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THE PROGRESSIVE ERA AND ITS ENDURING IMPACT ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Efficient, Rational Solutions to Moral and Social Problems

Many historians of higher education, regardless of the topic of their inquiry, have indicated that the late 1800s and early 1900s form a key period in a number of changes in U.S. higher education. There is little reason, if any, to argue against those conclusions. The 1800s set several factors in motion, such as the increasingly substantial enrollment of white women and African Americans and the development of institutions enrolling those students as well as shifts in the curriculum, which have had a lasting influence on colleges and universities. It was also when research universities began to develop, as discussed in Chapter 7. The central part of this chapter's investigation, however, is a revision of other examinations of higher education in the period from the late 1800s through the mid-1900s through consideration of the role of higher education in presenting efficient and rational solutions to national problems to create a better future. In a word, Progressivism. (Although many contemporary scholars seem to prefer the lower case in reference to Progressivism, the upper case marks the movement as real, powerful, and enduring as well as distinct from generalized notions of progress and progressive behavior—terms used often enough in the early 2000s and, hence, all too prone to presentism.) And there are curious but not incidental links to the previous chapter in that Progressivism has its roots in the Midwest; in addition, as will be shown in this chapter, even during wartime Progressivism had an impact on higher education, thereby anticipating in part the chapter on war.
While historians of education have investigated a variety of events and institutions related to Progressivism and the school as well as higher education in the Progressive era, there is no work on the lasting effects of Progressivism in higher education other than discussion of the Wisconsin Idea and pedagogical experiments at some institutions of higher education. This chapter offers conceptions of the relationship of higher education to state and national interests that began in the late 1800s and early 1900s and left a heritage of those conceptions to the present, presenting the argument that leaders in higher education increasingly turned to varying forms of Progressivism to address problems in higher education as well as societal problems that higher education could presumably solve, furthering the reach of the socioeconomic contract. Hence, this chapter begins the break with a simple chronology because some of the discussion reaches into the 1960s, and the break continues with the next three chapters. After an overview of Progressivism, this chapter offers five investigations of how fundamental characteristics of Progressivism have long affected, and continue to affect, higher education. In the first case, I highlight the work of women academics, both in terms of the scholarship that they pursued, particularly in the 1920s and 1930s, as well as a broader context of what one historian has called, in centering gender in the study of the history of higher education, the politics of knowledge. Second, the work of Abraham Flexner in the substantial reform of medical education in the early 1900s in the United States highlights rational approaches to solving societal problems. In the third example, the discussion of the development of junior colleges exemplifies the strong drive to establish a middle class and create educated workers, particularly for important local and state employment. In the fourth case, employing a contemporary of Flexner who shared some similar principles as well as disparate ones, the economist Thorstein Veblen, offers the argument that the slow development of faculty unionization in the early 1900s exemplified the anti-corporate sentiments of Progressivism. (The rapid development of unionized faculty members at other than research universities in the 1960s and 1970s is one of several examples of the important differences in organizational goals in U.S. higher education.) In the final example, the use of apparently scientific approaches to solve social problems, served as guiding principles in the development of the 1944 G.I. Bill; that more lengthy discussion is based on primary and secondary sources and, thus, both illustrates how key elements of Progressivism have endured for colleges and universities and provides readers new to historical inquiry with another understanding of how a historian employs primary and secondary sources to form historical arguments. The drive to establish a rational and planned future through such government actions as the G.I. Bill
(the 1944 Serviceman's Readjustment Act), in the midst of the horror of global warfare, had roots in Progressivism. Comments by a variety of participants in the development of the G.I Bill indeed reflect "the cultivation of a public philosophy," what one historian identifies as "the principal ingredient of a political realignment" that occurred as a result of Progressivism.¹

PROGRESSIVISM

Historians, including historians of education, have identified many problems in attempts to define Progressivism. As Lynn Gordon remarks, "Historians disagree about the nature and meaning of progressivism." She goes on to note the focus on scientific solutions to natural and social problems as a key component of Progressivism on college and university campuses, a focus with important consequences for women in college seeking places in higher education and in the society at large.² In one sense, then, it might appear as if Progressivism is simply a historical convenience, a means of marking, albeit indefinitely, a critical time in this nation's history with substantial meaning, yet admittedly rife with ambiguity. Nevertheless, Progressivism is a real historical force, perhaps with its roots in the Enlightenment. Enlightenment philosophers argued that humans were capable of reason, a capacity long ignored in the presumptions about an aristocracy and rule by kings and queens based on the Christian God's precepts. Hence, with the use of reason, humans could achieve reform, progress, and happiness, in other words, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (a rather long content endnote follows).³ Despite the ambiguities surrounding Progressivism, there is, indeed, a defensible definition of the movement based on rational approaches to societal issues.

By the end of the 1800s the Progressive movement was underway, offering a blend of reform and restraint by emphasizing the importance of providing social and economic opportunity while often assigning societal roles on the basis of gender, race and ethnicity, and class. The rise of testing in the early 1900s was one such means of assigning societal roles—an effort largely based on attempts in the Armed Services during World War I (examined in the next chapter) to determine the seemingly appropriate fit of individuals to various tasks and responsibilities. One strand of Progressivism (it was not, much like other political movements, uniform in its principles except in very broad form) advocated efficiency, and testing appeared to be socially efficient. That claim too easily overlooked differences in background, such as level of schooling, quality of schooling, and a person's first language, which could affect test results, or in other words, testing could be willfully used to marginalize or
exclude groups. That strand of Progressivism intersected with the powerful efficiency movement, symbolized by the work of then-prominent Frederick Winslow Taylor. It is instructive that Taylor’s first instruction in efficiency occurred in a mathematics classroom at Phillips Exeter Academy (a New England prep school), where the instructor used a specific instructional technique to ensure that he tested all students for their comprehension in each class meeting. Members of the elite educational institutions devised means for efficiency that would serve not only pedagogical goals but also economic, political, and social ones.

In broad form, Progressivism represented three fundamental concerns: limiting “the power of business, a commitment to ‘pure democracy,’ and the dedication to new rights as a bulwark against the uncertainties and injustices of the marketplace.” It was also a distinctly middle-class movement. Remember Richard Hofstader’s assessment of Progressives as so middle class as to be “palpably, almost pathetically respectable”; that assessment foreshadows Burton Bledstein’s argument that the middle class reformers of the middle and late nineteenth century were almost obsessed with proper social position and behavior. Achieving that respectability came in great part from education, a primary concern for the Progressives and a vehicle “through which the people could gain an understanding of civic obligation.” In Progressive terms, education served as the fountainhead for the preservation of democracy.

The goals of Progressivism, brought about by the challenges of a new era characterized by the phenomenal growth of the large corporation and resultant opposition and the remarkable influx of immigrants, needed means for implementation. Progressives did not have to look very far in their new world; the new social sciences beckoned. The growth of the social sciences in the late 1800s, especially economics, political science, psychology, and sociology, provided ample opportunity for reformers to claim a new means for improving society, a means replete with rationality. The way to control excesses—whether those of large corporations, of ill-educated classes, or of immoral enemies—was through rational assessment of the problem and efficient solution.

Thus, as a definition, Progressivism is the predominantly middle-class impulse that represents the need for political, social, economic, and even moral reform through administrative, often governmental, structures. Education was one of those structures. No single university better exemplifies the fervor, the moral code, the importance of offering a useful curriculum, and the power of scientific examination in social and political arenas than the University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin Idea. Although the Wisconsin Idea had few statewide imitators, its focus on the use of...
academic expertise to solve social problems, a key element of Progressivism, eventually permeated higher education; University of Wisconsin professors offered "a new role for trained intelligence in government" in the development of laws as well as in administration of government agencies. There were early and direct efforts to link Progressivism and higher education at the University of Wisconsin. Although University presidents advocated for the Wisconsin Idea before the development of the Progressive political movement, the university in the service of the state as a rational, social instrument, was in fact lauded by perhaps the most visible of all Progressives, Wisconsin's U.S. Senator Bob LaFollette. President Charles Van Hise's inaugural address at the University of Wisconsin in 1903 is, according to Lawrence Cremin, "the classic Progressivist statement of the role of higher education in a democracy. Its theme from beginning to end is service to the state." There must be, of course, a note of caution about such an assessment; as Frederick Rudolph observes, service to the state is the only consistent theme in U.S. higher education from the colonial colleges to the 1950s. What distinguishes the Wisconsin Idea is the degree of cooperation between the university and the state, the extension education program (first in agriculture, later in engineering), and perhaps most important for the Progressive movement, the social sciences. Some of the University of Wisconsin social science professors were tireless advocates of the University's capacity to initiate social change, based on rational approaches to social, political, economic, and moral problems (a phrase I at times shorten to societal problems in the remainder of the chapter), and remarkably, at one point nearly all of the social science professors at Wisconsin were also working with state agencies.

Service to the state, however, had its obstacles because at times faculty members in the social sciences challenged the norms of the business community (despite a common conception of the conflicts between the social scientists and external constituencies, it was business people more than politicians who proved to be the antagonists in academic freedom situations). One early case of academic freedom occurred at the University of Wisconsin. Economist Richard T. Ely opposed the laissez-faire claims of businessmen (again, the gender use is intended), favoring government controls to provide a defense for the public at large. A committee of Wisconsin's governing board reviewed his work, and although it was a committee of "conservative lawyers and businessmen" (who were also well represented on the board), the committee conclusion was in fact a clear defense of his right to conduct research and teach, offering a lengthy statement on the necessity of such freedom; two sentences are poignant, and perhaps sardonic, in refuting the idea that universities
ought to dismiss or criticize professors with contrary views: "Such a course would be equivalent to saying that no professor should teach anything which is not accepted by everybody as true. This would cut our curriculum down to very small proportions." In the matter of social science research and instruction, the Progressive movement in higher education had one stalwart defender.

There were some institutional experiments of Progressivism in the 1920s and 1930s, most notably at Sarah Lawrence, Bennington, Black Mountain, Bard, and Rollins Colleges as well as the General College of the University of Minnesota, although in contrast to the University of Wisconsin, these were by and large pedagogical experiments. While one historian of education argues that the General College experiments found life in post-World War II community colleges (linked in this chapter to Progressivism), these institutional approaches differed from the Wisconsin Idea. Most notably, the institutional experiments of the 1920s and 1930s addressed the importance of the liberal arts as a means for student growth rather than the application of scientific expertise to social and economic problems. And, the experiments occurred only at a handful of institutions; the broad Progressive movement seemingly ended at Wisconsin's borders.

White women's colleges, however, furthered the practice of Progressivism in solution of social problems. The first generation of women faculty members began in the 1870s. Geraldine Clifford edited a book, *Lone Voyagers*, which speaks to the experience of seven white and African American women who were among the first women on different campuses in the late 1800s and early 1900s, women who succeeded despite isolation. And then there was the second generation, as increasing numbers of women entered colleges and universities, as students and as faculty members (most often in the case of the latter, at women's colleges). Women entering academe faced multiple challenges at the same time that they were creating opportunities. In a very important sense, their primary institutional means of creating a scholarly identity occurred at women's colleges, specifically the white women's colleges. All-male and coeducational colleges for many years had no interest in appointing women as full-time faculty members, although a number of universities were most assuredly interested in having women in their doctoral programs, a curious turn on the meaning of Jefferson's idea about seeking talent. Their tuition revenue was welcomed, their employment was not. Furthermore, women were far more likely to enter the humanities or the social sciences, although as Margaret Rossiter has thoroughly documented, many women entered the natural and physical sciences, for example creating and securing space in laboratories and working with eminent male scientists. At times, not surprisingly,
those women scientists were instrumental in advancing the frontiers of knowledge, without, again not surprisingly, receiving much if any recognition.19

Another area where women were instrumental in advancing knowledge was in the social sciences. Here Progressivism and gender intersect. As Mary Ann Dzuback and Patricia Palmieri have shown, women social scientists as well as their institutions' deans and presidents focused on the social sciences, and in particular on social science research with direct implications for practice. For example, in the case of Bryn Mawr College, its president, M. Cary Thomas, as well as a department chair and several faculty members, developed a research culture that supported both faculty members and graduate students interested in the applications of social science research examples. The department chair, Susan Myra Kingsbury, helped students to identify research problems and methods, analyze their data, and publish their dissertations. Topics covered a wide area in the social sciences, with careful attention to social conditions and the effects of policies and social norms; in one case, Bryn Mawr researchers found in a Philadelphia study that over half of the families in working-class neighborhoods did not rely solely on the father's income, although the mothers still had responsibility for household demands. In a different form in great part because Bryn Mawr faculty included a number of men because President Thomas wanted to ensure recognition for the College's research, while all of Wellesley's faculty members and the president were women and they, more than Bryn Mawr's faculty, represented gendered approaches to the social sciences. (Wellesley College is the sole women's college to have only women presidents throughout its history and to hire only women faculty members in its early years.)20 Wellesley faculty members tended toward direct social activism, in working for and advocating such Progressive solutions as settlement houses, developed to educate immigrants in American ways—both in basic improvements such as healthy eating as well as acculturation into the dominant culture—based on the research done by Wellesley faculty members and students. Perceiving the need to address social problems (including support for the suffrage movement) and being a patriotic American was compatible, remarkably evident in one Wellesley professor's case, Katherine Bates, who authored "America the Beautiful."21 At both institutions, the women faculty members and students pursuing social science research, using the quantitative approaches that were the norm of the day, were intent on scientific planning that would provide the means for governmental or private agency efforts to effect social, even moral, reform.

The idea of the social sciences as rational instruments of societal and moral judgment informing decision-making—in government, in business, in individual
life—marks the enduring effect of Progressivism in higher education. Such an idea does not represent a radical departure from college intent over the centuries, but adds an essential element, the results of empirical research, to the moral virtues practiced and professed in previous centuries, whether those virtues were expressed in the destructive efforts to acculturate members of American Indian tribes in the colonizing colleges era or in the words of the Yale faculty in 1828. The reform of professional education symbolizes that combination of moral virtues and empirical perspectives.

MEDICAL EDUCATION

The decisive reform of medical education in the United States in the late 1800s and early 1900s, highlighted by the critically important 1910 work by Abraham Flexner, Medical Education in the United States and Canada, illustrates how social science study could lead and often has led to reform. In this case, the reform was more enduring and with deeper impact than many other attempts at reform.

By the late 1800s, physicians represented what would now be seen as an unusual range of practices—not in the modern sense of specialties but rather in terms of how they perceived the fundamental principles of curing human ailments. Nor were they typically educated in medical schools as is the case today; instead apprenticeships or brief educations in medical schools (many of which were for-profit institutions with very small enrollments) were the primary forms of preparing physicians. One consequence of such an education meant that, in one historian's words, "Democratic ideology received its sharpest expression in lay medicine." Beginning with the colonial period, members of Native American tribes and white women were often doctors; in the latter case, in some communities, white women were often the only doctors. By the late 1800s, however, efforts to reform medical education and practice, led by physicians in creating, for example, state licensure of physicians, were well underway. Concerned about the poor conditions of medical practice, Henry Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching commissioned Abraham Flexner to conduct a review of medical education and practice. He was an educator, not a physician, who had majored in classics at the Johns Hopkins University (in two years) and completed graduate courses at Harvard and the University of Berlin; he was also an advocate of a liberal arts education to develop the whole person. Flexner conducted the review with enthusiasm, preparing an extensive report after visits to all of the medical schools across the United States, and he provided a scathing statement for reform of medical education and practice.22
Drawing attention to poor and often common practices, such as the absence of laboratories, or perhaps worse, autopsy laboratories with rotting corpses, Flexner argued for a new form of medical education and practice, one reflective of the reform efforts already extant yet also sharply divergent from such practices as providing medical education through for-profit institutions. He drew on the John Hopkins University model of a teaching hospital with formal relationships to the university, providing medical education that was at once clinical and academic with students in the hospital and studying the natural sciences. The report proved to be a catalyst, and within a few short years, by and large medical education and practice, including control of access, education, and certification of physicians themselves, began to resemble what is now modern medicine. The issue of access, however, was highly problematic for white women and African Americans (although curiously, Flexner at times argued for equality of the sexes and races and equal treatment). In 1900, approximately 10 percent of all medical school students were women, and there were seven medical schools in the thoroughly segregated United States (North as well as South, East as well as West) that provided access for African Americans. With a few short years of the Flexner report and the surge of reform, white women faced near exclusion with outright quotas of 5 percent at some medical schools, and there were only two medical schools for African Americans.23

The exclusion continued for decades, and the efforts of medical educators and physicians to effect the exclusion were not surprising, but remarkable and disingenuous. As Charlotte Borst shows, the entrance requirements for medical school in the 1920s and 1930s relied on different means of evaluation—whether they were interviews or standardized tests or both—to ensure that “the right man” would be selected. Gender and race played a role, with questions on the medical school entrance examination regarding, for example, the Civil War battle of Chancellorsville far more likely to reflect the knowledge base of middle- and upper-class white men than white women or African Americans. For white women, even given multiple commission reports on nursing that mirrored the Flexner report in the 1920s and beyond, for those controlling the field of medicine, the Civil War meant that nursing was their appropriate choice. For African Americans, for whom the Emancipation Proclamation was likely the deep meaning of the Civil War, exclusion was a matter of fact. Furthermore, the selection of the right man reflected concerns about ethnicity, with clear references to Eastern or Central European men, as well as Jews, as not having the right character (typically prior to World War II, both Jews and people
from eastern and central Europe were considered to be non-white). And as medical schools slowly but surely increased the requirements for admission, with more focus on a baccalaureate degree and background in both the sciences and the liberal arts, efforts on the part of African American educators to introduce black literature, history, and social sciences at black colleges meant that those students would either not have the specific knowledge of the white canons or would have to work twice as hard to have the knowledge base required by both the college and medical schools. The challenge was even more considerable, as the Southern Association of Schools (the regional accrediting association) consistently gave black colleges a B rating, second to the A rating of white male and coeducational institutions and insufficient for admission to medical schools. While medical schools slowly opened their doors to white women and African Americans starting in the 1960s, exclusion persisted in both subtle and institutional patterns; female physicians often entered lower-paying specialties such as obstetrics-gynecology, pediatrics, and family practice, and the third medical school on a black college campus, Morehouse School of Medicine, did not open until 1975, preceded by Charles Drew Medical University in Los Angeles, opened in 1966 (this institution differed from the others in that it did not have a specific affiliation with a college or university).

This was not simply a price of exclusion from a higher-class status as a physician. Health care remained a segregated system, and not only did African Americans have less access to health care, but also it was not uncommon for an African American after a serious injury or illness to die, either refused care at an all-white hospital or unable to gain access to health care in the African American community.

In contrast to the results of the Flexner report, in the early part of the 1900s the nursing profession attempted reform with little success. The 1923 Goldmark Report (arguably the primary report among others on nursing reform) did not have the broad support that the Flexner report enjoyed, and the nursing profession was unable to develop the coherent strategy of reform that was evident in the call to reform the education of physicians. “However, despite this inability, the fundamental issue that challenged nurses was how to elevate a practice field dominated by women in a culture where the role of women was one of subservience.” Black nurses faced particularly strong challenges because the racist policies of Southern white hospitals would not allow them to practice at those institutions; nevertheless, they held high regard in the African American community, but in both cases of gender and race, the ability of white male medical professionals to control medicine remained paramount.
Here, then, is an unsettling and fundamental tension resulting from a Progressive approach to higher education, a tension that historical understanding illustrates. Clearly health education and health care improved as a result of the reforms promoted by Abraham Flexner, but the reforms were deliberately exclusionary, implemented to ensure a form of professional education that defined gender as well as race and ethnicity as exclusionary characteristics.

**THE JUNIOR COLLEGE**

Another organizational problem in higher education in the early 1900s was the increasing enrollment of four-year institutions because of the perceived need for a higher education in order to succeed in life. Universities and communities sought solutions, and the two-year college, the junior college, was one attractive possibility. On the surface, it appears that the increasingly selective four-year institutions, particularly universities, needed an efficient means for sorting students, offering access but with varied opportunities.

By and large the literature on the origins of the two-year college is thoroughly inaccurate. Over the decades, beginning as early as the 1920s, scholars and observers attached great importance to university presidents and a national movement of advocates for the junior college, but in a remarkable dissertation by Robert Pedersen, the historical record becomes clear.27

The earliest junior college was not Joliet Junior College (Illinois) in 1901 as a result of negotiations between William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago and the principal of Joliet High School (who, interestingly, is rarely named in these discussions). As early as the 1880s, Joliet High School was offering college-level courses, and by the end of the 1890s the school's courses were recognized by the University of Michigan, indicating not the efficiency of administrative Progressivism but rather the blurred lines among educational institutions in the 1800s. The first appearance of the term "junior college" in school records was in 1913, and not until 1916 did the school board distinguish between the high school and the junior college. It is far better to understand this part of the origin of the two-year college as murky, different secondary schools offering some college-level instruction that in some cases slowly developed into a junior college. While national leaders in education advocated for different means of efficiently organizing higher education, standardizing the types of institutions, they offered a variety of solutions (the 6-4-4 organization, six years of
elementary school, four years of secondary school—i.e., grades 7, 8, 9, 10—and four years of post-high school education was a very popular one), the junior college was only one proffered solution among several. More important, those leaders were simply not as influential as the more common claims suggest.

In terms of the actual decisions to establish public junior colleges, one characteristic ought to be familiar, local boosterism. Especially in small cities of the early 1900s, local civic leaders saw the potential to grow into large cities (as had happened at Chicago, for example), and one of the many means to do so was to have a college; hence, junior colleges were a viable solution. In addition, often regardless of location, parental preference played a role in establishing these institutions because parents did not want their children far away from home, perhaps exposed to the Godless state university or simply as a means to keep the family intact; reinforcing that aspect was the common student desire to attend a college close to home, a much cheaper and convenient arrangement. In all cases, the junior college presented the opportunity for a higher education.

Nor were these open-access, egalitarian institutions, despite the sweeping claims of retrospectives and histories that have been popular since the 1950s. They often had admission requirements that were just as rigorous as those for four-year institutions, and they were typically segregated. Even more fascinating is that the presentism seems to have taken a powerful hold on the authors of the retrospectives, arguing from the knowledge that many two-year colleges charged little or no tuition. Pedersen examined the actual tuition charges of public junior colleges and flagship state universities, using Arizona, Iowa, Oklahoma, and Texas as examples, and found that in each case public junior colleges charged more for tuition and fees than the universities. Free or low tuition was the exception, not the rule.

Furthermore, student life would presumably be quieter on public junior college campuses because students from lower-income backgrounds would need to work in order to finance their education. Pedersen's investigation resulted in a much different portrait: "There is more than ample evidence that the student culture of the typical pre-1940 junior college was no less self-absorbed and self-indulgent than the student cultures at Stanford, Ann Arbor, Berkeley, and Minneapolis." Much like at the normal schools, although their students typically came from lower-income backgrounds, student life included athletics, debating societies, student newspapers, and social gatherings. While appearing to be the result of efficiency in organizing higher education and the influence of national leaders, one Progressive principle,
these institutions were actually much more reflective of a more fundamental characteristic of Progressivism, the rising middle class and the desire for respectability.

FACULTY UNIONS

There were, of course, parts of higher education that clearly reflected the efficiency of administrative Progressivism. Eight years after completing his manuscript and looking for a publisher willing to publish his book, Thorstein Veblen succeeded, and Hueblng published Higher Learning in American: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men in 1918. Veblen excoriated colleges and universities for their unrelenting movement toward corporate practices in higher education, or as Laurence Vesey observed a half-century later, the second stage of administrative growth began in the early 1900s, and it has never ceased. Such practices found their way into details of the college and university, such as the rise of the credit hour. Veblen took a less sanguine view of the movement, and in a telling passage on page 202 (of early editions), he states that the best thing to happen to colleges and universities would be the removal of presidents and boards of trustees. That suggestion never took form in reality.

What both Veblen and Vesey illustrate, however, is that the rise of business practices on campus across the nation in the late 1800s and early 1900s was prevalent, and the long-held position that faculty members were employees was as popular as ever. One possible response to such a position was the identification of the professor as a professional, situated at an institution that needed to provide the professor with such protections as to ensure freedom of inquiry and freedom in the classroom. Such a response was deeply embedded in two German principles about professors, Wissenschaft and Lehrfreiheit (both discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7 on research universities). The former was a principle of scientific investigation, and the latter was the freedom of German professors to discuss topics of their choosing in the classroom, although such freedom had much to do with the fact that they were civil employees of various German states and, thus, the principle of Lehrfreiheit offered protection against professorial dismissal by irate political leaders as well as distinction as professors rather than ordinary civil servants. In an act of banding together, a small group of white male scholars called for a new organization of professors, which became the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915. The AAUP wanted to focus on the professional role of professors including faculty governance of colleges and universities but found itself more often addressing issues
of academic freedom, initially on an ad hoc basis (as contrasted with the AAUP's own history on its web page), encouraged to do so by an early AAUP leader, Arthur O. Lovejoy.\textsuperscript{31} The AAUP maintained a level of exclusion at its onset, inviting only distinguished scholars to become members, and not until 1939 did the Association accept members from two-year colleges. By 1940 the AAUP had also developed in its final form (earlier iterations occurred in 1915 and 1925) its statement on academic freedom, one that incorporated processes regarding tenure and dismissal.\textsuperscript{32} To date, the 1940 Statement on Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure remains the primary document addressing academic freedom; the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association also have such statements but the AAUP is often the organization highlighting the issue of academic freedom.

Another act of organizing also began in the early 1900s, faculty unionization. The AAUP was adamant for decades that it was not a union, despite on occasion being identified as such; the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), in contrast, embraced the possibilities of defending professors against corporate control effected by higher education administrators.\textsuperscript{33} The AFT was also an advocate for academic freedom, but its focus both nationally and in local activity tended to be on such matters as negotiating with the administration on such matters as faculty hiring and dismissal, faculty salaries, and faculty authority in regard to curriculum and teaching responsibilities.\textsuperscript{34} Nevertheless, AFT locals on campuses were rare well into the 1960s, in part because of faculty indifference or opposition to unionization (often on the basis of the professional arguments about faculty life) and in part because of the need for state or federal enabling legislation that would authorize formal bargaining units with the power to negotiate on behalf of faculties with administrations.\textsuperscript{35} Successes tended to be local and not necessarily consistent, as Timothy Cain shows in his examination of unionization efforts at Howard University from 1918 to 1950. Howard's local was the first in the nation, affiliated with the AFT, lasting briefly until 1920, with the faculty organizing a second local in 1936, which closed in 1943. In that same year faculty and staff members in the Howard University School of Medicine organized a local affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations (organized by labor leaders in the mid-1930s as a competitor to the American Federation of Labor); it lasted until 1950, by and large a victim of the increasing anti-Communist fervor of the post-World War II era.\textsuperscript{36} Although not a continuously successful organization, the Howard locals are prime evidence of faculty resistance to corporate control.

Here then, is the Progressive characteristic of controlling corporations, or at least constraining the power of corporation in regard to their employees. It would not be
until the early 1960s that faculty unionization began in its full form, only occurring when an administrative structure was in place—state or federal enabling legislation and the concomitant appointment of state or federal labor relations boards with the responsibility of determining a faculty union’s right to bargain—to effect reform.

THE EXIGENCIES OF WAR

One of Progressivism’s fundamental characteristics was political engagement, and college and university advocates recognized the potential for their role in the polity. While important Progressive politicians such as President Theodore Roosevelt and Senator Bob LaFollette were no longer part of the national picture by the mid-1920s (the former passed away in 1919, the latter in 1925) the efforts of the movement continued. The New Deal represents, in a variety of ways, the goals that Progressives espoused. For example, assistance to parents without adequate resources, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), passed as part of the New Deal, and was the result of earlier Progressive proposals to assist those very families.37 Progressivism indeed focused on creating a better life for the poor and for the uneducated, although that focus derived from white middle-class perspectives on the meaning of a better life and complicated by assumptions of who belonged where, as in the case of medical education and the practice of medicine. By the 1940s, although Progressive leaders continued to be visible, such as Henry Wallace, vice president under Franklin Roosevelt, nevertheless the direct impact of Progressivism appeared more in specific forms of legislation and more broadly and importantly, in the policies of the federal government.38

The need to educate veterans once World War II ended had three over-riding and extremely important goals, girded with the assurance that the United States was the world’s repository of democracy and justice. One goal was to ensure that never again would the nation be so complacent about the power of evil in the world, especially in totalitarian governments. This goal was more often implicit than explicit, but most certainly it was an important one when it was acknowledged. In terms of higher education, the report of the President’s Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, clearly and eloquently voiced that goal.39 Another goal was to make life sane for service men and women who had experienced terror and horror and survived. Finally, the polity recognized that service men and women deserved a reward for their sacrifices. Only a well-organized effort could accomplish such goals. By the end of the war the nation was not only immediately celebratory but
also anticipatory of a brighter future. One of the key programs, the 1944 Serviceman's Readjustment Act, popularly known as the G.I. Bill, emphasized such readiness.

During World War II the American Council on Education (ACE) worked with federal government agencies and officials in its efforts to create a focus on higher education and its capacity to work on behalf of the nation. These efforts reflected the use of an administrative structure—in this case, committees staffed by political and higher education representatives—to solve moral and social problems in the interests of the middle class. President George Zook of the American Council on Education reported in a 1939 editor's note of the Educational Record that the Council had begun preparation to implement services that would aid the federal government in the effort to combat Germany, two years before the United States officially entered World War II. As a result of the Council's decisions, Zook was able to secure funding from the General Education Board to hire Francis Brown, a New York University professor who had already coordinated two conferences of educational leaders (one in Washington, DC and one in New York City) to discuss preparation for the possible war.40

Brown's dedication to the development and passage of the G.I. Bill is a key example of higher education's work with the federal government. His work represents the first legislative implementation of higher education as a means to national defense in the policy terms later articulated in Higher Education for American Democracy, and to a lesser degree, to civil rights. Brown's work is also a powerful example of the underlying assumptions about effective, rational solutions to the moral and social problems of the time.

The impact of the GI Bill is as much mythological as it is empirical. While empirical studies tend to show that for the most part those who attended college on the GI Bill after World War II were either those whose higher education was interrupted by the war or those who were likely to have attended college if it were not for the war, nevertheless the stories of veterans who decided that this was a unique opportunity abound. Veterans most certainly went to college in unprecedented numbers, popularized by the press and by Hollywood, as Daniel Clark has ably shown in his work. And, many of the veterans—in particular the white male veterans—had attended college prior to becoming a member of the Armed Services or would have been likely to attend college.41 Raccoon coats and college banners were no longer the only icons of college life—although it is an error to think that those were the only aspects of college life, given the number of poor students who attended college well into the late 1800s, if not later. Even the spouses and new families of veterans went to college; the G.I. Bill provided support to married veterans, and often their families lived with them in
Quonset huts placed on campuses across the nation. Now new phrases about college became common: "The thought of college never even entered my mind," or "I was the first one in my family to go to college." The meaning of college access changed. Even many of those veterans who left college to join the armed services or deferred college for military service were not traditional college students; they returned home having experienced the brutality of war and were certainly not the young men and women who wore raccoon coats and waved college banners at sporting events.

While the New Deal often seemed to offer proof that direct federal intervention in state and local affairs would result in benefits for individual citizens and for the nation as a whole, it was World War II that offered not only compelling proof, but more important, compelling patriotic proof that direct federal intervention—in a variety of settings, including education—was an effective and efficient way of addressing social and moral problems. The early years of planning for a successful 1944 G.I. Bill through the education of U.S. soldiers and sailors provides a clear illustration of the ongoing importance of Progressivism.

The G.I. Bill had a powerful political history. Veterans of World War I, bitterly disappointed by the federal government's refusal to pay them their promised stipend, gathered in Washington, DC, in 1932 in an encampment known as the Bonus March Camping Ground. Unable to convince the angry veterans to move, eventually President Herbert Hoover ordered U.S. Army troops to disperse the veterans and destroy the camp. Pictures of the attack, led by General Douglas MacArthur, capture the terrible irony of the event, as soldiers gas and attack ex-soldiers. President Franklin Roosevelt, the American Legion, and armed services commanders wanted no such protest much less those counter-measures, and they all also wanted to recognize the veterans for their sacrifices. Furthermore, placing the veterans in education suggested there would be some relief for the tremendous shift from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Efforts to establish a well-adjusted veteran in a peacetime democracy and economy began early. Several scholars have documented the political context for the G.I. Bill.42

Yet in addition, the G.I. Bill has an important organizational history within the federal government, especially the executive branch, one not yet investigated, a history that reflects the rational, planned society that was so attractive to Progressives at the turn of the century. Part of the organizational history addresses policy development, and there has been some investigation of that characteristic, but the larger organizational history has not been addressed in terms of Progressivism.43 While the armed services had long engaged in technical education and training for officers
and enlisted men and women, during World War II another form of education, one substantially based in the traditional liberal arts, developed. The armed services coordinated the educational developments with several educational organizations, the most influential being the American Council on Education (ACE). The development was based on assessment, experiment, implementation, organization, and planning, a highly rationalized approach to the social problem of educating members of the armed services. In addition, the use of existing educational activities and facilities provided much needed efficient use of resources. Hence rational planning based on social science expertise joined with efficiency to inform the federal government's interest in educating soldiers and sailors. Initially the Navy and the Army ran their own programs—conducting with ACE assessment, experiment, implementation, and organization—although rational use of resources eventually dictated a joint program.44

Long-term planning occurred through two committees, the Post-War Manpower Re-Adjustment Conference and the Armed Forces Committee on Post-War Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel (these were the days before the sound-bite titles and acronyms that now force acronyms from words). Each would eventually issue a report leading to the G.I. Bill.45 Both the conferences and federal committees benefited from contributions by educators, most of all those from the American Council on Education. In the following, there is a brief summary of the process of developing the G.I. Bill and then a more extended discussion of the administrative, executive branch development of the education of soldiers and sailors, a development that was part of the foundation for the G.I. Bill.

In July 1942 the Conference on Post-War Readjustment of Civilian and Military Personnel met (the name was later changed to the Post-War Manpower Re-Adjustment Conference). Its chair was Floyd W. Reeves, a University of Chicago professor and ACE staff member, and its membership included Francis Brown. Reeves developed the agenda for the first meeting, an agenda focused on the problems of a post-war economy and the need to educate both civilians and veterans after the war's end. The agenda also included the proposal that the government provide direct financial assistance. Keith Olson reports that the agenda "provided the conceptual framework of the group's final report, and aroused no opposition at the meeting."46 The conference members studied both past efforts to provide veteran education, the limited federal and state efforts following World War I, and 1941 Canadian legislation that offered veterans stipends and fees depending on their length of service. The final report, issued in June 1943, offered more than 90 recommendations, and while many were general, some specified veteran benefits for education. Shortly after the Post-War
Manpower Conference submitted its report, another committee, the Armed Forces Committee on Post-war Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel also issued a report focused on veteran education, a report very similar to the one by the Post-War Manpower Conference. Floyd Reeves, an advocate of planning, worked very closely with that committee.47

In October 1943 the American Council on Education also proposed a plan for veteran education, one developed by its Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government—whose membership included Rufus C. Harris, president of Tulane University and a member of the Armed Forces Committee on Post-War Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel. The ACE report, as had occurred with the Osborn report, resulted both from committee deliberations and a survey of member colleges and universities. All three reports were very similar and served as the basis for the G.I. Bill.48 The ACE monitored the passage of the G.I. Bill carefully, as Francis Brown attended all of the hearings on the bill, and at one hearing Brown even corrected Senator Claude Pepper on the issue of subsistence grants for veterans.49

Thus, the American Council on Education, in continuous cooperation with a variety of federal agencies and Congressional committees, was instrumental in the development of the plan for the 1944 Serviceman's Readjustment Act. Planning also occurred in specific organizational approaches in standardization of courses, student achievement, and the evaluation of the educational experience for service personnel as well as veterans, providing in a very real way a social science experiment in preparation for the G.I. Bill (i.e., evidence that veterans wanted an education and were capable of achieving one). In cooperation with the armed services, the ACE helped to develop a process that experimented with ways of providing education to service personnel and veterans that reflected national democratic goals, used federal resources yet preserved local, institutional characteristics, and rested on rational means. The roots of such national activity appear in the late 1800s and early 1900s, specifically in Progressivism. The general education efforts are reminders that Progressives consider schooling an intrinsic part of the democratic process, and that educated citizens are necessary components of a healthy democracy. The use of experts in such matters as test development, in the use of a social science to solve a social problem, is also clearly a mark of Progressivism.50 Just as important, however, are far more subtle manifestations of Progressivism, means to accomplishing Progressive goals. A telling example exists in the development of procedures for assessing U.S. Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) courses for academic credit. Progressives worried about the relationship between a national, central government and the local agencies, arguing that
both had to have robust lives in order for democracy to grow. The American Council on Education implemented a program whereby centralized information about the USAFI courses was available for all colleges and universities, so that those institutions could make local judgments about appropriate credit, with expert advice from the ACE.\textsuperscript{31} This was the Wisconsin Idea writ large, to give expert advice so that local entities (individuals or institutions) could make informed, rational, effective decisions to solve social problems.

Who, then, would use rationality to serve the state? Not only the politicians and citizenry in need of expertise, but also the experts themselves in order to advance their institutions as well as society. As Hawkins argues in \textit{Banding Together}, the first half of the twentieth century represented a period when representatives of higher education increasingly recognized the national opportunities for cooperation, especially but not exclusively among like institutions. Given the lack of a national system of higher education characteristic of many other countries, such coordination could indeed prove more fruitful than hundreds of colleges and universities pursuing related but individual goals. The ACE membership was broad by the 1940s, and the Council’s work represented administrative Progressivism, what David Tyack and Elizabeth Hansot identify as the search for efficient ways to run educational institutions.\textsuperscript{32} In terms of rational planning and expertise in education, the American Council on Education was at the center of the cultivation of a public philosophy, and its staff members and committee members provided the very sort of academic links to the government that were evident in the Wisconsin Idea.

In the nearly three centuries from the 13 colonies to the mid-1900s, colleges and universities increasingly identified themselves as central to the nation’s political and economic growth, although the public-at-large did not fully embrace that identification. College and university enrollment was typically no more than 5 percent of the college-aged population (an age range just as broad then as it is now) well into the 1900s. Nevertheless, by the early 1900s colleges and universities had begun to seize upon a new means of being central to the nation, through Progressive service to the nation, serving as the core of rational planning to solve moral and social problems.

\textbf{PROGRESSIVE PRINCIPLES AND HIGHER EDUCATION}

While it would not be a wise use of historical inquiry to insist that Progressivism lurks behind every desk on campuses nationwide, it is appropriate to understand two key issues and to raise a third that is implicit in this chapter. First, the very sort
of reform evident in arguments by Enlightenment philosophers and at the core of the reasons for establishing the great experiment, the United States, echoes into the reform movement of the late 1800s. Sometimes history has constants, and human behavior and values as individuals or institutions obtain over time; the arguments of the Enlightenment and the broad goals of Progressives sustain over centuries. Second, the tensions of control and social resistance are evident in different ways across the examples. Neither white women nor African Americans were completely excluded from modern medical education. Advancements in professorial contributions to government problems occurred at the University of Wisconsin but were widespread among white women's colleges advancing practical solutions based on social science research. Administrative control over colleges and universities was substantial, but professors sought social control of the institution and had some limited successes. Organizing and passing a bill to provide higher education for veterans resulted in a shift, as much mythical as real but no less important, in understanding who could and ought to benefit from a higher education. Finally, an important shift occurred in how citizens and leaders viewed the mechanisms of the government, especially the federal government, during the Progressive Era. As Ellen Lagemann argues in her work on the Carnegie Corporation, up until the late 1800s, government was viewed not so much as a direct instrument but as a broad implementation of policy. Slowly during the late 1800s and the early 1900s, people increasingly viewed government as a direct mechanism, with a civil service, for the implementation of the details of policy; it is possible to extend her arguments to include the processes of controlling entry into the medical profession, examining social conditions using social science research, implementing the G.I. Bill, and enabling faculty unionization. The idea of government mechanisms of such detail plays out in formidable ways in the late 1900s, whether in the matters of football or research universities. War too had a response in rational approaches, although such issues as patriotism challenged notions of rationality.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How is it in regard to the reform of medical education that both "the issue of access... was highly problematic for white women and African Americans [while] (curiously, Flexner at times argued for equality of the sexes and races and equal treatment)?" More broadly, can reform be well intentioned if it clearly excludes or marginalizes certain groups, or do the mores and values of the time constrain the perspectives of reformers?
2. What does it mean in Progressive approaches, in a society founded in Enlightenment principles, when a supposedly rational approach to solving problems only partially addresses power relations?
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War has had a variety of important effects on U.S. higher education, and indeed the wars in the colonizing era had effects on the colonial colleges. Such campus and higher education matters as changes in enrollments in regard to men and women, faculty attrition due to contributions to winning the war, institutional and faculty commitment to national interests, and definitions of citizenship are common themes in times of war. This chapter addresses, in some detail or another and some manner or another, the American Revolution, the Civil War, World War I and World War II, the Cold War (part of the section on the war on terrorism), the Vietnam War, and the war on terrorism, with an important final discussion of the sustained war against Native Americans, which was in fact the first war of the colonies and continued well past the American Revolution and the Civil War.

One important effect of World War II up until the Vietnam War,¹ might be summarized in a single phrase: The men left. While to some degree the phrase is simplistic, it is also highly representative of how institutions of higher education in this nation reacted to war. These institutions found out that white women could pay tuition, succeed in the classroom, take leadership positions on campus, and after college (either as graduates or having left before completing their degrees) pursue careers.

War too had a powerful effect on African Americans. The most poignant example may well be World War II and African Americans' participation in multiple efforts to
win the war, from working in factories that manufactured weapons and machines to serving in the armed services; whether they fought the war on the home front or in theatres overseas, many came to realize that the battle for the Double V was the real battle—Victory at home for equality and Victory overseas to defeat totalitarian forces. Both of those battles were fraught with challenges.

For many people on campuses across the nation, one theme seems clear: often framed in terms of enthusiastic if not strident patriotism, college and university leaders, faculty members, staff members (once the administration began its growth in the early 1900s), and students heeded the national call to win the war. Dissent was rarely tolerated, and dissenters typically faced marginalization, rebuke, or dismissal.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

One distinct difference between many other nations and their higher education institutions and the United States is that in the United States, there is no federal ministry of education that controls most if not all colleges and universities in the nation. As a result, nor is there one (nor are there two or more) colleges or universities that are the exemplars of what the nation as a political entity wants to accomplish in terms of higher education. Nevertheless, in the early years of the Republic, national leaders argued for such an institution. Expectations about education for the nation varied by such characteristics as gender.

As noted in the Introduction, the American Revolution occurred as the Enlightenment was having a powerful effect, especially among leaders in the colonies. Formal schooling was a highly appropriate mechanism for ensuring that the values of the Enlightenment as expressed in the Early Republic were part and parcel of each white citizen's understanding of his or her role in the new nation. White women articulated their participation in new ways, as Barbara Solomon voiced:

"This war, like all wars, heightened the importance of women; some overcame their lack of confidence during the long struggle. Moreover, those identified with the patriots discovered that their political ideology about the rights of man had meaning for the female sex."

Works such as Linda Kerber’s “Daughters of Columbia: Educating Women for the Republic” are instructive for understanding what higher education needed to achieve. Since the nation was not to rely, in philosophical argument, on an aristocracy that transferred power and control from generation to generation, education became the
means for creating a citizenry that knew how to govern itself. Most proposals paid scant attention to the higher education of citizens, focusing instead on the need for basic literacy and numeracy. And as Kerber argues, mothers of the Republic were well situated to educate children who would be ready for the self-governing demands of a democratic republic.

The former colonial colleges claimed the role of educating the elite, the leaders of the governing councils, a claim made obvious in the Yale Report of 1828. Nevertheless, national leaders fretted about the lure of the venerable universities of Europe and their ability to draw the most talented students. Fearing the possibility that those students would return with notions of aristocracy, some national leaders called for a national university. While the idea would never come to fruition, even George Washington (who was neither college educated nor even schooled at the lower grades) deeded land to the United States for a national university campus.5 Hence the need for both citizens and leaders educated in the ways of the new republic was an early and important goal for higher education.

Then too another critical issue for higher education arose, academic freedom. Although more than a century would pass before the process of codifying the meaning of academic freedom would begin, nevertheless, concerns about the loyalty of professors and their rights to freedom of speech began with the American Revolution. One important aspect of professorial loyalty prior to the Revolution was in regard to denominational interpretations of the Bible, and a New Light minister’s attack on the Harvard faculty because “bad books were being read at Harvard” resulted in a careful refutation by the professor of divinity, Edward Wigglesworth. In another instance at King’s College (now Columbia University) in 1775, Alexander Hamilton, then a student, was able to forestall a mob long enough for the Loyalist president (most students, faculty members, and presidents supported the Revolution) to escape tar and feathering.6 While the latter is not a matter of academic freedom but rather an issue of civil liberty, the two incidents serve as a reminder that external or internal criticism on college or university campuses easily elevates to outright attacks.

THE CIVIL WAR

The Morrill Act of 1862 had a role in the Civil War, as its required military training resulted in what we now know as the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC); its graduates fought for both the Union and the Confederacy. Campus military training was popular throughout the nation even among institutions that were not Morrill
Land Grant institutions, including at several Southern colleges and universities such as the Citadel, the University of Alabama, and the University of Tennessee. Participation in this training was a patriotic duty of the white male student.

Citizenship required different forms of citizenship, however, when the nation split apart and then reunited. The Civil War devastated much of the South and re-arranged education in the public schools. In order for the states of the Confederacy to return to the Union, one requirement was that each state have free and public education for all citizens, a condition hardly followed in the North. As a consequence, one fully implemented following the end of Reconstruction in 1877 and the return of white domination in the South, Southern states created separate public school systems for white and black citizens. In similar form, the passage of the 1862 Morrill Land Grant Act, while putatively for all citizens, reflected the racism in the nation in the need for the passage of the 1890 Morrill Land Grant Act. The Morrill Acts also represent increased forms of student access, as noted in the chapter on the 1800s, a reminder that in nearly any careful scholarly investigation, simple answers may not obtain since the two Acts represent both discrimination and increased access.

On campus during the war, women were engaged in discussions about the conflict; in the case of one Ohio college for white women, there were frequent “scraps” between Northern and Southern students; as was the case with the American Revolution, white women articulated their engagement with the political setting. In the South after the Civil War, large numbers of white women found themselves suddenly responsible for the care of their families, including the financial affairs of the family. For those women from wealthy backgrounds, educated to be the wife of a plantation owner, their education rested more in the liberal arts in classical terms, with additional emphasis on the fine arts. As Christie Ann Farnham observed, their education was intended to show how they could complement their husbands. Nevertheless, Southern white women often rose to the challenge, managing farms, running small businesses, or becoming schoolteachers. Both Southern and Northern white women taught in schools in the South that served both black and white students or black students only. They were often teachers out of economic necessity or called to teach (often in the context of evangelical backgrounds), and they brought education to the young even in the face, at times, of deeply racist responses in their communities.

The Civil War also brought emancipation from enslavement with the 1863 Emancipation Proclamation and then the passage of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution in 1865, and hundreds of thousands of newly emancipated African
Americans faced the challenge of securing financial stability and ensuring their citizenship. Education became a central goal in what many scholars identify as racial uplift, a concerted effort across the African American community to establish equality with white people in social, economic, and political terms. Given the rampant racism across the nation, even seemingly well-intentioned efforts by Whites to assist African Americans often had results that continued the marginalization and oppression of African Americans. The matter of what sort of college would best serve African Americans had advocates of differing opinions, although it appears that the now-popular distinctions between the advocates (usually portrayed as Booker T. Washington in support of practical education and W.E.B. Du Bois in support of the liberal arts and the training of a Talented Tenth) may be more a construction of social scientists, especially historians, than a principled division; disagreement between those two may well have been more personal than recognized, and Black colleges readily incorporated both practical and liberal education while valuing the latter, as did White colleges. In any regard, it is not wise, however, to under-estimate the efforts of African Americans and the minority of Whites who were supportive of equality, and the growth of Black colleges across the South, both private and public, speaks clearly to the intent and will of African Americans to secure what could never be taken away, an education. The private institutions often began as the result of efforts by missionary societies (during the nineteenth century and earlier, these groups were instrumental in the development of Western forms of formal education, both in the United States and elsewhere in the world), and the public ones as a result of African American presence and lobbying in state legislatures. In both cases, the colleges had to begin with their students, who were either literate at a basic level or just learning to read and write. As James Anderson has richly documented, the stories of Black education in the South after the Civil War and through the Jim Crow era manifest a strength of will and commitment that is enviable. Resisting efforts to develop a curriculum heavily focused on practical or industrial education, steadily across the decades these institutions developed into four-year colleges, even as critics (ignoring the need for preparatory academies at white institutions of higher education) called for cutting the number of Black colleges in order to create a more selective group of institutions.

The white colleges and universities in the South had to respond to what essentially constituted their near extinction during the Civil War. Not only did the white male students and professors leave (the white women attended only women's colleges), but also the Union forces often destroyed many of the buildings on campuses, either
burning them to the ground or using them for housing or hospitals and effectively ruining the interiors. Consequently, rebuilding these institutions entailed both curricular and architectural decisions, and in both cases, the general tendency was toward an affirmation of traditions, both of the South and Western Europe. The curriculum at many all-white colleges and universities before the Civil War focused on the classical curriculum, what might well be considered a forerunner of the modern liberal arts with their division on disciplines such as physics, sociology, English, and theatre; the classical curriculum evidenced little such division given the centrality of the Bible and ancient Greek and Latin texts but nevertheless was of less immediate practical use than majors in such areas as engineering or, in the later decades of the 1800s, business. The curriculum after the Civil War drew upon the classical curriculum but began to include such subjects as modern languages, evidencing what one historian identifies as liberal Christian education, as well as practical subjects such as engineering. New architecture much resembled the old architecture, with Georgian and Federalist buildings, red brick and white-columned, arising on many campuses. One historian identifies three important consequences of the Civil War on colleges and universities not only in the South, but also in the North. Michael David Cohen explores the effect of the war in terms of the war mobilization efforts throughout the nation (one might well attend to the Civil War memorials scattered across campuses), an effort reflective of a budding commitment of the federal government to higher education as well as the commitment of the institutions' constituencies to provide assistance to the federal government. This assistance extended to the provision of assistance to formerly enslaved Africans, primarily through the efforts of the Freedman's Bureau. So too was the assistance to veterans a new governmental approach, often done at the state level by offering educational benefits to them, including in the Deep South, an early version of the 1944 G.I. Bill. Second, as noted earlier, the state university (also identified as the comprehensive university) was developing, and efforts to create higher education access after the Civil War accelerated as states strove to provide more higher education to more people. Finally, and a curious tension with the increasing federal role, institutions of higher education enrolled more local students.

Hence the meaning of citizen shifted for white women, highlighting their need to be economic providers. For African Americans, decided steps toward citizenship occurred, although the advent of the Jim Crow era when Reconstruction ended in 1877 meant the pace slowed greatly; nevertheless, their institutions of higher education
continued to make gains even in the face of virulent racism. Finally, the federal government had taken important steps in its involvement with colleges and universities.

WORLD WAR I

Perhaps because World War I was the first war in which the United States engaged an enemy on European soil (as opposed to such actions as invading the Spanish colonies of Cuba and the Philippines in 1898), signaling in another form the newfound might of the nation, patriotism on campuses was palpable. For example, the Student Army Training Corps (SATC) was a highly visible presence on campus, as young men went into military training offered at colleges and universities in preparation for the battles in Europe.

At some institutions, such as Columbia University, faculty members and the president, Nicholas Murray Butler, viewed the role of the university as the creator of the nation's leaders. As such, the formation of those leaders had two dimensions—beyond the clear assumption that they would be men. In terms of educating those leaders, Professor John Erskine organized a seminar of Western civilization, a seminar designed to present the unifying and superior dimensions of Western civilization for the men of Columbia. Just as important, the university needed the right men, men of character; character, however, was defined by class as well as race and ethnicity. African Americans were not threatening to break open the doors of the institution, but the Jews were, and institutions such as Columbia developed sophisticated and at times explicit mechanisms to ensure that white Protestant males were the men of character best suited to a higher education preparing them for national leadership.¹⁴

Butler not only led the effort to properly educate the proper man, but also he was adamant about the need for the institution to be fully and unequivocally committed to winning the war. As a result, he saw the need to dismiss faculty members who remained uncertain or in opposition to the war, including the prominent historian Charles Beard, author of An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution, a radical interpretation of the U.S. Constitution that did not elevate the Founding Fathers but rather found them wanting in their creation of a document that safeguarded their financial interests. Beard did not, however, receive much assistance from the newly formed American Association of University Professors (AAUP), organized as a result of a call to professionalize the professoriate, and immediately faced expectations about supporting the nation in its efforts to win the war. The AAUP had found itself unexpectedly and quickly responding to threats against the developing notion of academic
freedom, yet at the same time its members were called upon to provide justifications for the war and promote the nation's superiority in moral and political terms over Germany. The irony of such promotion lay not only in the AAUP and its efforts on behalf of academic freedom but also in the fact that many of the nation's more prominent social scientists had earned their doctorates in Germany. Even the AAUP itself was engaged in the promotion and propaganda that so often has characterized the verbal and written national responses to war.\textsuperscript{15}

World War I brought about the popularization of a specific form of assessing students, one that persists today with no end in sight. As the armed services increasingly recognized, in an increasingly sophisticated and specialized industrial world, the need to assign people (especially white men) to different roles in order to achieve the goal of efficiently winning the war, they drew upon the nascent efforts in standardized testing to identify levels of intelligence.\textsuperscript{16} Ignoring such characteristics as level and extent of schooling and quality of schooling, proponents of standardized testing effectively began a march toward numeracy in the evaluation of students' potential for success that privileged any group that had more access to more education, within the context of defining education in terms as specific as Western civilization courses. A careful analysis of the 1917 Army Alpha Intelligence Test by John Rury highlights this issue; the U.S. Army tested about 1,750,000 men and determined that native Whites were more intelligent than immigrant Whites and Blacks (and Northern Blacks tested better than Southern Blacks). According to the test results and in deeply disturbing language of the time, "89 percent of the black men qualified as 'morons.'" Rury's quantitative analysis illustrates the strong relationships between level and extent of schooling and standardized test results, but the test (based on Stanford professor Lewis Terman's model and administered by a team led by Harvard professor Robert Yerkes) was foundational in using standardized testing to stereotype groups. Indeed, as Christopher Loss notes, World War I marks the implementation of the idea of a personnel movement, specifically an ideal person (whose characteristics did not change) based on white, male, upper-class and middle-class notions of a person, a movement.\textsuperscript{17}

Finally, in view of the heavy preponderance of male student enrollments in higher education until the late 1800s, World War I was the first time that the men left (although in this case, only the classroom and extracurricular activities). In the fall of 1918, in "simultaneous assemblies at 516 colleges and universities throughout the country, 140,000 male students were inducted into the U.S. Army and assumed the novel status of student-soldiers, in a program known as the Students' Army Training Corps (SATC)."\textsuperscript{18} This program effectively changed colleges into military training sites,
signaling their commitment to the effort to win the war, and fortuitously, providing many of them with much-needed income because their tuition revenue seriously declined as young men volunteered to go to war. The ROTC units (not named as such until 1916) were replaced by the SATC. Although faculty members across the nation initially welcomed the program, as SATC regulations (such as the requirement that students march to class) and the loss of academic courses (which increasingly focused on military matters) became more important, they lost their enthusiasm. One course, however, elicited faculty interest, on the issues of war, a course that cast the German as evil and the U.S. citizen as good. In regard to military training at civilian institutions, despite concerns about the SATC effect on campuses, after the war colleges and universities increasingly re-adopted ROTC units. The measure of citizenship for men included commitment to military education.

White women often supported the war effort too, although in different ways. The most common approach was in the form of supportive activities such as preparing warm clothing for shipment to men serving at the front, as discussed in a biography of two teachers who were at the University of Maine during World War I. The identity of patriotism, developed in the American Revolution, now stretched into modern warfare and international efforts to defeat an enemy.

MODERN WAR, MODERN HIGHER EDUCATION: WORLD WAR II

It is hard to grasp the dimensions of World War II. Two facts are informative; first, every single continent, including Antarctica (albeit to a very small degree) experienced some form of military engagement. Second, there is no firm number of how many people lost their lives because of the war, but estimates go as high as 60 million.

The origins of rational, effective use of such national resources as "scientific personnel and equipment" to win a war were as early as World War I, if not earlier in the Civil War. World War I set the pattern for military-business cooperation and planning in World War II. In regard to the Civil War, the period between Civil War and World War I was the key period for the development of military-business cooperation and planning; the historical role of higher education, evidenced in the passage of the 1862 Morrill Land Grant Act with its explicit conditions of vocational education and military training (the latter of which assured passage by the United States Congress) remains largely unexplored in these complex relations. Yet the rise of science in World War II, culminating in devastation created by the atomic bomb, is
far more notable than in the Civil War or World War I. The capacity of universities to produce basic and applied scientific discoveries, the understanding that an increasingly broad range of students could benefit from higher education, and the beginning identification of higher education as a critical, if not the central institution for the advancement of national interests, all make World War II a particularly important time for colleges and universities.

Science, and more particularly departments in the natural and physical sciences, benefitted greatly from World War II, in great part because of their willingness to work with external organizations (both industrial and federal) to define their work and receive external funding, a willingness underway in the 1930s prior to the war. Rebecca Lowen provides an especially instructive examination of the Department of Physics at Stanford University, where the department faculty split along the lines of practical science (of immediate use to industry or the government) and basic science (i.e., theoretical investigations and laboratory work not necessarily leading to practical application). Those faculty members advocating the practical application eventually took the day, while receiving generous external funding from industry (they were well aware that there were possibilities for government funding as well). By the time of World War II, at a university without an engineering program until the early 2000s, one that has long declared its commitment to the life of the mind, the University of Chicago was the center of the development of the most powerful practical application of science, the atom bomb. All of this led to a report to President Roosevelt by Vannevar Bush called *Science, the Endless Frontier*, a report resulting, after political struggles, to the establishment of the National Science Foundation in 1950.

In addition to the planning for the education of veterans as discussed in the previous chapter, the armed services and the American Council on Education (ACE) developed educational programs for armed services personnel, programs that illustrated the broad range of individuals who could benefit from further education. As early as 1940, prior to the nation's entry into World War II, Francis Brown, an ACE staff member, was working directly with the Army and the Navy to develop educational programs for officers and enlisted personnel. In October 1940 the ACE Subcommittee on Military Affairs met and recommended that the armed forces establish a committee on education, and in November of that year the Subcommittee met again to formulate a plan and also met with representatives of the Army and Navy to discuss educational programs for armed forces personnel. In February 1941 the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation was appointed, and that committee established a subcommittee on education with Francis Brown as executive secretary.
This discussion focuses on the educational programs of the Department of the Navy; the War Department, with responsibility for the Army, followed a similar pattern although the programs themselves differed. The Navy began assessment of the educational needs of its personnel in 1941, beginning with a base in the Caribbean where officers and sailors had no contact with females, excellent recreational facilities, and considerable off-duty time. Concern about the men wondering about present dangers and future uncertainties, "(their 'thinking time' period) ... the danger period," led to a report resulting in two high school teachers being sent to the base. By 1943 about 15 percent of the men were taking courses, with technically trained men preferring liberal arts courses and liberally educated men preferring mathematics, science, and technical subjects. Following the experiment, the Navy established Educational Service Centers throughout the Caribbean, North America, and in Iceland and Ireland. In Alaska, instruction occurred essentially as a result of members of construction battalions organizing informal courses ranging from cabinet-making to art appreciation, a program jokingly called the University of Kodiak. Education, then, was both an external need, as the Navy determined that its personnel needed certain forms of education, and an internal need established by the personnel themselves.

The Navy also implemented an off-duty program so that officers and enlisted men and women could continue their interrupted educations, or learn skills essential to their Navy jobs, or address "a concern for the eventual return to civilian life and a desire to understand better the problems of that life in a rapidly changing world." The off-duty program included a component for those men and women in hospitals suffering from "cases of nervous disorders, such as those caused by severe shock," since they were "capable of educational rehabilitation." Thus the Navy very clearly recognized that education was a means of re-adjusting the sailor to civilian life, even for those suffering from debilitating emotional states. An assessment of the Navy's off-duty program in 1944 confirmed that objectives of the program included officers' and sailors' preparation for return to education after the war, including the specific responsibility of officers in charge of the program to counsel students concerning their educational and vocational choices.

In January 1942, the armed services established the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), a program offering hundreds of courses at the secondary school and college levels. The program had five objectives, three of which focused on training needs for the armed forces, one on the preparation of personnel for citizenship, and one "to enable those whose education had been interrupted to return
to civilian educational activity." Unlike the Navy's program, USAFI courses were initially only correspondence courses. In addition, the armed services offered self-teaching, and the Navy's off-duty courses. The Armed Forces Institute developed "measures of general educational development" to assist students who wanted educational institutions to be able to evaluate their work in the armed services educational programs, indicating government and institutional preparation for veterans' entry into colleges and universities. The program also foreshadowed the unprecedented level of access that the G.I. Bill offered, as African American service personnel enrolled in USAFI courses too. The issue of access for African American veterans very nearly halted the passage of the 1944 Serviceman's Readjustment Act, as the American Legion had to fly a Georgia representative to Washington, DC to ensure approval of the bill, in response to opposition by the racist chair of the conference committee for the bill, Representative John Rankin of Mississippi.39

The USAFI leadership favored using tests to measure student achievement, in part because of the various ways in which students could learn (even including "miscellaneous" as well as "informal and individual" approaches), and the ACE was able to supply the necessary expertise.30 In terms of instruction on college and university campuses, both the Department of the Navy and the War Department instituted programs, the Navy College Training Program (eventually known as the V-12 Program) and the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP), respectively. An evaluation in 1944 suggested that the most important positive conclusions were that colleges and universities were far more flexible than most people assumed—including a willingness to "meet the needs of new types of students"—and benefited from federal aid.31 Both the federal government as well as colleges and universities were learning during World War II the apparent benefits of government—higher education cooperation, especially in educating a broader range of students.

The implementation of the G.I. Bill, the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, began a substantial shift in perceptions of who belonged on college and university campuses, especially in terms of class issues (one aspect of its passage, in organizational terms, was discussed in detail in Chapter 4 on Progressivism), reflecting the USAFI experience. Colleges and universities had limited scholarships and loans for needy students, but the sheer size of the G.I. Bill was a fundamental shift in student financial support.32 The federal government had previously signaled its willingness to use higher education to achieve national purposes, through the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Acts and also through New Deal programs such as the National Youth Administration, which provided loans and campus jobs to college and university students in an effort
to keep them in college and away from unemployment lines. The jobless rate was nearly 25 percent in 1933 (a rate likely under-measured given the struggles of poor people, especially rural poor people, throughout the nation); many college and university students faced financial stress, and jobs and loans benefitted them, and often institutions of higher education. Although administrators at some private colleges balked at the idea of the federal government dictating institutional programs as well as the problem of supporting students at the same financial rate regardless of public or private institution tuition, the program was moderately successful. It may be also seen as the first instance of federal aid for students, as opposed to the financial support for institutions evident in the Morrill Acts.\textsuperscript{33}

Whether in popular magazines or in terms of classroom experiences, veterans who had little time for cheering on the football team or joining a fraternity (given that the vast majority of the G.I. Bill beneficiaries were men, particularly white men) showed that they were determined to succeed in the classroom and did so. Such potential for success had social as well as academic characteristics, with even popular magazines and advertisements increasingly turning to portrayals of the veteran on campus, succeeding and smiling.\textsuperscript{34} Although popular accounts of the G.I. Bill, and some historians of higher education, are prone to point to the G.I. Bill as a major impetus in the democratization of U.S. higher education, a step toward mass higher education, it was mostly a democratization by class for white men; for example, about 75 percent of the veterans attending Harvard had been previously admitted to that institution. The democratization was also as much symbol as reality, inasmuch as the majority of veterans who took advantage of the educational benefits of the bill would have gone to college nonetheless; one estimate suggests that only about 20 percent of the veterans using those benefits enrolled as a result of the bill. African American veterans faced a very different set of issues because so many white institutions of higher education either resolutely remained segregated or admitted African Americans in small numbers while many black institutions of higher education faced substantial financial constraints and could not afford enrollment increases given their limited facilities and little chance of further funding to increase their enrollment capacities. One aspect of the veterans that had an impact on the administrative side of higher education, regardless of whether the veteran had been to college or was likely to have enrolled, was the widespread concern about his (in a far more limited sense, her) readjustment after experiencing the brutalities of war. Colleges and universities began to develop student personnel staffs, to some degree extending the vision of the 1937 statement, \textit{The Student Personnel Point of View}, authored by a committee of the American Council on Education.\textsuperscript{35}
The G.I. Bill captured the public imagination, and of course Hollywood responded. In *An Apartment for Peggy*, an old white male philosophy professor, a member of a campus classical music group, ready to commit suicide as logical response to a rewarding life, rents his attic to a G.I. Bill couple, and despite the challenges, the husband succeeds in college. The ending is, of course, a Hollywood happy one, without suicide. The veterans’ success provided a powerful symbol for the possibilities of mass higher education, and the G.I. Bill represented a landmark in the movement toward federal funding of college and university students. It was, however, a targeted program for veterans rather than providing general support for any student qualified to enter college. Nevertheless, the massive surge of white male students showed that college could be for a far broader range of students than originally assumed, if, of course, they had adequate funding.

As suggested in the inclusion of African Americans in the USAFI programs and the G.I. Bill, matters of citizenship in the United States experienced renewed importance during World War II. This time, however, elements of inclusion appeared, in contrast to the general tendency of exclusion during previous wars. While the historical context of civil rights in the 1940s is obvious in view of a growing body of scholarship, that context provided little environmental pressure on colleges, universities, and education associations; what follows is a discussion of the remarkable levels of visibility of the issue in the 1940s, a visibility dimmed in the Eisenhower years (see the following long endnote).

There was some discussion within higher education about African Americans and their role in higher education’s efforts to further the effort to win the war. For example, at a 1941 conference organized by the American Council on Education, with eight sectional meetings divided by types of institutions and constituencies, the shortest and most succinct report was titled “Rights of Minorities.” That report stated in full:

The Negroes pointed out that they had to “fight for the right to fight,” that they are discriminated against by draft boards, that they frankly do not know where they stand in America today. They are loyal and want to share responsibilities as well as rights. The feeling in the group was that minorities should be protected, especially when we are fighting for democracy.

In general, those voices were unheard or dismissed in higher education during the 1940s, as there were few efforts to desegregate colleges and universities, other than those of the Legal Defense Fund of the NAACP. That those voices were public is, however, now clear.
Furthermore, African American leaders were able to convince President Truman of the importance of equal opportunity, and he repeatedly made clear that this particular topic held urgency. Although initially evidencing little concern about racism, he changed his mind during a meeting with Black leaders who told him of lynchings and brutality in the South and "the flood of viciously anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, anit-labor, and anti-foreign-born literature." One of Truman's fondest memories was his service in an artillery battery during World War I, and the descriptions of racist attacks on African American veterans returning home left him aghast. Walter White, president of the NAACP at the time, recounts Truman's reaction at the September 19, 1946 meeting: "When I had finished, the President exclaimed in his flat, Midwestern accent, 'My God. I had no idea it was as terrible as that. We've got to do something!'" While he balanced principles and politics in a number of matters, Truman acted upon the issue of civil rights despite its lack of salience in the polity and the public. He appointed the Committee on Civil Rights immediately following the meeting, and it issued a frank report in 1947, To Secure These Rights, preceding the 1948 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (which in fact referenced the report on civil rights). To Secure These Rights offered a highly critical view of race relations in the United States. It was remarkably inclusive, specifically naming and addressing discrimination faced by such groups as (in the language of the time) Negroes, Mexicans, Hispanics, American Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, Koreans, Eskimos, Indians, Polynesians, Micronesians, and Puerto Ricans; the Committee was most concerned, however, about African Americans. It designated four essential rights: "the right to safety and security of the person," "the right to citizenship and its privileges," "the right to freedom of conscience and expression," and "the right to equality of opportunity," which included educational opportunity. Although much of the report addressed problems of law enforcement, voting, housing, and health care, the Committee took a brief but harsh look at higher education. The document highlighted Northern higher education and the exclusion of Jews. It also discussed liberal arts colleges' tendency to argue for a "representative and diversified student body" as means to exclude on the basis of race or religion. It even identified the explicit mechanisms by which colleges and universities used application questions on race and religion to exclude and noted that in Northern institutions Jews and Blacks never had much representation. Nor were professional schools exempt from criticism, with medical schools in New York City identified as discriminatory—with a later argument that Blacks as a result had more health problems than Whites. White institutions of higher education, however, were not often interested in these issues. As James Anderson has shown in his discussion of
African American professors and white colleges and universities in the 1940s, Northern white institutions of higher learning were unwilling to provide places, much less create supportive institutional mechanisms, in order to integrate their faculties. There were instances of institutional desegregation, for example linked to wartime shifts in populations; at Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama, desegregation occurred in the early 1950s in part because of some Catholic educators committed to equality and in part because the industrial effort to win the war brought white Northerners and African Americans closer in the community and the factories. One step toward greater desegregation at Northern colleges and universities resulted from a program initiated by a Smith College alumna concerned about the small number of African Americans at the Seven Sister colleges. The National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students began in 1947 and providing its search for talented Black students until 1974, its origins evidencing the goal of the Double V. For the most part, however, both Northern and Southern colleges and universities either remained fully segregated or only nominally desegregated, a few people of color across the students and, rarely, the faculty (the first African American scholar appointed to a tenure-track position at any white university was Allison Davis, in 1942 at the University of Chicago).

In concert with the Committee on Civil Rights, the 1947 President’s Commission on Higher Education offered a clarion call for equality, in rich language and persistent presentation of data. Arguing that the world would not succeed without the achievement of equality of all and respect for each other, the Commission members authored a report that subtly shifted the conversations about the meanings and uses of higher education as the central actor in creating a better democracy:

If we cannot reconcile conflicts of opinion and interest among the diverse groups that make up our own Nation, we are not likely to succeed in compromising the differences that divide nations. If we cannot make scientific and technological progress contribute to the greater well-being of all our own citizens, we shall scarcely be able to exercise leadership in reducing inequality and injustice among the other peoples of the world. If we cannot achieve a fuller realization of democracy in the United States, we are not likely to secure its adoption willingly outside the United States.

While this call would eventually fall prey to the demands for higher education to educate for the sake of economic gain, for decades the idea of the college and university as a place for the achievement of democracy held prominence. In fact, even in 1947, a
report published that year provided convincing evidence that college graduates made more money, indicating that a clear path to success resulted from college graduation.47

Although women and equality were virtually missing from the discussion about democracy and equality in the report by the 1947 President’s Commission on Higher Education, World War II had an impact on the lives of women on campuses, one that led to some gains in the post-World War II period. As Charles Dorn shows, focusing on the University of California Berkeley while drawing upon examples from other institutions, when the white men left, the white women entered the leadership roles previously reserved for the most part for men. Following the return of men, women retained some of the leadership positions, such as editor of the student newspaper.48

Finally, while elements of access occurred during World War II and thereafter, national interests framed by white men and women continued efforts to exclude. Perhaps most notable, ensuring exclusion from higher education in the most basic way, the internment of Japanese Americans meant that their educational efforts were within those internment camps, through powerful means but not through formal educational organizations recognized by accrediting agencies.49

VIETNAM

It seemed to be a time of protest, beginning with protests against segregation and increasingly confrontational protests against the Vietnam War (discussed in Chapter 6 on students). It was also a time of significant shifts in enrollments, brought about in part by the nation’s experience in Vietnam and in part by an increasing commitment to providing broader access to colleges and universities; discussed both in this section and the latter issue of increased access again in Chapter 8 on exclusion and stratification. In addition, the nation’s involvement in Vietnam reinforced the relationships between academic science and the federal government. Finally, and curiously, the Vietnam War brought about skepticism toward colleges and universities, a skepticism that undergirded eventual efforts to ensure that public institutions of higher education had less public financial support and colleges and universities focused on efficiency.

Shortly after the veterans returned from service in World War II, the nation experienced what is called the Baby Boom, an extraordinary rate of growth in the number of babies born each year. Initially, of course, the population growth put a strain on the nation’s schools, starting in the mid-1950s and continuing to the late 1960s and early 1970s. By the late 1950s, colleges and universities began to experience the pressure on enrollments, and the growth of college enrollments became extraordinary,
as did the growth of institutions of higher education. For example, for a while at the end of the 1960s, states were establishing community colleges at the average of one per week. Enrollment growths at four-year colleges, especially at public institutions, were equally remarkable. According to the *Digest of Educational Statistics*, there were about 2.3 million students enrolled at colleges and universities in 1947, 4.1 million in 1961, and 8.5 million in 1970; hence in two decades, college and university enrollment essentially doubled each decade. Part of the reason for the enrollment growth was the male student response, particularly among white men, to the nation’s Selective Service exclusion from the draft of men enrolled in college. There was also a declared war that had a direct impact on enrollment, the War on Poverty, which President Lyndon Baines Johnson declared in 1964. He saw education as one of the key means for eradicating poverty, and proposed legislation that went far beyond the G.I. Bill and the National Defense Education Act because the only criterion for eligibility was family or student income. Federal funding for scholarships and loans accelerated in 1965 with the passage of the Higher Education Act authorizing 1.2 billion dollars in support for higher education, including loans and grants; lower-income students found new ways to afford college. This law represents the first full-scale use of federal dollars to provide financial assistance to students in higher education, without targeting them on the basis of national defense interests or service to the nation, and the enormity of the financial commitment (more than the amount authorized to support public schools in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 despite the far larger number of students, teachers, and administrators in public schools) offered a convincing statement as to the federal commitment to supporting higher education.

Access, however, is not simply a matter of enrollment numbers, although it is highly important to remember the numbers in order to inform the meaning of access. (Obviously, the fact that very few African Americans enrolled in higher education in the pre-Civil War era means that the nature of their experience differs from increases in their enrollment in the post-Civil War era.) During the Vietnam War protests, women, especially white women, increasingly found voice in their desire to have futures that culminated in more than lives as mothers and wives. The post-World War II articulation of the limits and possibilities of white middle-class women arguably began with Betty Friedan’s 1963 *The Feminist Mystique*. Its arguments were within the context of the white middle class, given that African American women were already working and did not need liberation to work, but it framed such an understanding of women as equal and capable that one might, indeed, suggest that the understanding is ovarian rather than seminal. Furthermore, her arguments found support in the theoretical landscape of higher education, resulting in
the development of courses that examined women as full participants in the shaping of the society, the polity, and the economy. The Vietnam war and the protests accelerated the rise of feminism (which would become feminisms) on college and university campuses in the late 1960s because women participating in the anti-war activities often found that they were asked to vote and then asked to make the coffee and cookies rather than working in leadership roles during the conduct of protests. Those developments signaled a shift in social attitudes, yet there were political attitudes and instrumental values of the past in regard to higher education that continued.

While the federal government had identified the importance of science, especially in its practical application, to the advancement of national interests, federal support of academic science grew to unprecedented amounts in the Vietnam years. Discussion of research universities in this time period occurs in a later chapter, providing the reader with the long traditions of research beginning in the mid-1800s and the power of research dollars to shape universities in the post-World War II period. For the purposes of this chapter, it is important that readers understand that the federal commitment to research, particularly in the natural and physical sciences, shaped universities in substantial ways. Universities experienced even greater separation (in what was already an important distance) between undergraduate life and graduate life than prior to World War II, with the latter focused on research and external funding.

Two enduring consequences of World War II, the development of a national sense of the worth of college enrollments beyond the traditional students of mostly white middle-class or upper-class families and the importance of science in advancing national interests, were of great importance during the Vietnam years. Enrollment growth of nearly unbelievable proportions coupled with investments in research that opened graduate programs at a remarkable level of expansion began the creation of what one university president called, in borrowing a term from another writer, the multiversity. Having become all things to all people, the U.S. university seemed to be fulfilling the goals of advancing national interests on a variety of fronts, even though, as the president noted, the only shared grievance among faculty members was that there was not enough parking.

"THE SHIBBOLETH OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM":

THE COLD WAR, THE WAR ON TERROR

One consequence of allowing war to define citizenship and leadership was the application of restraints on academic freedom; this section's title includes a quote from the New York Times in 1917, lauding the trustees of Columbia University for dismissing
Charles Beard, whom the *Times* considered to be someone who would advance "radicalism and socialism" under the guise of academic freedom. Such restraint continued in the early 2000s, while those issues certainly arose during declared wars of on-the-ground combat, the warlike atmosphere of the late 1940s and the early 2000s—the former in regard to the intensely combative relationship between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), the latter in regard to terrorist attacks and deadly responses—are highly illustrative of the subtle yet powerful ways in which nations (in this case, the United States) expect all citizens to be patriotic, exhibiting in fact a form of patriotism that is suspicious if not exclusionary in regard to others.

In February 1951, Senator Joseph P. McCarthy of Wisconsin delivered a speech in Charleston, West Virginia charging that there were nearly 200 Communists employed in the State Department. His claim galvanized support for anti-Communism that had been building since the end of World War II, and the fears of the Cold War (including the Chinese Communist takeover of the nation in 1948 and a nuclear winter resulting from atomic warfare between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that would end life on the planet except for, perhaps, roaches) lasted, in terms of intensity, until late 1954 when the U.S. Senate, in a rare moment, censured Senator McCarthy. Prior to McCarthy's claims, there had been two major instances of fear about Communist faculty members and their potential for disruption of university life and their ability to use university resources to persuade others, especially students, to become Communists. The first incident occurred at the University of Washington and resulted in the dismissal of three faculty members; the second incident at the University of California (which at the time consisted of two campuses, one at Berkeley and one at Los Angeles), which resulted in the dismissal of 51 faculty members. The California case is notable not only because of the large-scale dismissal but also because it highlighted an instrument of the state, the loyalty oath. The Board of Regents at the University had mandated that all faculty members sign a loyalty oath swearing that they were not members of any group attempting to overthrow the government, and 51 professors refused to sign the oath. While some relented, 29 continued their refusal and remained dismissed. This incident also marked the beginning of a long period in which the AAUP avoided any confrontation with colleges and universities over issues of academic freedom, although many professors throughout the nation suffered harassment or dismissal because of past or present political interests or activity. It was a time when the phrase "Are you now or have you even been a member of the Communist Party" became widespread, a phrase that lasted well into the 1960s and was used to damn anyone based on political activity or
political party membership, however weak or strong that interest. The constraints on faculty members, and to a lesser degree administrators and students, were often subtle; there were, however, times when the constraints were direct, as in the case of the Association of American of Universities, the group of leading research universities, which in 1953 issued a public statement calling for the outright dismissal of any faculty member even suspected of Communist activity.

The attacks, however, were more than attacks on political activity. In a broad and damaging sense, a sense of Americanism permeated the investigation of educators throughout the nation. Southern anti-segregationists often falsely linked desegregation activists to Communism, as occurred at Fisk University in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The president of Fisk, Charles Johnson, who firmly advocated for equal rights based on a rational, social scientific approach, made the difficult (and later, in reflection, wrong) decision to dismiss an activist professor who encouraged demonstrations against racism and segregation and was also questioned by the infamous House Un-American Activities Committee. At UCLA a professor with accused same-sex identity was investigated for her links to Communism. She was one of only two women who were full professors at the institution, but the administration, despite a recommendation from a faculty committee to support her, dismissed her. In West Virginia, an art professor from New York City was assailed for her Bohemian ways, and the American Legion was instrumental in her dismissal from the university because she was anti-American. Citizenship definitions took form in a highly prescriptive set of norms, as white and heterosexual identities were reinforced as the only appropriate behaviors and values.

Concern about the safety of the nation escalated in October 1957, when the USSR launched a satellite, Sputnik, into orbit around the Earth. Radio stations in the United States as well as the much smaller number of broadcast television stations, played tapes of the satellite's beeping transmissions back to the USSR. Public outcry and Congressional demand resulted in the rapid 1958 passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). The Act provided monies to support the study of mathematics and the science as well as critical areas (for example, languages such as Russian but also loosely defined in terms of area studies of different parts of the globe), and it generated another set of unprecedented funds for the support of higher education, although once again targeted at specific populations such as scientists and college students preparing to be teachers in the schools. Yet again, the federal government became more deeply involved in supporting higher education, including the acceleration of federal agency programs and administration in order
to manage the money. In addition, it required that anyone receiving funds from the Act sign an oath of loyalty to the government (which some states, such as Georgia and Alabama, still require for employees in public institutions of higher education), yet again highlighting the specific definition of citizenship in the democracy. In this instance the AAUP coordinated a long effort to remove the oath; the Association's efforts were notable if only for the fact that it coordinated a fight against the oath. 59

Although the fall of the USSR in the 1980s marked the end of one undeclared war, the deaths of U.S. citizens and members of the armed services at that time and later in the simmering conflict between the United States and a variety of Islamic groups led to another undeclared war, marked by the attacks on the World Trade Center towers in September 2001. It was one of the defining moments for the seemingly invincible United States, one not unlike the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, with the conclusion that the nation's soil had been violated. Yet again, the person not of Western European heritage became suspect, but this time the suspicion was fueled by national media and social network outlets that discovered those who were not American.

Not American meant not only born different, but also those who spoke out against U.S. activities that led to the attacks on the World Trade Center were under investigation. In 1940 the American Association of University Professors issued its Statement on Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure, resulting from six years of negotiation with the Association of American Colleges. The statement defined academic freedom as full freedom to conduct and publish research and to teach with full freedom in regard to their subject, although avoiding controversial issues outside their subjects. It also cautioned professors about extramural utterances,

When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution. 60

A case that illustrates the complex nature of academic freedom is that of Ward Churchill, a professor at the University of Colorado Boulder. Professor Churchill
wrote a scathing indictment of U.S. foreign policy and the work of corporations and their employees the day after the attacks, arguing that the attacks were justified. His indictment was not an academic publication, nor did it identify his institution, and it remained nearly hidden for years. Eventually it came to public attention when he was invited to speak at a small college in New York, and the outrage among conservatives as well as the caution among moderates and liberals led, according to a jury decision in Colorado, to his investigation for research misconduct at the University of Colorado that led to his termination. Although there was no direct link between his essay and his research, the jury concluded that the investigation would have not occurred if he had not come to such prominence because of his essay. The judge over-turned the jury’s decision, and Ward Churchill's appeal was denied by the state's supreme court. The boundaries between the freedom to speak freely in the classroom or in academic settings (whether they are publications and presentations) and outside those arenas are unclear. What is clear is that being deemed an American is typically of utmost necessity during times of war according to varied and powerful social and political forces.

THE TRIBAL COLLEGES

It would be wrong to ignore the centuries of war against the native tribes of North America, and specifically that part of the hemisphere named by Western Europeans and colonized, repeatedly brutally, by them and for them, as the United States. For that matter, while Dartmouth, Harvard, and William and Mary were attempting to colonize young American Indian men, the American Indian Wars (the plural is instructive) were underway, and an honest review of the armed conflicts between Western settlers and Natives indicates that they did not end until the 1880s (with such important exceptions as the 1973 events at Wounded Knee). There were early efforts to educate members of the tribes during the colonial era, and as early as the late 1700s, the U.S. Congress passed a law for the education of the Cherokees in farming. By the late 1800s there was some support among Whites for the higher education of Native Americans, support evidenced by efforts to enroll them at Hampton Institute, a Black college, although that experiment failed, in great part because there was fear of racial mixing and subsequent societal acceptance of Native Americans; the numbers of Native American students remained small over the decades after the 1870s. On occasion a tribe would initiate efforts to secure higher education for its youth, as occurred with the Choctaw Nation from the 1830s to the early 1900s. The 1830
Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek authorized the forced expatriation of all Choctaws from Mississippi to Oklahoma; the tribe's leaders were committed to securing a white education for its youth in recognition of the need to know the white man ways of governance and administration, and some of its youth had already attended college. Through a variety of programs over the decades, the Choctaws identified youth for college attendance and provided financial support for them to do so. In reflection of the challenges experienced by American Indian youth at colonial colleges, many of those young men and women did not complete college, but of equal import is the fact that among those who finished college, many returned home and became leaders, in contrast to so many white youth who left home for college and did not return. While these leaders reflected the European nature of their higher education, they also reflected the importance of their tribal identity. At times, however, respect for tribal identities resulted in the formation of colleges that combined Christian and American Indian perspectives. For example, Bacone College (OK) began in 1880, established by the American Baptist Home Mission Society, has long served the Cherokee and the Muscogee Creek Indian tribes. Its faculty and graduates have included many prominent Native Americans, and it has held to its tradition of Christian education and the preservation of American Indian cultures. Nevertheless, the overall picture is clear in regard to U.S. higher education and American Indians.

One overview of the history of American Indian postsecondary enrollment notes that by 1932, only 52 American Indians had graduated from postsecondary institutions in the period from 1636 to 1932. In erratic and minimalist form thereafter, the higher education of American Indians (the term used today by many Indian studies scholars, including radical ones, to identify the cultural rather than the political issues), continued to be typically Western in institution and expectation. While the numbers of Native students increased in the post-World War II era, they remained small, and today the percentage of American Indian students enrolled in U.S. postsecondary institutions remains at 1 percent, a number that has been relatively constant for decades. As many scholars in recent decades have argued, by and large only tribal colleges make a concerted effort to bridge students' native cultures and the expectations of Western civilization. Native Americans have sustained a history in the twentieth century, developing most rapidly in the post-World War II period, of providing higher education to the members of their cultures, but with little recognition from accrediting agencies for differences and often with sparse funding. In the 1960s and 1970s, leaders in the Native American community began establishing tribal colleges (typically community colleges) in a deliberate attempt to contest assimilation
into the white culture and affirm tribal cultures, an effort paralleling the civil rights
movement. Both securing charters and funding (of both buildings and equipment as
well as salaries and financial support for students) proved challenging, but the leaders
of the tribal college movementpersisted and succeeded. As of the writing of this book,
there were 32 tribal colleges.

It is well worth contemplating the meaning of attempts to assimilate those who were
first here in what centuries later would become, named by others, North America. It
is also instructive to examine the foundational characteristics of efforts to establish
colleges serving specific populations, efforts that are at once separatist and reflective
of assumed central norms of U.S. society.

CONCLUSION

Through the centuries in efforts to win wars, from the colonies to the modern era,
institutions of higher education and their participants ignored, or struggled with, or
intensified, meanings of citizenship. Higher education occupied an increasingly cen-
tral role in defining those meanings, and while it also increasingly provided means to
some form of citizenship to more and more groups, it sustained both overt and subtle
mechanisms to offer more central meanings for some groups than others. In terms of
socioeconomic class, gender, race and ethnicity, and sexual identity, access to higher
education and its benefits were reflective of exclusion and stratification.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Who has benefited in what ways from college and university participation in
efforts to win wars?

2. Why has war had such an effect on definitions of citizenship and who is a citizen
in what ways?

3. Why would participation in efforts to win wars result in increased opportunities
for government and private monies for financial aid?

NOTES

1 In political terms, it was the Vietnam conflict, since the United States never officially declared war on what
was at the time North Vietnam. While that is an important characteristic of the period, and no small cause
for student demonstrations of the time, the fact remains that tens of thousands died. I offer this note in
respect for Howard Zinn, who was an outspoken critic of the Vietnam conflict.
2. I could easily argue, unfortunately, that the federal act, No Child Left Behind, has all the marks of a federal ministry of education that controls all schools, as of yet there is no such act for colleges and universities, although the multiple efforts of federal agencies to ensure compliance on matters as broad-ranging as student drug use and ethical research projects has increasingly led to federal control of higher education.


41 President's Committee on Civil Rights, *To Secure These Rights: The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1947), 15–16 on groups, 6–9 on four rights.


62 As an example of an early effort to illuminate these tragedies, I recommend Dee Brown, Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee. Any edition will do.

64 Donal F. Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute, 1877–1923* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995); Steven Crum, "The Choctaw Nation: Changing the Appearance of American Higher Education, 1830–1907," *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (February 2007): 49–68; Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy, Angelina E. Castagno, and Jessica A. Solyom, "Introduction," in *Postsecondary Education for American Indian and Alaska Natives*, ed. Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy, Amy J. Fann, Angelina E. Castagno, and Jessica A. Solyom (San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, 2012), 6–10. It is instructive that the authors identify those who drafted parts of this manuscript rather than the scholarly practice of identifying authors. This approach raises the important questions, who is the author and how do we define that person?