THE IMPACT OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR ON LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

By

JOHN WILLIAM TRESCH, JR.

Bachelor of Arts
Belmont College
Nashville, Tennessee
1959

Master of Divinity
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, Texas
1963

Master of Arts
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas
1963

Doctor of Divinity
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee
1970

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1986

Thesis
1986D
T796i
cop. 2

THE IMPACT OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

ON LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION

IN THE UNITED STATES

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

1258591

C O P Y R I G H T

by

John William Tresch, Jr.

May 10, 1986

PREFACE

This study of the impact of World War II on liberal arts education in the United States has been an interesting pilgrimage. It began within the context of a series of readings concerning liberal arts education. Most of the books read as part of that program were written between 1938 and 1948. An over-arching concern reflected in virtually every one of those books dealt with the fate, plight, or future of liberal arts education in the United States because of the Second World War.

Trained in history, which stimulated a natural curiosity, having spent most of my education experiences in liberal arts educational institutions, and engaged in an academic program of higher education, my curiosity was significantly aroused by those readings. I began to wonder about the extent to which the war had impacted higher education in the United States. Because liberal arts education was predominant, I elected to narrow the field of study. Numerous questions arose in my mind: Did the nature and definition of liberal arts education change as a result of the war? If so, how and to what degree? To what extent was the financial structure of liberal arts educational institutions changed--if indeed they were changed --by the war? Were there any alterations in the enroll-

ment patterns before, during, and after the war? Was there agreement or diversity of understanding with respect to the role of the liberal arts in American higher education? To what extent were the various facets of the impact temporary? How potentially far-reaching did those facets of that impact appear to be?

With those questions--among many others--in mind, I decided to pursue the answers. And, with the approval of my committee, I proceeded with the research. To begin, I read every available book written during that period of history on the subject of higher education. Then, I researched various journal articles published during that era. My next strategy was to review other books and articles which had been identified in the bibliographies of those books and articles.

Because I was aware of the significance of the study, I read General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee, which was published in 1945. This well-known "Harvard Redbook," which was the result of an exhaustive study by members of the Harvard faculty, held the potential for articulating in a concise manner the concerns expressed by numerous persons and groups in higher education during the period of history under examination. Hopefully, it would provide the nucleus of the agreement in behalf of liberal arts and education.

In addition, the six volumes of Higher Education for Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher

Education, published in 1947, were analyzed. The significance of this report was the fact that it articulated the arguments in behalf of a new, revised approach to higher education. Although the Commission did not reject the notion of liberal arts education, it did enunciate a call for a broader, more pragmatic approach to higher education. The Commission carefully--but subjectively--analyzed the current status of higher education in the United States, as well as the perceived needs and wishes of the general public. Probably its most meaningful contribution was the rationale for increased federal government involvement in higher education -- especially in the realm of funding.

Having completed those facets of the research, I wrote Earl James McGrath, highly-regarded expert on the matter of liberal arts education in the United States. After sharing with him a copy of my dissertation proposal, I asked him to make an assessment of it and to suggest possible areas for further research. In his response, he identified those components of the topic which had surfaced most prominently in my own research as the areas for investigation. Encouraging me in the task and its importance, he quickly stated that I had "selected a very interesting and challenging topic. I must say that I am surprised that no one has undertaken this research earlier." Then, he added the observation that "changes of great social and cultural significance occurred between 1940 and 1945 in the purpose, substance, patronage, and consequences of liberal arts

education." Later in the letter he wrote that "yours is an engaging project. It is difficult because some of your conclusions will require judgements that cannot be derived exclusively from analysis of quantitative data."[1]

With that optimistic and encouraging letter in hand, I proceeded to attempt to attain some additional data by writing selected liberal arts colleges. I asked the appropriate person (usually the Registrar) in each institution to provide the following information from their catalogs for 1935, 1940, and 1948: (1) the mission statement of the college, (2) the admission requirements for each of those years, (3) the core curriculum for each of those years, and (4) the financial charges to the students during those years. The following schools were invited to respond:

Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts
Bates College, Lewiston, Maine
Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine
Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island
Birmingham Southern College, Birmingham, Alabama
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
Colby College, Waterville, Maine
Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire
Franklin Pierce College, Rindge, New Hampshire
Mercer University, Macon, Georgia
Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont

---

[1]Letter, December 16, 1985

Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts
Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio
Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, Arkansas
Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhose Island
Smith College, North Hampton, Massachusetts
Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticutt
Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticutt
Williams College, Williams Town, Massachusetts
Yale University, New Haven, Connecticutt

Most, but not all of these institutions, responded. One individual replied that, to the best of his or anyone else's knowledge, that New England school had never had a mission statement. Another individual wrote that their archives were in such disarray that it was impossible to locate the requested data. My reason for requesting that information was to enable me to compare any changes reflected in that data with the results of my broader study in order to measure, in another way, the impact of the Second World War on liberal arts institutions.

The pilgrimage has been long and arduous. It would not have been possible without the encouragement and assistance of some very special persons. First, I am grateful for the love and support of my wife, Beverly, as we pursued this additional degree. Then, there are my sons, David and especially Kyle, who shared my efforts during the time of comprehensive examinations. Also, I am appreciative of Dr. Tom Karman, who first invited me to enter this academic

program and directed the writing of this dissertation. In addition, there is President-emeritus, Robert Kamm, who not only served as chairman of my committee, but has been a caring mentor and friend. Next, there is Dr. John Gardner, who has challenged and encouraged me to research and write. The final member of my committee is Dr. David Baird, a fellow historian, who has offered considerable assistance.

Furthermore, I would acknowledge my appreciation for Dr. Ann Austin and Dr. William Camp, who, although not members of my committee, nevertheless have provided valued inspiration and counsel. Also, I would express my appreciation for Dean Donald Robinson, who made possible a wider learning experience and an income which enabled me to continue and complete this program of study. Finally, I would express my gratitude to Kendra Thorp, who worked so well with me as she typed this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

Self-understanding Adjusted. 4
War and Higher Education in General. . . . 6
Wars and American Higher Education 7
The Second World War 10
Reflections on the Relationship. 12
Liberal Arts Affected. 13

II. THE IMPACT ON HIGHER EDUCATION PHILOSOPHY . . . 17

The Goal of Higher Education 18
The Objects of Higher Education. 20
The Meaning of Higher Education. 21
The Role of Higher Education 22
The Nature of Liberal Arts Education . . . 24
Challenges to Liberal Arts Education . . . 32
The Direction of Liberal Arts Education. . 34
The Struggle for Direction 36
The Struggle for Meaning in Society. . . . 41
The Struggle for a Focus 44
The Struggle with Change 49
General Education--A Response. 51
Liberal Arts Education and a Future. . . . 54

III. THE IMPACT ON CURRICULUM. 58

Criticisms and Challenges. 58
Content or Definition. 64
Redirection Called For 68
Opportunities. 72
Wartime Adjustments. 74
The Harvard Plan 78

IV. THE IMPACT ON PROGRAMS. 83

A Long-time Struggle 84
Liberal Arts Response. 90
The Role of Society. 97
Democracy and the Liberal Arts Program . . 104

Chapter Page

Challenges to the Programs 107
Student Expectations 114
The Issues of Language Study and Research 121
The Changing Practice of the Federal Government 124

V. IMPACT ON FINANCIAL MATTERS 129

A Shift in Involvement 132
The G. I. Bill of Rights 134
Other Post-War Approaches. 138
Problems and Concerns. 143
Cost Factors 148

VI. IMPACT ON ENROLLMENTS 151

Pre-Second World War and Wartime 152
Post-War Impact. 155
Ebbing Tide. 160

VII. CASE STUDIES. 164

Amherst College. 164
Bates College. 166
Bowdoin College. 167
Brown University 168
Dartmouth College. 169
Mercer University. 170
Middlebury College 171
Mount Holyoke College. 172
Ouachita Baptist University. 173
Smith College. 173
Trinity College. 174
Wesleyan University. 175
Williams College 176

VIII. CONCLUSION. 177

BIBLIOGRAPHY 183

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Wars are disruptive to society in general--and the Second World War was no less disruptive to society in the United States. Industry, the economy, mores were all affected. In addition, liberal arts education in the United States was impacted by the war. Areas of liberal arts education which were impacted included the nature and definition of liberal arts education, curricula, financial matters, and enrollments. To determine the extent of that impact, I read every available book written during that period of history on the subject of higher education. Then, I researched various journal articles published during that era. Those books and articles served as primary sources for the historical research because they were not written to describe or interpret events after-the-fact. Rather, their authors were expressing their concerns and struggles which the war occasioned. In addition, I examined the catalogs of a number of well-established liberal arts colleges to ascertain the extent of the war's impact upon them. To facilitate an understanding of the impact the Second World War had upon liberal arts education in the United States, a cursory book at an historical

perspective is beneficial.

Higher education has, from colonial days, been a priority for the American people. In fact, scarcely had the earliest settlers arrived from England before they began to consider the need for what we today label higher education. One of the most significant components of the heritage they brought with them was a love for and commitment to education. The three basic professions were the clergy, medicine, and law--and education was essential for anyone to enter any one of those professions. Although such education was elitist, apparently the colonists did not deem it to be inequitable. Elitism was accepted as inherent in education. Because of the felt need for clergy, religious denominations were responsible for and instrumental in the founding of almost every one of the earliest colleges in the colonies. In fact, it was not until well after the United States had become a nation that the idea of egalitarianism in higher education began to surface.

As the United States began to mature and expand, so did the attitude of the nation's citizens toward education. With the passing of time, Americans gradually shifted in their thinking about higher education as being only for the elite in society to the point where larger numbers of parents began to dream of it as a privilege for their children. Later, that thinking evolved to an attitude that higher education was more than a privilege--it was a right that belonged to every American young person. With

that significant change in concept came the perspective that education was by far the largest and the most helpful of the nation's enterprises. Even during this evolution in thinking, the liberal arts continued to predominate in that concept of education. Although they remained as the core of higher education, there were intermittent pressures to modify higher education to be more responsive to the needs and desires of society.

Faith in higher education, therefore, has long been "one of the most deeply rooted ideals in American culture and is ever reverently on the lips of every speaker and writer on the subject, whether lay or professional."[1] Such lofty words of praise have been spoken because of the many contributions higher education has made to American life. Among other contributions, it has, by opening the door of opportunity to the masses, developed the democratic spirit of the American people. Moreover, it has raised the standards of living of those people through technological advances; and, thereby, it has been largely responsible for the tremendous economic and industrial strides the nation has taken. Also, it has led to the development of the most adequate program of research and professional education in the world.[2]

---

[1]Isaac Leon Kandel, The Cult of Uncertainty (New York, 1943), p. 24.

[2]Oliver C. Carmichael, "Weaknesses in the College," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), pp. 38-39.

Self-Understanding Adjusted

Higher education might never have been able to make those contributions without also making adjustments in its own self-understanding. Many Americans had erroneously viewed higher education as being merely a process of stuffing the mind with facts. This misconception had largely grown out of their misunderstanding of the nature of liberal arts education. Such inaccuracies of thinking often led to stereotyping and even prejudice. Fortunately, there were persons who held a loftier view of higher education. For example, members of the Harvard University faculty pointed out that higher education "is not merely the imparting of knowledge but the cultivation of certain aptitudes and attitudes in the mind of the young."[3] Elsewhere there was the notion that higher education was responsible for the making of the future. To fulfill that assignment in a democratic society, higher education was to assume the role of both critic and leader, as well as servant. Accordingly, its task was not merely to meet the demands of the present but to alter those demands if necessary, in order to keep them always suited to democratic ideals. "Perhaps its most important role is to serve as an

---

[3]General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge, 1945), p. 64. (Hereafter cited as The Harvard Redbook).

instrument of social transition."[4]

Believing that higher education ought to look to the whole man--the good man, the good citizen, the useful man --it was assumed that the goal of higher education would be to enable that good man (one who possesses an inner integration, poise, and firmness) to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, and to discriminate among values.[5] However, that assignment, it was believed, was not limited to citizens of the United States. Rather, American institutions of higher education were viewed as having an enlarged responsibility, around the world, to help people move from the provincial and insular mind-set to an international mind-set through an intensified study of all aspects of international affairs. Such adjustment in thinking was necessary because the world was likened to a centrifugal culture in extreme need of unifying forces, such as a better understanding of the human past.[6] Although such thinking had been taking place prior to the Second World War, it was renewed and reinvigorated by the war and its aftermath, which created new educational forces.

---

[4]The President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. I (Washington, D.C., 1947), p. 6.

[5]The Harvard Redbook, pp. 65-74.

[6]The President's Commission, p. 15. The Harvard Redbook, p. 108.

War and Higher Education in General

There have been numerous historical connections between warfare and education which go much deeper "than the simple but impressive connection between destruction and technical training."[7] Whereas education, in general, has tended to become increasingly involved with warfare as warfare has developed, higher education was more seriously affected by the war than any other branch of American education.[8] Although education has been regarded as a social process which derives its meaning and purposes from the culture of a people whether organized as a community or as a nation, in the past, when wars were fought with professional or volunteer armies, the effects upon the normal life of a people or upon the progress of education were not felt either directly or immediately.[9]

Nevertheless, war has often seemed to quicken a nation. For example, the founding of the University of Leyden and the University of Berlin were both the result of an interest in education, which interest had been heightened by the wars. However, when Frederick William III founded the University of Berlin, in 1810, although it

---

[7]Charles F. Thwing, History of Education in the United States Since the Civil War (Boston, 1910), p. 4. Howard Mumford Jones, Education and the World Tragedy (Cambridge, 1946), p. 18.

[8]Ibid., p. 20.

[9]Isaac Leon Kandel, The Impact of the War Upon American Education (Chapel Hill, 1948), p. 3.

was intended to be "a weapon of war as well as a nursery of learning," it made its martial contribution in the field of the spirit only. Its curriculum was not dictated by Prussian generals, and Lehrfreiheit and Lernfreiheit, two essentially civilian concepts, were from the beginning the theoretical principles of its life.[10] Hence, although higher education has been thought of as a pawn for use in military efforts, that expectation has seldom been realized. For example, even under the despotism of Napoleon the University of Paris continued to operate as a civilian institution. Whereas, in the 19th century, Britain sometimes stood alone, and sometimes feared an invasion from the Continent, Oxford, Cambridge, St. Andrews, Edinburgh, and Dublin Universities continued to pursue the peaceful tenor of their civilian ways. Furthermore, in the United States, neither the War of 1812 nor the war with Mexico touched the lives of its colleges significantly.[11]

Wars and American Higher Education

Nevertheless, wars have made impact on higher education in the United States. One of the most far-reaching evidences of that impact was the First Morrill Act of 1862. The provisions of that act, which was designed to make a

---

[10] Thwing, pp. 5-6. Jones, pp. 20-21.

[11] Jones, pp. 20-21.

utilitarian college education available to the sons and daughters of the working class, are well known. The act awarded each state 30,000 acres of land per each United States Representative and Senator from that state. In turn, the state was allowed to sell that land and use the proceeds from the sale in its agricultural and mechanical college endeavors. Not so widely publicized, however, has been the fact that the law required each college which profited by it to institute courses in military training or to offer equivalent instruction. That requirement was a direct result of circumstances developing during the United States Civil War. During the early phase of that conflict Confederate officers appeared to be superior to those in the Union Army. Generally, that superiority was attributed to the fact that most of the Confederate officers had been trained at the United States Military Academy at West Point and to the relatively large number of military schools operating in the southern states. It was in an attempt to equalize that situation that the law contained the provision for military training.[12]

There have been other developments in the relationship between higher education and military concern. For example, in 1916, the National Defense Act further enriched the alliance between war and education by creating in the colleges the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in more than 400 colleges. The significant fact was not the success or

---

[12]Ibid., p. 22.

failure of this enterprise; rather it was that the colleges accepted it almost without protest, as part of their duty to the nation. The Students' Army Training Corps, established two years later, made education subordinate to the military, because its sole purpose was to increase the military power of the nation. Under the program, academic standards were arbitrarily set aside and military standards, manners, and methods were instituted.[13] In the spirit of patriotism, the American Council on Education grew out of a movement organized in January, 1918, to place the resources of the education institutions of the United States more completely at the disposal of the national government.[14] Then, when the National Research Council set forth its program, two of its six stated aims were avowedly military in nature. First, they proposed "the quickening of research in the sciences and in their application to the useful arts in order to increase knowledge, to strenghten national defense, and to contribute in other ways to the public welfare." Then, they announced their intention to "call the attention of scientific and technical investigators to the importance of military and industrial problems in connection with the war, and to the furthering of the solution of these problems by specific researches."[15]

---

[13]Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[14]Ibid., p. 24.

[15]Ibid., p. 25.

The Second World War

With that heritage of involvement and impact, it was not surprising to discover that, like all other wars, the Second World War had a profound effect on practically every facet of life, and that perhaps no human activity or institution felt that impact more strongly than did higher education. The net effect of the Second World War was to broaden and extend the relation between war and higher education which had been worked out some 30 years earlier. Consequently, the impact of the Second World War on higher education was more general and widespread than it had been during the First World War. For example, because of the withdrawal of teachers from schools for military service or for war-related industries, institutions for the preparation of teachers, as well as public schools, experienced a serious and growing crisis.[16]

Moreover, the Second World War effected a number of other changes, such as hastening the thinking that public education at all levels should be classless, coeducational, nonpartisan in politics, and secular. Somewhat aligned with those changes was the development of a widespread tendency to discard traditional values, forms, and conventions.[17] Early in the war, acknowledgement was made concerning the fact that war changes values both for the

---

[16]Ibid., p. 4.

[17]Isaac Leon Kandel, American Education in the Twentieth Century (Cambridge, 1957), pp. 65, 1.

nation and for the individual. As immediate goals became more urgent than long-range objectives, and traditions became less binding upon policies, one question became uppermost in the minds of administrators, teachers, and students in the colleges and universities: "How can this institution, how can I as an individual, best serve the nation?"[18] Also, there was an acceleration of interest in the study of international relations, as well as the exchange of students, teachers, and professors. On the other hand, it became increasingly apparent that all governmental agencies ought to recognize that higher education as such was a national defense. Additionally, education was of vital importance to maintain a continuous supply of men and women trained in mind and body. Through effective instruction and guidance, it was believed, colleges and universities could make a most important and necessary contribution to national defense. Regardless of the needs and potential contributions of higher education, government agencies favored "the continued operation of educational institutions with as little disruption as possible and have not attempted in any way to advocate or sponsor a reorienting of college courses."[19]

---

[18]American Council on Educational Studies, Higher Education and National Defense, Bulletin 19 (Washington, D.C., 1941), pp. 1-2.

[19]American Concil on Educational Studies, Higher Education Cooperates in National Defense (Washington, D.C., 1941), p. 32.

At the outset of the war, two points were stressed. First, there was an intensified obligation upon colleges and universities to maintain with courage upon their campuses the atmosphere of free discussion and teaching which was characteristic of institutions of higher education in a democracy. Second, it was essential that the great ongoing task of service, teaching, and research focused in state-supported institutions of higher education must proceed with as little disturbance as possible and with a consideration throughout all readjustments for the adequate performance of those traditional duties.[20]

Reflections on the Relationship

There were other facets of the impact of the Second World War on higher education in the United States. The war led to a serious reflection upon that relationship. Realizing that wars begin in the minds of men, the conclusion was drawn that it was in the minds of men that the defenses of peace would necessarily have to be constructed. The war had forced an inquiry into the nation's system of education not only as to whether it could meet the test of war, but whether it was adequate to meet the demands of the peace that would follow the war.[21] The private colleges,

---

[20]American Council on Educational Studies, Organizing Higher Education for National Defense (Washington, D.C., 1941), pp. 44 ff.

[21]The President's Commission, p. 15. Kandel, Impact, pp. 4-5.

especially, had to engage in some serious reflections because of other factors. Although they were free from the direct influence of governments which subjected the tax-supported institutions to periodic investigations to assess their support of the existing order, these colleges were subject to a special array of reactions to their basic purposes because, increasingly, their students were representing the conservative, technologically oriented impulses of society. Moreover, they received much of their support from middle class families who had an interest in preserving their advantages.[22] Consequently, institutions of higher education--both public and private--came to experience substantial pressures to provide the preparation demanded for the armed services and for the technical fields. In response to those pressures, leaders of higher education felt that it was their obligation to do everything they could to preserve a place for the humanities. They reasoned that the sciences, both pure and applied, needed no special pleading for retention in the programs of higher education.[23]

Liberal Arts Affected

Liberal arts education was also affected. In times past it had always been designed for the free, the socially

---

[22]W. Max Wise, The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry Into the Processes of Collegiate Government (New Haven, 1969), p. 33.

[23]Kandel, Impact, p. 6.

and politically competent elements of society, who were an elite within society. The war, however, redefined that free element in society to be the entire mass of the population, men and women, naturally talented or untalented, rich or poor.[24] There were, however, educators who challenged the imputation that liberal arts colleges, historically, had been guilty of withdrawing to an ivory tower. On the contrary, they were viewed as having richly fertilized American life and thought.[25] Because the colleges felt a dual obligation both to contribute to the winning of the war and to prevent a "blackout" of liberal arts education in order to protect the future of American culture, they discovered that the war "almost completely suspended liberal education."[26]

For some years there had been extensive discussions among educators with regard to the nature, content, essence, and future of liberal arts education. However, with the advent of the Second World War, all such discussions were suspended for some months by immediate preparations for war. After all, colleges for men had to think of the needs of the armed forces. Later, as tension in the educational world gradually eased, those discussions were

---

[24]Thomas Woody, Liberal Education for Free Men (Philadelphia, 1951), p. 228.

[25]Theodore Meyer Greene et al., Liberal Education Reexamined: Its Role in a Democracy (New York, 1943), pp. 11-12.

[26]Mark Van Doren, Liberal Education (New York, 1943), p. vii. Kandel, Impact, p. 6.

resumed.[27] Hence, the period from 1940 to 1946 could well have been one of the most significant and fruitful periods in the history of liberal arts colleges in the United States because of the nation-wide discussions and the extensive literature dealing with the meaning of a liberal arts education and the methods for achieving it. Historically, the liberal arts have gone through three steps of a cycle on more than one occasion. In the final (third) step (which began during the latter stages of the war) the liberal arts had been modified by omitting some of the skills once inculcated, and by adding a broader scope of areas of the world along with a diversified selection of aspects of life. Thus modified, the liberal arts were deemed to be better suited to acquaint men with problems than to provide them with a means for understanding or for action.[28] The future of the liberal arts was staked on the continued vitality of academic freedom, and would be crucial in the years following the cessation of the war. This factor was viewed as particularly important in light of the fact that most of the colleges were understood to have been founded for utilitarian purposes and their work has been guided largely or totally by utilitarian considerations.[29]

---

[27]William F. Cunningham, General Education and The Liberal College (St. Louis, 1953), p. v.

[28]Richard P. McKeon, "Future of Liberal Arts," Smith, pp. 172-173.

[29]George P. Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College: A Chapter in American Cultural History (New Brunswich, 1957), p. 261. Thorstein Veblen, Higher Learning in America (New York, 1935), p. 32.

Interestingly enough, these discussions regarding liberal arts education focused upon attempts to formulate and understand the meaning of the subject. Generally, the three major fields of human knowledge were considered to be the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. It was further believed that any undergraduate whose special interests lay in one of those fields would be enabled to understand his own field in the context of the whole of human knowledge.[30] However, the role of the humanities was highlighted--especially toward the conclusion of the war, because of the discovery of the murderous potentialities in nuclear energy. Therefore, the most tremendous task before higher education became the search for a means of "restoring between human being and human being the calm and confident relationship which our western culture has lost, is losing, and will continue to lose until" that simple faith between persons could be restored.[31]

---

[30]Aston R. Williams, General Education in Higher Education (Columbia, 1968), p. x.

[31]Jones, pp. 77-79, 106.

CHAPTER II

THE IMPACT ON HIGHER EDUCATION PHILOSOPHY

One of the most important facets of the impact of the Second World War on liberal arts education was with regard to the philosophy which undergirded higher education. As mentioned earlier, there had been an extensive pre-war discussion with regard to the nature, content, essence, and future of liberal arts education. That discussion, however, was within the context of a larger discussion of the philosophy of the entire scope of higher education. The war brought the country to a clearer realization that higher education was a national concern and that, if the faith of the American people in education and in the ideal of giving every potential citizen a chance for his fullest development was to continue, the resources of the nation needed to be pooled. After all, higher education, like all of society's prime needs, had changed as society had changed. Whereas the high school had tended to be a civilizing place in the fundamental sense of giving young people the tools on which any civilization depended, the college had stood in direct, almost mirror-like relationship to the state of knowledge, responding to its movements, changing

as it had changed.[1]

Higher education has had a long-standing interrelationship with society at large. It has served as the formally organized process whereby society had conserved, transmitted, and advanced its intellectual resources. In fact, the service of higher education to society has been the primary justification for its existence. "But a good society must be composed of good men; men educated for leadership in society must be competent individuals."[2] Higher education has long been social-issue-centered, with the advantage of a more-or-less clearly articulated scale of values to give it direction.[3]

The Goal of Higher Education

Inherent in the entire discussion of that era was a consideration of the goal of higher education to be the preparation of each individual, so far as his native endowment would permit, to live well in his society and in the universe in which he found himself. Taken as a whole, higher education has sought to accomplish two things. First, it has endeavored to help young persons fulfill the

---

[1]General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge, 1945), p. 36. (Hereafter cited as The Harvard Redbook).

[2]Algo D. Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education: A Study of the Liberal Arts Program (New York, 1944), p. 42. John D. Millett, Financing Higher Education in the United States (New York, 1952), p. 3.

[3]Stewart G. Cole, Liberal Education in a Democracy: A Chapter for the American College (New York, 1940), p. 56.

unique, particular functions in life which it was in them to fulfill. Second, it has labored to equip those same young people, so far as it could, for those common spheres which, as citizens and heirs of a joint culture, they would share with others.[4] Because man is a rational animal, the purpose of higher education has been to make him more rational and less like an animal; that is, to give his rationality control over his animality. Therefore, the ability to think and to reason, within the limits set by one's mental capacity, should be the distinguishing mark of an educated person.[5]

Higher education was considered to have, therefore, three identifiable objectives. First, there were the educational goals involved in realizing the intellectual aims of higher education. Second, there were the social goals involved in determining how large a part of our population institutions of higher education ought to endeavor to educate. Third, there were the structured or organizational goals of the American system of higher education arising from its entire concept of a free society. Each of those three different, but closely related, aspects of higher education needed to be clearly understood if it was to find meaning.[6]

---

[4]Theodore Meyer Greene, Liberal Education Reconsidered (Cambridge, 1953), p. 24. The Harvard Redbook, p. 4.

[5]William F. Cunningham, General Education and the Liberal College (St. Louis, 1953), p. 243.

[6]Millett, p. 3.

The Objects of Higher Education

Predicated upon the concept of the sociological nature of higher education, the discussion shifted in focus to the objects of that education. In other words, was higher education to be restricted to a special, elite group of young people? Was it to be made available to every young person in the United States? Or, was there to be some compromise to determine the qualifications necessary for young people to attend an institution of higher education? There was no unanimity in the response to those questions. Many persons--principally educators--raised the question as to whether it was sound social policy to educate so many people at the college level. They were genuinely apprehensive that greater problems would arise by educating more persons at that level than could be absorbed into occupations requiring college-level training. The concern was that, should such a condition eventuate, it would lay a foundation for grave social unrest and widespread personal disappointment and sense of frustration. However, these same educators were quick to observe that no society could ever have too many liberal arts graduates.[7]

Not everyone shared that apprehension. In fact, the spirit of Jacksonianism seemed to be stronger than ever. Recognition was made of the fact that the American people

---

[7]John Dale Russell, "Major Problems Facing Higher Education," _Current Problems in Higher Education_ (1947), p. 12.

had long before acknowledged that education was not only democracy's obligation but its necessity--because it has served as the foundation of democratic liberties. Democracy, it was taught, is dedicated to the proposition that all men are entitled to an equal chance to be free and to seek happiness, despite the observation that American society was plagued with inequalities--even in so fundamental a right as education. Based upon their experiences, the advocates of an expanded enrollment in higher education, reasoned that these institutions had awakened intellectual curiosity and ambition in many youth who would not otherwise have sought any college education. Liberal admission policies were, therefore, vital for the further development of the United States.[8]

The Meaning of Higher Education

In the efforts to settle the issues of the goal of higher education and the characteristics of those persons who ought to participate as students, there evolved complicated discussions focusing upon the basic question: what is higher education? Not only was there a search for an acceptable working definition of higher education, the value, role, and purpose of higher education were brought into question. Although there were numerous statements, throughout the period, that favored higher education, there

---

[8]The President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. I (Washington, D.C., 1947), pp. 12-13, 25, 70.

was still the need for something more than rhetoric to demonstrate that fact. Statements of purpose had been developed--but often without support from persons and groups related to the colleges. In fact, those interested parties often appeared to be working at cross purposes, with the result that they frustrated any clear sense of direction in those schools.[9] Seemingly, during much of that era, most American colleges had no comprehensive conception of educational objectives, even though they espoused a concern with the source of ideals and values by which men lived.[10] Almost all statements of purpose lacked any clear exposition of assumptions which would distinguish one college from the others. Those statements were uniformly unclear with respect to the student clientele served, the particular strengths of curricular offerings, and the degree to which the college accepted an explicit theory of learning, that is, the relative importance of traditional exposition by faculty versus the shifting of responsibility for learning to the student.[11]

The Role of Higher Education

Once again, the Second World War accelerated the discussion relative to the role of education in the struggle

---

[9]W. Max Wise, The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry Into the Processes of Collegiate Government (New Haven, 1969), p. 16.

[10]Cole, p. 59. Isaac Leon Kandel, The Cult of Uncertainty (New York, 1943), p. x.

against error and sin. As is apparently the experience whenever that discussion has arisen, there were persons who argued that higher education ought to serve as a kind of insurance against those evils. Some persons even implied that higher education, if conducted properly, would actually prevent error and sin. They failed to realize that there would continue to be plenty of both in a universe which man did not create, and which he inhabits as a more-or-less refractory citizen. If war be termed a gigantic error, education alone could not cure it, neither should it promise to do so. To make such a promise was described as being as unrealistic as promising "to find every man the right wife, or guarantee that each of his children will be helpful to him in his old age."[12]

Higher education, it was reasoned, needed to aim at a broader target than the then current role. Such a change would require educators to reflect upon their intentions, and move beyond the naive assumption that the world's ills were the result of the past generation of students not having been taught to believe enough things. Instead, higher education needed to explore for the innate possibilities in young people, and then direct their efforts so that they would become searchers after knowledge and self-motivated to grow.[13] Afterall, as Rousseau had stated:

---

[11]Wise, pp. 14-15.

[12]Mark Van Doren, Liberal Education (New York, 1943), p. 8.

[13]Ibid., p. 5. Henderson, p. 115.

"Those of us who can best endure the good and evil of life are the best educated."[14] According to some writers of that period, education was designed to prepare men to do what they have never done before, by emphasizing power to adapt oneself and proceed alone.[15] Another writer, after observing that growth takes place both extensively and intensively, commented that "education is growth in the direction of living more fully."[16] Similarly, education described the "bringing forth or maturing of the intellectual powers of man rather than the pouring in of factual information."[17] Therefore, education, if rightly established, would provide for "happy functioning of citizens individually and collectively."[18]

The Nature of Liberal Arts Education

Even though there were extensive discussions relative to the nature or meaning of liberal arts education, there was no unanimity as to a precise, agree-upon definition. At one extreme there were educators who insisted that

---

[14]Cited in Van Doren, p. 14.

[15]Theodore Meyer Greene et al., Liberal Education Re-examined: Its Role in a Democracy (New York, 1943), p. 12.

[16]Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 184.

[17]John Dale Russell, "Major Problems Facing Higher Education" (Appleton, 1937), p. 17.

[18]Thomas Woody, Liberal Education for Free Men (Philadelphia, 1951), p. 50.

liberal arts education could only be defined in terms of the original seven liberal arts. However, there were other educators who insisted on a much broader definition, insisting that a liberal arts education was any education that liberated the student to become mature and without prejudice.

As had been the situation in earlier discussions, once again the discussion of the nature of higher education--especially liberal arts education--began to look at the place of the past and culture in higher education. On one hand, there were those critics who scolded higher education because it was predicated upon the past. They insisted that it was not up-to-date, lacked modernity, and failed to deal with the things of today and tomorrow. Had it not been so oriented toward the past, they reasoned, the war would have been foreseen and educated against. Unfortunately, they argued, the "values cherished by the colleges are antiques. Their habits of thought are outmoded."[19] According to the further reasoning of this group of writers, the older educational goal of producing a cultured man was inherently static. It was an outgrowth of one basic objective of the college -- that of passing on the cultural heritage, the possession of which became a badge of social privilege. Consequently, that approach to higher education largely lost its social usefulness.[20]

---

[19]Henry Merritt Wriston, The Nature of a Liberal Education (Appleton, 1937), p. 17.

However, there were proponents of liberal arts education who endeavored to counter the arguments of the critics. They perceived that higher education--especially liberal arts education--produced more than a life of cultural richness. It also had produced that technological competence and leadership which seemed to be a consideration relevant to a determination of a desirable level of national effort. Actually, cultural value meant much more than immediate contemporary relevance. The accent on practical relevance had too often masked a retreat from the ideal of genuine education.[21] The reminder was given that it "is the responsibility of higher education to devise programs and methods which will make clear the ethical values and the concept of human relations upon which our political system rests."[22]

Ultimately, liberal arts education sought to develop in students rigorous thinking detached from self-interest. The ability to think in accordance with the facts and with the laws of inference, to choose wisely, to feel with discrimination has always been that which distinguishes mankind from the animals and endows him with intrinsic

---

[20]Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 110.

[21]James Earl Russell, Federal Activities in Higher Education After the Second World War: An Analysis of the Nature, Scope, and Impact of Federal Activities in Higher Education in the Fiscal Year 1947 (New York, 1951), p. 84. Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 12.

[22]The President's Commission, Vol. 2, p. 12.

worth. The ability to reason has been both an end in itself and a means to the mastery of life. Hence the final test of education would be the union of knowledge and reason in the integrated personality.[23] Liberal arts education, therefore, endeavored to engender certain types of personality traits and abilities. For example, it tried to provide essential knowledge--at least the vital system of ideas of a period. Then, it was to cultivate those intellectual skills which enabled the student to think logically and clearly, so as to have the ability to organize his thoughts on any subject on which essential facts were possessed or attainable. Finally, it labored to cultivate certain character traits, such as: the intellectual curiosity and intellectual humility of the tolerant, temperate, balanced man of maturity and magnanimity, whose rational processes were not at the mercy of his fears and prejudices.[24]

Thinking for the sake of thinking was not the sole objective or outcome. From a practical perspective, it was believed, more higher education could produce more individuals of improved capacity who might, in turn, develop additional economic opportunities. Such a development would utilize the services of more persons with advanced thinking. This focus grew out of the attitude that, al-

---

[23]The Harvard Redbook, p. 168. Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 9.

[24]Earl James McGrath, Liberal Education in the Professions (New York, 1959), pp. 18-25.

though learning for learning's sake might have been a noble aim of university educators, it tended to be so ideal that it was often the objective in practice of only a few students--those who had an eye on an academic position.[25] Therefore, if college graduates were to learn how to be free, thinking, and of improved capacity, colleges would have to "concern themselves with the development of self-discipline and self-reliance, of ethical principles as a guide for conduct, of sensitivity to injustice and equality, of insight into human motives and aspirations, of discriminating appreciation of a wide range of human values, of the spirit of democratic compromise and cooperation."[26] Accordingly, the college that carried on its activity in a climate of freedom was more than just an instrument of a free civilization--it was one of the special places where the meaning of that civilization was to be found.[27]

Everyone had encountered education in one form or another. It had always come from a variety of sources: pleasure, work, disappointment, through friends and lovers, in laws and customs, religion, popular art, posters, and proverbs.[28] Hence, the availability of education was not

---

[25]James Russell, p. 84. Aston R. Williams, General Education in Higher Education (New York, 1968), p. 17.

[26]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 10.

[27]G. Kerry Smith, ed., Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970 (San Francisco, 1970), p. 124.

[28]Van Doren, p. 85.

the issue. Rather, the concern was with the refinement and systematizing of those educational experiences. In an effort to respond to that concern, President Harry S. Truman appointed a commission to consider such matters as the best procedures for expanding educational opportunities for all able young people, an assessment of curricula, the viability of intermediate technical institutes, and the financial structure of higher education.[29] That study was, in many respects, an outgrowth or evolution of developments which had been occuring across several years. In fact, since 1900, the central influence on the political processes of the American college was that the basis for the legitimacy of the use of power in the college by the governing board, the president, and others, was gradually transformed from parochial bases related to particular geographic, religious, and ethnic relationships to cosmopolitan bases which expressed the values of pluralism and cosmopolitanism.[30]

Although much of the discussion employed the term "higher education," it was almost universally understood that the term was synonymous with liberal arts education. After all, at the very heart of the entire intellectual conception of higher education was liberal arts education. During the war, there was a growing group of educators who contended that educational salvation would be possible only

---

[29]Isaac Leon Kandel, The Impact of the War Upon American Education (Chapel Hill, 1948), p. 164.

[30]Wise, p. 26.

by a return to the seven liberal arts (grammer, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy).[31] In its most simple form the argument was that, since the primary business of education was with the moral and intellectual "virtues," the proper organization of a college ought to be around those seven liberal arts. Even at the outset of the impending war, there was expressed the firm belief that a liberal arts education, which would focus on the building of a person, afforded the only hope for rebuilding a better world.[32] It was even stated that any tendency to neglect liberal arts education would threaten the American culture and democratic way of life.[33]

Historically, the liberal arts college has played the major role in the development of higher education in the United States. Traditionally, it has been the most characteristic type of American institution of higher education -- even though many outstanding liberal arts colleges have expanded into universities.[34] These schools had pioneered

---

[31]Millett, p. 14. Kandel, Impact, pp. 202-206.

[32]Howard Mumford Jones, Education and World Tragedy (Cambridge, 1946), pp. 56-57. Stewart G. Cole, Liberal Education in a Democracy: A Charter for the American College (New York, 1940), this was the theme of his entire book. William F. Cunningham, General Education and the Liberal College (St. Louis, 1953). He wrote this book to respond to Robert Hutchins' challenge to Catholic educators. His goal was to save liberal arts education in Catholic schools.

[33]Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 43.

[34]Francis H. Horn, "The Privately Supported Liberal Arts College -- Problems and Policies," Current Trends in Higher Education (1949), p. 162.

in educational experiment, vigorous teaching, the maturing of character, and the development of responsible human beings. In some of those colleges, however, inadequate attention had been paid to the spiritual values which gave the ideal of democracy its meaning.[35] In the presence of cultural and academic forces which tended toward the fragmentation of knowledge, the liberal arts college sought to foster an awareness of the interdependence and complimentarity of the several intellectual methods and disciplines; and it did so as a means of incubating intellectual humility and intellectual wholeness in both student and teacher. Although the American liberal arts college had become vulnerable, it was still viable.[36]

Even The President's Commission acknowledged the vital need for liberal arts education. The group called for the education that liberates and ennobles to be made equally available to all American young people.[37] The services of those colleges were to be needed in the future as had been true in the past. It was expected that the liberal arts colleges would provide three basic types of programs. First, they would provide the four-year, broadly general curricula embracing the thirteenth through the sixteenth years. Second, they would provide the two-year general curricula embracing the thirteenth and fourteenth years.

---

[35]Kandel, Impact, pp. 9-10.

[36]Smith, pp. 162, 165.

[37]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 101.

Third, they were to provide a program designed to combine general education with preparation for occupations such as teaching, art, journalism, and music.[38] However, the Commission further declared that whereas, in the past, the liberal arts colleges had stressed the history, arts, and institutions of Western culture without giving much time or attention to the kinds of civilization that exist in other parts of the globe, in the new world it would not be enough to know and understand only the American heritage. Man would need to sense the sweep of world history in order to see his own civilization in the context of other cultures.[39]

Challenges to Liberal Arts Education

There was a lack of agreement among educators with regard to the nature and source of perceived weaknesses of liberal arts colleges. For some educators the fundamental weakness was that the colleges lacked a clear and commanding educational purpose with which to govern their policies, programs, and leadership.[40] Closely akin to that observation was the notion that the weaknesses were due to the narrowness of liberal arts colleges' objectives, which attempted to produce "cultured men" or "rounded individuals" without reference to the social scene in which those

---

[38]Ibid., Vol. III, p. 16-18.

[39]Ibid., Vol. I, p. 17.

[40]Cole, p. 50.

men would live and function. The result was "confusion concerning social purposes. Cultured for what? Rounded for what?[41] Consequently, the college programs were not contributing adequately to the quality of students' adult lives either as workers or as citizens, because the unity of liberal arts education had been splintered by over-specialization. The resultant failure to provide any core of unity in the essential diversity of higher education became a cause for grave concern. For, when a society whose members lack a body of common experience and common knowledge, it becomes a society without a fundamental culture, and, in turn, tends to disintegrate into a mere aggregation of individuals. Some community of values, ideas, and attitudes was held to be essential as a cohesive force in an era of minute division of labor and intense conflict of special interests.[42]

Changing circumstances such as, new economic conditions, conflicts between the ideals of democracy and other forms of government, the new role of the United States in international affairs, the new intellectual interests which resulted from that situation, the spectacular developments of the sciences and technology, the consequent conflict between the claims of the humanities and the sciences in education, and the new vistas opened up to the millions of young men and women who engaged in military

---

[41]Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 26.

[42]The President's Commission, Vol. I, pp. 47-49.

service in all parts of the world, combined to emphasize the urgent need for a new direction and orientation for liberal arts education.[43] Frequently, the emphasis upon scientific analysis which characterized undergraduate instruction in practically all fields and the failure to devote adequate attention to synthesis, to putting the pieces together to form a meaningful design left the student adrift and without motivation. This emphasis was expressed in the "harmful fallacy," implicit in the unit and credit-hour system, that discrete fragments of knowledge, however well mastered, would automatically mold to produce the liberally educated graduate.[44]

The Direction of Liberal Arts Education

Sometimes, in attempting to define something, it has been helpful to determine what it is not. That strategy was utilized during that period of time in an effort to establish the parameters of the meaning of liberal arts education. For example, to counter the attitude that couched the value of education only in monetary terms, it was necessary to assert that the values of a liberal arts education were not primarily financial. Neither could it be defined in terms of a standardized body of subject matter.[45] Nor could a liberal arts education be acquired

---

[43]Kandel, Impact, pp. 173-174.

[44]Smith, p. 42.

[45]Wriston, pp. 31, 144.

by the accumulation of credits or conveyed entirely by mechanical or assembly-line techniques.[46] Further, a liberal arts education did not depend upon the form of college organization or the content of the curriculum, both of which had changed and would change again, but upon the open mind.[47]

Liberal arts education had come to a crossroads. The form and direction it had received from religion was, for the most part, gone, its traditional four-year content had been so adulterated as to be no longer recognizable, and its service in making value judgments on human progress had largely been lost. On the other hand, the proponents of liberal arts education were slow to recognize the new function which liberal arts education ought to have in contemporary society.[48] On balance, it was important to remain mindful of the fact that, in his quest beyond the gadget world of tangible things, the complete man has always turned for guidance to the classics and humanities, in their way, and to religion in its kindred way.[49] By

---

[46]Howard R. Bowen and Gordon K. Douglas, Efficiency in Liberal Education: A Study of Comparative Instructional Costs for Different Ways of Organizing Teaching-Learning in a Liberal Arts College (New York, 1971), p. 4.

[47]George P. Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College: A Chapter in American Cultural History (New Brunswick, 1957), p. 261.

[48]Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 87.

[49]Peter Viereck, "Frontier Behind the Forehead," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), p. 53.

others the liberal arts college was viewed

> as nothing more or less than a place which renders possible the growth into maturity of free men and women, not wage slaves or salary slaves, nor slaves to the sense and passions. Its aim is not to train the masses for cheap power and service, but to send into society enough thoughtful and high-minded persons whose works and deeds possess a courage and truth to which others will be tempted to rally. Let the scoffer say what he will, society has a conscience, a capacity for response to what is obviously right and enthusiasm for nobility, which is again and again duped and perverted by demagogues and mass insanities (this being a world of evil as well as good), but is ever waiting to reassert itself when spurred by the right word or deed.[50]

The Struggle for Direction

Assuming that the aim of liberal arts education was the development of the whole person, and that human nature involved instincts and sentiments as well as the intellect, the educational process had somewhat failed of its purpose whenever it produced the merely bookish youth who lacked in spirit and was all light without any warmth.[51] Liberal arts education needed to be comprehended as both an end in itself, as any human good needed to be, and a means to the end of university studies, which could not be undertaken except by a mind which its owner knew how to use.[52] Thus, the educated man ought to be one who would be able to

---

[50]Norman Foerster, The Future of the Liberal College (New York, 1938), p. 80.

[51]The Harvard Redbook, pp. 74, 75, 168.

[52]Van Doren, p. 100.

distinguish between sound and shoddy work in a field outside his own.

Among other things, a liberal arts education was described as "essentially an introduction to intrinsic values and cultural perspectives."[53] A liberal arts education was said to consist in the "acquisition and the refinement of standards of values--all sorts of values--physical, intellectual, emotional, aesthetic, and spiritual."[54] Appropriately, liberal arts education ought to make every effort to be intelligent about virtue so as to find and keep the one definition of it that can weather change, outlive appearance, and perfect a way by which it can be processed (a most practical aim). Therefore, the liberal arts college sought to encourage students to establish certain values as dominant in their lives. Those values needed to have universal validity--that is, they must be adapted to all times and all circumstances. Also, they needed to have intrinsically trustworthy qualities which were separable from experiences or ideas having specific values only, or particular validities. The basic qualities of those values were to be so vital in character and so unchallengeable that those who acquired them were equipped for effective living in a sense which would not be true without them.[55]

---

[53]Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 36.

[54]Wriston, p. 9.

[55]Ibid., p. 142.

In the classic liberal arts college, culture was acquired for its own sake, as a kind of veneer. It was considered as a treasure to be hoarded instead of an attitude that would vitalize and enrich life. But culture was not a veneer to be gotten by studying either the introductory courses of the several fields of knowledge or the classics. Rather, it was a way of life, implying effective living for social ends.[56] And the most important task of liberal arts educaton was viewed in terms of its contribution toward the advancement of culture, because the best contribution could come from those individuals who, while attacking experimentally the crucial problems before the world, could bring to bear upon their solution the best thinking and experience of the past. Sounding a note of caution, the observation was made that the notion that a liberal arts education was for the gentleman (connoting elegant leisure) went beyond the mere support of a luxury, whereas the tendency had been to use a liberal arts education to maintain and to widen the class distinctions in society.[57]

A liberal arts education was described as the process of making men fit for freedom, because they not only must live in the world and be part of it, they must also live out of the world and beyond the daily grind.[58] That facet

---

[56]Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, pp. 4, 71.

[57]Ibid., pp. 2,3,12.

[58]Kandel, Impact, pp. 193-194. Wriston, p. 21.

of liberal arts education was not so dependent upon the subjects themselves as upon the way in which those subjects were taught. Assuming that the real function of liberal arts education in society was to provide leadership for the progressive solution of the essential problems of society, then the education of the individual, including the solution of his own problems, must have been combined with something larger that gave it meaning. And that larger view was essential to get beyond the current clutter and confusion.[59] To accomplish that objective, the liberal arts college must always have been developing the power to think--which in itself assumed the proper function of knowledge, the use of the scientific method, and learning to apply the thought process to the practical problems of life. Out of that would evolve a maturing philosophy of life which progressively set the direction of growth both for the personal life of the individual and for the endeavor to secure higher social values.[60] To that end, the liberal arts college endeavored to foster lifetime habits of reading literature of quality and significance. Those ingredients combined to make the liberal arts college the place where intelligence and action went hand-in-hand. Intelligence in action meant intellectual integrity, which meant that the individual must use his intelligence in

---

[59]Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 26.

[60]Ibid., pp. 181-185.

accord with his own best beliefs and purposes in life, and intellectual responsibility, which meant that he must use intelligence for social, as distinguished from antisocial, ends.[61]

Another way of expressing that thought was to assert that a liberal arts education was nothing less than a complete one within the limits of human reason and imagination.[62] It did not stop with the development of intellectual powers, for, to have a satisfying and successful life, a person also needed to be emotionally stable and mature, able to endure the conflicts and tensions, the compromises and defeats, that life was almost certain to bring. Thus, the liberally educated person endeavored to develop the strength of mind and heart to stand alone, if necessary, whenever his sense of justice and good conscience compelled him to an unpopular course of action.[63]

An interesting definition of liberal arts studies spoke of them as those which a college were "not at liberty to omit."[64] The essentials of that education were held to be the identification of the essential disciplines, some skill in using those disciplines, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of education through those disciplines.[65]

---

[61]Ibid., p. 102.

[62]Van Doren, p. 12.

[63]The President's Commission, p. 53.

[64]Van Doren, p. 111.

The Struggle for Meaning in Society

Having debated the purpose of liberal arts education, educators then turned, prompted by the war, to a discussion of the nature of liberal arts education. A liberal arts education was understood to be more than a classical education, more than an education in English literature, more than an education in what was called the humanities, and more than a training in the moral virtues, although each of those was necessary to the whole -- but separately none was the whole.[66] If the primary objective of a liberal arts education was defined as the acquisition of truth for its own sake, then the function of a liberal arts college was not to propagandize or to induce uncritical acceptance of dogmas. However, the nature of a liberal arts education was seen by many persons as more than the acquisition of knowledge. Instead, it was to give meaning to life and a guiding philosophy for action.[67]

Contrary to the often-expressed sentiment that defined success in terms of obtaining material wealth, man was seen as living best when he lived by spiritual values and moral qualities. In fact, a liberal arts education was said to have failed except it had cultivated in the student the

---

[65]Wriston, pp. 147-149.

[66]Van Doren, p. 43.

[67]Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 36. Kandel, Impact, p. 189.

ability to think clearly, with judgement, taste, understanding, imagination, and critical-mindedness. It should be as concerned with the development of feeling as with intellectual training, and with the cultivation of emotions as much as of reason.[68] Having taught the student to think, a liberal arts college should have inspired him with such a love and devotion for truth that it would encourage him to seek truth wherever it might be found--whether in lazy meadows or crowded streets, in the gutters or in the stars, in the test tubes and retorts, in the ancient dog-eared folios or in the latest volumes off the press--and would give him courage to follow truth even though it might have led him to deserted loneliness.[69] During a radio broadcast on December 20, 1943, Robert Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago commented:

> What we need to make the shifting environment intelligible is ideas, standards, and principles; ideas, the instruments of knowledge; standards, to judge objectively the problems that present themselves; and principles of conduct which transcend the particular problems of the day. Our graduates must have above all the capacity to face new situations. This means that they must know how to think. If we can help them learn this, we have done the most that we can do for them.[70]

Accordingly, the crucial task of higher education was to

---

[68]Cole, p. 56. Kandel, Impact, p. 189-190.

[69]J. W. R. Maguire, The Liberal Arts College Movement, ed., Archie M. Palmer (New York, 1930), pp. 99-100.

[70]Quoted in Kandel, Impact, p. 202.

provide a unified learning experience for American youth. In the world of that day, liberal arts education needed to aim at the generosity of nature, as well as work to make the aristocrat--the man of grace--the person, as numerous as fate would allow.[71]

There was a call for liberal arts colleges to prepare citizens embued with courageous and enlightened patriotism, instead of the blatant, ignorant, chauvinistic patriotism that shouted such nonsensical slogans as "My country right or wrong." Rather, the call was for an enlightened patriotism that would cause citizens to love their country so much that they would always desire her to be right, and would endow them with the courage, ability, and self-sacrifice to ensure that she would always be right.[72] Thus, the qualities which a liberal arts education was called upon to develop were freedom, self-reliance, a sense of responsibility, intellectual curiosity, fair-mindedness, open-mindedness, the ability to think critically and independently, and a generous spirit in all human responses together with a readiness to recognize the worth of other persons and to deal with them in a spirit of equality.[73] Stated in a slightly different way, the liberal arts college in the United States was being called upon to give to

---

[71]Van Doren, p. 31.

[72]Maguire, p. 100.

[73]Kandel, Impact, p. 209.

its students that kind of education which, as the experiences in Western tradition had taught, held the best promise for turning out free men and free women who alone could preserve and improve a free society. A person so educated would possess the advantages to the degree he was freed from the limitations of prejudice and provincialism and accepted the responsibility of helping to enrich the common life of his fellow man.[74] After all, the thesis of liberal arts education was the existence of a common denominator of knowledge which everyone in a democracy ought to possess. That common denominator has been traditionally referred to as the arts and sciences.

The Struggle for a Focus

Liberal arts education has been intended to serve genuinely humanizing needs by seeking an appreciation of the unity and interrelation of human knowledge.[75] Thus, it found its full justification in its promotion of an intrinsically valuable experience. It was considered to be a preparation for life only in the sense that its vital influence was continuous and always led from one experience to others which were even richer. That result stemmed from the fact that its focal point was life, which enabled it to be broader in range and perspective than an education

[74]Cunningham, p. 246. Cole, p. vii.

[75]Lloyd J. Averill, "Viability of Liberal Arts," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), p. 162.

concerned with immediate application.[76] The first step liberal arts colleges needed to take to lay legitimate claim to their special reason for being and to justify their survival to restore their identity as institutions having special and socially indispensable purposes, keeping in mind that their primary occupation was with the skills of being. To that end, advanced courses in the liberal arts were deemed necessary to force the student to grapple with difficult and complex intellectual tasks, so as to provide both depth and breadth in his educational experience leading to the capacity for intellectual independence.[77]

Many different happenings had served to precipitate that need to rethink the nature, role, meaning, and purpose of liberal arts education. For example, events of the nineteenth century had had a disintegrating effect upon liberal arts education. First, there had been the impact of new theories in the physical sciences--in particular Darwin's theory of evolution--which, on the one hand, controverted orthodox religion and, on the other hand, opened up vast areas for the search for new knowledge. Then, there was the Marxian theory of history and economics, which gradually undermined the entrenched classical

---

[76]Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, pp. 12-20, Kandel, Impact, p. 190.

[77]Earl James McGrath, Values, Liberal Education, and National Destiny (Indianapolis, 1975) p. 16. Van Doren, p. 67. The President's Commission, p. 71.

doctrines. In addition, there were the Freudian theory of human behavior, and the impact of the advanced stages of the Industrial Revolution, whose leaders and workmen hungered for new techniques, and which also brought inventions in communication which permitted the quick tapping of the knowledge available in other contemporary cultures.[78] Consequently, the liberal arts education which the Second World War threatened was viewed by some educators as "not altogether worth saving."[79] That part of liberal arts education which deserved to survive was that which was capable of demonstrating that bad thinking produces bad consequences. To have done that would have required the rediscovery of the arts and the knowledge necessary to its life at any time. After all, Pascal had described the educated person as one who had substituted learned ignorance for natural ignorance.[80] Because colleges of liberal arts were seldom challenged to defend or explain such a title, the need was for a definition of liberal arts education whenever and however it managed to exist. This need was heightened by the fact that, out of the thousands who annually became "masters" of those same arts, proceeding thence to teach under their sign, only a handful ever knew what they had been dubbed masters of.[81] The

---

[78]Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 84.

[79]Van Doren, p. 70.

[80]Ibid., pp. vii, 14.

[81]Ibid., pp. vii, 72.

liberal arts, by being concerned with ideas rather than facts, helped liberate men from such false problems as the antithesis between science and the humanities, which was the current revival of the medieval distinction between arts of things and arts of words.[82]

Although there had been intermittent discussion of the meaning of liberal arts for many years, it was the Second World War which provided the catalyst needed for a renewed and concerted discussion of the subject. Not in nearly one hundred years had the appreciation of the need for a liberal arts education been more widespread in educational circles than it was then.[83] It was thought that the term liberal arts education needed a new definition which would emphasize the fact that it was an education which tended to produce the liberal individual -- that person who, because of his perspective of history, his critical observation of contemporary society, and his understanding of social dynamics, helped to facilitate needed change in the world, and thereby helped to advance contemporary culture.[84] Some educators reverted to a classical definition of liberal arts, such as the one ascribed to the early Roman: "the education of a free man, able to win and maintain his freedom."[85] Epictetus had expressed the sentiment that

---

[82]Cunningham, p. 9. Smith, p. 173.

[83]Millett, p. 14.

[84]Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 15.

[85]Woody, pp. 59-60.

"rulers may say that only free men should be educated, but we believe that only educated men are free."[86] The term had been used in a variety of ways. For example, it had been commonly used to describe the kind of discipline by which, during the era of Hellenic splendor, leaders of Greek society were educated. Those leaders, called liberi by the Romans, were the only free citizens of the republic; and they alone were deemed worthy to receive a liberal education. It was also used to refer to "a system of education which frees, or liberalizes, the individual from narrowness of vision, shallowness of thought, the inhibition of prejudice, and from the enslavement of the passions."[87]

The liberal ideal, which was freedom of the mind and spirit from fear and all inhibiting emotions, was particularly valuable in a world enslaved to lesser objectives. Therefore, assuming that the true function of the liberal arts was to liberate men, a liberal arts education was viewed by some as an attitude applicable to the entire educational program rather than a set curriculum in a particular kind of college.[88] Training in the liberal arts freed men from ignorance, undeveloped capacities as they exercised those two abilities that made them men -- the

---

[86]Cunningham, p. 17.

[87]Ibid.

[88]Wriston, p. 9. Smith, p. 172. Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 13.

ability to think and the ability to communicate their thoughts to others and in turn receive their own, and the domination by animal inpulses to act under the motivation of human ideals. Its aim was identified as the excellence of the student, or the perfection of his intellectual character, so as to make the person competent--not merely to know or do, but, chiefly, to be.[89]

The Struggle With Change

Changes in liberal arts colleges were called for. Whereas it was believed that the liberal arts college must continue to produce men and women of disciplined intelligence, appreciative of old and hospitable to new truths, and responsive to the problems of the day, it had been seen as too much a class privilege. For example, the allegation was made that one-half of the nation's best high school graduates could not attend college largely because they could not afford to -- a situation that was considered to be inappropriate in a democracy. Furthermore, the charge was made that liberal arts colleges had been too preoccupied with advancing the social prestige of a restricted group of students to prepare them for a life of leisure, luxury, and white-collar jobs.[90]

Those critics suggested that changes were necessary if

---

[89]Cunningham, p. 77. Van Doren, p. 67.

[90]Schmidt, p. 261. Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, pp. 37-38.

liberal arts colleges were to survive. Those suggested changes included the need to speculate upon the larger purposes in life, critical analysis of the problems existing in contemporary society, and a determination to engage in research.[91] As would be expected, there were educators who insisted that liberal arts colleges had no business engaging in research. Rather, they advocated that the college programs be limited to the dogmatisms and discoveries of the past. However, critics of that viewpoint believed it was more logical to say that, wherever there was intelligence competent to make critical inquiry, there should be creative activity of the research type, thereby advancing human progress in facilitating both the negative and the positive aspects of change. The question, then, was seen as more one of resources and energy than of the relative desirability of research versus no research.[92]

Furthermore, those critics who argued for a revised statement of purpose by liberal arts colleges, warned that for liberal arts colleges to continue in the assumption that faculty, students, and interested citizens would continue to support the college only because of traditional loyalties would be a serious misreading of the contemporary forces in the society. They reasoned that, unless those colleges articulated their purposes clearly and elicited a considerable degree of freely given commitment to those

---

[91]Henderson, pp. 34, 107.

[92]Ibid., pp. 34, 108, 109.

purposes, the plight of those colleges would only worsen.[93]

General Education - A Response

Perhaps one of the most significant of the responses made to the pressure, intensified by the Second World War, for liberal arts education to rethink its nature, role, meaning, and responsibility was to foster general education as a model. Those who advocated general education as a revision of or replacement for liberal arts education tended to maintain the attitude that, because the liberal arts were the traditional heart of the old education, they must be abandoned. It was claimed that the characteristic studies were no longer relevant; that they did not contribute directly or materially to the new social order. Therefore, it was held to be essential to substitute something new, which was given the vague name of "general education," a spiritually neutral word, devoid of any implications of insight, perception, and values.[94] General education was viewed as extending beyond the limits of merely literary preoccupation. Thus, from the viewpoint of content, general education was an outgrowth of liberal arts education, which undertook to liberate the student from provinciality by exposing him to the most significant spheres of human interest, thereby enablng him, as an

---

[93]Wise, p. 10.

[94]Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 7.

intelligent spectator, to "see life steadily and see it whole."[95]

In a definition not too dissimilar to some which had been given for liberal arts education, general education was labeled as that education which enabled the student to know his past, his place in the present, and enabled him to communicate with himself and others concerning the questions that should move everyone.[96] Stated in a slightly different format, it was considered to be general because it was the education all the citizens of any free society ought to have, and citizens must be familiar with the advancing knowledge that brought that society into being and the culture that characterized it in the contemporary era.[97]

To accomplish its intended purpose, general education was not to be limited to a block of courses which the student was to take and "get over with in order to go on with the more interesting and significant special study."[98] Quite the contrary, the student was to be enabled to view his special field in the context of the larger body of

---

[95]Clarence E. Ficken, "General Education as a Professional Attitude," Current Trends in Higher Education 1949), p. 51.

[96]Stanley J. Idzerda, "Academic Rigor," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970, p. 108.

[97]Cunningham, p. 6.

[98]The Harvard Redbook, p. 196.

knowledge, because he needed to have some measure of common learning in all the fields of human knowledge. Thus, he should develop a freedom from pride which reminded him that he did not know all the answers, but gave him the curiosity to look for them, and the confidence to know where to find them.[99] Because general education was tauted as the appreciation of the organic complex of relationships which gave meaning and pointed to the specialty, it was compared to the trunk of a tree from which branches, representing specialism, went off at different heights.[100]

The purposes of general education were to be understood in terms of performance--of behavior--not in terms of mastering particular bodies of knowledge. It was the task of general education to provide the kinds of learning and experience that would enable the student to attain certain basic outcomes. Consequently, the aim of general education was to develop the skills, attitudes, and sense of values a student needed for living constructively in his society, regardless of the special role he might fill in economic and social life. To that end, the primary skill to be cultivated was critical thinking or selective judgment based upon the acquisition of reliable information.[101]

---

[99]Williams, pp. 7-8. The Harvard Redbook, p. 192.

[100]The Harvard Redbook, pp. 102, 195.

[101]Loren D. Carlson, "Objectives, Content, and Organization of General Education," Current Trends in Higher Education (1950), p. 65.

If the perceived purpose and aim of general education were to be actualized, faculty members in such a program must continuously ask themselves the significance of every element in each course being taught, its relationship to other subjects or areas, as well as paying close attention to the quality of their teaching.[102]

Actually, there was not a sharp distinction of general education from liberal arts education. The two programs differed more in degree than in kind. General education was primarily an effort to redefine liberal arts education in terms of life's problems as free men faced them, to give it human orientation and social direction, to invest it with a content that was directly relevant to the demands of contemporary society. General education was liberal arts education with its matter and method shifted from its original aristocratic intent to the service of democracy, seeking to extend to all men the benefits of an education that liberates.[103]

Liberal Arts Education and a Future

Therefore, despite all the criticisms, pressures, and discussions of liberal arts education, it had a future. To be sure, there had been an attitude which contended that only a small library of books had any real value. For persons who held that attitude liberal arts education was

---

[102]Idzerda, p. 108.

[103]The President's Commission, Vol. I, pp. 48-50.

expressly forbidden to have anything directly to do with learning to make a living.[104] However, as a result of the criticisms, pressures, and discussions, liberal arts education, following the Second World War, sought to develop those energies of mind that directed skill. In sum, it became the paradigm of higher education.[105] Earlier, Homer P. Rainey, President of Franklin College, had predicted that if wealth and leisure increased, there would undoubtedly be a greater demand for the cultural values of liberal education; and, if science became increasingly more democratic, the future for the liberal arts college would be bright.[106] During the post-war period, a "smothering blanket of timidity" had "settled on the land" and the United States had been "backing away from controversy"--a situation which made liberal arts, whose hope and essence was freedom to investigate all relevant controversial issues, all the more needed.[107] Moreover, in the post-World War II era, the labor market for graduates was strong; and the offerings of liberal arts programs were greatly expanded. In fact, between 1945 and 1966, the number of liberal arts institutions increased by 361.[108]

---

[104]Jones, pp. 57-58.

[105]Earl F. Cheit, The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition (New York, 1975), pp. 11-12.

[106]Quoted in Palmer, p. 91.

[107]Scmidt, p. 261.

[108]Cheit, p. 13.

Unfortunately, as that increase came about, an increasingly larger proportion of liberal arts faculties were staffed with men and women who had no commitment to liberal arts teaching, and the task of maintaining the integrity of the liberal arts ideal became increasingly difficult. As a result, even the most traditional liberal arts departments frequently became preprofessional.[109]

All-in-all, the impact of the Second World War upon the philosophy which undergirded higher education in the United States was healthy. Although there had been intermittent discussions for many years, the war served as a catalyst to accelerate and intensify those discussions -- and to focus them. And it is both necessary and good for higher education, including the liberal arts, to rethink, periodically, its mission, purpose, meaning, and role. While there were some educators who would have radically altered or even eliminated liberal arts education in the United States, other educators advocated an equally radical return to the concept of liberal arts education as it had been a century or more before. Fortunately, liberal arts education in the United States was able to make necessary and appropriate adjustments in its philosphy so that it was able to provide a stabilizing influence in higher education. It was able to meet the educational needs of a significant portion of American young men and women, and,

---

[109]Averill, pp. 164-165.

thereby, experience a bright future--as well as brighten the future of those same men and women. Moreover, the proposed alternative to or adjustment of liberal arts education--namely, general education--was not significantly different from liberal arts education. This fact would serve to underscore the strength and viability of liberal arts education. Of course, there were other facets of the impact of the Second World War on liberal arts education in the United States.

CHAPTER III

THE IMPACT ON CURRICULUM

Not only was the impact of the Second World War experienced at the point of the philosophical foundation of liberal arts education, but it was also experienced at the point of the curriculum. That impact would be expected to have occurred. The criticisms and challenges, together with the resultant modifications in understanding the nature, role, and purpose of liberal arts education, should have been expected to carry over into the area of the curriculum. After all, curriculum has always been the outgrowth or reflection of the stated purpose or philosophy of the educational institution. Whenever a college sensed the need to make alterations in its mission statement in order to be responsive to the needs, desires, or pressures of that society it endeavored to serve, it would, of necessity, make changes in its curriculum.

Criticisms and Challenges

Liberal arts education experienced a number of criticisms of and challenges to its curriculum during that era. The criticisms and challenges came from a variety of sources. Ironically, at a time when the education offered by

the liberal arts curriculum was most needed in the world, it was least wanted. A war-torn world needed the strength of leadership which a liberal arts education could develop. It needed the pooled knowledge that could be derived from analyzing the experience of all nations, the tolerance and good will that would come with understanding the cultures of other races, the perspective that resulted from studying mankind's progress over the centuries, and the wisdom that was distilled from the best philosophy of the ages.[1]

However, the problem was not just a matter of the societal rejection of the liberal arts curriculum. Liberal arts programs were criticized for not being responsive to the issues and concerns of the day. They were caricatured as sitting on the sidelines while the world was struggling through what was, potentially, the most far-reaching revolution of all time. They were charged with attempting to imitate Oxford and Cambridge universities, thereby keeping their curricula unsoiled with anything contemporary or even remotely vocational, preferring, instead, to prepare students only for the "respected" professions.[2] Even though that was their presumed goal, they allegedly failed to produce effective leadership.[3]

Some critics went so far as to suggest the root cause

---

[1]Algo D. Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education: A Study of the Liberal Arts Program (New York, 1944), p. xi.

[2]Ibid., pp. 1-3.

[3]Ibid.

for the Second World War as the inappropriateness of the liberal arts curriculum. The thesis that Western liberal arts education was synonymous with world-wide wisdom was called into question--especially since that wisdom had eventuated in an imperialism, facism, and frustration so great that Europe, incapable of saving itself from destruction, had to call upon the British Commonwealth of Nations, Russia, and the United States for aid.[4] Closely related was the criticism that the liberal arts curricula, with their formal requirements of concentration and distribution and their formal requirements of concentration and distribution and their formal logical structures, falsely assumed that they succeeded in producing cultivated graduates in the humanistic sense of the word. Accordingly, it was further alleged that educated men in that day spoke no common language, because the liberal arts colleges gave no common stock of ideas because they were vague in their aim, "their professors being by nature and nurture incompetent to offer general training that is both broad and deep."[5]

The allegation that liberal arts curricula were impractical was both a criticism and a challenge. As a criticism, it was said that the liberal arts graduate, generally, faced pathetic problems, because, although liberal arts training provided cultural values and trained men for life, it did not equip them to make a living. "But

---

[4]Howard Mumford Jones, Education and World Tragedy (Cambridge, 1946), pp. 70-73.

[5]Ibid., pp. 52, 114.

cultural values fly out the window when men can't get and hold jobs, and little self-respect remains if they can't make a living."[6] The supposed lack of relevance of the liberal arts curricula was cited as the reason most professional schools gave only a minimal place for any liberal arts in their programs. Sensing the danger inherent in responding to that criticism as a challenge, Robert Maynard Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago, just prior to the Second World War, asserted that one of the chief forces threatening to disintegrate liberal arts education was "vocationalism; that is, securing jobs . . . for its (the college's) graduates. . . . Consequently, intellectual training has been driven out of the curriculum . . ."[7] Those colleges of liberal arts who did attempt to respond to that challenge later discovered that, to a large extent, their curricula became as specialized as that of the medical school or the law school.[8]

Other critics even denied the possibility of having a truly liberal arts curriculum because, as they perceived it, there was no common concept of knowledge for its own sake in higher education. After all, they argued, even Aristotle had observed that there was "disagreement about

---

[6]Wallace B. Donham, Education for Responsible Living (Cambridge, 1944), p. 35.

[7]Quoted in Wiliam F. Cunningham, General Education and The Liberal College (St. Louis, 1953), pp. 2-4.

[8]Earl James McGrath, Toward General Education (New York, 1948), p. 11.

the subjects" to be included in a liberal arts curriculum.[9] Therefore, because the genius of mankind could never be wrapped up in a neat curricular package, no body of subject matter, by itself, could be classified as liberal. Only liberally minded teachers and students would be able to achieve a liberal education, for such education depended, essentially, upon the contact of mind with mind in dealing with significant ideas.[10] Paradoxically, another criticism of liberal arts curricula was that they never built for time but always for eternity.[11]

There were varied assessments of the results of those criticisms and challenges. Some educators interpreted the results in a positive manner, reasoning that the breadth and depth of the liberal arts curricula could serve as a partial corrective to any deficiency of either quality in the state schools, where too many of the best minds were busy only in the sciences, and in technical, specialized, vocational training. In contrast, the liberal arts curricula encouraged or required all their students to give balanced and almost equal attention to the sciences, the humanities, and the social sciences.[12] On the other hand,

---

[9]Jones, p. 52. Thomas Woody, Liberal Education for Free Men (Philadelphia, 1951), p. 193.

[10]Theodore Meyer Greene et. al., Liberal Education Re-examined: Its Role in a Democracy (New York, 1943), p. 8.

[11]Jones, p. 88.

[12]Paul B. Anderson, "The Privately Supported Liberal Arts College -- Problems and Policies," Current Trends in Higher Education (1949), p. 170.

there were educators who interpreted the results in a negative manner. They concluded that the war had put all liberal arts curricula out of balance. In fact, some educators went so far as to state that, because of conditions in academia which were accelerated by the war, "any concept of a general, liberal or common education disappeared."[13]

Content or Definition

Although there had been, for many years, an off-and-on discussion of the meaning or content of a liberal arts curriculum, that discussion became more intense during and immediately after the Second World War. The discussion was important because "a curriculum creates a world" by providing it with "a center and an order of parts."[14] Thus, the curriculum was comprehended as an organized means through which the student could take advantage of the stimulation, counseling, and instruction which the teaching staff was able to offer. They key world was "organized," because it implied opportunity--content, place, methods --for defining and enlarging upon the observations and problems of experience, assembling additional facts and noting the problems of other human experience, considering

---

[13]Woody, p. 232. Jones, pp. 51-52.

[14]Mark Van Doren, Liberal Education (New York, 1943), p. 114.

expert opinion and arguments of other explorers for knowledge, subjecting the data and ideas to analysis, and checking and verifying judgments formed and results obtained.[15]

Having agreed upon the necessity for and function of a curriculum, the discussion intensified and focused upon the content of a liberal arts curriculum. At one extreme, certain educators pointed to the pattern of antiquity as the best and only true liberal arts curriculum, fit for all epochs and universal, because knowledge of the past and of other contemporary cultures was understood as especially valuable as perspective for the present. Along that same line, there were educators who urged a return to the medieval mode, and its authoritarian, supernatural sanctions. Yet others would have reverted to an even earlier epoch, arguing for the literatures of Greece and Rome which comprised "the heart of what we need to know."[16] A knowledge of what other men of the past have considered good was viewed as essential for there to be any improvement of the immediate experience.[17] Cicero had observed: "He who is ignorant of what happened before his birth is always a child."[18] A study of the past was considered an important

---

[15]Henderson, p. 69.

[16]Van Doren, p. 91.

[17]Henderson, pp. 91-92.

[18]Quoted in Van Doren, p. 118.

basis for communication. After all, tradition, too often underrated, has served as the indispensable medium through which persons could understand one another.[19]

At the other extreme, there were educators who demeaned the value of studying history. They argued that only the present was important for the demands of everyday life.[20] Their argument was based on the notion that people ought not to have to study subjects in which they were not interested--and most students, they argued, thought the study of history to be boring. To counter that argument, T.S. Eliot was quoted: "no one can become really educated without having pursued some study in which he took no interest--for it is a part of education to learn to interest ourselves in subjects for which we have no aptitude."[21]

Students needed especially to gain perspective on ideas; and, because the liberal arts were the specifically intellectual arts, they were keys to all of man's operations as man. They were basic to the life he lived in so far as it was unique.[22] Moreover, a good liberal arts education involved more than the transmission of facts and ideas of a kind that could be measured by test scores. It also involved outlooks, attitudes, values, motives, and

---

[19]Ibid., p. 119.

[20]Woody, p. 222.

[21]Van Doren, p. 15.

[22]Ibid., p. 74.

development of character and personality.[23] Accordingly, cultural wisdom was not understood to be a "distilled something" that could be handed to, or lectured at, the student. Rather, it was interpreted to be an application of knowledge to present action, and therefore must rest upon a foundation of experience in the life of the student himself. This factor required that the student's opportunities to observe his contemporary culture must be greatly enlarged in order that his study of the past and of other cultures could have meaning in terms of the present.[24]

That understanding, however, was not without its critics, who reasoned that merely to reaffirm past values by a return upon dead sages was insufficient. Humanism, it was said, was never good enough, because it took too thin a view of man, separating him from nature as the Greeks had never done.[25] Instead, they insisted that the need was for an educational program that would face the present with courage and interest.[26] In response to that line of reasoning, advocates of the classical liberal arts curriculum observed that the criticism of the classics and other

---

[23]Howard R. Bowen and Gordon K. Douglas, _Efficiency in Liberal Education: A Study of Comparative Instructional Costs for Different Ways of Organizing Teaching-Learning in a Liberal Arts College_ (New York, 1971), p. 4.

[24]Henderson, pp. 95-96.

[25]Van Doren, p. 55.

[26]Jones, p. 79.

liberal studies wholly overlooked the fact that the traditional curriculum, even in its purest form, never guaranteed a liberal education.[27] The analysis could have been summarized in educational terms by stating that sensitivity to certain individual and social values comes through a study of men's past ideas and experiences, and of other racial or national cultures.

Redirection Called For

Although there was, in many quarters, the contention that there was a need for redirection in liberal arts curricula, there was no agreement as to what that redirection ought to be. One thing was certain, however, and that was that, because the post-World War II world was expected to be increasasingly complicated, the needs for liberal arts education would be greater than ever.[28] Beyond that point, there were differences of opinion. Some educators reasoned that, if liberal arts curricula were to furnish their share of cultural dynamic, they would need to focus their attention upon the world as it was then, and not upon the world as it had been in some distant past.[29] The need for less specialization in the curricula was also stressed. Alternatively, the need was to give the students a method and

---

[27]Greene, p. 8.

[28]John Dale Russell, "Major Problems Facing Higher Education," Current Problems in Higher Education (1947), p. 14.

[29]Jones, p. 176.

habit of acquiring further information, whet their appetites for more-and-more of the values that could be obtained from available treasures of culture.[30] Therefore, the four years of every student ought to be devoted to two principal and simultaneous activities: learning the arts of investigation, discovery, criticism, and communication, and then achieving at first hand an acquaintance with the original books, the unkillable classics, in which those miracles had happened.[31] One of the proposed programs to redirect liberal arts curricula called for professional or vocational training for every student, the study of the theory of science and of the application of scientific discoveries to American technology, the assumptions and workings of representative governments -- particularly in the United States and in the British Commonwealth of Nations, the study of Russia, the study of the Orient, and the study of personal relationships in modern society.[32]

Because liberal arts curricula did not stand in isolation but were intertwined with other levels of the educational experience, the need for redirection had other motivation. For example, given the fact that higher education (which was largely liberal arts) determined, in a general way, the nature of primary and secondary education, the

---

[30]Russell, pp. 14-15.

[31]Van Doren, pp. 144-145.

[32]Jones, pp. 91-106.

redirection was necessary to avoid the errors of the past. At the other end of the spectrum, if liberal arts curricula were to survive, it was believed that the graudate level curricula needed to be completely redone to avoid the excessive imitation of the nineteenth century German university curricula.[33]

> The root of our educational difficulties goes back to the graduate schools. The problem of graduate training, too little known, too little studied, too superficially dealt with, too potent in its final effects upon world culture to be left to technologists and specialists, must be studied by thoughtful Americans.[34]

And faculty members for liberal arts colleges were coming out of those graduate schools with an increasingly narrow focus of academic training and a resultant lessened appreciation of and preparation for teaching within a liberal arts curriculum. There was marked concern that, unless something was done, in a few years there would no longer be anyone teaching in college who was trained to teach the interrelatedness of those academic disciplines which were at the heart of the liberal arts curricula. Added to that concern was the belief that the war, the technology in preparation for the war, and nationalism had so warped the healthy development of liberal arts education that any universal notion of the content of a liberal arts curricu-

---

[33]Russell, p. 15.

[34]Jones, p. 178.

lum was either destroyed or irrevocably distorted.[35]

For half a century prior to the Second World War traditional liberal arts curricula had been losing ground, and for the duration of the war it was practically discarded. It was not surprising, therefore, that, during the immediate post war period, it was thought of as a "useless luxury" which, in military terminology, was expendable.[36] Although professional and liberal arts faculty clearly supported the liberal arts requirements, the American educational process was viewed as falling short of what it might have been. The fault was said to lay with the alleged provincialism and weaknesses of liberal arts curricula, which were due, in large part, to the narrow vision the confined study of American cultural heritage had produced.[37]

Some curricula, however, were revised to incorporate modern notions of scholarship in the disciplines, so as to focus around the study of the vital problems in society.[38]

---

[35]Ibid., pp. 34, 78-79.

[36]Henderson, p. xi.

[37]Ibid., p. 91. Paul L. Dressel and Margaret F. Lorimer, Attitudes of Liberal Arts Faculty Members Toward Liberal and Professional Education (New York, 1960), pp. 47-52.

[38]W. Max Wise, The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry Into the Processes of Collegiate Government (New Haven, 1969), p. 15. Henderson, p. 73.

That revision was in sharp contrast with the image of the classic liberal arts curriculum which comfortably avoided not only the market place but all the controversial problems of the day; and whose professors could be scholars who dealt with ancient matters and supervised the preparation of theses on them, and made no effort to influence the sweep of current events.[39] Actually, liberal arts curricula were held to have great social utility, if the design of the curricula were based upon the vital problems of society. The study of the more comprehensive ones would orient the students to the culture in which they live, and the more intensive study of those in a particular field would give them a preparation for their life work.[40]

Opportunities

The Second World War afforded liberal arts curricula some significant opportunities. Then, as has often been true throughout history, when men no longer believed in the culture which had maintained them, a psychology of fear became central in their emotions and in their actions--and the war did send tremors throughout the culture. In such times, western man has frequently sought security in familiar educational patterns--and what was more familiar than the liberal arts curricula. It was that liberal arts

---

[39]Henderson, p. 4.

[40]Ibid., pp. xi, 83, 93.

curricula which was believed to be able to provide the dynamic for the psychological readjustment which would be necessary after the war concluded. If that were to happen, however, it was stressed that western tradition must not be mistaken for an affirmative creed, chauvinism must not be confused with democracy, snobbishness was not to be confused with American industrial aristocracy, and the traditional veneers of genteel training should not be equated with the essence of a sound, affirmative education.[41]

Truly, there was a need for the type of stability which came from the studies which typified liberal arts curricula--studies that enabled students to discover the depths of their emotional and intellectual roots in the past. After all, such stability was not to be found in the shallows of the present only. Rather, as students studied the experiences of the present against the backdrop of the experiences of mankind through the ages, they were able to shed the pessimistic disorientation which plagued many of their contemporaries.

Not everyone, however, shared that assessment of the value of liberal arts curricula. To be sure, they acknowledged that it was a time of upheaval as the existing patterns in technology and in economic, social, and political life were being smashed and new ones forged, causing human life to reach an acutely dynamic stage. But, they

---

[41]Jones, p. 80, 87-88.

argued that, throughout all that turmoil, liberal arts education had kept its curricular "head buried in the sands of the past," and, consequently, was unable to recognize the tremendous forces at work and their significance in the march of human progress.[42] To be sure, the deepest intellectual and moral division in American civilization--the conflict between means and ends, techniques and values, or science and the humanities--was felt most intensely on the college and university campuses.[43]

Wartime Adjustments

The upheaval in society at-large and felt intensely on the campuses precipitated adjustments in the lives of institutions of higher education. In fact, it was stated that there could be no doubt that the deliberations of the war years represented an important stage in the reform of liberal arts curricula. Both secondary schools and institutions of higher education found themselves threatened with the disappearance of the traditional academic studies, except those which appeared to be needed for winning the war. Colleges and universities, for example, to the degree they were capable, were called upon to devote their resources and efforts to the preparation of their students not

---

[42]Henderson, p. 1.

[43]Charles Frankel, "The Happy Crisis," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), pp. 124-125.

only for service in the armed services but for technical services in war industries, and other occupations created to meet war needs.[44] Most federal involvement was aimed at special types of education or special students. To get federal funds colleges had to adjust their curricula or change their approach to students.[45] Aware of those potential pressures, a conference of college and university presidents had met on January 3 and 4, 1942, and recommended an acceleration of programs of higher education without any lowering of established standards of admission. Those presidents also called for a consideration of an extension of the annual period of instruction and adjustments of curricula. In response to that suggestion to accelerate their educational programs, most colleges adopted a plan calling for a 48 week academic year and a six-day academic week, which made graduation possible in two and two-thirds to three years.[46]

In addition, various agencies of the federal government became involved with assisting colleges and universities with making curricular adjustments. For example, the Business Extension Service of the Office of Small Business assisted schools of business in colleges and universities to establish teaching programs adapted to the needs of

---

[44]Isaac Leon Kandel, The Impact of the War Upon American Education (Chapel Hill, 1948), pp. 230, 4.

[45]Russell, pp. 12-13.

[46]Kandel, pp. 138-139, 149.

small businesses; the Aviation Education Program of the Civil Aeronautics Authority assisted institutions of higher education in setting up programs of aviation education; and the United States Public Health Service assigned some of its personnel to institutions to provide instruction in certain medical matters.[47] In October, 1940, authorization was given for the provision in degree-granting colleges and universities of short courses in Engineering, Science and Management Defense Training (ESMDT)--to "meet the shortages of engineers, chemists, physicists, and production supervisors in fields essential to national defense."[48] By the end of 1943, there were 12,500 short courses in one thousand towns and cities in more than 200 colleges at a cost of $21 million. These progams trained 356,000 engineering students, 14,000 in chemistry, 9,000 in physics, and 120,000 in production management. Twenty-one percent of those students were women.[49]

The war's impact on curricula was also experienced in other ways. There was, for example, a dramatic shortage of all kinds of supplies, such as: books, paper, typewriters, and audio-visual equipment. Generally, the lecture method

---

[47]Russell, p. 54. One such liberal arts college which participated in some of these programs was Oklahoma Baptist University.

[48]Kandel, pp. 146-147.

[49]Ibid.

of teaching had to used, when laboratory work was best.[50] Even in fields of liberal arts learning, the subject matter was becoming more technical and even illiberal--so much so that liberal arts curricula began fragmenting. As a part of that adjustment, faculty specialists and their colleagues negotiated treaties which gave everyone the right to teach his or her specialty; but coherence of the curriculum was no one's concern.[51] With the increased interest in professionalization or specialization, there was an accelerated trend toward some form of the "major-minor" system, as well as a variant of the major plan termed the area study type of concentration.[52]

Nevertheless, immediately following the cessation of the Second World War, attitudes toward the liberal arts and their role in the university were such that a liberal arts education was considerd still to be the heart of the academic enterprise--especially when it called attention to the need to develop international understanding and cooperation.[53] However, in many cases, the effect of some of those programs was, in the opinion of some educators, to

---

[50]James L. McCaskill, "Insructional Equipment and Supplies," Current Problems in Higher Education (1947), pp. 60-64.

[51]Earl F. Cheit, The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition (New York 1975), p. 12.

[52]Willis Rudy, The Evolving Liberal Arts Curriculum: A Historical Review of Basic Themes (New York, 1960), pp. 44-45.

[53]Cheit, p. 11. Kandel, pp. 8-9.

expand opportunities for higher education at the expense of quality.[54]

The Harvard Plan

Historically, it has been extremely difficult to free liberal arts curriculum from the limitations of its original purpose. Liberal arts studies, it was alleged, had often remained remote from practical considerations, and many educators still persisted, throughout the era encompassing the Second World War and the post-war period, in keeping them at arm's length from preparation in sharing in the world's work. And yet, it was also said that the curriculum of the liberal arts had been expanding and disintegrating to an astounding degree, because of the expansion of the boundaries of knowledge.[55]

War, with its emphasis on the domestic reinforcement of national values and traditions, had been the frequent catalyst in precipitating needed adjustments in liberal arts curricula in American universities and thereby furthering the ideal of the liberal arts education. One such evidence of that fact was shown in the way the Second World War spurred the general education movement at Harvard College.[56]

---

[54]Russell, p. 67.

[55]The President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American democracy, Vol. I (Washington, D.C., 1947), pp. 62, 47.

[56]Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago, 1970), pp. 207-208.

In a response to the impact of the war on liberal arts curricula, the Harvard faculty undertook an extensive study of its own liberal arts curriculum. They proposed to assess the relevance of their curriculum to the needs of contemporary students, while retaining as much of the ideal of liberal arts education as possible. In their report, they posited their philosophy of liberal arts, or general, education. Having enunciated their understanding of the nature, role, and purpose of general (liberal arts) education, they proceeded to describe the curriculum which, in their opinion, would most effectively accomplish their goal and actualize their philosophical understanding of liberal arts education. The proposed curriculum was presented under three large areas. First, the humanities were to include a study of the "Great Texts of Literature," literature, philosophy, fine arts, and music. Second, the social sciences were to include: "Western Thought and Institutions," American democracy, and human relations. The third large area of the curriculum, science and mathematics, consisted of an Introductory Program, mathematics, science, a course in the principles of physical science, and a course in the principles of biological science.[57] When this study of the curriculum commenced, the education prescription at Harvard, in 1941, had been: one prescribed

---

[57]General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge, 1945), pp. 204-230. (Hereafter cited as The Harvard Redbook).

course in English composition for freshmen who could not demonstrate their proficiency, a reading knowledge in one of ten languages (ancient or modern), a freshman curriculum which limited (though not finally) the choice to about 46 courses, a choice of concentration among 32 fields, many of them further subdivided, a prescription of general distribution so wide as to include in most of its sections the entire curricula of several departments.[58]

More specifically, in the revised curriculum, the comprehensive survey courses in the humanities, social sciences, and physical and biological sciences were expected to demand about fifty percent of a student's time during his first two years of college. However, they could demand nearly one hundred percent of his time. Although there were 16 courses required for the bachelor's degree, those courses were to be distributed in such a manner as to ameliorate some of the shortcomings of the elective system. The program consisted of requirements concerning how, in the interests of breadth, a student should distribute a portion of his courses among the various areas or departments.[59] The course in the area of the humanities, "Great Texts of Literature," required of all students, had, as its aim, the fullest understanding of the work read rather than of men or periods represented, craftsmanship evinced, his-

---

[58]Ibid., p. 188.

[59]Ibid., pp. 181-196.

toric or literary development shown, or anything else.[60] That approach was in contrast to the "Great Books" program in which students spent four years studying 100 great books of the Western tradition, supplemented by ancient and modern languages, mathematics, and laboratory science, with no electives and no specialization. The Harvard faculty had assessed the "Great Books" program to be a secular continuation of the spirit of Protestantism, which had placed a substantial reliance upon each man's personal reading of the Scriptures.[61]

The revised curriculum proposal called for some courses which would fulfill the aims of general education exclusively and not incidentally, courses which were concerned with general relationships and values, not with the learning and the technicalities of the specialist. Those courses ought not, according to the recomendation, all be taken at one time, or even in one period of the college career.[62] The entire system of concentration and distribution in Harvard College afforded rich opportunities for specialization and, therefore, for differentiation. However, it was a weak index in the opportunities it provided for the development of a common body of information and ideas which would be, in some measure, the possession of

---

[60]Ibid., p. 205.

[61]Ibid., pp. 44, 181-182.

[62]Ibid., pp. 195-196.

all students. The Harvard faculty considered it to be of foremost importance that honest thinking, clearness of expression, and the habit of gathering and weighing evidence before forming a conclusion be encouraged. Nevertheless, there were to be functional courses dealing explicitly with some important phase of active life, such as maintaining health, choosing a vocation, managing and raising a family, or buying goods and services wisely.[63]

The concentration culminated in the General Examination which was designed to test a student's understanding of the entire field in which he concentrated beyond the comprehensive survey courses. Unless a student could demonstrate in that examination that he had mastered the subject of concentration as a whole, he was ineligible for the degree, regardless of his record in the courses. The student, however, was not left to his own abilities to prepare for that examination. To help him prepare for that experience, the student was ordinarily tutored, from the beginning of his sophomore year, by a member of the field of concentration and was usually restricted to the area of that field.[64]

Thus, the Second World War either precipitated new or accelerated earlier facets of the impact on liberal arts curricula. That impact consisted of criticisms and chal-

---

[63]Ibid., pp. 181, 190-192.

[64]Ibid., pp. 188-189.

lenges, at the point of content or definition, and calls for redirection. The war provided the liberal arts curricula with some significant opportunities, and facilitated some adjustments. Probably the most far-reaching adjustment was the report of the faculty committee of Harvard College. Ironically, the report, generally, had more impact on other liberal arts colleges than it did on Harvard. But the impact of the war did not end with the curricula. It also impacted other components of liberal arts education in the United States.

CHAPTER IV

THE IMPACT ON PROGRAMS

Whereas the focus of curriculum has been upon the courses of study, the focus of program has been broader. Although it encompassed the content of courses of study, it was more concerned with the interrelatedness of those several courses, teaching methodology, as well as extracurricular matters. Combined they comprised the essence of program.

Liberal arts education in the United States has always known the impact of its society. The degree of sensitivity and response to that impact, however, has varied. When it has responded, it has moved slowly and deliberately--much like a giant ocean liner making a major change in its direction. To be sure, there have been occasions when reaction was a more appropriate term than response.

The underlying question or concern dealt with whether the programs of liberal arts education were able to serve the needs of society. It was a long-time struggle which went beyond, at least in the understanding of the general public, the topics of a philosophy or curriculum for liberal arts. The American people have tended to focus their interest upon pragmatic outcomes. They have been

more concerned with what happens than with why or how it happens. It was not surprising, therefore, that society, prompted by the Second World War, became, once again, a strong advocate of vocationalism as an essential program of higher education. Not only did society believe that higher education ought to serve the vocational needs and interests of students, but it also ought to serve the needs of democracy.

Liberal arts programs experienced a variety of challenges--and sometimes threats from a number of sources. For example, at the same time the war was wreaking havoc with liberal arts faculties thereby threatening the continuity of their programs, there was an insistence upon the need for liberal arts programs to produce leaders and thinkers. Student expectations, not always acknowledged by the liberal arts colleges, presented another challenge--as did the insistence upon new programs of language study. The accelerated emphasis upon research, and the growing involvement of the federal government provided additional challenges.

A Long-Time Struggle

United States' culture had long had conflicts between liberal or academic education and the demands for practical studies--between a type of education which had continued to be described as "aristocratic" and the education of the common man. And that conflict was highlighted by the

Second World War.[1] Earlier, Alfred North Whitehead had described the tension between liberal arts education and the "useful" program of studies as "the key fact in education, and the reason for most of its difficulties."[2] Supposedly, liberal arts colleges had precluded vocational education from their programs because it had seemed better suited to slaves or to industrial surfs than to free men.[3]

Specialization, or vocationalism, was viewed as a hallmark of American society, and its advantages to mankind had been remarkable. But in the educational system it had become a source both of strength and of weakness. Filtering downward from the graduate and professional school levels, it had made of the liberal arts colleges little more than another vocational school, in which the aim of teaching had become almost exclusively preparation for advanced study in one or another specialty.[4] The pragmatism inherent in vocationalism was concerned with the development of the mind of the student through the method of experimentation in dealing with concrete situations and problems of immediate interest to the individual. Accordingly, it was both a way of looking at the world or life

---

[1]Isaac Leon Kandel, The Impact of the War Upon American Education (Chapel Hill, 1948), p. 174.

[2]Quoted in Earl F. Cheit, The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition (New York, 1975), p. 11.

[3]Thomas Woody, Liberal Education for Free Men (Philadelphia, 1951), pp. 256-257.

[4]The President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. I (Washington, D.C., 1947), p. 48.

or reality and a methodology. In its first aspect it rejected the notion that the world or life or reality was ever complete or certain and concentrated on the ever-pressing exigencies of change or precariousness. In its second aspect, its methodology was one of experimentalism to solve the ever-changing situations presented by life as well as to discover truth or value. Its theme was: That is true which is found to work. Value itself was not something fixed but was itself a process of evaluation of a belief or solution to see if it worked. According to pragmatism, nothing, in fact, was good or evil, true or false, until it had been tried out to ascertain how it worked. Until that test was applied, the individual had to remain neutral and objective. The source of moral values lay in the concrete experience of desires and satisfaction; rightness or wrongness could not be accepted on authority.[5] Pragmatism held that vocational and avocational interests, and personal and social effectiveness, were but integral components of the philosophy of life; and served as the channels through which that philosophy received expression and meaning. All together they represented the coupling of emotional drive to reasoned action--a concept not too dissimilar to that of liberal arts programs.[6]

The impetus behind the drive to include vocational

---

[5]Isaac Leon Kandel, The Cult of Uncertainty (New York, 1943), pp. 62-66.

[6]Algo D. Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education: A Study of the Liberal Arts Program (New York, 1944), p. 53.

education as a program in higher education stemmed from the land-grant movement which, propelled by populist impulses, brought the useful arts into the modern universities. With the aim of extending the prestige of professional status to such people as farmers and mechanics, the land-grant institutions made the issue of the tension between the liberal arts and the useful arts a political matter.[7] Actually, by historical accident, the American university at large had grown out of professional training-schools--primarily schools for training in theology, secondarily in law and medicine.[8] In later years, the abuse of the major or concentration became a degree of specialization that amounted to vocationalism in liberal education. When the liberal arts college allowed its students to specialize in one field of study so early and so intensively that other areas of knowledge were ignored or barely touched upon, it gave up its liberal arts birthright and became, in fact, a professional school.[9] Beyond that, dissatisfaction with the elective system, the failure of colleges to provide a balanced education and a common background to students, the growing demands for vocational or professional, at the expense of liberal arts, education programs, the status of graduate education, and the preparation of college teachers

---

[7]Cheit, p. 10.

[8]Thorstein Vebben, Higher Learning in America (New York, 1935), p. 33.

[9]The President's Commission, Vol. I, pp. 71-72.

were all factors which had begun to cause unrest for some time prior to the outbreak of the Second World War.[10]

With the advent of the war, the struggle between a pure liberal arts education program and a vocational education program intensified to the point of being labeled as a crisis. American preoccupation with technology, whereby the image of science and the image of technology had been absorbed into higher education, was viewed as the greatest danger to the liberal arts programs.[11] The liberal arts colleges had strenuously endeavored to avoid any taint of vocationalism, reasoning that a vocation was something apart from one's real life. Rather, a vocation was seen as the necessary but dirty business of earning one's daily bread, of producing objects which were sold in the market place. When a man was through with the eight hours of the day devoted to that kind of business, he could "slip into his smoking jacket and consort with the great minds of the past, with only the glow of the fireplace to remind him of the world about him."[12]

Circumstances following the conclusion of the war created intense pressures to alter that rather idealistic notion. For example, eighty percent of the military veterans who enrolled in colleges and universities demanded

---

[10]Kandel, Impact, p. 173.

[11]Charles Frankel, "The Happy Crisis," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), p. 124.

[12]Henderson, p. 4.

some kind of vocational training. The thing they most wanted from higher education was the acquisition of technical and professional skills in order to increase their chances for reinstating themselves in what they perceived to be America's unsympathetic economic society. They knew that education correlated with job possibilities, having seen that the amount of formal education frequently meant the difference of being an officer and being an enlisted man. They further knew that, on the whole, the trained man was the first to get a job, and the most likely to get a well-paying job. In the fight for survival, education gave him his weapons against his fellows.[13] The returning veteran was being pragmatic.

With the impetus for education becoming "to get a job," pressure to alter liberal arts education programs increased, and the humanities were assigned a lesser role in colleges. For example, philosophy represented a search for truth, whereas science represented a search for knowledge. A curriculum built around the former focused attention on meaning, while one dominated by the latter was likely to overemphasize the importance of facts.[14] During the postwar period, the actual programs of higher education in America were becoming more and more technical, in the sense of becoming vocational rather than intellectually

---

[13] Howard Mumford Jones, Education and World Tragedy (Cambridge, 1946), pp. 88, 175.

[14] Oliver C. Carmichael, "Weaknesses in the College," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), pp. 40-41.

precise. Critics were also concerned about the shifting emphasis in graduate education toward creating specialists rather than teachers and away from teaching to research. "Training" sought to supply the skills and techniques to do repeatedly what had once been learned. It was essentially a static concept, whereas education was dynamic.[15]

Liberal Arts Response

The liberal arts could not have been expected to remain silent amidst those pressures. Quite the contrary, they responded in a variety of stances. To be sure, they would not have made a total capitulation to the pressure for an increase in vocational education programs. Neither would it have been advisable to retrench and retreat into a purely classical liberal arts program. (However, there were advocates of both extremes.) In their struggles to comprehend this impact on their programs, liberal arts education institutions were actually formulating a better self-understanding of their role in society. A typical response spoke of the "only hope" of liberal arts programs as being not to abolish or ignore professional or vocational training, but to recognize it for what it was, and to raise programs of liberal arts education to an intellectual dignity and an immediacy of meaning equal to that of

---

[15]Cheit, p. 12. Theodore Meyer Greene et al., Liberal Education Re-examined: Its Role in a Democracy (New York, 1943), p. 12.

the professional or vocational program. The imputation of inferior intellectual status to vocational or professional training was held to be astonishing, in view of the patent fact that medical student, law students, engineering students, and other students who knew their own minds, worked about twice as hard as students in the liberal arts programs.[16] The difficulty with the genteel college was that it remained genteel, espousing a culture as something for one's leisure hours, for women, for librarians, and for other minority groups. The difficulty was that books read in a vacuum, philosophy taught formally, history as a requirement, and science as a required balance to intellectual digestion which had a somewhat remote significance for one's later life -- except to a minority of scholarly or aesthetic temperaments.[17]

A more balanced perspective noted that, although liberal arts programs were concerned with the non-specialized activities of living, it was by no means antagonistic to vocational education. Rightly conceived, the two programs were complementary. Liberal arts education should contribute to vocational competence by providing the breadth of view and perspective that made the individual a more effective worker and a more intelligent member of a society of freemen.[18] Whereas vocational studies were

---

[16]Jones, pp. 166, 92.

[17]Ibid., p. 114.

[18]The President's Commission, Vol. I., p. 61.

believed to liberate a man from ignorance and prejudice in his own field, liberal arts studies put a man on the road to freedom from ignorance and prejudice in all other fields.[19]

Although the dangers of vocationalism were said to be self-perpetuating, the problem was not to deny the necessity for vocational education programs but to control and guide its force. After all, it was thought to be possible to provide an education in depth without losing the breadth that is the essential of liberal arts education; therefore, it should be possible to steer a sensible course between overgeneralization and overspecialization. Whereas a vocational education could be ever-narrowing; a liberal arts education should be ever-widening. Thus, vocational education would only be able to realize its major purposes within the larger general context of the liberal arts, with which it could never afford to sever organic connection.[20]

All education had been held to be useful--and none was more so than the kind that made men free to possess their nature.[21] Historically, the B.A. degree had had a vocational aim as preparation for the learned professions.

---

[19]Aston R. Williams, General Education in Higher Education (New York, 1968), p. x.

[20]Ibid., pp. 6, 11. Jones, p. 97. The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 71. General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge, 1947), p. 195. (Hereafter cited as The Harvard Redbook.)

[21]Mark Van Doren, Liberal Education (New York, 1943) p. 166.

Hence the argument was, it was not out of keeping with the traditional purposes of the liberal arts education program to extend it to serve other vocational interests.[22]

However, not every educator considered vocational education to be the panacea many of its adherents purported it to be. Bemoaning the unfortunate state of American higher education, one writer observed that "not only has there been a sacrifice of the notion of a liberal education, but even vocational education has proved to be unsatisfactory--for instance, when the needs of the Armed Forces and of industry had to be met on the outbreak of World War II."[23] Furthermore, while the vocationalist was most knowledgeable about his own, tiny corner of the universe, he was radically ignorant of all the rest of the universe -- a human product unparalleled in history. Previously, men could be divided simply into the learned and the ignorant, those more or less the one, and those more or less the other. But the vocationalist could not be brought in under either of those two categories. He was considered to be not learned, for he was formally ignorant of all that did not enter into his speciality; but neither was he ignorant, because he was "a scientist," and "knew" very well his own tiny portion of the universe.[24] Granted that

---

[22]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 74.

[23]Isaac Leon Kandel, American Education in the Twentieth Century (Cambridge, 1957), p. 14.

[24]Jose' Ortega y Gasset, The Revolt of the Masses (London, 1951), pp. 81-82.

study in depth was indispensable, so too was study in breadth; and study in depth and study in breadth were not mutually exclusive. Indeed, if knowledge be a true whole, depth of understanding in one field and breadth of appreciation of many were parts which should enrich not only the whole but also each other.[25]

A valuable perspective was being gained by both parties involved in the discussion as they came increasingly to acknowledge that "beneath to-day lies yesterday; beneath techniques lie principles."[26] Thus, liberal arts education was interpreted to be distinguished from the more specialized vocational education not so much in terms of subject matter as in terms of method and outlook. Some men, however, insisted that

> Education should be confined to some particular and narrow end, and should issue in some definite work which can be weighed and measured.... This they call making Education and Instruction "useful" and "Utility" becomes their watchword.[27]

General and vocational education, it was argued, were not, and must not be placed in competition with each other. The former should provide not only an adequate groundwork for the choice of a speciality, but a milieu in which the speciality could develop its fullest potentialities. The Harvard faculty sought to avoid a system in which general,

---

[25]Williams, p. 7.

[26]Henry Merritt Wriston, Challenge To Freedom (New York, 1943), p. 133.

[27]John Henry Newman, The Idea of a University (San Francisco, 1960), pp. 115-116.

or liberal arts, education was carefully segregated from vocational education as though the two had nothing in common. But, they reasoned, if there be no separation at all, if general education was left entirely to courses taught from a special or technical point of view, or with a special, sometimes vocational, end in mind, then general education would, as a matter of course, suffer even though almost any first-rate vocational education program promoted in some measure the ends of general education.[28]

Perhaps the most persistent illusion of those persons who were concerned for liberal arts education was that it had nothing to do with vocational or professional training and would be contaminated by that training. Conversely, one of the most stubborn obstacles to a proper appreciation of a liberal arts education was the latent suspicion that it was impractical.[29] Significantly, the old prescribed program of higher knowledge, which was "liberal" because it liberalized the mind and trained it to respond to a variety of experiences with reason, had, in recent times, come to mean "unspecific" or "general," and that which was "useful" had changed with the demands of the market.[30] Liberal education served professional purposes because "technique" was the Greek word for art, and there was a human art which

---

[28]The Harvard Redbook, pp. 190-195.

[29]Jones, pp. 91-92. Henry Merritt Wriston, The Nature of a Liberal Education (Appleton, 1937), p. 4.

[30]Cheit, p. 3.

dominated with all other arts, since it was the art that taught them all. It taught them how men do what they do. To miss that lesson was not to know what human work was. It was not even to be prepared for a profession. No antipathy should appear between the vocational and liberal arts education if it is remembered that both are concerned with art.[31] Stated in a slightly different way, vocational education was considered to instruct in what things could be done and how to do them, while the liberal arts education instructed in what needed to be done and to what ends. The reminder was given that the useful was not always good, but the good was always useful. Hence, real liberal arts education was considered to be the most useful of all. Therefore, it was believed that the more effectively a person was liberally educated, the richer would be his own personal life, the further he would be able to develop in his profession or vocation, and the more significant would be his total contribution to society.[32]

The crucial task, then, of higher education in that era was to provide a unified liberal arts education for American youth. Colleges were exhorted to discover the right relationship between vocational training on the one hand, aiming at a thousand different careers, and the transmission of a common cultural heritage toward a common

---

[31]Van Doren, pp. 166-167.

[32]Cheit, p. 10. Theodore Meyer Greene, Liberal Education Reconsidered (Cambridge, 1953), p. 37.

citizenship on the other hand.[33] In other words, whereas liberal arts education was described as an organism, whole and integrated, vocational education was described as an organ, a member designed to fulfill a particular function within the whole.[34] After all the discussion, the words of John Henry Cardinal Newman were sounded as still true:

> This process of training, by which the intellect, instead of being formed or sacrificed to some particular or accidental purpose, some specific trade or profession, or study or science, is disciplined for its own sake, for the perception of its own proper object, and for its own highest culture is called Liberal Education; ... this I conceive to be the business of a University.[35]

The Role of Society

Because the American college was one of the earliest cultural institutions to be established in the New World, it has always been affected by society. For example, from its beginnings in American society, the college has been a mendicant institution, depending on the charitable impulses of the people for its support. Consequently, it has, in part, tailored its purposes and its expenditures to the level of contributions it has received from interested patrons.[36] Society has impacted the programs of liberal

---

[33]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 49.

[34]The Harvard Redbook, p. 195.

[35]Newman, p. 115.

[36]Stewart G. Cole, Liberal Education in a Democracy: A Charter for the American College (New York, 1040), p. 3. W. Max Wise, The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry Into the Processes of Collegiate Government, p. 108.

arts colleges in a variety of ways, including its espousal of the need for colleges to serve the national interests. Then, too, both high schol and college programs had had alternate periods of expansion and reexamination. One of the most powerful forces acting upon liberal arts programs was nostalgia -- or the sentiment, "Was the education the last generation got better or worse than what the present generation is getting?"[37] Therefore, many of the developments in those colleges had been taken in the absence of well-defined, coherent plans, which meant that most decisions were on an ad hoc basis and were often contradictory to each other. Interestingly, the doctrine of relevance was considered to be valid only in a perfectly stable world where the future was easily predictable.[38]

The social unrest which stimulated the concern about the status and future of higher education antedated the outbreak of the war by several years. But it was brought to a head by a realization that the postwar era would demand serious reconstruction and adjustments at all levels of education. The resultant crisis in American society was related to the derangement in human goals and a loss of confidence in the leaders' ability or willingness to make the value judgments necessary to restore order in public

---

[37]Stanley F. Idzerda, "Academic Rigor," Twenty five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), p. 108.

[38]Wise, p. 15. Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 10.

and private lives.[39] So far as the western world was concerned, it was possible to assume either that its culture was breaking up around them or that they were experiencing the pangs of a global revolution so vast, so profound and perhaps so incomprehensible that men--even educated men--did not want to face it and try to estimate its causes, its direction, or its possible end.[40] That tragic sense of discontinuity made its inevitable impact upon educational thought. Education had been a glowing faith throughout most of American history. Suddenly, because it had not prevented the Second World War, or the economic depression, or general hardship, it was said to have failed. Criticism of its institutions and programs followed the dominant pattern of negativism, and a "new" education was the inevitable demand by a large segment of society.[41] At the same time, there was another segment of society whose desire to return to the educational format of the past echoed a part of the thirst for security which was a characteristic of that frightened age.

Because institutions of higher education were so sensitive to the society around them, many of the major changes in their programs appeared to be unplanned. Sometimes, new federal legislation made matching funds available for

---

[39]Kandel, Impact, p. 172. Earl Jones McGrath, Values, Liberal Education, and National Destiny (Indianapolis, 1975), p. 17.

[40]Jones, p. 79.

[41]Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 7.

instructional facilities, often representing needs of low priority. On other occasions, the change would occur because of an unexpected gift with conditions which made possible a new program, even though it had little connection with the central purposes of the college. At other times, a tax-supported college would be established nearby which threatened the drawing power of the college for students in the immediate geographic area.[42]

Ideally, and in the popular understanding, institutions of higher education were, as had been historically the case, a corporation for the civilization and care of the community's highest aspirations and ideals. But those ideals and aspirations had changed somewhat with the changing scheme of the Western civilization. As a consequence, those institutions of higher education had also changed in character, aims, and ideals so as to leave it still the corporate organ of the community's dominant intellectual interest. After all, since the community changes its mind, it would be expected that those institutions, which were subject to the conditions and limitations of the community, would similarly change.[43] Education was seen as society perpetuating its spirit and inner form in a new generation. And, because that society was dynamic, it constantly changed--either progressing toward a better

---

[42]Wise, p. 15.

[43]Veblen, pp. 33-34.

group life or retrogressing. Two factors have been involved in the changes: thinking and acting. Societal progress, therefore, was understood to come through thought in action--that is, it must be dynamic. Since it was the concern of education to aid people in developing the qualities which would secure social progress, education itself must have been dynamic in its methods.[44]

If the colleges and universities were, indeed, concerned solely with the market place, they were the creatures of their environment. As such, they were merely reflections of the bustling activity which took place in that environment. If they were primarily concerned with the vocational aspects of life, they were kaleidoscopic mirrors of society instead of being instruments for its development or control. Hence, they could become as confused as the traffic at a busy intersection.[45] Yet, for the private, liberal arts college there was not a very viable option. As a mendicant institution, it had to give careful attention to the public interpretations of its activities. It has always run the risk of alienating a traditional source of support at grave risk to its programs; and it has sought constantly to publicize evidence of strength and efficient operation. Every disruption of the appearance of harmony was a potential disaster and

---

[44]The Harvard Redbook, p. 104. Henderson, p. 110.

[45]Greene, Liberal Education Re-examined, p. 11.

letters of complaint which alleged that the college condoned or failed to suppress expressions or actions which were contrary to prevailing mores were given careful attention by most colleges.[46]

Not only did the liberal arts college fear the possible alienation of its constituency, it had the added apprehension of a potentially negative impact of a shifting emphasis upon higher education programs by the larger public. For example, the Second World War led to an accelerated growth movement in behalf of junior and community colleges. However, the President's Commission reported that the liberal arts college was "so well established in the American educational tradition that it need not fear community colleges will weaken its own appeal."[47] Of course, the fear of the liberal arts college had been occasioned by the fact that the liberal-arts-centered Utopia, long envisioned by some devotees of liberal arts education, seemed to have become gradually more remote and inexpedient. But there was no inherent reason why the college needed to maintain an artificial environment secluded from the main currents of life. Indeed, the less isolation the better it would be.[48] On the contrary,

---

[46]Wise, p. 31.

[47]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 70.

[48]Paul L. Dressel and Margaret F. Lorimer, Attitudes of Liberal Arts Faculty Members Toward Liberal and Professional Education (New York, 1960), p. 2. Henderson, p. 123.

liberal arts colleges were enjoined to envision a much larger role for higher education in the national life. Consequently, they could no longer consider themselves merely the instrument for producing an intellectual elite; they needed to become the means whereby every citizen, youth and adult, would be enabled and encouraged to carry his education, both formal and informal, as far as his native capacities would permit. It was imperative for those institutions to take a large part of the responsibility for making those changes which would enhance the education of an increasing number of Americans.[49] They also needed to appreciate the fact that the strength and freedom enjoyed by public institutions of higher education derived from the fact that the liberal arts colleges themselves were strong and free.[50] In fact, the major social value of the independent, liberal arts college was its freedom--freedom to resist external pressures, especially political pressure, freedom to experiment, freedom, conversely, to hold fast to traditional values when it wished to do so.[51]

---

[49]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 101. McGrath, Values, p. 19.

[50]Paul B. Anderson, "The Privately Supported Liberal Arts College--Problems and Policies," Current Trends in Higher Education (1949), pp. 170-171.

[51]Francis H. Horn, "The Privately Supported Liberal Arts College -- Problems and Policies," Current Trends in Higher Education (1949), p. 164.

Actually, the most serious danger liberal arts colleges were believed to face was their readiness to risk their dignity in a rush to keep up with events, to serve mankind in a low way which would sacrifice respect. The world needed liberal arts education programs so badly that those colleges must study to preserve their programs so as to be able to meet that need.[52] Believing the entire higher education enterprise in the United States to be in need of a renewed direction and assistance, President Harry S. Truman, on July 13, 1946, appointed a special commission to "re-examine our system of higher education in terms of its objectives, methods, and facilities, and in the light of the social role it has to play," and to examine "the functions of higher education in our democracy and of the means by which they can best be performed."[53]

Democracy and the Liberal Arts Program

Although the ideals of democracy had been woven tightly into the fabric of American society and liberal arts education programs, the Second World War heightened that relationship even more. Increasingly, all of higher education was expected to serve the needs and aspirations of democracy, the central purpose of which was viewed as the liberation and perfection of the intrinsic powers of

---

[52]Van Doren, p. 5.

[53]From the letter creating the commission, quoted in Kandel, Impact, p. 164.

every citizen, along with the furtherance of each individual's self-realization. Underlying that understanding was the assmption that, if democracy, as the ideal social order through which to achieve freedom and equality of opportunity for all individuals, an abundant economy, and cooperation on a world-wide basis, was to bring order out of the chaos of that period, it needed to have educated leadership--and the institutions of higher learning which purported to give a liberal arts education should be the wells from which that leadership should mainly flow.[54]

However, the relationship between a democracy and liberal arts education programs involved mutual responsibility. A democracy that was interested in its future would give each of its members as much liberal arts education as he could assimilate, neither would it allow him to elect to miss that much because he was in a hurry to become something less than a man. It was obvious that everyone could not be a philosopher-king; but it was equally obvious that everyone must not be less than he was--and a democracy must be prepared to give the entire quantity of itself that could not be taken.[55] Moreover, basic to the practice of democracy was a clear understanding of its meaning, which was said to reside in the human values and

---

[54]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 9. Henderson, p. 1.

[55]Van Doren, p. 33.

ethical ideas on which democratic living was based. Democracy, after all, was viewed as much more than a set of political processes--it formulated and implemented a philosphy of human relations whose requisite was the freedom to change.[56] And liberal arts education was indispensable to the maintenance and growth of freedom of thought, faith, enterprise, and association. Thus, the social role of higher education in a democratic society was to ensure equal liberty and equal opportunity to differing individuals and groups, and to enable the citizens to understand, appraise, and redirect forces, men, and events as those tend to strengthen or to weaken their liberties. Hence, education in a democracy was more important than education in either a theocracy or a political monarchy, because, in a democracy, the people represent a power at once so mobile, so unresponsible, and so strong that its very continuance depends upon the enlightenment and steadying forces which education alone gives.[57]

The importance of liberal arts education for American democracy, it was believed, could hardly be exaggerated during the Second World War, which was a conflict between two radically divergent philosophies--one of which was coercive and authoritarian, while the other was persuasive

---

[56]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 11. Henderson, p. 33.

[57]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 5. Charles F. Thwing, History of Education in the United States Since the Civil War (Boston, 1910), pp. 1-2.

and dedicated to liberty. The former philosophy had seriously challenged democratic principles -- even previous to the outbreak of the war. And it continued to be a threat following the conclusion of the war. The most important defense against that threat was the development of a firm allegiance to the democratic faith taught in classrooms typical of liberal arts education, which, alone, was able to create an atmosphere in which the mind could be opened to every intimate impulse and voice in free contact with other minds of a like sort.[58]

Challenges to the Programs

Whereas there was the rather widespread acceptance that democracy and liberal arts education programs had, and ought to maintain their mutual relationship, and that there was little danger that liberal arts education would not be wanted again, there was also the acknowledged danger that the kind of liberal arts education which might eventuate, as a result of numerous challenges, would not seem to be worth having.[59] A partial reason for such a pessimistic attitude was explained via the sentiment that, in recent years, the crisis of Western civilization was due to the separation of its culture from its religious basis--and

---

[58]Greene, pp. xiii, 39, 40. The President's Commission, Vol. I, pp. 6, 8, 9, 14. J. William Fulbright, "Maintenance of Freedom," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970), ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), p. 64.

[59]Van Doren, p. viii.

that had been, historically, an essential facet of liberal arts education programs.[60] Interestingly, the Second World War evoked such a sharp debate among Roman Catholic educators in the United States over the maintaining of liberal arts education and the content of a core of subjects to be required in any liberal arts college program that the Liberal Arts Committee, who were supposed to deal with the issue, became hopelessly divided and was discharged.[61]

Compounding the challenge was the dispute over the identity of the "enemy," in the struggle between violence and understanding, between ideas and machines. On the one hand, the enemy was viewed as external. But there were advocates of the notion that the true enemy was within mankind and, if left alone, would devour the heart and mind of humanity. Only the liberal arts would be able to effect the necessary cure. In the latter days of the war, Father Hugh O'Donnell, C.S.C., then President of the University of Notre Dame, expressed the fear that the war in the United States would so upset "the proper balance between the liberal and technological subjects . . . as not to preserve the cultural disciplines of philosophy, history, the languages, and allied subjects."[62] Closely related was the

---

[60]Christopher Dawson, _Education and the Crisis of Christian Culture_ (Chicago, 1949), p. 5.

[61]William F. Cunningham, _General Education and The Liberal College_ (St. Louis, 1953), pp. vi-vii.

[62]Van Doren, p. 4. Cunningham, p. vi.

strong opinion that no education could be liberal unless it were classical, for it was believed that the classics and philosophy best sharpened the minds and enlarged the hearts of free men; and freedom, somehow or other, seemed all wrapped up in the literary declarations of two ancient democracies, Athens and Rome.[63]

One of the most threatening challenges to liberal arts education programs came from the President's Commission on Higher Education when it proposed that the balance which had previously existed between the public and the private groups of institutions of higher education ought to be radically upset.[64] That recommendation had reflected the criticism of liberal arts education programs during the Second World War to the effect that many people felt they were not educated--but people have never thought they were truly educated. Even Aristotle had written: "There are doubts concerning the business of it, since all people do not agree in those things they would have a child taught, both with respect to improvement in virtue and a happy life; nor is it clear whether the object of it should be to improve the reason or rectify the morals."[65] Those academic programs were frequently described as weak because they did not develop rigorously the ability to think.

---

[63]Cunningham, p. 1.

[64]Horn, p. 164.

[65]Van Doren, pp. 1-12.

In the formal approaches in education, the courses were informative, but were handed to the students rather than used as the basis for further thought. Yet, in the more progressive programs, in practice, the problems presented were frequently of insufficient challenge to the students; neither was there required adequate collection and analysis of facts as a basis for arriving at conclusions.[66]

Words of wise caution were, fortunately, sounded. There were educators who recognized that, to be too critical of a college--that is, to attempt too much reform--could potentially kill that college.[67] It was considered to be important, therefore, to remain mindful of the fact that the American college was the one place where liberal arts education could keep its heart whole. Whether that would be done depended, as always before, not only upon the faculties of those colleges but upon their students, not only upon their alumni but upon the parents; and increasingly it depended upon the view of education that was held everywhere--in the general opinion no less than in the particular opinions of elected governments.[68]

Another challenge to the liberal arts education programs was at the point of the teaching staffs. Expanding

---

[66]Henderson, p. 24.

[67]Ibid., pp. 104-105.

[68]Van Doren, p. 106.

enrollments after the conclusion of the Second World War had created a serious deficiency in the teaching staffs of most institutions. It was expected to be several years before the graduate schools could begin to produce as many faculty members as would be needed to staff the college-level programs. That situation was further complicated by the fact that the training of college teachers had become so overwhelmingly oriented toward research in some special field of scholarship that all too few were either competent to teach liberal arts education courses or sympathetically inclined to try to do so.[69] The teacher shortage had begun when, in 1940, substantial efforts were made, at the national level, to locate pure and applied science research experts in the colleges and universities who might be available to the federal government for national defense service.[70]

Several efforts were made to remedy the teaching situation. For example, the creation of a graduate (Ph.D level) program not geared to research but to the preparation of teachers--especially in the liberal arts colleges

---

[69]John Dale Russell, "Major Problems Facing Higher Education," Current Problems in Higher Education (October, 1947), p. 21. The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 60.

[70]Garland G. Parker, The Enrollment Explosion: A Half-Century of Attendance in U.S. Colleges and Universities (New York, 1971), p. 35.

--who could integrate knowledge was advocated.[71] Moreover, teachers were cautioned to be teachers of students first, and of subject matter as the means toward that end. Additional characteristics cited as being necessary in college teachers included: (1) sound scholarship, which did not mean brilliant scholastic success, but a mastery of one's chosen field, (2) a basic interest in people, so as to be able to teach people and work with colleagues, and (3) an attractive personality, which was a complex combination of personal, social, psychological, and physical characteristics which were difficult to evaluate.[72] Following the war, some college or university teachers became reluctant to remain in that profession because of a variety of challenges to academic freedom. Some of those educators were accused of being members of the communist party, or "fellow-travelers," with the guilt-by-association formula being extensively used. Others were accused of racial or religious bias. Those teachers who aspired to participation in politics were reluctant to do so lest their academic freedom be jeopardized. Others were inhibited from acting upon their desire to share in the administration of the college for the same reason.[73]

---

[71]Jones, pp. 145-178.

[72]Henderson, p. 185. Lloyd A. Garrison, "Preparation of College and University Teachers," Current Trends in Higher Education (1949), p. 100.

[73]Charles W. McKenzie, "Interpreting Academic Freedom," Current Trends in Higher Education (1949), pp. 120-123.

One of the critical assignments of liberal arts education programs was the development of needed leadership. Liberal arts education was tauted as the "most effective means yet discovered to develop God-given talents of leadership."[74] The second half of the twentieth century had opened with a faith in education that not only was undiminished but rather was enhanced by the realization of the position of leadership achieved by the United States and of its responsibilities among the democracies of the world. And leadership as a nation was dependent upon the leadership of individual. Leadership that was educated with an over-all view of society seemed to be the most desirable form of leadership. Unfortunately, the colleges and universities had not been too successful in producing that kind of leadership.[75] Effective thinking (of which logical thinking was a part) was said to be the essential ingredient for an effective leader. Logical thinking was defined as the capacity to extract universal truths from particular cases and, in turn, to infer particulars from general laws. More strictly, it was the ability to discern a pattern of relationships--on the one hand to analyze a problem into its component elements, and on the other to

---

[74]J. Douglas Brown, "Education for Leadership," Association of American Colleges Bulletin (December, 1950), p. 564. This same sentiment was expressed by other writers. Cunningham, p. 278. James L. Mursell, Education for American Democracy (New York, 1943), p. 9.

[75]Isaac Leon Kandel, American Education in the Twentieth Century (Cambridge, 1957), p. 1. Henderson, p. 36.

recombine those elements, often by the use of imaginative insight, so as to reach a solution. Effective thinking, however, went beyond logical thinking. It involved a man who could handle terms and concepts with skill, and yet did not confuse words with things. It included the understanding of complex and fluid situations.[76]

Student Expectations

When the Selective Service System was introduced in 1940, there was no concerted plan to deal with the problems of higher education, nor any disposition to make special provisions for students as a class. Therefore, it should not be surprising that students and potential students, both during and after the Second World War made an impact upon the programs of liberal arts education. Neither should anyone be surprised at the response or reacton by those institutions. Just prior to the United States' involvement in the war, a formula was reached, on March 18, 1941, under which local Selective Service Boards could grant occupational deferment to "any registrant found to be a 'necessary man' in any industry, business, etc." necessary to the nation--an action which would, in time, complicate the program plans of liberal arts colleges.[77]

---

[76]The Harvard Redbook, pp. 65-67.

[77]Kandel, Impact, pp. 123-125.

Nevertheless, the issue of student deferment was not stabilized until the beginning of 1944, and after the system of specialized training for the Army and Navy had been established in colleges and universities. Even those institutions failed to develop an over-all plan for higher education during the war because of the difficulty of anticipating the needs of the armed services under the war conditions, which were constantly changing.[78]

In the midst of their frustrations, the liberal arts institutions attempted to resolve their dilemma by developing a plan to educate selected enlisted men for specialized training to meet the needs of the Army and Navy within the framework of their programs. These special students were on active military duty, in uniform, received pay, and under military discipline. Those programs were designed to upgrade the learning level of those selected enlisted men by providing them with at least a rudimentary liberal arts education, which would enhance their abilities to think and reason. Of course, that plan was also intended to help those colleges continue their academic programs by stabilizing their enrollments.[79] The war also demonstrated the value of non-curricular services for students.

---

[78]Ibid., pp. 126, 157-158.

[79]Ibid., pp. 151-156. Oklahoma Baptist University was typical of such liberal arts colleges which adopted such a plan for military personnel. The value of the plan for that institution was evidenced by the fact that it did, indeed, stabilize its program, enrollments, and finances.

Further, it multiplied the need for an increase in student personnel services, in some of the colleges, because of larger enrollments.[80] Mercer University made extensive adjustments to their programs during the war. For example, they adopted a trimester program; the student load was increased from 15 to 18 hours per week and class days from five to six. In addition, those colleges provided facilities and personnel for training officers and specialists. The Army's facet of those training programs graduated 64,332 men between April 1943 and December 1945. The Navy's college training programs graduated 219,150 persons during the same period of time.[81] In yet another venture the Bolton Act established and guided the Cadet Nurse Program and set up a series of standards by which eligibility of nursing schools for participation in the program was to be determined. The system of payments to Cadet Nurses had the effect of making the status of Cadet Nurse much more attractive than that of student nurse. It also meant that eligible girls would tend to enter schools that participated in the program.[82]

The problem involving students did not cease with the conclusion of the war, however. Instead, it changed direc-

---

[80]James Earl Russell, Federal Activities in Higher Education After the Second World War: An Analysis of the Nature, Scope, and Impact of Federal Activities in Higher Education in the Fiscal Year 1947 (New York, 1951), pp. 22-23.

[81]National Education Association, Education's Part in the War Effort (1946), p. 37.

[82]Russell, Federal Activities, pp. 47-48.

tion and became more intense, as the eleven million veterans who had fought in the Second World War flooded the colleges. Their influence, wants, goals, and ambitions would dramatically shape liberal arts education programs. Those veterans were, by and large, serious students, who performed at least as well as, and usually better than, their non-veteran counterparts. It soon became obvious that the veteran presented a point of view and a student attitude different from that previously known to most faculty members and college administrators. In general, they, for example, ignored those extracurricular activities that, in reflection of their maturity and experience, they deemed frivolous.[83]

Returning veterans brought a new attitude to those institutions of higher education. They were intensely serious in purpose, had an immediate objective, and were positive in their opinion of the quality of the instruction which they received. They believed that, in education, they could find the answers to philosophical or socio-economic questions which had troubled them in the depression and war years, could find the reasons behind the horrible waste of natural resources and human lives--those wealths of nations.[84] Their impact on liberal arts education programs was highlighted by the fact that, by-

---

[83]Parker, p. 38. J. F. Bartlett, "Preparation for College and University Teaching," Current Issues in Higher Education (1950), p. 135.

[84]Bartlett, p. 135. Jones, pp. 174-175.

and-large, the veterans elected studies in technological, business, preprofessional, and professional areas. Relatively few of them chose the arts and sciences and educational programs. In fact, they were so oriented toward the pragmatic, immediate outcomes that many of those veterans were quite willing to dispense with a formal education if they could effectively be prepared for a good job.[85]

Furthermore, there were unique characteristics of those veterans, which helped create new challenges for liberal arts education programs. For example, many veterans revealed that having a family was not a handicap in the pursuit of an education. Hence, the complexion of those institutions was dramatically altered by the attendance of more married students.[86] Those new students were different from those in the past in several ways. They came from homes that did not have a background of higher education as a family tradition. Their first priority, as was suggested earlier, was for financial security in an economic society.[87]

Liberal arts institutions varied in their response or reaction to challenges presented by those new students. Ironically, many of those schools which cast aspersions

---

[85]Parker, p. 38. Smith, p. 1.

[86]Phillip S. Donnell, "Building and Plant Expansion," Current Problems in Higher Education (1947), p. 59. (Donnell was Dean of Engineering at Oklahoma A & M College.)

[87]Russell, Federal Activities p. 14. Jones, pp. 172-174.

toward the idea of pragmatism in the affairs of education (lest the purity of liberal arts education programs become contaminated) made the decision to expand their enrollments on a wholly pragmatic basis: the possibility of increasing their incomes from tuition while making relatively low-cost arrangements to care for the greater numbers.[88] However, most of those institutions apparently were influenced by a sense of public duty, both to veterans whose education had been interrupted by war service or previously discontinued for economic reasons, and to the younger groups whom they did not wish to shut out because of the difficulty of crowding them in alongside the veterans. In all fairness to those institutions who based their decisions solely or in large measure upon financial considerations, it should be remembered that, as those veterans returned to college by the hundreds of thousands, those schools faced a period of trial which was taxing their resources and their resourcefulness to the utmost. That was justification the federal government used for taking all practicable steps to assist those institutions in meeting that challenge and to assure that all qualified veterans who desired to continue their education had the opportunity to do so.[89] That postwar flood of students highlighted three conditions. First, there had been an acute shortage of qualified personnel for teaching at the college level. Second, there

---

[88]Russell, Federal Activities, pp. 65-66.

[89]The letter from President Truman appointing the Commission on Higher Education, July 13, 1946.

was no longer a typical highly selected "Joe College," the then present college students being a fairly representative cross section of American life. Third, the older, sober, more experienced college G.I. had demanded instructors who could teach courses with "meat on their bones" effectively, economically, and fairly.[90]

Explicably, there were liberal arts colleges which failed to acknowledge the needs, challenges, and opportunities offered by those students. Some educators, by way of illustration, ignored the circumstances and alleged that the largest number of students seeking some kind of education beyond high school would spend the first few years in something called a college of liberal arts, or of arts and science, or just "the college."[91] The slow sifting and screening of students in the liberal arts college increased the chances for each student to make the right vocational choice for himself, and for the whole range of vocational choices to be more varied and socially useful.[92] Hence, there were educators who advocated not allowing a student to enroll in a liberal arts college until he had given reasonable assurance that he proposed to pursue a course of professional or vocational training, so as to bring his

---

[90]Garison, p. 99.

[91]George P. Schmidt, The Liberal Arts College: A Chapter in American Cultural History (New Brunswich, 1957), p. vii.

[92]Anderson, p. 170.

education into focus.[93] The over-all situation of growth was illustrated by the fact that, whereas, in 1949, there were 453 separate liberal arts colleges in the United States with accredited status, as of 1950, that number had increased to 490 -- 440 of which were private liberal arts colleges, of which 400 were single-purpose institutions devoted to the end of providing a liberal arts education for their students.[94]

The Issues of Language Study and Research

The study of foreign languages had always been an essential element in liberal arts education programs. In the earliest days of those programs, only the classical languages--predominantly Greek and Latin--were studied. With the passing of time, however, the study of modern languages was permitted--sometimes as an alternative, sometimes in addition to the classical languages, sometimes as a replacement for the classical languages. Whereas language study had originally taken place to enable the student to read the classics of literature, with the translation of those classics into English, that reason was no longer valid. With the advent of the German model of higher education into the American system, the study of German and French languages began to become acceptable

---

[93]Jones, pp. 94-95.

[94]John D. Millett, _Financing Higher Education in the United States_ (New York, 1952), pp. 189-190.

studies--either as substitutes or as alternatives. Nevertheless, throughout that development, the focus of language study was to facilitate the student's ability to read the language being studied.

The Second World War, however, significantly impacted that component of liberal arts education programs. It fostered a change in the way foreign languages were taught. Language study became a tool, instead of a leisure or gentlemanly activity. The war precipitated a change in language study so that it became, not only the development of a means for communication, but also the acquisition of a knowledge and understanding of the culture which surrounded the language being studied.[95] The change had resulted from the urgent need of the armed forces for officers with a mastery of foreign languages to deal not only with prisoners of war, but also with the people in occupied areas, along with the new role the United States seemed destined to play in international affairs exercised an important and profound influence on the development of new materials and new directions in education.[96] Moreover, the format for the study of foreign languages was altered. Instead of using the traditional format in which a language was studied three hours a week in a program spread over one or

---

[95]Kandel, Impact, pp. 9, 233-235. The Harvard Redbook, pp. 121-122.

[96]Kandel, Impact, p. 231.

more years, the wartime experience had demonstrated the effectiveness of a concentrated, accelerated program of language study. The experience had shown that languages could be satisfactorily learned in a shorter period of time.[97]

Another important post-war index of public favor for higher education was the amount of support provided for university research. The war effort had underscored the need to study what happened to scientific discoveries when they were practically put to work in an industrial culture.[98] As a result of the competition engendered by the Second World War and its aftermath, research became increasingly important. Therefore, there developed an increasing absence of true teachers -- that is, persons who could explicate complex issues, who could go to the heart of the matter, and who were essential for liberal arts education programs.[99] Two types of research were recognized. The first was general research, which was a continuously active inquiry into all aspects of life, an attempt to define and refine one's own philosophical concept of life or of particular phases of life. The second was the special or technical type of research, and referred to specific studies where original inquiry attempted to

---

[97]The Harvard Redbook, p. 194.

[98]Jones, pp. 97-98. Lewis B. Mayhew, "And Now the Future," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), p. 309.

[99]Smith, pp. 14-15.

extend the scope of human knowledge. It was that second, narrower definition that was what the academically trained men ordinarly meant by the term "research." And it was the impetus or pressure to do that kind of research which threatened to undermine the liberal arts education programs. Essentially, that pressure was upon the young faculty member who, in order to establish his own creditials within his own discipline, had to focus his attention on doing research rather than upon developing as a teacher of the liberal arts.[100]

The Changing Practice of the Federal Government

The accepted tradition in the United States had been that higher education was not a federal function. Instead, it was a matter of concern to the states and to private groups operating under charters granted by those states. Yet, although recognizing that higher education was a function of the various states, the federal government had, through the years, provided substantial aid to those states for education. As a result of the Second World War, however, that situation had changed via the accelerated involvement of the federal government that it could no longer be said that higher education was exclusively a state and local operation. It had, indeed, become a major concern of

---

[100]Henderson, pp. 107-108. Lloyd F. Averill, "Viability of Liberal Arts," Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco, 1970), pp. 164-165.

the federal government. Without ever accepting general responsibility for higher education, the federal government had step-by-step come into a central position in the field. Each step had been taken in response to public or private pressures of one type or another, and had been intended to achieve some specific end. But the sum of all those steps had brought the federal government to the threshold of a new responsibility.[101]

Immediately prior to the United States' involvement in the Second World War, the Executive Committee of the National Commission on Education and Defense, on November 6, 1941, still found it urgent to recommend the preparation by the National Commission of "a forceful statement emphasizing the necessity of maintaining education at a high level of effectiveness during the present emergency" and its wide circulation through governmental agencies and educational institutions.[102] Six months later, July 15-16, 1942, a meeting of higher education administrators, meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, deplored the continuing lack of any adequate, coordinated plan for the most effective utilization of higher education toward the winning of the war; and they urged the establishment of such a coordinated plan at the earliest possible moment. They further complained that the federal government was not utilizing institutions of

---

[101]Russell, Federal Activities pp. 3, 69. The President's Commission, Vol, V, pp. 40-41.

[102]Kandel, Impact, p. 135.

higher education to capacity and was, therefore, "impeding the flow of highly trained manpower essential to victory in a long war."[103]

Shortly after the conclusion of the war, however, there had been completed a dramatic swing regarding the federal government's involvement with higher education. Whereas, in 1942, higher education administrators had voiced their frustration because of the federal government's lack of involvement with higher education, by 1947, they had come to recognize that the federal government had come to take a central and potentially dominant position in the general national scheme of higher education. Moreover, they had begun to realize that the effects of those federal programs were far-reaching and widespread, and that no institution of higher education in the United States could afford to ignore the effects of federal activities. In fact, many educators had begun to denounce those activities as dangerous trends wich needed to be reversed.[104]

The federal government based its increased involvement in higher education on several factors. First, it reasoned that the education of American young people was necessary to the survival of a democratic society. Second, military service in the war effort had interrupted the normal education of hundreds of thousands of young men and women.

---

[103]Ibid., p. 141.

[104]Russell, Federal Activities, pp. v, 78.

Third, after the war the economy of the country might not be able to absorb young people into business and industry as fast as they were discharged, and higher education would be preferable, for those who could make use of it, to "government-made work." Finally, the government could not afford to permit a large group of former service men and women to go out on their own to possible disillusionment because they could not find jobs or reemployment in their former jobs.[105] In 1947 alone, the federal government provided education of the higher type for about 85,000 persons in schools, several of which offered programs similar to those of four-year liberal arts colleges, which it operated for that purpose. With other colleges, the federal government offered a series of services to individuals that enabled them to obtain a higher education. It also dealt with those institutions to assist them, obtain services from them, or both.[106]

Thus, the programs of liberal arts colleges were impacted by the Second World War, which was the culmination of a long-time struggle with their responsibility to society. Society had increased its clamor for vocationalism in education. It had also called upon the liberal arts colleges to structure their programs so as to serve the requirements of democracy. Both faculties and students

---

[105]George Lynn Cross, The University of Oklahoma and World War II (Norman, 1980), p. 136.

[106]Russell, Federal Activites, pp. 15, 35.

were part of that impact on programs. Although changes in language studies and research had made their contributions, it was the federal government which was most dramatic. Indeed, it was becoming apparent that liberal arts education programs would never be the same again.

CHAPTER V

IMPACT ON FINANCIAL MATTERS

Finances have always been a concern of higher education. No matter how idealistic the faculties, administrators, and students might have been with regard to the philosophy of liberal arts education, curriculum, or programs, without adequate financial support, those ideals had little chance of becoming reality. As was suggested previously, liberal arts colleges have been, historically, sensitive to society--its needs and aspirations. Consequently, they had, on occasion, experienced the need to alter their programs or curricula in order to procure the necessary monies which would enable them to continue. Then, there had been times when financial benefactors had made support available for a new program. Once again, the liberal arts colleges made adjustments--if not outright changes. That they did so was not necessarily a fault--even though there were purists who had idealistically insisted that to make such changes because of financial consideration was tantamount to those institutions prostituting themselves in the shrine of mammon. Most of the time the decision to make the adjustments was done to be realistic with regard to the need for institutions to

operate with a balanced budget. However, there had been very little federal involvement in the financial matters of the nation's liberal arts colleges.

Nevertheless, from the earliest period of American history, the federal government had given financial assistance to colleges and universities. Such assistance was intermittent and was granted for individual institutions. For example, the ordinances of 1785 and 1787 had given one section of each township in the Northwest Territory for the maintenance of public schools within those townships. It was not, however, until 1862, with the passage of the Morrill Act, that the federal government initiated a program of subsidizing specific areas of interest. That Act, which gave each state specific grants of land, provided that the income from the lease or sale of such land should be used to develop and expand education in agriculture and the mechanical arts. Later, via legislation supplementing that Act, other fields were added to those subsidized and provided through the land-grant colleges. In addition, the federal government made a substantial, although indirect, subsidy to all nonprofit-making colleges and universities by exempting them from certain federal taxes commonly paid by industrial establishments.

Prior to 1935, the total proportion of the current cost of higher education in the United States borne by the federal government amounted annually to less than five percent. But the depression years of the 1930's marked the

beginning of a sharp upward swing in federal funds for higher education. In order to cope with the social and economic problems of that period, the federal government had expanded its relatively small financial role in higher education through such new developments as: (1) the granting of funds for the construction of buildings for tax-supported institutions, under the Work Projects Administration and Public Works Administration Construction programs, (2) the support and control of the educational programs of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and (3) the provision of work scholarships for needy students under the program of the National Youth Administration. Although those emergency programs all ended before or soon after the beginning of the Second World War, they had left their mark on the pattern of financing higher education.[1]

The financial relationships between the federal government and the colleges and universities were further expanded during the war. Their relationship was largely in the form of contractual arrangements for the training of military and civilian personnel, for research, and for other specific wartime needs and services. Those contracts made it possible for many colleges to continue in operation during a critical time when other sources of income were temporarily reduced.

---

[1]The President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. V (Washington, D. C., 1947), pp. 52-53.

A Shift in Involvement

With the conclusion of the war there was a substantial shift and tendency of the federal government to get involved in higher education and for educators to look increasingly to the federal government for financial assistance. Whereas in 1930 and 1940, the federal government's interest in higher education had been confined to land-grant institutions and to programs of agriculture education and research, by 1950, the federal government had expanded its interest to include many other institutions and types of research.[2] To some observers, that alliance probably seemed strange--especially if they were among those persons who alleged that, until the outbreak of the Second World War, the federal government had done almost nothing in the field of education apart from its traditional contributions of modest subsidies of general and special programs, statistics, and information.[3] During the war, however, the federal government had granted funds to colleges, either directly or through some intervening agency -- usually a state government. As was stated earlier, one of the most far-reaching programs involving federal fiscal

---

[2]John D. Millett, Financing Higher Education in the United States (New York, 1952), p. 347. James Earl Russell, Federal Activities in Higher Education After the Second World War: An Analysis of the Nature, Scope, and Impact of Federal Activities in Higher Education in the Fiscal Year 1947 (New York, 1951), p. v.

[3]Theodore Meyer Greene et. al, Liberal Education Reexamined: Its Role in a Democracy (New York, 1943), p. 3.

assistance consisted of programs for the training of military personnel. Schools without those military units were hard-hit both in finances and students -- but they managed to survive. It had not been intended that the more than four hundred schools which held military training contracts would make a profit; but such operations did permit those institutions to keep their faculties occupied and their physical plants operating in educational service important to the nation. Yet, in 1944, even schools with military service units began to suffer, because of the departure of their military trainees for active service in large numbers. The bind was especially tight upon the private schools, where tuition normally provided fifty percent of their income.[4] Only the women's colleges seemed to escape dire financial problems as the enrollments of women reached new heights in 1944.[5]

As the war moved toward its conclusion, there began to be concern relative to the impact the war had made upon the financial plight of colleges. Accordingly, the Borden Bill (H.R. 346) was introduced on May 3, 1945, to create a Commission on Emergency Aid to Higher Educational Institutions, consisting of seven members, to administer an emergency fund of $25 million to be disbursed through contracts for stand-by and other services. The aid was intended to

---

[4]Russell, Federal Activities, p. 43. Garland G. Parker, The Enrollment Explosion: A Half-Century of Attendance in U.S. Colleges and Universities (New York, 1971), pp. 36-37.

[5]Parker, p. 37.

compensate the colleges for tuition losses suffered during the war. Unfortunately, the resolution did not make it out of the committee.[6]

The G. I. Bill of Rights

Probably the most significant federal program of education assistance ever provided by any nation was that made available for veterans of the Second World War through Public Laws 16 and 346, which were commonly known as the Rehabilitation Act and the G. I. Bill of Rights. These measures were viewed as the use of education as an instrument of national policy. That was especially true of the latter bill. In enacting that legislation the Congress was searching for nothing more than the most satisfactory device for demobilizing the armed forces, for making the transition from war to peace with a minimum of disruption. Education was thought of less as an end in itself than as a solution for what was, primarily, not an educational but a political and social problem.[7] The G. I. Bill provided that all veterans, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, who had served ninety days on active duty on or after September 16, 1940, would be eligible to "receive such course of education or training, full-time or the

---

[6]Isaac Leon Kandel, The Impact of the War Upon American Education (Chapel Hill, 1948), pp. 163-164.
The G.I. Bill of Rights

[7]Harold W. Stoke, "Education as National Policy," Current Issues in Higher Education (1950), p. 12.

equivalent thereof in part-time training, as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution in which he chooses to enroll." That education or training could be pursued for one year plus the time the veteran had spent in active service between September 16, 1940, and the termination of the war. However, the total years of education could not exceed four years; and the veteran had to initiate his education within two years of his discharge and complete it within seven years of his discharge.[8] The measures made provisions for educational and training benefits for a potential group of 16,000,000 veterans of the Second World War. Each grant had a minimum cash value of approximately $1,000 per academic year. The veteran with no dependents received $65 per month for nine months and the institution received up to $500 for his tuition and essential supplies. Veterans with one or more dependents received a subsistence of $90 per month.[9]

It would be an error to assume that educational benefits were provided for veterans because of a general desire to raise the productive and social capacities of the American people -- although that desire may have been in the minds of many persons who supported the programs. Also, many supporters may have felt some special sense of responsibility because many veterans had given up their ambitions to complete their formal education in order to enter

---

[8] Kandel, Impact, p. 243. Millett, p. 344.

[9] The President's Commission, Vol. II, p. 50.

the military service. And, the G.I. Bill had the effect of enabling hundreds of thousands of veterans, regardless of the motivations of the supporters, to enjoy educational opportunities that they could scarcely have hoped for had they not served at all. To be sure, those motives were complex; and to analyze them would involve an understanding of the place of veterans and their organizations in the whole scheme of political party and pressure group organization in the United States. In the case of the Veterans' Readjustment Program, for example, the offer of educational benefits apparently was more a bonus granted for service than an effort to make up for lost time.[10] Neither should the ongoing tide of patriotic fervor he overlooked as a significant factor in the initiation and wide-spread support of those programs.

As a result of the provisions of the G. I. Bill, larger-than-ever numbers of high school graduates went to college. And that condition impacted liberal arts colleges in a variety of ways. For example, because so many of those new students had been exposed to unit courses, they brought added pressure on the colleges to fragmentize their programs.[11] Moreover, because of the surge in enrollment, precipitated by the G. I. Bill, the task of securing

---

[10]Russell, pp. 36-37.

[11]Federal Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge, 1945), pp. 25-35. (Hereafter cited as The Harvard Redbook.)

facilities alone--such as, Quonset huts, empty army barracks, and other surplus properties--involved many changes in federal laws and regulations, as well as new pressures upon the financial picture of liberal arts colleges, as they struggled to meet the needs of those students with at least minimally acceptable facilities. In addition, recruiting and preparing additional faculty, reshaping curricula, and other challenges put even more pressure upon the liberal arts colleges' financial plight.[12] It should not be overlooked, however, that that surge of students also brought financial benefits to those same liberal arts colleges. Even though the G. I. Bill led to an overcrowding of those institutions, which were still predominantly tuition-driven, those students paid tuition and fees, which accounted for an average of seventy-five percent of the income of most liberal arts colleges. Hence, the G. I. Bill allowed those institutions to select more students from larger and better lists of applicants than before. Actually, the liberal arts colleges, by virtue of the G. I. Bill, became more attractive to students than did the public institutions.[13]

To illustrate the impact of the G. I. Bill on the financial portrait of those institutions, it would be only necessary to recall the fact that the provisions of that

---

[12]G. Kerry Smith, Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970 (San Francisco, 1970), p. xi.

[13]Russell, pp. 64-65.

measure accounted for one-third of their total income in 1947. In fact, in the first six months of that year, the total expenditure of the federal government under the law was nearly $2.8 billion.[14] Little wonder, therefore, that the success of the G. I. Bill of Rights made new allies for the cause of education. Whereas education had once been looked upon as an irritating, albeit necessary, expense upon the community, to be kept as low as possible, it had now led to a new conception, largely under the sponsorship of civic clubs and business organizations, to point to expenditures for education as a device to help maintain a high level of business activity.[15]

Other Post-War Approaches

Nevertheless, the die had been cast in favor of increased and broadened federal financial support of higher education. Expressing a wide-spread sentiment, the President's Commission declared that higher education was an investment, not a cost. They saw it as an investment in free men, and as an investment in social welfare, better living standards, better health, and less crime. It was also termed an investment in higher production, increased income, and greater efficiency in agriculture, industry, and government. Moreover, it was an investment against

---

[14]The President's Commission, Vol. II, pp. 45-50.

[15]Stoke, p. 12.

garbled information, half-truth, and untruths; against ignorance and intolerance. Furthermore, it was hailed as an investment in human talent, better human relationships, democracy, and peace.[16] The Commission had also reasoned that it seemed obvious that, in the national interest, the United States as a nation could well afford to invest in the education of needy nonveterans amounts of money approaching those which they were already investing in the education and training of qualified veterans.[17] Furthermore, they asserted that, as great as the total American expenduture for education might have seemed, the United States had not been devoting any really appreciable part of its vast wealth to higher education. In fact, they observed that the one billion dollars the nation had put into its colleges and universities in 1947, was less than one-half of one percent of the Gross National Product.[18]

In an action intended to provide a stable pattern for the development and expansion of the federal financial relationship with higher education, the Commission recommended a set of basic principles to be followed in guiding that relationship:

1. In its relationships to higher education, the Federal Government should recognize the national

---

[16]The President's Commission, Vol. V, pp. 26-28.

[17]The President's Commission, Vol. II, p. 52.

[18]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 27.

importance of a well-rounded and well-integrated program of education for all citizens, regardless of age, sex, race, creed, or economic and social status.

. . . .

2. Federal funds for the general support of institutions of higher education should be distributed among the states on an equalization basis.

. . . .

3. Federal appropriations for the general support of higher education should clearly recognize the responsibility of the states for the administration and control of the education programs.

. . . .

4. Adequate safeguards should be established by the Federal Government to assure the full realization of the purposes for which aid is to be granted.

. . . .

5. Federal funds for the general support of current educational activities and for general capital outlay purposes should be appropriated for use only in institutions under public control.

. . . .

6. Federal funds provided for scholarships or grants-in-aid for the purpose of helping individuals of

ability and fellowships for those of special talent to obtain equality of opportunity in education should be paid directly to the qualifying individuals.

. . . .

7. As is deemed necessary, the Federal Government should make contracts with individual institutions publicly or privately controlled, for specific services authorized by national legislation.[19]

The Commission further concluded that realization of the basic aim of equal opportunity for higher education for all qualified persons would require federal financial support on a very large scale. Accordingly, they recommended an allocation of $989 million dollars for the first year alone, with increases in the allocation to be made in each subsequent year.[20] At the center of their recommendation was a scholarship program which would be intended to equalize educational opportunity for all potential students by eliminating, at least in part, the economic factor in determining college attendance. The amount of each of the scholarships awarded would vary with the financial need of the individual, depending on the actual amount required to make it possible for him to attend and continue in college.

---

[19]The President's Commission, Vol. V, pp. 54-59.

[20]Russell, p. 3. The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 44; Vol. V, pp. 59-62.

To justify their recommendation, the Commission called attention to the inadequacy of existing funds for scholarships and fellowships which made a national program imperative if higher education was to fulfill its responsibility to the individual, to the nation, and to the world. Moreover, the American people, they believed, had set, as their ultimate goal, an educational system in which, at no level, would a qualified individual in any part of the country encounter an inseperable economic barrier to the attainment of the kind of education suited to his aptitudes and interests. That goal meant that the United States should aim at making higher education available to all young people, as they were doing education in the elementary and high schools, to the extent that their capacity warranted a further social investment in their training. It was estimated that scholarships would be given to some 300,000 students that first year.[21]

The post-war intention of the federal government was not to undertake general financial support of higher education. On the contrary, every program had a specific end in view--either encouragement of a certain type of education, or enlargement of the opportunity of a special group to obtain it. Most of the federal activity with individuals consisted of payments on behalf of special groups of individuals associated with national defense.[22]

---

[21]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 36; Vol. II, pp. 51-53.

[22]Russell, pp. 43-44, 35.

Problems and Concerns

Although the G. I. Bill had been a tremendous boon to the liberal arts colleges, and actions had been initiated in the post-war era to help those institutions maintain as much financial equilibrium as possible, there were still problems and concerns. As stated earlier, the G. I. Bill had enabled many liberal arts colleges to raise their tuition charges and fees. And, because the overall demand for higher education became so great that institutions ran no risk of losing students if they raised their fees to the levels set in the act, they generally raised them to that level in a short time.[23] However, if that new boom was to continue beyond the initial surge in enrollments, something would have to be done to keep enrollment--and, subsequently, income--at or near the 1947 levels. To do so would have required more, new federal scholarships programs.

As a matter of fact, there was a decrease in veteran enrollment, after the post-war surge, which led to financial difficulties for the liberal arts colleges. Some form of financial assistance from the federal government was deemed necessary--especially since the program for veterans had already justified itself as a splended contribution to post-war progress for the individual and for society. Recognition was made of the fact that the period of declin-

---

[23]Russell, p. 65.

ing veteran enrollment would bring not only the general problems of providing for reduced numbers of students but, also, in numerous instances, a financial problem, because reimbursement from the Veterans' Administration would no longer be forthcoming.[24] It was in an effort to lessen the negative impact upon the financial situation of liberal arts colleges that led the President's Commission to recommend that the G. I. Bill be amended and new programs be initiated to assist the nonveterans.[25]

Moreover, while it was acknowledged that not everyone ought to go to a college of liberal arts, it was equally true that there were many thousands of young Americans who should attend those institutions. They were young people who had the time, the intellect, the character, the sensitive emotional organization, the philosophic potentialities, and the spiritual resources to find life, as such, an absorbing and a thrilling experience. To have curtailed their outlook by a too hasty emphasis upon a specific vocation, to inhibit their growth by nagging them about the merely economic aspects of survival, to confuse them by

---

[24]Francis H. Horn, "The Privately Suppoted Liberal Arts College -- Problems and Policies," Current Trends in Higher Education (1949), p. 165. The President's Commission, Vol II, p. 51. Edward F. Potthoff, "Future Enrollments and the Factors Affecting Them," Current Trends in Higher Education (1949), p. 8.

[25]The President's Commission, Vol. II, p. 51. In the years ahead, the provisions of the G. I. Bill were increased and extended to provide financial assistance for the purpose of higher education to veterans of the Korean Conflict, the Vietnam war, and the Cold War.

setting material comfort above intellectual enrichment and spiritual satisfactions would have been "to rob democracy of its meaning, to impair the structure of our national life, and to make a mockery of our shibboleths."[26]

With the broadening of the federal government's involvement with higher education, other concerns began to surface. One of the more prominent of those concerns was the matter of the control of education -- was it now in the hands of the federal government, or did the principal control continue to reside with the local, liberal arts college? The veterans' educational programs had been designed to aid the veterans and not the institutions of higher education per se. Moreover, they were organized in such a way as to avoid problems of control, by the federal government, of the institutional practices or content of the curriculum of any institution. These objectives were effected by two principal provisions: (1) the decision to subsidize the individual and not the institution, leaving to the individual a free choice as to which institution he would attend, and (2) certification was to continue to be a function of the state school officials in the individual states.[27] The concern had arisen because, when the President's Committee had enunciated the seven principles guiding the federal financial relationships, it had not

---

[26]Henry Merritt Wriston, The Nature of a Liberal Education (Appleton, 1937), pp. 32-33.

[27]Russell, p. 42.

addressed that concern, but had spoken of protecting the federal government's investments. A closely-related issue was the concern of church-related schools, which comprised a substantial percentage of the nation's liberal arts colleges. The problem was considered a grievous one, because, on the one hand, the denominational institutions and their backers tended to resist any program that left them out of account, while, on the other hand, the supporters of the rigid separation of church and state resisted any program that included denominational institutions. Both apprehensions were largely allayed, however, when it was shown that the aid was to be granted to the individual rather than to the institution.[28]

The issue of federal control did not quickly, immediately, and totally die. There were voiced concerns that there would be an increase of federal control for, when federal monies found their way into nonfederal institutions, those institutions, in most cases, would adjust their offerings to take advantage of those funds. But that was no different than what liberal arts colleges had been doing historically with regard to their private benefactors. Other means of federal control were cited, however, such as: (1) the required submission of annual reports to the federal government, (2) the requirement of the prior submission of budgets and administrative plans, with the

---

[28]Ibid., pp. 43, 81.

power of disallowance granted to the federal agency, (3) direct contracts with institutions, (4) the placement of federal officials on the governing boards of institutions, (5) annual inspections and audits, and (6) standards of eligibility for receiving funds.[29] In response, three measures were put forth as a means for avoiding federal control. First, it was suggested that the federal government subsidize the student rather than the institution, according to earlier plans. Second, it was recommended that unconditional grants be made to the states for general higher education purposes. Third, it was recomended that the power to decide who should receive what benefits be turned over to boards on which the institutions or professions concerned would be represented.[30] The expansion of federal financial involvement in higher education presented another threat to the liberal arts colleges. Because of that increasingly generous tax funding, publicly-supported institutions were able to experience an accelerated growth. When those conditions developed, they were enabled to provide education at a considerably lower cost to the student, which was a distinct threat to liberal arts colleges.[31]

---

[29]Ibid., pp. 47-49.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Horn, p. 163.

Cost Factors

Even with the accelerated infusion of federal monies into higher education, cost factors continued to be a concern. For example, the operating or current educational expenditures for all institutions of higher education in the United States totaled over one billion dollars in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and were nearly double the amount spent during the fiscal year 1940. That tremendous increase was due in part to a decline in the purchasing power of the dollar; but in large measure it was due to the rapid rise in enrollments at the conclusion of the Second World War.[32] Whereas the post-1945 enrollment boom should have been a bonanza for the liberal arts colleges, inflation kept many of them from taking advantage of it. To illustrate the situation, using a base year of 1954 as 100, consumer prices for all purchases rose by more than 110 percent from 1940 to 1960--but the average tuitional charges at 99 private colleges almost tripled during that same period of time.[33] Moreover, low family income, together with the rising costs of education, constituted an almost impassable barrier to college education for many young people. Caught up in the vicious circle of rising costs and of a relative lessening of public support, the

---

[32]The President's Commission, Vol. V, p. 11.

[33]Millett, p. 192. Earl James McGrath, Cooperative Long-Range Planning in Liberal Arts Colleges (New York, 1964), p. 52.

liberal arts colleges were having to depend more-and-more on tuition fees to meet their budgets.[34]

Other cost factors were involved in the experience of the liberal arts colleges. A major factor which made them expensive to operate and financially unstable were their instructional procedures, whereby they sought to imitate universities by proliferating their course offerings while, at the same time, attempting to retain small student-teacher ratios.[35] Moreover, whereas the salaries of college faculties had been relatively stable prior to the Second World War, the unprecedented demand for college teachers deriving from the rapid rise in enrollments had resulted in a general increase in salaries. However, that alteration should be placed in the context of the fact that, between the fall of 1940 and the spring of 1947, there had been an average salary increase of less than thirty percent (often as low as seven percent). During that same time frame, the cost of living had increased by fifty-seven percent.[36] Hence, the conditions were ripe, in 1947, for the college teacher to receive an increase in salary. Then, too, there was the need for an increase in the number of college teachers. Therefore, an increase in instructional costs was virtually unavoidable at most

---

[34]The President's Commission, Vol. I, p. 28.

[35]Millett, pp. 192-195.

[36]The President's Commission, Vol. IV, pp. 50-52.

liberal arts colleges.

Hence, the Second World War did, indeed, impact the liberal arts colleges at the point of financial matters. The war became the occasion for a shift in the involvement of the federal government with higher education in the United States. That shift was prompted by the awareness of the vital role higher education played in the life of the nation. There was also the recognition of the tremendous financial strain which the war had placed upon those institutions. And, there was a sensitivity to the needs of the nation, returning veterans of military service, and those colleges for financial assistance. The most far-reaching of the federal financial programs for helping to alleviate those needs was commonly known as the G. I. Bill of Rights. Rather quickly, following the conclusion of the war, the federal government acknowledged the advisability of extending financial assistance even further via other post-war projects. That financial impact was not, however, without concerns by the liberal arts colleges. Closely aligned with the impact of the war upon financial matters was its impact on enrollments.

CHAPTER VI

IMPACT ON ENROLLMENTS

Colleges exist to serve the educational needs of students, who are their lifeblood. Without students, colleges would have no reason to exist. In the early days of higher education in the United States, the elitist nature of that education somewhat automatically limited the size of the enrollments. Colleges were for the few--not for the many. With the advent of Jacksonianism, however, there came the corresponding emphasis upon egalitarianism in higher education. Slowly, but surely, college enrollments crept upwards. Thus, enrollments in higher education in the United States have historically been dependent, in a large measure, on the social influences, the economic conditions, the extent of public aid to education, and the possible expansion of instructional resources and physical facilities.[1] What's more, war had had an earlier impact on college enrollments. For example, the period, 1919-1920, immediately following the conclusion of the First World War had demonstrated that military service undoubtedly had alerted veterans to the value and need of college training

---

[1]Ernest C. Miller, "Enrollment Trends," <u>Current Problems in Higher Education</u> (1947), p. 27.

and had stimulated their enrollments, as well as initial entry, into college. However, that impact on enrollments receded after only a couple of years.[2]

Pre-Second World War and Wartime

Despite the recession in enrollments during the first part of the second decade of this century, those enrollments began to climb steadily. In fact, the tendency toward larger and larger college enrollments, after the depression years' decline, was interrupted by the Second World War, as adoption of a national system of compulsory military training delayed some 366,000 men each year from attending college for one year.[3] In 1940-41, despite a growing awareness of the consequences of the war abroad and anticipated military Selective Service obligations, there were increases in full-time and grand total enrollments of less than one percent. However, there was a drop of two percent in the 243,141 freshmen in five large fields of study at 643 institutions, reflecting the early effects of the coming war upon the plans of young men.[4] In an attempt to forestall further declines, many institutions, in 1940,

---

[2]Garland G. Parker, The Enrollment Explosion: A Half-Century of Attendance in U.S. Colleges and Universities (New York, 1971), pp. 23-27.

[3]John D. Millett, Financing Higher Education in the United States (New York, 1952), pp. 38-39. John Dale Russell, "Major Problems Facing Higher Education," Current Problems in Higher Education (1947), p. 11.

[4]Parker, p. 35.

began to ask the federal government for Reserve Officer's Training Corp (ROTC) units to be assigned to their campuses. Because the officers required to staff those units were needed in active military service, most of the requests could not be approved. Nevertheless, there were 115 institutions which had ROTC units.[5]

By 1941-42, there were declines of 9.2 percent in full-time and 8.9 percent in grand total students reported for 669 accredited institutions. Those were the first sharp enrollment drops since the depression years of 1932 and 1933, and were attributed to the effects of the Selective Service Act, as well as to the lure of high-paying jobs in defense-oriented industries. At the freshmen level, where the entrants were under the draft age, the decline was only 4.5 percent. Generally, enrollments rose or held their own in areas where deferments were granted, such as: engineering, medicine, dentistry, some sciences, and nursing. The losses, however, were severe and remained so throughout the war, in graduate level arts and sciences programs, law schools, and teacher training (which experienced an alarming loss of 22.7 percent and presented the future danger of a grave teacher shortage).[6]

Furthermore, the decline in enrollments continued.

---

[5]Raymond Walters, "Statistics of Registration in American Universities and Colleges, 1940," Schools and Society (1940), pp. 609-610.

[6]Parker, pp. 35-36.

That the exodus from academic campus to armed camp was underway in 1942-43, was shown in the additional drop of 9.5 percent in full-time and 13.9 percent in grand total students. At the same time, freshmen were down only 1.7 percent, which was reflective of their below-draft age and their response to advice from the War and Navy departments that their continued education would be valuable in later military service. The following academic year witnessed an additional forty percent decline in the number of full-time students, and another thirty percent decline in the grand total. Hence, the enrollments of civilian students in all higher education institutions in the United States, in 1943-45, was only fifty-four percent of what it had been in 1939-40.[7]

The enrollment picture would have been even more bleak, however, had it not been for an interesting development. With their sons gone to war, many families chose to concentrate on the education of their daughters. Those young ladies tended to study the arts and sciences particularly, and, consequently, did much to keep the torch of liberal arts education burning throughout the dark years of the war.[8] Truly, the war effort had an impact on liberal arts education in the United States at the point of enrollments.

---

[7]Ibid., pp. 36-37, Isaac Leon Kandel, The Impact of the War Upon American Education (Chapel Hill, 1948), p. 160.

[8]Parker, p. 37.

Post-War Impact

Whereas the war-time years had impacted enrollments in a negative sense with annual declines, the post-war period brought another dimension of that impact. Dramatically, there was a shift from the declining enrollments to rapidly increasing enrollments. Because the war in Europe only ended on May 8, 1945, and against Japan on August 14, 1945, it had been impossible for veterans in large numbers to be ready for collegiate enrollment before October 1, 1945, by which date most higher education institutions were in session. However, the academic year of 1946-47, was a different matter. That year witnessed the greatest expansion in the history of American higher education. Veterans, together with other students, poured into the halls of the colleges and universities in a flood fully twice the size of the 1945-46 total enrollment, even though the enrollment figures were still nearly twenty-two percent below the 1939 figures. Still, the enrollment change from 985,227 in 1945-46, to more than 2,354,095, approximately fifty percent of whom were veterans, in 1946-47 was impressive, significant, and would require rapid adjustments by the liberal arts colleges.[9]

That surge in enrollments also reflected the general tendency for more and more young people to attend college, which was becoming increasingly a standard pattern for

---

[9]Ibid., pp. 37-38. Russell, pp. 7-8.

young people in American society. By so doing, the enrollments surge created some problems for liberal arts colleges. Among other things, they had to struggle with their more-or-less rigid concepts of instructional standards. Failure to make the necessary adjustments as rapidly as required led to the development of new junior colleges and technical institutions.[10] Furthermore, whereas the historic relationship of the liberal arts colleges toward their students had been *in loco parentis*, when the large numbers of older and more mature college students were introduced under the auspices of federal aid to veterans, a serious challenge to student regulations was mounted. The usual response of the colleges to such pressures was to retreat and to liberalize the regulations.[11] The enrollment conditions of 1946-47 overwhelmed most of the liberal arts colleges, as classrooms, laboratories, and residence halls became crowded beyond capacity. In an effort to meet the need, the colleges brought temporary buildings, barracks, portable houses, and local school buildings into service.[12]

Traditionally, the size of American colleges had been determined, not by conscious planning based on some philosophy about what would be an appropriate size, but in terms

---

[10]Millett, p. 192. Russell, pp. 8-9, 24-25.

[11]W. Max Wise, *The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry Into the Processes of Collegiate Government* (New Haven, 1969), p. 25.

[12]Miller, p. 28.

of the numbers of students who wanted to come to a particular institution and who could pay the bill. The surge of student enrollments following the Second World War meant that, for the first time, significant numbers of institutions faced the question of selection. They had "more academically qualified candidates than they could admit and had to start thinking about which ones they should admit."[13] And those students did come in numbers, as a direct result of the G. I. Bill of Rights. Although, in 1945-46, only some 90,000 veterans were taking courses under that law, by the end of that academic year 6,597,290 veterans had applied for the certificates of eligibility for education.[14]

Strategies as well as enrollment trends, to accomodate those students was not easy and uncomplicated. First, most of the demand for admission by qualified students was met, although not in the college of the student's first choice. Second, cooperative planning among colleges to provide additional facilities was successful in some states. Third, because the quality of the work of the veterans was generally above average, it had a positive effect on their continued enrollment. Fourth, it took a while for nonveteran enrollments to return to their prewar level.

---

[13]Earl James McGrath, Cooperative Long-Range Planning in Liberal Arts Colleges (New York, 1964), p. 63.

[14]Parker, pp. 37-38. Russell, pp. 7-8. The President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. II (Washington, D.C., 1947), p. 49.

Fifth, those curricula which had the greatest numerical increases were: the liberal arts, engineering, business administration, and law. Sixth, the influx of the veterans did not interfere with the admission of women to the colleges. Seventh, there was a signficant increase in the enrollment of part-time students. Finally, there was an increased demand for admission by foreign students.[15]

The liberal arts colleges found it difficult to cope with fluctuating enrollments after the Second World War. For example, a college which had enrolled 500 students in 1940 was likely to have more than 800 students enrolled in 1949. Bates College, for example, lifted its enrollment limit temporarily to make it possible for more veterans to enrol, because so many of its alumni and students had participated in the war and there had been a Navy V-12 unit on the campus for seven semesters. Middlebury College also acknowledged changes to permit the admission of qualified veterans, by giving particular consideration to credentials from service schools and to results of qualifying examinations taken in the service or at the time of discharge.

Using an interesting pattern of reasoning, there was at least one disclaimer to the importance of the G. I. Bill to student enrollments.

---

[15]Millett, p. 29.

> Do not attach undue importance to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Of the total college enrollment of 2,080,000, 1,080,000 were veterans. Of the latter, approximately 600,000 had been in college prior to military service. Of the remaining 500,000 some 350,000 to 400,000 would have gone to college normally. Thus, only 100,000 to 150,000 of the veteran enrollment may be attributed to the G. I. Bill.[16]

What that writer had done was to develop a syllogism using specious evidence. For example, he purported to know the innermost thinking of some 350,000 to 400,000 of those students who, he claimed, would have attended college with or without the G. I. Bill. Furthermore, although 600,000 of those students may well have been in college prior to military service, there was no hard evidence to establish that they would have remained in college. His contention that the G. I. Bill had only minimal impact on college enrollments lacked credibility. Nevertheless, it was in interesting idea.

The veteran enrollments pattern for 1946-47 is worth noting. For example, fifty-seven percent of the enrollments in 131 universities and large colleges were veterans, while forty-four percent of the men enrolled in 557 independent four-year colleges of arts and sciences were veterans. At the same time, sixty-one percent of the students enrolled in 287 independent technical schools were veterans; and they comprised forty-three percent of the enrollments in 650 junior colleges. Interestingly, forty-

---

[16]Ibid., pp. 33-34.

one percent of the enrollments in independent teachers colleges were veterans.[17]

Ebbing Tide

The peak veteran enrollments in institutions of higher education came in 1948, and continued to be high into 1949. That situation continued to hold true despite the veteran fall-off in freshmen in 1947-48, which occurred because many of them were taking jobs, while others had family obligations which precluded college study, and a large number of the veterans pursued the many accelerated programs provided by colleges for their benefit.[18] That that change impacted the liberal arts colleges was reflected in the fact that, in 1949, all of the separate liberal arts colleges accounted for only twenty-three percent of all student enrollments.[19] However, the peak enrollment (including non-veterans) in post-Second World War was in 1950-51, with 2,659,021 students, 800,000 of whom were veterans.[20]

After 1950, enrollments began to decline. That development meant a decrease in income from student charges,

---

[17]Parker, pp. 38-39.

[18]Ibid. Russell, p. 10.

[19]Millett, p. 190.

[20]Federal Security Agency, Office of Education Circular No. 326 (1951).

but not necessarily a corresponding decrease in expenditures. The average number of students per class declined, and expenditures per student rose as enrollments went down. However, the liberal arts colleges were most adversely affected because of three basic factors. First, the generally small size of those colleges gave them less flexibility in adjusting to changing loads. Second, their single educational objective and standards of instruction made for an expensive educational operation. Third, they were dependent upon traditional sources of financing.[21]

It would be helpful to visualize the fall enrollments over the thirteen-year period beginning with the fall of 1939.

Fall of	Enrollment	Index (1939=100)
1939	1,364,815	100
1941	1,180,365	86
1943	733,190	54
1945	1,073,629	79
1946	2,098,095	152
1947	2,338,226	171
1948	2,408,249	176
1949	2,456,841	180
1950	2,296,592	168
1951	2,116,440	155

Source: U.S. Office of Education, Circular No. 328.

[21]Millett, p. 192.

By looking at that profile, the rise and ebb of the tide of students enrolled in colleges and universities should become clearer. To develop an appreciation of the impact of the G. I. Bill on enrollments, it is helpful to examine the numbers of veterans who received educational benefits and were enrolled in higher education institutions:[22]

Fall of	Enrolled	% change from previous year
1947	1,122,738	. . . .
1948	1,021,038	-9.1
1949	853,007	-16.5
1950	572,307	-32.9
1951	388,747	-32.1

In order to formulate a better perspective of the flow and ebb of the enrollments tide, it should be recalled that the receding haze of the Second World War in the early years of the 1950's was soon obscured by the smoke and fire of the limited, but hot, conflict in Korea. The shadow of that conflagration hung over college campuses and collegians in the early and mid-1950's and affected enrollments, first as a depressant and later as a stimulant. That circumstance was compounded by the fact that the decreasing birth rate of the late 1920's and early 1930's resulted in a decreasing number of college-age young people up until the middle of the 1950's.[23] However, the President's Com-

---

[22]Ibid., p. 67.

[23]Parker, p. 43. Russell, p. 9.

mission on Higher Education were convinced that the enrollment trends of the immediate post-war period was more than a temporary buldge. Based on the findings of several demographic studies, they projected a minimum college and university enrollment of 4,600,000 students by 1960.[24]

Therefore, as has been seen, the Second World War did have an impact on enrollments in liberal arts colleges. Whereas there had been an incline in enrollments in the latter half of the 1930's, the outbreak of the war precipitated a decline in those enrollments, even though there was an increase in the number of women attending college and the utilization of special programs to educate military personnel. However, with the conclusion of the war and the introduction of the G. I. Bill of Rights, there came a surge in those enrollments. The surge stretched the facilities and faculties of the liberal arts colleges as they endeavored to meet the needs of those new students. That surge peaked in the 1949-50 academic year, and was followed by a gradual ebbing of the enrollments tide.

---

[24]The President's Commission, Vol. II, p. 50; Vol. V, p. 2, 9.

CHAPTER VII

CASE STUDIES

A review of the literature has reflected an impact of the Second World War upon liberal arts education in the areas of the philosophy of liberal arts education, curriculum, programs, financial matters, and enrollments. But to what extent could that impact be discerned from an examination of the catalogs of selected liberal arts colleges from the years 1935, 1940, and 1948? The following items were examined and analyzed from those catalogs: (1) the mission statement of the college, (2) the admission requirements for each of those years, (3) the core curriculum for each of those years, and (4) the financial charges to the students during those years. A summary of that examination of the catalogs from each college which responded follows.

Amherst College

Founded in 1821, with its stated purpose to be the preparing of students for the ministry, the college soon widened the scope of its activities to include the idea of a liberal arts education, which they defined as one designed to liberate the student, "if he will take advantage of his opportunities, from the bondage of ignorance, super-

stition and provincialism." Although the college continued to reject totally the notion of permitting vocation training to become a part of its academic program, it did, in the 1948 catalog, concede the inclusion of the sciences within the curriculum--provided they were understood to be a "part of a broad liberal education." With regard to academic preparation for admission, there was no substantive change in the requirements from 1935 to 1948, with the possible liberalization of the foreign language requirement. In 1948, no specific foreign language, such as Greek or German, was identified as mandatory--although at least two years of foreign language (ancient or modern) was still required for admission. Military veterans were invited to apply for admission, but were subject to all the admission requirements which every student was to meet.

There were only moderate changes made in the graduation requirements between 1935 and 1948. One of those changes, possibly reflecting the advisability of fostering an appreciation of other cultures by their students, permitted those students who were to graduate in 1951 or thereafter to meet the language requirement by studying Italian, Russian, Spanish, Latin, or Greek instead of the previously-mandated French or German. The other change was a modification of the length of residency requirement for those students who had attended Amherst between June 15, 1942, and June 15, 1945, and had followed the accelerated program. Financial charges did not even change enough to

keep abreast of inflation. Whereas, in 1935, the fee for tuition, room and board amounted to $977 for the year, in 1948, that charge had only increased to $1090. Hence, there was no evidence of any effort to take advantage of the G. I. Bill of Rights or subsequent federal financial programs. Declaring its intention to remain small, the college reported that, although it had experienced a post-war enlargement of enrollment (850 students), the ratio of teachers to students had been maintained at about one to ten. Although that would have been expected to have caused a financial burden to Amherst, there was no indication of it in the catalog or in its fee schedule.

Bates College

Throughout the years, the college maintained its commitment to being a liberal arts college, because training in the liberal arts helped the students "grow in self-mastery and personal depth, to develop wider and deeper appreciation, to acquire an enthusiam for hard work, to love good talk and good books, to delight in the adventures of intellectual curiosity, to become fair-minded, open-minded, and generous, all their human responses." Acknowledging in their 1948 catalog that pre-war colleges had been frequently criticized for allowing their students to drift through four years without sufficient incentive or goal, they announced their adoption of THE BATES PLAN, under which a student was encouraged from the very begin-

ning of his college course to choose a definite goal toward which he would aim, and to plan his work with that end in view. The college, thereby, acknowledged that a student should use his college education to lay the basis for a career, and that a liberal arts education with the proper sequence of courses was the most important career preparation that could be given.

The college also encouraged military veterans to enroll: "Partly because so many of its own alumni and students participated in the war and partly because of the presence of a Navy V-12 unit on the campus for seven semesters, Bates is especially interested in the servicemen." The college even lifted its enrollment limit temporarily to make it possible for more veterans to enrol. They even made adjustments in the structure of the aptitude tests in order to meet the needs of those servicemen better. Although there was some change in the fees for tuition, room and board ($600 per annum in 1935 compared with $850 in 1948), the charge was not exorbitant. Apparently, the college made wise adjustments to the various facets of the impact of the Second World War without compromising its integrity.

Bowdoin College

The only difference between the catalogs of 1935 and 1948 was that the former reported that the total number of students in the college was limited to five hundred, while

the latter catalog merely observed that the college, "in striving to obtain a smaller enrollment, must regretfully refuse admission to many well-qualified candidates." Even the tuition, at $250 per annum, remained unchanged.

Brown University

Interestingly, Brown University had never had a mission statement. Hence, it could not have made any changes at that point. That which most approximated a mission statement appeared in its charter of 1764, which declared that it was to provide the community with graduates "duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation."

Whereas, in 1935, the catalog declared that the freshman class was limited to "four hundred young men who, in the judgment of the Committee on Admissions, can make effective use of the educational opportunities available," the 1948 catalog reflected no such restriction on numbers. The 1948 catalog further reflected modifications of the school's admission requirements in light of the military veterans. For example, although, in 1935, four years of secondary school work was required for admission, in 1948, the statement was that "four years of secondary school work, or the equivalent, are normally required for admission." In addition, the catalog contained a substantial amount of information describing the various options for veterans who wished to apply for admission, depending upon

the veteran's background and experience. The college put forth considerable effort to facilitate the veteran's admission process. The tuition fee was increased from $200 per semester, in 1935, to $250 per semester, in 1948. However, following the printing of the latter catalog, tuition was increased to $300 per semester for the 1948-49 academic year, plus a new general fee of $22.50 per semester. Brown University, it would appear, responded to much of the impact of the Second World War as though it presented an opportunity rather than an obstacle.

Dartmouth College

Repeatedly, the college affirmed its commitment to being a liberal arts college whose objective was "to stimulate minds to activity in consideration of present-day problems under restraint of lessons of the past and under spur of imagination as to the possibilities of the future." The college viewed its responsibility to be to "graduate men with the broad and liberal outlook upon which good citizenship is based."

Changes in the curriculum for freshmen, from 1935 to 1948, included the deletion of a required course in Evolution and the addition of courses in Social Science and Hygiene. Also, an NROTC Unit was added at some time during the Second World War. Tuition was increased from four hundred dollars per year to three hundred dollars per semester. The provisions of the G. I. Bill of Rights were

acknowledged and veterans were instructed with regard to the options they had for taking advantage of those provisions.

Mercer University

Begun in 1833 for the expressed purpose of "the training of young men for the ministry," Mercer University, owned and operated by the Georgia (Southern) Baptist Convention, had become a full-fledged liberal arts institution of higher education by 1845. Whereas, in 1935, there were no imposed restrictions, other than the more-or-less generally accepted need to be a certified high school graduate, the 1948 catalog contained the statement: "Because of the unusual pressure of applications preference in acceptance will be given to those students who are residents of Macon and the state of Georgia." The 1948 catalog reflected other facets of the impact of the Second World War. For example, the Navy College Program (V-12) had been activated there on July 1, 1943, to train junior officers for the Navy. The program was continued through October of 1945. From July 1, 1943, to August, 1945, inclusive, the University had operated an accelerated program of study; the school year for the duration of the program was on a trimester basis; the student load was increased from 15 to 18 hours per week and class days from five to six; and civilian and Navy students were integrated into one school except for courses relating primarily to Naval Science.

The University program for civilian students returned to the quarter plan at the beginning of the Fall 1945 quarter. In addition, in the spring of 1947, official notice was given that the Mercer application for an R.O.T.C. unit, which had been made in 1941, had been approved. The other change worth noting was the increase in the annual fees for tuition, room and board from the 1935 levels of $421.50 for freshmen and sophomores and $444.00 for juniors and seniors to the 1948 levels of $651 and $681 for the two groups respectively.

Middlebury College

Founded in the late nineteenth century as a distinctly men's college ("women were not even admitted inside the rail fence which surrounded the campus protectively"), Middlebury College had historically remained a liberal arts college. As such, it had never had any vocational or professional schools. True to its liberal arts commitment, the college offered only the Bachelor of Arts degree.

Whereas, from 1935 until 1948, tuitional fees had increased only from $250 to $300 per semester, the per semester charges for room and board had been increased from $150 to $265. The college also, in 1948, acknowledged changes to permit the admission of qualified veterans, by giving particular consideration to credentials from service schools and to results of qualifying examinations taken in the service or at the time of discharge. In addition,

former students who expected to complete the work for their degree after release from the armed forces were given special consideration.

Mount Holyoke College

Tracing its origins to 1836, Mount Holyoke College had, since 1893, been a liberal arts college for women. The only significant change in requirements from 1935 to 1948 was expressed in the catalog statement articulating the change:

> Mount Holyoke College believes that a liberal education should develop the student as an individual and prepare her for participation in a free, democratic society. Hence the student must possess the necessary tools for the acquisition of knowledge, she must have access to the great reservoirs of human experience and scientific learning, she must develop her power to discriminate and to evaluate, she must acquire a sense of responsibility to the world in which she lives, and she must have an opportunity to express her developing ideas and feelings in social action, artistic creation, or in some other vital way.

To accomplish that goal, the college had divided its program into two parts. The first two years were concerned with general education; and the final two years comprised the field of concentration. The change was reflective of the college's announced intention to enter into the life of its times, which, during the Second World War, had led the students and faculty to respond to the emergency needs of the country in a variety of ways. Moreover, in keeping with that spirit, it had been at Mount Holyoke that, in March 1943, the first school for officers' candidates in

the Women's Reserve of the Marines had found a temporary home. Fees for tuition, room and board increased from $1000 per annum in 1935, to $1,500 per annum in 1948.

Ouachita Baptist University

Founded in 1885, Ouachita Baptist University was owned and operated by the Arkansas (Southern) Baptist Convention as a coeducational liberal arts college. Located in the southwestern section of Arkansas, in the foothills of the Ouachita Mountains, the school was, apparently, impacted only slightly by the Second World War. In fact, the only discernable change in the catalogs from 1935 to 1948 was in the area of financial matters, where tuition charges were increased from $30 per semester to $130 per semester, and room and board charges were increased from $20 per semester to $182.70 per semester. However, there was nothing which suggested that those increases were, in any way, related to post-war federal financial plans.

Smith College

Founded as a liberal arts college for women, Smith College stated its purpose to be "to afford intelligent and adequately prepared young women an opportunity to obtain such knowledge of the world and of thought, and such appreciation of artistic and of ethical values as will enable them to develop their best potentialities to the fullest degree, to spend their leisure hours valuably, to enjoy

life in a civilized manner, and to become forceful members of the community of which they find themselves members." Furthermore, they identified the chief purpose of education as being "to produce free spirits, and to let them work freely." There were no alterations to the curriculum between 1935 and 1948. Financially, the fees for tuition, and room and board had been increased from $1000 per annum to $2150.

The college experienced the impact of the Second World War, first, when a number of its faculty members were called away for research or government service. Then, during the summer of 1942, after the passing of the Act to establish a Women's Reserve in the Navy, the Navy Department invited the college to provide the necessary facilities for the establishment of the first Officers' Training Unit of the Women's Reserve. That school was closed after the graduation of the twenty-eighth class, December 21, 1944, when approximately 9567 officers had been commissioned. The college also announced that there would be flexible entrance requirements and curriculum requirements for returning women veterans of military service.

Trinity College

Named Washington College when it was founded in 1823 to serve the "sundry inhabitants of the State of Connecticut, of the denomination of Christians called the Protestant Episcopal Church," Trinity College remained a men's

college, in 1948, totally committed to providing a liberal arts education. Only two changes were reflected in the catalogs from 1935 to 1948. First, tuition fees rose from $350 per annum to $500 per annum--a most modest increase. Second, in 1948, a temporary enrollment increase of 331 students was permitted, in addition to 410 other students who were "using the college facilities for extension study."

Wesleyan University

The oldest surviving college founded by Methodists, Wesleyan was founded in 1831, in Middletown, Connecticut. Although, in 1873, the college broadened its curriculum to permit electives, the school retained its commitment to being a liberal arts college for men by awarding only the Bachelor of Arts degree. Whereas the college had, in previous years, limited its enrollment to 700 students, in 1948, "because of the large number of returned servicemen, the College will operate somewhat in excess of that number." One other change from 1935 was interesting, but probably not a result of the impact of the Second World War: the earlier declaration that preference would be shown candidates for admission who offered four years of Latin did not appear in the 1948 catalog.

During the war, Wesleyan "did a double job--special research for the government and training Navy V-5 and V-12 personnel while continuing to offer its traditional liberal

arts program to a limited group of civilian students. And after the war, the College turned to solving its postwar problem of redeeming its pledge to readmit undergraduates who left for the armed services and freshmen who left for the armed forces before they could start, raising academic standards, replacing faculty, and housing a greatly increased student body, while attempting to improve quality." Charges for the academic year had been increased from the 1935 level of $400 to $600 in 1948.

Williams College

Founded in 1781, for the purpose of promoting education in western Massachusetts and having had Mark Hopkins as one of its early presidents, Williams College maintained a zealous commitment to being a liberal arts college. Although the college, in 1948, announced that it would not permit an enrollment larger than the traditional 1100 students, some consideration for returning military veterans was shown. For example, "all men who left Williams in good standing to enter the armed forces will be readmitted." The college also made provisions for a limited number of returning Williams students who were married. The school, in addition, stated its willingness to give academic credit for certain kinds of work taken in preparation for, or, in connection with military service. Fees for tuition, and room and board increased from $1000 per year in 1935 to $1500 per year in 1948.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The Second World War definitely made an impact upon liberal arts education in the United States. Although philosophical discussions relative to the nature, meaning, goals, role, and purpose of liberal arts education had been in various stages of development for several years, the war acted as a catalyst for intensifying those discussions. As extensive and exhaustive as those discussions were, there was still a rather wide divergence of opinion relative to those topics. Consequently, there was no universally agreed-upon definition of liberal arts education. Neither could educators agree upon a concise statement of the philosophy which was to undergird that education. On the one hand there were educators who were seemingly terrified that liberal arts education might be abandoned entirely and replaced by professional or vocational schools. Reflective of that fear, they advocated a retrenchment-- some even advocating a return to the classical liberal arts curriculum. On the other hand, there were strong advocates of the position that a liberal arts education was no longer useful and ought to be cast aside. In between those extremes was

a group of liberal arts educators who advocated doing what liberal arts education in the United States had historically done: be sensitive and responsive to society without voiding the over-arching focus of a liberal arts education. Perhaps the clearest statement of that position was the Harvard University faculty report and recommendation relative to general education. Like all facets of higher education, liberal arts education has need for conducting, periodically, a self-assessment--and the Second World War stimulated that experience. Not only did that facet of the impact result in slight adjustments, it infused the liberal arts with a renewed confidence as they moved into the future.

By impacting the philosophy undergirding liberal arts education, the war had a consequent impact on liberal arts curricula and programs. The curricula in many liberal arts colleges was adjusted during the war to meet wartime needs. For example, foreign languages were taught in a more accelerated learning mode. Whereas the historical pattern for learning a foreign language had involved at least one academic year, during the Second World War that experience was compressed into a matter of weeks. Additionally, the war precipitated an expansion of the physical sciences' curricula. And a number of those colleges determined that those changes, instead of decimating the curriculum, actually enhanced the curriculum. Although the struggle between maintaining the purity of the liberal arts programs

and the pressure to develop a more vocational program had been brewing for some time, it was the Second World War which accelerated that discussion. The basic question underlying the discussion was the extent and nature of education's responsibility to serve the needs of society. Programs were adjusted, during the war, on the basis of pragmatic considerations, rather than because of a philosophical rationale. Therefore, many colleges, in order to accomodate the needs of society, students, or the military, altered their academic year to a trimester system, instead of their customary quarter plan. Also, the academic week was frequently lengthened from five days to six days. Following the war's conclusion, some colleges reverted to their previous programs. However, many other colleges chose to retain the war-time programs. As a consequence of the war, students began to have a renewed voice in the content and direction of academic programs. For many of those students, especially returning veterans, in loco parentis was no longer relevent. After all, they had confronted a deadly enemy and, therefore, felt capable of making their own decisions. Furthermore, they insisted that academic programs be practical--though not necessarily vocational--rather than philosophical in their orientation. Those students wanted programs which would help them earn a livelihood.

Having impacted the liberal arts at the point of its philosophy, curricula, and programs the war's impact was

also felt in financal matters and enrollments. With the outbreak of the war, liberal arts colleges felt a drain on both finances and the numbers of students. To help alleviate that impact, the federal government contracted with a number of liberal arts colleges to provide a limited, accelerated program of education for selected military personnel. Both the Army and the Navy contracted with liberal arts colleges for such programs of study. Generally, the military personnel were enrolled in the same courses as civilian students--except for courses in military science. The monies paid those colleges enabled many of them to survive the war years, instead of having to curtail or cease operation. Those contracts made it possible for a number of colleges to retain most, if not all, of their faculty members.

It was, however, in the post-war period that the greatest impact was felt. The principal factor in that impact which directed larger-than-ever revenues into the coffers of many of those colleges and swelled their enrollments was the G. I. Bill of Rights. The G. I. Bill not only paid for the veteran's basic academic costs but provided him with some measure of living expenses. Such provisions produced a surge in enrollments in liberal arts colleges during the years 1947-1950. As a consequence of those burgeoning enrollments, colleges experienced difficulty accomodating those students. There was a need for additional classrooms, for example. The success of that

program and the felt need to provide similar assistance to non-veterans led President Harry S. Truman to appoint a committee to study the situation and present a recommendation. The report of that Commission significantly impacted liberal arts education in the United States and altered the relationship between the federal government and liberal arts colleges. Whereas, previous to the Second World War the relationship had been minimal, activities during the war demonstrated the mutual benefits of a more involved relationship. The federal government made available monies to those participating colleges in return for those colleges providing educational programs which would meet identified federal government needs. One of the most significant facets of the Commission's report was their contention that, instead of being a financial liability, higher education was actually a major asset to the nation. Therefore, federal monetary contributions to higher education was viewed as an investment in the future of the United States. The further rationale for such monetary investments was that to contribute to the education of military veterans only would be discriminatory against civilians. Thus, the G. I. Bill of Rights, which had impacted liberal arts colleges so dramatically, became the prototype for an expanded contribution to and impact upon liberal arts education in the United States.

The impact of the Second World War upon liberal arts education in the United States compromised a fascinating

study. The impact was akin to a large rock being cast into a lake: the ripples it generated continue to be experienced in both domains. Liberal arts colleges benefited by rethinking their philosophies and discovering that they could adjust their curricula and programs without destroying their commitment to and expression of liberal arts education. The financial impact enabled them to expand and improve their faculties and facilities. The impact on enrollments made it possible for them to learn that a larger student body would not necessarily dilute the quality of their programs.

This study, of necessity, could not be exhaustive. There are other areas which need to be researched. For example, the total impact on women should be studied, asking, for example, to what extent did those circumstances liberate women from the notion that only secretarial instruction was proper for them? To what extent were students from families in lower social classes attracted into the liberal arts colleges, especially since those institutions did not emphasize vocational training? Assuming that the necessary data has been retained by the colleges, the utilization of the computer in extending this study would be of substantial value. Other studies could include research into the impact of other wars, such as, the Civil War and Vietnam, upon liberal arts education in the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS

Averill, Lloyd F. "Viability of Liberal Arts." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 160-170.

Bowen, Howard R. and Douglas, Gordon K. Efficiency in Liberal Education: A Study of Comparative Instructional Costs for Different Ways of Organizing Teaching Teaching-Learning in a Liberal Arts College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Brubacher, John S. and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Turansition: An American History: 1936-1956. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958.

Carmichael, Oliver C. "Weaknesses in the College." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970a. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 34-43.

Cheit, Earl F. The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Cole, Stewart G. Liberal Education in a Democracy: A Charter for the American College. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1940.

Cowley, W. H. "Critical Decisions." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 147-159.

Cross, George Lynn. The University of Oklahoma and World War II. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.

Cunningham, William F. General Education and The Liberal College. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1953.

Dawson, Christopher. Education and the Crisis of Christian Culture. Chicago: Henry Rigmery Company, 1949.

Donham, Wallace B. Education for Responsible Living. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944.

Dressel, Paul L. and Lorimer, Margaret F. Attitudes of Liberal Arts Faculty Members Toward Liberal and Professional Education. New York: Columbia University, 1960.

Faust, Clarence H. "Specialization and Liberal Arts." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 44-51.

Foerster, Norman. The Future of the Liberal College. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938.

Frankel, Charles. "The Happy Crisis." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 117-130.

Fulbright, J. William. "Maintenance of Freedom." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 62-68.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. "Social Balance." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 87-95.

Gasset, Jose' Ortega y. The Revolt of the Masses. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1951.

General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Greene, Theodore Meyer, et al. Liberal Education Reexamined: Its Role in a Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Greene, Theodore Meyer. Liberal Education Reconsidered. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Gruber, Carol S. Mars and Minerva: World War I and the Uses of the Higher Learning in America. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1975.

Henderson, Algo D. Vitalizing Liberal Education: A Study of the Liberal Arts Program. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1944.

Idzerda, Stanley F. "Academic Rigor." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 105-110.

Jacob, Philip E. "Student Values." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 75-84.

Jones, Howard Mumford. Education and World Tragedy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Kandel, Isaac Leon. The Cult of Uncertainty. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943.

________. The Impact of the War Upon American Education. Chaptel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.

________. The New Era in Education: A Comparative Study. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955.

________. American Education in the Twentieth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Letter, Sidney . (ed.). The Time Has Come Today. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.

Mayhew, Lewis B. "And Now the Future." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 299-318.

McGrath, Earl James. Liberal Education in the Professions. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959.

________. Toward General Education. New York: MacMillan Company, 1948.

________. Cooperative Long-Range Planning in Liberal Arts Colleges. New York: Columbia University, 1964.

________. Values, Liberal Education, and National Destiny. Indianapolis: Lily Foundation, 1975.

McKeon, Richard P. "Future of Liberal Arts." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 171-183.

Millett, John D. Financing Higher Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press 1952.

Mursell, James L. Education for American Democracy. New York: W. F. Norton & Company, 1943.

Newman, John Henry. The Idea of a University. San Francisco: Rinehard Press, 1960.

Palmer, Archie M. (ed.). The Liberal Arts College Movement. New York: J. J. Little and Ives Company, 1930.

Parker, Garland G. The Enrollment Explosion: A Half-Century of Attendance in U.S. Colleges and Universities. New York: School and Society Books, 1971.

The President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy, 6 volumes. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

Pusey, Nathan M. American Higher Education, 1945-1970: A Personal Report. Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1978.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Rudy, Willis. The Evolving Liberal Arts Curriculum: A Historical Review of Basic Themes. New York: Bureau of Publications, 1960.

Russell, James Earl. Federal Activities in Higher Education After the Second World War: An Analysis of the Nature, Scope, and Impact of Federal Activities in Higher Education in the Fiscal Year 1947. New York: King's Crown Press, 1951.

Sanford, Nevitt (ed.). The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Sanford, Nevitt. "The Goal of Individual Development." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 131-146.

Schmidt, George P. The Liberal Arts College: A Chapter in American Cultural History. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957.

Shedd, Clarence. "Higher Education in the United States." The University in a Changing World. Ed. Walter M. Kotschnig. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

Sinclair, Upton. The Goose Step: A Study of American Education. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

The Sixty College Study: A Second Look. National Federation of College and University Business Officers Associations, 1960.

Smith, G. Kerry (ed.). Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 19-33.

Thaler, Alwin. Liberal Education for Democracy. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press 1945.

Thwing, Charles F. History of Education in the United States Since the Civil War. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1910.

Truman, David B. "Relevance of Liberal Arts." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 248-253.

Van Doren, Mark. Liberal Education. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1943.

Veblen, Thorstein. Higher Learning in America. New York: Viking Press, 1935.

Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the-American University. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Viereck, Peter. "Frontier Behind the Forehead." Twenty-five Years: 1945-1970. Ed. G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970, pp. 52-61.

Williams, Aston R. General Education in Higher Education. New York: Teachers College Presss, 1968.

Wise, W. Max. The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry Into the Processes of Collegiate Government. New Haven: The Hazen Foundation, 1969.

Woody, Thomas. Liberal Education for Free Men. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951.

Wriston, Henry Merritt. The Nature of a Liberal Education. Appleton: University of Wisconsin Press,s 1937.

________. Challenge to Freedom. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943.

________. Academic Procession: Reflections of a College President. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

II. JOURNAL ARTICLES

Anderson, Paul B. "The Privately Supported Liberal Arts College -- Problems and Policies." Current Trends in Higher Education. (1949), pp. 162-175.

Bartlett, J. F. "Preparation for College and University Teaching." Current Issues in Higher Education. (1950), pp. 135-139.

Carlson, Loren D. "Objectives, Content, and Organization of General Education." Current Trends in Higher Education. (1950), pp. 65-78.

Dewey, John, Meiklejohn, Alexander, and Buchanan, Scott. "The Function of the Liberal Arts College in a Democratic Society." The American Scholar, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Autumn, 1944), pp. 391-406.

Donnell, Phillip S. "Building and Plant Expansion." Current Problems in Higher Education. (1977), p. 59.

Ficken, Clarence E. "General Education as a Professional Attitude." Current Trends in Higher Education. (1949), pp. 50-55.

Garrison, Lloyd A. "Preparation of College and University Teachers." Current Trends in Higher Education. (1949), pp. 99-102.

Horn, Francis H. "The Privately Supported Liberal Arts College -- Problems and Policies." Current Trends in Higher Education. (1949), pp. 162-169.

McCaskill, James L. "Instructional Equipment and Supplies." Current Problems in Higher Education. (1947), pp. 60-64.

McKenzie, Charles W. "Interpreting Academic Freedom." Current Trends in Higher Education. (1949), pp. 120-123.

Miller, Ernest C. "Enrollment Trends." Current Problems in Higher Education. (1947), pp. 19-32.

Nason, John W. "What We Have Learned." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 15, (June, 1944), pp. 287-298.

Potthoff, Edward F. "Future Enrollments and the Factors Affecting Them." Current Trends in Higher Education. (1949), pp. 7-11.

Randall, John Herman Jr. "Which Are the Liberating Arts?" The American Scholar, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Spring, 1944), pp. 125ff.

Russell, John Dale. "Major Problems Facing Higher Education." Current Problems in Higher Education. (1947), pp. 7-26.

Stoke, Harold W. "Education as National Policy." Current Issues in Higher Education. (1950), pp. 11-16.

Walters, Raymons. "Statistics of Registration in American Universities and Colleges, 1940." School and Society, Vol. 52 (December 14, 1940), pp. 601-619.

III. CATALOGS

Amherst College Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Bates College Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948,49.

Bowdin College Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Brown University Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

The University of Chicago Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Dartmouth College Catalogue of Officers, Regulations and Courses, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Mercer University Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.
Middlebury College Catalog, 135-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Mount Holyoke College Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Ouchita Baptist University Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Smith College Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Trinity College Bulletin, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Wesleyan University Catalogue, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

Williams College Catalog, 1935-36, 1940-41, 1948-49.

IV. PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Brown, J. Douglas. Education for Leadership. Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, December 1950.

Conant, James B. Education Beyond the High School. Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, March 1947.

Director of War Mobilization. The Veteran and Higher Education. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1946.

Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Circular No. 326, August 1951.

U.S. Office of Education, Circular No. 328, November 1951.

V. PAMPHLETS, CIRCULARS, REPORTS

American Council on Education Studies. *Higher Education and National Defense*. Washington, 1942.

Higher Education and the War. Washington, 1942.

________. *Higher Education Cooperates in National Defense*. Washington, 1941.

________. *Organizing Higher Education for National Defense*. Washington, 1941.

Quattlebaum, Charles A. *Federal Aid to Students for Higher Education: A Report Prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

VI. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

McGrath, Earl James. Personal Letter. December 16, 1985.

2

VITA

John William Tresch, Jr.

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE IMPACT OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR ON LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Nashville, Tennessee, March 28, 1937 son of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Tresch. Married to Beverly Jean Gilliam, July 3, 1957. Father of two sons, John David and William Kyle.

Education: Graduated from Central High School, Nashville, Tennessee, in June, 1955; received Bachelor of Arts degree in History from Belmont College in 1959; received Master of Divinity degree in Theological Studies from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1963; received Master of Arts degree in History from Texas Christian University in 1963; received Doctor of Divinity degree in American Church History from Vanderbilt University in 1970; Summer Study in Oxford University in 1976; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1986.

Professional Experience: Assistant Professor of History, Belmont College, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963-67; Senior Pastor, Parkway Baptist Church, Madison, Tennessee, 1967-72; Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church, Greenville, Tennessee, 1972-74; Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church, Cherryville, North Carolina, 1974-78; Professor of Evangelism, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1978-81; Dean of The School of Christian Service and Professor of Evangelism, Oklahoma Baptist University, Oklahoma, 1981-84; Vice President for Religions Life, Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma, 1982-84; Executive Assistant to the Dean of the College of Education, 1984-1986.