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GEOGRAPHY AT ILLINOIS

The Beginnings: 1867-1920

The importance of Geography as a study of scientific and cultural merit was recognized by the organizers of the Illinois Industrial University, and the discipline—in various guises and subdivisions—was incorporated in the prospectus of the University and in its earliest suggested curricula. Despite that initial enthusiasm and despite continuous instruction in Geography from the founding of the University, recognition of the field as a discipline in which a "major" might be offered was delayed more than fifty years; independent departmental status occurred a quarter century later.

In discussing the aims and scope of the University, the Report of [the] Committee on Courses of Study and Faculty for the Illinois Industrial University proposed six departments, including a "Department of General Science and Literature" which embraced "the course in Natural History, Chemistry, etc." Under this rubric were "The natural sciences, or sciences of nature, embracing natural history, chemistry, natural philosophy, geology, physical geography and uranography [which] especially exercise and cultivate the powers of observation, classification and inductive reasoning." The Committee indicated as "among the more important departments or chairs of instruction:

"10. The Professorship of Geology, Mineralogy and Physical Geography"

The early years of the University were a period of fluxion. Each successive Circular and Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the Illinois Industrial University showed changes in departmental organization and curricula; each indicated the introduction of new courses and subject matter. But each, also, made room for Geography and, increasingly, for its subdivisions. The Circular for 1867/68 includes meteorology in the second term and physical geography in the third for students in the "Department of Science, Literature and Arts"; that for 1868/69 suggests that in the "Department of History and Science" "The study of historical geography will keep even pace with the history studied...". By 1874/75 physical geography and meteorology appear as requirements in the School of Agriculture, the School of Horticulture, and the School of Natural History and, in the following year, in Civil Engineering. By 1882/83,

"Physiography, or 'the study of nature' is taught by illustrated lectures.... The subjects considered are the origin of the earth, and its relation to other worlds; the distribution of land and water; the direction and extent of mountain chains and of ocean currents; the influences which determine the climate of any locality; the systematic distribution of animals and plants; and especially the biological position of man, and his relation to the animate and inanimate worlds around him."

In 1898/99, "Teachers and others who desire an introduction to the new geography are offered a ten hours' course in physiography."2

After long years of program development and increasing specialization, there emerged in 1901 the separate Department of Geology with which Geography was to be so long joined. In the early years of the century, however, the juncture was not total. The Department of Economics, too, had an interest in Geography and proceeded to demonstrate it in 1902 by the introduction of Economics
"26. Economic and Commercial Geography," a course which, after several changes, is dropped from the Annual Register for 1922/23—perhaps because the need was being filled in the then new Geography Division.

With this exception, however, instruction in Geography—and the expanding program in the discipline—was tied to Geology, very much, in the early years, as a subordinate interest of that Department. Initially, only two courses identifiable as geographic subjects were scheduled: Physiography and Meteorology, the latter "offered especially for students in Agriculture." To make the affiliation certain, however, in the University of Illinois Announcements for 1904/05 the entry for Geology 8 (physiography) reads: "See under Physical Geography." In the same Announcements, under "courses for Graduates," there is listed "108. Physical Geography.--Studies in Illinois geography...." and in 1905 a methods course, "Teachers Course in Physical Geography," was added.

An independent program was beginning. The Geology Department appears to have recognized that, although incorporated within it, Geography had intellectual interests and problems different from those of Geology. By 1909/10 this recognition became formalized, with the Department offering "three lines of work"—one of which was "Physiographic Geology, Physical Geography." This "line," or area of specialization, was designed for the student whose "interest lies more in the earth's surface, the origin of its topographic forms, the agencies which are transforming them, and the influence of these upon the welfare of plants, animals and man."4

As a token of their commitment to the encouragement and support of a Geography specialization in the department's structure, the purely "geological" staff added a member with previous identification with Geography. John L. Rich, a new Ph.D. from Cornell, joined the Department in September, 1911, and served successively as Assistant, Instructor, and Associate until 1918. With prior experience as Instructor in Physical Geography at Cornell from 1909 to 1911, Rich had already, under the sponsorship of R. S. Tarr, twice presented papers before the Association of American Geographers and was a member of the then prestigious National Geographic Society.

With his arrival there was a burgeoning of Geography offerings. Over the next few years Rich introduced and taught5 "Regional Geography"6 (1911); "Geography of Europe" and "Geography of North America" (1912); "Influences of the Geographic Environment"7 and "Advanced Physiography" (1913); "Geography of South and Central America" (1914); "Principles of Geography" (1916); "General Geography", "Geography and the War"8, and "Human Geography"9 (1917).

Rich left the Department in 1918, leaving behind a remarkably well-developed program in Geography. It was a program broader and richer than the purely physical geography "line" established prior to his arrival. Incorporating regional, human, and topical approaches, the curriculum Rich developed represented an appreciation of the breadth of the field and an awareness of the structure it was assuming as it was so rapidly developing at other major universities—especially in the Midwest. Certainly, Rich must have been encouraged to develop a Geography program of significant scope within the Department of Geology; that is to the credit of the Department. That he did so with such a sure hand and with such boundless energy is an unmistakable monument to his own vitality and intellect.10
The program John Rich created did not survive intact his departure. For
reasons now unknown, his replacement—Alyda Caren Hansen—allowed his formid-
able array of courses to contract, in 1918/19, to four: "Human Geography," "Meteorology," "Geography of the War and Reconstruction," and "Geography of
North America." In the following year a further reduction was experienced by
the dropping of "Geography of the War." But a momentum had been created that
continued in the advance of Geography on two vital fronts: the creation of a
programmatic "major" in the discipline within the Department of Geology, and
the appointment of a truly professional Geographer to give that program
guidance.

The Formative Years: 1920-1934

The Annual Register for 1920/21 indicates that Geography had reached a
new level of acceptance within the structure of the Geology Department.
Recognizing the interests of "students whose major is made up of courses in
Geography," the offerings of the department are clearly distinguished between
those of group "A. Geology" and those of group "B. Geography." They were
not equivalent in number or status. While specialization in Geology was
accommodated by sixteen undergraduate courses and two "Courses for Graduates,"
the undergraduate program in Geography had but eight offerings, 11 and no
graduate-level instruction was available. The proffered program in Geography
was minimal, unbalanced, and far less equivalent to the breadth of training
available at other major universities than had been the program developed
during the tenure of John Rich. But a recognized "major" had been established
and, with the introduction of Geography "7. Field Geography" ("The field
selected for study in 1921 is the Ozark Mountain Area of Southern Illinois"), a
component of professional research training had been introduced.

Not since Rich's departure had the Geography program had fully professional
guidance. From 1918/19 to 1920/21, Miss Hansen almost single-handedly carried
the instructional load. 12 However, the Geology Department was during this
period actively seeking at least one professionally trained Geographer to
direct the recently created major program.

The full scope of that personnel search is obscured by the passage of
time. Although other candidates for the post of "Geographer" within the
Department may have been considered earlier, Charles C. Colby—much later to
be briefly associated with the then separate Department of Geography at
Illinois 13—reported in a December 30, 1943, letter to then Dean M. T. McClure
that he had been offered a position as "Professor of Geography" in 1918 by
Eliot Blackwelder, Chairman of Geology. Since Colby did not receive his Ph.D.
degree (Chicago) until 1917, the rank may be in doubt. The departmental
intent immediately to find a replacement for the leadership of John Rich,
however, is clear.

With academic year 1921/22, the Department began to add the Geographers
it sought. In that year William O. Blanchard joined the staff as the University's first professionally trained Geographer, and the first Geographer to
hold professorial rank. His initial title, however, was Assistant Professor
of Geology. Indeed, with but two exceptions, until 1934 all who taught courses
in Geography held ranks in Geology. 14 Blanchard himself was the first to
break the pattern, being appointed Associate Professor of Geography in 1925.
In that same year, John B. Appleton (Ph.D. Chicago, 1925) came from an Assistant-ship at Chicago to join the staff as an Assistant Professor of Geography. Although over the years there were numerous personnel changes and most ranks were held in Geology, by 1933 four geographers, including John L. Page (Ph.D. Clark, 1929), held distinct disciplinary appointments within the nineteen-member staff of the Department of Geology.15

But Blanchard was first, and by virtue of that fact, by his continuously higher rank, and by the length and devotion of his service was recognized as the leader of the Geography group in all ways until the appointment of Joseph A. Russell as first Head of Department in 1949. Blanchard received all of his education at the University of Wisconsin--as an undergraduate in Physics and a graduate student in Geography (Ph.D., 1921). Responding to a January 4, 1921, letter from T. T. Quirke, Head of Geology, indicating the availability of a “geography position,” he joined the staff the following September as an Assistant Professor at the then most respectable salary of $3,000.16 His unusual devotion to duty and love of teaching is evidenced by his taking but a single sabbatical leave during the almost thirty-one years he was a member of the faculty, and by his serving as adviser to both graduate and undergraduate students during twenty-seven of those years. Death in 1952 ended his service before retirement.

Staff changes were numerous during the years of Geography’s affiliation with the Department of Geology. Between 1920 and 1934, nineteen individuals held faculty positions. Most tenures were short, most ranks low (see Appendix Table 1). Even Appleton, who came at the then relatively exalted rank of Assistant Professor, remained only four years. But a very small number made a long-term professional commitment to the University of Illinois and provided the staff continuity essential to the development of a lasting departmental program. Together with Blanchard, John L. Page (Ph.D. Clark, 1929) and J. Herbert Burgy (Ph.D. Clark, 1930) bridged the period, with long terms of service, from 1921 to 1965.17

The instructional program as it developed during these Formative Years appears not to have been guided by an established departmental philosophy. Blanchard, the acknowledged and designated leader of the changing Geography group was not, as Page has orally reminisced, “a pusher”; those like John Appleton and Guy-Harold Smith, who were, did not remain long enough to put a distinctive programmatic stamp on the Department. The informally created curriculum was, however, unexceptionable for its period and common today: relatively balanced with appropriate components of regional geography, of the branches of systematic geography then current, and of training in geographic techniques. Blanchard’s interests in economic geography were early apparent, but late in the Formative Years he reminded the staff of the need to maintain a strong physical focus in all course descriptions and content.18

The Geography major program in 1921/22 was described as “Geography 1 [Principles of Geography] or Geology 1 followed by 20 hours of courses that have prerequisites in geography except that geography 14 [Weather and Climate] and 2 [Human Geography] may be included.” The entire program consisted of ten undergraduate courses,19 six of which were taught by Blanchard.20 In the succeeding years, the core curriculum remained much as it was at the outset and only a few new courses were added: “Advanced Industrial and Commercial Geography” (1922); a seminar in “Industrial and Commercial Geography of Countries Exclusive of North America” (1924); “Individual Research in Geography” (1928); “Geography of Africa,” “Geography of Asia,” “Climates of the Continents,” and “Physiography” (all in 1929); “Cartography” (1930); and a seminar, “Introduction to Research” (1931). During this period, too, there occurred some name
changes and the designation, beginning in 1922/23, of certain of the courses as
designed for advanced undergraduates and graduates.21

Growth of the curriculum, either in breadth or depth, during the fourteen
years 1920-34 was not impressive; growth in registrations in Geography was
(Appendix Table II). Two hundred-fifty students enrolled in Geography in
academic year 1920/21. By academic year 1933/34, students totalled 828 and
then registrations jumped to over twelve hundred in 1934/35 as the College of
Commerce added "Elements of Geography" to the list of courses meeting under-
graduate requirements in science. Growing enrollments and consistently small
staff numbers placed heavy work burdens on the faculty. The number of contact
teaching hours was not unduly great for the period before World War II, ranging
from about eleven to fifteen.22 It was, rather, the size of classes which was
the problem. In an undated memorandum to F. W. Dewolf, Head of the Department,
written during academic year 1934/35, the Geography staff noted that enroll-
ments in "Elements of Geography" had been increased by 2.5 times as a result
of the College of Commerce action already noted. Consequently, "as an emergency
measure we abandoned the quiz-discussion method of teaching and have for the
past two years attempted to use the large lecture section--5 lectures per week
in this course." "Economic Geography," too, "has already increased 2.5 times
since 1933" and "we may reasonably expect a further increase in that course," but
"the schedules provide only the same number of sections next year as were
offered this year...". J. L. Page recalls quiz sections of 63 and 87 students
each, and they were not unusual. Section size was limited only by the
 capacitities of available classrooms. Particularly galling, in Professor Page's
recollection, was the fact that in 1931/32 the Geography staff of five was
teaching the same number of students as was the Geology staff of fourteen.23

To the problems of teaching ever-larger introductory classes were added
the pleasures and strains of working with an increasing number of graduate
majors. The first two Master's degrees with Geography specialization were
awarded in 1926 and another fourteen were granted by the end of 1933. The
degrees were given in Geology although some recipients took no work in that
discipline. Indeed, only one Master's thesis was written on a physical geo-
graphic topic and that was related to climate, not geology (see Appendix Table
III).

As far as the extant record would suggest, the Geographers, if not wholly
content, were at least quiescently resigned to the subordinate role of their
discipline within the Department of Geology during the 1920's. Individual
staff reportedly felt that they and their colleagues were not treated--
particularly financially--with full fairness,24 and there is some evidence of
resentment among the geographers over the disparities between the two fields
in teaching loads and staff sizes. But the archives do not yield evidence of
overt expressions of discontent or of agitation for an altered status for the
Geography program.

However, behind the scenes, it is apparent, the Geography group wished
for independence and for University recognition of the discipline's separate
worth. In an undated memorandum sent by "the Geography Staff" to W. S. Bayley,
then Department Head, during the Fall of 1930 there is the pointed observation
that "In the past decade the two divisions have drifted farther and farther
apart until there is at present little but the catalog designation and a common
Chairman which ties them." The chief expressed complaint was, simply, that
Geography had outgrown its gemorphological origins to assume, through "human
geography," a position intermediate between the natural and social sciences;
that it had developed philosophies, techniques, and terminology purely its
own; and that the existing tie with Geology was an unnatural relic of history. They asked that "departmental separation at Illinois...be made true in name as it already is to a large extent in practice." In response to this forwarded memorandum, Dean K. C. Babcock appointed, on November 7, 1930, "a committee to review and report upon the request...for the creation of Geography as a separate department."25

Although the committee reported favorably on December 10, 1930, its recommendation for separate departmental status for Geography was not acted upon. President H. W. Chase accepted the report as valid for some future action, but he refused to commit "the University to any particular date or method of carrying out [the] recommendation." In conveying this decision to Professor Bayley, Dean Babcock cited as his personal resistance to immediate creation of the new department "the state of progress of the Division" of Geography, which did not seem to warrant separation, and his reluctance to commit additional funds to create the "much stronger Department of Geography" which he seemed to have envisioned.

Whatever else may have been involved in these decisions, money in that depression period was an over-riding consideration. A July 5, 1932, memorandum to department members from DeWolf pointed out that the Department had cut its budget only nine percent, not the ten percent requested, for fiscal year 1932.26 The mimeograph machine was shut down, the staff was reminded that "The University does not favor furnishing paper to students for quizzes..." the supply of "wolverine files" was cut off, and other cost-saving measures were suggested. Certainly, the financial climate was not propitious for promoting a new department, with new staff and new operating expenses.

The Transitional Years: 1934-1945

Although attempts at creating a separate Department of Geography were not immediately rewarded, intermediate success was achieved in 1934 when the Department of Geology became the Department of Geology and Geography.27 For the first time, all Geographers were officially recognized as such by appointment title; for the first time they felt they had recognized status. The Geography staff began to meet independently of the Geologists, although their sessions were chaired at first by Professor DeWolf, Head of the combined department. Although DeWolf eventually stopped attending the meetings, all matters of business cleared through his office and he constituted an intermediary between the Geographers and the Administration. Geology still controlled the purse strings.

The new status of Geography may have been emotionally satisfying, but it was not reflected in dynamic new thrusts in program development. The curriculum developed during the 1920's remained essentially unchanged. There were, of course, minor program alterations and course additions, but the new semi-independence did not lead to a re-thinking of the Geography curriculum or to a re-structuring of its offerings. The fleshing-out of the regional program was the most apparent effort in this period. The "Geography of Illinois" (1935)28 and of "Caribbean America" (1939) were added; "Geography of North America" was split into separate courses on Eastern and Western North America (1936); and "World Regional Geography" was introduced (1942). Only two other new courses, "Geography of Trade Territories" (1940) and "Interpretation of Maps and Aerial Photographs" (1942; "Elective course for students in the enlisted reserve"), were added between 1934 and 1944.
The lack of program expansion did not inhibit growth of the graduate student body. Even with the disruption implicit in the wartime period, twenty-six Master's degrees were awarded during the Transitional Years. To the extent that student research interests may be presumed to reflect those of the faculty and, therefore, be indicative of program emphasis, one must conclude on the basis of theses titles that the departmental orientation was distinctly non-physical and was heavily influenced by Blanchard's concerns with economic geography (Appendix Table III). Only three titles imply dominant interest in the physical, and two of these are climate-oriented. Primary production, particularly agriculture, dominates, while purely regional studies have several examples. The intellectual divorce from Geology appears complete.

Total enrollments, which took a startling jump in academic year 1934/35, reflecting changes in requirements and electives in the College of Commerce, continued at their new and higher level—above one thousand per year exclusive of Summer Session or, later, of military students. Assistance in maintaining enrollments also came from the inclusion of Geography as an approved subject satisfying both physical and social science requirements in the undergraduate curriculum in general education. The continuing high enrollments were not matched by compensating staff enlargement; in a plaintive letter of October 28, 1936, to Professor DeWolf, Blanchard points out the need for a full-time equivalent staff expansion of 1.5 for Geography 1 and 2 alone, since "Geography 1 has had to refuse students for the past seven semesters."

World War II brought a true crisis in instruction and staffing. Civilian enrollments held up well through academic year 1942/43, even as much of the younger staff was requesting—and being granted—leaves of absence for wartime service (or were submitting resignations when leaves were not approved). Oliver Beimfohr, Alfred Booth, J. Herbert Burgy, A. B. Cozzens, Raymond Crist, Alden D. Cutshall, and Robert Voskuil all departed temporarily or permanently at some time between 1942 and 1944. In the face of this staff depletion, the remaining faculty was suddenly confronted by a monumental problem of numbers. In July, 1943, 1438 military personnel arrived on campus for academic training, with physical geography a required subject. In that summer only Blanchard and Page were in residence to receive them and instruct them. The Department had already had a taste of new teaching responsibilities related to wartime needs. Two courses, "World Regional Geography" and "Interpretation of Maps and Aerial Photographs" were approved in September, 1942, "for the period of the emergency" and offered especially for the Enlisted Reserve Corps; they subsequently became part of the regular offerings of the department. No comparable easy response to military requirements could be made in July, 1943. The more than 1400 servicemen presented a problem of stupefying proportions to the depleted staff; the problem was compounded by unavailability of new Geography staff and by University policy.

The first summer's program was adjudged a disaster. J. L. Page, alone, taught the first Army Specialized Training Program (A.S.T.P.) group in six lecture sections of two hours each, in addition to his regularly scheduled thirteen hour class load. The size and length of the lecture sections, the lack of smaller-sized quiz sections, and the general indifference of the students yielded results with which the Army expressed dissatisfaction. The solution was obvious: organize instruction around the lecture-quiz format. This, however, demanded new staff at a time when Geographers were in great demand in Washington and at other universities with comparable instructional assignments. John H. Garland (Ph.D. Chicago, 1940) joined the department from Western Reserve as Assistant Professor in September, 1943, with the specific assignment of taking over the A.S.T. Program in Geography. But further staff
was required. On November 12, 1943, Dean McClure sent telegrams to six universities and to Richard Hartshorne of the Office of Strategic Services in Washington, D.C., soliciting names of men who could 'administer and participate' in the military program. Some names were suggested, but 'The men in the Department are not much impressed by any of the men recommended.'

Simultaneously with sending the telegram DeWolf wrote McClure that 'I am inclined to think that our need is not so much for a man to head the group as several good men at a lower level. The future work will have its greatest drawback in the fact that ten or a dozen volunteers from other departments are to help with it. It would be far better to have trained geographers doing this work. However, the present plan is according to University policy.' That policy, of course, resulted from the need to find useful employment for tenured staff rendered partially superfluous by drastically reduced civilian enrollments. DeWolf was not happy with the arrangement, but found comfort in the plans developed to acquaint the newcomers with the subject matter they were to teach. The new demands on the staff necessitated the cancellation of many of the regular departmental courses; that cancellation, plus the shrinking of the civilian student body, resulted in plummeting regular enrollments in Geography: from 1008 in 1942/43 to 218 in 1943/44. Registrations remained low through academic year 1944/45, increased by 50 percent in 1945/46 and then shot up rapidly to nearly 1400 in 46/47 as the post-war college boom began.

The Division of Geography was ill-prepared for its wartime duties; it was, in a very real sense, ill-prepared for anything. The product of long years of subordination, poverty, teaching overloads, and Administration indifference—even hostility—the Division further suffered from lightning-like faculty turnover and from a lack of self-defined goals. There appears to have been developed no sense of purpose or destiny; Blanchard didn't, and the others couldn't, effectively assert the importance of Geography to the University. No program of excellence in teaching or research emerged after semi-autonomy was achieved. Only Blanchard was an (elected) member of the Association of American Geographers in 1945; only Blanchard had published in the Annals. Not only was the Division ineffectual in impressing the University of Illinois with its worth, it was ill-regarded or disregarded by the profession at large. In a letter to Dean McClure (April 21, 1943), Arthur B. Cozzens, then on wartime leave, submitted his resignation, saying he was influenced in his decision 'by the opinion of my superior in Washington. He most strongly advised me against returning to the geography section of the University of Illinois, stating that such an action would be 'committing professional suicide.' He also thanks McClure for his kindnesses: 'Without these, I could not have borne the unwholesome situation in the Geography section.'

Nevertheless, the early 1940's saw the initiation of moves and the development of Administration opinions which would culminate, in 1945, in the creation of a separate Department of Geography. In December, 1939, prompted by stimuli not now clear, the Executive Committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences recommended to President A. C. Willard certain steps be taken with respect to the 'organization of the Geography group.'37 As reported to Blanchard by DeWolf in a letter of January 10, 1940, and independently by Dean McClure in one of January 12, the recommendations were:

'1. That as a temporary measure the Geography Section of the Department of Geology and Geography be organized, within the Department of Geology and Geography, as a committee of the
whole, with Professor W. O. Blanchard as chairman, for the purpose of organizing and administering the internal affairs of the section.

"2. That the recommendations of the committee be transmitted through Professor F. W. DeWolf with any comments that he may wish to make to the Dean of the College."

Presumably the Administration had qualms about the implications of this move: "The President preferred to have the above plan put into effect unofficially so as not to appear to be taking a step for the division of the Department into two separate and independent units."

But that, of course, was just exactly the implication of the move, though no further formal steps toward full separation were taken for the next three years. In the interim the "Geography group" had made, through the A.S.T.P. instructional program, not only a significant contribution to the armed services but also a heroic contribution to the financial support of the University and several of its underemployed faculty. Whether out of gratitude for services rendered or from a belated recognition of the significance of Geography (The "real world," after all, obviously found the discipline of value), the Administration again moved to a reconsideration of the status of Geography. An early indication comes from Dean McClure. In an October 26, 1943, letter to A. J. Janata, Assistant to the President, he comments: "I do not see how we can hold [Booth's] position here over a period of two or three years, especially since I have in mind a thorough reorganization of the Division of Geography."

The "Minutes of Geography Staff Meeting - January 4, 1944," refer cryptically to more positive Administration action by noting "Rumours relative to a change in the status of geography..."; group discussion lead to the preparation of a "Recommendation of the Geography Staff" to be presented to DeWolf for transmittal to Dean McClure. DeWolf, in forwarding the "Recommendation," notes that he has "been handed statements regarding two outstanding geographers [Derwent Whittlesey and J. Russell Whitaker] who are highly regarded by the Geography staff in case a new head for a department is to be invited here." He adds, perceptively: "Probably a real plan for strengthening the Geography work would be necessary in order to attract either of them, or any one in like position."

McClure, in a response to the Geography staff of January 11, 1944, tried to set events in perspective. He reported that he brought up the matter of a separate Department of Geography to the Executive Committee of the College "for the purpose of discussion. No action was taken at that time, nor has any been taken since." He assured the Geographers no steps would be made in that direction or in the selection of a Head of Department without full consultation with them.

The Geographers began to smell success. At their March 2, 1944, staff meeting, the establishment of a Department of Geography at Johns Hopkins was favorably mentioned, although it was opined that "A Department of Geography at Illinois, a major state university, should be even broader in scope than the plan [there]..." But at the meeting of April 12, 1944, "Professor Blanchard, reporting on a conversation with Dean McClure, stated that no departmental reorganization of geography can be contemplated this year," leaving, no doubt, the impression that their hopes might well be realized in 1945.
There is distinct reason to believe the Department of Geography at the University of Illinois does not exist. No evidence can be cited that the Board of Trustees ever formally acted upon or approved the Department's establishment; no record has been located that the matter was ever voted upon by either the faculty of the College or by the University Senate, all procedures mandated by the University of Illinois Statutes. Like the British Empire, the Department appears to have come into existence in a fit of absentmindedness. In an April 12, 1945, letter to Nels Bengston of the University of Nebraska soliciting his opinions about a list of prospects for the Headsip, Dean McClure comments: "It seems likely now that beginning in September, 1945, we will separate Geography from Geology, and set it up as an independent department." At their meeting of August 29, 1945, the Board of Trustees approved a University budget which allocated $25,000 for the "Department of Geography." Apparently, however, no study committee recommended separation, no formal report was made, no official action on establishment was taken. With the exception of approval of a budget which included a separate Department of Geography, the first official notice taken by the Board of Trustees of the new University unit came at their meeting of January 31, 1946, when the Board approved a non-recurring expenditure grant of $1,000 for "maps, equipment and office furniture for the Department of Geography." It was not, however, until the August 5, 1947, meeting of the Board that President George D. Stoddard requested and received authorization to appoint a Head of the Department.

Stoddard was a bit premature in his request, although he had every reason to believe the authorization he sought would soon be exercised. In fact, however, the appointment of a Head was a long-standing point of contention between the Administration and the Geography Department. During the years from September, 1945, until September, 1948—when Dean Larsen offered and Russell accepted the post—the search for a Head was continuous and marked by differences of opinion between the Administration and the Geography faculty. In addition to Joseph A. Russell, at least twenty-one other prominent geographers were seriously mentioned and came under some degree of consideration for the post. Several of them, according to the recollection of J. H. Garland, were invited for interviews or were tendered offers. The difficulty encountered in getting agreement by all parties on a candidate of stature led to Administration expressions of displeasure with the Geography group.

The initial phase of governance of the new unit was simply solved; during academic year 1945/46 DeWolf served as administrative head of Geography just as he had prior to separation. Upon DeWolf's retirement August 31, 1946, President Stoddard, on Dean McClure's recommendation, appointed as the "Administrative Committee of the Department of Geography" W. O. Blanchard, Chairman; J. H. Garland, and J. L. Page for the year ending August 31, 1947. With failure to appoint a Head, these assignments were renewed until Russell took the post effective February 1, 1949.

Although the selection and appointment of a new Head was an obvious preoccupation of the Administrative Committee, it was also faced with the necessity of carrying on normal departmental activities, of rebuilding courses and staff in the post-war period, of providing space for its present and future operations, and of determining, if only tentatively, directions of growth.
Money was a first item of concern, but funding was intimately related to obtaining staff, to re-establishing and adding needed courses, and to servicing a growing student body swollen by the return of college-age applicants, by government-supported veterans, and by instructional demands of new programs in L.A.S. and other colleges. The initial 1945 budget of $25,000 was augmented by the Trustees' allocation of an additional $1,000 for map, equipment, and furniture expenditures. This additional appropriation satisfied modest needs of the moment, but did nothing to assure funding problems associated with program requirements or institutional demands. Despite a 38 percent increase in budget to more than $34,000 in fiscal year 1946/47, Blanchard, as spokesman for the Administrative Committee, was moved to point out to President Stoddard\(^47\) that the Department was forced to close sections in Geography I [Elements of Geography] and Geography 22 [General Geography, a service course for the College of Commerce]. He mildly complained that the department was not allocated sufficient funds to employ staff on an "overtime" basis to meet student demand\(^48\) and requested, for Semester II, 1946/47, the "authority to schedule...sections as an overtime load and pay for them as such." The staff of nine full-time Professors, Instructors, and Assistants tried to cope with the rising teaching load and only barely managed that second semester, with two instructors and one assistant carrying overloads of five hours each.\(^49\) Only a minimum program could be accommodated, however, with inadequate offerings at the advanced undergraduate and graduate levels.\(^50\) Staff additions, including the hoped-for new Department Head, were proposed for fiscal years 1947/48 and 1948/49 and budget allocations were requested and granted for that purpose.

Budget allocations, of course, do not necessarily equate with departmental expenditures. If hoped for staff is not hired, or if the department fails to spend up to the permitted limits on equipment or wage items, unspent funds lapse and are lost.\(^51\) The 38 percent budget increase for fiscal year 1946/47 was followed by a further 49 percent increase in fiscal 1947/48, indicating University support of the developmental program. A budget increment of less than 5 percent occurred in fiscal year 1948/49.

Although there were some changes in personnel and in the distribution of ranks held (Appendix Table 1), there was no growth in staff numbers between 1946 and 1949. The most notable changes in the professorial ranks were the departure of Cutshall to the Navy Pier Branch (eventually, the Chicago Circle Campus) of the University and the return of Alfred W. Booth (Ph.D. Wisconsin, 1936), who had served as Instructor from 1936 to 1943, departed for military service in Washington, D.C., (Office of Strategic Services) and a years' appointment at Washington State College, and returned as Assistant Professor for Semester I, 1947, to remain until retirement February 1, 1972.\(^52\)

The split-up of the former combined Department presented certain housekeeping problems. During the summer of 1947, T. T. Quirke and J. L. Page "were asked to represent Geology and Geography, respectively, in proposing what appeared to be an equitable distribution of what had previously been office space and equipment for the combined Department...."\(^53\) Geography's resulting share of both appears to have been fair under the circumstances, but grossly inadequate to the prospective needs of a Department presumably destined to expand materially. There was, indeed, a general shortage of space throughout the University in those booming post-war years, as was noted by Blanchard in the Annual Report of the Department for academic year 1947/48 and reiterated in general correspondence within the University in this period. The allocated departmental space was on the south side of the Natural History Building on a
portion of the second (main) and fourth floors. Three fourth-floor classrooms housed essentially all instruction; two second- and four fourth-floor offices (aggregating less than 1400 square feet) housed seven faculty, with another three crammed into 130 (out of 400) square feet of room 249, shared then with Geology but ultimately to be remodeled for the administrative offices of the Geography Department. A March, 1948, assessment of additional space requirements resulted in a request for nearly 5000 square feet of additional area exclusive of new classrooms, including space for a seminar room, drafting room (cartography laboratory), map and storage room, and several additional offices. It was space, by implication, which did not have to be within the Natural History Building, but space that should "be located within the main Liberal Arts and Sciences portion of the campus." The further request that allocated new space be "grouped in one building, preferably on one floor," was not to be realized. Rather, the Department eagerly seized upon an offered single room in a former residence, since demolished, at 402 South Mathews (occupied September 24, 1948), and space for a cartography lab made available by Director Robert B. Downs of the University Library in the Map Room of the Main Library (occupied during academic year 1949/50).

The search for a new Head, the details of departmental separation and of securing space and equipment, the changing staff of relatively constant size, and the overwhelming problems of accommodating increasing numbers of students did not permit program expansion. With the exception of University-mandated course renumbering, the list of offerings at the start of academic year 1948/49 was essentially identical to that of 1945. It was a list with almost no courses (and no substantive ones) at the purely graduate level and only seven for advanced undergraduates.56 There is evidence, however, of planning for future development; particularly was there the recognition of a need for expansion, outlined in the Annual Report, of offerings at the advanced undergraduate-graduate levels. There are no documents extant reflecting Administrative Committee deliberations on the long-term program of the Department it felt desirable. Perhaps this is a reflection of an absence of intensive discussion, indicating the Committee's awareness of the determining role that would inevitably be played by the new Head, whoever he might ultimately prove to be.

A remarkably thoughtful and prescient letter does exist, however, written by J. H. Garland to Provost Griffith upon Garland's return from the joint Association of American Geographers, National Council of Geography Teachers, and American Society for Professional Geographers Christmas meetings at the University of Virginia. Reporting that he had found great interest in the potential of Illinois among leading geographers, he summarized both his thoughts and those volunteered by others in the profession. Assuming leadership in the discipline was incumbent upon the new Department, Garland suggested excellence could be achieved by one of two means: (1) offer the traditional undergraduate and graduate program with strong teachers and outstanding scholars, individuals of such distinction as to make the Illinois program outstanding; or, (2) do the traditional instructional tasks but make the program one of disciplinary leadership by specializing in the unique. He opined that two new developments in geography were of sufficient interest to the profession as to invite consideration as areas of specialization at Illinois. They were military geography and applied economic geography. The first he dismissed as already usurped.58 The second, however, he advocated from the standpoint of establishing academic leadership and engaging in public service. Presumably without clairvoyance, Garland anticipated the interests of the first Head of the Department nearly eight months before his name had been
proposed. Except for details of organization Garland outlined a principle thrust of the Department, and a main basis of its reputation, for years to come. 59

In a letter to Dean McClure of June 10, 1946, "the senior members of the geography staff" 60 tried to draw a word picture of the qualities essential in the man, whoever he might be, ultimately selected to manage the fortunes of the new Department. "We feel the ideal combination in a department head would be a good administrator, a good teacher, and a good research man.... We do feel... that in selecting a head we should choose a man whom we believe can handle in the most satisfactory manner our most pressing needs." The first mention of the man who exactly fitted that description came from Glenn Trewartha of the University of Wisconsin. In a spontaneous July 29, 1948, letter to Blanchard, Trewartha asked: "Have you ever thought seriously of Joseph Russell, associate professor of geography at Syracuse, as a candidate for your position [?] Here at Wisconsin we all think very highly of Russell and his organizing ability. Moreover he has been an active investigator and writer in the field of economic geography.... I happen to know he likes administrative work." 61

Blanchard immediately sent out letters of inquiry (August 2, 1948) to Lester E. Klinn of the University of Pennsylvania, to Robert Hall of Michigan, and to George Cressey and Preston James of Syracuse. On the strength of the positive letters of recommendation received in response, and in light of the apparent interest expressed by the Department, 61 Russell was invited by Dean Larsen to Urbana for an interview and visited on September 17. A verbal offer of the Headship was made the following day and confirmed by letter on the 21st. The offer was accepted, by letter, on the 22nd and the necessary formal nomination by Larsen to Stoddard was dated September 29. The appointment was approved by the Board of Trustees at their meeting of October 21, 1948. After the years of acrimony and indecisiveness the final solution, when presented, was quickly seized upon with enthusiasm.

Professor Russell's prior academic and public service record was distinguished. A recipient of the Ph.D. (1937) from the University of Michigan, Russell was, prior to World War II, a faculty member at Syracuse University, to which department he returned after wartime service as Chief of Geographic Research for the Military Intelligence Service. Joining the Department of Geography at Illinois at the start of Semester I, 1948/49, Russell served as Head until returning to full-time teaching in 1965. His early retirement at the end of Semester I, 1972/73, was followed immediately by a Visiting Professorship for that winter quarter at the University of Florida and then by a return to part-time service at Illinois in the Fall of 1973. Throughout his tenure at Illinois, Russell played a prominent role not only in directing the fortunes of the Department but also in participating importantly in College and University activities.

Russell, even prior to his assumption of departmental direction in February, 1949, faced serious problems of space, staffing, library development, and the immediate question of the developmental thrust of the new Department. Orally, Russell had been charged by Dean Larsen to "continue the development of strong elementary and advanced undergraduate work in geography and to recruit staff and design physical and library facilities which will permit Illinois to become one of the outstanding graduate departments of geography in the United States." 62 In the long run, Russell took most seriously the charge to enhance the graduate program as the main thrust of his administrative tenure; for the short run, all levels of the instructional program came under his (and the staff's) scrutiny.
In a letter to Blanchard announcing his acceptance of the Headship, Russell promised soon to ask "for a statement on objectives toward which we should strive, and other data which may clarify the aims of the department." There seems to be no record of the inquiry. However, a subsequent letter proposed a Christmas Eve meeting with the "Professors on the staff...to go over in a preliminary way the answers to the questions I posed some time ago...." The result of that meeting, convened "for the purpose of discussing the future objectives of the department," was the formulation of the first of a series of departmental program emphases. In perfect accordance with the professional interests of Russell, the recommendations of Garland, and the established emphasis of the Department, "it was agreed that besides the traditional job of teaching a well-rounded group of course offerings, the department would address itself to the problems of applied geography especially at the graduate level." In order to pinpoint needed new staff specializations, a comprehensive listing of regional, systematic, and technique subject coverage was detailed. The emphasis was distinctly on an anticipated dominance of graduate-level programs; "undergraduate offerings were reviewed and emphasis placed upon..." designation of a course sequence to meet general education requirements in the physical sciences and the "immediate need of offering an eight hour sequence" for social science general education.

A number of course introductions and modifications were proposed during, particularly, the second semester of academic year 1948/49 to implement these program decisions. More were added for first semester 1949/50. Most of the proposed courses received temporary approval only, a circumstance which led Russell to remonstrate that "all of these new courses must be a part of our permanent departmental offerings, even though all except Land Utilization [361] are approved on a temporary basis." The purpose of these course introductions, and of continuing staff discussions on the topic, was to "insure the University of Illinois a well-rounded program in Geography" covering "all levels of work from elementary to advanced graduate training" that would be organized around a series of "functional cores" made up of physical, cultural, economic, and regional geography; and techniques and philosophy. Course offerings from these "functional groups," Russell proposed, "will be used to set up departmental major programs" in six fields: (1) urban and business geography; (2) rural and land use geography; (3) cartography and graphics; (4) meteorology and climatology; (5) teacher training; and (6) professional geography (university-level teaching).

Responding effectively to Dean Larsen's mandate and satisfying his own and his colleagues' high professional aspirations required Russell simultaneously to pursue multiple developmental lines. By virtue of his status as Professor and Head of the Department, Russell had been granted "full membership" on the Graduate Faculty of the University; only W. O. Blanchard of the others of professorial rank had the same recognition. In a letter to L. N. Ridenour, Dean of the Graduate College, Russell recommended that Page, Garland, and Booth be granted the same full membership, citing their "demonstrated capacity to do scholarly research and to direct the work of others...." His recommendation was acted upon favorably.

The implication, obviously, was not only recognition of merit but also of imminent introduction of a program proposal which would include authorization to grant the Ph.D. Such authority was implicit in the establishment of the Department at a major university and in the charge given Russell by the Administration. Discussions of a doctoral program antedated Russell's assumption of
control, and he was the first to pose the question in a letter to Blanchard.70 Blanchard's response was totally pragmatic: "...it seems to me that [granting the doctorate] should be one of our immediate concerns. Without it we are hamstrung in obtaining assistants."71 Russell acknowledged that "The matter of the doctorate is a very serious one, and it must be placed high on our list of things for discussion..."72 Apparently it was, and approval of the doctoral program was granted by the Board of Trustees on April 19, 1950.73

The establishment of the doctoral program was carried out simultaneously with undergraduate and Master's-level course development. "A complete revision of the curriculum of the Department of Geography was proposed during 1949/50."74 The revision involved the introduction of nearly twenty new courses. It "included additional courses at 100, 200, 300, and 400-levels" and "the retitling of several previously offered courses."75 The new offerings, in the areas of climatology, economic geography, regional geography, cultural systematic geography and techniques, were sorely needed. In 1949/50, only five subject content courses were offered at the 300-level—one in climates, two in economic geography, and two regional courses. No substantive courses at the 400-level existed. During 1950/51, seven 300-level systematic or regional courses and four technique courses appear in the timetable, along with six 400-level systematic and technique offerings, exclusive of "Advanced Studies in Geography." The Master's program, first introduced in 1926, at last had a broad instructional base to buttress it and permit it diversity.

Development at the undergraduate level was less extensive and, apparently, of less immediate concern. The concern that was expressed, indeed, dealt with the short-term decline anticipated in the Department's undergraduate enrollments as a consequence of program changes within and without the College. In December, 1950, the University Senate approved curricular revisions for the College of Commerce which made certain Geography courses no longer mandatory for Commerce students. At nearly the same time, "Introductory Physical" and "World Regional" geography were placed in the Social Science sequence for general education in Liberal Arts, setting them against competitive entrenched courses in History, Political Science, and Sociology. Anticipating the impact of these developments, Russell wrote Dean Larsen76 "that the probable resultant decrease in geography enrollments...will create serious problems for the department." He was "certain that, given normal University operation, geography will recapture at least its present enrollment status" but felt that the losses to be sustained "will make it necessary for us to devote a considerable part of our energies rebuilding the department to the level it now occupies."77 He feared that that necessary task might be "unrewarding to the professional growth of members of the staff."

That staff, in 1949/50, was composed of Professors J. A. Russell and W. O. Blanchard; Associate Professors A. W. Booth, F. W. Foster, J. H. Garland, and J. L. Page; and Instructors Mary Grant and Marjorie Smith. C. C. Colby was serving as Visiting Graduate Professor for the academic year.

Fred W. Foster (Ph.D. Michigan, 1940) joined the staff from O.S.S. and Michigan State University in September, 1949, to inaugurate programs in field study, cartography, and in photo interpretation. Other teaching faculty appointments were made during the Russell Years, in every case reflecting expanding departmental needs for curriculum development and expansion. The first phase of active recruiting came during the early 1950's: Jerome D. Fellmann
(Ph.D. Chicago, 1950) joined as Instructor in September, 1950, with responsibilities for urban geography (introduced the previous year by Colby), for the Soviet Union, and for bibliographic techniques; Robert L. Carmin (Ph.D. Chicago, 1953) came from Michigan State as Assistant Professor in February of 1951 to work in the areas of Latin America, economic geography, and photo and map interpretation. His Latin American interests predominated, and Carmin was named Chairman of the Latin American Studies Committee of the University in 1957 and Director of the Center for Latin American Studies in 1959; he left the University in 1962 to become Dean of Sciences and Humanities at Ball State University. Howard G. Roepke (Ph.D. Northwestern, 1953) assumed duties as Instructor in September, 1952, to work almost exclusively in the fields of theoretical and applied economic geography. In September, 1953, Charles S. Alexander (Ph.D. California-Berkeley, 1955) took over responsibilities in physical geography, the Caribbean, and, later, Africa; together with Foster, Alexander developed the summer field program of instruction.

Later in the Russell Years further staff additions were made, several as joint appointments with other campus agencies or departments. Demetri B. Shimkin (Ph.D. [Anthropology] California-Berkeley, 1939) came on campus as Visiting Professor of Anthropology in February, 1960, and remained as Professor of Anthropology and Geography beginning in September, 1960; his principal contributions to the Geography program were in the areas of quantitative methods, the Soviet Union, and through cooperation in the development of the University's (and Department's) human ecology interests. Everett Smith, Jr., (Ph.D. Minnesota, 1962) took a nominal Assistant Professorship in the Department beginning September, 1961, and became engaged in full-time research in the Office of Community Development; he found time, however, to participate productively in the Department's program, assuming responsibility for a widely acclaimed television program teaching geographic concepts at the elementary school level and in developing an innovative course in "Geography and World Affairs." Smith left for the University of Oregon in August of 1965. Ronald R. Boyce (Ph.D. Washington, 1961) came to the campus in September, 1961, as a full-time member of the Bureau of Community Planning and immediately established close and contributory contacts with the Department. By Semester I, 1962/63, he held a joint appointment with the Bureau and (one-quarter time) the Department as Assistant Professor. Boyce did much to advance training in quantitative techniques and conducted stimulating urban and planning seminars; he left for Iowa at the end of that same academic year. In 1963, Shannon McCune, an Asia specialist (Ph.D. Clark, 1939), accepted a post as Consultant to the President of the University and Visiting Professor of Geography effective February, 1964; he remained with the University until June, 1965, when he assumed the Presidency of the University of Vermont; but administrative duties kept McCune from participating actively in Departmental affairs. In September, 1964, R. Warwick Armstrong, a former student (Ph.D. Illinois, 1963), having taken a Master's of Public Health degree at Michigan, returned to the Department to pursue, in teaching and research, his interests in medical geography and bioclimatology; he also carried on the teaching work in quantitative methods that Boyce had developed. A native of New Zealand, Armstrong's Pacific interests took him to the University of Hawaii in Fall of 1968. The final staff addition of the Russell Years also held a joint appointment: John Thompson (Ph.D. Stanford, 1958) came as Director of the Center for Latin American Studies, succeeding Carmin (and Alexander who was interim Acting Director) and as Associate Professor of Geography effective June, 1964. He retained these dual roles until installed as the second Head of the Department in September, 1966.
These staff additions, the new instructional and research directions of the Department, and, particularly, the growing size and sophistication of the graduate student body, made imperative new attention to library resources and provision of new and expanded departmental space.

From the standpoint of library collections, the developing Geography program was extraordinarily well served. University holdings in general made it the fourth largest (third largest University) collection over-all in the United States. As a full-range University, including agriculture and engineering, holdings in fields ancillary to, and allied with, Geography, were strongly developed and available. Although Geography had not had a strongly developed instructional and research program, and had had only minimal funds assigned to it for acquisitions following its separation from Geology, the Geography collection itself was surprisingly strong. A 1950 assessment and ranking of libraries in the United States on the basis of their holdings of leading geographical serials showed Illinois to be in a cluster of third-ranked collections with holdings equivalent to those of, among others, Columbia, Minnesota, and California at Los Angeles. The collection's evident strength was certainly the result of the breadth and care of the acquisitions program of the library in general rather than the consequence of systematic large-scale purchasing initiated by the Geography staff. Prior to 1945, the few book requests made by the Geographers were subjected to close scrutiny by the Head of the combined department who preferred to spend his limited library allocations on Geology material. After departmental separation, Geography purchasing allotments were initially miniscule: $225 for 1945/46 and 1946/47. From the beginning, the Department made near-constant efforts to gain increases in the book budget. A September, 1947, plea by Blanchard to R. B. Downs, Director of Libraries, citing "the increase in the price of...books," won an increase to $400 in the budget for 1947/48 and 1948/49. Although the original document is lost, a letter from Russell to Downs of October 12, 1950, comments "this Department only recently asked for an increase in its library budget." That increase--to $700--was granted but was, because of budget constraints, cut back to $550. Under prodding by Fellmann, who had been assigned responsibility for development and improvement of Geography holdings, Russell wrote to Helen Welch, Acquisition Librarian (March 23, 1954), that "Our situation is critical and if we are to maintain our geographic library at an effective level we must ask for an increase in our appropriations." It was granted and further increments followed in response to repeated documented requests in subsequent years. When allocated funds were insufficient, pleas for supplemental appropriations were sent forward.

In actuality, library support of the Department's program was wholehearted, and obscured rather than revealed by the allocations officially made. The Library Administration made major commitments of funds from its "general" and "sets" accounts to purchase older monographs and serials not on campus but essential to a major Geography collection, or needed to fill gaps in series runs. Further, the Department was permitted to order regional materials on budgets assigned to the developing "language-area" programs, and special appropriations were made to purchase complete sets of important serials appearing on the second-hand market. In all ways, the Library cooperated to the utmost in assuring the Department of the literature base essential to the development of a first-class program of instruction and research.

From the creation of the Department, Geography library materials were intermixed with Geology and Biological Sciences and housed in the Natural History Library, conveniently close to Departmental quarters in the Natural History Building. This did not, however, provide the distinctive, separate collection
envisioned by Russell and the Geography staff as the ideal. A separate departmental library for Geography was rejected by Director Downs as unwarranted and uneconomical; but repeated presentations by Russell led the Library Administration to accept the feasibility and desirability of combining the Geography collection with the University's map and atlas holdings in a composite Map and Geography library on the fourth floor of the Main Library building. The Department's willingness to relocate cartography equipment from 418a Library to temporary quarters in Davenport Hall, and the University's removal of the A. A. Harding collection of band instruments from 416 Library, made space for the expanded combined Map and Geography Library. Detailed planning for the development of that new facility began late in 1954, the housing of newly acquired Geography purchases there began in November, 1955, and the transfer of nearly 6,000 volumes from Natural History Library to Map and Geography took place during fiscal year 1956/57. The Geography and Map collection grew from 5,058 books, 176,398 maps and 7,563 air photos in 1955 to 14,302 books, 235,578 maps, and 27,989 air photos at the end of the Russell Years in 1965.

The consolidation of the Map and Geography collections into a separate library unit was a desirable and gratefully received improvement of supportive facilities; the essential need, however, still unsatisfied in the early 1950's, was control of space sufficient in amount, type, and layout to carry on the basic instructional and research programs of the Department and to house its faculty and graduate students. The Administrative Committee of the Department had, in a report revised to March 23, 1948, requested the assignment of 8,570 square feet of space as Geography's share of an anticipated reallocation of area in the Natural History Building. Within a year of his appointment, Russell adjudged that request as totally inadequate to the current needs of the Department and completely unrealistic in light of its developmental plans and apparent trends of growth. In a letter of January 12, 1950, to John Ballar, Chairman of the Space Committee of the College, Russell enunciated in detail the full extent of departmental requirements: new office space for recently recruited staff and for those for whom hiring authorization had been received; "ample and continuously available space" for instructional work in cartography; "a number of special-purpose laboratories and additional classrooms;" "adequate and safe storage...for manuscript maps, cartographic supplies and field equipment, and field instruments;" and "the full time assignment of classroom space." There was, reported Russell, "every indication that the student load of the Department of Geography, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, will continue to increase" and "the research activities of the staff are also expanding. Both of these aspects in our growth and development are hampered and in some cases stalemated by the lack of adequate space." The Department absolutely required, Russell summarized, "the allocation of approximately 16,500 square feet of floor space. This figure represents our minimum needs...."

The Department was not to get the requested space—at least not in the Natural History Building. In a period of rapid physical evolution of the campus, of new building planning and construction, and of differential patterns of growth of departments, a continuing program of assessment of space needs and assignments was conducted by the College and by the Administration. Geography's requirements were given full consideration in those deliberations, and in March, 1952, Dean Larsen was able to report to Russell that "Davenport Hall has now definitely been assigned as part of the sphere of Liberal Arts and Sciences... The section assigned to Geography will be the central structure now containing laboratories and Morrow Hall. To make this suitable for your department this section of the building must be completely remodeled."
The University proposes, but the Legislature disposes; in June of 1953
Russell lamented: "It is disappointing that the preparation of our newly
assigned space in Davenport Hall will be unavoidably delayed because of lack
of funds during the next biennium."86 But remodeled or not, first-floor space
was there—a sprawling maze of vermin-infested temporarily-partitioned cubby-
holes and open areas, housing the Photographic Services department of the Uni-
versity. Russell seized upon it. In a letter to Dean Larsen of July 27, 1953,
Russell wrote: "This is to inform you that the Department of Geography plans
to use the space assigned to us on the first floor of Davenport Hall immedi-
ately upon the removal of the University Photographic Laboratory from that
space. It is our plan to use this space for graduate student offices until
such time as the permanent remodeling is started." At the same time he re-
linquished "two rooms in 402 South Mathews for other assignment." In addi-
tion, "Funds have been allocated to remodel two classrooms in Davenport Hall
for geography use starting in the fall of 1954."87 One was to be used as a
temporary cartographic laboratory, thus clearing room 418a Library for the pro-
jected consolidation of the Map and Geography collections, and the other was
designed as a regular classroom, freeing an assigned Geography classroom in
Natural History Building for other departments' use. A somewhat skeptical
C. S. Havens, Director of the Physical Plant Department, tried to establish
definitively the implications of Russell's proposal:88 "It is my understand-
ing that you are willing to move into [the space vacated by the Photographic
Laboratory] if it is clean and with the understanding that painting will be
deferred...[Such temporary occupancy is] approved with the understanding that
when... funds become available, the space will be vacated, and if necessary,
without the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences being assigned additional
space during the period of remodeling."

During academic year 1955/56, detailed plans for the reconstruction of
the Davenport Hall space were drawn, with A. W. Booth given responsibility
for the planning of the new facilities. In anticipation of the imminent need
to vacate the temporary space for the construction process, Foster and the
graduate students who occupied part of the area were moved during September of
1956 to the east reading room of Altgeld Hall for the duration of the remodel-
ing project. Actual reconstruction took place during 1956/57—reconstruction
which involved the gutting of the central section of Davenport Hall from the
dirt-floored basement to the steel beams supporting the roof above the third
floor level. The basement was lowered and paved for graduate student office
space (since abandoned because of flooding problems), and three new floors of
office, classroom, and laboratory space were created. The first floor was
designed for faculty offices, map mounting and storage, and for a new corridor
connecting the east and west sections of the building; the second floor housed
the departmental offices, three additional staff offices, and a large seminar
room also serving, with its Pullman kitchen, as the departmental meeting place
for coffee hours. The third floor, the only centrally air-conditioned portion
of the new quarters, was designed to contain a large cartographic laboratory
with attached area for ancillary equipment (Bruning copier, Coxhead-Liner,
printing press, etc.); a classroom equipped with tables and floor electrical
outlets especially designed for air photo and map interpretation studies; an
office for James A. Bier (M.S. Illinois, 1957), the newly appointed depart-
mental staff Cartographer; and a darkroom. The Department moved into its new
quarters on June 10, 1957.

Program development and course introductions of the 1949-1951 period con-
stituted simply the first stage of near-continuous faculty discussion of
undergraduate and graduate curricula and degree requirements carried on during
the Russell Years. Commenting that his enforced absence on active military service during 1951/52 interrupted "the progress of the Department toward its goals," Russell found comfort in the fact that "this period did...provide a space of time for review of curricula and academic procedures which has proved to be healthy. As a result the staff critically have studied course offerings, graduate examination systems, thesis and dissertation procedures, course outlines and prerequisites, and other matters pertaining to both undergraduate and graduate teaching. We are now preparing proposals for certain changes which will give the Department a more solid training program."

During 1953/54, "Several revisions in courses [were] proposed to the College Policy Committee and to the Graduate College," the result of a major curriculum re-examination begun with the naming of a Curriculum Committee and three advisory subcommittees. Upon receiving the Curriculum Committee report, the entire staff was to "act as a committee of the whole in formulating a new statement for major requirements at undergraduate and graduate levels, reorganization of existing courses, recommendations for new courses, and any other matters which may be expected to improve the quality of training given our major and minor students." Russell anticipated that these deliberations would be completed early in Semester II, 1955/56, and could, if revisions were so extensive as to warrant it, be reviewed by the Policy Committees of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and of the Graduate College, for effectuation in the Fall of 1956/57. Events did not develop as anticipated. First, "The curriculum revision inaugurated during 1954-55...was held up to a degree because of Professor Russell's sabbatical leave during Semester I, 1955-56. The final report will not be prepared until September 1, 1956-1957." Next, "The departmental Curriculum Division Committee has presented its recommendations to the full staff of the department and this matter will be considered during the fall semester and the revisions agreed upon forwarded to the College Policy Committee during the spring semester of 1957-1958."

The curricular revisions, when finally agreed to, involved changes in undergraduate major and minor statements, some minor course additions at both levels of instruction, and the formal recognition of differing educational and career objectives of both undergraduate and graduate students with departmental establishment of recognized "tracks" to accommodate them. At the undergraduate level, recommended programs, in addition to the existing Teacher Training curriculum, were created for students with interests in: liberal education; cartography; business; government; and preparation for graduate school. At the Master's level, again in addition to the established Teacher Training program, curricula in cartography, government service, business geography, and preparation for Ph.D. study were outlined. The separate programs were not rigorously defined or mutually exclusive; they were, rather, suggestions of departmental course combinations and recommended extra-departmental study. The discovered record does not indicate whether or not these agreed-upon "tracks" were reported to the College Policy Committee. It doesn't really matter; the new programs of study did not become operative or effective elements in the organization of the Department's curricula.

Nevertheless, the Department continued its process of self-examination and program improvement. Proposals for revision of the system of examination for the Master's degree were offered, primarily by Roepke, in November, 1959, and put into effect during January, 1960; revisions in testing procedures, involving primarily the institution of a departmental "pre-prelim" to examine Ph.D. candidates in their fields of claimed competence and to determine their readiness to proceed to the stage of dissertation proposal and preliminary
examination, were discussed during 1963/64 and instituted during the following year. A new phase of reconsideration of the undergraduate program was begun during 1962/63 and 1963/64; "...this has resulted in substantial changes in nearly every course offered by the department at the 100-, 200-, and 300-levels."98 The changes were approved by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and by the Graduate College for implementation during second semester 1964/65. By October, 1963, the Department attempted a new formulation of "areas of concentration" representing departmental emphases and programs of graduate study. Several summarizations, dating from 1963/64 and 1964/65, of the accepted new thrusts of the Department exist, all stressing the conviction "that excellence in graduate training must rest upon great technical competence." With that as given, "the department has regrouped and redefined its courses and its research into three general fields that have emerged as the interests and capabilities of the staff have developed. These fields [are] intended to offer an essential balance between the systematic physical aspects of geography, the systematic human aspects of geography, and the synthesizing of these as causes and consequences of differences and similarities between regions.... These three fields are: Physical-Ecological Geography; Theoretical and Applied Area Development; Regional Geography."99 Although some elements of the claimed departmental emphases endured, the adopted nomenclature did not last beyond the Russell Years.

Programmatic development was keyed to the changing numbers, mix, and interests of the student body. Total enrollments in the Department increased by 122 percent between academic year 1945/46 and academic year 1964/65, from 915 to 2035 students.100 More important than sheer numbers was the change in the mix of enrollments resulting from course introduction and graduate program development under Russell's direction. In 1948/49, the first year for which enrollment figures by course level are available, "the distribution of enrollments represent[ed] a lack of balance in the teaching effort within the Department. Approximately 30% of the enrollments [were] 100-level courses; about 65% of the total enrollments [were] in strictly elementary courses."101 In 1954/55, after program expansion and curricular development, 78 percent of enrollments were at the 100 and 200-levels, and eleven percent were at the 400-level alone. During 1964/65, Russell's last year as Head, 100 and 200-level courses represented only 74 percent of total registrations. The shift in degree candidates within the Department was even more striking than changes in over-all enrollment patterns. In 1947/48, the Department had ten undergraduate majors102 and fewer than ten graduate students in residence, although a total of twenty-nine, including, presumably, Teacher Trainees at the Master's level, were carried on the roster. None of the graduates, of course, was in a formal Ph.D. program. By 1964/65, however, "there were 27 Liberal Arts and Sciences undergraduate majors,"103 and an additional twelve in the Teacher Training curriculum. At the graduate level, there were fifty-one departmental majors, of whom twenty were in the Ph.D. program.

The shifting emphasis of the Department during the Russell Years—from operation as fundamentally an undergraduate service program for other majors in Liberal Arts and Sciences and other colleges, particularly Commerce and Education, to independent status as a major graduate program in American Geography—is reflected in its degree-granting history from 1945-1965. A steady flow of Bachelor's degree recipients was maintained through the Department despite its shift in interest to expansion of the graduate program. An average of from eight to ten degrees at this level was awarded each year during the twenty-year period. The Master's program showed a burst of vigor and productivity reflective of the multiplication of course offerings and curricular
options at that level, of the expanded staff, and of the improved departmental reputation in graduate training. From its first granting of a Master's degree in 1926 (from then to 1933, officially a degree in Geology) to 1945, the Geography program awarded a total of fifty-five first graduate degrees exclusive of Teacher Training Master's. In the 1945-1965 period, approximately 140 Geography M.A. or M.S. degrees were earned in the Department. The Ph.D. program, for which permission was first granted in 1950, was solely a product of the Russell Years: during the first Head's tenure, to June, 1965, 36 doctoral degrees were awarded (Appendix V). The Department attracted graduate students from New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia as well as from all parts of the United States. Doctoral candidates at Illinois were awarded half a dozen Foreign Area Field Research Fellowships granted by the Geography Branch of the Office of Naval Research in support of their doctoral field work; an award for Ph.D. field research came to one from the Social Science Research Council, and Fulbright funds supported one candidate in India. Research under these and other grants ranged from New Zealand and Tasmania to Iceland.

Program development and teaching, though important and central to the Department's concerns, were not the sole activities in which the faculty were engaged. Impressive achievements in College, University, professional and public service were recorded, and solid accomplishments in research and publication were registered by all of the staff. Particularly noteworthy during the Russell Years were departmental, as opposed to purely individual, research activities. During 1952/53, "two Government-sponsored research programs were conducted for the University by the Department of Geography." One, under the direction of Foster, involved a map indexing project for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. Funds received from this contract research were used to support for several years the W. O. Blanchard Lecture-ship through which distinguished Geographers were brought to campus for a public address and departmental seminars and discussions. The other governmental project, "a classified program of research in industrial Climatology for the Cambridge Air Force Research Center," was headed by Russell and also involved Foster, Booth, Page, and Research Associate John W. Waters (Ph.D. Iowa, 1954) who was employed specifically for the duration of the project. The Air Force study, now declassified, continued during the following academic year and the results were subsequently published as a monograph by the American Meteorological Society. Beginning in 1957/58 a project of several years' duration--the preparation and publication of a multi-volume Atlas of Illinois Resources--was initiated under the general research and cartographic editor-ship of Foster. Contributions to individual sections of the Atlas were made by staff members of other departments, bureaus, and state Surveys, as well as by faculty of the Department. The Atlas, sponsored by the State of Illinois, Division of Industrial Planning and Development, received a special citation from the Geographic Society of Chicago in 1960 for the two (out of a final six) volumes then published as being an outstanding contribution to the field of American Geography; this award was accepted for the State and the University by the then Governor of Illinois. It also earned a "Best of Class" in the 1961 Literature Awards Contest of the American Industrial Development Council. During academic year 1958/59, at the request of the Illinois Division of Industrial Planning and Development and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Booth, Fellmann, Roepke, and Russell undertook a two-volume study to assess the probable impact of the new St. Lawrence Seaway upon the industrial economy of Chicago and northern Illinois. In a different vein, and under the direction of Booth, several faculty participated, during 1956/57, in a cooperative Department of Geography-Ford Foundation-WILL-TV production of a television
series "Neighbors Near and Far." Other examples of departmental and individual public service exist for the period.

The Russell Years were fruitful ones. Finding an unformed, undergraduate service department of four members--three without Graduate College status--a veritable absence of graduate courses, and a fiscal year 1945 budget appropriation of $25,000, Russell left to his successor a vastly different structure. The Department grew to eleven members, all with Graduate College recognition; it achieved the balanced undergraduate-graduate student population that was its objective; its nearly forty Ph.D. recipients included more than a dozen who already had been appointed administrative officers of their respective departments; it secured the physical facilities, the research equipment, and the financial support (fiscal year 1964: $195,300) necessary to support the level of excellence it had achieved. That excellence was recognized by the Department being listed number nine among the "Top 15 Departments" in the Keniston Study of 1957. When he felt his job was done, when the joy of creating and building was, for him, diminished, Russell stepped aside as Head in June, 1965.

The Thompson Years: 1965-

No replacement for Russell had been arranged for prior to his leaving administration. A. W. Booth, who had had experience in the post previously during Russell's absences, was appointed Acting Head for academic year 1965/66. A first order of business was the establishment of a search committee to seek out, correspond with, interview, and--with the concurrence of the Department--make recommendation for appointment of a new Head to the Dean. After serious consideration of a reportedly large number of potential nominees, and after several had been invited for campus visits, the Committee recommended, and the full faculty concurred, that the preferred candidate was one who was already a member of the staff: John Thompson, then Associate Professor within the Department and Director of the Center for Latin American Studies. Thompson accepted the post, severed his budgetary ties to the Center, and assumed the Headship effective September 1, 1966.

The educational and fiscal climates of the University, as they began to emerge during the Thompson Years, were markedly different than they had been during Russell's Headship. In those latter years, the period of the 1950's and early 1960's, a constantly rising number of students at both the undergraduate and graduate level put new pressures upon the University and the Department, but frequent appeals for budget increases elicited, in general, prompt and favorable response from the General Assembly as education at all levels ranked high in the State's priorities for expenditure of public funds. A generally quiescent faculty and student body did not impinge themselves adversely upon the public consciousness, and a willing and financially healthy University Administration gave full support to developmental programs and justifiable staff and space expansion requests of the Department.

By the start of the Thompson Years, however, the halcyon days of generous support were drawing to a close. The Illinois Board of Higher Education, established by an Act of the Legislature on August 22, 1961, assumed, beginning in 1969 under the staff direction of James Holdeman, a nearly adversary position with respect to University funding requests in response to perceived needs for new directions in higher education in Illinois and in response to
changing spending priorities and apparent fiscal crises at the State level. The
passing of the "bulge" in college-age populations and, particularly, student and
faculty militancy, rioting, and physical assaults on University and private
property consequent upon discontent with the Viet Nam War, the Cambodian incursion,
and the Kent State tragedy, brought to an abrupt halt the years of nearly
unquestioning granting of University appropriations requests. By the early
1970's, campus budgets were being severely trimmed, higher education funds were
being diverted to the junior colleges, and established educational and research
programs were being called into question. New demands for "accountability" at
all levels increased vastly the number and scope of requests for departmental
reports to the Administration on matters budgetary and programmatic. At the
same time that "standstill" and, eventually, reduced budgets and mounting
burdens of paperwork increasingly afflicted the Head during the Thompson Years,
the traditional departmental administrative concerns of curricular modific-
ation and improvement, staff replacement and development, and equipment and
space acquisition and modernization remained.

Thompson was confronted immediately with a pressing need to revitalize a
department which had "plateaued" in its development and had lost the vigor and
thrust of innovation which had characterized it during the early Russell Years.
The discipline as a whole was undergoing dynamic change in methodology and in
emphasis. Quantitative methods, theoretical geography, new political and
social geographic thrusts, and new directions in physical geography presented
challenges the staff was not completely prepared or encouraged to meet. The
departmental program which had been appropriate, even noteworthy, during the
1950's and early sixties had now stagnated and was no longer reflective of the
innovative currents in Geography increasingly evident at other prominent de-
partments. Staff depletions113 reduced faculty capability to make course and
seminar introductions commensurate with the demands of the new trends in the
discipline even had they had the inclination or encouragement to do so. The
most senior staff began to change the nature and former level of its participa-
tion in the instructional program;114 the departmental colloquium series, the
forum for exchange of ideas and testing of frontiers, was moribund; student
morale was at a low ebb. Against this background Thompson had to move deci-
sively, building on currents of curricular improvement already nascent in the
100-level courses and encouraging thorough-going re-assessment of total de-
partmental program objectives and staff constitution.

His early concerns were in the areas of curricular renovation. The
faculty was encouraged and directed by committee assignment to intensify the
traditional departmental concern with self-evaluation that had been a recur-
ing theme during the Russell Years. Now, however, definite programmatic
priorities were established based upon staff assessments of existing weak-
nesses in departmental course offerings and of developmental trends in the
discipline at large.

The orienting decisions reached, with the concurrence of the staff, were:
that the Department's identity with physical geography-ecology had to be
strengthened; that its poorly defined human geography program needed a clear
social and urban direction; that the traditional applied economic focus,
fostered under Russell and Roepeke, should be given a broader and more theo-
retical basis; and that work in research techniques needed substantial
strengthening to meet the highest expectations of the academic marketplace.
Simultaneously, there was recognized the pressing need to invigorate the
undergraduate and educational geography programs and both to upgrade the
research capabilities and performance of staff and students and to make a
commitment to the enhancement of the instructional capabilities of the graduate students. In the process, Thompson had to reduce—in some instances for reasons beyond his control—the Department's earlier commitments to regional geography, to traditional rural land-use analysis, and to the programs of the Center for Human Ecology, the Center for Zoonosis Research and the C.I.C. Bio-Meteorology program. These new priorities determined the subject specializations sought during the extensive faculty replacement of the Thompson Years.

The physical geography-ecology program was in disarray. John Page, long responsible for the Department's work in meteorology and climatology, retired in 1965. His departure implied not only course and emphasis changes in the physical geography program of the Department but, followed by Armstrong's departure in 1968, also meant the effective cessation of the Department's concern with the Bio-meteorology program. During the last of the Russell Years departmental discussions were begun which, under Thompson's more active encouragement, led eventually (1969) to a revamping of the two 100-level courses in introductory physical geography and meteorology (101, 111) into two four-hour courses (102, 103) on "Atmospheric Environment" and "Earth's Physical Systems." Progress in the creation of an acceptable 100-level sequence, however, was hampered by the turn-over among, and academic interests of, Page's replacements. A 200-level course, "Advanced Physical Geography," was introduced (1964) before Thompson took over. The kind of coherent, innovative program in physical geography that Thompson envisioned, however, was slow in developing largely because of the professional personalities and brevity of tenure of, particularly, new faculty in the meteorology-climatology sectors. By the early 1970's, however, the Department had achieved a staged and broadened program of courses in the physical sector. The revamped 100-level work was supplemented, at the purely undergraduate level, by a revived and strengthened undergraduate field course (272); at the advanced undergraduate-graduate level, students had available new work in "Advanced Physical" (303), "Zoogeography" (305), "Atmospheric Ecology" (312), a revived "Climates of the Continents" (313), and an interdisciplinary "Air Pollution Seminar" (348). "Analytical Climatology" (412) and special topic seminars were available at the graduate level. In September, 1973, the physical geography group submitted for departmental review planned programs of physical specialization at all student levels. Despite changes in orientation and personnel in the physical geography-ecology program, the commitment of the Department to this area of the discipline has been enduring and productive. Some 25 percent of all dissertations since 1951 were physical or ecological in subject matter.

The social geography emphasis Thompson and the staff desired was more halting in its development. The traditional "World Regional Geography" (104) was by the late sixties undergoing the transformations that would lead to its retitling as "Geographic Perspectives on Human Behavior" in 1972, but, with the exception of urban geography and the faltering regional geography program, little else was available during the early Thompson period to make possible a specialization in this increasingly vital part of the discipline. Again, as in physical geography, solid advances awaited staff additions and the maturing of their professional interests. By 1973/74, the planned broadened base of social-urban geographic work was in place with offerings in historical geography of Europe (241) and of North America (325), "Interaction in" and "Perception of the Geographical Environment" (384 and 385) as well as longer-standing work in human ecology (369, 374), political geography (386) and in special topic seminars. The by-now expanded staff with human-cultural-social (and economic) concerns to be on campus during the spring and summer of 1974 was directed by Thompson to develop a departmental program statement to regularize advising and training in their areas of interest.
The Department had had from Russell's arrival a nationally recognized role and leadership in economic geographic work with particular emphasis upon its applied aspects. Its reputation in training graduates who successfully entered not only academic but also governmental and business fields as practitioners of "applied" skills attracted to the Department a continuous, sizable body of graduate students. Fully fifteen percent of the more than seventy Ph.D.'s granted between 1951 and 1973 involved training and dissertations in this segment of the discipline; the number of those seeking training at Illinois only to the Master's level was considerably greater. During that same period, however, and, particularly after 1960, Russell gradually withdrew from involvement in applied economic geographic work and turned his attention to Europe, historical geography, and the undergraduate program. Therefore, substantially the entire program of teaching and dissertation supervision in this area devolved upon Roepke. The developed situation was unsatisfactory from the standpoint of faculty responsibilities and unhealthy for the department's unique, established reputation. Its rectification through appropriate staff additions, with emphasis upon a broadened substantive and theoretical base, was an early (and, in the event, continuing) concern of Thompson. In an attempt to widen the program beyond its existing locational-manufacturing-mineral emphasis he sought out specialists in agricultural and theoretical transportation geography. That search, however, was abortive for reasons beyond the Department's control until the acceptance of a post by an established theoretical economic geographer, Geoffrey J. D. Hewings (Ph.D. Washington [Seattle], 1969) who came to the Department from Scarsborough College, University of Toronto, in Summer, 1974. The economic program, in conjunction with the broader "human" program, is to undergo reconsideration and developmental planning in 1974 and 1975.

The significant recent advances made in geographic research techniques were not fully reflected in the course offerings of the Department in 1965; the faculty sought, by staff addition and replacement, to modernize and expand course work in remote sensing, quantitative analysis, field studies, computer graphics and cartography to create within the Department the climate, personnel, equipment and software essential to the training of geographers and to the pursuance of advanced research through the application of new as well as traditional techniques of the discipline. A mensuration and graphics committee was established in 1973 to consider further program and curricular needs, detail equipment requirements, and suggest lines by which the integration of the technique programs and those emerging in physical and economic-social geography might be facilitated.

The continuing discussions, assessments and innovations in the selected areas of departmental emphasis were pursued against the backdrop of recurring evaluation of departmental degree requirements and testing procedures. Such evaluations had been important activities during the Russell period and had resulted in established departmental procedures and regulations by which uniform criteria of performance of students were outlined. The general structure of the Ph.D. program, applicable to all candidates, was embodied in a document of that period entitled "Examining Procedures for the Ph.D. Degree."121 In general it summarized the Department's underlying assumptions concerning the nature of the doctorate and of the study and research programs leading to it122 and detailed the sequence of examinations measuring candidate progress toward it. Reconsiderations of philosophy, requirements, and evaluation techniques in the light of both departmental experience and changing Graduate College requirements were frequent during the Thompson Years. An administrative structure formalizing Ph.D. procedures was recommended to the
Head and the staff in an unsigned memorandum of September 28, 1966,123 and adopted, with modifications, as departmental guidelines for distribution to students in February, 1967,124 Minor program and procedural alterations were adopted and announced to present and prospective students in subsequent years; a thorough-going revision of common program requirements and procedures at both the Master's and Ph.D. level was entrusted to a "Graduate Program Committee"125 in September of 1973; its preliminary reports were subjects of staff consideration during 1973/74, with final action deferred to Semester 1, 1974/75.

The Master's and Bachelor's programs were subjected to comparable re-evaluation in the light of experience and changing academic needs during the Thompson period. At the Master's level periodic adjustments were made in the procedures of examination first adopted in November, 1959.126 In 1970, for example, the qualifying examination as a necessary preliminary to testing for the Master's degree was dropped and a diagnostic examination, taken upon entry of the student in the program, and having only advisory connotations, was introduced effective September of that year. One year later an oral qualifying examination was introduced and the final written examination lost its quantitative scoring. Along with the Ph.D. program requirements, the Master's program and testing was being reconsidered during 1973/74. More important than the mechanics of evaluation, however, were substantive and philosophical introductions in the Master's program detailed in various documents from 1971 onward. These innovations incorporated a revised and broadened "Introduction to Research" (371) mandatory for all entering graduate students and a 371-471 ("Advanced Research Concepts") recommended for those intending to pursue graduate study to the Ph.D. level. Also required of all advanced degree candidates were field geography, a research technique sequence and at least one substantive research seminar.

At the undergraduate level, although the general format and requirements remained nearly constant since 1966, reconsideration of the nature, contents and sequence of offerings at the introductory level resulted in renumbering, credit changes, and significant alterations in philosophy and content in physical geography and in meteorology/climatology in 1967/68. Comparable changes were made in introductory human and economic geography in 1971/72. Honors sections were introduced in the elementary courses in 1967/68 and new or updated course work, as detailed previously, became part of the curriculum during the Thompson Years.127

Undergraduate majors, by 1973/74, were able to have their subject matter interests channeled into five different optional areas of emphasis: systematic social geography; systematic physical geography, including climatology; geographic thought and techniques; regional geography; and economic-urban geography. None of these options was meant to constitute a full major or an exclusive specialization within the discipline; each, however, had sufficient development to afford the student more than a superficial professional cognizance of its content. Each of the options represented program plans and faculty addition decisions that were the outgrowth of extensive departmental deliberations.

At the graduate level, but of great demonstrated value to 100-level students, there was introduced in 1966/67 a program of new Teaching Assistant orientation and training prior to the beginning of classes in Semester 1 of each year. One of the few in the University, the program won support from the Liberal Arts and Sciences College until funding was cut off in 1972 as a
result of University-wide budget restrictions; it was continued in 1973, however, when the Department's training and follow-up seminar proposal was accepted as one of five such Geography projects to receive financial support from the National Science Foundation through the Association of American Geographers.128 Also receiving funding--under the N.D.E.A. Title XI program--were Summer Institutes in 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968,129 primarily for in-service high school teachers, many of whom had only modest substantive training in the discipline.

Course innovations and program changes at all levels during the Thompson Years were the outgrowth of continuing self-evaluations generated from within the Department. There were, however, demands for formalized statements of self-evaluation and developmental planning issued by the University administration directly and by the Illinois Board of Higher Education indirectly from the late 1960's.130 The outgrowths of the successive calls for documentation of departmental self-assessment and planning were useful comprehensive statements of departmental status and prospects bringing together and focusing the disparate discussions and proposals generated separately by Thompson and the faculty. The first of the formal, externally demanded exercises was sparked by a request from the State Board to the University for a "long-range program and building plan for ten years into the future."

In his letter of instruction the Vice Chancellor noted that it was "critically important that each department make a careful examination of its present structure and future needs..." and that "planning [of developmental programs] should be related to an optimal departmental operation oriented toward quality..."132 Geography's response was submitted through Dean Rogers on January 29, 1969; a modified replacement version was forwarded to A. F. Graziano of the Long-Range Planning Committee on June 12, 1969.133 Although the document, as required, gave rather specific estimates of state-wide 1980 degree granting and enrollments at different instructional levels and made projections of the Department's probable share of Geography degrees among all departments within the state, the "Plan" for the most part dealt in generalities and hopes rather than in firm proposals. Among those hopes were: increases in undergraduate and graduate enrollments, including departmental degree candidates; additions to the teaching faculty to bring the F.T.E. level to twenty; increments in University support for expanded laboratory and instructional facilities and equipment and for field work; availability of funds on a sustained basis to support three or four research associates; increased participation in interdisciplinary programs; and further development in areas of existing departmental strength (specified as: economic; urban and regional; social and historical; geomorphology, climatology, ecology; and research techniques).

Within a year, another mandatory self-study was decreed, though this one carried more specific guidelines than those attendant upon its predecessor.134 Required points to be covered were: (1) "An account of the principal current developments within [the] discipline that may affect the choice of content and instructional methods..."; (2) "Proposals for updating existing requirements" for undergraduate and graduate majors; (3) formal proposals for eliminating no-longer-offered and fossilized courses; (4) requests for additional faculty occasioned by 'essential programmatic requirements'; (5) identification of needed new instructional resources; and (6) departmental views on unspecified matters of general college educational concern.135 After several months of intensive committee and subcommittee work (including graduate and undergraduate student input) and review by the whole Department, the completed report136 was submitted. Whatever its value in campus-wide planning may have been, the document did serve as a spur and guide to action for the Department itself. Immediately after the new "Ten-Year Plan" was submitted the staff began to
Implement the planned courses of action it contained.\textsuperscript{137} The foreign language requirement for the Ph.D. degree was dropped; revisions of procedures, requirements, and examination program for the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees were enacted to become effective September 1, 1971; modifications in the systems of graduate student advising were instituted;\textsuperscript{138} and subcommittees were set up to carry out proposals for new course development and existing course revisions and renumbering contained within the Plan. From the Department's standpoint, the mandated Ten-Year Plan stimulated internal, collective consideration of its own strengths, weaknesses and objectives. In that context, creation of the Plan was of value to the Department—if to no one else—in putting subsequent proposals for development and change into an agreed-upon perspective.

By 1972 a new, external, round of departmental and program evaluation was instituted. This project was initiated by the appointment\textsuperscript{139} of an all-campus Study Committee on Program Evaluation (SCOPE) charged with the establishment of "guidelines for the evaluation of units and programs" on campus in order to form a sensible basis for the re-allocation of restricted campus funds to accommodate the requirements of program innovation and change. The Committee's Preliminary Report (March, 1972) called again for: "the submittal by the program or unit of a statement of its mission...and... a critical self-evaluation by the program or unit of its current status, together with specific proposals for improvement of its quality and productivity."\textsuperscript{140} In a memorandum of May 25, 1972, Vice Chancellor Weir informed administrative officers that departmental Annual Reports, required by the Statutes, would not be mandatory for 1971/72; instead, "a self-evaluation report of the sort recommended in the preliminary report of SCOPE" would be substituted. In another memorandum of July 19, 1972, Weir spelled out what would be required: the completion of a twenty-one item "Program Review Questionnaire," one of whose purposes was: "To require faculty members to begin thinking in terms of the sorts of questions which would likely be a part of an in-depth evaluation." Many of the questions required answers already provided by the Department in previously ordered plans and reports; drawing upon those and upon the advice and comments of the faculty, Thompson submitted the SCOPE response, as instructed, November 1, 1972.\textsuperscript{141}

In-depth evaluations of individual departments and programs were placed under the general supervision of a separately appointed Council on Program Evaluation (COPE),\textsuperscript{142} although actual investigations were to be carried out by "task groups of five or six persons appointed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Evaluation...."\textsuperscript{143} Since not all of the various units of the Urbana campus could be studied simultaneously, departments and programs were segregated into "sets", with "sets" to be reviewed sequentially over a five-year time span. Geography was included with the "set" of social science and language departments and area-language centers slated for study during the first year of COPE activity, 1973/74. Individual departmental evaluations, including that of Geography, were submitted by the task groups to COPE during April, 1974, as documents confidential in nature and for COPE's information and potential action. No results of the review—reportedly favorable--of the Department had been conveyed by the end of Semester II, 1973/74.

The series of departmental self-assessments--those internally generated and those conducted in response to Administration demands--served to make plain to the Department areas of developmental need, both human and physical. Requirements in these areas were apparent to Thompson immediately upon his
assumption of the headship. Of the concerns normal to his position, that of staff recruitment and retention demanded, perhaps, the most recurrent and persistent expenditure of effort by Thompson. He was from the outset faced with three problems: the need to replace staff losses experienced since the last of the Russell Years; the approaching retirement of three senior members of the faculty; and the high rate of turnover among recently recruited staff as the Department sought a mix of faculty with high orders of commitment to research and to undergraduate and graduate instruction.

Even prior to the unexpected loss of the services of McCune, Shimkin and Smith and the anticipated departures through retirement of Page, Garland, Booth and Russell, the search for additional and replacement staff was undertaken as much in response to then-current needs as to anticipated vacancies. Perhaps querulously, perhaps with pride, Thompson notes in his Annual Report for 1966/67 "an uncommonly heavy traffic of candidates for faculty appointment" through the Department and adds: "Although many vitae of freshly-minted Ph.D.'s were reviewed, the search included personnel currently employed elsewhere." It was from this latter group that four new faculty appointments, effective September, 1967, were made. James F. Lahey (Ph.D. Wisconsin, 1958) came from Northern Illinois University as an Associate Professor charged with taking over and developing the meteorology-climatology program of the Department then being handled on an interim basis by Armstrong after the retirement of Page. John A. Jakle (Ph.D. Indiana, 1967) left Western Michigan for an Assistant Professorship in the Department with projected responsibility for development of a program in cultural geography, including historical geography and the revamping of 104--World Regional Geography--into a socio-cultural course. Jakle's interests in historical geography also were encouraged and resulted in course and seminar work in that area. Additional expertise was sought in theoretical physical geography and with the hope that he would provide it. Placido D. LaValle (Ph.D. Iowa, 1965), a quantitative physical geographer with primary interests in soils and karst topography, came as an Assistant Professor from California-Los Angeles to supplement the work of Alexander, Armstrong, Booth, and Lahey in the physical aspects of the discipline and to relieve Alexander after his long years in charge of "Introductory Physical Geography." To assist in the revamping of that 100-level course and to prepare and evaluate instructional and test materials, Janice J. Monk (Ph.D. Illinois, 1972), then working on her dissertation within the Department, accepted a position, partly paid by the Office of Instructional Resources, as Instructor. Monk, becoming an Assistant Professor on completion of her degree, turned her attention increasingly to social geography and geographic education. Both Monk and Jakle remained with the Department, but LaValle left for the University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada, in 1969 and Lahey for Oregon State in 1971.

Thompson announced himself "most pleased with the quality and spirit of the new faculty," and continued to press for further staff expansion in addition to the one new position authorized for 1968/69 claiming "innovation and enthusiasm can't be long sustained...unless the faculty be enlarged commensurate with the 35% total enrollment increase and 50% graduate major increment of the past four years." The additional authorized position, for which recruiting was done in 1967/68, brought back to campus as an Assistant Professor Nelson R. Nunnally (Ph.D. Illinois, 1965) to assume the work in remote imagery Booth was no longer able to carry and the instruction in quantitative methods which Armstrong, prior to his departure in June, 1968, had conducted. Nunnally, who left for the University of Oklahoma in 1971, also contributed strength in physical geography. Thompson based his contention that further staff additions were needed upon enrollment increases, faculty:student
ratios, and clock hours taught\textsuperscript{150} and concluded that: "The department must add four faculty positions by 1969-70... The four positions are in addition to replacement of four [sic] men who will retire over the next few years."\textsuperscript{151} He also made a bid for an additional 3.0 F.T.E. Teaching Assistants.

The Department did not immediately get the staff additions requested. Although Nunnally arrived, Armstrong left, and the level of staffing remained fixed for 1968/69. Recruiting for the following year was authorized, however, and 1.5 F.T.E. staff were engaged to join the Department during 1969/70. Curtis C. Roseman (Ph.D. Iowa, 1969) arrived in September, 1969, as Assistant Professor to enhance work in social geography and advanced quantitative techniques and to assume responsibility with Jakle for instruction in introductory cultural geography. John P. Augelli (Ph.D. Harvard, 1949) came from the University of Kansas at the start of Semester II to assume the twin posts of Director of the Center for Latin American Studies and Professor of Geography. His stay, however, was short; the following year (March, 1971) Augelli returned to Kansas.

At the end of academic year 1969/70 Thompson permitted himself a modest expression of satisfaction with the staff finally gathered and he looked forward to an even better tomorrow. "[I]n 1969-70...the quality of faculty and teaching assistant instruction was the best in three or four years. Additional changes in instructional staff should make 1970-71 even closer to what we aspire to do."\textsuperscript{152} He had a sound basis for his confident expectations; he could look forward to the addition of three men (two F.T.E.) to the teaching roster, two of them scholars of established national reputation. Augelli, who had devoted his time Second Semester 1969/70 to administrative work in the Center was scheduled to assume a teaching role in the Department; Herold J. Wiens (Ph.D. Michigan, 1949), who held a split-year appointment at the University of Hawaii and Northern Illinois University, was to join the staff (still retaining the 50 percent tie with Hawaii) as a Professor of Geography and member of the Center for Asian Studies. Donald L. Johnson (Ph.D. Kansas, 1972) was to come as Instructor pending completion of his degree and take over the introductory physical geography work from the departed LaValle as well as develop his own specializations in paleo-ecology and zoogeography. Thompson's hopes were not to be realized. Johnson remained on the staff, but Augelli tendered his resignation effective March, 1971, and returned to Kansas. Wiens was prevented by terminal illness from ever teaching a class at Illinois; his death in September, 1971, denied the Department a distinguished new colleague and deprived the profession of an honored scholar.

The staffing situation had abruptly taken a turn for the worse and Thompson had serious fears about what the future might bring. He voiced them in the Annual Report for 1970/71: "Shading the satisfaction [with other sorts of gains made during the academic year] has been the prospect of a serious decline in faculty effectiveness for 1971-72. We suffered a net loss of 2.0 F.T.E. instructional faculty in 1970-71,\textsuperscript{153} and are faced with a net loss of 3.0 F.T.E. in 1971-72 through retirements."\textsuperscript{154} Although Thompson issued a pro forma warning of dire consequences attendant upon failure to recruit a significant number of new staff,\textsuperscript{155} he was fighting a losing battle and knew it. The Governor and the Board of Higher Education had struck hard and effectively and the "budget crunch" was on. Nunnally's full line and Augelli's and Wiens' partial lines were absorbed by the College and no one-for-one replacement was to be permitted;\textsuperscript{156} although Thompson didn't know it yet, a comparable prohibition of replacements for the Booth and Garland lines was in the offing. Effective September, 1970, Fellmann had been named Associate Head to assist Thompson with the expanding burden of paper work being imposed upon him; the fifty
percent released time for this new duty was not absorbed by the College as had been anticipated, and the Department gained no compensating funds that might have been used to hire replacement personnel.

The actual or imminent loss of senior faculty and of junior faculty with highly specialized subject matter responsibilities confronted the Department with an instructional crisis that was exacerbated by the projected sabbatical leaves of Thompson and Foster in Semester II, 1971/72. Retrenchment and improvisation were necessary to maintain the essentials of the systematic and techniques teaching schedule. J. Ronald Eyton (M.S. North Dakota, 1968) and Lowell R. Goodman (M.S. North Dakota, 1966) were raised from Teaching Assistants to Instructors and given assignments, respectively, in remote sensing (cut to a once-a-year offering) and quantitative analysis (Eyton substituting for Nunnally) and cartography (Goodman replacing Foster). "Climates of the Continents" and "Regional Problems in Conservation" were dropped, as were "Geography of Transportation" and "Geography of Asia;" Richard L. Wise (M.A. Illinois, 1966) was increased to a .67 F.T.E. Teaching Assistantship to offer "Conservation of Natural Resources." Fortunately, the services of John W. Linde (B.S. Wisconsin, 1966) as Instructor had been secured so instruction in introductory meteorology-climatology was not interrupted. Upon his resignation (to enter medical school) at the end of the summer, 1972, Linde was replaced by Frank L. Charton (Ph.D. Michigan State, 1972) who joined the staff as Assistant Professor to work in the climatology and conservation of resources programs of the Department. Also in the meteorology-climatology areas William P. Lowry (Ph.D. Oregon State, 1962) and Stanley A. Changnon, Jr. (M.S. Illinois, 1956) became members of the Department in 1972. Changnon, Head of the Atmospheric Sciences Section of the Illinois State Water Survey, agreed to an appointment as Adjunct Professor with no immediate formal teaching responsibilities. Janice Monk, upon completion of her dissertation, assumed full-time duties as Assistant Professor at the beginning of Semester I, 1972/73. Lowry began part-time teaching duties as Professor in February, 1973 (while retaining a .75 F.T.E. appointment in the State Water Survey as Senior Coordinating Scientist of the National Science Foundation-supported METROMEX project); he joined the Department full-time in August of 1973. John V. O'Loughlin (Ph.D. Pennsylvania State, 1973) came in Semester I, 1973, to fill a much-needed role in social geography, political geography (formerly handled by Garland) and socio-political urban geography. Roseman's 1973/74 leave of absence necessitated further substitutions, in addition to the work assumed by O'Loughlin, to maintain the program. Slim Soot (Ph.D. Washington, 1970) came part-time in Semester I, 1973/74—while simultaneously serving on the University's Chicago Circle campus—to offer work in multivariate analysis and transportation geography and to act as a consultant to graduate students in the area of social geography. Fortuitously, Junjiro Takahashi (M.S. Keio, 1959), an exchange Professor from Keio University, Japan, in the Asian Studies Center, was housed in the Department from February, 1973, to February, 1974. During Semester I, 1973/74 he offered seminar work in urban systems and quantitative analysis. Geoffrey J. D. Hewings (Ph.D. Washington [Seattle], 1969), after declining an invitation to join the Department in 1973/74 reconsidered and accepted a post, with responsibilities in economic geography, regional analysis and transportation, effective June, 1974. Charton's resignation to accept a junior college position came during May of the same year.

Program development and enlargement and new staff professional interests made increasingly evident the inadequacies of some of the Department's physical facilities. Basic space requirements for the Department had been met by the
assignment and remodeling of the Davenport Hall area during the mid-1950's, but
the succeeding years made evident two unmet requirements. The first of these
was the need for increased, well-located office space for an expanding faculty
and for a rising graduate student population. The second involved an increasing
awareness of the inadequacies of existing classroom and teaching laboratory
space for introductory--particularly, physical geography--instruction, and the
realization that newly introduced or expanded advanced level teaching and re-
search in imagery interpretation, quantitative analysis, and physical geog-
raphy required facilities not available to the Department.

Quality classroom space was particularly in short supply. Immediately
after the Department had taken possession of the central area of Davenport Hall
in 1956, a large, nearly useless first floor classroom (177) was subdivided into
two small, nearly useless rooms (175 and 177) for introductory physical geog-
raphy quiz sections. Their dysfunctional aspect, even after the remodeling, was
the consequence of lack of ventilation, intolerable temperature control problems,
lack of equipment storage areas and wall map space and--in the case of 175--an
in-floor manhole from which periodically emanated stupefying effusions of sewer
gas. The search for more adequate instructional space through further remodel-
ing in Davenport Hall continued (and continues) to the present.

The problem of acquisition of that replacement classroom or new lecture
room space, and of needed additional office and laboratory areas, was made
complex and uncertain by considerations and constraints over which the De-
partment had no control: completion of the Psychology Building and the date
of release of that department's Davenport Hall space (1970); availability of
funds for remodeling either through legislative appropriation or non-recurring
expenditure allocations, and the position of the Department's requests on the
campus priorities list; the projected departmental space needs as determined
by formula by the Office of Space Utilization; and the allocations of specific
areas within the building as determined by the College of Liberal Arts and
Sciences to which vacated space in Davenport Hall was to be released.

During the early and middle sixties, acquisition of space was not dif-
ficult; having the space remodeled into optimal usable condition posed more
serious difficulties. The excavated and finished basement area (room 23)
under the main Geography section of the building had been from the start used
primarily as an office area for graduate students (and secondarily for storage
of field equipment). Its recurrent and costly flooding problems led, upon
departmental plea, to its replacement at the start of Semester 1, 1965/66, by
offices on the second floor of the east wing of Davenport Hall and by in-
dividual apartment house rooms at 1210 West California (1967) and 1208 West
California (1968). The California Street space was vacated in September,
1970,158 and replaced by additional offices on the east second floor of
Davenport. Space vacated in September, 1970, by Anthropology in the north-
west corner of the first floor provided additional old and unrefurbished
office and seminar room space for faculty and graduate students, though
longer range plans for its use envisioned its conversion into either,
initially, a large lecture room (to obviate professorial treks to Altgeld
Hall) or, later, into wet and dry labs for all 100-level instruction.
Specialized research and graduate teaching laboratories, not visualized or
planned for in the initial design of the Geography section of Davenport Hall,
were quickly and in part fortuitously acquired during the Thompson Years.
The Administration's decision, reached in the interest of fire safety, to
close off the three-story stairwell at the west center of Davenport at the
second floor ceiling provided, along with the unfinished waste third floor space thus created, an excellent opportunity for the Department to press for funds for an extensive third floor remodeling to fill felt laboratory needs. 159

Applications for improvement of all third floor space on the west side of the central portion of the building (including the stairwell and three offices to the south) were submitted beginning in April, 1967. The first to be approved involved remodeling for office use of rooms 314, 316, and 316-A; work was begun in late July, 1967, and completed during Semester 1, 1967/68. 160 A second, much more extensive and expensive, proposal was submitted in a now-lost letter of September 25, 1967. Involved was not only remodeling empty stairwell space as two laboratories (one for remote imagery interpretation, the other for statistical laboratory purposes) but also for equipping room 317 for soils analysis, teaching and research. Approval was granted for room 317 improvement alone; 161 construction, begun in the Summer of 1968, was completed during Semester 1. A second attempt to secure funding to complete the stairwell remodeling was made late in 1969. Placed eighth on the Liberal Arts and Sciences priority list submitted by the Building Committee of the College 162 to the Campus Committee on Nonrecurring Appropriations, the project was approved at that level, 163 and subsequently was granted funding by the Board of Trustees. 164 Construction began March 5 and was finished during September of 1970. The creation of the laboratories for statistical work and for remote imagery instruction freed room 323 for its original classroom purposes.

The recurring departmental requests for replacement or total conversion to other purposes than classrooms of 175 and 177 of Davenport Hall have regularly failed to gain higher-level support; the 137 D.H. complex, again one for which varying proposals have been made, remains in the form in which it was inherited from Anthropology. 165 A renewed request to secure remodeling funds for these areas was submitted October 15, 1973, 166 with the result that a two-step project was promised, to begin in 1975. Major problems in securing space envisioned for allocation to the Department as early as December, 1967 167 included the failure of the State to fund the addition to Turner Hall the construction of which would have completed the relocation of Agronomy and Animal Science, the paucity of remodeling funds available to the campus, the campus priority rating assigned to Geography requests, and the declining number of F.T.E. staff (and no better than stable student) numbers.

New staff, new teaching and research programs, and new laboratories all required additional equipment to render them effective. The search for equipment funds in a time of contracting fiscal resources was frequently frustrated, adding to the multiple concerns felt by Thompson in his struggle not just to improve but even to maintain the quality of the Department. Early disappointment came in 1967/68 with University refusal to support a departmental application to the matching-grant Instructional Scientific Equipment Program of the National Science Foundation. Totaling $14,861, half to come from University funds, "The proposal [was] intended to provide equipment that would be employed in honors and conventional sections at the 100-level as well as in upper division courses..." 168 Its rejection, added to failure to gain funding for the complete third-floor remodeling, and University dismissal of an application for Ford Foundation Funds 169 led Thompson, normally a patient and forbearing man, to complain:

"...we are deeply concerned with the failure of the University to support requests for funding of improvements in graduate and advanced undergraduate training. Geography's proposal for Ford Task Force support was dismissed as being modest, and
capable of internal support (which never materialized); a proposal for an N.S.F. instructional equipment award was not endorsed; a modest request for non-recurring funds to convert dead space into laboratories was just below the cut-off point; and we are advised that our proposal for funding of summer and other field training has been excised from the biennial budget. These are not the types of responses that build distinction in a department, and it is distinction that I was charged with developing when designated Head.\textsuperscript{170}

The complaint, apparently, was duly noted for in December of 1968 Booth (over whose name the original N.S.F. proposal had been submitted) was informed by the Vice Chancellor's office that it had "decided [it could afford] to submit [Booth's] proposal to NSF for possible funding and that the University [would] provide funds to match any amount that NSF might award...."\textsuperscript{171} The application was amended, through deletions, at the request of the N.S.F. during the Spring of 1969; it was acted upon favorably shortly thereafter and a combined University-Federal grant totaling $18,200 was made available to Geography.\textsuperscript{172} The acquisition of a Wang electronic calculator and of needed equipment for remotely-sensed imagery analysis, for climatological and other field research and teaching was evidence of University support of departmental work that was appreciatively noted by Thompson.\textsuperscript{173} Although the Annual Report, 1970/71 does observe\textsuperscript{174} that "The Vice-Chancellor, through the Committee on Undergraduate Education and Environmental Sciences, provided funds that have enabled the department to assemble or buy instructional aids for use in the undergraduate courses," no further sizable "windfalls" came to the Department. Subsequent additions to the equipment stock were made as modest departmental funds permitted.

Although it may be misleading to take two "cross-section" years and attempt meaningful comparisons, some measure of the growth and development of the Department during the Thompson Years may be derived from a survey of student enrollments and degree production between 1964/65--the end of the Russell era--and 1973/74, the last academic year for which data at this writing are available. Undergraduate (100- and 200-level) enrollments increased nearly twenty percent (1513 versus 1790), and the mix of registrations was altered. The increased emphasis on 200-level work during the Thompson Years resulted in a 240 percent increase in registration in those classes; enrollments at the 100-level remained constant at just under 1400. Advanced undergraduate registrations grew by 24 percent with a 23 percent increase at the 300-level and a 27 percent growth at the 400. Again recognizing the potential fallacy of such cross-sectional comparison, it may be noted that the student degree-level mix underwent change during the Thompson Years. Total "majors" (except teacher trainees) at all levels in departmental programs show an increase of almost 17 percent when comparing Semester II, 1965/66\textsuperscript{169} and Semester II, 1973/74. Undergraduate majors increased slightly in number (twenty-eight and thirty-six), as did those in the Master's program (seventeen and twenty-one). Doctoral candidates, however, increased materially--from twenty-five to thirty-eight, for a 52 percent gain. Although constant efforts were made during the Thompson Years to enhance the attractiveness of the undergraduate program--through personal letters from Thompson to quality students in the 100-level courses, efforts by the Geography Graduate Student Association to make individual contact with promising prospects in introductory course quiz sections, and addition of new, attractive 200-level courses--the Department nonetheless retained its strong orientation toward graduate work and increased its doctoral candidate component. That graduate
orientation was reflected in the continued high number of Master's and Ph.D. degree recipients during the post-Russell period from Semester 1, 1965/66 to June of 1974. In that span of years, seventy-four Master's degrees (exclusive of Teacher Training degrees) and thirty-nine Ph.D.'s were awarded.

The efforts of Thompson have been directed towards the same ends motivating Russell before him: to develop through excellence of advanced training and facilities appropriate to a major department a quality graduate degree recipient who would find ready acceptance in principal areas of professional work. Documentation (see Appendix VI) recently prepared by Professor J. F. Hart of the University of Minnesota shows, for Illinois Ph.D.'s, at least, the degree of success that has been achieved by those efforts. Illinois, somewhat under-reported at 42 doctorates through 1970, ties with Columbia for eleventh place in number of doctorates recorded in the 1970 A.A.G. Directory. However, with 28 of those Ph.D.'s on the faculty of doctoral degree-granting departments in 1973, Illinois is exceeded only by Minnesota and California-Berkeley in the percentage (Illinois = 67 percent) of its Ph.D.'s on faculties of doctoral-awarding departments. The products of the constantly developing program in Geography at Illinois have found high acceptance among the most critical of markets--the University's peer institutions of the United States.

The Thompson Years have not been easy ones for the Head or for the Department. The Administration encouragement of departmental plans and development--and the freely available funds to make that encouragement meaningful--that characterized the Russell Years was reduced during the late 1960's and early 1970's. Budgetary limitations constraining University-wide operations have also affected adversely the day-to-day operations and long-range planning of the Department. Incessant and increasing demands from all higher administrative levels, including the Board of Higher Education, for reports, accountings, and justifications vastly increased the burdens and reduced the pleasures of the Headship. Nonetheless, despite the obstacles and frustrations attendant upon its achievement, Thompson and his Department remain dedicated to the attainment and maintenance of excellence in the program in Geography at Illinois. Part of its tradition since the founding of the University, the discipline--and the Department founded to nurture it--remains a vital element in the fabric of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.