AMERICAN EDUCATION:

FROM CRISIS AND CONFRONTATION TO ACCOMMODATION AND COMPETITION

ERNEST 1. BOYER

PRESIDENT

7ME CALLE GIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TERCHING

Keynofe address to the Edited transcript of Dr. Ernest L. Boyer speech at January 27-29, 1985, Seminar: "From the 1960s to the 1970s: American Culture in Transition"

AMERICAN GOUCATION:

FROM CRISIS AND CONFRONTATION TO ACCOMODATION AND COMPETITION

It's a special joy for me to be at the American Studies Research Centre, and to join in what I consider to be an 7 ales enormously provocative and ambitious effort ____ That is, to make sense of decades that are still painfully a part of the memories task of us all. It was a considerable effort to extricate myself from my own experience of the last 20 years and try to be somewhat objective in my interpretation. I was almost inclined to rename 19605 my presentation "A Whirlwind Tour of the 60s and 70s: Painful howevers Memories." I hope to add some vividness to this effort, because we are not sifting through the ancient past $\sqrt{}$ we are dealing with the raw material of our own understanding and emotions. So, I will attempt to give at least one person's view of a 20-year period that marks an enormously important transition for America, and for American edilection. Before doing that, may I exercise a little poetic-licenseand try to put the American higher education scene, in larger context. The central point I would like to establish - is. that if you wish to understand the history and the culture of the nation, were must understand the role of education. In examining the transition from the 🐠 to the 70s we can gain some special insight into the nature and the character of the United States by To better do so, looking at its colleges and schools. In order to explore this, let me earlier periods of transition during which the role of the nation's colleges and the nation's aspirations were inextily interlocked.

From Massachusetts Bay to the 1960s

of Independence, the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed a law requiring every town and village of 50 or more souls to hire a school master at public expense to teach the children to read and write. From the nation's founding, education was judged to be far too important to be left to chance. Harvard college, of course, was founded just 6 years after the Massachusetts Bay Colony formally was established.

Thomas Jefferson, who in his own poetic way may be considered the patron saint of education in our country, put it the mafter pointedly when he said that in the history of America he who would be ignorant and free expects that which never was and never shall be. Jefferson went on to say: "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate power of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take from them, but to inform their discretion."

If they are not well enough informed to drive the engines of a democracy, do not deny them the democracy, inform the peoplethis was the audacious vision that Jefferson laid forth. Indends The wish to suggest that it was adequately fulfilled. For perhaps 200 years education remained an elitist, not a democratic, process in the nation and was for the privileged few-by-which I was well formed.

religious and civic values were the core of an emerging nation.

And these values could be achieved, it was assumed, only through education. It was further assumed that if the new nation was to have cohesion and to achieve the twin values of civility and religious prise then education for leadership was absolutely crucial. We have, then a strong in America. There has been a strong in America.

New have, then a strong connection between national purposes and the essentialness of common learning.

I will leap shead here and comment briefly on the early 19th century when, in my judgement, a new priority emerged. During this period a sense of nationhood was baking root and there was to some degree less concern about the leadership dimension and more commitment to national expansion. The goal was to build not just a governmental structure but an economic and physical And once again education reflected the infrastructure too. nation in transition. The institutions along the eastern remained seaboard mere committed to a classical education, but some brash and strange new experiments were emerging in the woods behind In 1824, a curious institution was launched in a little them. town called Troy, New York, -It bades strange name--Renssalaer Polytechnic Institute. One of our most distinguished American historians, Frederick Rudolph of Williams College, said that this weethe first technical institution in the country; that Renssalaer Polytechnic Institute or RDI was a "constant reminder" that the United States needed "not only academics, but railroad builders, bridge builders, and builders of all kinds." Some

were not only building the minds of men, as the faculty of Yale as well.

had decreed in 1848, but we were building bridges, and somehow addition was inextricably tied to this transition, too. Of course, Berhaps, the most audacious movement was the creation of the land grant colleges. The Morrill Act, the legislation creating these institutions was passed in the heat of the Civil war, The idea was that colleges would themselves help drive the engines of democracy to new frontiers. Their critics called them cow colleges.

The University of Wisconsin—a land grant college—to this modeled itself on the idea day has as its model, that the campus is the state, and whatever the state needed the University would constantly provide. When Lincoln Steffens visited there in 1901 he wrote that the University of Wisconsin is "as close to the intelligent farmer as his pig pen." There were skeptics about scholars being connected to the nation and indeed one cynic wrote that:

Education is the rage--in Wisconsin. Everyone is wise and sage--in Wisconsin. Every newsboy that you see Has a varsity degree, Every cook's a Ph.D. in Wisconsin.

education history, to what I'd like to cite as transition third major no. 3. This transition occurred at the turn of the century, and once again the nation's colleges and schools had a most important job to do. Between 1890 and 1910 over 12 million immigrants came

the United States, and Suddenly there was a sense of disintegration and dissembling the nationhood idea was being threatened by the immigrants who arrived in large waves at Ellis Island. One school alone as I read during our recent study of were American high schools, had over 26 languages being spoken.

There was a worrisomeness among the leadership that perhaps the sense of nationhood and cohesion would not last. And so the schools were charged with the responsibility of redefining the notion of Americanism in what was now the 20th century.

A study of the curriculum of those early years reveals that teachers in the schools taught not only what we call the academic basics—English and math and science—but they also taught health and nutrition and conduct—how to dress, how to walk, and how to behave in this new nation. Their job was to teach citizenship.

As I look back on when I went to school, I reflect on the degree.

to which the schools were committed to teach not just the basics but citizenship as well. The pictures of our presidents were surrounded the Caseroem, prominently displayed, and amount the mation, the flag was there a pledge of allegiance to it was a daily ceremony. So we went through a transition in which schooling and education in the nation was once again aimed toward not just leadership but populous cohesion for the nation.

This leads then to the next transition as we move toward the 1960s reason we are today the 60s and 70s. It believe that the fourth major transition which connected national intentions and the rule of formal learning occurred following World War II. It was the watershed in the nation's life and in education's life as well.

fair to say that during this period America lost its innocence and its isolation. Reluctantly, it became a world military and economic power, and education once again was called upon to help the nation maintain its so-called competitive advantage. This was achieved primarily through the scholarly contributions from the universities and ranking centers of higher education. At the beginning of the Second, War the President of Harvard College and the President of MIT both travelled to Washington, D.C. They had a conference with President Roosevelt, to whomand they offered to him the intellectual resources of the nation's higher learning institutions. And after the war, Vannevar Bush of MIT, who became the head of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, said in a laudatory paper on the role of the universities: "We all know how much the new drug penicillin/has meant to our greviously wounded men on the grim battlefronts of war....Some of us know the vital role which radar has played." Then, he concluded with this not too modest approbation: "Science, by itself, provides no panacea for individual, social and economic needs but it can be effective in national welfare as member of a team, whether the condition be peace or war. But without scientific progress no amount of achievement in other directions can insure our health, prosperity and security as a nation.... If this nation wants to achieve, there is no other answer, Mr. President, but the resources of the scholarly community of the university. World engagement came to the nation's conscience with some anguish and uncertainty, but if

centerpiece of the international dimension.

After the war then came a fifth transition.

After the war then trans great revolution in the nation which can be described as the revolution of rising expectations. Once again that movement was driven by the nation's higher learning institutions. As all of you perhaps know full well. Kight after the Second World War, when the Our own soldiers came back to the anguish that they would go on to the unemployment lines because the defense industries were closing down and there was a desire to somehow avoid another Great Depression. One legislators, in a burst of imagination, conceived the idea of giving all of these young men scholarships to send them back to college instead of the breadlines. As so over the next 15 years more than ower 8 million former servicemen were on college campuses most Mest not of them wouldn't have even dreamed of going on to higher education under the rather narrow selective system of the past, but now had earned this privilege. My memory is that those were -- largely 25 of 26 years old -the halcyon days of higher education. These men were there education because they felt it was a privilege, because classrooms were places of vital learning and because most of them were 25 or 26 they years old and were committed to help their families and become No secure. However, what was important was that a system had Former servicemen suddenly become open. And if the Grs thought going to college was a privilege, their children thought going to colleges was a right. And it planted the seeds of rising expectations that

what Martin Trow at the University of California calls an elitist to a mass system of higher education in which the promise was for higher education is promise was that anyone who has a desire to go on world find; a place.

I we given you this hop-skip-and-jump history of higher national learning in order to suggest that transitions in the nation, in my judgement, can be alleast partially if not fully understood by examining the role of education, which is in my view a civil for America. The one institution in which we all have faith, and when the nation is in great distress even though we might criticize the colleges and the schools, when we are in deep trouble once again, we turn to education as "Mr. Fixit" for the

#

we then come to transitions beginning with the decade of the anwards. It is important to recall

1960s; I should like to explore a bit of the climate on the colleges campuses and how we moved from one decade rapidly to another. On January 20, 1960, a new President was inaugurated took office in Washington, D.C. John F. Kennedy said in his inaugural address that the torch of leadership had been passed to a new generation. He said to the nation, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." At the spenning that the torch decade altruism and hope were rising very high. In those days there was no warning that America had just launched one of the most tragic and dramatic decades in its history. At the beginning of the 1960s, higher education in America shared in the same innocence and hope, and was convinced that it was would

affirmed. In fact it was Mr. Kennedy who had visited the University of Michigan and there for the first time announced the Peace Corps plan, inspiring college students once again to join the nation in a great crusade both here and far abroad.

During that first period of the 1960s, public confidence was strong, high; millions of students were coming to the campus, in the years that followed world war II, and graduate research grants were still rolling in. Faculty were getting tenure because we were opening positions, and if you were decent you could be assured of security later on. Every ten days a new community college was built during the decade of the 1960s. In the early years of the decade 1960s I was at the University of California at Santa Barbara. 4 had been sau that was one day the site of a small home economics college run by the state almost overnight was declared by the Board of Regents to be a "university center" Within a 10-year period a thousand students had exploded to 10,000, a whole new city had been built called Isla Vista. Buildings were growing up surrounding the quonset huts that had temporarily been placed to surging accommodate the upsurge in the number of students.

beginning and that the universities and colleges were sharing in the glow. But soon traumatic jolts began to intervene. In just a thousand days John Kennedy was dead, and by 1964 the golden age of American higher education had already begun to tarnish. A young student named Mario Savio began to shout four letter words

on the Berkeley campus, and Savio and his followers condemned the bloated higher education system, the same one that the GIs had so enthusiastically embraced. But now, two decades later, when campuses were numbering in tens of thousands, this younger generation, unmindful of the almost reverential feeling of their fathers, were concerned about what they called the lack of humaneness and personal attention on the campus and the slogar. "I am a human being, do not fold, mutilate or spindle" became the new slogan on the campus.

The curriculum was challenged too. I recall many occasions at the State University of New York, when in which students would occupy the office and would go through MILLERSIFY the catalogs that were being printed in New York and would remind me that those were courses decided by the faculty, not by them, The curriculum, they accused, was developed to preserve academic developed to create an acadmeic, tradition, not acound student to meet the courses student interest; and that it couldn't in any way reflect the coming generation because most of them had been designed by grey-haired an editorial in people over 30. I also remember reading the Stanford student expressing mila offense at the determination of the taculty newspaper in which the faculty at Stanford had determined to introduce a required course for all students, and a student ... editorial expressed mild offense. I quote now two important In particular phrases that I thought captured the spirit of the times. In the editorial, the students objecting to the required courses said, "Requirements are illiberal," and went on to say to the faculty, "How dare you impose uniform standards for non-uniform people." Those perhaps more than any other quotations I could cite captured dominant the mood--the notion of a somewhat bankrupt system, bloated and

without direction, imposing its own traditions on a new generation where the relevance was no longer there and where the whose non-uniformity and creativity and individuality of the students were denied.

At the University of Buffalo, which I know somewhat better than Stanford, for a period/the faculty approved what was called the "bulletin board curriculum." That meant that any group of 15 students who agreed they liked a course could post it on the bulletin board and the university would provide a teacher. The control of the curriculum had suddenly gone upside down. Instead of the faculty sitting on the curriculum committees to decide what students should be taught, students were deciding what they wanted to learn, and they expected the university to teach them on their terms. Lest I be misunderstood, I am here describing, Landidly that the not condemning. University had, in my judgement, been more concerned with growth than content; had been lacking in sensitivity to the changing had not adequately addressed the needs of students; and was unmindful of, larger ethical issues. that were not adequately addressed. And the shame of it was that many students were able to ask and get more answers to their questions outside the classroom than within. And so in a sense we had the inevitable backlash are growth and enthusiasm moderated by the cautious second thoughts that an irreverent student body, aggressively introduced. I am suggesting, though, that in the midst of the 1960s, confidence in both authority and the goals of education was enormously diminished, and the universities were seen by some as a source of evil, rather than a place of hope.

Meanwhile, as you meard in the summary of issues of the 60s by Dr. Luedtke, Martin Luther King had started his own long march towards equity and social justice. Inspired by Mahatma Gandhi, King like Lincoln said that no nation can be half-slave, halffree. The most dedicated recruits for the Civil Rights crusade during the mid-1960s came from the universities and colleges of the nation as students joined the marches and the sit-ins in the South. The summer of 1962 was memorable because literally, thousands of young students helped register voters. There was, frankly, on many campuses then what can only be called an exciting blend of altruism, protest and commitment. But the piont is that the students' energies had moved away from free speech on the campus, more flexibility in the dorms, and greater creativity in the curriculum, to a larger vision of national, equality and social and and equal justice, and the student movement then joined the civil rights crusade.

that, too, moved in with a vengeance as the decade proceeded.

Students accused the universities of complicity with aggression. They attempted to force the university to take a moral stand, collectively and cooperatively, against what they considered to be the bankrupt policy of the nation. In most instances the universities retreated on that

point, arguing Anthink with some justice that they could not collectively take a stand on this or any other matter beyond the campus, but that individually they would try. That was not sufficient, however, and the climate remained enormously tense, and considerably ambiguous. In response, campuses would often close down or converted classes, into teach-ins, where the confrontation would be aired.

It seems to me that behind the lines of new kind of has been congealing was beginning to take place. What scalled a "counter-culture" was rapidly emerging. We moved from the more free and open university to the determined search for civil rights, to the anguish over what was judged an unholy war, to a lifestyle view that tended, in my judgment, to go in two quite divergent directions at once. On the one hand there were the flower children - that was the name that they themselves had Their sense of new beginning and belief that life could be peaceful was celebrated by the great Woodstock sing-in, which that seemed to capture all the hopes and aspirations and openness and love that I think millions of our young students genuinely believed in and desired. On the other hand, there was what I carpe diem mood -think could only be called a hedonistic dimension of this. effort-fa sense that life is bitter and grim, that one must cultivate. return to a kind of negativism, rejecting all authority and even almost rejecting common sense in the name of a fast, drug-driven Value 1055 life, with no discernible values beyond living for the moment. Perhaps I did see as I watched it emerge, that, sense of great

hope and that sense of great despair as well, growing out of what seemed to be these intractable and unsolved problems of the campus.

the student movement in the more innocent days of the early sixties. Debates became more bitter, the cleavage between the campus and the world beyond became more intense because adults regarded saw these as centers of rebellion. And this culminated, of course, in bloodshed on the campus. I can only say that a decade that has been launched with a warm glow of hope ended with inconflict, bitterness, and destruction. John Kennedy's call to serve the nation was not met with hard cynicism because they saw a nation they could not trust.

That brings me then to the final transition to the decade of the seventies from this period that I hope I have at least in part recalled today. It a curious and unanswered question as to why, at least in higher education, we went from violent protest to quiet almost overnight. In July, 1970, I was called to Chicago, Illinois, by the National Association of State Universities and Land-grant Colleges. It was the first and only special meeting the university and college presidents had ever held. The meeting was not to discuss the academic life and the quality of scholarship, it was held to discuss how to control riots on the campus. We not only had testimony from presidents who had successfully managed to handle crisis but we had a speech 2 discuss by the head of the Chicago Civil Police and other law enforcement

agencies to advise regarding how to handle insurrection. It was another new world, and as I flew home it occurred to me that not in my wildest imagination had I ever dreamed that university administrators would assemble to talk about matters of force and confrontation in such stark and frightening terms.

The point I make, however, is that September of 1970 came and went, and we encountered not shouts of protest but an eerie silence on the campus. I remember giving a speech at the University of Buffalo in the middle of the academic year, and in a moment of brashness the said; "What have you learned from the student protest?" And the chairman of the board said, "I think you're crazy, because we're simply at a lull between the storms." I thought that somehow we had passed through an enormously crucial era and the was time for perhaps a sober reflection and anticipation.

I have only a few suggestions as to why the universities went from intense crises to a period of quietness in what seems within to be almost 60 days. I do think that the nation was in some way spiritually exhausted, and I do think that because of the shooting at Kent State, we were to some degree in a state of shock. The film of young people being shot down on campus and was played time and time again on television. It was on every magazine cover in the nation and suddent, the adults were having to confront the fact that we were killing our own children. And I think that a sense of anguish and sobrigty and second thoughts did take hold because it appeared that no one was in charge.

It appropriate to note too, that the war in Vietnam was winding down, though not immediately, to be sure.

Also, in the early 1970s the nation experienced a new University recession. I well recall when our budgets were being cut and talk about the lack of jobs became increasingly familiar. Suddenly think Students began to realize that when all the classes and the protests are and you're over 30, you have to have a job. So the issue of what follows college became more important -- a quiet dialogue if not a public confrontation: With college budgets being reduced, faculty positions being threatened, the faculty were less inclined to join in anti-war protests with the students. The mood on campus shifted dramatically from expansion to constriction. At the same time it became clear the nation was getting older. There would be fewer students in the days ahead, and at demography demonstrated that they we would have to work seriously with adults. HEach of these factors could, of course, be explored in detail, but I simply note them as headlines here to suggest that there were a number of forces at work--beginning with the shock wave of riots uncontrolled, followed by a sense of relief that the nation's conflict was waning reducing, then turning to the economic issues and imperatives that were touching the colleges, the faculty, and eventually the students. These were only hints at what might have been a remarkable and abrupt transition from the 60s to the 70s. All of these it did in fact contribute to the changing mood on campus that could only be characterized as more sober and reflective mood or campus at the advent of the 1970s.

The Legacy

I conclude then by offering what I think were perhaps the deeper legacies of this period in higher education. First, while there is an inclination to conclude that the students' protest over academic and curricular issues came and went, I disagree. I believe that higher education in America will never be the same. As an example, we had what is called in loco parentis, the practice of controlling student life with great rigidity.

Dormitories had hours. Young men and young women were separately housed, and restrictions and controls were dominant on campus.

In loco parentis collapsed during the decade of the sixties and there might even have been excesses in the freedoms introduced in its absence, there will be no turning back.

year study of colleges for a report to be released early next

year. Our survey of hundreds of colleges across the country

shows that they virtually have no rules in terms of student life outside

beyond the classroom. There are counselling and guidance

centers, but they do not have predetermined structures and

mandates except at the very conservative institutions. That is a

legacy of the impact of the sixties that lives on and one, altogether,

although, which is likely to remain with us.

I also believe that academically the campuses were made more susceptible to change, more willing to introduce new curriculum elements, more flexible to the open university models that are now spreading dramatically across the world. The idea that

learning is for students of all ages, that one can learn at other times and places than in the classroom and on the campus, the bestieve received enormous impetus from the students who said there must be a more flexible way to carry on their work. There are many examples where the legacy has been sustained and, in my view, has generally been wholesome and positive.

on the other hand, there is a darker side. I believe that Vietnam had a devastating impact on what I call the "worldmindedness" of the nation and our students. I remember the enthusiasm following World War II when international studies became popular and Washington was funding well area studies programs. I believe that Vietnam caused the nation to wonder whether we had any business going around the world either for good or bad. There was a sense of bankruptcy in the international dimension and the Interest in world studies dramatically declined, rederal support for interrational studies dramatically decreased -- an experience that occurred, unhappily, I think there was a kinder palpable new when I was in Washington. provincialism and isolationism; a conservatism that caused the nation to feet that our engagement in world affairs had brought tended to forget only grief. Under their influence we forgot withink, the Marshall plan, Fulbright program, the AID program--to name a few. I say what follows with considerable embarrassment with a that in a Calitarnia recent survey of community college students in California, a majority of the students could not locate Iran or El Salvador on steadily a map, even though those two countries are frequently in the headlines in our country of our media.

Above all, Interest the transition to the seventies was marked by a loss of confidence in our most sacred institutions, the universities included. Between 1964 and 1972 citizen alienation in America dramatically increased. Only 52 percent of eligible citizens participated in the 1972 Presidential election. During that same period, 51 percent of Americans surveyed said they did not believe that our government could solve our critical problems of energy, inflation, and crime. Between 1966 and 1979 the percentage of citizens who caid they had great confidence in the executive branch of government plummetted from 41 percent to 17 percent, and those who said they had great confidence in Congress plummetted from 42 percent to 18 percent.

Congress is corrupt; 31 percent said that major corporations are corrupt; 41 percent said that labor unions are corrupt; 39 percent said that the President is corrupt; and the list goes on. Never mind whether these are accurated perceptions. I can only say that at the beginning of the sixties there was disillusionment and suspicion that it would about

the efficacy of our institutions, and a deep suspicion work on our behalf, and even the suspicion that it was being led, about the trustworthiness of those who represent our by those whose interest they did not trust country's interests.

The dramatic transition of this period was captured by one of faculty member as follows. Although I think it could have been repeated by a thousand faculty, this quote comes from a professor, at George Washington University, a 20-year veteran of campus life. It describes most perceptively. I think, the transition in higher education during the decade we just discussed. "Ten years ago, the professor writes, students were actively engaged, caught up, and almost in spite of themselves in the general student unrest. Now they have withdrawn from all that...They are good at asserting their limited interests. They are especially clear about their limits. Most of the old issues of conscience are still there: race, women's rights, population, environment. Most sentiments about such issues among these students is 'right'--they hope things will work out well. The drift is toward political indifference."

In our own recent street of 5,000 American college and university students, 58 percent of those surveyed said they believed our political system was not working. The survey results also showed that American college students are increasingly materialistic: 77 percent agreed that "becoming well-off financially" was either important or very important to them. Further, 41 percent of those surveyed indicated that their main reason for attending college was related to getting a job.

Lewer

developing a "meaningful philosophy of life" was a central goal. Interestingly, tracking of these student attitudes over a life period shows a significant increase in commitment to financial gain, along with a decreasing emphasis on discovering meaning and purpose in one's life.

Meanwhile it seems the curriculum has also changed to reflect this new central focus of the students. It has become a job-related curriculum. About two-thirds of all undergraduate degrees granted by American colleges and universities today are in career-related fields. The field of sociology, for example, which was so strong during the 1960s when students were trying to understand the "social context" has had a dramatic decline in enrollments, while business, computers and health-related fields have experienced a dramatic increase in this decade.

I'm suggesting then that the transition from the 1960s to the 1970s was evidence in the attitudes of students as well.

John Kennedy's call for service was now forgotten, and the drive for justice had given way to new kind of individualism or privatism, and a kind of suspicion if not cynicism, both on and off the campus. In this sense the drift was so pervasive by late in the decade of the 1970s that President Carter shocked the nation (and perhaps contributed to his own undoing) when he tried to give it a name. Carter said, in 1978, that he believed

Americans were suffering from a national malaise. Maybe we were, but we didn't want to hear that from the President. We expected him instead to help us find a way out.

Before leaving the 1970s, I should make one final and important point regarding the transitions of this decade. During this historic period over 12 million new Americans were coming in from Latin America to the south and from Asia to the west. This happened to be the greatest migration in 70 years. I find it 15 particularly ironic that at the very same time the nation's sense of optimism seemed to be at an all time low, the wave of new immigrants coming to our shores was at an all time high.

In the period we are considering we can conclude that in one short decade America's colleges

we can conclude that in one short decade America's colleges
moved abruptly from a decade of inspiration to a decade of
confusion. They moved in one short decade from expansion to
retrenchment. They moved from a decade of world-mindedness to a
decade of careerism on the campus. I must also suggest, however,
that this transition was a sign more of fatigue than of a loss of
hope. While the impulses of hope and faith remained, there was they were
qualified that more realistic sense perhaps, of what could and could not
be accomplished through the student movements that have been
described.

Above ally I conclude that the future of the nation and education are inextricably interlocked. It is my own judgment that in the decade just ahead a larger, more inspired vision will once again appear on the nation's campuses as we seek to combine the social vision of the 1960s with the search for personal meaning that seems to dominate campus life today.