps some of Adams's influence can be seen in Hamilton's life-long interest in the intersection of law and economics, but Cooley's influence was also profound:

> He helped us see the industrial system, not as an automatic self-regulating mechanism, but as a complex of institutions in process of development. He may never had said so, but from him we eventually learned that business, as well as the state, is a scheme of arrangements, and that our choice is not between regulation and letting things alone, but between one scheme of control and another. In some way he forced us to give up our common sense notions, led us away from an atomic individualism, made us see "life as an organic whole." and revealed to us "the individual" and "society" remaking each other in an endless process of change (Hamilton 1929, p. 185).

Hamilton's fellow graduate students included David Friday and Walter Stewart, and all were listed as instructors in economics for the 1911/1912 academic year. Writing to Walter Stewart in 1912, Friday stated his conviction that "the day of the sociological economist is a hand" and that "presently the older generation will give up their seats of power and we will come into our own" (David Friday to Walter Stewart, September 21, 1912, H. C. Adams Papers, Box 13, David Friday Folder), and in 1913 he was appointed to a professorship at Michigan.[1] Before coming to Michigan, Stewart had worked as an assistant in economics at the University of Missouri and had overlapped with Thorstein Veblen for one semester. Stewart left Michigan after a year to study with John Dewey at Columbia over the summer, and then to return to Missouri to study with Veblen.[2] Beginning as an instructor, Stewart rose in rank and remained at the University of Missouri until 1916. He developed interests in money and banking, but he never completed his doctorate. During that time he became close friends with Veblen, Veblen even living with the Stewarts for a year. Hamilton stayed at Michigan, both completing his doctoral dissertation "Medieval Ideals of Authoritative Control," and becoming an assistant professor in 1913. The next year he was recruited to the University of Chicago on the recommendation of Robert Hoxie. There he became friendly with Hoxie and with Harold Moulton, but he only stayed for one year before being hired away to Amherst.

One product of Hamilton's teaching experience at Michigan and Chicago was his book of readings *Current Economic Problems* which first came out in 1915 (Hamilton 1919a). The collection (discussed in Rutherford 2000a) indicates both Hamilton's "institutional" point of view, with its emphasis on modern industrialism and "the pecuniary basis of economic organization," and his highly problem centered approach to the teaching of economics.

3. Amherst College 1915-1923

In 1915 Hamilton was appointed to the Olds professorship of social and economic institutions at Amherst College. Alexander Meiklejohn had become president of Amherst in 1912, having previously taught philosophy at Brown University. Meiklejohn was an enthusiastic educator with liberal ideals. He attempted to bring about innovations in the curriculum and in teaching methods, and hired a number of young faculty--Hamilton among them. Walter Stewart also joined the economics department at Amherst in 1916, and Hamilton and Stewart, along with a Professor Crook, taught the entire economics program. Clarence Ayres, who had majored in philosophy (with a minor in economics) at Brown, also came to Amherst. During the 1915/16 academic year he worked as an assistant for Hamilton's sections of the introductory course "An Introduction to Social and Economic Problems," which was his own introduction to institutional economics. The next year he left for Chicago to study under Robert Hoxie, but Hoxie committed suicide very shortly after Ayres's arrival, and Ayres switched to philosophy, graduating in 1917. After a few years teaching philosophy at Chicago, Ayres returned to Amherst as a member of the philosophy department in 1920. Hamilton and Ayres became close friends were to keep up a considerable correspondence.

The Economics program at Amherst between 1916 and 1923 was designed by Meiklejohn, Hamilton and Stewart, with advice from Wesley Mitchell (Hamilton 1917). The program itself consisted, first, of a general freshman course to be taken by all students, and also intended as a lead into the more advanced courses in economics, history, philosophy, and political science. As the title of the course, "An Introduction to Social and Economic Problems," suggests it consisted of "an analysis of the more important social problems of contemporary interest," and was explicitly designed to interest and challenge the student, create discussion, and give the student "a more active relation to intellectual matters than do the traditional subjects." The course discussed general problems of social organization and of the welfare of society, and sought to provide not final answers, but "a revelation of the disciplines in which the facts and principles necessary to their fuller appreciation are to be found" (Hamilton 1917, pp. 3-4,12). The teaching materials produced for this course by Hamilton and Ayres are quite fascinating as they consist entirely of pages and pages of questions with which Hamilton and his quiz masters would try to prod, provoke, irritate, and stimulate his students. One student, Dexter Keezer, has described

Hamilton beginning a course by talking about the law of contributory negligence, citing cases of how somebody had lost an arm but was awarded no damages as he had been standing two feet from the position he should have been in. Keezer thought he must be making the cases up and so went to the library to check (Keezer, 1972, Taped Interview by Robert Coleberd, Brookings Institution Archives, A86-011). This kind of attempt to stir students up was Hamilton's primary technique in a great deal of his teaching, and it probably had no greater success than at Amherst. In contrast, Stewart was a much quieter individual and did not use Hamilton's methods.

The program in economics proper was originally intended to consist of two full year introductory courses, followed buy a number of "advanced" courses. Of the introductory courses, the first was titled "The Pecuniary Order" and the second "Wealth and Welfare." Sections of these courses were offered by both Hamilton and Stewart in 1916/17. The outline for "The Pecuniary Order" states its content as: "a survey of the organization of society in its pecuniary aspects" including money, banking, accounting, the mechanism of the market, including investment and speculation, and "a study of the rise of the pecuniary calculus, its varying domain, its potency as an organizing force in society, the institutions and values which are beyond its pale, and its adequacy as a guide in programs of social reform" (Hamilton 1917, p. 12). The Hamilton papers contain collections of what might be materials for this course including a "fragment" of an outline called "The Pecuniary Order" written by Walter Stewart. This begins with a "General Statement" that reads:

> The Pecuniary Order is an organized and continuous process; it is the economic aspect of our experience. Economic activity which proceeds upon an institutional basis has been directed so largely by considerations of price that the economic organization of today may be viewed as a price system. Through its long history this system has proved its capacity for growth, having been constantly including and discarding elements and

> reorganizing itself to meet new situations. In its current phase it is going through the painful process of digesting the machine industry. The disintegration of the old order incidental to this change in technology has been accompanied by new integrations and specializations of function into the present order. The development of institutions and new activities are mutually conditioning, never taking place separately but always affecting one another accumulatively. By studying in turn the growth of these various agencies, treated as aspects of the developing system, the influences organizing the order may be understood. Such a survey of the pecuniary order from different points of view indicates its organic character, the interdependence of the functionally related parts, and gives some hint as to the direction in which the whole system is moving (Stewart nd, Walton Hamilton Papers, Box J13, Folder 5).

The course outline that follows contains sections titled "Institutional Basis of Pecuniary Order;" "Pecuniary Calculation;" "Pecuniary Competition;" "The Markets;" "Contract and Property;" "Corporation a Unit of Business Organization;" "Accounting and Corporate Policies;" "The Wage Earning Class;" "The Investment Organization;" "Speculation;" "Insurance;" and "Special Control by Government." An edited version of this outline also appears in a collection of material that seems likely to have been assembled for Hamilton's version of the course, material that included selections from Veblen, Cooley, Mitchell, Sidney Webb, as well as from his own *Current Economic Problems*.

The course "Wealth and Welfare" discussed the welfare of society as a whole, the division of society into pecuniary groups, distribution as affected by market prices and by social arrangements, the distribution of opportunity, and programs such as co-operation, welfare work, scientific management, trade unionism, and socialism.

Amherst College Calendars indicate that in the 1917/1918 year the first course was renamed

"The Economic Order," a title that Hamilton also used on a number of draft book manuscripts, and the second course was first moved to the advanced level and then broken up into courses on "Labor in Industrial Society" (usually taught by Hamilton) and "Problems of Labor and Management" (usually taught by Crook). Its place at the introductory level was taken over by a slightly more orthodox course in "Economics" or "Principles of Economics" described as "a study of current problems in their relation to economic principles" and taught by Professor Crook.

Other advanced courses included various (and varying) offerings of electives in topic areas such as public finance (taught by Crook), business cycles (Stewart), and money and banking (Stewart). Stewart's views of business cycles were based on Mitchell's work, while his institutionalist view of money emphasized "the socially organized character of banking activity," and the importance of understanding monetary and banking institutions and their "cumulative relations in time" (Stewart 1917). Also offered fairly regularly was "The Theory of Modern Industrialism," described as a genetic study of institutions and problems of contemporary society and taught by Hamilton and Stewart.

Amherst was also something of a home from home for Veblen, who visited quite often, usually staying at the Stewarts' house, next door to Hamilton's. Veblen gave a series of lectures at Amhest in May 1918, based on the material later published as *The Vested Interests* (Veblen 1919), and there were occasional larger gatherings including others with an interest in Veblen's ideas, such as Isador Lubin and Leo Wolman.[3]

In 1918 both Hamilton and Stewart were involved in work relating to the war and the Amherst teaching program became thinner than normal. Stewart competed a study on the prices of iron and steel products as a part of Mitchell's *History of Prices During the War* (1919). This work was done by the Prices Section of the War Industries Board, that Mitchell headed. Hamilton worked with the War Labor Policies Board as an economic expert dealing mainly with reconstruction issues. Felix Frankfurter was the Chairman of this Board, and Harold Moulton was also employed by them as an economic expert. It was at this time that Hamilton, Moulton, and J. M. Clark were discussing directions for economic research, and, with Mitchell, Stewart, and others, contemplating the possibility of a "permanent reclamation of the American Economic Association" (Rutherford 2000a; Letter from Harold Moulton to Walton Hamilton, May 31, 1918, Records of the War Labor Policies Board, Correspondence of Walton H. Hamilton, Economic Expert, June-Nov 1918, Box 1, Folder M). One direct outcome was the 1918 American Economics Association conference session involving Hamilton, J. M. Clark, William Ogburn, and with Walter Stewart in the Chair, in which Hamilton presented his institutionalist manifesto "The Institutional Approach to Economic Theory" (Hamilton 1919b).[4]

In the 1919/1920 academic year the Amherst economics program retuned to its previous configuration. Interestingly, R. H. Tawney was a visitor at Amherst that year and co-taught a senior course in "The Control of Social Development" with Hamilton and Stewart. Tawney’s *The Acquisitive Society* was published in 1921, and selections soon appeared in Hamilton’s course material. Hamilton was to maintain correspondence with Tawney, and he also knew other "liberal" British economists such as Henry Clay, the Webbs, John A. Hobson, and William Beveridge. His relationship with Clay was particularly close and they corresponded frequently. Also, as mentioned above, Ayres taught in the philosophy department from 1920, and at least one of his courses, "The Moral Order," was more a course in social theory than philosophy, with readings from William Graham Sumner’s *Folkways*, Charles Horton Cooley, Emile Durkheim, John Dewey and Veblen.

Walter Stewart took leave from Amherst in 1922 to go take up the job of Director of the Division of Research and Statistics at the Federal Reserve Board, a position he had been recommended for by Wesley Mitchell (Yohe 1990). A year later, in 1923, the Amherst experiment came to an end with the enforced resignation of Alexander Meiklejohn as President. The reasons for this action were most likely a combination of Meiklejohn’s liberalism and his hiring of many young faculty that upset others. The official reasons related to his somewhat extravagant lifestyle and personal financial difficulties. There were many protests over his firing, and Hamilton, Stewart, Ayres, and others all resigned their positions. Stewart was offered the Presidency but declined (Yohe 1982).[5] Hamilton's address to the graduating class of 1923 praised the merits of "education by adventure" and intellectual freedom as opposed to the "slavery" of education by ritual and of merely accepting opinions upon authority (Hamilton 1923). The protests were in vain, however, and, a few years later, Meiklejohn moved on to run the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin.

During the time that Hamilton, Stewart, and Ayres were at Amherst, there can be no doubt that the economics students were very explicitly exposed to a substantial amount of the "institutional approach" to economics. A number of their graduates went onto careers in economics or related areas. Several, such as Winfield Riefler, Stacy May, Dexter Keezer, Carl Raushenbush, and Addison Cutler followed Hamilton to the Robert Brookings Graduate School and their careers will be picked up again below. Others worthy of mention here are Morris Copeland, Carter Goodrich, Edward Morehouse, Paul Raushenbush, Willard Thorp, Louis Reed, and Talcott Parsons.

Morris Copeland started with an interest in philosophy and Greek, but late in his undergraduate career he took an introductory course in economics from Walter Stewart, followed by a senior seminar given by Stewart. Copeland and Stewart remained in touch and Copeland was always to credit Stewart with a great influence on his thinking. With Copeland's interest turned toward economics, Walton Hamilton helped him obtain a graduate fellowship in economics at Chicago. Copeland graduated from Amherst in 1917, and went on to Chicago to complete his doctoral thesis, "Some Phases of Institutional Value Theory," in 1921 under the supervision of J. M. Clark. On Stewart's advice he also studied accounting. Copeland became a well know member of the institutionalist group. He was a professor of economics at both Michigan and Cornell, a member of the research staff of the NBER, Executive Secretary to the Central Statistical Board (in which capacity he was heavily involved in the improvement of government statistical services during the New Deal), made major contributions to national income accounting, and was the developer of flow of funds accounting (see Rutherford 2000b for a detailed discussion of Copeland's career).[6]

Goodrich started in English and was a student of Robert Frost's. His shift into economics inspired Frost's poem "The Runaway."[7] Goodrich was interested in labor problems and American economic history. After his graduation in 1918, Hamilton arranged for Goodrich to visit Britain to work with Henry Clay, then with the Ministry of Labour. The material from this research became his University of Chicago doctoral thesis, published as *The Frontier of Control: A Study of British Workshop Politics* (Goodrich 1920). He returned to Amherst as a faculty member in 1921, and taught with Hamilton. In 1924 he moved to Michigan, and in 1931 was recruited to Columbia by Wesley Mitchell. Goodrich was later assistant to the Ambassador to Great Britain in 1941, and became very much involved with the International Labor Organization, chairing the governing body of the ILO from 1939 to 1945. He was a consultant to the United Nations from 1948 to 1951.

Edward W. Morehouse graduated in 1918 and went to Wisconsin to do his doctoral work. He studied under J. R. Commons and completed his doctorate in 1920. Morehouse went on to Northwestern University where he became Editor of the *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics* (later *Land Economics*). Morehouse was particularly familiar with Commons's legal economics and engaged in correspondence with Commons and with Karl Llewellyn of Columbia Law School over Common's definitions of "custom" and "working rules" (Karl Llewellyn to Edward Morehouse, December 15, 1925, John R. Commons Papers, Box 3, Folder 5).

Paul Raushenbush graduated from Amherst in 1920 and also went to Wisconsin for graduate work, but did not obtain a doctorate. For several years he was an assistant professor of economics at Wisconsin and worked at the Experimental College with Meiklejohn. He, along with his wife, Elizabeth Brandeis, were closely involved in the drafting of the Wisconsin unemployment compensation law in 1932. In 1934 Raushenbush was appointed as Director of the Unemployment Compensation Department of the Wisconsin State Government. His wife, the daughter of Justice Louis Brandeis, also taught economics at Wisconsin, becoming a professor, and was active in many labor and social issues and in the League of Women Voters.

Willard Thorp began in mathematics, but Hamilton persuaded him to move to economics by showing him "that mathematics could be used through statistics as a tool in economics" (Thorp 1947). He graduated in 1920, taught at Amherst in the 1921/22 year and then went to Columbia and, in 1923, also joined the research Staff of the National Bureau of Economic Research. He completed his PhD dissertation on "The Integration of Industrial Operation" in 1925, and, along with Mitchell, produced the volume *Business Annals* for the NBER (Thorp and Mitchell 1926). Thorp would later return to Amherst as a Professor of Economics and write an institutionalist textbook, *Economic Institutions* (Thorp 1928), but he remained on the staff of the NBER until 1933, and would later serve on the Board. He became Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in 1933 and was a member of the Industrial Committee of the National Resources Committee, a group that also included Lauchlin Currie, Mordecai Ezekiel, Isador Lubin, Gardiner Means, and Corwin Edwards. Thorp joined the State Department in 1945, became Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in 1947, and also served as an American representative to UNESCO. He was President of the American Statistical Association in 1947.

Louis Reed graduated in 1924 and went on to complete his PhD at Columbia University. He and Carl Raushenbush both became part of an institutionalist group that formed at the Washington Square College of New York University in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Willard Atkins was the Chair of the Department, and others in the group included Corwin Edwards, Anton Friedrich, and Donald McConnell. Edith Ayres was also on the faculty, and Clarence Ayres taught there in the summer of 1930. The textbook *Economic Behavior: An Institutional Approach* (Atkins et al., 1931) was the product of this group.[8] Reed became a member of the research staff for the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care (which also involved Walton Hamilton and Wesley Mitchell) and then moved to the Social Security

Board and the Public Health Service, contributing many papers and a number of books on health economics and health insurance. Later, he turned his attention to health insurance and psychiatric care.

Another, and very famous, Amherst student, Talcott Parsons, became a critic of institutionalism. Parsons took Ayres's philosophy course "The Moral Order" as well as a course from Walton Hamilton (Parsons 1976, p.175). According to Parsons, he received enormous stimulus from Hamilton and Ayres, "without their influence I would probably never have become a social scientist at all" (Parsons 1976, p. 179), "so institutional economics was really my jumping off place" (Parsons 1959, p. 4). After Amherst, Parsons went to study at the London School of Economics (with introductions provided by Hamilton) and was exposed to the work of Harold Laski, Richard Tawney, Bronislaw Malinowski, and Leonard Hobhouse, influences not out of line with those he had been exposed to at Amherst. Parsons then moved to Heidelberg and obtained his doctorate from there in 1927. Parsons earlier work shows some definite institutionalist and historicist influences (Parsons 1928/1929), but later, after moving to Harvard, Parsons became increasingly critical of historicism and institutionalism (Parsons 1934,1935), and shifted toward a concept of economics as an analytically abstract discipline, and of sociology as an search for uniform general laws (Hodgson 2001).[9]

4. The Robert Brookings Graduate School, 1923-1928

The Robert Brooking Graduate School was one of three organizations developed by Robert S. Brookings in Washington D. C. The first, The Institute for Government Research (IGR) was established in 1916 to promote work in the area of public administration, specifically concerning the efficiency of governmental administration and budgeting. Brookings became Chairman of the Board and raised the money for the Institute. During the War, Brookings Chaired the Price Fixing Commission of the War Industries Board and was impressed by the importance of economics to the formation of government policy. The result of this was the establishment, in 1922, of the Institute of Economics. The Institute of

Economics was funded by a substantial grant from the Carnegie Corporation for a term to expire at the end of 1931. Brookings hired Harold Moulton as the Institute's first Director, and Moulton quickly began to recruit a research staff including Helen Wright and Edwin Nourse. Moulton and Nourse had overlapped as students at Chicago, while Helen Wright was a new Chicago PhD with a thesis on "The Political Labour Movement in Great Britain, 1820-1914." Thomas Page (of the U.S. Tariff Commission) was also recruited, as was Isador Lubin.[10] Lubin had been a student of Veblen's at Missouri, had worked with Veblen at the wartime Food Administration, and with Mitchell in the Prices Section of the WIB. At the time of his move to The Institute of Economics he was an instructor engaged in graduate work at the University of Michigan.

The primary research areas that the Institute set itself were areas of key contemporary policy importance, such as post-war international finance (Moulton), labor issues and the coal industry (Wright, Lubin), tariffs (Page), and agriculture (Nourse). This policy orientation is what differentiated the Institute of Economics from the National Bureau, but while the Institute did not see itself as primarily involved in data collection it nevertheless attempted to stress the "scientific" nature of the work and the importance its non-partisan stance. A reputation for "objectivity and scientific competency" was seen as vital for the Institution to be able to make a contribution to a better informed public debate of the merits of "policies already established or under consideration" ("A Proposed Educational Division," Brookings Archives, Item 17, Box 1, Memoranda on the Early History of the Brookings Institution File).[11]

Brookings' vision, however, had always included an educational as well as a research component. Brookings felt that existing graduate programs did a poor job of training people for policy research or for senior public service positions, and he wished to establish a school to provide a type of training more directed to policy analysis and governmental careers than the usual graduate training with its orientation toward teaching. In 1923 the Robert S. Brookings Institute of Economics and Government was established as a graduate school at Washington University of St. Louis (with which Brookings had been much involved). A key feature of this program was the establishment of a "Residence Foundation" in Washington D. C. (provided by gifts from Mr. and Mrs. Brookings) where advanced students could live, profiting both from close association with each other and with the Institute for Governmental Research and the Institute of Economics. The intent was to have students work on thesis topics "falling within the general range of problems" with which the two Institutes were concerned (Moulton 1928, p. 3). The Residence Foundation was also willing to provide its facilities to advanced graduate students taking their degrees from other universities. For a variety of reasons, academic, financial, and legal, this arrangement underwent a series of rapid changes, with the residential period in Washington D. C. being extended from one to two years in April of 1924,[12] and the formal connection with Washington University being severed altogether in November of 1924. At that point The Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government was incorporated in Washington D. C. as an independent entity.[13]

Moulton recommended his friend Hamilton to Brookings as an ideal person to head up the program in Washington D. C., and Hamilton was hired in May 1923, spending most of his first year in St. Louis. As the School became independent, its philosophy increasingly took on a Hamiltonian slant. The School would be distinctive in that it would give its attention to "problems rather than disciplines, to relevant inquiries rather than to academic categories." It is "to teach the art of handling problems rather than to impart accumulated knowledge; and its end is to turn out craftsmen who can make contributions to the intelligent direction of social change." The School "is, and was meant to be, experimental," and "invites a more intimate, a more incisive, and a more individual method of instruction." Moreover, the School is to provide residence for its students to expose the students to "personal contact with many men of note," and to provide an informal means of education (Hamilton 1926).

For the 1924/25 year, the first for which the RBGS existed as a separate entity, there were three primary faculty members, Hamilton, Walter Shepard, a political scientist who had been appointed at Washington University about the same time as Hamilton, and the English economist J. A. Hobson, whom

Hamilton had arranged to visit Washington. In the 1925/26 year there were four "resident" members of staff, Hamilton, Shepard, Leverett Lyon (a Chicago economics PhD who had been Dean of Commerce and Head of the Department of Economics at Washington University), and Helen Wright who was "loaned" on a year by year basis from the Institute of Economics. This complement of four was as large as the core faculty of the School ever became, but the teaching and supervision of students in the School was supplemented by the staff of the Institute of Economics, particularly Moulton, Nourse, and Lubin, by various other "associate members" of staff who were employed in one or other of the Institutes or were otherwise available to be called upon to direct student reading or teach in specialized areas (these included David Friday), and, later, by visiting "consulting fellows" who stayed in residence and participated in the instruction and supervision of students (these included Morris Copeland). The School also used its location to attract a large number of visiting speakers who gave either single informal talks or seminars, short series of talks, or short courses.

The students were expected to have completed at least one year of graduate education before coming to the School, and many held MA degrees from other institutions. The School offered fellowships of up to $1000, and had no shortage of applicants. A system of selection gradually evolved in which prospective students were invited to the School for a "conference." The students were selected on the basis of their potential to benefit from the particular nature and atmosphere of the school with its emphasis on self motivation, wide ranging intellectual curiosity, and on the analysis and creative solution of social problems.

The program of study was *extremely* informal. Students were expected to "present" two languages, and complete an individualized program of study, write a thesis, and pass an oral exam. Traditional lecture courses were "under a ban," and there "was never a requirement of attendance upon courses, an accumulation of credits, or a system of majors and minors" (Hamilton 1926, p. 6). This made it possible for students with government jobs to complete PhDs at the School, attending such courses, seminars, and talks as they could. For example, many of the young economists that Walter Stewart recruited to his Research and Statistics Division of the Federal Reserve Board (including Winfield Riefler, William J. Carson, and Woodlief Thomas) completed their doctorates at the School.

The student's program did not specify credits or courses, but rather a series of areas and topics to be mastered. For example, the program outlined for Mordecai Ezekiel contained six major divisions: (i) "Economic Foundations" including pre-classical, classical, neo-classical, historical, and institutional economics, with the emphasis clearly on the last; (ii) "Description of the Modern Economic Organization," including "the pecuniary mechanism and institutions" and a series of more specific elements related to Ezekiel's interest in agriculture; (iii) "Technical Equipment for Economic Research," including quantitative analysis and "the scientific method in research and analysis;" (iv) "The Art of Economic Invention," dealing with issues of institutional design and "the invention of mechanisms for check, control, or direction of industries or of the economic organization as a whole;" (v) "Frontier Studies in Related Fields,"[14] including social psychology, political science, history, and philosophy; and (vi) "General Reading," including modern English and American literature, and selected essays in philosophy (Descartes, Locke, Montesquieu, Voltaire). Also noted was Ezekiel's choice of French and German languages (Tentative program of work to be offered by Mordecai Ezekiel, May 15, 1925, Mordecai Ezekiel Papers, Box 14, Student Notes and Papers Folder). Progress was checked by periodic "conferences" between the student and the staff, and lack of satisfactory progress could result in a student being asked to leave.

Courses were offered, but these were of various lengths, changed from year to year to accommodate the interests of students, and generally incorporated much discussion, reading, and student presentations. Some of the "major" courses offered by the regular faculty were Hamilton's "Modern Economic Organization," Lyon's "The Nature of Industry," Shepard's "Comparative Political Institutions," and Wright's "The Neo-Classical System of Economics." Wright also taught "The Uses of

Statistics," Moulton gave a series of lectures on "The Credit System," and Lubin taught on "Systems of Economics."

Information on course content is in most cases non-existent, but notes from Hamilton's and Lyon's courses from 1925 can be found in the Ezekiel papers (Mordecai Ezekiel Papers, Box 14, Student Notes and Papers Folder). The notes from Hamilton's course on "Economic Organization" display his style of throwing out questions, problems, different points of view, possible points of study, and assignments to students. He asks questions such as: "Why start with a study of the price system?" or "Is demand antecedent to and independent of an actual market situation?" or "What meaning do various authors have when they use the term competition?" As he proceeds, he suggests many readings from Smith, Cannan, Marshall, Pigou, Veblen, Cooley, Commons, Mitchell, Tawney, as well as from works in history, philosophy, and biography.

The course has a clear focus on the institutional organization of economic activity and expresses a critical view of classical and neoclassical theory. It begins with a general and historical discussion of the "Pecuniary Organization of Society," the price system and its direction of the industrial system, and with references to the classical, neoclassical, and institutionalist "explanations" of the price system. This is followed by a more in-depth discussion of the competitive system and its development, which includes discussions of property, the "separation between those who own and those who direct" in the case of the "modern corporation," and a very lengthy discussion of contract, including such questions as "Does the contract include all the features of the relations, or are some of them fixed by law (or custom) and only a few left for contract?" Hamilton then proceeds to the issue of whether profit making ensures that social ends are properly served, defining the "liberal" view as "Profit [is] a device for getting things done, but in no sense a sacrosanct thing, and subject to modification in particular cases where it fails to work properly." In the next section on "Competition" he notes the confusions in meaning (particularly between competition and laissez-faire) and insists that competition is "complementary to a great number of other institutions, and its nature is modified by the way these institutions impinge upon it."

Hamilton moves on to discuss production, including issues of advance in technique, the functioning of the patent system, and measurement through indexes of production. He then discusses capital, investment, and savings (which includes discussion of both personal and corporate savings), and the possibility that the "maladjustment of saving and production of durable goods" might provide an explanation of business cycles. He then talks of various forms of organization of industry including competitive, monopolized, nationalized, and various forms of "control" including rate regulation and the possibility of new forms of control by bodies of producers and consumers.

The final sections of the course deal with the "Classification of Economists" and "The Clash Between Institutional and Neo-Classical Economics." Institutionalists "recognize that the whole system is in process of change, and is subject to direction and control, and may best be directed by knowledge of specific problems and the facts of the case." In this Hamilton makes much of the work of Veblen and Cooley, of John Dewey's particularism and instrumentalism, and Mitchell's statistical approach. He argues that Mitchell accepted Veblen's "general point of view," but became interested in working it out on a specific problem. In contrast, neoclassicals are "system-builders, leaving practical questions out of the system; and they come to a defense of the system rather than to a practical program." Hamilton's course, then, is very explicitly institutionalist and anti-neoclassical in orientation.

Lyon's course "Nature of Industry" is also heavily institutional. It begins with a discussion of the problem of psychology and economics including references to Veblen and J. M. Clark. Deals with the history of the organization and control of industrial activity, stressing the role of custom, religion, laws and court decisions, trade practices, as well as individual enterprise, public enterprise, and the issue of culture lag. The course also has sections on capital creation, and a great deal on ways of organizing industries, the roles of government and private enterprise, and government administration. A significant amount of the rest of the course is made up of student presentations on topics relating to their particular areas of interest, such as "Frontier problems in Transportation," "Measuring Production," "Elements in Business Forecasting," and "Aspects of Mineral Production."

In the 1926/27 year the School experimented with "group inquiries" in which a group of more senior students with interests in a single field were put together with a member of staff in collecting "points of view, ideas, and materials." This inquiry would be made the sole occupation of the student, and would last some 15 weeks. Each student would be expected to produce an "essay of some consequence." In that year group inquires were led by Shepard on "The State and the Individual," Hamilton on "The Place of the Supreme Court in the Economic Order," Hamilton and Wright on "Types of Industrial Control," Graham Wallas (visiting from England for a semester) on "The Ends and Means of Social Control," Moulton and Lubin on "The Economic Position of Great Britain," and by Lyon and Charles Hardy on "The Market Economy."[15] The School also experimented with 6 or 7 week reading courses designed to open up a subject area to students, and to provide a basis for later group inquiries and special investigations by students. These were offered primarily by regular staff and associate members, but some were offered by visitors. For example in 1926/27 reading courses were given by Helen Wright in "The Coming of Industrialism," George Sabine, a philosopher from Ohio State, on "Political Classics," Walter W. Cook, a prominent legal realist from Johns Hopkins, on "The Logic of Inquiry," Lewis Lorwin, a staff member of The Institute of Economics, on "Proposals for Economic Reorganization," and by Leverett Lyon on "Financial Institutions." To some extent these reading courses and group inquires replaced the "more extended courses of reading and discussion" (Lyon 1927, pp.6-7).

In addition to these types of courses, it was a policy of the School to attract visiting speakers. One of Hamilton's concerns was to provide enough breadth for the students, particularly given the small size of the core faculty. In this he was spectacularly successful, and in a very short time the School accumulated a vast list of speakers, some of whom gave "short courses" running between 2 and 10 sessions, some a short series of informal talks, and some only a single talk. For the 1926/27 year alone the School listed 14 short courses, including Walter W. Cook on "The Logic of the Law," David Friday on "Economic and Financial Stabilization in Europe," A. A. Goldenweiser on "Race and Culture," John Mecklin on "Individual and Social Psychology," Max Otto on "What is Truth, What is Right, What is Man," Joseph Redlich on "Recent Developments of Democracy in Central Europe," and Gaetano Salvemini, a leading anti-fascist, and formerly a professor of history at the University of Florence, on "What is Fascismo" and "Dante and his Times" (Lyon 1927). Others who, at various times, gave short courses or series of talks included economists (Clarence Ayres, John R. Commons, Herbert Davenport, William Foster, Carter Goodrich, Alvin Johnson, Laurence Laughlin, Willard Thorp), historians (Charles Beard, Carl Becker, William Dodd), philosophers (Morris Cohen, Alexander Meiklejohn), legal scholars (Felix Frankfurter, Roscoe Pound, Thomas Powell), political scientists (Harold Laski), anthropologists (Bronislaw Malinowski, Clark Wissler), writers (Lewis Mumford), journalists, directors of research foundations, government officials, and members of international organizations. Single talks were given by economists such as Eveline Burns, Gustav Cassel, J. M. Clark, Edwin Gay, Sumner Slichter, Walter Stewart, Rexford Tugwell, and Leo Wolman, legal scholars such as Robert Hutchins and Herman Oliphant, historians such as Paul Mantoux, political scientists such as Charles Merriam, and numerous others from the President of the International Seaman's Union and the Director of Maternity Work, Kentucky Mountains, to professors of English literature and zoology (RBGS General Catalogue 1923-1928). Again, many of these short term visitors would stay in residence and interact with the students. Veblen also stayed at the residence for a period of weeks, but did not give any talks, despite being invited (Dorfman 1972, Taped Interview by Robert Coleberd, Brookings Institution Archives, A86-011).

Another of Hamilton's concerns was with the development of good writing skills among his students. He argued that the usual doctoral thesis was far too large a project to be completed by a relative novice in a period of two years. With a few notable exceptions, theses "are inchoate speculations or mere descriptions; the run of them exhibits few qualities of workmanship above clerical heroics"

(Hamilton 1926, p. 11). Hamilton argued for developing the "art of inquiry and the art of writing" together, beginning with "simple and unpretentious bits of work" and gradually moving on to more ambitious projects. To this end Hamilton encouraged his students to begin by writing book reviews of the latest works in their areas of interest. He and John White (a student) put together a compilation called *A Book of Book Reviews* (Hamilton and White 1926), a work that was much more than just a sample of reviews, but a real pedagogical tool and guide to review writing. The group inquiry courses also encouraged writing and were designed to get students to produce work of publishable or near publishable quality. Another innovation of the School was to substitute a requirement of a series of essays of publishable quality (or actually published) in place of the usual "monumental tome." [16]

The residential nature of the RBGS also deserves special emphasis. This created a close community of students many of whom developed a strong loyalty to the School and to Walton Hamilton. There were a significant number of women students, 10 in each of the 1926/27 and 1927/28 years, and the students became a close group. There were sing-songs, dancing after dinner, and weddings. [17] Thanks to Hamilton's law and economic interests, occasional suppers were given for Brookings students by Justice Brandeis.

All of this resulted in the School attracting and producing some remarkable students. In the first1923/24 year the School had seventeen students, including Isador Lubin and Helen Everett who were members of the Institute of Economics staff (working on a study of the British coal industry) as well as students at the School. The next year the total number of students rose to 32, and reached a peak of 40 students in 1926/27. A total of 114 students are listed as having attended the School between 1923 and 1928 (RBGS General Catalogue 1923-1928). Some attended only for a year or two, but many of these completed PhDs elsewhere. In addition, the School played host to a number of Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fellows from Europe, including Eveline Burns. Between 1925 and 1930 the RBGS itself awarded 66 PhD degrees.[18] Many of these graduates went on to distinguished careers in government and/or in academics, and many played key roles within the New Deal Administration.

The graduates with perhaps the most notable governmental careers were Winfield Riefler, Isador Lubin, and Mordecai Ezekiel. Winfield Riefler had a significant career with the Federal Reserve Board, and his book *Money Rates and Money Markets* (1930) was the product of his Brookings thesis research. He became Economic Advisor to the Executive Council during the New Deal, Chairman of the Central Statistical Board, and later held an appointment at the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton. Riefler also played a major role in various NBER monetary projects, and later became heavily involved with the League of Nations. He was President of the American Statistical Association in 1941.

Lubin stayed with the Institute of Economics for some time, working first on miner's wages and the cost of coal (Lubin 1924) and then on the British Coal industry with Helen Everett (Lubin and Everett 1927).[19] These books complemented those by Hamilton and Helen Wright on the American bituminous coal industry (1925, 1928).[20] At this time the coal industry on both sides of the Atlantic was mired in excess capacity, old equipment, low wages, and poor working conditions, and was regarded by both Lubin and Hamilton as indicating the failure of private competitive industry. Lubin was then put in charge of the Institute of Economics' study of unemployment. This led him to become increasingly engaged with issues of the measurement of unemployment, and closely involved with those members of Senate pushing to improve government statistics, introduce federal unemployment exchanges, and provide unemployment insurance. In 1933 he was appointed Commissioner of Labor Statistics, a position he kept until 1946, doing much to improve the statistical work of the Bureau. He was a member of the Central Statistical Board and of the Industrial Committee of the National Resources Committee. Later, during World War II, he became a special advisor to President Roosevelt. After the War he helped negotiate Allied policy on German reparations, and represented the United States in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (UNESCO), and in the General Assembly of the International Labor Organization.

Mordecai Ezekiel was employed as an economist in the Department of Agriculture while attending Brookings. He had a particular interest in statistical methods and published *Methods of Correlation Analysis* in 1930. Ezekiel did much to formulate the details of what would become the Agriculture Adjustment Administration, and helped to draft the Agricultural Adjustment Act. From 1933 to 1944, Ezekiel was Economic Advisor to the Secretary of Agriculture and, along with Rexford Tugwell, a strong supporter of extending the concept of planned production to industry in general (Ezekiel 1936, 1939). Later in his career Ezekiel worked with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, becoming Special Assistant to the Director General, and then moved on to serve as Chief of the United Nations Division of the United States Agency for International Development.

Other RBGS graduates with substantial government careers included Oscar Kiessling, with the Bureau of Mines; Henry Chalmers, as Chief of the Division of Tariffs, Department of Commerce; Leon Truesdell, as Chief of Population Division, Bureau of the Census; Woodlief Thomas with the Research and Statistics Division of the Federal Reserve Board; Norman Myers with the Department of Interior, Petroleum Division; Harry Cassidy as Director of Social Welfare in British Columbia, Canada; and Paul Lewinson, who wrote *Race, Class, and Party: A History of Negro Suffrage and White Politics in the South* (1932), became Director of the Industrial Records Office of the National Archives and led the research staff that produced the *Guide to Documents in the National Archives for Negro Studies* (1947).

Among other well known graduates can be counted Dexter Keezer, Stacy May, and Max Lerner. Keezer taught as an instructor at Cornell while Copeland was there, but later moved to Brookings. His thesis, co-authored with Stacy May, dealt with the legal issues of "affectation with a public interest" and was later published as *The Public Control of Business* (Keezer and May 1930). For this work they spent most of their time at the Supreme Court Library and received much advice from Felix Frankfurter. After Brookings, Keezer went into journalism and publishing, but continued to write on economic affairs and was asked to join the Consumer’s Advisory Board of the National Recovery Administration. Between

1934 and 1942 he was President of Reed College, and served on the National War Labor Board during World War II. Stacy May did his undergraduate work at Amherst and Columbia, where he took courses in law. He knew Hamilton very well from Amherst where he had not only been an undergraduate, but had also taught worker's education classes organized through local trade unions (Stacy May, June 1972, Taped Interview by Robert Coleberd, Brookings Institution Archives, A86-011). Prior to his thesis work with Keezer, May had co-authored *The Control of Wages* with Walton Hamilton (Hamilton and May 1923). May's career after Brookings included brief teaching stints at Dartmouth College and Cornell. He became Assistant Director of the Social Sciences Division of the Rockefeller Foundation between 1932 and 1942, served as Director of the Planning and Statistics Division of the War Production Board during World War II, and went on to work on with Nelson Rockefeller on his overseas economic development program. Lerner began as an assistant editor of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, and later held a number of college positions. He contributed several papers on law and economics for the *Yale Law Review*, including a lengthy appreciation of the pragmatic and experimental approach to the "living law" to be found in the opinions of Justice Brandeis (Lerner 1931), but, for the most part, he directed his career to more popular commentaries on economic and political affairs from his liberal point of view. In this he was highly successful. He edited *The Nation* between 1936 and 1938. Lerner also wrote on Veblen (Lerner 1935), and produced an edited collection of Veblen's writings (Lerner 1948).

Riefler, Lubin, Ezekiel, and, to a lesser extent, Keezer and May were a part of the network of individuals that made up the institutionalist movement in the interwar period. There were other Brookings students who had connections to institutionalism. Robert Montgomery was with the economics faculty at the University of Texas, and returned after graduating from Brookings in 1926 to become a part of the institutionalist group that formed there (from 1930 including Clarence Ayres).[21] William J. Carson, hired in to the Research and Statistics Division of the Federal Reserve by Walter Stewart, graduated in 1928, and became a professor of finance at Wharton. He later served for many years as the Executive Director of the NBER. Carl Raushenbush only stayed a year at Brookings, but then joined the institutionalist group at Washington Square College of New York University. Another of the Washington Square group, Anton Friedrich, also spent one year at Brookings, and Frieda Baird, a 1929 graduate from Brookings, spent the 1930-31 year at Washington Square as well. Walter Morton spent a year at Brookings in 1924-25 before returning to Wisconsin. Gustav Peck (1927 PhD) worked with Leo Wolman on "Labor Groups in the Social Structure" for the report of the President's Committee on Social Trends (Wolman and Peck 1933). Harry Hascall Moore (1926 PhD) became Director of Study for the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care and wrote the pioneering *American Medicine and the Peoples' Health* (1927). Lewis Jones (1927 PhD) also worked for the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, while George Galloway (1928 PhD) was much involved with the National Planning Association.

Less obviously an institutionalist, but still a person with an interdisciplinary perspective, was John Nef. Nef wrote on the early history of the British coal industry for his Brookings thesis, submitted in 1927. He had begun on this subject in 1922 while at Harvard, but it had attracted the attention of both Hamilton, then still at Amherst, and R. H. Tawney in England. His spent several years in London and Paris, returning in 1926, whereupon he was invited to Brookings by Hamilton. Moulton and Hamilton actively helped him obtain a position in the economics department at Chicago (Nef 1973, pp. 106-107, 191). Nef's interests were broad, covering the rise of industrial civilization, its cultural foundations and impacts. His dissatisfaction with specialized graduate education expressed itself in his work in founding an interdisciplinary department at Chicago as well as the Committee on Social Thought and the Center for Human Understanding (Nef 1973).

Paul Homan had a slightly different reaction to exposure to the Brookings experience. Homan's 1926 thesis consisted of a number of the essays later published as *Contemporary Economic Thought* (1928), including an essay on Veblen. As a result Alvin Johnson asked Homan to write the essay on the

"Institutional School" for the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. In this piece and in his "An Appraisal of Institutional Economics" (1932), Homan attacked the idea that there was a "distinguishable body of economic knowledge or theory" that could be properly called institutional. While Homan's work clearly shows his intimate knowledge of the institutionalists he is discussing, his arguments helped to create a growing scepticism concerning the ability of institutionalism to live up to its earlier promises, and a tendency to see institutionalists as bound together only by their rejection of standard theory.[22] Homan also wrote on the New Deal and on anti-trust issues, and was editor of the *American Economic Review* between 1941 and 1951.

Addison Cutler also became a critic of institutionalism, but from a very different perspective. He was a 1924 graduate from Amherst and obtained his Brookings PhD in 1930, having been enrolled from 1926. He then became an assistant professor of economics at the University of North Carolina. With Keezer and Frank Garfield he co-edited a book of readings *Problem Economics* (1928). Keezer regarded him as brilliant. Ayres later described him as an "Amherst bred, Hamilton trained 'institutionalist' who later went Marxist" (Clarence Ayres to I. Leo Sharfman 9 July 1945, I. Leo Sharfman papers, Box 1, Ayres Folder). This Marxist point of view is evident in his 1938 paper critical of institutionalism "The Ebb of Institutional Economics" (Cutler 1938). As with the critique by Homan, this paper shows very close familiarity with Hamilton's work and with his institutionalism. Cutler's later career was with the Federal Reserve Bank in Cleveland and the University of Cincinnati.[23]

Outside of economics, RBGS graduates became lawyers, and professors of law, political science, and sociology. Ralph Fuchs became a professor of law at Indiana, was involved in the drafting of the Administrative Procedure Act, served as Special Assistant to the US Attorney General and to the Solicitor General, became an expert on administrative law, and was an active civil libertarian and involved with the American Association of University Professors and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Eleanor Bontecou became dean of Bryn Mawr, professor in the

Graduate School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, and an attorney in the Civil Rights and Research Sections, Criminal Division, Department of Justice. Breck McAllister became Special Assistant to the US Attorney General in 1929. He then joined the New York Bar, but continued to contribute frequently to law journals.[24] While at Brookings, Frank Tannenbaum used to visit remote areas of Mexico on mule. He became an advisor to the Mexican Government in the 1930s, was involved with the Farm Security Bill during the New Deal, and became a very well known professor specializing in Latin American history at Columbia University (1929, 1933, 1946). Carl B. Swisher became a professor of political science at Johns Hopkins, and a well known scholar of the supreme court and American constitutional development (1930, 1943). Walter Sandelius became a professor of political science at the University of Kansas. Constantine Panunzio became a professor of sociology at the University of California and well known for his books on immigrant experience. Portions of his book *Immigration Crossroads* (1927) were submitted as his Brookings thesis. Many others could be mentioned.

Despite the obvious enthusiasm of the students, equally enthusiastic comments from visitors such as Bronislaw Malinowski,[25] and the undoubted successes of the graduates of the program, the RBGS essentially disappeared in the amalgamation that formed the Brookings Institution at the end of 1927. The discontinuance of the School created considerable student protest, including an article in *The Survey* (Peck and Galloway 1928) and resulting correspondence concerning questions raised by Charles Beard (Moulton 1928). The School continued for the 1928-29 year, but Hamilton and Wright both left.[26] Wright went to the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago, and Hamilton accepted an offer from Yale Law School that he had been considering. The place of the School was taken by the "Training Division" of the Brookings Institution, which was designed as a vehicle through which more advanced and post-doctoral students could be involved in the work of the Brookings research staff. The last RBGS doctoral degrees were awarded in 1930, and the Charter of the School was surrendered in 1931. The Brookings Institution itself awarded a small number of PhD degrees via its Training Division through to 1936.

Why was the School terminated? There seem to have been two interconnected reasons: the financial difficulties facing various of the Brookings enterprises, and a divergence between Robert Brookings and Hamilton on the nature of the School and the type of graduates being produced. It must also be said that Hamilton had not maintained good relations with the major personalities involved in the IGR, and had little or no support from that quarter.[27]

The major financial problem was the imminent ending of the Carnegie grant that had been funding the Institute of Economics. Although this grant was given with no assurance of any further funding, Brookings and Moulton had hoped to persuade Carnegie to provide a permanent endowment for the Institute. In this they failed.[28] To many of the students it seemed that the School, which was relatively well endowed, had been sacrificed to save the Institute of Economics, but the story is a little more complex. Other than Carnegie, the most promising source of funding was the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation, which had provided funding for the research activity of the IGR. Those at Rockefeller were, however, insistent that an amalgamation of Brookings' various organizations should be undertaken before anything further could be considered (Beardsley Ruml, memorandum "Institute for Government Research, Institute of Economics, Washington Graduate School of Economics," January 24, 1924, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Series 3.6, Box 49, Folder 517). Once the new Brookings Institution was formed Brookings and Moulton set about the task of increasing the Institution's endowment funding. As a part of that effort, they were awarded over $2 million by Rockefeller in 1928 (well before the Carnegie grant expired).

Of course, such an amalgamation need not have involved the demise of the School in something like its existing form, and several versions of amalgamation plans were produced in which the School and the Institutes were maintained as a separate "Divisions" within a larger Brookings Institution. What to do about the School was an issue much considered by Brookings, Moulton, and the Executive Committee. Brookings also asked Abraham Flexner, of the General Education Board, to examine this issue and report back to him. Flexner did make an extended visit to the School, spoke with the staff, and requested written statements concerning the future of the School from Hamilton and Lyon. These were prepared. Flexner did not complete a written report, but he was heard to remark that a faculty consisting of "three men and a girl" was hopelessly weak (Moulton 1928, p. 21). Hamilton's own suggestions involved not only maintaining the School in as independent a form as possible, but also significantly enlarging its resident faculty.[29] However, Brookings' own thinking was moving along very different lines, with his main concern being the integrating of the training function with the research activity of the institutes. Brookings was clearly concerned that the School was operating largely independently, and was following its own path in its "experiment" in graduate education. The School was being guided as much by Hamilton's educational philosophy as by Brookings' original intentions. The Students were not closely involved with the research work of the institutes, the School had developed particularly few connections with the IGR, and from the lists of graduates produced in 1927 it seemed that a high proportion were moving into university or college careers and not into the kind of non-academic positions that Brookings had intended. In fact, in 1927, the number of public service or research positions of the type that Brookings had originally had in mind was not large. With the New Deal many such positions did materialize--particularly in economics--and numerous RBGS graduates did move into government positions, but from the perspective available in 1927 it could be argued that the School was not meeting its original mandate, and was duplicating the role of university graduate programs.[30] In any event, the School disappeared in the amalgamation, Hamilton and Moulton's friendship came to an end, and many students remained embittered.

5. Conclusion

American institutionalism as it formed in the period immediately after World War I was a combination of the Veblenian view of the significance of "pecuniary institutions" and their failings, with several other elements. These other elements included an emphasis on legal institutions and their evolution; an emphasis on empirical work broadly defined; and a highly reformist attitude gained both from the earlier progressive movement in America and from John Dewey's instrumentalist philosophy (Rutherford 2000a, 2001a). Hamilton's particular version of institutionalism, which he developed from Veblen, H. C. Adams, and Charles Horton Cooley, with its emphasis on the importance of understanding the institutional nature of the "economic order," and the possibilities for "social control," display this perfectly.

It is not surprising that Hamilton, the programs he implemented at Amherst and Brookings, and the students he produced, played a central role in the institutionalist movement in the interwar period. Ayres, Copeland, Goodrich, Thorp, Riefler, May, Lubin, Ezekiel, Paul and Carl Raushenbush, Reed, Friedrich, and Montgomery were all first exposed to the institutionalist approach at Amherst or at Brookings. The connections with other centers of institutionalism are numerous. In the case of Columbia and the NBER, Hamilton knew many of the Columbia faculty including J. M. Clark, Mitchell, and Robert Hale, Stewart and Lubin had worked with Mitchell, Lubin was close with Leo Wolman, Goodrich himself joined the Columbia economics department, and Thorp and Copeland were long time staff members at the NBER. Hamilton, Stewart, Riefler, and Thorp were all at various times on the NBER board, and Carson was Executive Director. In the case of Wisconsin, Lubin knew Commons well, and Commons taught at Brookings while in Washington for part of 1928. Prior to that, Hamilton had written to Commons indicating that several of his students were studying the *Legal Foundations of Capitalism* (Walton Hamilton to John R. Commons, June 8, 1925, John R. Commons Papers, Box 13, Folder 1).[31] Other Wisconsin connections mentioned above include Morehouse, Paul Raushenbush, and Walter Morton. Another Wisconsin student, Elsie Gluck, spent two years at the School, and Commons's student Ewan Clauge stayed at the Residence when first in Washington, although he never attended the School. In terms of Texas, Hamilton's influence can be seen in Ayres and Montgomery. The Washington Square group included Friedrich, Carl Raushenbush, and Reed. In the area of government, the institutionalist presence in the Research and Statistics Division of the Federal Reserve Board included Stewart's recruits and RBGS graduates Riefler, Carson, and Thomas, while the institutionalist contingent in the New Deal administration included Hamilton himself as well as Riefler, Lubin, Ezekiel, Thorp, and Copeland.

Another connection that becomes apparent in the history of Amherst and Brookings, is the very close links between Hamilton and British "liberal" economists and academics. Hamilton's interests in the coal industry, in unemployment insurance, in regulation, in new forms of "social control," and in the policy ideas of the British Labour Party led him and some of his students (particularly Goodrich, Lubin, and Nef) to develop personal connections with people such as the Webbs, Henry Clay, R. H. Tawney, J. A. Hobson, Graham Wallas and William Beveridge. It is also notable that among those who visited and taught at Amherst or at the RBGS included Tawney, Hobson, and Wallas, and, for shorter periods, Laski and Malinowski. These connections between American institutionalists and British left-of-center academics (and particularly those associated with the London School of Economics) have yet to be fully explored.

Hamilton, of course, was not merely interested in passing on his own specific views on economics, but in imparting an approach, an approach that would be truly *investigative* and related to "the problem of control." Hamilton's approach to teaching was very much related to his view of an institutional economics as problem centered and not a study of an abstract "value theory." To start with an issue or a problem, to search for the information and tools to approach that problem with little regard to conventional disciplinary boundaries, and to be creative in the search for solutions. These ideas of being investigative, and of being actively involved in the development of new methods of social control were a central part of what many young economists in the 1920s found so exciting and attractive about Hamilton and his programs, and it is what brought a good number of them to institutionalism. As Stacy May explained, Hamilton was the type who could take students and get them genuinely excited about finding something out, and in the kind of work that had to be done in order to find something out. Hamilton's method of instruction would now be thought of as a paradigm of "active learning." Hamilton himself has been described former students as lively, interested in all kinds of ideas, amusing, and encouraging to students, and as a man with a "complex, deep probing, original, whimsical, and unpredictable mind" (Walter Morton to Robert Coleberd, March 4, 1973, and Anita Lerner to Robert Coleberd 1972, Brookings Institution Archive, A86-011, Box 1, Replies Folder). In addition, he eschewed formality and academic conventions, believed in maintaining close contact between students and staff and between the students themselves, strongly encouraged interdisciplinarity, particularly as between the various social sciences and law, deliberately exposed students to speakers of the highest calibre in an even wider range of disciplines (including especially history and philosophy), and gave careful attention to the development of writing skills. The former students who recalled the RBGS at its 50th Anniversary Reunion spoke repeatedly of the informality and the interdisciplinarity of the program (Brookings Banquet, October 17, 1973, Taped by Robert Coleberd, Brookings Institution Archives, A86-011). Even those who did not become associated with institutionalism clearly took away a great deal from the interdisciplinary nature of Hamilton's educational philosophy.

In terms of neoclassical economic theory, it is noticeable that Hamilton's students received virtually no formal training at all. Some Brookings students would have received previous graduate training in neoclassical economics, but not those who came from Amherst or from many other places. At Michigan, Chicago, and at Harvard students certainly *were* drilled through neoclassical theory, and this type of "drill sergeant" approach to teaching, still common in economics, can itself be seen as related to the nature of neoclassical theory and the desire to impart a through understanding of an established and complex theoretical framework. In Hamilton's own programs, in contrast, no one was drilled through Marshall or neoclassical theory as Hamilton himself had been drilled by Taylor. This fact reinforces the impression given by my work on institutionalism at Columbia (Rutherford 2001b) that there was no uniform dominance of Marshallian economics in American graduate education in the interwar. Marshallian economics did not dominate at Columbia (where the only required graduate theory course was Mitchell's Types of Economic Theory), not at Wisconsin, and certainly not at the Robert Brookings Graduate School. Moreover, this almost complete lack of training in standard theory (except for material covered in the students' own reading) does not seem to have been a barrier to governmental employment in the 1920s and 30s. Even within the academic world Amherst and Brookings graduates found employment in all but the few most theoretically inclined economics departments.

The other side to this, however, was a lack of emphasis on the development of a systematic theoretical core within institutional economics. Hamilton's institutionalism was an investigative approach to specific problems within only a very broad conceptual framework concerning the institutional character of the economic order. His general direction and stress was on applied issues of economic policy, an emphasis that was only strengthened by the specific purposes of the Brookings Graduate School. The idea developing systematic theory in the sense of a body of theoretical principles was not a part of this conception. The resulting difficulty of defining exactly what the common elements of "the institutional approach" consisted of was the point that critics such as Homan and Parsons began to emphasize in the 1930s. While it may be ironic that these critics should themselves have been products of the institutionalist orientation of Hamilton and his programs, it was perhaps their intimate knowledge of Hamilton and his institutionalism that allowed them to be as effective as they were.

Furthermore, and despite Brookings' view of the number of students going into academic careers, many of the most able students *in economics* did in fact go into public service and made their contributions there rather than in academic economics. In an interesting comment on the legacy left by the Brookings School students in the area of economics, Winfield Riefler observed:

> It did not leave a lot of books written, it did not leave a lot of text books, and it did not leave a lot of academic writing. . . . I think that for the caliber of the group they deposited less of that kind, so an economist coming on thirty or forty years later wouldn't get the flavor of that whole movement at all. . . . Jack Viner would say "if you're going to be an economist you've got to write something," and I would say "you've got to *be* somebody" (Riefler 1972, Taped Interview by Robert Coleberd, Brookings Institution Archive, Item A86-011, Robert S. Brookings Graduate School 50th Anniversary).

It has sometimes been claimed that Wisconsin institutionalism did not reproduce itself because many graduates pursued governmental as opposed to academic careers. Jeff Biddle's (1998) quantitative examination of Wisconsin graduates is inconclusive on this point, but in the case of the RBGS there is no doubt that the most able of the economics graduates did not go into academic careers and did not themselves produce very much academic output or have numbers of graduate students. On top of this, the ending of the RBGS and Hamilton's move to Yale Law School were themselves major losses to the institutionalist movement in economics and undoubtedly weakened it and reduced its visibility.

Hamilton did retain some involvement in economics, particularly during the New Deal when he was a member of the National Recovery Administration Board, served as Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board, and conducted a set of price studies, some of which were later published as *Price and Price Policies* (Hamilton and Associates 1938). He also served several terms as the Yale University representative on the board of the NBER, but he was no longer in a position to promote institutionalism in economics in the way he had at both Amherst and at the RBGS. As

Herbert Davenport said to Clarence Ayres in 1930 "I used to think Hamilton was the one who was going to tell us what institutionalism is all about; but I’ve about decided he isn’t" (Clarence Ayres to Allan Gruchy, February 11, 1969, Clarence Ayres Papers, Box 3F288, Allan Gruchy Folder).

Notes

1. Details of Friday's later career, which included stints in private consulting, being Chair of the Department of Economics at New York University, President of Michigan Agricultural College, and, later, a professor at the New School of Social Research, can be found in Dorfman (1959, pp 403-405). His best known work was *Profits, Wages, and Prices* (Friday 1920), a book that was commonly cited in the institutionalist literature in the 1920s. Friday also served on the Board of the NBER.

2. Stewart had been an undergraduate at Missouri, graduating in 1909. Shortly after he returned to the University to teach as an assistant and remained there for a year and a half before moving to Michigan. Veblen begin teaching at the University of Missouri in February of 1911. Stewart also knew of Veblen through his friendship with E. H. Downey, who taught at Missouri during the 1909-10 year.

3. According to Dorfman (1973, p. 214), in July 1919 a group including Veblen, Hamilton, Stewart, Lubin, Wolman, and Robert Duffus met at Amherst for a weekend conference "for an investigation of the economic order." According to Lubin, this conference was really about trying obtain a research grant from the Inter-Church World Movement who had an interest in an investigation of the workings of the economic order and "devising a plan for a reorganization of our economic system." The group spent the weekend making plans and "it looked as if Veblen was finally to realize his ambition of getting a group of people around him to look into the vitals of the economic order." The plan, however, came to nothing as it was too radical for the Inter-Church World Movement (Isador Lubin to Joseph Dorfman, January 28, 1932, Isador Lubin Papers, Box 6, January 1932 Folder).

4. I have discussed this session in other papers (Rutherford 2000a). Clark, Hamilton, and Moulton also co-edited a book on reconstruction issues, *Readings in the Economics of War* (1918).

5. Stewart wrote relatively little but commanded great respect. From the Federal Reserve, where he made major contributions, he went into private business with Case & Pomeroy. Between 1928 and 1930, he was a special advisor to the Bank of England. He was on the Board of Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1931-1950, becoming Chairman of the Board in 1940. He held an appointment at the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton from 1938, acted as advisor to successive Secretaries of the Treasury, and was a member of the Council of Economic Advisors between 1953 and 1955. See Yohe (1982 and 1990). He maintained close connections with the NBER, serving on the Board and advising on monetary projects.

6. Copeland knew Clarence Ayres very well from their time at Chicago, and his first wife was Edith Ayres, Clarence Ayres's sister.

7. This was the recollection of Casey Shulberg, Goodrich's grandson, at Goodrich's memorial service: "Grandfather was a student of Robert Frost and worked with him on a literary magazine. *The Amherst Monthly,* when the poet wrote "The Runaway." When Grandfather changed his major interest to economics from literature, Frost said he had lost a poet to economics. Grandfather met Frost again at a reading of his poems some thirty years later, and learned for the first time that Frost was thinking of him when he wrote "The Runaway" (Perlman 1971).

8. Carter Goodrich, writing to Copeland in 1932, tells of his giving a presentation of some of his work under the title "Is This Institutionalism?" to the "Washington Square crowd." Goodrich continues: "they

were almost inclined to add me to the roster of institutionalists which they announced as consisting of Hamilton, Copeland, and Washington Square" (Carter Goodrich to Morris Copeland, April 5, 1932, Morris A. Copeland Papers, Box 1, 1927-1932 Folder).

9. Parsons sent a copy of his "Some Reflections on 'The Nature and Significance of Economics'" (Parsons 1934) to Hamilton with the inscription "Another blast from the semi-enemy's camp for your delectation" (Walton Hamilton Papers Box J53, Folder 3). Later Karl Polanyi described Parsons in a letter to Carter Goodrich as "our friend and opponent" (Karl Polanyi to Carter Goodrich, nd, Carter Goodrich Papers, Box 3, Polanyi Folder).

10. Others hired in the early days were Charles Chase, Horace Drury (Columbia PhD), Leo Pasvolsky (who had been working towards a PhD at Columbia and later obtained his doctorate from the Brookings Institution), Arthur Sufferin (Columbia PhD), and Henry Schultz (Columbia PhD). Schultz left for Chicago after a year, very dissatisfied with his time at Brookings.

11. The objective and scientific character of the Institute of Economics was hotly disputed by Abraham Flexner, of the General Education Board, who regarded Brookings as wishing to use the Institute of Economics to engage in political propaganda. Beardsley Ruml, however, thought that Moulton was interested in a more objective approach (A. F. [Abraham Flexner], "Institute of Economic Research," December 22, 1923, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Series 3.6, Box 49, Folder 517).

12. This had been much discussed between Brookings and Hamilton in the fall of 1923. See Robert Brookings to Wickliffe Rose, November 13, 1923, and attached memos from Walton Hamilton to Robert Brookings, nd., Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Series 3.6, Box 49, Folder 517.

13. The first change was made on academic grounds. The final separation of the RBGS from Washington University, made formal in November 1924, was a result of both financial concerns relating to the taxation of Brookings' estate and a belated recognition that the University of Washington had no authority to operate a School outside of the St. Louis area.

14. There was a great deal of talk about "being on the frontier." See the song in note 17 below. Walter Morton has recalled many of the students at Brookings were "talking about the new frontiers of economics" and that "some of us called them the 'new frontiersmen'" (Walter Morton to Robert Coleberd, March 4, 1973, Brookings Institution Archives, Item A86-001, RSB Graduate School 50th Anniversary, Box 1, Letters in Reply Folder).

15. Graham Wallas had been a leading member of the Fabian group and a professor of politics at the LSE until 1923. He was on the staff of the School for part of the 1926/27 year. Hardy was a Member of Council of the Institute of Economics.

16. This is the first "essay" approach to thesis writing in economics that I know of. Mordecai Ezekiel wrote in his diary for March 13 1926: "Much to my surprise the Robt. Brookings felt I had about all the work I needed, accepted my various magazine articles in lieu of a thesis, and gave me my preliminary and final oral exams, the latter yesterday. They accepted mathematics as one of my languages. As a result as soon as I do a paper on Hobson . . . I can get my degree. Probably in June" (Mordecai Ezekiel Papers, Box 5, Dairies 1922-29 Folder). In another case a piece of work carried out jointly by Dexter Keezer and Stacy May was accepted as meeting the requirements of both students. Oral exams could

also be very informal. In the case of Max Lerner, he was invited to a Saturday morning discussion over tea or coffee with Hamilton. Over time other staff members arrived and joined in the discussion. After a couple of hours of discussion Hamilton announced Lerner had just successfully completed his oral examination. The questioning was less to find out what Lerner knew, than to discover "how he would handle problems" (Isador Lubin, 1974, Taped Interview by Robert Coleberd, Brookings Institution Archives, Item A86-011).

17. The material collected by Robert Coleberd and now in the Brookings Institution Archive contains a RBGS song book. A pencil note on it from Harvey Young reads "We would assemble in the lounge after dinner and have a sing-song" (Brookings Institution Archives, Item A86-011, Box 1, Brookings Songs Folder). A sample is: "On the Economic Frontier:"

> On the economic frontier,
> Far from Smith and Mill,
> Stands dear old R.B.G.S.E.G.,
> Would it had a hill!
> Hail to Brookings, Alma Mater,
> Alma Pater too,
> World's salvation in the balance,
> Gosh! What shall we do?

Some of the social aspect of the School are remarked upon in a letter written back to John R. Commons by three of his "Friday Nighters:"

> My good fortune brought me to that centre of iconoclastic social science known as the Brookings School. . . . . When I arrived there on a September evening . . . I found about two dozen happy young people sitting in a spacious dining-room under a Venetian candelabrum. I was rather confused because of the great number of girls who seemed to dominate the conversation completely. Their names -- Ida and Esther, Jean and Winifred, Margaret and Anita, Elizabeth and Marguerite -- were being called all over the place. I felt considerably relieved when the crowd adjourned to a large drawing-room where a pleasant hour was spent in dancing to the tunes of an enormous victrola (orthophonic). This was my first impression; since then I have become acquainted with all of them and find that they are very interesting and hard working people, though some of them might profitably spend a semester or two in the University of Wisconsin (Dorothy Whipple, Heinrich Pollak, and Ewan Clauge to John R. Commons, November 9, 1926, John R. Commons Papers, Box 3, Folder 6).

Mordecai Ezekiel also recalls that the residents used to "roll up the rugs" and have dances after supper a few times a week. Among the marriages between students at the School were Anita Marberg and Max Lerner, Jean Flexner and Paul Lewinson, Idella Gwatkin and Carl Swisher, Rose Stahl and Ralph Fletcher, Margaret Keister and John White, Elizabeth Webb and Roy Veach. Ruth Ayres married Meredith Givens, a Wisconsin PhD who was in Washington for a time, and Helen Everett married Alexander Meiklejohn.

18. The first year PhDs were awarded was in 1925. Students who had been enrolled in the RBGS obtained their degrees with that designation through to 1930. Although the School had ceased to exist in

its previous form as of the end of the 1928 academic year, a program for second year students was offered in 1928-29. A complete list of PhDs awarded and of students who attended the School by year can be found in the Brookings Institution Archives, Item 41, Office Files of Elizabeth H. Wilson, 1922-1961, Box 3, Folder: Historical Notes, 1953.

19. Lubin was close friends with Leo Wolman and also provided a great deal of help to Joseph Dorfman in his work on his Veblen book.

20. Hamilton and Lubin were keen of having their books on coal jointly reviewed, as they felt that their investigations were not primarily descriptive, but investigations into economic theory (Isador Lubin to Max Handman, December 5, 1927, Isador Lubin Papers Box 1, Correspondence 1927 Folder).

21. Clarence Ayres obtained his first regular academic job since his time at Amherst in 1930 in the economics department at the University of Texas, replacing Max Handman who had gone to Michigan.

22. Interestingly, the charge Homan was given by Alvin Johnson was to "attempt to systematise and establish relations between the work of Veblen, Mitchell, Commons, and the younger men in America and the sozial politische orientation in Germany (Sombart, Weber, the group of the Archiv fur Sozial wissenschaft.)" (Paul Homan to Rexford Tugwell, December 18, 1930, Rexford G. Tugwell Papers, Box 11, Paul Homan folder). Homan wrote to Mitchell, Dorfman, Tugwell, and others to ask for their opinions, and received a wide variety of responses, including the claim, from Mitchell and Dorfman, that Veblen alone should be classified under the category of institutional economics. J. M. Clark defended a broad view of institutionalism against Homan (Clark 1932).

23. Among many other students who followed career paths in economics were Fred Berquist, Montgomery Anderson, Orval Bennett, George Terborgh, Lazar Volin, and Paul Webbink. One might also mention Theresa Wolfson. She taught at Hunter College, was an economic consultant to the American Nursing Association, and was involved in research in the fields of worker's education and labor economics.

24. The 1931/32 issue of the Yale Law Journal has articles by Hamilton, Fuchs, Lerner, and McAllister. Very much related to the theme persued by Keezer and May, McAllister wrote on the early history of the doctrine of "affectation with a public interest" (McAllister 1930). This was also one of Hamilton's themes (Hamilton 1930).

25. He wrote: "put up at Robert Brookings School, finding there at once a number of old acquaintances and of new interests. The more I saw of this school, of its staff and students, the better I liked it. Its size, system and personal quality make it one of the best sociological workshops I know of--if not the best" (Extract from Letter from B. Malinowski to Outhwaite, June 1, 1926, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Series 3.6, Box 49, Folder 518).

26. During the 1928/29 year a course was offered partly by visitors, including Wesley Mitchell, J. M. Clark, Sumner Slichter, and Frank Knight, and partly by Institute of Economics staff. The students themselves ran a seminar on the novel in which each student gave a presentation on one of the great novelists (George Marshall to Robert Coleberd, September 25, 1974, Brookings Institution Archive, A86-001, Box 2, Folder Reunion October 16 II). Hamilton was greatly missed. Hamilton and Wright returned for the oral exams of students, but even this became an issue when Wright discovered that there

would not be at least two members of the examining committees from the former School staff (Helen Wright to Fred Powell, May 13, 1929, Brookings Institution Archive, Item 136, Correspondence of the Training Division, 1928-1941, Box 2, Folder W).

27. In his 1926 report to the Board of Trustees, Hamilton complained that the School had tried to build links with the IGR but had failed due to the interests of the IGR being much too narrowly focused on issues of administrative "economy and efficiency" to furnish "a proper research complement to the School's work in politics" (Hamilton 1926, p. 16). This drew an angry response from W. F. Willoughby of the IGR who blamed the lack of interaction between the IGR and the School entirely on Hamilton (W. F. Willoughby to Robert S. Brookings, May 24, 1926, Brookings Archive, Item 17, Box 1, Appendix 4 to Moulton 1928). Another cause of friction concerned the use of the Rockefeller funding, which although given to the School was intended to be used as a "research fund" to support the IGR (the Institute of Economics being already provided for by funding from Carnegie). In order to do this the Trustees of the School assigned the funds to the IGR and assumed control over the IGR by becoming members of the IGR's Board. IGR Board members who were not also Trustees of the School had to resign. The School staff argued that they should also have some access to these funds to support their own research, but were not successful. Finally, Hamilton and Wright's second book on the bituminous coal industry, which suggested a virtual nationalization of the coal industry, "provoked sharp dissent in its conclusions by two staff members" (42 Year Report, Brookings Archive, Item 18, Box 1). Dorothy Ross claims that "Pressures from the coal companies and the conservative political scientists of the IGR conspired to bring Hamilton down and to eliminate the graduate school altogether" (Ross 1991, p. 417). However, Hamilton and Wright's second book did not appear in print until 1928, while the amalgamation plan was finalized and agreed to by the end of 1927. Hamilton and Wright's proposals were modeled on those proposed in 1919 by Henry Clay for the British coal industry (Dorfman 1974, p.14).

28. The reasons for Carnegie's refusal involved changes in policy with respect to the granting of permanent endowments, financial retrenchment, and the irritation of one member of the Carnegie Board with Moulton's work on the financial condition of France (Moulton 1928; Robert Brookings to Harold Moulton, June 1, 1926, Brookings Archive, Item 30, Box 1, Robert S. Brookings [1925-1926] Folder).

29. Hamilton indicated that given his wishes he would like, over a two year period, to try to hire Carl Becker in history, Joseph Redlich in politics, Walter Stewart in economics, and Arthur Macmahon, John Dickenson, or John Gaus in administration (Hamilton 1927).

30. It may also have been the case that other universities were not keen on the RBGS as it was tending to "poach" some of their better graduate students.

31. Despite this interest in Commons's work, Hamilton did not think that highly of Commons's legal scholarship (Isador Lubin, 1974, Taped Interview with Robert Coleberd, Brookings Institution Archives, Item A86-011).

References

Adams, Henry C. 1887. On the Relation of the State to Industrial Action. *Publications of the American Economic Association* 1, No 6.

Atkins, Willard, E., Donald W. McConnell, Corwin D. Edwards, Carl Raushenbush, Anton A. Friedrich, and Louis S. Reed. 1931. *Economic Behavior: An Institutional Approach*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Biddle, Jeff. 1998. Institutional Economics: A Case of Reproductive Failure? In Mary S. Morgan and Malcolm Rutherford, eds. *From Interwar Pluralism to Postwar Neoclassicism*. Annual Supplement to Volume 30, *History of Political Economy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp.108-133.

Clark, John M., Walton H. Hamilton, and Harold G. Moulton, eds., 1918. *Readings in the Economics of War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, John M. 1932. Round Table Conferences--Institutional Economics. *American Economic Review*, Supplement, 22 (March): 105-106.

Cooley, Charles H. 1913. The Institutional Character of Pecuniary Valuation. *American Journal of Sociology* 18 (January): 543-555.

Commons, John R. (1924) 1968. *The Legal Foundations of Capitalism*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Cutler, Addison T. 1938. The Ebb of Institutional Economics. *Science and Society* 2 (Fall): 448-470.

Dorfman, Joseph. 1949. *The Economic Mind in American Civilization, Volume 3*. New York: Viking.

_______. 1959. *The Economic Mind in American Civilization, Volume 5*. New York: Viking.

_______. 1973. New Light on Veblen. Introduction to Thorstein Veblen, *Essays Reviews and Reports*, edited by Joseph Dorfman. Clifton: Augustus M. Kelley, pp. 5-326.

_______. 1974. Walton Hale Hamilton and Industrial Policy. Introduction to Walton H. Hamilton, *Industrial Policy and Institutionalism: Selected Essays*. Clifton: Augustus M. Kelley, pp. 5-28.

Ezekiel, Mordecai. 1930. *Methods of Correlation Analysis*. New York: J. Wiley.

_______. 1936. *$2,500 a Year: From Scarcity to Abundance*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

_______. 1939. *Jobs for All Through Industrial Expansion*. New York: A. A. Knopf.

Friday, David. 1920. *Profits, Wages, and Prices*. New York : Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

Graduate School of Economics and Government, Washington University. 1924-1925. Preliminary Announcement 1924-1925. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Record Group 3.6, Box 49, Folder 517.

Goodrich, Carter L. 1920. *The Frontier of Control: A Study of British Workshop Politics*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

Hamilton, Walton. 1917. Problems of Economic Instruction. *Journal of Political Economy* 25 (January): 1-13.

_______, ed. 1919a. *Current Economic Problems*, revised edition. Chicago: University of Chicago.

_______. 1919b. The Institutional Approach to Economic Theory. *American Economic Review* 9 (March): 309-318.

_______. 1923. Education--Ritual or Adventure? *The Nation* 116 (June): 720-721.

_______. 1926. Report to the Board of Trustees, The Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government, April 30, 1926. Appendix 3 to Harold G. Moulton, The History of the Organization of the Brookings Institution, June 1928. Brookings Institution Archives, Item 17, Formal and Informal Histories of the Brookings Institution, 1928-1966, Box 1, File: Memoranda on the Early History of the Brookings Institution.

_______. 1927. Memorandum to Abraham Flexner: The Brookings Ventures at Washington. Appendix 12 to Harold G. Moulton, The History of the Organization of the Brookings Institution, June 1928. Brookings Institution Archives, Item 17, Formal and Informal Histories of the Brookings Institution, 1928-1966, Box 1, File: Memoranda on the Early History of the Brookings Institution.

_______. 1929. Charles Horton Cooley. *Social Forces* 8 (December): 183-187.

_______. 1930. Affectation With Public Interest. *Yale Law Journal* 39 (June): 1089-1112

Hamilton, Walton H. and Stacy May. (1923) 1968. *The Control of Wages*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.

Hamilton, Walton H. and John C. White. 1926. *A Book of Book Reviews*. Washington D.C.: np.

Hamilton, Walton H. and Helen R. Wright. 1925. *The Case Of Bituminous Coal* . New York: Macmillan.

_______. 1928. *A Way of Order for Bituminous Coal*. New York: Macmillan.

Hamilton, Walton H. and Associates. 1938. *Price and Price Policies*. New York: McGraw Hill

Hodgson, Geoffrey M. 2001. *How Economics Forgot History: The Problem of Historical Specificity in Social Science*. London: Routledge.

Homan, Paul T. 1928. *Contemporary Economic Thought*. New York: Harper.
_______. 1932. An Appraisal of Institutional Economics. *American Economic Review* 22 (March): 10-17.

Johnson, Alvin. 1952. *Pioneer's Progress*. New York: Viking.

Keezer, Dexter M. and Stacy May. 1930. *The Public Control of Business*. New York: Harper.

Keezer, Dexter M., Addison T. Cutler, and Frank R. Garfield. 1928. *Problem Economics*. New York: Harper.

Lerner, Max. 1931. The Social Thought of Mr. Justice Brandeis. *Yale Law Journal* 41 (November): 1-33.

_______. 1935. What is Useable in Veblen? *New Republic* 83 (May): 7-10.

_______. 1948. *The Portable Veblen.* New York: Viking.

Lewinson, Paul. 1932. *Race, Class and Party: A History of Negro Suffrage and White Politics in the South*. New York: Oxford University Press.

_______. 1947. *A Guide to Documents in the National Archives for Negro Studies*. Washington D. C.: The American Council for Learned Societies.

Lubin, Isador, 1924. *Miner's Wages and the Cost of Coal*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Lubin, Isador and Helen Everett. 1927. *The British Coal Dilemma*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Lyon, Leverett. 1927. Report to the Board of Trustees, The Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government, April 30, 1926. Appendix 10 to Harold G. Moulton, The History of the Organization of the Brookings Institution, June 1928. Brookings Institution Archives, Item 17, Formal and Informal Histories of the Brookings Institution, 1928-1966, Box 1, File: Memoranda on the Early History of the Brookings Institution.

McAllister, Breck P. 1930. Lord Hale and Business Affected with a Public Interest. *Harvard Law Review* 43 (March): 759-791.

Mitchell, Wesley C., ed. 1919. *History of Prices During the War*. War Industries Board Price Bulletins Nos. 1-57. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Moore, Harry H. 1927. *American Medicine and the Peoples' Health*. New York: Appleton.

Moulton, Harold G. 1928. The History of the Organization of the Brookings Institution, with 24 Appendices, June 1928. Brookings Institution Archives, Item 17, Formal and Informal Histories of the Brookings Institution, 1928-1966, Box 1, File: Memoranda on the Early History of the Brookings Institution.

Nef, John U. 1973. *Search for Meaning: The Autobiography of a Nonconformist*. Washington D. C.: Public Affairs Press.

Panunzio, Constantine, M. 1927. *Immigration Crossroads*. New York: Macmillan.

Parsons, Talcott. 1928/1929. Capitalism in Recent German Literature: Sombart and Weber: Parts I and II. *Journal or Political Economy* 36 (December): 641-664, 37 (February): 31-51.

_______. 1934. Some Reflections on "The Nature and Significance of Economics." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 48 (May): 511-545.

_______. 1935. Sociological Elements in Economic Thought. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 49 (May): 414-453.

_______. 1959. A Short Account of my Intellectual Development. *Alpha Kappa Delta* 29 (Winter): 3-12.

_______. 1976. Clarence Ayres's Economics and Sociology. In William Breit and William Patton Culbertson, eds., *Science and Ceremony: The Institutional Economics of C. E. Ayres*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 175-179.

Peck, Gustav and George B. Galloway. 1928. On the Dissolution of the Robert Brookings Graduate School. *The Survey* (May 15): 229-231.

Perlman, Mark, ed. 1971. *Carter Goodrich, 1897-1971*. Np.

Riefler, Winfield W. 1930. *Money Rates and Money Markets in the United States*. New York: Harper.

Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government. 1928. General Catalogue 1923-1928. Washington, D.C. Appendix 23 to Harold G. Moulton, The History of the Organization of the Brookings Institution, June 1928. Brookings Institution Archives, Item 17, Formal and Informal Histories of the Brookings Institution, 1928-1966, Box 1, File: Memoranda on the Early History of the Brookings Institution.

Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government, The Institute of Economics, The Institute for Government Research. 1924-1925. Personnel. Walton H. Hamilton Papers, Box J9, Folder 5.

Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government, The Institute of Economics, The Institute for Government Research. 1927-1928. Personnel. Walton H. Hamilton Papers, Box J9, Folder 5.

Ross, Dorothy. 1991. *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rutherford, Malcolm. 1999. Institutionalism as "Scientific" Economics. In Roger E. Backhouse and John Creedy, eds., *From Classical Economics to the Theory of the Firm: Essays in Honour of D. P. O'Brien*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

_______. 2000a. Understanding Institutional Economics: 1918-1929. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 22 (September): 277-308.

_______. 2000b. Morris A. Copeland: A Case Study in the History of Institutional Economics. Paper Presented at the History of Economics Society Meetings, Vancouver BC.

_______. 2001a. Institutional Economics: Then and Now. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 15 (Summer): in press.

_______. 2001b. Institutional Economics at Columbia University. Paper Presented at the ASSA Meetings, New Orleans.

Stewart, Walter W. 1917. Social Value and the Theory of Money. *Journal of Political Economy* 25 (December): 984-1002.

Swisher, Carl Brent. 1930. *Stephen J. Field: Craftsman of the Law*. Washington D. C.: Brookings Institution.

_______. 1943. *American Constitutional Development*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Tannenbaum, Frank. 1929. *The Mexican Agrarian Revolution*. New York: Macmillan.

_______. 1933. *Peace by Revolution: An Interpretation of Mexico*. New York: Columbia University Press.

_______. 1946. *Slave and Citizen: The Negro in the Americas*. New York: Vintage Books.

Tawney, Richard. H. 1921. *The Acquisitive Society*. London: G. Bell.

Thorp, Willard L. 1928. *Economic Institutions*. New York: Macmillan.

_______. 1947. Entry in *Current Biography 1947*. New York: H. W. Wilson.

Thorp, Willard L. and Wesley C. Mitchell. 1926. *Business Annals*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Veblen, Thorstein. (1919) 1964. *The Vested Interests and the Common Man*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.

Wolman, Leo and Gustav Peck. 1933. Labor Groups in the Social Structure. *Recent Social Trends in the United States*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Yohe, William P. 1982. The Mysterious Career of Walter W. Stewart, especially 1922-1930. *History of Political Economy* 14 (Winter): 583-607.

_______. 1990. The Intellectual Milieu at the Federal Reserve Board in the 1920s. *History of Political Economy* 22 (Fall): 465-488.