



4

## Paul Hanna at Stanford University

**A**t Stanford University, Paul Hanna became a leading figure in American education. There he solidified his growing academic reputation and parlayed that reputation into entrepreneurial efforts that benefited both the university and himself. He established himself as a writer and developer of school textbooks and as a consultant to school systems across the United States and around the world. Sometimes those interests overlapped. His entrepreneurial skills helped shore up Stanford's shaky finances during the war years and enriched both the Hannas themselves and the friends that he brought into his business endeavors.

While at Stanford, Hanna became intrigued with the instrumental use of schools to promote democracy on a global scale. He served as a consultant to governments in many foreign countries and founded an institute to study education as a tool in international development and to prepare policy makers in its use. Ironically, this scion of democratic education came under fire from forces on the political right wing for his associations with progressive educators at Stanford and Columbia Universities. Hanna's career on the Stan-

ford faculty spanned three decades, and his association with the school lasted even longer. It culminated in significant bequests to various units of the university, although, curiously, not to its School of Education.

#### HANNA AND STANFORD

Hanna first taught at Stanford during the summer session of 1934. Late that summer, his wife Jean joined him in the West, and the two made favorable impressions on the Stanford faculty. The mild climate and relaxed lifestyle of California impressed them as well. “We found it a paradise in contrast to New York City” (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 17). When the offer of a permanent job followed in early 1935, Paul Hanna gladly accepted. In June of 1935, Paul and Jean packed a trailer, loaded their three small children and dog into their Chrysler Airflow, and headed for California.

Stanford University at that time had a mixed reputation. Its nickname was “the Harvard of the West,” but the appellation was not entirely complimentary. It was widely known as California’s “country club university” (Davis and Nilan 1989, 221). A 1931 *Time* magazine article referred to Stanford as “predominantly a rich man’s college” (1931, 40). The article emphasized the upscale facilities of the university, including “one of the finest Pacific Coast golf courses, two lakes, a polo field . . .” (ibid.). Regarding the student body, the article claimed that “more than half own automobiles. Some fly their own planes” (ibid.).

Stanford students were politically conservative. Straw polls revealed that an overwhelming majority of students preferred Republican to Democratic candidates in presidential elections throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Students preferred Stanford alumnus Herbert Hoover to Franklin Delano Roosevelt by a three-to-one margin in 1932 (Davis and Nilan 1989, 219).

The Depression accelerated the narrowing of Stanford student

demographics (*ibid.*, 218). The university served an increasingly homogeneous conservative, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon student population drawn from middle and upper socioeconomic backgrounds. The student tuitions imposed in 1920 to support university expansion had become a necessary funding source that further limited diversity in the campus population (*ibid.*). Stanford's academic reputation suffered a blow in 1934 when the school's academic council decided that students unable to maintain an adequate level of scholarship would not be dismissed. Instead, the university would rely on students' common sense to know when to disenroll. Critics suggested that this change in policy demonstrated that tuition was more important than scholarship (*ibid.*, 220). These factors served to diminish Stanford's academic reputation; a national survey of academic institutions ranked Stanford twelfth. In a humiliating turn, the same survey placed the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford's arch rival, in fourth place (Embree 1935).

Despite its somewhat exaggerated reputation for lavishness, Stanford remained one of the premier universities on the West Coast, particularly in the field of education. The School of Education at Stanford had been led by Ellwood P. Cubberley since 1898. Under his guidance, the school became an important center of educational thought. When Cubberley retired in 1933, he was followed as Dean by Grayson Kefauver of Teachers College, who continued to build a first-rate faculty and program. When Paul Hanna joined the Stanford faculty in 1935, he had good reason to be optimistic about the university's prospects.

#### THE TEACHER EARLY IN HIS CAREER

At Stanford, Hanna employed the teaching methods that he had found effective at Teachers College. He preferred a seminar format designed to foster investigation, discussion, and debate among his students, similar to what he had experienced in planning the Edu-

cation 200F course at Teachers College. He often enlisted students in his own textbook and curriculum projects. This approach is not surprising considering his foundational belief that education is best achieved through real life experience, but it seemed exploitative to some students (Douglass 1998). However, the majority of Hanna's students who were interviewed by this author remembered him as an engaging and stimulating teacher with a strong but winning personality.

The first classes Hanna taught after joining the Stanford faculty were three seminars during the 1935 summer session. Throughout his career at Stanford, Hanna taught most of his courses during summer sessions. Summer courses were especially suited to Hanna's seminar style, because most of his students were experienced school administrators continuing their education while holding jobs in the schools (Mayhew 1974, 30). In fact, Stanford University consistently conferred many more Doctor of Education degrees, those preferred by educators planning careers in school administration, than it did Doctor of Philosophy degrees in education (*ibid.*, 32; Stanford University 1952).

One of the 1935 summer session courses, a seminar in elementary school curriculum labeled Education 256, illustrates Hanna's teaching style. Hanna's colleague and friend, Harold Hand, taught a companion course: Education 331, Seminar in Secondary Education (Hanna 1935c). The two young faculty members planned their seminars in tandem, and they jointly wrote the syllabi. The seminars met together for orientation on the common problems of curriculum development in the elementary and secondary schools. Students then met with Hanna or Hand and developed individual curriculum inquiries based on their own interests. For the balance of the course, students pursued their projects. No grades were assigned, but a plus or minus was given based on criteria established by the student and the instructors in their planning conferences. Mandatory meetings of the whole group occurred each Monday.

Attendance at other meetings was optional when individual topics proved interesting to the students. Even these seminar topics were chosen by a vote of the students (*ibid.*).

This course represented an early attempt by Hanna, with Hand's involvement, to design a course unfettered by imposing authorities such as those at Teachers College. Nevertheless, it retained several features of significant Teachers College courses. Hanna and Hand expected their students to display a high level of competence. Although no specific prerequisites were listed in the syllabus, a section in the document entitled "assumptions" states that the seminars were planned for

mature students who have previously made a systematic study of curriculum development . . . have reasonably adequate backgrounds in educational sociology and psychology . . . reasonably adequate conception[s] of the nature of the learning experience and of the guidance service which the school should provide . . . [and] some one or more problems which [they] want to work out, preferably for a specific educational situation (Hanna 1935c).

The syllabus advised students who did not meet these criteria to enroll in another course. In addition, students were advised that as part of their individual project planning sessions, the instructors would probe their knowledge of such areas as educational sociology and psychology (*ibid.*).

Another imprint of Teachers College influence on Hanna's seminar was the assumption of the school's dual role in meeting the needs of both individual learners and the larger society. The syllabus included the assumption that "all students will possess a reasonably adequate understanding of the social and individual needs which the school should attempt to meet" (*ibid.*). These needs were not detailed, but neither was the mission of the school left open to debate: the school was to serve both the individual and society. This assumption remained a constant theme in Hanna's writing and teaching throughout his career.

Perhaps the most direct connection of Hanna's seminar to his experiences at Teachers College was his description of the instructional personnel. He and Hand listed themselves as chairmen of the seminars, whereas other teachers were described as "seminar staff" (*ibid.*). Perhaps Hanna attempted to replicate on the West Coast the incredibly rich experiences that he and his students had enjoyed as participants in the Teachers College Education 200F course. Hanna cotaught courses with Hand for several years thereafter.

Another summer course taught by Hanna in 1937 displayed many of the same characteristics. Education 256, *The Curricula of Modern Elementary Schools*, was a general survey of three approaches to curriculum organization: the traditional approach, with subjects taught as distinct courses of study; the broad fields approach, with subjects grouped as social sciences, general science, and so forth; and the integrative activity approach, with subjects taught in integrated units (Hanna 1937a). The integrative activity approach apparently drew heavily on Hanna's own experience, because the Lincoln School and the Virginia state curricula were listed as examples to be studied. The course evidently was designed for school administrators, because discussion of each curriculum approach included consideration of how to organize a staff to meet school goals (*ibid.*).

The syllabus offered students considerable latitude in how to approach their study. It contained a seven-and-one-half-page bibliography from which students were to pick their own readings. Hanna advised students to read "those particular aspects of the problem which interest [them] most" (*ibid.*). He required them to submit a bibliography of materials read during the course, but no annotations were requested beyond what they "may care to keep for [their] future reference" (*ibid.*). Hanna did not require a term paper, but he had no objection to students organizing their studies around such a project if they so desired. Assessment was individualized and very subjective, based on student participation in class discussion,

individual conferences, and “the keenness of the reaction to the reading” (Hanna 1937a).

Despite the elements of student choice, the organization of the 1937 summer course displayed far more structure than did the one taught two years earlier. A curriculum dictated by Hanna replaced a purely student-generated one. Although he offered students considerable latitude in their choice of reading, they picked from an approved reading list. No such list accompanied the 1935 syllabus. These differences indicated a further departure on Hanna’s part from the idea of student-designed curricula, in favor of the idea of a common core of concepts essential to each discipline. This change in his approach roughly paralleled his struggles within the Progressive Education Association dealing with similar curriculum issues. Hanna’s gradual change to a more structured approach also may reflect his internalization of the conservative, traditional environment he encountered at Stanford. He also may have determined that education courses should be as soundly ordered as courses in other academic disciplines.

During the 1930s, Hanna developed many new courses and taught a wider variety of courses than he would in later years, including one-time offerings such as Silent Reading to the Upper Elementary and Secondary Schools (Stanford University 1936) and Natural Science in the Elementary and Junior High School Curriculum (Stanford University 1938). Evidently, Hanna was not shy about teaching courses outside of his immediate areas of expertise.

Hanna also maintained his heaviest teaching load during those years. Stanford operated on the quarter system, and Hanna taught an average of ten courses a year. During the academic year 1938–1939, the busiest of his career at Stanford, Hanna taught thirteen courses (Stanford University 1938). Some of these courses were offered year after year, including his Seminar in Elementary School Administration and his Seminar in Elementary School Curriculum (Stanford University 1935). Throughout his career, he taught ad-

ministration and curriculum courses more often than he taught any others.

During Hanna's first two years at Stanford, the School of Education conferred three Ph.D. degrees and fourteen Ed.D. degrees. Hanna's first doctoral advisee was Cecil W. Mann, who wrote a dissertation entitled, "The Education System of the Colony of Fiji" (1936). Apparently, Hanna had an interest in international education even at this early stage of his career. Mann's dissertation was the only one that Hanna supervised during this time.

#### HANNA TURNS WEST

In March, 1938, Hanna was invited to head the elementary education program at Teachers College, Columbia University (Russell 1938). This position was possibly the most prestigious in its field. In addition, Teachers College offered him a salary of \$7000 per year, nearly a \$3000 increase over his Stanford salary. To apply even more pressure, his former Teachers College colleagues showered him with telegrams in which they urged him to return. For example, Dean William F. Russell wrote, "We want you to throw in your lot with us," and asked Hanna to "tell Mrs. Hanna for me that Mrs. Russell and I particularly want her to come down" (ibid.).

The job offer was tacit acknowledgment that Hanna had become the outstanding figure in the field of elementary education. His mentor, Jesse Newlon, articulated its significance when he wrote, "I am very confident that you will make a most important contribution to American education wherever you may work . . . . My eagerness for you to come here was evidence of my realization that you have come to full maturity and a place of leadership" (Newlon 1938a).

Newlon also warned Hanna that ". . . Stanford is likely to fold up educationally and . . . all important contributions are going to be limited to Teachers College" (Newlon 1938b). This view reflected

a common attitude among easterners toward educational institutions in other regions, particularly on the West Coast, but it spurred Hanna to write Grayson Kefauver about the future of the Stanford School of Education. Kefauver urged Hanna to stay at Stanford, but his letter must have been small comfort. He wrote it from Austin where he was interviewing for the presidency of the University of Texas (Kefauver 1938). Retired Stanford Dean of Education Ellwood P. Cubberley even weighed in on the matter. He wrote to Stanford President Ray Lyman Wilbur of Hanna's concern that

The president and trustees be willing to support Dean Kefauver in enabling him to retain the present rather remarkable group of young teachers he assembled here . . . . Hanna said that if he felt sure that this group could be held together, and augmented as vacancies occur, he had no doubt we could equal any place in education within the next decade, and under such circumstances he would want to remain. If, on the contrary, the group . . . was to be continually raided by other institutions and men were lost because the university would not or could not make such conditions as to keep them here, then he would prefer to leave now (Cubberley 1938).

Hanna did not allow the prestigious weight of the Teachers College name and the flood of flattering telegrams to cloud his thinking. He followed the same deliberate decision-making process he had employed in the past. He consulted with colleagues whom he knew and trusted. Willis Scott of Scott, Foresman and Company argued, "Of course, from our standpoint as publishers, you would be in a much more prominent position there at T.C., and you would be able to exert much more powerful influence at T.C. than you can at Stanford" (Scott 1938). Genevieve Anderson, his coauthor on the Scott, Foresman textbooks, sent a telegram warning that the Hannas would have regrets if they turned down the position (Anderson 1938).

The most influential input into Paul Hanna's decision, however, was that of his wife, Jean. In a note to her husband dated simply

“Monday,” she reassured him that she understood what the invitation from Teachers College meant to his career, but she relayed her conviction that, “. . . we shall have a greater degree of happiness if we remain here” (Jean Hanna 1938, undated). She expressed her concern that “The strain of building up the Elementary Department there together with the necessary coordination with Lincoln and Horace Mann will put a strain on you that your health won’t stand” (ibid.). She listed ideas for strengthening the education program at Stanford and asked, “Will the results be any more valuable for Education than if you remained here and helped to establish a strong, influential school of education on the West Coast?” (ibid.). She argued also for quality of life: “What became of all the talk of living the good life when we deliberately and willfully turn our backs upon and choose the worst sort of environment . . . . Our professional life is so short! And then what?” (ibid.).

Jean Hanna saved her most powerful argument for last. She wrote that they had a duty to support the philosophy of architecture they had adopted in 1935, when they had engaged Frank Lloyd Wright to design a home for them. A move now, she argued, would be “. . . a blow to Wright’s living architecture. When the most beautifully livable of all homes couldn’t keep us from the siren call of the big invitation!” (ibid.) Beyond their obligation to Wright’s architectural philosophy, the Hannas had very real financial obligations to Scott, Foresman and Company. Paul Hanna’s publisher had arranged loans to help the Hannas build their dream house. Besides, in the spring of 1938 they had only lived in their new home for a few months, after years of anticipation.

Whether or not his wife Jean’s arguments were those that swayed him, Hanna decided to remain at Stanford. He relayed his refusal to Dean Russell on April 27, 1938. Many at Teachers College and elsewhere did not understand the reasons for his decision, attributing it to simply “. . . too much house” (Hand n.d.). With this decision, Hanna turned his back on the East Coast educational

establishment in favor of the promise of the future represented by Stanford University and the West. Some educators, then and since, have taken him less seriously because of his choice, but Hanna always considered it to have been the right one (Hanna 1974, 139).

#### HANNA AND HIS FAMILY

The Hanna family thrived in California. Lula Shuman, Jean's mother, moved to the area, and other family members visited often. The Hannas' focus, though, was on their children. Colleague Richard Gross recalled Hanna as being "highly concerned with his family" (Gross 1998). As evidence, he pointed to Hanna's Frank Lloyd Wright-designed home, known as the Hanna-Honeycomb House. Wright designed the structure to change according to the growth of the Hanna children. For instance, a room that originally served as the children's playroom was converted to a dining room as the family's needs changed. The children's bedrooms became a spacious master suite once the children were grown and moved away. Other needs were considered, as well. Wright originally suggested that the two boys, John and Robert, share a room, but their parents insisted on their need for privacy and independence. They also insisted that their daughter, Emily, have her own bathroom, despite the increased costs of building additional rooms (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 92).

The Hannas shared aspirations for their children and worked as a team to see them fulfilled. Paul and Jean attended Methodist worship services only rarely, although they did see to it that their children received a Sunday School education (John Hanna 1998). John Hanna believes that his parents' nonchalance toward religious matters was a reaction against their childhoods as children of clergymen. Although rejecting their parents' lifestyles of faith, the Hannas embraced their work ethic and they expected their children to do so as well. They always worked industriously around the house,

whether in the yard or in their study and their children naturally picked up this ethic. Family discussions centered on social and political issues and they rarely included talk of money or religion. John Hanna does not recall that his parents ever argued so that their children might hear (*ibid.*).

The Hannas placed a high priority on their children's educations and devoted considerable resources to them. Emily Hanna, born in 1932, attended the Castilleja School, an exclusive private school for girls near the Stanford campus. She graduated in 1948 and went on to Claremont College and Stanford for her college study (*ibid.*). Paul Hanna served on the Board of Trustees of Castilleja from 1957–1981, and he endowed the Hanna Family English Chair there with a \$100,000 gift in 1982 (Castilleja School 1982).

Both of the Hanna boys attended the Menlo School, a private school in the Stanford area. Richard Gross, later a colleague of Hanna's on the Stanford faculty, was a social studies instructor there. He remembered teaching Robert, the youngest Hanna child, born in 1934. He recalled Robert as a shy boy (Gross 1998). After high school, Robert attended the University of Colorado. Never particularly interested in academic pursuits, he became the showman of the family (John Hanna 1998). Taking the stage name "Dusty Russell," he formed a traveling stunt show known as the World Champion Auto Daredevils in the 1960s and 1970s. After the troupe dissolved, he settled in Vancouver, Washington, where he became a successful businessman (*ibid.*).

John Hanna, the eldest child, was born in 1930. After attending the Menlo School, John enrolled at Andover. Although he excelled academically, he and his father did not always share priorities in that regard. John Hanna recalled that he had fallen behind in school at Andover, due to illness. Spring break lay just ahead and he planned to go on a trip with some school chums. His father advised him to stay at school and use the vacation week to catch up on his studies, but Hanna went with his friends instead (*ibid.*).

John Hanna was admitted to both Harvard and Stanford Universities. His father wanted him to attend Harvard, but John chose Stanford. Paul Hanna was fond of telling people that John argued, “Why should I go to the Stanford of the East when I could go to the Harvard of the West!” John Hanna subsequently graduated from the Stanford Law School and became an invaluable legal adviser to his parents in later years (John Hanna 1998).

These few family anecdotes illustrate the high expectations Paul Hanna held for his children. He expected them to adopt a positive work ethic and to excel at their various endeavors. He also generously provided for their formal educations. No record exists that he perceived any inconsistency in sending his children to private schools while his consulting and publishing work focused on public schools.

#### THE TEACHER LATER IN HIS CAREER

Hanna gradually moved toward a more structured approach in his teaching in the years following his decision to remain at Stanford. Part of this shift was due to the atmosphere at Stanford, but part was due to his growing prominence in his field and his increasing conviction in the correctness of his own ideas. Despite the shift in style, students continued to enjoy his seminars. Forbes Williams recalled, “He was very democratic except that you never for a moment forgot that he was running the seminar. He liked people to express their ideas; he never put you down” (Williams 1998). In later years, Hanna gathered small groups of eight or nine graduate students and assistants for informal discussions. Although these meetings were not part of the formal course requirements, preparation often was necessary. One participant recalled that Hanna set up debates between students to stimulate the flow of ideas (Rusteika 1998). Although these discussions were informal, “attendance, though he never did say it, was mandatory. . . . A command

from Paul Hanna, if you worked for Paul Hanna, was next to God. At the same time, nobody that I know of, including myself, ever objected to those [seminars]. We looked forward to them” (Williams 1998).

The purposes of these meetings ranged from gleaning feedback on one of Hanna’s ideas to listening to visiting scholars. Hanna’s worldwide network of colleagues afforded seminar attendees unsurpassed learning opportunities. Williams, for example, recalled a day-long affair that began with a spirited discussion with the superintendent of schools of New Delhi, India, in the morning, and concluded with similar interaction with the superintendent of the New York City schools in the afternoon (*ibid.*). Former Hanna student George Rusteika reported that Hanna frequently shared his own experiences in international education in these seminars (Rusteika 1998).

The years surrounding World War II marked an interlude in Hanna’s teaching career as he directed his energies and time toward securing government contracts for Stanford University. Stanford records reveal that he served as adviser on two doctoral dissertations in 1941 and four in 1942, but none in 1943 and only one in 1944 (Stanford University 1952). He taught fewer courses during these years than he had in the previous decade, averaging only nine per academic year. During 1941–1942, Hanna’s sabbatical year, he taught only two courses, both summer seminars (Stanford University 1941). He followed a similar pattern in 1942–1943, when he was most deeply engaged in lobbying work in Washington, D.C., on behalf of the University (Stanford University 1942). Many of the new courses Hanna offered in the 1940s were simply revisions of courses he had developed during the previous decade. For example, *Curricula of Modern Elementary Schools*, developed in 1936, became *Curriculum of the Elementary School* in 1943, and *Individual Study in Elementary Curriculum and Instruction* became *Individual Study in Elementary Curriculum, Instruction, and Supervision*.

The war years also shifted Hanna's focus from domestic to international education, and he was frequently away from campus in the 1950s. He taught an average of just five courses each academic year during his heaviest involvement in consulting work in the Philippines. As usual, most of his courses were concentrated in the summer sessions. Richard Gross took one of Hanna's courses in the years soon after the war, a lecture course in elementary curriculum. He recalled it as a well-organized and somewhat demanding class. He thought that it "covered the field adequately," but was not especially inspiring, and he noticed that Hanna made liberal use of teaching assistants to operate the course. Gross identified I. James Quillen, not Hanna, as the best teacher he had at Stanford (Gross 1998).

As Hanna gained prominence in the field of elementary education, he received invitations to teach at other prestigious institutions. The courses he taught there revealed a stronger trend toward structured presentations. They also served as opportunities for the entrepreneurial Hanna to promote his own concepts of curriculum. For example, in the summer of 1958 he taught a course at the Harvard University Summer School entitled *Social Studies: Curriculum in the Elementary School*. The course syllabus listed topics to be covered, and they read like an outline of Hanna's critique of modern society and the role of the school in addressing it.

The critical imbalance of our time—the lag of the social sciences and humanities behind advances in science and technology; the need for the social studies curriculum to prepare tomorrow's citizens for creative effort toward cultural imbalance; the design of the social studies curriculum with the "expanding communities of men" and the "basic human activities" as the two dimensions (Hanna 1958b).

The course required considerable writing on the part of the students. Assessment was based on a midterm exam, a final exam,

and a term paper, a dramatic change from the days when Hanna assigned only plus/minus grades and had “no objection” if students wished to write a term paper. Students were expected to engage in “wide reading” from the list of items Hanna had placed on library reserve in Lawrence Hall. Hanna’s reading list was revealing. The entire first page was devoted to a group of Stanford doctoral dissertations that Hanna had sponsored, on generalizations in the social sciences. He also included his own essay, *Society-Child-Curriculum*, and two of his school textbooks, *At Home, At School*, and *In the Neighborhood*. Hanna had moved from teaching a variety of schemes for curriculum organization to advocating only his own.

Although Hanna dictated the reading list and topics for the course, his methods of instruction and evaluation still permitted wide student choice. In addition to required readings from two textbooks, he permitted students to choose selections from his reading list based on their own interests. His testing also allowed students some latitude in responses. The midterm exam was an essay about his *Society-Child-Curriculum*. For the final exam, students had their midterm exams returned to them, and Hanna asked them to evaluate their own examinations in terms of content and presentation. They then were asked to make any changes to their original statements that they wished, and to explain the reasons for those changes. Some very focused short-answer questions followed, but the last question asked students to write an editorial reacting to a proposal that the school teach geography as a separate subject, beginning in the fourth grade (Hanna 1958b).

The following summer, Hanna returned to Harvard to present his controversial proposal for a national curriculum commission. He spoke at the Advanced Administrative Institute on the topic, “A National Curriculum Center: Threat or Promise?” (Harvard University 1959).

Hanna’s teaching load did not grow lighter in his last decade on the Stanford faculty. During the 1960–1961 school year, for

instance, Hanna taught three courses during each of the fall and winter terms, including courses in elementary school social studies, elementary school curriculum, and general curriculum development. During the spring term he taught four courses, including two graduate courses in elementary school curriculum, instruction, and supervision, and he taught two courses during the summer of 1961 (Stanford University 1961). In a testament to his tremendous energy, he taught the summer session while suffering from hepatitis (Hanna 1961d).

Hanna maintained a similar courseload for the following year. In 1961–1962, he taught three courses each term. Most were similar to the ones he had taught the previous year, but he added a course in elementary school supervision and administration with a field experience component. During the summer session he taught the same two courses he had taught in the summer of 1961 (Stanford University 1962).

Hanna taught a reduced courseload in the school years 1962–1963 and 1963–1964, teaching only two courses each term. He taught only one course during the summer session of 1963 and none during the summer of 1964. All of these were graduate courses (Stanford University 1963; 1964). The reduced load for the 1962–1963 school year was due to the fact that Hanna served as acting dean that year, while I. James Quillen was on sabbatical leave (Hanna 1962a). Reasons for his reduced teaching load the following year are unclear. Hanna taught an average of seven courses each academic year during the 1960s. His heaviest teaching load was in the year of his retirement, 1967 (Stanford University 1966).

During the 1960s Hanna developed new courses that reflected his interest in international education. In 1961, he offered a course entitled Seminar in Comparative and Overseas Education (Stanford University 1961). In 1964, he developed Comparative Education (Stanford University 1964), and in 1966 he offered an International Development Education Seminar (Stanford University 1966).

As Hanna gained both national and international prominence during the 1950s and 1960s, his relationships with his students changed. In earlier times, students and faculty had played together in a recreational softball league (Davis and Nilan 1989, 77). Hanna described the warm camaraderie and good-natured teasing between students and faculty in games organized by Harold Hand. He recalled that the faculty team “could expect to be worked over at every game by a determined student team” (Hanna 1976, 5). Few of the faculty players could compete with the students, so there was a standing practice of collusion with the umpires. Sometimes a faculty player would be allowed to bat out of turn, to help another around the bases. Then the crowd erupted into screams of “pseudo protest that the faculty was being pampered by a prejudiced umpire. But by fair or foul means, the faculty did win as many games as they lost” (ibid.).

By the 1950s and 1960s, however, the nature of faculty–student relations at Stanford had changed as a result of the university’s increased enrollment and rising national reputation (Lowen 1997). Hanna’s own growing reputation and his advancing age also were factors in the changed nature of his relationships with students. Former students remembered him fondly, but they also held him somewhat in awe: “not fear, but awe” (Gross 1998). For instance, former student Forbes Williams reported that his first meeting with Hanna in the early 1960s was interrupted by a telephone call from the United States ambassador to the United Nations. Williams was impressed (Williams 1998). Hanna’s students took pride in his prominence. For example, Williams recalled that Hanna’s students basked in the reflected glory when he was the sole American educator invited to an exclusive conference at Lake Como, Italy (ibid.).

Hanna’s students also benefited from his prominence and his network of former students and professional colleagues. Many reported that their connection with Hanna led to employment. Harold Drummond, who served as Hanna’s personal secretary in the im-

mediate postwar era, reported that Hanna recommended him, at different points in his career, to friends at Allyn and Bacon publishers for work on geography textbooks, to Teachers College colleague Hollis Caswell for a position on the editorial board of Childcraft Books, to other colleagues at the National Society for the Study of Education as a writer on community schools, and to those at George Peabody College for Teachers for a faculty position there. He also recalled that his work as Hanna's secretary itself was invaluable: "It was a wonderful learning experience, for I got to know through correspondence almost every leader in American education. When I met them later, most of them would greet me with, 'Oh yes, I know you—you were Paul Hanna's secretary'" (Drummond 1997).

Richard Gross was not one of Hanna's advisees, but Hanna was responsible for his first faculty appointment. In 1950, Florida State University had just expanded its program and was seeking new faculty. Search committee members there had exhausted funds set aside for interview visits without finding a suitable candidate, and they called Paul Hanna for a recommendation. He suggested that they talk with Gross, and he was hired sight unseen. Florida State University again figured in a 1967 recommendation Hanna wrote to R. Freeman Butts, enlisting his help in gaining a position there for Richard King. He wrote, "If you would put in your word to [Associate Dean of Education, Philip] Fordyce, I think the chances are very great that Tallahassee will make him an offer right away" (Hanna 1967a).

Hanna recommended former doctoral advisee Robert Newman to the editorial board of *Weekly Reader Magazine* as a writer and several others to Houghton Mifflin as textbook authors. Long after his retirement, he continued to help people in this manner. In 1975, Donald Foster, a 1959 doctoral advisee of Hanna's, wrote to express thanks for Hanna's support of Foster's application for an administrative position at the East-West Center in Hawaii. He reminded Hanna, "You've given so much to so many" (Foster 1975).

For all the help he could offer, some students found Hanna's networking distastefully self-serving. For example, George Rusteika recounted an instance in one of Hanna's informal seminars when a student asked him how he had gained such international prominence. Hanna proceeded to relate a detailed list of image-building activities to pursue, including joining the *right* organizations and getting to know the *right* people. The discourse made him sound "like a real manipulator" (Rusteika 1998). Many of the students left the meeting discouraged by the level of personal politics involved and wondered if they could adjust to academic life as Hanna portrayed it.

Other aspects of Hanna's personality and career also bothered his students. For example, Malcolm Douglass remembered Hanna as "a fairly distant guy" (Douglass 1998b). Harold Drummond, among others, noted that Hanna "was out of town a lot" (Drummond 1997). His absence from campus was also a sore spot between Hanna and faculty colleagues, but Hanna was not unique. Visiting scholar Edgar Wesley was amazed at the tendency of Stanford faculty to leave campus for long periods during the school term. Richard Gross explained that Stanford paid low salaries but allowed faculty members generous time for consulting, saving university funds and increasing Stanford's prestige at the same time (Gross 1998).

Some students were unaffected by Hanna's travels. Malcolm Douglass somewhat sarcastically counted himself "lucky that Hanna was on campus throughout my work" (Douglass 1998b). Others were more generous. Forbes Williams reported that Hanna was

always available to his graduate students. If you had a problem you could stick your head in the door and say, "Mr. Hanna, what do you think about this?" and he'd say, "Well, sit down for a minute" and we'd talk about it. He was very approachable. Whatever his activities were . . . it never seemed to me, from my personal

viewpoint, to detract from my ability to work with him or ask him questions or get advice and counsel (Williams 1998).

Some graduate students objected to Hanna's using them as cheap or free labor in his own business undertakings. For example, several members of the education faculty were partners with Hanna in a Christmas tree farm. Malcolm Douglass reported that these men often employed their graduate students to cut and load trees for customers. He termed it a "sort of enslavement" (Douglass 1998b). John Hanna also recalled working alongside his father's students on the farm (John Hanna 1998). Students may have thought that helping in this way, although not required, constituted one of those *Hanna commands* that was *next to God* or a way to ingratiate themselves with one of the *right people*.

Perhaps more seriously, some graduate students criticized him for assigning them to work for him on his various textbook publishing projects without pay or acknowledgment (Williams 1998). Douglass (1998a), for example, recalled that Hanna, "did a lot of consulting through his students." Hanna had a longstanding consulting career with state and local school authorities. This consulting sometimes was done in conjunction with his work on the Scott, Foresman textbook series. Before coming to Stanford, Hanna had served as a consultant to the Chicago Public Schools in 1932 and worked on a State of Arkansas curriculum revision in 1933.

On the West Coast, Hanna expanded his consulting work. In 1935 he undertook a Virginia-style study of the Santa Barbara city and county schools. One result was a scope and sequence plan for Santa Barbara that closely followed that of Virginia, including elements reflecting Hanna's interest in community schooling. During the same year, Hanna worked as a consultant to the Fresno, California, Schools and served on the Curriculum Scope and Sequence Committee for the State of California.

As his national reputation grew, Hanna expanded his work to

other regions. In 1937 he worked in Michigan with the Flint, Grosse Pointe, and Detroit schools, and two years later he led a landmark curriculum study in the San Diego public schools. As late as 1975, Martin Gill wrote to Hanna, "I was in Los Angeles this summer for a bit of consultation work that brought me to the office of the Superintendent of Schools. You may chuckle to know that the mere mentioning of your name still causes the red carpet to unroll" (Gill 1975). This author experienced the same phenomenon in 2001.

Certainly, Hanna did not do all this work on his own. Douglass claimed that "Paul was the senior consultant and he would blow in and blow out at a very handsome fee and the rest of us were left there to do the work. As I understand it, he had a lot of that going on" (Douglass 1998b).

Oddly, Hanna did not keep a list of his doctoral advisees, but many former students remember a map that Paul Hanna kept in his office showing where his students were employed. Each of his students was represented by a small pin. The map was an impressive display of the spread of Hanna's influence worldwide, and some of his students considered their inclusion to be a badge of honor. However, Douglass and some others referred to themselves derisively as just "pinheads on his map" (*ibid.*).

Despite some negative experiences, most of Paul Hanna's students felt warmly toward him, and even his critics among them found him "very stimulating" (*ibid.*). In fact, his captivating presentations were what attracted some of his students to Stanford in the first place. Hanna seemed to have no need to recruit students. His reputation and prominence were such that individuals sought to study with him (Douglass 1998a). For example, George Rusteika first encountered Hanna in 1948 at a teachers institute on international affairs. He had read some of Hanna's work during graduate study at the University of Chicago. Although Rusteika recalled that he disagreed with the views Hanna presented at the institute,

he thought, “Here’s a person I hope I can keep talking to because I’m learning so much” (Rusteika 1998). Ten years later, Don Foster heard Hanna at another teachers institute on world affairs. He knew of Hanna from the Hanna Series of textbooks, and he recalled being “captivated by Paul’s seminars at our conference, and [I] followed him like a groupie afterwards” (Foster 1998a).

Evidently, Hanna’s ability to captivate audiences translated to the personal level, as well. Foster declared, “I unabashedly respect and admire Paul, and often refer to him as a surrogate father” (ibid.). Forbes Williams reported that although “he had a million of them,” Hanna’s graduate students were extremely loyal and always wanted to do their best work for him (Williams 1998). He attributed this loyalty to Hanna’s ability “to make you feel as if you were the only important person in the entire world when you were talking with him” (ibid.). Hanna also had an uncanny ability to remember names. Douglass remarked that he “could enter a classroom of several dozen students and within an hour or so, he would know all their names” (Douglass 1998b). Some of Hanna’s personal magnetism was a matter of learned skills, but much of it grew out of his genuine warmth and interest in people.

#### HIS STANFORD COLLEAGUES

From his first days on the Stanford campus, Hanna encouraged improved relations between the School of Education and other academic areas, even in an environment notorious for its lack of collegiality (Gross 1998). True to his commitment to integration of subject matter, Hanna encouraged his students to add to the depth of their substantive knowledge by taking graduate courses in relevant academic departments. George Rusteika, Richard Gross, and Forbes Williams followed his advice, and each reported receiving warm welcomes across campus when they mentioned that they were

Hanna's students. Likewise, Hanna's network of colleagues in the social sciences—at Stanford and across the nation—enabled his students more easily to enlist the aid of social science authorities in their educational research. Williams, for example, established a nationwide jury of thirty or forty leading social scientists to evaluate his identification of social science concepts applicable to the elementary school curriculum. Williams recalled, "They were all friends of Paul Hanna! His name opened doors" (Williams 1998).

For all of his work to build bridges between social scientists and the schools, some scholars retained the attitude that Hanna had encountered when he first tried to employ authorities to help with his social studies textbooks in the 1930s (Hanna 1973a). Williams recalled an encounter with a leading anthropologist at Stanford's Cubberley Conference in 1964. The Conference brought school teachers and academic authorities together to help the teachers increase their substantive knowledge and translate it into useful curriculum elements. In the flush of goodwill surrounding the week-long meeting, Williams asked the anthropologist how many of his colleagues would be willing to give a year to work with teachers on similar projects. The anthropologist answered that they could be counted "on the fingers of one mutilated hand" (Williams 1998).

On the Stanford campus, Hanna constantly sought ways to improve programs in the School of Education. He pioneered a five-year elementary education certification program in his early years there. Students began the program in their sophomore year and were awarded a Master of Arts degree upon completion of their courses and fieldwork. The program became a model for others nationwide (Gross 1998). In 1955, Hanna founded the Stanford International Development Education Center (SIDECE) to study the uses of education as a tool for economic, political, and social growth in developing countries. Through these activities and others on behalf of Stanford, Hanna developed formidable influence across

the campus. Unfortunately, his influence gave rise to both political and ideological conflicts with colleagues.

Fannie Shaftel was one of Hanna's doctoral advisees in 1948 (Stanford University 1948). She joined the Stanford faculty, and she and Hanna served together on many dissertation committees. Over time, however, relations between the two soured (Gross 1998). She declined this author's request for an interview about her work with Hanna. Richard Gross, a Stanford colleague of both Shaftel and Hanna, believed that their estrangement resulted from ideological differences (Gross 1998). Like Hanna, Shaftel was educated in the progressive tradition at Teachers College. She was an unabashed proponent of child-centered, problems-centered curriculum approaches at a time when Hanna was becoming increasingly focused on issues of content in the curriculum. She hoped that she would find an ally in Hanna, but was disappointed (*ibid.*).

Hanna grew skeptical of child-centered progressivism early on, believing that "what you teach should never be determined only by how children learn" (Rusteika 1998). After moving to Stanford, he increasingly focused on balancing children's perceptions of their own needs with his perceptions of society's needs as the key points of curriculum development. Shaftel, on the other hand, was process-oriented (Shaftel and Shaftel 1967, 8). In 1950, the two joined forces to produce a textbook in elementary social studies methods (Scott, Foresman and Company 1950). Shaftel did much of the preliminary work, but then Hanna sought to mold it to the expanding communities curriculum design (Gross 1998). She disagreed with Hanna's scheme, and the two could not come to philosophical agreement on an alternative approach (Gross 1998). The book was never completed.

The ideological estrangement between Hanna and Shaftel only deepened with time. According to Richard Gross, Shaftel came to feel that "Hanna had sold out" (*ibid.*). In response to a paper George Rusteika wrote, Shaftel said, "George, I'm disappointed. You seem

to have taken the Hanna approach hook, line, and sinker” (Rusteika 1998). Still, she recognized Hanna’s influence. When Hanna suggested to Malcolm Douglass that he ask her to serve on his dissertation committee, Shaftel made it clear that she disagreed with many of Douglass’ and Hanna’s curriculum assumptions underlying the research, but she agreed to serve and replied with resignation, “anything Paul wants” (Douglass 1998b).

Ideological disputes with colleagues also arose over a dissertation series on social science generalizations that Hanna proposed in the early 1950s (Rusteika 1998). He planned to develop a group of dissertations, each identifying generalizations from a different social science, but all using the same research design. Such a project had never been undertaken at Stanford before, and some on the faculty opposed the idea. Chief among the project’s critics was Arthur Coladarci, the chairman of the committee for advanced graduate degrees (*ibid.*). This committee was charged to approve all dissertation research, and the chairmanship put Coladarci in a position to block Hanna’s project. Nevertheless, through Hanna’s persuasion and skillful enlistment of faculty members to serve on the various dissertation committees, many dissertations were completed as part of Hanna’s project (Douglass 1998a). His success with this project was a measure of his influence and persuasive powers.

Throughout his career at Stanford, Hanna helped to raise funds for the university, and he was not above reminding his colleagues in the School of Education of his long service to Stanford. In 1951, for example, Hanna wrote a strong letter to Dean A. John Bartky, arguing for a salary increase for himself and his colleagues. Among his reasons were the rise in the cost of living since his last raise, and he claimed he had not received an increase since 1946. In the ensuing years, he argued, the Consumer Price Index had risen thirty-three percent, and “my current salary of \$9000 represents in purchasing power the equivalent of \$4850, or \$400 less than I

received from Stanford 14 years ago” (Hanna 1951). He also cited job offers he had received at much higher pay, although he stated, “I have no desire to leave Stanford” (ibid.). Hanna pointed to the relatively low level of salaries for the education faculty compared to those in other Stanford Schools. He wrote, “I note in the AAUP [American Association of University Professors] report that the top salary of full professor of \$9000 in the School of Education is out of line with the top salaries in the Biological Sciences (\$11,000), the Humanities (\$10,000), the Physical Sciences (\$12,000), the Social Sciences (\$12,000), Business (\$10,600), Law (\$12,500), and Medicine (\$10,000) (ibid.).

Hanna argued that such a salary relationship was out of line with the tuitions that the School of Education attracted to the University compared to those brought in by many of the other schools on campus, “When the substantial net gain to the University from tuition over budget from the School of Education is taken into account competitively with other schools, then it appears reasonable to expect the salaries in Education to be equally generous” (ibid.). He concluded with a pointed reminder of all the funds he helped bring in through his work with University Services and private donors (ibid.). No record exists to indicate whether or not Hanna’s salary was increased.

Sometimes his disputes with other faculty members were not ideological at all, but only political. Early in his career at Stanford, for example, Hanna was instrumental in the initiation of a five-year teacher certification program in elementary education (Gross 1998). By the 1960s, however, his main interest had changed to international education. Stanford’s system of funding faculty positions required cutbacks in other programs to free up resources for his growing international education program (Douglass 1998a). Richard Gross described the shock and dismay of some faculty members when Hanna proposed in a faculty meeting in 1967 that the entire elementary education program be abolished (Gross 1998).

Again, Hanna's influence helped carry the proposal and the elementary program was scrapped. George Wesley Sowards was a former doctoral advisee of Hanna's and his colleague on the elementary education faculty. As a result of Hanna's proposal, the salaries of Sowards and a number of other faculty members were defunded, and they were forced to seek positions elsewhere (*ibid.*).

Hanna was a supremely self-assured man, and his success in business and academic life only increased his self-assurance. Some on the Stanford faculty may have disliked this aspect of his personality, and others may have envied his international reputation. Richard Gross recalls hearing pointed remarks about Hanna's extended absences from campus due to his international consulting work (Gross 1998). Some may have envied his nationwide prominence resulting from an extensive and lucrative career as a consultant to school districts and state education agencies and his production of school textbooks. Some might even have envied his influence with elements of the Stanford administration gained through his long service to the University in fund-raising efforts. Predictably, Hanna's influence at Stanford declined steadily after his retirement in 1967, to the point that even his reminders of his long service and many contributions to the university could not always accomplish his goals.

#### FUNDING FOR THE UNIVERSITY

A large part of Hanna's career at Stanford included extraordinary success in attracting funds to the University, especially during the postwar era. Throughout the 1920s, Stanford came to rely on student tuitions in addition to Stanford family funds, for operational revenues (Davis and Nilan 1989, 218). This reliance made the University increasingly vulnerable to external economic forces. Despite Stanford's reputation as a school for economically privileged and socially elite students, the decade of the Great Depression showed

how vulnerable the school had become to the vicissitudes of the market cycle (Lowen 1997, 26). Many students in the 1930s lacked even basic transportation. Hanna recalled that in his early years at Stanford, drivers customarily picked up “hikers between campus and downtown Palo Alto” (Hanna 1976). Certain street corners on campus and in the town became regular pickup points for students who did not have their own transportation.

By the mid-1930s, Stanford students began to receive support from the California State Emergency Relief Administration, and about twelve percent of all students were enrolled in federal work relief programs (Lowen 1997, 23). Still, the university found federal support for private higher education unpalatable and suspect. Like many private institutions, Stanford questioned the propriety of accepting government support. Reliance on government funds seemed to blur the traditional distinction between public and private education and to threaten the independence of the private university (*ibid.*). For Stanford, however, the issue included a personal dimension. Both Stanford president Ray Lyman Wilbur and trustee and former United States president Herbert Hoover intensely disliked and distrusted President Franklin Roosevelt, and they disdained his New Deal initiatives (Nash 1988, 124). They were intent on heeding James Conant’s admonition that “[I]f and when private institutions pass under government control, [it will be] because they were forced there as a result of their begging policy for money” (Conant 1937). Wilbur and Hoover encouraged Stanford to seek funds elsewhere.

Licensing technological innovations to industry seemed a promising source of revenue. Although some at Stanford saw peril in becoming too closely allied with industry, others welcomed the opportunity. Notably, Robert Swain, chairman of the chemistry department, and Frederick Terman, chairman of electrical engineering, actively courted this type of industrial relationship (Lowen 1997, 36). The results were mixed. Stanford signed a potentially profitable agreement with the Sperry Gyroscope Company regard-

ing a navigational device developed by Stanford scientists, but the agreement degenerated amid concerns over faculty autonomy, control of university research facilities, and how traditional university promotion policies might be altered by the influence of business (*ibid.*, 37–42).

Paul Hanna became involved in fund-raising for the university early in his tenure at Stanford. In 1936, Paul H. Davis, a 1923 graduate of Stanford and the newly named general secretary of the university, saw entrepreneurial qualities in Hanna that could be put to good use. He prevailed on Paul and Jean to join the Stanford Associates in their fund-raising efforts (Hanna 1982b). Few stones were left unturned in the search for private support for Stanford. Faculty members and alumni approached the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and other organizations and individuals with a variety of funding proposals (Lowen 1997, 29). The economic conditions of the Great Depression, however, saw a decline in the availability of private funds (Davis and Nilan 1989, 224). Neither support from industry nor private sources of funding provided the steady income stream that Stanford needed in the 1930s.

By 1940 the university was again in severe financial straits, but a new model of government support had evolved. Instead of distributing funds through grants to private institutions, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics had pioneered the use of contracts with individual researchers. In the words of one historian of university-government relations,

To those such as [Stanford President Ray Lyman] Wilbur, who worried that government support for private institutions represented an encroachment by the state, the contract was a reassuring symbol of the marketplace. It suggested, in form if not in fact, that the university was not a supplicant to the government but that the parties involved had reached a mutual agreement (Lowen 1997, 47).

Moreover, the generous provisions for the university's overhead expenses in these contracts resembled *profit* for Stanford, another concept from the world of business with which Stanford trustees were most familiar.

World War II marked a philosophical watershed for Stanford, as it did for many other private universities. The growing conviction that war might be unavoidable made alliances with the government seem to be a patriotic duty. Indeed, many in the Stanford community were frustrated by President Wilbur's reluctance aggressively to seek out government research contracts in the days before Pearl Harbor. Hanna joined other faculty members in purchasing a full-page advertisement in the local newspaper to argue that Stanford should prepare to take part in the war against National Socialism (Hanna 1974). As he recalled, "This was serious, this was survival—we knew we had to defeat the Germans." In response, Hanna received a "most devastating letter from [Herbert] Hoover, as a member of the Board of Trustees, telling me to shut up" (*ibid.*). Hoover's violent opposition to any alliance between Stanford and the Roosevelt administration helps explain President Wilbur's reticence on the issue, but Hanna was adamant about the need to prepare for war.

As a member of the National Resources Planning Board from 1937–1939, Hanna came to believe that U.S. involvement in the war was inevitable. Hanna met with President Wilbur and recalled Wilbur's telling him, "I just don't want anything to do with this, but I wouldn't restrict you" (*ibid.*). Hanna took him at his word and met with Donald Tresidder, president of Stanford's board of trustees. As a result of their meeting, Tresidder appointed Hanna to chair the Committee on University Services to investigate further opportunities for the university to contribute to wartime research (Lowen 1997, 55). Tresidder was a businessman rather than an academic. He did not share the view that Stanford must maintain a pristine separation from government, and he saw qualities in

Hanna that he recognized from the business world. Tresidder later succeeded Wilbur as president of the university, and he and Hanna formed a firm bond of mutual respect.

As war seemed increasingly likely, the federal government authorized creation of the National Defense Research Council (NDRC) and the Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD) to coordinate federal government contracts for war-related research and training. The NDRC panel that let contracts was a clubby group of academicians, and personal and professional contacts were as important as merit in their decisions. The primary recipients of NDRC–OSRD contracts included the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, both of which had officers serving on the NDRC–OSRD review board. When Stanford officials saw that the California Institute of Technology and the University of California, their West Coast rivals, had been granted NDRC–OSRD contracts, they decided to take a positive step toward securing similar contracts themselves. Demonstrating that they understood the gamesmanship involved, Stanford trustees offered the university presidency to Vannevar Bush, head of the NDRC–OSRD board, when President Wilbur’s retirement approached. Unfortunately, the offer was made on December 5, 1941 (*ibid.*, 52), and events of the following days rendered Bush’s consideration of such an offer impossible.

The U.S. declaration of war posed other setbacks for Stanford. Students left the university to enlist in the armed services, further cutting into revenue from tuitions (*ibid.*, 49). President Wilbur advised them to consider an alternative course of action: “Be reluctant to drop out of the University. The government will pull you out if it wants you. An engineering student who can get a new idea that will make an airplane go twenty miles faster per hour is worth a hundred thousand men in uniform” (*Stanford Daily*, 10 December 1941).

Just as ominous for the long-term health of the university was

the exodus of its professors to schools with more prestigious, better-funded war research projects. Frederick Terman, for example, left to head up the Radio Research Laboratory at Harvard. By January of 1942, Stanford had lost forty professors to war work at other sites (Walker 1942). With the defection of top faculty members and fewer opportunities for research, many of Stanford's graduate programs also threatened to fold (Lowen 1997, 54). Whatever reservations Stanford officials still held about federal funding of private universities were swept away by the winds of war.

Hanna's University Services Committee geared up quickly. It recommended that the university send representatives to Washington, D.C., to offer Stanford facilities for war-related research. To President Wilbur, this smacked of begging the federal government for financial assistance and he was reluctant to commit precious funds to the effort (*ibid.*, 56). The committee argued that success in Washington could enhance the university's prestige, stem the flight of faculty and graduate students, and provide needed revenue (*ibid.*, 55). Members also contended that helping the war effort through research and training was a patriotic act. Their arguments swayed Hoover and the other trustees, and with their plan approved, Hanna and Paul Davis left for Washington in late 1942 (*ibid.*, 56).

In fact, Hanna had already engaged Stanford in wartime research for the federal government. Beginning in 1942, Japanese nationals and Japanese-Americans throughout the West were evacuated to relocation centers administered by the War Relocation Authority (WRA). Many of these evacuees were children. Hanna knew that nobody benefited if these children languished educationally for any period of time, so he offered the services of his summer session graduate class to the WRA (Hanna 1942g).

In early July, 1942, the twenty-five students in Hanna's Education 299b course—Curriculum Development—undertook the study of educational problems at the relocation centers to ensure

that Japanese-American children and youth, “continue their growth toward American ideals during the war” (ibid.). The incongruity of that goal to a situation in which American citizens were deprived of liberty and property because of their ethnicity received no comment from Hanna’s class. The study began with a review of background materials concerning “the problem of cultural absorption of an alien minority group” (ibid.). Officials from the western regional office of the WRA met with students on the Stanford campus, and together they decided to focus on the Tule Lake Center in far northern California as representative of the educational challenges throughout the system of WRA installations. Seventeen members of the class then visited the center for a two-day period. In a series of subsequent meetings and conferences with WRA officials, Hanna’s class sketched out a sample curriculum for camp schools (James 1987, 38–39).

The result was a design that blended Hanna’s ideas of the community school and his notions about an expanding communities scope and sequence. The final report to the WRA contained a scope and sequence diagram in which the scope consisted of eight *basic human activities*: production; public works; community service; transportation, communication and supply; maintenance and operation; community enterprise; placement and labor relations; and administration. The sequence involved a progression from grades K-12 of studying each activity in the context of an historical, political, geographical, or conceptual community. The overarching integrative theme for all grades was Adaptation of our Socio-Economic Arrangements to the Control and Direction of Technological Development. Each cluster of grades—primary, elementary, and secondary—had a subtheme. For instance, the subtheme for the secondary grades was “Improvement of human arrangements to make better use of scientific technics [sic].” The curriculum at each grade level was organized around a *center of interest*. For example,

the eleventh grade center of interest was “Continuous improvement of living within the community and the region” (Hanna 1942g).

Despite the complex nature of the curriculum design, the recommended content was eminently practical, and it clearly reflected Hanna’s interest in the community school concept. For instance, under the basic human activity entitled *public works*, first graders considered how the schoolyard could be “made more useful and beautiful.” Under *maintenance and operation*, they were to consider, “How can we help each other at the mess hall?” (ibid., IV-8).

Hanna’s attempts to balance child-centered and content-centered curriculum approaches were also reflected in the curriculum plan. The explanatory material in the document specified that the curriculum design should have two major divisions:

1. There should be provided experiences which are common to all youth. Common experiences should be provided throughout each of the twelve school years.
2. The curriculum should also provide opportunities for selective subject experiences which the learner feels he needs for satisfactory living now or in his preparation for future living (ibid., III-2).

A chart in the document suggested time allotments for each strand of the curriculum. Equal school time was devoted to *common experiences* and *selective experiences* through grade six, but from grades seven through twelve, more and more time was to be given to selective experiences, until they consumed up to seventy-five percent of the school day by graduation.

The reality of relocation center life entered into the planning process. Because the student body was a captive group, idle time could become a problem. Hanna’s class proposed year-round schooling as a remedy.

One of the WRA’s goals was to provide the evacuees with “educational opportunities which will equip them for their return to postwar society” (ibid., III-1). Much of the center’s population had

been engaged in agriculture before the war, but because evacuation had forced them to sell their farms at bargain prices, evacuees were unlikely to return to their previous ways of life. Vocational education, then, became a major component of the curriculum plan. Most of the vocational component was taught in a traditional manner during school time allotted for selective experiences. However, in keeping with Hanna's view of the community school, some vocational education was implemented through community service. Students observed and participated in the center's motor pool, farm, maintenance shops, and other facilities in order to gain knowledge and skills. Thomas James, in a critique of the vocational approach, pointed out that participation in these community activities was inadequate social education for children. He felt they did not reflect the world outside the centers, but only the administrative divisions the government had established to manage center life (James 1987, 39).

The curriculum model proposed by Hanna's class was adopted for the relocation center schools in the western region of the WRA, although it was not slavishly followed (Light 1947). The document that resulted from their study clearly stated that "intimate contact with each Relocation Center would be necessary to insure the practicability of the recommendations in each instance" (*ibid.*). Hanna and his students recognized that each center had unique circumstances.

The result of the curriculum plan was mixed. Although the goal that students in the centers develop "the attitudes essential to democratic participation in group life" was evidently realized in most of their lives, that influence was not enough to prevent strife in the centers. Tule Lake, in particular, the very center Hanna's class had studied, was the site of considerable violence between the evacuees and officials. In the final analysis, the peaceful continuation of life and education may have been an unrealistic expectation under such adverse conditions.

Following his work on the relocation center project in the summer of 1942, Hanna, along with Paul Davis, prepared to travel to Washington, D.C. to offer Stanford's research and training facilities for war-related work. Once there, the two realized that their task was more formidable than they had anticipated. They were in competition with representatives of dozens of other institutions. Davis minimized the intensity of the competition in a letter that assured Wilbur, somewhat disingenuously, that he and Hanna were not like the "desperate university presidents [who] . . . sat on every doorstep and with trembling voices pleaded for a handout" (Davis 1943).

Hanna and Davis realized that the only way to earn Stanford a hearing in the capital would be to establish a permanent presence there. They leased space for a permanent office in the American Council building, on Lafayette Square, across the street from the White House, in order to cultivate the personal contacts upon which their enterprise depended. From that base, the two hosted events for Stanford alumni holding high government positions in order to gain information and plan strategies for approaching various government agencies. Hoover and Frederick Terman arranged introductions to important officials, and Terman was especially helpful. Hanna recalled that his name was "an open sesame to all the scientific research groups" (Lowen, 57).

Hanna's interpersonal skills, entrepreneurial frame of mind, and tremendous energy proved to be a match for his new task. *Time* magazine labeled him "Stanford's ambassador to the U.S. Government" (1943, 25). His schedule was grueling, typically alternating two weeks in Washington with two weeks in California. During this time, he maintained a minimal schedule of classes. He did not serve as adviser for any of the seventeen doctoral degrees in education conferred by Stanford in 1942–1943, and served as adviser on only four in the years 1944–1945.

In Washington, Hanna approached government officials through high-level contacts he made as a member of the exclusive

Cosmos Club. He recalled, “Most of the leaders of the war effort would gather for lunch. I would listen and ask questions and find out where research or training needs . . . were . . . And then I would come back and write up a proposition and take it back [to the appropriate officials]” (Hanna 1986).

Aggressively lobbying the Washington bureaucrats benefited the university. By the end of the war, Stanford had inked twenty-five contracts with the NDRC–OSRD (Lowen 1997, 57). These alone were worth more than \$500,000, of which Stanford received almost \$125,000 in overhead expenses (*ibid.*). In addition, the Office of Strategic Services enlisted Stanford to study German food production and distribution capabilities (Nash 1988, 114). The Civil Aeronautics Administration contracted with the School of Education to produce a sourcebook for aviation education. That contract resulted in more than \$25,000 for Stanford’s general funds, as well as a position for Hanna on the advisory board of *Air Affairs* magazine (Hanna 1982b). Later, *Air Affairs* considered moving to Stanford with Hanna as editor, but that possibility never materialized. By war’s end, Hanna and Davis were directly responsible for dozens of contracts between Stanford and agencies of the U.S. Government that were worth hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Hanna also continued his efforts to raise funds from private sources. A 1944 memo by Hanna described a meeting in Detroit with Fred Black about strategies for getting financial help from the Ford Foundation. Hanna detailed a plan to induce Edsel Ford’s son, William, to enroll at Stanford prior to approaching the foundation. Hanna wrote, “Mr. Black suggests that we get former Hotchkiss boys who are at Stanford, or who have gone to Stanford, to work on this possibility. Also, the Hoover boys appear to be rather close to the Ford boys and might be of assistance” (Hanna 1944). In the postwar era, the Ford Foundation became a major donor to Stanford and other universities (Lowen 1997, 194).

As director of Stanford University Services, Hanna oversaw the university's training programs for military personnel. These programs included the Army Specialized Training Program, programs run by the Signal Corps and Women's Army Corps, language and cultural training, training in military government, and other projects (Hanna 1982b). By the end of the war, Stanford ranked second among American universities in the total number of military personnel on campus, and its enrollment reached an all-time high during the war (Lowen 1997, 53). Donald Tresidder attributed Stanford's strong financial position at the end of the war to the work of Hanna and University Services (Hanna 1982b). Hanna continued to benefit the university by negotiating private fund-raising efforts in the following decades.

Hanna personally benefited in a number of ways from his wartime activities on behalf of Stanford. First, he earned the gratitude of powerful individuals in the Stanford administration. Although their gratitude did not express itself in concrete terms, it enhanced his prestige among his colleagues. Hanna thought that his actions during the war obligated the university to him and he occasionally reminded officials of his work. Unfortunately, university officials did not always respond as Hanna wished, and later events embittered him toward Stanford.

A second benefit Hanna gleaned from his wartime work in Washington was the opportunity to interact with powerful people. He built a useful network of relationships among leaders in government and industry, but more importantly, he learned how those contacts could be enlisted in helping him complete projects. He applied that knowledge in the ensuing years as he worked with government officials, business leaders, and the staff of international organizations in educational consulting abroad.

Finally, Hanna's wartime work helped him develop a deeper understanding of the relationship between the university and the

government. He knew that partnerships between the two institutions could profoundly change university culture. In a 1964 memo entitled “The University and the Government,” Hanna asked a series of probing questions about these relationships. He questioned the nature of the research—operations, applied, or basic research—that universities should offer government. He thought that each kind carried different moral implications (Hanna 1964a). He asked what restrictions government should be allowed to put on scholars’ dissemination of research results. He thought that the confidentiality required by government for certain types of research ran counter to the traditions of the university, and he wondered if universities should relax their admissions requirements for foreign students attending school as part of a government contract (ibid.). All of these questions had direct bearing on Hanna’s work in international education through SIDEC in the 1950s and 1960s.

#### THE *BUILDING AMERICA* CONTROVERSY

The war years marked a turning point in American education. The pragmatic mood of the country favored traditional over experimental approaches to instruction. A return to traditional interpretations of American history was part of this pragmatism. One historian asserted that many people “believed the schools, in their excessive concern for well-rounded social development, were neglecting their responsibility to train youngsters’ intellects” (Graham 1967, 123). In this atmosphere, progressive education and its products were attacked indiscriminately. Paul Hanna and his *Building America* series of magazines for schools became a target of these attacks.

*Building America* was begun in 1934 as a project of the Society for Curriculum Study. Paul Hanna proposed to the society the publication of a series of monthly magazines, designed for use in the classroom, to generate discussion of significant issues facing the United States. They would follow a *social problems* approach, and

Hanna intended that teachers would use them to help students become more informed and to discuss policy alternatives. Hanna believed that teachers must be agents of change, writing that “The social studies teacher accepts the challenge that our culture may be improved by the process of analyzing the culture’s shortcomings, projecting solutions, and taking the necessary action to translate plans into achievement” (Hanna 1938b, 143). Through social analysis and action, teachers would help prepare students for active citizenship as adults.

By 1946 the magazines were used in thousands of schools across the country, including hundreds of California schools (Newman 1961, 291). In that year, the California State Curriculum Commission proposed an appropriation of over \$173,000 to bind twenty selected issues of the magazine into three volumes as supplemental textbooks for California seventh and eighth grade classrooms (ibid., 292). The State Board of Education initially supported the idea. Among the Curriculum Commission’s goals for the adopted texts was that they “emphasize desirable social attitudes and ideals and loyalty to principles of American Democracy” (California State Board of Education 1945, 3). Another goal for the textbooks was that they “contribute to an appreciation and understanding of present day social and civic conditions and problems” (ibid.). Controversy surrounded the textbook selection process as camps formed around differing interpretations of the two goals.

Foremost among the groups opposing the adoption of *Building America* was the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution (CSSAR). This group believed that *Building America* was part of a larger plot by communists to undermine American values and institutions. The Society’s concern was first voiced at a Curriculum Commission meeting in mid-summer, 1946, by CSSAR representative Aaron M. Sargent, a San Francisco attorney.

Sargent’s initial attack was not directed against *Building America* itself, but against the progressive education approaches mani-

fested in integrated social studies and child-centered methods. Over the course of the summer, he broadened his attack to include *Building America*. In testimony before the State Board of Education on July 30, 1946, Sargent questioned the efficacy of social studies in the schools, compared to the more traditional single-subject curriculum. He claimed that social studies contributed to “illiteracy, civic illiteracy, ignorance of our form of government,” and he argued that the study of current events, as presented by *Building America*, was insufficient for teaching children about their government (California State Board of Education 1946, 5–6). He took a broader swipe at some of the experiential methods of progressive education when he described a typical field trip:

In the activity program they go to the firehouse to see whether they think it is a good idea, if they like the firehouse. Those things are useful in developing interest in your government but you can't learn about our constitution that way. You have to study history, where history was made, the past, and the experiences of the past, and so on down the line. In other words, ladies and gentlemen, this [social problems] method has been producing a mass of doubting Thomases, students without experience, who don't even have the stability of religious ideals, morals, patriotism, allegiance and loyalty to our government, which normally children should have (ibid., 6–7).

If Sargent had talked with Hanna, he might have found significant points of agreement. Hanna, too, objected to meaningless activities in instruction, and later wrote, “Children learn *something* and we are definitely concerned that this something be good subject matter. I cannot agree with some who say that *any* content is of equal value with *any other*, or that content generally must be subordinate to process [emphasis his]” (Hanna 1954, 273). Their fundamental disagreement centered not on whether students should be presented with substantive material, but on the proper way to

prepare children for citizenship and the way in which American culture should be portrayed.

Sargent's testimony before the Board of Education continued with a criticism of how world affairs were taught. "We find that the facts regarding the rest of the world are generally being taught before the facts of our own country are being taught. There is a definite attempt here to slide in some of this world citizenship, this half-baked, undigested material" (California State Board of Education 1946, 7).

Here, Hanna and Sargent parted company. Hanna passionately believed that American schoolchildren should understand their roles in communities larger than just the nation, and his concern rendered *Building America* vulnerable to Sargent's next attack. Brandishing a volume of the proposed text, Sargent asked,

What do you suppose is in it? There should be something about America, shouldn't there? Let's open it. The first part of that book is about China, pictures, impressions, slick writing about China . . . What is the next thing about building America? Russia. A long chapter about Russia . . . the next section—Pacific neighbors, the East Indies; then some information about American possessions. Then there is something about Africa; American outposts; then there is a section on American and foreign trade, current events . . . That is all there is about building America, just that (ibid., 7–8).

Apparently, Sargent missed the point that the proposed *Building America* textbook was intended as a supplement to a more traditional textbook. He proceeded to drive home the argument that a social problems approach alone was insufficient to teach American history and geography. He quoted from a 1943 state board document that rejected Harold Rugg's textbooks: "We do not believe in the study of problems as a satisfactory method of education for children of that age . . . The pedagogical principles upon which these books are built disregard the fundamental fact that founda-

tions of basic knowledge and skills must be laid before pupils are given the impression that they are ready to deal with contemporary problems” (ibid., 8).

Here was Sargent’s main curriculum point: the need to return to a traditional organization of social science instruction in the schools. Discounting the history of curriculum reform which had led to the integration of social science content under the rubric *social studies*, he concluded by pleading with the board that, “if you here can conscientiously agree with us as to the apparent need of separating history and geography you will make another landmark in the educational history of California” (ibid., 9).

In Hanna’s view, the traditional approach Sargent advocated had long since proved itself insufficient to meet students’ modern needs. He wrote, “The typical curriculum of the traditional school has lacked vitality and meaning for children and youth. School tasks have become almost exclusively unrelated to the life of the community” (Hanna 1937b, 46).

The State Board of Education aligned itself with Hanna’s approach to citizenship education. Some members of the board questioned Sargent’s assertion about the civic and historical illiteracy of California’s schoolchildren. Others took issue with his characterization of progressive education methods. All agreed to a formal reiteration of statements in the State Education Code underscoring the importance of instruction in civics and American history, focusing especially on the founding documents (California State Board of Education 1946). They emphatically refused to rule on the adoption of the *Building America* textbooks.

In August, 1946, Sargent renewed his attacks at the board’s meeting in Los Angeles. In each community, competing newspapers allied themselves with one or the other side in the controversy. Polarization was especially keen in cities served by newspapers published by William Randolph Hearst’s media empire.

In January, 1947, the state board voted unanimously to adopt

the *Building America* series, but the appropriation to purchase the magazines was blocked in the state legislature by Senator Jack B. Tenney. Tenney followed the path of many prominent California politicians by advancing his career through McCarthyite investigations and pronouncements. He raised the stakes in the *Building America* controversy by instigating a full-scale legislative investigation in April of 1947 (Newman 1961, 370).

This move was precipitated by a formal petition for redress of grievances filed by Sargent on February 21, 1947. In it, Sargent maintained that, “*Building America* is a subversive publication in that it undermines principles essential to our form of government” (Sargent 1947, 2). Sargent outlined a number of grievances against the series, ranging from revisionist interpretations of American history to promotion of specific political policies. He warned that “adoption of *Building America* is part of a plan to enable radical educators to secure a monopoly over the subject content of courses in American history, civics, and American principles in the public schools” (ibid., 3–4). The “radical educators” were identified as “a group of left wing educators dominating its Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development” (ibid., 4). Sargent referred to the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association, an organization that sponsored the publication of *Building America* during this time.

Sargent called on the California State Assembly to take action. He asked that the assembly request a congressional investigation into the “interstate and international aspects of this situation” (ibid.). He also requested a suspension of the appropriation for the proposed printing and distribution of *Building America* and for a joint legislative resolution naming *Building America* “subversive, detrimental, propaganda, [and] dangerous,” a publication to be banned from California’s public schools (ibid., 5).

Sargent concluded by requesting a public investigation, into not just the immediate issue of using the magazine in public schools,

but also the effects of “the so-called ‘progressive’ education method” in the schools, of individuals in the State Department of Education, and of “communistic and subversive teacher training programs being conducted by University Schools of Education and by State Colleges” (ibid.). This final request fed the hysteria reflected in a pamphlet entitled *Red-ucators at University of California, Stanford University, California Institute of Technology* (1950). The pamphlet listed faculty members at the three schools who belonged to purported communist organizations. Hanna was not among the three Stanford faculty members listed, but Lewis M. Terman was, apparently for his membership in the Consumers Union. Hanna was not singled out in the tract, but as chairman of *Building America*’s editorial board, he became a focal point of a subsequent investigation in the California Legislature.

The Senate Education Committee’s investigation crystallized around the *Building America* issue entitled *Russia* that was proposed as part of California’s textbook series. The editorial board of *Building America* did not shy away from controversial issues, but it miscalculated the mood of the times in presenting the Soviet Union in a somewhat sympathetic light. *Building America* was primarily a pictorial representation, and many were concerned about the pictures used to portray Russia, in which “all the Russian women are robust, sturdy, well-fed, well-dressed and appear to have been freshly scrubbed. Every field is lush with grain or corn; every barn is bursting with hay; the people are smiling and happy” (California Library Association 1948). Such a rosy portrayal was doubtless inaccurate, but so was the version the critics preferred. “None of these Soviet citizens appear to be afraid of the secret police, the purges, exile to the salt mines or Party discipline” (National Council for American Education 1948b).

In the supercharged atmosphere of the postwar era, a true portrayal of life behind the Iron Curtain was likely to be impossible. When the question arose in the committee as to where the favorable

pictures came from, the Americana Corporation, *Building America*'s publisher, replied that they had indeed been supplied by "SOV-FOTO, the official and only source for pictures from Russia." In its defense, Americana stated that "*Building America* made an earnest effort to obtain photographs which would show existing poverty and distress. Such photographs were unavailable . . . I think everyone is well aware of the 'iron curtain' around Russia, and how difficult it would be to come out of Russia alive with the type of realistic photographs *Building America* feels should be included" (Newman 1961, 359). Apparently, Americana chose to use photographs it knew to be propagandistic rather than publish a text-only edition of its pictorial magazine. The question of whether or not the Soviets ought to be able to portray their nation as they pleased was not discussed. In the supercharged atmosphere of the committee hearings, such a question could not even be raised.

Ironically, the Soviet Union was no more pleased with the Russia issue than was the CSSAR. In a speech before the annual conference of California school superintendents in October, 1946, Hanna explained that the Russian consulate had protested *Building America*'s depiction of the USSR. In a swipe at both the Soviets and the CSSAR, he declared that "The truth must stand for children and youth to see no matter how deeply it may offend totalitarian states where freedom to speak the truth is denied" (*San Diego Journal* 5 October, 1946, 2). The State Board of Education decided in October to proceed with the adoption of the series, but with some revisions to address the complaints (Newman 1961, 360).

The investigation exonerated California's education officials, but it left a cloud over the *Building America* series and its proponents. Paul Hanna attended the hearings fresh from his service on behalf of the U.S. military government in Germany, but he was compelled to defend his patriotism (*ibid.*, 352). Aaron Sargent testified on behalf of the CSSAR and claimed that the Stanford School of Education contained a "communistic cell closely linked with Co-

lumbia University.” He labeled Hanna as “having leftist tendencies. I don’t know how deep” (*Palo Alto Times* 7 April, 1947, 1).

As a result of the committee hearings, two pieces of legislation that aimed to change the California Education Code were introduced in the Legislature. One bill mandated a *back to basics* approach in the schools and limited use of the *social problems* approach to teaching the social sciences. It stated, “It shall be the primary function of the teacher to give effective instruction in fundamentals. Thorough instruction in fundamentals . . . shall be prerequisite to the participation by pupils in advanced courses, particularly in studies involving solution of social, economic, governmental and moral problems” (SB 1029, Sec. 1). The other bill allowed for the dismissal of an employee of a public school if he “advocates or is a member of an organization which advocates overthrow of the Government of the United States or of the State, by force, violence, or other unlawful means” (SB 97, Sec. 1). Both measures passed the California Legislature during the summer of 1947.

Many schools continued to use *Building America* despite the controversy (Newman 1961, 417). The U.S. Army used certain volumes in its education efforts in the occupied countries of Austria, Germany, Korea, and Japan (*Palo Alto Times* 31 March 1948, 2). The U.S. Navy ordered special sets as training materials for new recruits (Hanna 1974). Repackaged as *Your America*, the sets avoided the controversy surrounding the issue on Russia, but they did include such potentially controversial titles as Democracy and Totalitarianism, Roots of American Loyalty, and The Places of the Armed Forces in Our Democracy. The State of Georgia adopted *Building America* for its schools even in light of the California investigations (ibid.). Nevertheless, the controversy took its toll. California failed to fully adopt *Building America*, and the refusal of such a prominent state to place the magazine in its classrooms spelled its doom. It ceased publication in 1948.

Hanna remained strangely quiet throughout the *Building America* affair. His most eloquent defense of the series was made in a speech away from the government investigations:

We do believe that strength sufficient to withstand the world pressure of communism will be enhanced if we are (1) realistic about our own achievements, and (2) know the strengths and weaknesses of our adversaries. To deny our youth a chance to study a balanced statement of the good and evil in our own nation and in the world is to render our future citizens weak and unprepared for the struggle of our time (*Palo Alto Times* 31 March 1948, 2).

He may have relied on the good sense of members of the California State Board of Education to see Sargent's attacks for what they were. Indeed, the board consistently supported *Building America* throughout the controversy. Hanna told Martin Gill that his friends on the board protected him during the hearings. He said, "I think they prevented any name calling" (Hanna 1973a, 40). He also did not take Sargent's charges very seriously (Newman 1960, 352). Unfortunately, when the hearings moved into the more politically charged atmosphere of the California Senate, neither Hanna nor his powerful friends could control the outcome. In the end, he chose to follow Ray Lyman Wilbur's advice to avoid confrontation (Hanna 1974, 109). Hanna might not have been able to prevent *Building America's* demise by assuming a more combative posture, but his decision to avoid the fight virtually ensured that the magazine would fail.

Hanna did not emerge from the investigations personally unscathed, either. His name was prominently connected with the magazine, which meant guilt by association in some quarters (Newman 1961, 432). In February of 1948, he attended a dinner in his honor given by the Americana Corporation. There he was introduced to "a little man who jumped up smiling and rushed toward us, extending his hand. The introduction was made but just the moment the

little fat fellow heard the words *Building America*, he dropped my hand as though it had been molten iron and rushed away” (Hanna 1948).

On the heels of the controversy, Hanna was offered the deputy directorship of the Operations Research Office at Johns Hopkins University, a think tank organized to review promising research projects for the U.S. Army. The climate was such that California Superintendent for Public Instruction Roy E. Simpson found it necessary to emphasize in his recommendation letter that Hanna was “loyal to the United States. I have never discovered any reason that would change my opinion concerning his integrity of purpose in the democratic processes as they are generally practiced throughout the country” (Simpson 1948).

Nor did the controversy fade quickly. A 1953 booklet entitled *Communist-Socialist Propaganda in American Schools* dedicated an entire chapter to *Building America*. It rehashed the criticisms leveled against the magazines in California and claimed that “No single project of the National Education Association, or any of its divisions or departments, more certainly types the nation’s greatest organization of educators as contributing to the cause of Communism-Socialism, than sponsorship of the textbooks *Building America*” (Kaub 1953, 63).

In 1961, Robert E. Newman recounted the controversy in a Stanford dissertation, *History of a Civic Education Project Implementing the Social-Problems Technique of Instruction*. Even then the subject inflamed passions. Newman recalled, “My jargon title of the dissertation was necessitated by the fears of some, when I wrote the dissertation, that its presence might stir up, anew, the conflict. . . . In order to get official permission to write the dissertation I had to do minor things like write the title without having the words *Building America* appear in it” (Newman 1969).

The *Building America* controversy may have contributed to Hanna’s change in focus from domestic to international education.

He saw international education as a new, safer venue for his efforts to help students grow as democratic citizens.

#### INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Hanna claimed that his experiences with government work during the war “. . . broadened my horizons tremendously” (Hanna 1974, 142). More significantly, those experiences provided a venue in which he could continue to develop programs for citizenship education away from the intense scrutiny that had surrounded the *Building America* controversy. That venue was overseas, and it began with his war-related travel on behalf of the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs (CIAA).

The CIAA was established under the authority of the Council on National Defense to coordinate the cultural and economic activities of U.S. Government agencies in Latin America. By 1940, growing U.S. concern over Nazi infiltration of Latin American economies brought the Coordinator under the direct purview of the President. On August 16, 1940, Franklin Roosevelt appointed Nelson Rockefeller head of the CIAA (Reich 1996, 187).

In late 1940, Paul Hanna met Rockefeller’s newly appointed Coordinator of American Affairs, Robert G. Caldwell, at a dinner party for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Hanna was on sabbatical leave from Stanford, and during the course of the evening he described his upcoming trip to Central America to visit archaeological sites. The CIAA had been collecting firsthand information on Nazi incursions into South American culture, politics, and economies, so Caldwell asked Hanna to keep his eyes open and report on his impressions when he returned (Hanna 1974, 74). Hanna’s trip became one of at least nine fact-finding missions authorized by the CIAA that year.

Hanna enjoyed the cloak-and-dagger mission. He characterized himself as “a first counter-espionage agent to find out what in hell

Germany was doing” (ibid.). Upon his return, he reported on German influences in the schools of the countries he had visited. The report influenced the CIAA to alter the thrust of its efforts in Latin America from parrying Nazi propaganda to aiding economic development, with education as a significant component (Reich 1996, 243). Hanna followed this trip with another in 1941–1942, from which Stanford benefited by landing a small contract to update the Latin American edition of *Who’s Who* (Lowen 1997, 57).

From these missions Hanna developed the conviction that the wider world should be included in his conception of expanding communities and that education holds a pivotal role in national and international development (Hanna 1974, 142). His growing interest in international education coincided with the growing realization among policy makers and average Americans alike that the postwar world would not be one in which the United States could isolate itself. International cooperation would be the commonplace.

Through international education, Hanna was able to wed his interest in democratic education to his activities for Stanford’s benefit. He took steps to position Stanford as a leader in international education studies. Even before the war ended, Hanna planned a conference at Stanford that would bring together top figures from American universities, corporations, foundations, and government to discuss programs of training, research, and service for the Pacific, Asia, and Latin American regions (Hanna 1943). The conference never took place due to lack of funds, but Hanna was undeterred.

In May of 1945, Hanna proposed the formation of a Stanford Pacific Institute. Its fivefold purpose would include “teaching and training personnel for duties in Far Eastern countries; [research to make] relations with the Orient more effective and productive; collection of materials on the Far East; dissemination of information; and promotion of international cultural relations” (Hanna 1945). Part of the value of such an institute, Hanna wrote, would be “an effective impact of American educational ideals and methods with

their emphasis on democracy and equality of opportunity.” He felt that those ideals “can prove one of the great moulding forces in the future of the Pacific” (ibid.). The effect of such an institute would be that Hanna’s ideas on education for democratic citizenship could be spread globally, as indeed they were in later years through his work with national and international agencies.

Hanna’s work in international education gradually came to dominate his professional efforts. In the immediate postwar period, he traveled to Germany as an educational consultant to the Office of Military Government–U.S. (OMGUS) (Tent 1982, 262). He also spent time in Panama as a consultant to the U.S. Army in the Canal Zone (Newman 1961, 429). These efforts expanded into a series of contracts involving Stanford, the United States Government, and the Republic of the Philippines. Under the aegis of the Agency for International Development, Hanna administered multimillion-dollar contracts spanning the years 1951 through 1966 (Hanna 1982a). Stanford resources were devoted to helping the Philippine government rebuild the University of the Philippines’ Colleges of Engineering, Business Administration, Education, and other institutions. Hanna made frequent trips to the Philippines and other regions of east Asia during this period, often staying for weeks or months. The overhead payments alone from these contracts amounted to more than two million dollars for Stanford (ibid.).

Hanna expanded his work in international education beyond southeast Asia with the development of the Stanford International Development Education Center (SIDECE). This institution was supported with grants from the U.S. Office of Education and private foundations. Its purpose was to study the “complex relationship between education and economic development and social and political change” (SIDECE 1967) Students came to SIDECE from around the world, sometimes with generous grants from their home governments (Foster 1998b). They often returned home to high positions in government (Foley 1997). Over time, these students formed

a worldwide network of alumni loyal to both Stanford and Hanna. He was able to enlist their help in fund-raising efforts, arranging introductions with officials from their home governments, and establishing other important contacts overseas. These contacts and Hanna's growing international reputation led to consultations in Africa, Europe, and elsewhere.

SIDEC was not Hanna's only vehicle for bringing international education and increased funding to Stanford. In 1944 he was appointed to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation Advisory Committee on Education, and he served in that capacity for more than three decades. During that time, the foundation was involved in numerous international education projects centered at Stanford.

By 1955, Hanna was fully integrated into the network of international education leaders. In that year he was offered the directorship of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) Department of Education (Adiseshiah 1955). Hanna was chosen for several reasons. First, his network of friends and colleagues would enable him to enlist American scholars to support the work of UNESCO. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah, UNESCO's assistant director-general, wrote that American scholarship "should now be associated more closely with UNESCO's programme" (*ibid.*). Hanna was highly interested in the position. As was his practice with major career decisions, he sought the counsel of many friends and colleagues. Ultimately, he refused the post. The reasons he gave at the time included his ongoing administrative responsibilities on a number of overseas contracts and his publishing commitments at home (Hanna 1955). In addition, accepting the post would have required that the Hannas move to Paris and away from their lovely home. They looked forward to the last of their children leaving home and a fresh round of remodeling to plan and manage.

## PHILANTHROPY

Paul Hanna's reputation as an educational leader at home and abroad rendered his fund-raising efforts on behalf of Stanford University more fruitful. Soon after their arrival on the Stanford campus, the Hannas joined the Stanford Associates organization in its fund-raising efforts. They were asked to cultivate two wealthy sisters, Margaret Jacks and Mary Jacks Thomas, both Stanford alumnae. The Hannas escorted them to numerous Stanford events, lectures, dedications, dramatic and musical performances, and commencements. An especially close friendship developed between the Hannas and Margaret Jacks. She visited the Hanna home on birthdays and holidays, and they were frequent guests at her homes in Palo Alto and Monterey. She and Jean Hanna took an extended trip together to visit Jacks' mother's birthplace in Oaxaca, Mexico (Hanna 1982a).

In 1957 the Jacks sisters drew funds from the estate of their sister, Lee L. Jacks, to endow two professorships in the School of Education at Stanford. Professor W. H. Cowley was the first David Jacks Professor of Higher Education, an endowed appointment named for their father, and Paul Hanna became the first professor to hold the Lee L. Jacks Chair of Child Education. Margaret Jacks later gave additional funds to enlarge both endowments (*ibid.*).

When Margaret Jacks died in 1958, she willed her \$10 million estate to the university. At the time, it was the largest gift to the school since the original Stanford family endowment. Some of the bequest was used to rebuild the old physiology building, now Margaret Jacks Hall, and some of the funds endowed four more Jacks chairs in the School of Education (*ibid.*).

In 1943, the Stanford Associates asked the Hannas to approach Mrs. Myrna B. Martindale Freeman about establishing an appropriate memorial to her late husband, Dr. John Howard Martindale.

In visits to each other in their homes, they discussed archiving Dr. Martindale's papers and other ways of to memorialize him. In 1944, with input from the Department of Biology, Mrs. Freeman donated nearly \$400,000 to establish the Myrna B. Freeman Scholarship Fund and the Dr. John H. Martindale and Myrna B. Freeman Institute of Biology (*ibid.*).

The general secretary of Stanford University approached the Hannas in 1967 with the need to renovate the organ and organ loft in the Memorial Church (*ibid.*). The Hannas were music lovers, and they especially liked organ music. They agreed to host a series of musical evenings at the Hanna-Honeycomb House for prospective donors (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 42). After each event, the Hannas personally contacted any guests that showed an interest in the organ project. Evelyn Almack Turrentine eventually donated \$500,000 to the project (Hanna 1982a).

Late in his life, Hanna helped create the Associates of the Stanford University Libraries and he served as the group's first chairman. By inviting members to upgrade their membership classifications, Hanna helped raise more than \$50,000 to support the libraries (*ibid.*).

The gifts to Stanford that gave the Hannas their greatest pleasure, however, were those that arose from their personal philanthropy. Paul Hanna recalled fondly the dedication, soon after his arrival at Stanford, of the Cubberley School of Education Building (Hanna 1976). Ellwood P. Cubberley had retired as Dean of the School of Education in 1933. During his long career, he had published a number of professional books that enjoyed solid financial success. He invested the royalties shrewdly and was able to donate sufficient funds for Stanford to build the new education building and to create a library fund, as well (Henderson 1952). Hanna took this act as his model.

Hanna's own publishing activity paid handsomely, but the business endeavors that enabled him to provide funds for Stanford and

other benevolences were his real estate partnerships. In 1954, the Hannas and others purchased a tract of redwood timberland (John Hanna 1998). Paul and Jean had been interested in conservation at least since the days of Paul Hanna's prewar service as national director of the U.S. Council for Conservation Education. They had considered purchasing their own tract of forested land for some time, not simply for their own recreation, but also for conservation-oriented tree farming. The idea had first been proposed to Hanna at a Kiwanis Club breakfast by Ben S. Allen, a former Hoover administration official who was inaugurating a conservation education program in California. One evening, a dinner guest told the Hannas about a 1440-acre parcel of redwood growth for sale in the Santa Cruz mountains (Hanna 1957d). The Hannas approached their neighbors and education colleagues, I. James Quillen and William Odell, about forming a partnership to purchase and manage the land. Subsequently, the Hannas, Odells, and Quillens bought the property together, and Paul Hanna became the managing partner (John Hanna 1998).

After spending nearly every free weekend for two years camping on the site and trying to develop it themselves, the Hannas decided the job required professional management. They hired California-Pacific Forest Consultants to advise them. Under professional supervision, the forest land eventually became not just profitable, but also a model of managed timber harvesting. Additional tracts were purchased over the years by various combinations of the partnership. By 1971, their Gazos Creek Tree Farm consisted of 2464 acres of timberland in San Mateo County. Lumbering in redwood country had been a long-standing controversial issue in California, but Hanna received awards for ecologically sound practices, and San Mateo County used the Gazos Creek Tree Farm as a model for responsible timber management (*ibid.*).

The land was put to many uses. Cal-Pacific marketed its timber as logs, shakes, stakes, firewood, Christmas trees, and other prod-

ucts (Hanna 1957d). In 1966, Charles Taylor, Stanford's athletic director, established a summer camp on the property for children ages 9 to 16. Hundreds of children visited Chuck Taylor's Mountain Camp each summer and engaged in all of the typical camp sports and activities (*ibid.*). An additional tract known as the Blue Canyon Property was acquired in the Sierra Nevada Mountains to serve as a cut-your-own Christmas tree farm. Unfortunately, heavy snows forced its closure several years in a row. By the time more temperate winters returned, the stands had grown too big for Christmas trees and had to be sold as timber.

Paul Hanna began shopping for a buyer for the tree farms in the 1970s. His approach to pricing was unique. Instead of calculating the value of the land and timber and setting the price on that basis, Hanna calculated the value of gifts he wanted to bestow from sale proceeds and established his price from that number. He planned to endow chairs at both Hamline University and Stanford, as well as provide other gifts. The price he established was nearly twice the land's worth, but George Pope, a member of a family with timber interests in the Cascade Mountains of the Pacific Northwest, bought the property with cash. Pope lost the property, and it changed hands several times until it was acquired by the *Semper-virens* Fund for development as a park (*ibid.*).

The land sale netted the Hannas ample funds to donate generously to chosen beneficiaries. In 1975 they created an endowed chair of philosophy at Hamline University, their alma mater, and gave an equal amount to Hamline's general fund (Hamline University 1975,1). The gifts honored Professor Gregory D. Walcott, who had been "the most significant intellectual influence in shaping their life styles and careers" (*ibid.*). The Hannas originally planned a similar gift to Stanford's School of Education, but by the time of the land sale, they thought that they had not been treated fairly by the school and the Stanford University administration.

## CONFLICTS WITH STANFORD

The Hannas' conflict with the university administration centered around use of the Hanna-Honeycomb House after the Hannas donated it to Stanford in the 1970s. In order to understand the depth of bitterness generated by the dispute, the Hannas' attachment to their home must first be understood.

Since their early courtship, the Hannas had shared a desire to build their own home. Both grew up in parsonages, their families never able to make significant alterations to suit their lifestyles (Hanna and Hanna 1963, 57). However, moving every few years afforded them the opportunity to experience living in a variety of homes with both good and bad characteristics. Throughout the first few years of their marriage, the Hannas collected architectural ideas. Then, in 1930, they came across newspaper reports of Frank Lloyd Wright's Kahn Lectures at Princeton University. Intrigued, they secured a copy of Wright's *Modern Architecture* (1931) and read it again and again. Wright's ideas resonated with the Hannas, and they decided that "there could be no other architect for us" (Hanna n.d., 1). Indeed, Wright's declaration that "I don't build a house without predicting the end of the present social order" resonated with the mood of Hanna and his colleagues at Columbia in those years. The Hannas were so taken with Wright's articulation of principles that they wrote him what amounted to a fan letter (Hanna and Hanna 1963, 58). To their delight, Wright replied with an invitation to visit him at Taliesin, in Spring Green, Wisconsin. Whether or not Wright expected his offer to be accepted, the Hannas included a trip to Taliesin in their regular visit to their families in Minnesota the following summer. Wright received the Hannas warmly and the young couple spent the day touring Taliesin, observing the interaction between Wright and his apprentices and listening to Wright describe his philosophy of architecture. As they departed, the Hannas somewhat impetuously asked Wright if he

would design their house someday. He answered affirmatively (ibid.).

The Hannas were fond of telling people that upon receiving the offer of employment from Stanford, “We were overjoyed. We made two phone calls: one to Stanford accepting the appointment, and one to Mr. [Frank Lloyd] Wright asking him to think about a house for us in California” (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 17). Few events in Paul Hanna’s life better illustrate his entrepreneurial abilities and determination than the design and construction of their home on the Stanford campus. Unfortunately, the Hanna-Honeycomb House became a cause of conflict between the Hannas and Stanford University.

The idea of a junior faculty member contracting with the world’s most famous architect to design his private residence was audacious. The plan was alternately referred to as “Hanna’s Folly” (Hanna n.d., 4) and “A dream castle come true” (*Stanford Daily* 14 February 1938). The Hannas’ first challenge would be finding an appropriate site for the house. They hoped to lease a site from Stanford University in a previously undeveloped tract known as Frenchman Hills, which the *Stanford Daily* called “Stanford’s most romantic spot” (ibid.). Wright enthusiastically approved the site, but Almon Roth, the university’s comptroller, informed Hanna that Stanford planned to keep that tract as open space for all time.

Hanna employed his formidable political skills to address the problem. Grayson Kefauver also wanted to lease a building site in Frenchman Hills, so he and Hanna devised a strategy to weaken the administration’s resistance. Each week, one of the men met with Roth and the other met with President Ray Lyman Wilbur. Each made a particular case for leasing them the sites. The next week they switched, and each met with the other official. After several weeks of these exchanges, Wilbur decided to grant the requests of the two men. Hanna attributed this change of policy to his and Kefauver’s persistence, but the prospect of a Frank Lloyd Wright

house being built on university land must have helped sway President Wilbur.

The building site was leased for twenty years, renewable, at \$100 per year. In a reflection of Hanna's trusting nature the deal was sealed with a handshake, as was the Hannas' agreement with Wright, and work was begun before a formal lease was executed (Hanna 1976, 2). In later years, Hanna's son John, an attorney, chided his father for this naive style of doing business (John Hanna 1998).

Wright's design, which became the basis of the final structure, arrived in California in January of 1936. The Hannas were "speechless, curious, electrified—in that order" (Hanna n.d., 3). The house was to be built in hexagonal modules, like a redwood-and-glass honeycomb laid flat. Wright explained, "I am convinced that a cross section of a honeycomb has more fertility and flexibility where human movement is concerned, than the square. The obtuse angle (120 degrees) is more suited to 'to-and-fro' than the right angle" (Wright 1938). The Hanna design was Wright's first use of the obtuse angle as an organizing principle for a residence (Hanna n.d., 3). The house was designed to be built in stages as the Hanna family grew and their needs changed. They added to it in phases in the ensuing decades.

Much of the correspondence between the Hannas and Wright during the design and construction of their home revealed anxious, impatient clients and a seasoned master who often had to allay their fears as he educated them. For example, in a letter dated October 15, 1936, the Hannas self-consciously wrote, "Children never had as difficult a time waiting for Santa Claus as we are" (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 29). Looking back, the Hannas characterized their language as "sharp, even abrasive," and their attitude as one of "intolerance and arrogance" (ibid., 50). They frequently pressured Wright to come and inspect the work personally. A letter dated August 15, 1937, stated, "WE and YOU will be better pleased if you

come out *now* [emphases theirs]" (ibid., 68). Wright was in ill health during much of this time, and the Hannas' constant, sometimes peevish, entreaties must have grown tiresome.

Sources of the Hannas' anxiety varied. Much of it arose from the contracting arrangement they struck with Wright. The innovative design contained features never before seen on the West Coast. Because the Hannas knew as much about the philosophy behind the design as anyone, they chose to act as their own general contractors. In one of Paul Hanna's few admissions of failure, shortly after the start of construction in January, 1937, he hired an assistant, Harold P. Turner, to help oversee the work (ibid., 42). Apparently, even the supremely energetic Hanna could not adequately balance the roles of teacher, author, consultant, husband, father, and construction foreman.

Even with the addition of Turner, the project still encountered numerous setbacks and unanticipated problems. The structure was built primarily of wood, but the local carpenters were so accustomed to building with right angles that they found the obtuse angles in the plan confusing. The few who managed to adapt to the new design—and to Wright's and Hanna's exacting standards—proved themselves to be true master craftsmen. Still, mistakes were made because of the long-distance relationship between designer and builders, and some were quite costly (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 41).

Another source of anxiety for the Hannas was opposition and nay-saying from the local community. Some objected to their building on that pristine corner of Stanford land. Others complained about the unorthodox structure itself. President Wilbur later related to the Hannas that two senior faculty members visited him one day. They told Wilbur that he had a "madman" on his faculty. When pressed, they explained, "Dr. Wilbur, he's a new young faculty member building an atrocious house over on Frenchman's Hill; only a madman would consider putting up such an outrageous structure.

It's our recommendation that you get rid of him before tenure comes up" (ibid., 64). To his credit, Wilbur defended the Hannas. Wright attempted to reassure his clients in the face of this criticism by underscoring the long-term importance of what they were doing. On January 27, 1937, he wrote,

It is no matter of taste but, if it were, good taste is all on the side of more human proportions for articles of human use. Habit is a hard horse to beat, as you know. But you and Jean are yet young, I believe. And the children will grow up with the new sense of things. They will start a little ahead of their parents, therefore, who grew up in the old order and have to turn now and look at it in the face for what it is worth. This is the new reality, Paul. Your house is a factor in it of no mean import if you stand up to it (ibid., 51).

More serious concerns were raised by Comptroller Roth. Among his duties was to approve all building on Stanford lands. He favored the predominant Spanish ranch-style architecture of the campus buildings, and the Hannas feared that he would find the Wright design too different and would not approve the final plans. For their important meeting with Roth, the Hannas prevailed on Wright to come to Stanford. After a meditative stroll among the fine old buildings of the inner campus, Hanna and Wright arrived at the comptroller's office.

Mr. Wright, in his most charming manner, said, "Mr. Roth, I cannot tell you what an inspiration it is to stroll through the beautiful inner and outer quads of this campus. No university architecture can compare with what Richardson's associates gave you. It is truly a magnificent architecture." He paused, then continued, "But, Mr. Roth, I would like to take the person who has been responsible in the last decades and hang him from your tallest tree."

Paul watched in horror as Mr. Roth changed his expression from pleasure to anger. Paul, as shocked as Mr. Roth, decided that approval of the plans had suddenly died.

But Paul glanced at Mr. Wright and was confused to note that his eyes were sparkling with humor. Then Mr. Wright said, "Mr. Roth, I will tell you what to do. You give me the commission, and I will restore this campus just as Richardson would have approved."

With this Mr. Wright burst into a joyful laugh. Mr. Roth saw the humor of Mr. Wright's approach and joined in the laughter. He thrust his hand toward Mr. Wright and said, "Mr. Wright, if Hanna wants you to design his house, I will approve your plans without even looking at them."

Thus began a friendship between our architect and Stanford's comptroller, and thus was set in motion our Honeycomb project (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 39).

In the fall of 1936, the Hannas spent a Sunday afternoon on their hillside lot, staking out the floor plan. They encountered Bailey Willis, a renowned geologist on the Stanford faculty, who stopped while on his Sunday walk. He asked them what they were doing. The Hannas proudly showed him their plans, to which he responded, "You can't build here; a minor earthquake fault runs right through this hill" (Hanna n.d., 4). When given this news by the worried Hannas, Wright cabled them simply, "I built the Imperial Hotel" (*ibid.*). Wright had indeed designed the Imperial Hotel in earthquake-prone Tokyo. It withstood all challenges but Allied bombing in World War II. Dr. Willis followed up his warning with a helpful letter of advice on how to build an earthquake-resistant house. His concerns proved to be justified in October of 1989, when the Hanna House suffered extensive damage in a major earthquake. After extensive renovation the house is once again open to the public as a museum and conference center.

The modular design of the house alleviated some of the immediate financial burden, but still the project grew immensely expensive. In their initial planning discussions, the Hannas had told Wright that \$15,000 was the upper limit of what they could afford, but they quickly realized that figure was only the beginning of their

costs. In a letter dated January 2, 1937, Wright attempted to educate them on the reality of building from a new concept on a sloping lot. He wrote, "This can't come down from heaven as things are . . . . So I think it is only just to say at this juncture that you should brace yourself against a minimum of \$23,500 and a maximum of \$25,000" (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 41). Cost overruns were frequent, and Paul Hanna received advances on future textbook royalties from Scott-Foresman and Company in order to finance them (John Hanna 1998).

Final expenditures topped \$37,000, and Wright had to reassure his nervous clients. He wrote, "The only consolation I can offer you for being in debt, like me, is that it is a spur to action and that unlike most home owners you have something worthwhile to show for the 'indebtedness'" (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 70). Wright could not have been more correct. Their home mortgage weighed heavily on Paul Hanna, and it certainly spurred his publishing activities. It is likely that it turned him from strictly academic writing toward more remunerative textbook production. Over the years, expensive additions and renovations to the house kept him producing textbooks. The Hannas finally paid off the last note on their house and its many renovations in 1964, twenty-seven years after it was constructed (Hanna n.d., 5).

For all the concern their Wright house caused them, the Hannas deeply loved their home. It became a focal point in the young family's life. One of the original design principles established with Wright in 1935 was to create the structure to provide as seamless a transition as possible between indoors and outdoors. The result was expanses of glass and redwood facing rolling hills. Numerous doorways led to wide patio terraces bringing the outdoors inside the home.

The Hanna children were especially fond of these features (John Hanna 1998). Their bedrooms were small, but the furniture was efficiently built in and each room had direct access to the outside.

The overall effect was one of wide-open space. The children roamed the oak-covered hills and helped their parents cultivate a wide variety of fruits and berries on their nearly two-acre tract. They even kept goats for a time to provide milk for Robert, the youngest son, who was allergic to cow's milk. Objections from nearby neighbors ended this experiment in family farming (*ibid.*).

The Hannas were exceedingly proud of their home, and they realized the responsibility of owning such a unique architectural masterpiece. They hosted Stanford architecture classes and seminars on an annual basis and often opened their home to visitors from other colleges and universities (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 92–93). Individuals often arrived on their doorstep to request a tour, and the Hannas usually accommodated them. The Hannas' oldest son, John, recalled waking one day to find strangers peering through his bedroom window (John Hanna 1998). As this sort of inconsiderate intrusion increasingly interfered with the family's daily activities, the Hannas developed a system for showing the home by appointment only.

The house also was the site of various university events. Paul Hanna's students remember frequent gatherings there, including Sunday morning brunches for his graduate students at which he cooked flapjacks (Douglass 1998b). Paul and Jean Hanna devised ways to set up buffet tables on the wide terraces to accommodate more than a hundred people for outdoor barbecues (Hanna and Hanna 1963, 93). The Hanna-Honeycomb House also became the natural place to lodge visiting dignitaries and to host faculty receptions. Many of the later renovations to the house were performed to accommodate these activities, and Stanford University financed some of them (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 113).

In 1960, the American Institute of Architects named the Hanna-Honeycomb House one of the seventeen Wright structures that should be preserved as "an example of his architectural contribution to American culture" (Hanna n.d., 12). The house is also included

in the Register of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (*ibid.*). The Hannas kept careful records of their fifty-eight-year association with Wright, and those priceless documents are housed today at Stanford. They also donated the house itself and many of its valuable furnishings to Stanford University in a series of gifts culminating in 1975. Sadly, controversy developed over the proper use of the home.

The story of the Hanna-Honeycomb House is important in the overall story of Hanna's career at Stanford for a number of reasons. First, it illustrates his dual qualities of supreme self-confidence and boundless energy. The project was much better suited to someone at the height of his career than to a thirty-five year-old associate professor still rising in the academic world. It made a negative impression on some of his senior colleagues at Stanford. Nevertheless, either because he did not care about that aspect of faculty relations or because he ignored it, Hanna chose to add supervision of the home's construction to his already busy schedule of teaching and writing.

The house also required the utmost of Hanna's political and entrepreneurial skills. He searched out materials for its construction, and recruited and trained craftsmen in innovative construction techniques to execute Wright's design (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 46). At the same time, he had to negotiate with Stanford administrators and assure them that his home would complement the older architecture on campus. Despite setbacks, he carried those tasks through to completion.

Perhaps most significant in gaining an understanding of Paul Hanna, the story of his devotion to his home illustrates his sense of priorities. Hanna risked collegial relationships and academic prestige so that he and his family could live surrounded by his own sense of beauty. He sacrificed other potential projects to produce the books that paid for the house, in large part because he valued quality of life over career. Quality of life formed the basis for Hanna's

decision to stay at Stanford rather than returning to the more prestigious Teachers College.

As early as 1959, the Hannas began to consider options for the final disposition of the structure (Hanna and Hanna 1963, 105). It stood on leased Stanford land, and university rules prohibited anyone but members of the Stanford community from residing on university property. This provision made selling the house difficult and deeding it to family members impossible (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 121). The Hannas decided to give the house to the university for use as a museum or conference center, but Stanford rejected those uses as disruptive to the existing neighborhood and too hard on the house itself (*ibid.*). The issue remained dormant until 1966, when the Hannas conceived the establishment of an endowment to bring a visiting scholar to campus, donating the house for use as his residence while there. Their idea was this: “Annually, Stanford could invite a man or woman of world distinction to be its guest in residence. Such scholar, leader, or creative genius would live on campus, sharing ideas and inspiration with faculty and students, offering seminars or lectures as desired and appropriate” (*ibid.*, 125).

The Stanford administration approved the idea, although it insisted that the visitor be an academic person. The house was deeded to Stanford in portions: twenty percent was given in 1966, another twenty-five percent in 1969, and an additional twenty-five percent in 1971 (*ibid.*). After their 1971 gift, the Hannas were informed that although they could state their wishes as to how their house would be used by Stanford, their gift was unconditional. Their concern was that the house ultimately could be put to a use radically different from what they had envisioned. Upon relating this concern to the Stanford administration, they received assurances that the house would indeed be used as part of the visiting scholar program (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 126).

In 1973, Stanford President Richard Lyman announced the

appointment of a board of governors to supervise maintenance of the home, manage the project's endowment, and suggest candidates for visiting scholar (ibid.). The Hannas served as nonvoting members. The board decided that two separate endowments were necessary, one to preserve and maintain the house, and another to fund the visiting scholar program. Stanford University embarked on a major capital fund drive in 1973, but no money was raised for either the house or the visiting scholar endowment. The Hannas and other members of the board questioned the university's commitment to the program and volunteered to raise the funds themselves (ibid., 128).

The Hannas planned to raise \$500,000 to support the structure's maintenance and then raise an additional \$1 million to endow the visiting professorship. To this end, they flew to Tokyo in 1975 to meet with old friends and admirers of Frank Lloyd Wright, and with officers of the Nissan Motor Corporation. Those officials later visited the Hannas at Stanford, but no commitment of funds was forthcoming.

In October of 1975, the Hannas deeded their last interest in the house to the university and moved to faculty apartments on campus. That same month, Stanford announced that since no money had been raised for the visiting scholar program, the Hanna House temporarily would be used to house the university provost. The Hannas thought that this was a sensible arrangement until funds could be raised (ibid., 132). Unfortunately, alterations were made to the house without consulting the board of governors. In fact, the board was never convened after 1974.

In 1976, Nissan Motors announced that it would fully fund the \$500,000 endowment for the house, but that it could not help with the endowment for the visiting scholar. The Hannas and others spent the following year negotiating with other Japanese auto makers to help with the project. The responses were encouraging until a competing fund drive to establish a chair in Japanese studies at

Stanford approached the same companies. That appeal stalled the Hannas' efforts (Hanna and Hanna 1981, 136).

In the years that followed, the Hanna House was used continually as a residence for Stanford officials, first the new athletic director and then another provost. The Hannas were heartsick at the turn of events, and Paul Hanna spent sleepless nights in his despair (A. Hanna 1999). He could see his dream for its ultimate use slipping away. John Hanna suggested that he fight Stanford in court, but he refused, claiming that it would be too disruptive to the community of which he had been so long a part (John Hanna 1998).

The conflicts with Stanford over the use of their house caused the Hannas to reconsider their plans to endow a chair at the university, and other conflicts played a part, as well. By the time Paul Hanna retired in 1967, Stanford had become one of the leading schools of education in the nation. Hanna knew that he had played a large part in building that reputation during his thirty years of service. Still an active scholar at home and abroad, he requested that the School of Education provide him with an office and with clerical help to continue his work (Douglass 1998b). The university had no policy to provide offices to retirees, and the dean refused his request. Hanna was stung by what he felt was the ingratitude of the institution. After all, Hanna's fund-raising and contract administration on behalf of the university had brought in more than \$16 million. The Hannas own gifts added nearly another \$2 million (Hanna 1982a).

Of more serious concern than office space was the administration's choice for his successor at SIDEK. After his retirement, a succession of social scientists became directors of SIDEK, and the emphasis of the center slowly shifted from education to social science research (Foster 1998b). Under Hanna's leadership, SIDEK admissions preferred students with some background in education, but that preference slowly faded away after his retirement. Don

Foster recalled meeting post-1967 SIDEc graduates who took pride in the fact that “they matriculated without ever having to take an education course” (ibid.). In addition to the shift in emphasis, some of the directors who followed Hanna held political views that conflicted with Hanna’s concepts of democratic education (Douglass 1998b).

Shortly after Hanna’s retirement, H. Thomas James, dean of the School of Education, requested that Hanna help prepare a grant extension request for SIDEc. James recognized the cachet Hanna’s name had in Washington, and wanted to make use of it. Hanna replied somewhat bitterly

As you have so clearly communicated by word and action, you believe your philosophy and mine with respect to the roles of SIDEc, its program focus, and its management, are somewhat at variance. I would not presume to try to interfere with your efforts to shape SIDEc’s future. For me to continue to represent SUSE [Stanford University School of Education] in the coming negotiations would only mislead the donor as to your expectations and could be a major deterrent to moving the research in the direction you desire (Hanna 1968c).

For one who had been such an influential figure at Stanford for such a long period of time, taking a back seat in important decisions—especially in decisions about a program he had founded—was humiliating. In his reply to Dean James, Hanna referred to himself in the third person as he occasionally did when coming to grips with unpleasant realities. He wrote

Over the coming years, I hope to be able to continue to assist the University in fund-raising. But one principle I am sure we all agree upon: Hanna is no longer in a policy-making position in the Stanford community. Therefore, Hanna will concentrate his efforts to help fund what his colleagues in decision-making positions wish implemented. This is the nature of the ballgame as I clearly

read the record of action of the past few months—I understand, accept, and shall try to play the game loyally according to these rules (*ibid.*).

By early 1971, SIDEAC was experiencing confusion as to its identity and mission. Frank J. Moore served as acting director for a time, in 1971, and was convinced that this confusion would “be the end of an effective and meaningful program, capable of attracting the financial support required to sustain it” (Moore 1973). Within a few years, SIDEAC’s financial instability was so acute that it jeopardized the retention of key faculty in the areas of Southeast Asian and Latin American regional studies and in economics. SIDEAC Director Hans Weiler recommended that “if no budget provisions for this component can be made, the degree programs in International Development Education be [sic] terminated” (Weiler 1973). SIDEAC eventually closed its doors. Moore termed it “a great pity, to have so promising a program fold for so patently wrong reason at so obviously the wrong time” (Moore 1973).

These factors weighed in Hanna’s decisions about how to donate his money to Stanford. Instead of creating a chair in the School of Education, he decided to give funds to create the Hanna Collection within the Hoover Institution (Gross 1998). Hanna’s goal was to create a collection of materials that could be used for important research into the relationships between education and economic, social, and political development in the twentieth century. Hoover provided him office space and secretarial help to develop the collection (A. Hanna 1999).

When the dean of the School of Education, Arthur Coladarci, learned of Hanna’s gift to the Hoover Institution, he requested a lunch meeting with Hanna. He told Hanna that he could not believe that his donation went to the Hoover instead of to the School of Education, and asked why he had redirected the money. Hanna answered that the school’s refusal of office space and staff, and its handling of SIDEAC, had made the decision for him (Gross 1998).

Clearly a man as involved and energetic as Paul Hanna would not suddenly step away from his professional life upon retirement. He continued to work on so many projects in publishing, consulting, philanthropy, and other areas that he needed an official base. The Hoover Institution offered him this home, funded through his own gifts.

#### HANNA'S LAST YEARS

The major scholarly activity of Paul Hanna's final years centered on the Hanna Collection at the Hoover Institution. From his early career in academia, Hanna had been interested in the ways in which government could use education to achieve national goals. His post-war experiences in international education only deepened his interest. With a substantial endowment, the Hannas created within the Hoover Institution the Paul and Jean Hanna Archival Collection on the Role of Education in the Twentieth Century. Paul Hanna stated their goal in a column for Stanford's *Campus Report* newsletter:

There can be no doubt that education has figured importantly in laying the groundwork for revolution and wars, in the creation and maintenance of peace, and in nation-building . . . . Yet curiously this kind of instrumental use of education has remained almost unexplored ground in the world of scholarship. An enormous amount of data exists throughout the world in private and public hands. The Hoover Institution will be the first to systematize as much of it as possible to facilitate research and publication (Hanna 1977, 2).

Hanna spent the final phase of his life working as a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution. He solicited papers from organizations and individuals to add to the collection and oversaw publications resulting from the collection's use.

Some have assumed that Hanna's affinity for the Hoover Insti-

tution reflected his own political conservatism (Tanner 1998). Over the years, he had indeed grown more conservative, “but not in the vernacular that Hoover represents . . . . He was concerned with what was best for education no matter which side it came from” (A. Hanna 1999). More likely, he recognized in the Hoover a comfortable, prestigious post from which to develop the Hanna Collection.

Hanna provided the driving force for the collection from its inception until his death. He began his work by surveying the existing holdings in the Hoover Institution Library to identify those having to do with education. From that base, he developed a list of individuals and institutions to contact about depositing records in the Hanna Collection. Many of these people were his old friends and colleagues. He estimated that the time from his initial request for an individual’s papers until their arrival at Hoover averaged six years. During that time, he maintained regular communication with potential donors, and he personally catalogued many of the donations when they arrived (*ibid.*).

The Hanna Collection grew rapidly under Hanna’s leadership. By the time of his death it included more than 750 separate archives, and it is now the largest collection of its kind in the world (Hoover Institution n.d.). Among its holdings are documents from organizations such as the American Council on Education, the American Educational Research Association, the Asia Foundation, and the Atlantic Council, and from individuals such as R. Freeman Butts, Otis Caldwell, William G. Carr, and several former U.S. commissioners of education.

The Hoover Institution has published some of the results of scholarly research in the collection as the Education and Society series of booklets. Hanna was enthusiastic about these publications. Of them he said, “We’re beginning to turn out basic books that ought to tell us nationally and internationally what we have to pay attention to and what are the differences in objectives and methodologies of systems of education that result in the acceptance of

totalitarian, repressive governments as against the democratic ones” (von Kreisler-Bomben 1984, 47). Paul Hanna’s final publication, *Assuring Quality for the Social Studies in Our Schools* (1987), was published as part of the series.

On behalf of the Hanna Collection, the Hoover Institution also has supported scholars in residence and sponsored seminars such as the national Seminar on Civic Learning for Teachers. Through these activities and others, the collection serves as a major research tool for scholars interested in the instrumental uses of education in this century.

#### THE END

Paul and Jean Hanna moved out of their Honeycomb House and into the Pierce-Mitchell townhouse development for Stanford faculty in October of 1975. Hanna had spearheaded the development, but after forty years of living in Wright’s architectural masterpiece he was not content. He complained about the shoddy workmanship of the development and insisted on renovating his unit to accommodate his and Jean’s needs. Nevertheless, the Hannas lived happily, traveling occasionally, visiting with friends and family, going to their offices at the Hoover Institution, and crossing swords with the Stanford administration—until Jean injured herself in a fall in 1985.

Both Hannas had experienced minor health problems over the years, but Jean’s last illness proved serious. She suffered a fall in the townhouse and underwent surgery to repair the damage to her knee, but she never fully recovered. She lost mobility and required more care than Paul could provide, so they moved to a retirement facility with nursing care. Her health continued to decline and she died in March, 1987.

Following Jean’s death, Paul Hanna married Aurelia T. Klipper, who had been his assistant at the Hoover Institution since 1981.

Although they worked closely together on Hanna Collection projects, Paul's proposal of marriage took her quite by surprise. After receiving the Hanna children's blessing, the two were wed on December 26, 1987. Their brief life together was filled with travel. Following a honeymoon trip to Hawaii, they journeyed to Guatemala to visit Mayan ruins there. This trip was special to Paul Hanna, because Guatemala was the site of the wartime trip for CIAA that had launched his career in international education. They traveled with a Stanford-sponsored educational tour, and Aurelia Hanna recalled that one day her husband presented her with a stack of books to read in preparation for the trip. Paul Hanna was worried about his ability to keep up with the younger travelers, but he had no problems. On the heels of that success, the Hannas planned a trip to the South Pacific, but they never traveled together again.

One night in the early spring of 1988, Paul Hanna awoke without warning, in excruciating pain. Mrs. Hanna rushed him to the hospital, where they waited many hours for diagnosis with Paul suffering great pain. The final diagnosis was an embolism in the aorta and Hanna was taken into surgery. The surgeons corrected the problem, but the trauma of surgery was too much for his eighty-five-year-old body. Paul Hanna died on April 8, 1988.

#### CONCLUSION

Paul Hanna's years at Stanford University were years of building. Having turned his back on the East Coast educational establishment by refusing a chair at Teachers College, he threw himself into contributing to Stanford University and to the development of his own career. He enjoyed spectacular success in both efforts. He developed an unassailable national reputation through his textbook publishing and his consulting work. He employed the financial rewards of those successes to build a marvelous Frank Lloyd Wright-designed home. In that home, he and Jean built a family.

*At Stanford University*

137

Their children and grandchildren continue to contribute to their communities. Hanna's tremendous energy and entrepreneurial skill helped the university through rocky economic times during the war years. His continued work on behalf of the university increased not only its wealth, but its reputation as a major research center in education and other fields. His expertise as a teacher produced generations of leaders in education, both in the United States and abroad, and helped spread the reputation of Stanford's School of Education worldwide. His interest in preparing children for their roles as citizens in democracies expanded beyond American schools through his international development education efforts, and it resulted in the creation of SIDEC, a major center for such work. His devotion to the Hanna Collection archives in his retirement years built a major research tool for scholars interested in the relationships of education to national development in the twentieth century. Perhaps his most enduring legacy, though, are the generations of children whose worldviews he helped shape through his publications.