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Foreword

David B. Baker

It is hard to believe that a year has passed since publication of the inaugural volume in the Center for the History of Psychology Series. The series is designed to make available unpublished primary source materials from the Center’s collections. The response to the first volume, Walter Miles and His 1920 Grand Tour of European Physiology and Psychology Laboratories, has been positive and encouraging. It has provided the proof of concept that we envisioned for the series.

We are fortunate that the Center for the History of Psychology has an embarrassment of riches. It is satisfying to select the next work in the series and once again, the task was easy. We are pleased to present the unpublished autobiography of Harry Hollingworth (1880–1956). The autobiography provides detailed and descriptive information about the development of applied work in psychology. The reader will find much of interest about Harry Hollingworth, Leta Stetter Hollingworth, Nebraska history, graduate education in early twentieth century America, and the rise of applied psychology. The work is published in two volumes. This makes the size of the autobiography more manageable and most importantly, is true to the manner in which Hollingworth himself conceived and prepared the work. Both can be read in their own right, the first volume telling the story of Hollingworth’s Nebraska roots and the second providing a first person account of the rise of applied psychology in the industrial northeast of America. Taken together these two volumes provide a glimpse into a transformative time in American history and psychology.

It was only natural that Ludy T. Benjamin Jr. of Texas A&M University serve as one of the editors for this volume. Professor Benjamin is recognized as a leading authority on the history of American psychology. He has researched and written extensively about the life and work of Harry Hollingworth. He is joined by Lizette Royer Barton, senior archives associate at the Center. Ms. Barton was an editor on the first book in the series and brings the skill and knowledge necessary for another successful project.

I am certain that the reader will find in these pages new insights and understandings of psychology in twentieth century America.
Introduction

Ludy T. Benjamin Jr.

This is the second volume of Harry Hollingworth’s previously unpublished autobiography, which he wrote in 1940 at the age of sixty. The unexpected death of his wife, Leta Stetter Hollingworth (1886–1939), in November 1939, prompted this examination of his life. The Hollingworths had what psychologists today refer to as a companionate marriage, a relationship in which the husband and wife are wholly dedicated to one another. That does not mean that they did not value friendships, of which they had many, or that they did not value their relatives in Nebraska. It means that they had a singular devotion to one another, manifested in a very happy marriage, with professional and leisure activities typically enjoyed together. Thus the loss of his partner was especially devastating. Hollingworth was bitter and angry at the loss of someone so young (she was fifty-three) and so promising in a career that had thus far benefitted so many, especially children. Going forward with his life suddenly became much more difficult.

The first volume of this autobiography, Roots in the Great Plains: The Applied Psychology of Harry Hollingworth, also published by the University of Akron Press, details Hollingworth’s origins in poverty in rural Nebraska and his struggles toward a life of the mind, which eventually saw him graduate from the University of Nebraska. This volume of the autobiography, which he originally titled “Years at Columbia,” opens with the receipt of a telegram from New York City, offering him a position as a laboratory assistant in the psychology department at Columbia University. The telegram was from Professor James McKeen Cattell (1860–1944), one of the most eminent psychologists in North America and head of a psychology department and psychology laboratory that had few, if any, peers in terms of its excellence.

It was in this culturally and intellectually rich milieu that Hollingworth found himself in 1907 at the age of twenty-six. He arrived in New York City by train from Fremont, Nebraska, in the midst of a raging snowstorm. He walked a few miles in the storm before he found a hotel. It was an inexpensive hotel, but it still cost him most of the $3 that he had set aside for emergencies. He would find the university in the morning and begin his new life.
Hollingworth completed his doctorate in 1909 with a stellar triumvirate, James McKeen Cattell, E. L. Thorndike (1874–1949), and Robert S. Woodworth (1869–1962), at Columbia University. He accepted a position at Columbia’s Barnard College, Columbia’s college for women, where he remained for his entire career. Between 1910 and 1940, he published twenty books and approximately one hundred research articles and reviews. Not included in that number are the technical reports, probably more than forty, provided by contract research he did for numerous companies.

Hollingworth was well-respected as an applied experimental psychologist. His peers elected him to membership in the prestigious Society of Experimental Psychologists and to the presidency of the American Psychological Association (APA) in 1927. He was acknowledged, even in his own time, as one of the pioneers in applied psychology, largely because of his caffeine studies and his early work on the psychology of advertising, which resulted in three applied psychology books by 1917. But he also wrote books on other applied topics, including vocational psychology, educational psychology, clinical psychology, judging human character, and public speaking. These applied books and his many research contracts made him famous. They also made him wealthy; wealthy enough that in 1944, after having had no raise in salary at Barnard for fifteen years, he wrote a check to Columbia University for $51,000 to endow a scholarship in his late wife’s name.

Harry Hollingworth spent his entire professional life working in the field of applied psychology. Yet, in taking stock of that life in his autobiography he wrote, “I might as well say once and for all to the undoubted amazement of my colleagues and professional associates, that I never had any genuine interest in applied psychology, in which field I have come to be known as one of the pioneers. It has become my sad fate to have established early in my career a reputation for interests that with me were only superficial.”

That is a fascinating statement; to believe it is to conclude that Hollingworth spent his life working in a field that held no interest for him. Why would he do that? He offers us one possible answer in the last sentence of that quotation, that he felt trapped in applied psychology because of his early success there, successes that somehow prevented him from doing other things. Historians have written much about issues of objectivity in trying to reconstruct the past, what Peter Novick has called “that noble dream.” On dimensions of objectivity, autobiographies and oral histories are especially suspect, not only because of what psychologists know about the fallibility of memory, but also because of what is known about the self-serving nature of such recall. Hollingworth also had this to say about his career as applied psychologist, “I became an applied psychologist in order to earn a living for myself and for my wife, and in order for her to undertake advanced graduate training ... Except for the revenue resulting therefrom, I found all these activities distasteful. There were plenty of interesting philosophi-
cal questions I wanted to investigate and researches I would have liked to undertake. It was disagreeable in the extreme to spend my time trotting down to these business clubs, talking the most elementary kind of psychological lore, and illustrating it with car-cards, trademarks, packages for codfish, and full color spreads. But I did it with such enthusiasm as I could muster.”

It is difficult to believe Hollingworth’s claim—there is fairly compelling evidence that he had ample opportunities to leave applied work and pursue subjects of greater interest.

Beginnings of an Applied Psychology Career

In 1909, when Hollingworth graduated from Columbia University with his doctorate in psychology, he was a newlywed, having married his Nebraska sweetheart, Leta Stetter, at the end of 1908. Although she had a college degree from the University of Nebraska and had taught school for three years after graduation, she could not get a teaching job in New York City because of her marital status. The Hollingworths lived in a small apartment in Manhattan, surviving on his $1,000 salary from Barnard. They were in need of money, and especially so, because Leta wanted to continue her education.

In his first year at Barnard, Hollingworth got the opportunity to offer an evening course in the extension division of Columbia University, essentially a curriculum intended for the working public, especially individuals in business. Not surprisingly, many of the courses were practical in nature. Hollingworth’s initial course was titled “Applied Psychology.” Like the other extension instructors, he was paid on a fee basis, that is, a fee from each of the students enrolled in the course, but no additional salary from Columbia. Thus Hollingworth had plenty of incentive to make his classes popular. In his initial class, he had five students and received the total sum of seventy-five dollars. A year later he also offered a similar course in the evening program of New York University.

Hollingworth’s applied courses focused on the psychology of advertising. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the advertising profession in America grew considerably due to mass production and other industrial changes that allowed the mass-marketing of products. Viewed as the science most related to consumer advertising appeal, it was natural for the advertising industry to seek psychology’s help. Through his contacts in these evening classes, Hollingworth was invited to offer, for a fee, a special set of ten lectures to the Advertising Men’s League of New York City. The lectures, given in the spring of 1910, were eventually serialized in Judicious Advertising, a magazine for advertisers, and then published in 1913, in his first book on applied psychology, Advertising and Selling.
The Coca-Cola Caffeine Studies

Another event at the beginning of Hollingworth’s career, the research that he conducted in 1911 at the request of the Coca-Cola Company, had profound implications for his career as an applied psychologist, as well as for his wife. In 1911, Coca-Cola was brought to trial by the Federal Government under the recently passed Pure Food and Drugs Act of 1906 for marketing a beverage with a harmful ingredient, namely caffeine, an ingredient that the government claimed produced motor problems and impaired mental efficiency. As the Coca-Cola scientists and attorneys prepared for trial they realized that they had no behavioral or cognitive data on the effects of caffeine on humans. So they sought to contract for such research as quickly as possible, given the nearness of the trial dates. The archival record concerning who they may have contacted is incomplete, but eventually the offer went to a financially needy Harry Hollingworth.

In this volume of his autobiography, Hollingworth devotes more space to the caffeine studies than any of his other research projects or books. There is good reason for such attention, because the studies can easily be seen as the watershed event of his career. How enthusiastic was he to accept this contract? He was aware that other psychologists had turned down this opportunity; he certainly was aware of the tainted nature of this kind of work. Indeed, he reported that colleagues had made clear the lamentable nature of such work, “Applications outside the school were tacitly assumed to be unclean. Inquiries and appeals for help from businessmen, employees, manufacturers, lawyers, advertising men, were often either evaded by the seniors or at best referred to younger and more venturesome spirits in the laboratory, who had as yet no sanctity to preserve.”

Particularly problematic was the concern about scientific integrity, raised by a company spending large sums of money for research that it hoped would benefit its legal and commercial needs. Although Hollingworth may have had some concerns about his arrangements with the Coca-Cola Company, the evidence is that he was eager to accept the task. He wrote that his willingness to undertake the work was both because of the scientific value of the studies as well as the financial rewards.

Here was a clear case where results of scientific importance might accrue to an investigation that would have to be financed by private interests. No experiments on such a scale as seemed necessary for conclusive results had ever been staged in the history of experimental psychology. . . . With me there was a double motive at work. I needed money and here was a chance to accept employment at work for which I had been trained, with not only the cost of the investigation met but with a very satisfactory retaining fee and stipend for my time and services. I believed I could conscientiously conduct such an investigation, without prejudice to the results, and secure information of a valuable scientific character as well as answer the practical questions raised by the sponsor of the study.
Thus Hollingworth argued that the problem was one of scientific interest which offered the prospect of valuable scientific information, namely the effects of caffeine on mental and motor efficiency in humans. There is no reason to doubt his assessment, but it seems reasonable that Hollingworth would not have taken on the research had he not so desperately needed the money.

Hollingworth’s autobiography is filled with tales of poverty in his family and especially that of his wife’s family. They faced serious financial crises in the early years of their marriage, particularly surrounding the death of Leta’s sister in Chicago and the expenses they incurred in transporting her body back to western Nebraska for burial. To survive financially during that time, they borrowed money from several friends in New York, something that was very difficult for them.

As noted earlier, marriage barred Leta Hollingworth from some employment, at least the ones in which she was most interested. She had a genuine desire to pursue her own doctoral work and the academic talents to succeed, partly evidenced by her graduation as valedictorian from the University of Nebraska. So one can imagine the frustrations they felt—they even considered the possibility of moving back to Nebraska where both of them could teach school. They reasoned that their financial situation could not be worse in Nebraska and that at least they would be closer to family. The offer from the Coca-Cola Company ended those discussions.

The Coca-Cola funds were an economic windfall for the Hollingworths. Hollingworth noted that the funds completely paid for Leta’s three years of graduate study at Columbia, where she received her doctorate in 1916, plus most of their spending while on vacation in Europe during the summer of 1912.

**Other Applied Opportunities**

The success of the caffeine studies, no doubt coupled with the success of the Coca-Cola Company in its case, gave Hollingworth considerable publicity within the business community. This resulted in a deluge of consulting opportunities from various businesses. By 1913, he was earning more from his consulting jobs than he made from his Barnard College salary. His account of some of the applied questions that he was invited to answer follows.

A federal department wants advice on how to interview farmers ... a perfume manufacturer wants psycho-galvanic studies of the effect of his products; a silk manufacturer wants studies of the appeal of his fabrics; an evening newspaper wants to support its advertising columns by evidence that suggestibility is greater in the late hours of the day; a famous railroad wants advice and perhaps experiments to guide it in deciding what color to paint its box cars; a city planning commission requires data on the legibility of traffic signs; a manual trainer wants to know the
psychological height for work benches ... an advertiser wants to know where on the page his return coupon should appear; several people want to know the differences in buying habits men and women exhibit; more than one question concerns ... whether appeal to the eye is or is not better than appeal to the ear; a rubber company wants tests made for the better selection of clerks and other employees; and a type foundry wants studies of the legibility of different type-faces.12

It is not clear how Hollingworth chose among his many offers—perhaps his decisions were based on how well these consultations paid. It is also not clear how long he pursued this line of contractual research. Unlike the caffeine studies for Coca-Cola, most of the work for companies such as Grinnell Sprinklers, Savage Firearms, Gorton Codfish Company, and the United Drug Company, was not published. This contractual work was typically about improving the company’s advertising. The Hollingworth Papers contain unpublished technical reports, yet information in the autobiography makes it clear that those records are incomplete. It is likely he accepted only a few of these contractual studies after 1925. By then, the financial picture for the Hollingworths was quite good; two academic salaries and book royalties and consulting income for both. However, his applied research continued until at least the late 1930s.

Following the early work in advertising, Hollingworth moved into studies of selection, especially the selection of salespeople, creating the Hollingworth Tests for Selection of Salesmen in 1916.13 This work coincided with his efforts to debunk the physiognomic systems that were then popular, in which companies were urged to hire employees on the basis of facial characteristics alleged to be indicative of certain abilities and talents. He published a book in 1923, Judging Human Character, that was especially critical of the physiognomic system of Katherine Blackford that was used by many American businesses.14 In his own book on judging character, he promoted a mental testing approach to selection, drawing on the work pioneered by his mentor, Cattell. His book on vocational psychology also promoted assessment using mental tests.

The Psychology of Chewing

The Coca-Cola studies have been emphasized for reasons that are obvious—they were the principal force in directing Hollingworth’s feet to an applied path. As the title of this volume indicates, there is another of his applied studies that is well-known, one that occurred toward the end of his applied career—a study on why people chew gum.

In his scientific monograph on this subject, the beginning can be somewhat confusing and frustrating, due to the obtuseness of the language. Hollingworth tells his readers that the research is about a human motor automatism. Such human automatisms include head nodding, finger tapping, foot swinging, scratching, shoulder shrugging, and thumb twiddling. But, according to Hollingworth, no automatism is more com-
mon in humans than chewing. He observed that, “This activity has the special character of being an essential feature of a fundamental vital activity pattern—eating. But it is much indulged in ... divorced from this fundamental pattern. Chewing is such a satisfying activity, in itself, that random masticatories such as straws, toothpicks, rubber bands, are utilized in order to support it. Most popular of all are the various chicle preparations. . . .”

Although the scientific jargon may obscure the meaning here, this was research about the effects of chewing gum.

This research was undertaken in 1934 and 1935, at the request of Bartlett Arkell, president of Beech-Nut Foods. Arkell was a friend of Hollingworth and had contracted with him for research on several earlier occasions. Gum chewing was growing in popularity in the 1930s, and Arkell wanted to know what the benefits might be. The study results were published in a ninety-page monograph which included investigations of the energy cost of chewing as reflected in pulse rate, the metabolic costs of chewing, the relationship of chewing to muscular tension, the effects of chewing or not chewing on various motor and cognitive tasks, and the influence of chewing on work output. Hollingworth found that chewing gum does provide relief from tension and that the tension reduced is muscular. Not only is there motor evidence of tension reduction, but subjective reports acknowledge the same, that is, subjects reported being more relaxed while chewing.

Arkell was very pleased with the research results and modified his advertising for Beech-Nut Gum, proclaiming that chewing gum relieves tension. Hollingworth described the tension reduction by couching it in terms of redintegration, a process by which a complex experience is generated by associations triggered by a single cue that is part of the larger experience. He explained, “Our interpretation of the mechanism ... is a very simple one ... The primary role of chewing is in the mastication of food. Eating is ordinarily a more or less ‘quiet’ occupation. When we eat, we sit, or otherwise repose. Random restlessness is at a low point. We rest; we relax; and the general feeling tone is one of agreeableness and satisfaction. An important item of the eating situation is the act of chewing. We suggest that, as a result of this contextual status, chewing brings with it, whenever it is sustained, a posture of relaxation. Chewing, in other words, serves as a reduced cue, and to some extent redintegrates the relaxation of mealtime.”

**Conclusion**

Harry Hollingworth claims that he had no genuine interest in applied psychology and he followed that assertion with the following, “My activity in the field of applied psychology was mere pot boiling activity, and now that it is over there is no reason why the truth should not be revealed. My real interest is now and always has been in the purely
theoretical and descriptive problems of my science, and the books, among the twenty I have written, of which I am proudest, are the more recent ones which no one reads.”  

The reference to the recent books is not clear—he wrote those words in 1940, when his most recent books were the 1939 monograph on gum chewing, a 1935 book on the psychology of the audience, and a 1933 book on educational psychology. Based on other passages in the autobiography, it is certain that the book that he felt was his greatest contribution was his 1928 book, *Psychology: Its Facts and Principles*, a general psychology textbook. This book was derived from years of teaching the general psychology course and represented his attempts to systematize the field. Indeed, he referred to this book as his “system.” Hollingworth noted that he had always considered this book his masterpiece. “This volume did me personally a lot of good. It straightened out my thinking in psychology, heretofore muddled and messy, and mapped out a path for all of my subsequent work to take. But it was never widely adopted as a text. . . . One of my colleagues described the book as having been written for myself alone.”

The textbook was unique and its narrow approach likely ensured its commercial failure. It described most psychological processes in terms of the concept of redintegration. His utter satisfaction, indeed his joy, with his system is indicated in several places in the autobiography. He described it as bringing him an intellectual peace, allowing him to reach equilibrium in his thinking. Consider the following passage, “I had already formulated my “system” and arrived at a satisfactory Weltanschauung ... My frantic intellectual fumblings had all represented the endeavor to alleviate the distress of doubt and uncertainty. To be in an intellectual muddle was always for me the strongest of irritants, that is, the most powerful of motives. I had now achieved, if you like, a formula which was in my experience so uniformly applicable and relevant that intellectual distress was almost wholly abolished.” The system was so idiosyncratic that few psychologists found it useful as a textbook or as a system of psychology and the reviews of the book were not good.

It is also clear from the more than sixty published reviews of Hollingworth’s books that the applied books reviewed quite well when compared to the books that were more theoretical in nature. Surely that was a source of considerable disappointment for him. Clearly this textbook was critically important to Hollingworth—with it he had achieved an understanding of psychology that had evaded him for the first twenty years of his career. The book afforded him a vision of psychology that bordered on certainty, yet he seemed to be the only one who saw it that way. How would that affect his evaluation of his work?

Hollingworth could draw the conclusion that his theoretical work was of little value and that the real contributions he made in psychology were represented by his many
applied works. That view might have been endorsed by many who knew his work. Or he could conclude that he had been typecast as an applied psychologist in the early years of his career, which made it impossible for his nonapplied work to be taken seriously. Or he could conclude that his system was misunderstood because he had failed to present his theoretical ideas appropriately. That is precisely the claim he made—that he resurrected a historical term, “redintegration,” which carried historical baggage with it and led to misunderstanding; that he gave too much emphasis to the cue-reduction process in his theory, which was his use of a redintegrative idea; and that he should have devised a clever name for his system as some kind of “ism” rather than portraying the system as psychology.20

To maintain faith in his theoretical work, Hollingworth might have been inclined to devalue his commitment to the applied work. But what of his work did he consider applied? Consider the following passage in which he discussed the caffeine studies and other studies he did on alcohol: “Although both of these investigations were sponsored by industrial interests, I have never considered them to lie in the field of applied psychology. They were from the beginning straightforward efforts to discover the nature of certain facts and relationships, and the chief interest of the findings has never been in any industrial or commercial application of them.”21

Clearly, he found those studies interesting. Further, he recognized them to be excellent experimental work. Yet this passage indicates his penchant for splitting hairs, arguing that they did not represent applied research. The studies were done for specific applied purposes and he took the money to work toward those purposes. He enjoyed the chewing gum research as well.

Hollingworth was educated at a time when the distinction between pure versus applied science were made evident and students were encouraged to walk the path of academic truth doing “pure” research and to avoid the temptations of real-world riches from applied work, a distinction still evident in psychology and other disciplines. Academics in Hollingworth’s time might have accepted applied work in educational and clinical settings, but when the work was funded by businesses with a clear agenda for the outcome of the research, then the work was open to serious questions about its scientific merit. Hollingworth’s writings, both published and unpublished, indicate that he was well aware of what academic sanctity was about.

Perhaps Hollingworth felt himself to be a failure as a scientist because certain key markers of accomplishment had alluded him. For example, he was never elected to the prestigious National Academy of Sciences, whereas many of his contemporaries were, including eight of the twelve APA presidents surrounding his election year. Further, he never held a faculty position in a graduate research department. Although he was
a member of the Columbia University faculty for his entire career, his assignment was to an undergraduate department at Barnard College, meaning that he could not leave a legacy of doctoral students he had trained. In evaluating Hollingworth's autobiography it is important to remember that those words were written in the months after Leta's death. So perhaps his disclaimer about his interest in applied psychology could be attributed to his grief.

In conclusion, it could be argued that at the age of sixty, Hollingworth doth protest too much. If he became an applied psychologist to make a living and to aid his wife in going to graduate school, then he could have abandoned that work by 1925. Although it does seem that he stopped the small contract studies by then, he continued to publish books on applied topics and continued to work on other large-scale, commercially-funded projects until near his retirement. Why would he have continued that work for all those years if indeed it was of no genuine interest? If the theoretical and philosophical problems of his discipline interested him more, then why did he not work on those? Perhaps he followed the rewards, and not just the financial ones. That is, he continued to do the work that earned him good reviews and brought him attention, which was his applied work.

In summary, Harry Hollingworth was a creative applied psychologist. He was an experimentalist who brought his science to bear on real-world problems in rigorous and imaginative ways. He was arguably one of the best of his day at what he did. Yet his comments at age sixty—and there is no evidence that he retracted those statements in the remaining sixteen years of his life—express dismay and maybe even shame about his applied work and perhaps about his career. It is disappointing that at the end of his career he could not be comfortable with his place in psychology's history as one of the individuals whose work expanded the domains of psychological science and practice beyond the boundaries of the academy. This volume of his autobiography, from the Coca-Cola studies to the investigations of chewing gum, tells the fascinating story of a pioneering psychologist whose work and reputation helped open a vast field for those psychologists who would follow.
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Editorial Note

Harry L. Hollingworth's two volume autobiography is part of the Harry and Leta Stetter Hollingworth papers housed in the Archives of the History of American Psychology at The Center for the History of Psychology located on The University of Akron campus. The manuscript is reproduced here as an archival facsimile. The original is available for viewing at the archives by appointment.

The manuscript has been reproduced in its original typescript. Hollingworth included numerous photographs in his autobiography and many of the images appear throughout the facsimile. Please note that a few images are missing and appear to have been lost to history as they could not be located within the Hollingworth papers.

Page numbers have been added to those pages that Hollingworth did not number. The original manuscript does not include pages 121a or 128.

Hollingworth typed the manuscript and later penciled in page numbers, photograph descriptions, and additional notes. Over time, the writing has become very faint. Despite our best efforts, much of the handwritten script remains difficult to read.

These pages have been modified in the following manner: the scale has been reduced to fit within the pages of this book and section pages and headings have been added to enable the reader to navigate this work.
When juvenile back-sliding saved me from this fate there was none of the emotional conflict that is sometimes experienced when the faith of childhood collapses under sceptical insight. Instead, my solution was a more or less humanistic interpretation of the theological dogmas. It may be that this preoccupation developed an inclination for philosophical reflection. It seems more probable however that this very mode of solution of the intellectual conflicts of adolescence grew directly out of an original predisposition for abstract speculation, verbal manipulation, and psychological analysis.

It must be borne in mind that psychology as we now know it is a new subject. Psychology and I are really contemporaries, for the first psychological laboratory was established by Wundt in Leipzig in 1879, this being the year in which my parents married and in which I was conceived. The first man to be called a professor of psychology was the same Cattell whose assistant I was to become at Columbia. I must therefore have found my way into the subject before it became widely known, and long before it was heard of in our town.

I seem to have been from the beginning headed for philosophical pursuits. It was the heavy and serious essays and the volumes on abstract topics that I bought from Montgomery Ward and Company as a boy and which constituted for me the introduction to the world of books. Boyish papers published for me in the magazine Word and Works were on definitely psychological themes, although I did not then know it. “The Unconscious in Education” and “The Optics of Life”. The earlier religious attraction was more to theology than to practice. I was granted permission to study history of philosophy while still a preparatory student, at my urgent request. At the University of
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(A Sequel to Born in Nebraska)
This story runs in sweet and tender ways,
For always and forever roses die
And all about us fragrant petals lie;
The remnants of the precious, perfect days
Which come and pass.. But mem'ry still may lend
A fragrance sweet to gladden to the end.

Leta Stetter
1906
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Overture

My life falls naturally into two sections, the break coming in the spring of 1907 when I left my native state of Nebraska and came to New York City. This was in the middle of my twenty-seventh year. The Nebraska period is of little general interest although to me of course its incidents are full of significance. Personal curiosity about the influences and events operating in those developmental years has led me to write about them in detail in another manuscript, which bulks larger than does this volume. There is no reason to suppose that it will ever be published and for the purpose of the present volume all that is required is a brief, objective account of what happened before the "Years at Columbia" began.

The little town of De Witt, where I was born in May, 1880, had been in existence only a few years. It was but a few miles north of Homestead No. 1 whose claim by Dan Freeman has become from the subject of an oft repeated bit of pioneer history. A population of about 1,000 in its most prosperous days, it has declined now to about half this size. It was in an agricultural area and depended for its existence chiefly on the trade of farmers within a radius of five or six miles. These farmers now whisk past the little town in their motor trucks, headed for some distant but more animated metropolis.