DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 569 HE 007 308

AUTHOR McGrath, Earl J.
TITLE Values, Liberal Education, and National Destiny.
PUB DATE Jun 75
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Educational Development; *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; *Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; *Liberal Arts; Personal Values; Post Secondary Education; Social Problems; *Social Values

ABSTRACT

Discussion of the future of the liberal arts college is more fruitful if it begins not with its own practical internal matters but rather with a consideration of the problems in the supporting society in the solution of which the colleges could, if they chose to do so, render unique assistance. External activities designed to improve the lot of the colleges through more vigorous recruiting efforts, through intensified campaigns for additional financial support, through more sophisticated marketing techniques, and the internal efforts to improve operational and management efficiency will help the liberal arts colleges to survive. Innovations in the substance and the process of education will also make these institutions more attractive to students and prospective benefactors. The key to survival and continued well-being, however, lies not in tinkering with established policy and practice but rather in basic reform of the purposes and services of liberal education. (Author/KE)

Foreword:

The climate of American postsecondary Education has never been better suited to a full analysis of the nature of its several major components. Indeed, in the face of increasingly keen competition for resources and for students, a search for the defining and unique characteristics of each segment is critical. Perhaps we should not ask a single person to undertake the task for all segments, but we feel no reluctance in asking a single person to focus on a major component of the postsecondary scene. In fact we have done so, and the work which follows reflects the wisdom of our choice.

The author, Earl J. McGrath, is a virtual composite, a reflection of the system he examines and exhorts. The very substance of the small, private college is laid bare before us. There is no prolonged lamentation for its problems, but there are great expectations in its vigor. Those expectations and that vigor are examined in a finely drawn perspective which, simultaneously reveals a sharp sense of pertinent origins, of present entanglements, and of future pitfalls and promises.

Despite the author's obvious affection for the private college, perhaps because of, it is not allowed to escape unchallenged. The blueprint which unfolds in the following pages is the thoroughly considered judgment of one who has devoted his exceedingly productive life to the survival of significant educational institutions. This is not the first, nor will it be the last of Earl McGrath's commentaries. Those of us who champion the private sector acknowledge our special debt, those of us who have lived and continue to sense the great dream of a diverse postsecondary educational community feel and appreciate the strength of his insights and his wisdom.

James B. Holderman
Vice President, Education
Lilly Endowment, Inc.
Indianapolis, Indiana
June 18-22, 1975

Biographical Sketch: Earl J. McGrath

Earl J. McGrath received his bachelor's and master's degrees in German and Psychology at the University of Buffalo and the Ph.D. degree in Higher Education at the University of Chicago. Forty-three colleges and universities have awarded him various honorary degrees. Dr. McGrath has held teaching and administrative positions at the University of Buffalo; University of Chicago; University of Iowa; University of Kansas City; Teachers College, Columbia University; and Temple University. He served as United States Commissioner of Education under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower and, as Chancellor of Eisenhower College, worked closely with the former President in the development of that institution. Dr. McGrath is the author of many books, monographs, and articles, several of which in recent years have dealt with various aspects of colleges of liberal arts. He has served on educational commissions in many states and in Israel, Turkey, Peru, Uruguay, Switzerland, France, and Germany. At present Dr. McGrath is serving as Senior Advisor for Education at the Lilly Endowment and is Director of the Program in Liberal Studies at the University of Arizona.

Values, Liberal Education, and National Destiny

Earl J. McGrath

The eve of the American Bicentennial is a fitting moment in our history to review the evolution and the present state of education in the liberal arts and sciences. The changes which have occurred in this branch of higher learning in the two hundred years since the founding of the Republic have been greater than those which took place from the establishment of the University of Bologna some seven hundred years earlier. The core of the curriculum in the nine colonial colleges varied in no substantial respect from the humane tradition which had dominated the European universities for centuries, and those who had the opportunity for any formal schooling beyond the elementary grades pursued essentially the same classical course of study.

The significance in the life of our country of the liberal arts college which provided this type of education is manifest in the lives of the celebrated statesmen who played decisive roles in bringing this nation into being and in establishing the intellectual, political, and moral traditions that shaped our character and destiny as a people. In a discussion of the bearing of learning on the quality of life today, it is especially fitting to observe that nearly half of the fifty-six who took part in the debates which shaped the Declaration of Independence and later our government studied the liberal arts either in our own fledgling colleges or in a European university. In Virginia, where political acumen was highly concentrated, six of the seven signers, Jefferson, Richard Henry Lee, Harrison, Wythe, Braxton, and Nelson, were the products of such learning. Others, like Benjamin Franklin, by tutor or by their own efforts, acquired an acquaintance with the humane classics of the Western world. These men had read deeply in the Hellenic and Judeo-Christian literature, as well as in the more recent philosophical, political, and theological treatises of European thinkers. They conceived and embodied in our laws and in our customs — our way of life if you will — the basic ideas of freedom, the dignity of the individual, and the rule of law rather than of men which have been the admiration of the civilized world.

The majority of our liberal arts colleges were founded in the days after the formation of the Republic when these intellectual and moral traditions continued to dominate the thought and shape

---

NOTE: The ideas expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the policies of Lilly Endowment, Inc.

the lives of the citizens and the social institutions of this nation. As late as the mid-nineteenth century, college archives reveal courses of study made up almost exclusively of the classical languages and literatures combined with the intensive study of our Greco-Roman and the Judeo-Christian philosophic heritage. Even at the turn of the century when the disciplines in the natural and social sciences were multiplying and dividing and gaining a more prominent place in the college curriculum, the common core of any higher education consisted of the body of knowledge found in the humanistic literature.

It is significant that although many of the state universities had come into existence by 1900, and a few had attracted a not inconsiderable student body, the vast majority of young people attended the liberal arts colleges founded and sustained by various religious denominations. Even as late as 1950, fifty-three percent of all those pursuing a formal education beyond the secondary school were enrolled in privately supported institutions and a large proportion of these students attended comparatively small colleges.

In celebrating the past and attempting to visualize the future of the nation, it is proper to recall that these institutions produced graduates who achieved distinction in their callings and in public affairs out of all proportion to their enrollments. In recent years, the rapid growth in numbers of students in other types of institutions, especially the publicly supported universities, has reduced the *percentage* of liberal arts college graduates in positions of public visibility and influence. In absolute numbers, however, the graduates of these venerable institutions continue to be significantly represented in the top brackets of all walks of life: government, science, industry, communications, the arts, and public affairs.

In view of the obvious historical relationship between the character and quality of the education provided by the liberal arts colleges and the well-being of both individual citizens and society at large, one of the most fateful issues before the American people today can be stated very simply in the form of a question: In the days of our two hundredth anniversary, are the privately supported liberal arts colleges going to be allowed to wither and die? This question merits the serious consideration of all Americans who cherish our free institutions and wish to preserve them to our posterity for some informed and unpartisan commentators have already answered it affirmatively. To do so is to accept the fact that our dual system of higher education composed of institutions supported predominantly either by private or by public funds is destined to disappear.

Some officers and faculty members in privately supported institutions view this basic restructuring of our system with little concern; indeed, an increasing number see a transformation of the independent institutions into state and nationally supported

agencies as the only way to preserve their own positions, salaries, and specialized scholastic interests. These members of the academic community can most confidently make such dispiriting predictions because by their very expressions and actions, they are engaging in self-fulfilling prophecy. By drifting with the tide of events, by failing to consider the larger social consequences of such a fundamental change in American higher education, by focusing attention on current financial problems, these members of the profession may be irrevocably upsetting the balance in our system. Instead of attempting to deal with the imposing social problems and trying to preserve the special contribution the colleges can make in redefining our national and personal goals, the Casandras of our day help to bring to realization the disaster others view with such deep concern.

No one should underestimate the severity of the problems of survival many colleges face, but the situation is not as hopeless as some would have us believe. Those who think that the privately supported colleges have a significant contribution to make to society as a whole — particularly to the individuals who attend them — and believe that under favorable circumstances they can continue to do so will want to examine the recent institutional obituary notices with discriminating judgment and a respect for facts. A recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*[1] listing the colleges that have disappeared reveals that since 1970, seventy-two privately supported institutions either have closed, merged with another private college or university, or turned over their assets and management to public control. More detailed examination of this report, however, discloses other facts which anyone who wishes to gain an objective understanding of the present situation ought to ponder. In the first place, these seventy-two institutions include a number of theological seminaries and technical schools which made no pretense of offering an undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences. Thirteen were so weak and undistinguished that they were not even included in the list of invisible colleges identified by Astin and Lee as those with modest national reputations and limited resources.

Second, the majority, when they closed or merged, had fewer than three hundred and over twenty percent had fewer than one hundred students. The history of most of these colleges reveals that they had never had sufficient enrollments or fiscal resources to assure viability in a period of economic stress like that of the past several years. With the notable exception of a few like Parsons College, they were not robust liberal arts colleges wiped out by sharp drops in enrollment, competition from new community colleges, or the current pervasive economic crunch. Twenty-five were sustained by a single religious denomination—the Catholic Church—often located within easy travel distance of other colleges of the same faith offering programs with much in common. It is questionable whether their closing has denied a quality higher education to many young persons of that particular religious persuasion.

It could be parenthetically observed, in fact, that there are many church-related colleges in close proximity to one another with small enrollments which could be merged with no loss of educational advantages to their several clienteles and, in some cases, with an improvement in quality. One Midwest city has three institutions within ten minutes commuting distance of one another supported by the same church with duplicate programs but with an aggregate enrollment of under a thousand students. Their merger would not deny a quality higher education to their religious constituency; indeed, a consolidation of services would result in marked economic savings which, if prudently used to support the remaining single institution, could raise the quality of education for their patrons.

One other fact about the seventy-two which closed deserves mention. Of the forty-seven-nonpublic, non-Catholic institutions included in this group, twelve had a Protestant affiliation and thirty-five were classified as independent of any church relationship. Considering the nearly three thousand American institutions of higher education, the demise of twelve Protestant, twenty-five Catholic, and thirty-five independent colleges, however important they may have been to the members of their own academic communities or nostalgically enshrined in the hearts of their alumni, hardly takes on the aspect of the major national disaster suggested in today's headlines. These figures deserve this extended analysis because they dispel the illusion that the private, independent colleges are dying off at an epidemic rate. As far as the youth of this country seeking an institution in which religion constitutes a genuine element in the total educational experience is concerned, they are more likely to be denied this opportunity not by the closing of denominational colleges but by the abandonment of religiously related goals and practices by institutions which continue to publicize a nominal church relationship.

Having questioned the validity of the dire predictions about the future of the independent liberal arts colleges, anyone willing to face the facts must nevertheless abandon the Micawber-like attitude that if they simply *continue* the purposes, policies, and practices of the past, everything will somehow turn out all right. The disturbing circumstances in which the private colleges now find themselves result not only from the play of external forces but to a considerable extent from a failure to adhere to their own special mission and services. If the private liberal arts colleges recast their responsibilities in the light of the disordered conditions in the lives of individual citizens and in society at large and devote their resources unswervingly to their own traditionally distinctive goals a large majority will not only survive, they will actually flourish as indeed a fair number are now doing.

Prophesying educational trends and events, especially in the unstable social conditions of our day, is a hazardous undertaking for recent events have completely reversed expert earlier predic-

tions. As a graduate student at the University of Chicago in the Great Depression of the 1930s, I heard William Ogburn, then an internationally renowed sociologist and an adviser to President Roosevelt, forecast the population of the United States through the 1960s. Using 1930 as a point of departure when the population was roughly 123 million, Ogburn extrapolated a growth curve over four decades which showed a steady leveling off up to the last third of the twentieth century during which he expected either a stable population or a further drop. As we now know, rapid social changes at home and war overseas drastically upset Ogburn's predictions; before a decade had passed the baby boom had begun. In the intervening decades, instead of having reached a low-level, stable growth rate, the population had risen to 205,235,298, an increase since 1930 of about sixty-six percent.

Witnessing this social phenomenon and estimating its future impact on institutions of higher education, educators made extravagant enrollment predictions some of which exceeded thirteen million students. The turn of recent events — the sharp drop in the birthrate, some public disenchantment with higher education, and economic adversity—has already nullified these forecasts. Yet, for a score of years they encouraged institutions—at increasingly high costs—to expand instructional and living facilities; structures which on some campuses are now under-used or closed. Faculties were substantially increased and given tenure and therefore not released as falling enrollments obviated their services. The hope for constant growth inspired by optimistic enrollment predictions has gone unrealized causing widespread disillusionment and loss of morale among administrators and faculties.

The pendulum of despair may have swung too far. The economic condition of the country will improve. Students have begun to believe again that whatever its defects higher education offers the best avenue to personal and national well-being and indeed that an enlightened people employing the democratic philosophy and practice of government can deal equitably and effectively with the trying problems of our time. But to gain these goals attention must be given to some things other than enrollment predictions based mainly on such external matters as economic conditions, unemployment among college graduates, competition from public institutions, and a declining birthrate. These factors may turn out to be spurious because they fail to take into consideration the one single factor that may determine the survival or extinction of the liberal arts college. That factor is the ability and the willingness of the colleges to reshape their policies and programs so as to assist our people in dealing with the enormous problems they face in their public and private lives as the nation enters its third century. Hence, discussion of the future of the liberal arts college will be more fruitful if it begins not with its own practical internal matters but rather with a consideration of the problems in the supporting society in the solution of which the colleges could, if they chose to do so, render unique assistance.

THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN LIFE

On this assumption, before treating the state of the college enterprise and the changes in policy and practice that will have to be instituted to assure its continued viability, it is essential to review conditions in the society which it serves. The outlook on the contemporary scene, even to the robustly optimistic observer, must be far from heartening. The surface indications—the headlines in the press and the daily news commentaries on the air—suggest a pervasive malaise and confusion in our national and private lives. These weather vanes cannot be disregarded with impunity.

On the surface to be sure, there are many evidences of good intentions among our people and of remarkable social advances. Over the past two centuries compared to other societies the amelioration of the conditions of life for the average American has been unparalleled. With all its inadequacies and inequities, on balance, our culture still deserves admiration and its traditional social institutions merit emulation. The events of recent days have proved the strength of our constitutional government. It is evident that our people will not tolerate corruption, barratry, perjury, and police-state tactics at the highest level of government. Opinion polls as well as shifts in voting show that the instinct for decency in governmental and human relations still stirs the majority of citizens to action when they discover that their basic moral or civic code is being violated.

As measured by standards of freedom, social mobility, and general well-being, America also still stands high. In contrast, people in the Communist countries enjoy little political and social liberty and the standard of living falls far below our own. Even in those nations recently unyoked from colonialism, dictators or military oligarchies predominantly rule. Freedom of speech and political action are commonly suppressed, vested economic and social interests protected, and aid from wealthier countries used for the benefit of the ruling class rather than for the alleviation of human degradation and social ills. In spite of its patent deficiencies, our political and social system still affords the most effective apparatus for enhancing the lives of its citizens and protecting the common good.

In terms of our personal concern for the poor, the sick, the handicapped, and those who strive to better their condition, as a people we rate very high. Quite aside from the billions of dollars spent by federal, state, and local governments for health, education, and welfare programs, no other people can match the voluntary outlay of funds by private citizens and philanthropic organizations. The less fortunate in other lands in the material satisfactions of life regularly receive our help through public and private channels, and as a Canadian recently remarked, we are often the first and the most generous people in aiding other nationals stricken by floods, earthquakes, epidemics, and other

disasters. Concern for our fellow human beings here and abroad is reflected in the enormous sums voluntarily contributed to philanthropic agencies. In 1974, for example, the Red Cross received from its fund campaign alone contributions of $125,553,000. CARE, ministering primarily to the needs of other nationals, sent abroad money or material valued at $18,633,402 which, supplemented by host governments in the year ending on June 30, 1974, rose to a total of $109,011,414. In 1973-74, colleges and universities received $2,240,000,000 in gifts, a considerable proportion of which enabled young people of limited or no means to gain the advantages of a higher education. Contributions of millions of Americans go annually to dozens of organizations—the American Cancer Society, the Muscular Dystrophy Foundation, and the American Heart Association, to name a few—for research and treatment of the ailments that afflict all human beings regardless of class or wealth.

In creature comforts, technological devices to lift physical burdens from human backs, the availability of nourishing food, shelter from debilitating heat and cold, and public protection against slavish conditions of work, the United States excels. In these and untold other respects, no nation can match our security against physical want, privation, and the despair which attends them. In spite of the discontent among workers with their financial lot and despite obvious drains on their available income caused by rising costs, the lot of the average American citizen has markedly improved since the Great Depression. Without invidious comparisons, it can be said in respect to the satisfaction of primary human needs that the United States can justly claim preeminence among the nations. It is unnecessary to pile up the available mountains of evidence proving the values which animate the concerns of our people for their fellowmen at home and abroad.

Why then are our social system and our private lives in such an unsatisfactory state? Quite aside from those who struggle to free themselves from the agonizing throes of privation and uncertainty, there are millions of persons ostensibly secure who are bored, surfeited, irritated, embittered, frustrated, disgruntled, and otherwise emotionally and spiritually disturbed. Why is it that so many who have received so much of the "good things of life" paradoxically exhibit such unprecedented dissatisfaction with the conditions of their existence? Why are so many incapable of coming to terms spiritually with their lot in an affluent society with unparalleled opportunities for the further enhancement of life for all?

What evidence is there in fact that such personal moral and mental malaise exists? Concrete evidence abounds on every side! The existence of conditions today must convince the most cautious generalizer that the desire to escape from the realities of life is epidemic. The use of alcohol and other toxic drugs has markedly increased, in fact, has grown to the magnitude of a national

problem In the suburban areas around the largest cities, the number of units of Alcoholics Anonymous runs into dozens. As a magazine article reveals, in affluent urban communities some parents send their children out for the evening so that they (the parents) can entertain at "pot" parties. The use of a variety of drugs and hard liquor in the "best" high schools is well-known among officers of the law. What ought to be most unsettling to thoughful citizens is that the incidence of these failures to cope with the conditions of living is obviously heavy not only in communities of the underprivileged with few material satisfactions of life; it is high also in the areas where a large proportion of the residents are college graduates, hold high-paying executive positions, can afford to send their children to elitist schools, join socially exclusive clubs, and otherwise enjoy the putative benefits of affluence. Though abundantly available, no figures need to be assembled to prove that millions of Americans dissatisfied with their lives, are seeking escape from the ennui of "good" living.

Other types of evidence could be educed to add weight to the argument that we are adrift as a people. We seem to have no port to head for and we appear intellectually and spiritually rudderless even when we know where we would like socially, economically, and spiritually to sail. We no longer have the standards of ethics and human conduct and a sense of community which characterized our earlier national life. Group conflict has become the order of the day. Confrontations which only a few years ago accomplished great social advances like the alleviation of racial injustice and the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam now disrupt the lives of citizens over controversies as trivial as whether stores should be open on Sunday or dogs should be required to wear muzzles The practice of resolving differences through rational discussion and the democratic resolution of public issues which our elaborate educational system purportedly cultivates have been replaced by confrontation and violence.

And lastly, crime has increased to the point that the concept of "the land of the free" in our national anthem has for law-abiding decent citizens become a mockery. The prudent citizen is not free to walk the streets at night in the Nation's Capital, or in any large city, not free to leave his home on vacation without anxiety that in his absence his property will be stolen or vandalized, not free to defend his property and family by the use of firearms, denied quick and just consideration of his grievances by an antiquated, inadequate, permissive, and at times corrupt bench and bar. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that from 1960 to 1973, violent crime increased by 159.6 percent and property crimes by 116.5 percent.[3] The quality of life for the decent law-abiding citizen has obviously deteriorated as freedom for the law breaker has commensurately grown

HOW COULD THESE THINGS HAPPEN AMONG AN EDUCATED CITIZENRY?

The sensitive observer of the pervasive disarray in personal and public life in a democratic society where by definition the people not only make the laws but establish the mores which govern social behavior is driven to question the relationship between the condition of life and education. No nation in the long history of human societies has extended the opportunity for education and the social advantages it makes possible to such a large percentage of its people as has the United States. This statement is valid even when account is taken of the continuing discrimination on the basis of race, sex, and social status.

Increasing opportunity and easy access have been the most striking features in the two hundred year history of our educational system. As the historian of Harvard University Samuel Eliot Morison points out, the European tradition from which the educational practices of the colonial period sprang was undeniably aristocratic and at the higher levels rigidly restrictive, but this ideological social exclusiveness began to be replaced early in our national history by the conception that an educated electorate was the surest safeguard of our political liberties. This social philosophy embraced by many of those who like Jefferson and Franklin shaped our institutions was extended in the early nineteenth century to include the concept that the total well-being of the individual citizen—the chance to realize his potential to the fullest—would be largely determined by his accessibility to schooling. It would be superfluous to detail the practical results of extending educational opportunity. A few salient statistical facts will document the statement that as a whole our people have had greater educational advantages than any other. Consider the developments in this century alone.

In 1900, about one in ten, (11.4 percent) of the population of high school age were attending such an institution. Of the youth of college age, only four percent, or one in twenty-five, had the advantages of any post-high school education. Three quarters of a century later, 93.7 percent—virtually all mentally competent youth—attend some type of secondary school. Moreover, until the recent slump in enrollments, more than two-fifths of those 18 to 24 years of age attended a college or university.[3] To these figures must be added hundreds of thousands of all ages who pursue part-time instruction in myriad proprietary schools and classes within such organizations as corporations, churches, and women's clubs. The total expenditures for all kinds of education both public and private are hard to come by but the estimated figure for the academic year 1974-75 is 107.5 billion dollars.[4]

If the argument of the Founding Fathers and their philosophical descendants that education is the key to domestic tranquility had any validity, it would seem that as a people we should

not be living in the chaotic conditions which characterize our time.

Viewing the disturbing problems the average citizen now faces in his personal and public life and the confusion of purpose and counsel he witnesses among those who have been called to lead us out of the present human predicament, thoughtful observers are now raising basic questions concerning the philosophy, the goals, and the practices of the educational enterprise. This public interest and critical evaluation is not entirely the impropriety and detriment some members of the profession believe it to be. Contrary to a widespread opinion among the members of the academic community, the principal cause of the present questioning attitudes among the public at large is not a loss of faith or confidence in the value of education *per se.* By and large, the average citizen still believes in the efficacy of learning. Nor in spite of an evident public reluctance to increase expenditures for any public services—including education—are monetary considerations primarily at the basis of public aversion. Our people, who are in a questioning mood, seek not to undermine our educational institutions but to enlist their more effective assistance in restoring meaning and stability to our national and personal lives. If the traditional services of the liberal arts colleges in cultivating the traits of mind, character, and the spirit of a free people can be restored to the center of the entire enterprise of American higher education, they will receive the gratitude and the unreserved support of a people who yearn for honest and informed enlightenment in dealing with the issues of the day.

COLLEGES ARE ASKING THE WRONG QUESTIONS

The primary reason for the falling estate of the liberal arts colleges is their failure to raise the correct questions about their own goals and services. For some years, the principal concerns of policy-making bodies in academic institutions have revolved around the practical problems of day-by-day operation rather than the kind of philosophical issues raised a century ago by John Henry Cardinal Newman in his *Idea of a University.* One of the discouraging aspects of the present situation appears in the list of topics discussed at the annual meetings of national academic associations.[1] For some years after the end of World War II, national discussions per force dealt largely with pressing administrative problems resulting at first from the return of thousands of service men and later from the cumulative effect of skyrocketing birthrates. Such pressing matters as recruiting personnel, erecting additional facilities, and securing ever larger funds from private or public sources to accommodate the unprecedented influx of students, understandably occupied the attention and absorbed the energies of the academic community. Later, especially during the past several years, the topics have dealt with the reverse problem: how to draw additional students through new programs,

how to adjust faculty size and physical facilities to declining enrollments, and how to devise public relations techniques to attract public money and private gifts to supplement shrinking income. There are notable exceptions, but the preponderance of discussions today do not deal with the topics that should have been discussed even during the preceding score of affluent years. These questions can be gathered together under the general query as to whether the goals and programs of higher education today meet the needs of the persons and organizations from which its support must come.

The attitude of many faculty members that private individuals, corporations, and legislative bodies ought to make ever larger financial support available to institutions of higher education without raising questions about the services which these funds provide is no longer a realistic view. As Peter Drucker has pointed out; as long as a very small minority of youth attended colleges and universities and the costs of operation were small in terms of our total national wealth, few benefactors or taxpayers raised questions about the purposes for which funds were spent. Now, however, a large percentage of our people have had firsthand experience in these institutions, rightly or wrongly, they feel qualified to judge the purposes, program, processes, and products of liberal education; in a period of economic stringency they are increasingly conscious of the cost of education, and viewing the disorder in society, they wonder whether the results justify the investment. A priority item of business in the academic community ought to be an effort to answer that question affirmatively, and if it cannot be answered satisfactorily, the deliberations of academic bodies ought to be concerned with the changes in purposes and programs that need to be made to do so.

The liberal arts college more than any other institution ought to provide the forum for enlightened discussion of these crucial matters because the questions that are being asked about the character and quality of American life boil down to *value* questions. The traditional studies in the corpus of learning in the liberal arts from the days of the Greeks were concerned with the questions about human nature and destiny. Some of the voluminous additions to knowledge over the centuries richly illuminate these queries, but recent attempts to answer age-old questions with simplistic mechanistic explanations or by computer techniques now fail to satisfy both sophisticated intellectuals and the man in the street. Tolerable answers will require careful evaluations of alternative courses of human action in terms of the nature and destiny of mankind and thoughtful reexamination of the ends of being. The resolution of the related issues will depend not so much on the assembling of great masses of additional knowledge produced in the research centers, as valuable as that may be for the more immediate purposes of living.

Abundant knowledge already exists bearing on the issues before us, but it too seldom gets into the thinking of the average

citizen or into the processes of public decision making. The vast reservoir of concepts, facts, and theories in an ever expanding range of disciplines needs to be collated and evaluated within the framework of philosophic convictions and religious beliefs so that the wisdom of the ages reposing in humane learning can once again invest dehumanized modern facts with edifying meaning. This responsibility before the colleges today shrinks all others into insignificance. Unless we can restore rationality guided by moral precepts in the house of learning, all other efforts will be futile. As Whitehead observed some years ago when the present dissolution in an existing world view was in its early stages: *"Mankind is now in one of its rare moods of shifting its outlook. The mere compulsion of tradition has lost its force. It is the business of philosophers, students, and practical men to recreate and reenact a vision of the world, conservative and radical, including those elements of reverence and order without which society lapses into a riot, a vision penetrated through and through with unflinching rationality."* Whitehead, with characteristic prescience, has put his intellectual finger on the most disturbing problem of what someone has called "post-liberal" society.

Through the intervening decades mankind has been shifting its outlook at an ever accelerating tempo and it is the rare tradition that has not become further enfeebled. Philosophers who by profession might have been expected to apply unflinching rationality to recreating and reenacting a vision of the world including reverence and order have, as Abraham Kaplan has observed, been concerned with more trivial matters. It is not surprising that without leadership in the world of scholarship students and practical men have also been ineffective in restoring elements of reverence and order to Western culture. Whether our society has lapsed into the riot Whitehead predicted is a matter of opinion, but that it is increasingly disorderly and irreverent toward tradition cannot be questioned. The liberal arts colleges cannot by themselves be expected to restore order and thoughtful commitment to a reconstructed way of life, but they must, as Walter Lippmann contends, exert leadership in this fateful human effort. If the colleges assume this sobering commitment, they will gain the respect and gratitude of this soul-searching and goal-seeking generation. If they do not assume this obligation, they will expire or be absorbed in the larger institutions whose commitment to goals different from, if not alien to, liberal learning will only widen the gap between the ends of higher education and the crying needs of a hapless society.

The maintenance of a unique character is of overwhelming practical significance because unless the liberal arts colleges can show that they have something distinctive to offer their potential clienteles most of them will continue to lose students to their competitors. Other efforts designed to strengthen their attractiveness to prospective students or to potential benefactors will not guarantee their survival. Yet, one of the last analyses of the Carnegie

Commission reveals a steady trend toward sameness among eight types of institutions. Done by C. Robert Pace and reported under the foreboding title, *The Demise of Diversity?*,[6] this study leads the author to conclude that a pervasive similarity is developing among formerly quite varied institutions.

Reorienting the academic enterprise toward a concern with the problems afflicting humanity and reintroducting value considerations into the various disciplines will require a major effort. The universities because of their dedication to eclecticism and to the freedom of scholars to pursue their personal intellectual interests and to do research and offer instruction from which value considerations have been consciously extruded may be either unable or unwilling to achieve the needed reforms. The independent colleges, however, if they have the nerve to do so, can accomplish a rearrangement of functional priorities, for unlike their counterparts in large university communities they are freer from the domination of the graduate and professional schools whose purposes, even when not alien to their own, are at least diversionary. Unless they redirect their efforts, however, it is difficult to see what special attractiveness the liberal arts colleges will have to students in competition with institutions which in some other respects can outbid and outclass them.

If the colleges continue to emulate the universities in goals and services, they will fail in that effort and regrettably also in the activities in which, with single-minded purpose, they could notably succeed. The principal cause of the difficulties in which the independent colleges now find themselves is the intensifying effort over the past half century to imitate and increasingly to try to compete with the universities. If they continue in offering extensive specialized programs, in reducing teaching loads of faculty members to permit them to conduct research, in widening the gap between the learner and the teacher, in imposing elitist admission standards, in disregarding — if not repudiating — the concern for human values, they will wither and eventually die. The changes that have undermined the integrity and blurred the distinctive functions of the colleges of liberal arts over the past century have sprung primarily from the ideological shift from the British humane tradition of preparing youth for the broad responsibilities of citizenship and personal life to the German university conception of preparing scholars for the advancement of learning. Even if it were practicable to match the policies and practices of the universities, the effort would be reprehensible for today the pressing needs of our society require that the colleges set different goals and render different services.

Few men in the community of learning are better qualified by their own professional activities and status to authenticate the interests, activities, and goals of the professoriate in the universities than Talcott Parsons, Professor of Sociology at Harvard University. In an address on the character of academic society, Parsons reveals the dominant interests of faculty members:

The most important things a typical individual member does do not concern the interests of the organization as a whole in any very direct sense. They concern his teaching relations with a small minority of the total student body, the pursuit of his own research interests, which are inevitably in only one of the many fields of knowledge involved in the university, and his active collaboration with a small circle of collegues. Even the department, at the faculty level, tends to be a highly decentralized body, members of which act corporately only in a very limited sector of their functions, especially those having to do with two matters, namely, their responsibility for a teaching program and the all-important process of recruitment of new members. Except in crisis situations, even all faculty matters, to say nothing of all university matters, are relatively marginal and secondary to the primary professional interests of members. . . . Thus, the responsibility of the academic man is, as I have noted, not primarily to a group of persons, but rather to the integrity of his devotion to the learning process in its many ramifications.[7]

The acceptance of this university conception as the guiding philosophy of higher education in the undergraduate liberal arts college has changed its essential character and to a degree undermined its traditional purposes. It has moved the student from the center of institutional concern to the periphery. It has shifted the emphasis from the rounded development of the student, his mind, his character, and his affective dispositions to the cultivation of cognitive skills and the absorption of facts. It has transferred the allegiance of teachers from a total institutional commitment and the needs of the student to their own specialized branch of learning and the professional associations which represent it. No basic educational reforms can be expected in the liberal arts colleges while the mores of academic society encourage this kind of restrictive commitment.

COLLEGE PURPOSES NEED CLARIFICATION

In view of the urgent problems now facing this generation and the present state of the establishment of higher education, what are the prospects that the liberal arts can again become a vital force in American society? Taking into consideration all the adverse factors involved, I nevertheless believe—to paraphrase Mark Twain—that reports of the death of the independent liberal arts college have been greatly exaggerated. The facts of contemporary social and academic life strongly support the view that the majority of liberal arts colleges can, *under proper circumstances,* not only survive; they can maintain a relatively healthy financial condition and at the same time provide a service indispensable to the well-being and possibly to the very survival of this society confused about its values and hence impotent to deal

with its problems. The critical phrase in the foregoing statement is "under proper circumstances." At this crucial historical moment these conditions demand serious consideration.

It should be made clear at the outset that whatever is said here about the socially valuable functions of the liberal arts colleges, and however different they may be from the purposes of the universities, no depreciation of the *proper* services of the latter is intended. Those who decry the high status which scientific research and technological development occupy in the community of learning and in the larger society are engaged in an ill-conceived as well as a futile effort. The research activities in the academic establishment since the late nineteenth century have immensely enhanced the quality of our common life. The search for new knowledge and for ways of using it in the improvement of life must go on, and in some fields like biology and the health sciences, at a swiftly accelerating pace. The efforts of scholars in the advancement of learning in the specialized disciplines and the dissemination of this knowledge among the people generally has unquestionably enabled us to deal more effectively with *some* of the insistent problems of a dynamic society.

It does not follow, however, that all institutions of higher education and all members of their faculties are capable of being, or should be, involved in investigative activities. Nor is it necessary or proper that faculties in the undergraduate units in our system of higher education should devote their energies primarily to the transmission of the specialized knowledge and the cultivation of the skills of intellectual workmanship indispensable to those who expect to spend their lives in the academy. Abundant evidence gathered by productive scholars themselves has existed for decades showing that a large percentage of those who receive the Ph.D. degree never again engage in any really creative work, and many who try to do so produce only uninspired and uninspiring accounts of trivial inquiries. On the other hand, many dedicated and inspiring teachers suffer deprivations of income and status for failing to conform to the establishment's limited conception of the scope of scholarship.

It would have a salutary effect on society as a whole if every college teacher of a course not attended primarily by majors in his own discipline would ask himself at the beginning of each academic year what contribution his instruction will make to the effectiveness of the private and the public lives of his students. And in this exercise of self-appraisal, he could well keep in mind Montaigne's admonition that: *"The purpose of education is not to make a scholar but a man."*

To reverse the dominant trends of the past half century and to restore the colleges to vigorous health with a distinctive set of social services, I propose the following revisions in the theoretical conception of liberal arts education together with modifications in present practices consistent with these goals.

I. The independent liberal arts college reestablish its own particular identity as an institution with a mission different from the university and in some respects different from other institutions with generally similar goals.

II. Colleges review their admission standards in terms of the validity of college entrance examination scores and the later performance of students, correlations between which recent studies call into serious question. In this reexamination of admissions policies, it ought to be recognized that the pool of candidates in the upper brackets of ability cannot possibly supply a sufficiently large reservoir of students to provide adequate enrollments for the majority of American colleges and universities.

III. Any college with fewer than a thousand students ought to make every academically defensible effort to increase its enrollment. On the other hand, those already above this economically viable figure ought to use whatever additional resources they can accumulate to enhance the quality of their services rather than undertaking expensive new programmatic ventures requiring prohibitively expensive additions to faculty and physical facilities.

IV. Colleges ought to adopt the policy of appraising every present curricular offering and every new course proposed either by faculty members or by others outside the academic community in terms of their appropriateness as an essential element in an undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences.

V. The lobbying activities of private institutions for appropriations from state legislatures and the national Congress need to be intensified and the services and the financial needs of these institutions more vividly dramatized before these representative bodies and before the general public.

I. THE DISTINCTIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

The first step that colleges need to take to lay legitimate claim to their special reason for being and to justify their survival is to restore their identity as institutions having special and socially indispensable purposes.

It is my firm conviction that the ability and willingness of the liberal arts colleges to establish and sustain such a unique set of purposes to which all members of the academic society will subscribe will in large measure determine their chances for survival. This view of the social responsibility of institutions of higher education as a whole has been expressed by thoughtful analysts inside and outside the academic community. For example, Lippmann, addressing the annual meeting of the American Council on education in 1966 observed that:

> *One of the great phenomena of the human condition in the modern age is the dissolution of the ancestral order, the*

erosion of established authority, and having lost the light and the leading, the guidance and the support, the discipline that the ancestral order provided, modern men are haunted by a feeling of being lost and adrift, without purpose and meaning in the conduct of their lives. The thesis which I am putting to you is that the modern void, which results from the vast and intricate process of emancipation and rationalization, must be filled, and that the universities must fill the void because they alone can fill it.[8]

That the crisis in our society is related to the derangement in human goals and a loss of confidence in our leaders' ability or willingness to make the value judgments necessary to restore order in our public and private lives is evident in the opinions of the average educated citizen. A recent lead article in the *National Observer* presents a sobering view of the disordered and confused state of affairs in the United States as well as in the larger family of nations. The author reports polls showing that nearly fifty percent of our fellow citizens believe the federal government incapable of preventing a serious depression, that possibly only by means of war in the Middle East may the Western nations be able to obtain the oil needed to avert economic strangulation, that into the invisible future — for citizens in the highly industrialized countries — present conditions portend a life of austerity rather than plenty, that the balance of power which we have taken for granted is rapidly slipping away from the United States and its influential friends to what have been referred to as the "less developed" nations.

Scholars deeply grounded in history and well-informed about the current conditions in the Western world — for example, Arnold Toynbee in *A Study of History*, Rene Dubos in *Reason Awake*, Lewis Mumford in *The Myth of the Machine*, Robert Heilbroner in *Inquiry Into the Human Prospect*, James Burnham in *Suicide of the West*, to cite but a few — express the view that though science and technology have developed at a swiftly accelerating pace in recent decades, the ability of mankind to put their products to use in improving the human lot has lagged far behind. Indeed, few of even the "well-educated" seem to have any firm convictions about the kind of life they seek. Toynbee, among others, contends that the distance between our capacious knowledge and the moral wisdom to use it constructively may have become so great that we have passed the point of no return in closing the gap.

This view is, at best, of course, only speculation. Nevertheless, a critical review of the facts of life today reveals that the necessary reversals in public policy and in private choices will not occur without thoughtful consideration of the issues involved. In the last analysis, this process must proceed to a weighing of alternative values. These values in turn will have to be translated into choices among concrete options affecting the everyday lives

of all members of the human community. As stated earlier, what Lippmann and other perceptive critics are talking about is our value system and, by implication at least, the Judeo-Christian standards of conduct and moral judgment which have given direction to our personal lives and shaped our political and social institutions.

In view of the crisis in Western culture, the decreasing concern with values in the world of learning is a mystifying phenomenon. There is, to be sure, a voluminous scholarly literature on this subject and especially on related topics such as attitudes and human traits. As is customary in the learning community, however, those who have concerned themselves about values constitute a group of specialists in such fields as psychology, sociology, and philosophy. The representatives of other disciplines are typically not familiar with the research and writing of specialists in those fields, and as Lilge and others have observed, higher education as a whole has disavowed responsibility in this sphere of human behavior. This phenomenon is the more amazing because values are such central features in the life of the individual. They, much more than the current stimuli which play upon a human being, determine what his decisions and actions will be. In the larger realm, the commonly accepted system of values also determines major social decisions and public action.

Rene Dubos, observing the confusion in the contemporary world resulting from the rejection of traditional value systems and the failure of the learning community to create alternatives to vacuous countercultures, has this comment to make on the need to reverse this disintegrating process if Western culture is to survive:

> *One must be deaf and blind not to recognize that rich human values have come from belonging to a given nation and that these values have given particular national flavors to the joie de vivre.*
>
> *Both the religious and the national sense have become much weaker during the second half of the twentieth century and they have not yet been replaced by equivalent spiritual forces. Modern society is undergoing progressive disintegration; it has hardly begun to reform itself, still less to search for a really new form. The counter cultures are readily defined by what they reject — the consumer society, colonialism in all its forms, economic and military nationalism — but none has yet formulated a positive doctrine that could serve as a new cohesive social force. They have failed in this task because, despite their brave claims, their proponents have not found a way to introduce new enriching experiences into their own lives. . . . But there cannot be any true integration without a system of values accepted by the majority of the social group and generating a collective joie de vivre. The disarray and disenchantment which plague our times show that physical comfort, abundance of goods, and control of disease are*

not sufficient to bring about either individual happiness or harmonious social relationships.[9]

If a reconstituted and generally acceptable value system is to be conceived and disseminated among the members of society, the centers of learning must take a large part of the responsibility for doing so. Why then should scholars not place this matter high in the list of priorities among the purposes of their research and teaching activities? The exclusion of the very aspects of life which give meaning to an individual's or a society's existence is one of the most difficult features to understand in the evolution of higher education in Western culture. What we believe in and what we stand for and the validity of our convictions in terms of personal happiness and national well-being ought to be the central subject of research and teaching in the entire educational system. The institutions of higher education have the greatest responsibility in this area of learning because they alone are able to put the whole apparatus of scholarship to work in studying our value commitments and evaluating their validity in relation to conditions of life today!

Many members of the profession seem to be unable to see the difference between indoctrinating students with one inflexible set of rules of conduct and ethical judgment and the examination of various alternative systems of values and evaluating their human consequences. It must be admitted that since the dominant philosophy in the graduate schools has cultivated in the minds of future teachers the idea that values are none of their proper concern there is now a great deal of misunderstanding and confusion about how value considerations are to be reintroduced into the teaching process. No one has any ready-made answer to this question. Indeed, though interest is widespread, particular steps toward the working out of curricular designs and teaching procedures, campus styles, and evaluative techniques are relatively scarce. There are, however, notable exceptions to this generalization especially among liberal arts colleges and the Lilly Endowment is now vigorously engaged in assembling information on existing programs. The purpose of this project is not to impose ready-made solutions on the most difficult problem in higher education today but rather to stimulate discussion and critical evaluation of the attempts now being made. In these efforts, the Endowment hopes to aid the institutions in finding an acceptable philosophical orientation as well as practical help in setting new objectives. It is hoped also that by examining the views of some of the leading intellectuals of recent days who have attempted to analyze the condition of modern man, institutions of higher education may concentrate their limitless intellectual resources on the improvement of his lot.

Those who believe themselves to be morally obligated to restore value considerations to the center of the intellectual effort will gain some understanding of the obstacles they will encounter

by reviewing the history of the conflicts which occurred when the devotees of science opposed those who in the early European centers of learning propagated the humanistic Greco-Roman intellectual tradition and the Judeo-Christian conception of the nature of the world and of man. The naturalistically oriented scientists considered the humanistic tradition to be at best outside the proper sphere of intellectual pursuits and at worst sheer obscurantism calculated to preserve the mysticism, the ignorance, and the vacuous doctrinal conflicts of the dark ages. Although decades passed before the philosophy and methodology of the scientists gained undisputed ascendancy, the entire intellectual enterprise gradually abandoned its concern with values and the ethical implications with which they are invested. In a vividly documented treatise, *The Abuse of Learning,* Frederic Lilge exposes the divorce of value considerations from factual "truth" demanded by leading scientific thinkers of the nineteenth century, and depicts its distorting consequences in the intellectual enterprise. In the following statement, particularly the ending sentence, he describes a situation which widely prevails in education today:

> *It is unnecessary to go into a detailed criticism of these scientific philosophers. Their sophistry and glibness in passing over all the deeper problems are obvious enough. Yet, it is curious to see how, after having demolished the stately systems of Idealist philosophy, they built their own temples of devotion. Having denied responsibility and freedom to human life, they invested the atom with a singular dignity and restored the soul to the cell. Their complete disrespect for tradition, their incapacity to distinguish between the world of fact and the world of value, and their reduction of the human person to a thoroughly determined mechanism constitute an emphatic denial that education is a moral problem at all. For them it has, in fact, become a branch of technology.*[1]

This insightful treatise written by a recalcitrant product of the system he so vigorously criticizes traces the transition in the German university system (and subsequently in our own institutions) from a commitment to the dissemination of the humane learning to a preoccupation with the creation of new knowledge through objective research. The inference one can draw from this review of the developments in higher education is that the whole process was dehumanized, and the interests of the society of learning were detached from the concerns of ordinary mortals. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the twentieth century its members as a whole could not only condone the ethnic atrocities perpetrated by the Nazi regime, they could also with equal detachment disregard the biological and psychological nonsense which undergirded them.

THE DOMINANCE OF SCIENTISM OVER THE WHOLE ACADEMIC ENTERPRISE

If the mechanistic, materialist, naturalistic dogma had been restricted in application to the physical sciences where its phi-

losophical presuppositions and its methodology might have been defended as a means of advancing human thinking from an arid and mystical pedantry to a fruitful intellectual productiveness, the whole enterprise of higher education would be quite different from what it is today. Unfortunately, however, the disciplines concerned more directly with individual and societal behavior, eager to establish themselves on an intellectual par with those which produced "reliable" knowledge, adopted the latter's metaphysics, epistemology, and methodology. Aspects of reality related to human behavior refractory to the analytical treatment of science were nevertheless subjected to a methodology which often produced bodies of knowledge of irrefutable validity, but which shed little light on the purposeful behavior of the individual or the effectiveness of the entire social enterprise. Now, however, there is a growing unease among intellectuals of unimpeachable academic credentials who reject this limited approach to the understanding of men and the societies they make up.

A leading psychologist, Abraham Maslow, commenting on the separation of scientific facts and values, a practice he considers devitalizing to the disciplines concerned with the nature and destiny of man, states that:

> *What I am doing, in effect, is striking blows at one of the root conceptions upon which classical science is based, namely, its supposed value-free nature, its belief that it can study only neutral facts, and that the world of facts is totally different from the world of values. Everything to do with values — in art, religion, justice, education, politics, ethics — is cast out of the realm of human cognition by such a conception of science.*[11]

Unfortunately, this positivistic view which Maslow rejects had come to dominate not only the various disciplines assembled under the canopy of the natural sciences; in time it came to suffuse the entire atmosphere in the house of learning.

A perceptive, philosophically oriented scientist, Rene Dubos, has a chapter in his book, *Reason Awake*, entitled, "Visions and Disenchantments," which deals with this problem in the study of human behavior. Treating here the dream of early scientists that all human problems would eventully be solved by science and technology and observing the exclusion of purpose by these same visionaries from the study of human nature, Dubos remarks that:

> *Whatever its philosophical validity, this pragmatic attitude has obviously been immensely fruitful in the study of inanimate nature, but it may be less well suited to the study of living forms and is certainly insufficient when human problems are under consideration. Man is a goal-seeking creature, and purpose is an essential factor in his activities whenever he thinks about the future.*

The tendency to eliminate purpose and to concentrate instead on the description of mechanisms and the search for causes has progressively extended beyond the field of experimental science — where it had been adopted for pragmatic reasons — into other areas for which it was not originally intended, in particular the human condition.[14]

Under the impact of this philosophic dogma, the transcendent experiences of life were excluded from the discussions of the learned *cognoscenti*. Even those who accepted the reality of human purpose, free will, and spiritual phenomena, considered them impossible of treatment within the prevailing closed naturalistic system. The more superficial thinkers with little capacity for profound philosophical reflection treated the major human problems of aesthetic, spiritual, and moral values as nonexistent.

This narrow, positivistic, non-teleological doctrine, applied to the totality of human behavior in its purest and most dogmatic form a half century ago by John B. Watson in his book, *Behaviorism*, today enjoys a titivated revival in the theories of B. F. Skinner. This all-encompassing dogma also came to invest the presuppositions and the methodologies of other social sciences—sociology and anthropology, for example—but its limitations have been most dramatically exhibited in the area primarily concerned with human behavior psychology. All through the period of the dominance of the association, conditioning, positivistic school of thought, some dissidents of high intellectual competence and broad interests rejected the prevailing closed system of naturalistic determinism. Until recently, however, their voices were drowned out by the established leaders of their branches of learning.

The past decade, however, has witnessed the emergence of a somewhat different situation. In earlier days opponents of the narrow and arid methodology of the social science disciplines could be politely overlooked or laughed out of court. Now, however, a growing cadre of the society of learning is rebelling against the theories and previously unchallenged preachments of those who have attempted to make every aspect of human behavior fit the procrustean bed of scientific methodology and naturalistic determinism. To the good fortune of the human enterprise as a whole and the well-being of the society of learning, the present revisionists enjoy such professional stature that they can no longer be treated with indifference or ridicule. Let them now speak in defense of their own point of view.

Abraham Maslow, already mentioned, whose brilliant mind exhibited itself in the classroom, in learned articles and books, and in his election to the presidency of the American Psychological Association, was obviously qualified to speak from a position of unimpeachable scholarly stature. In an article written shortly before his tragically premature death, Maslow uttered some thoughts which ought to be pondered not only by the members

of his own discipline, but by all others employed in the fateful task of reevaluating the aims of education. In that article he summed up his objections to the positivistic treatment of human behavior as follows:

> *This is a revolutionary repudiation of 19th century science and contemporary professional philosophy, which is essentially a technology and not a philosophy of ends. I reject, thereby, the whole model of science, and all its works derived from the historical accident that science began with the study of nonpersonal, nonhuman things that in fact had no ends. The development of physics, astronomy, mechanics, and chemistry was impossible until they had become value-free, value-neutral, so that pure descriptiveness was possible. The great mistake that we are now learning about is that this model, developed from the study of objects and of things, has been illegitimately used for the study of human beings. It is a terrible technique. It has not worked.*
>
> *Most of the psychology on this positivistic, objectivistic, associationistic, value-free, value-neutral model of science as it piles up like a coral reef of small facts about this and that, is certainly not false, but merely trivial.*[13]

And on another occasion, Maslow, extending his criticism to the higher goals of education, contended that education should help

> *the person to become the best that he is able to become*
>
> . . . .
>
> *Such a goal involves very serious shifts in what we would teach in a course in the psychology of learning. It is not going to be a matter of associative learning. Associative learning in general is certainly useful, extremely useful for learning things that are of no real consequence, or for learning means — techniques which are after all interchangeable. And many of the things we must learn are like that. If one needs to memorize the vocabulary of some other language, he would learn it by sheer rote memory. Here, the laws of association can be a help. Or if one wants to learn all sorts of automatic habits in driving, responding to a red signal light or something of the sort, then conditioning is of consequence. It is important and useful, especially in a technological society. But in terms of becoming a better person, in terms of self-development and self-fulfillment, or in terms of "becoming fully human," the greatest learning experiences are very different.*

And then he concludes

> *Education is learning to grow, learning what to grow toward, learning what is good and bad, learning what is desirable and undesirable, learning what to choose and what not to choose. If one doesn't do that (learn one's own identity) it is useless.*[14]

As Maslow implies, the repudiation of the study of objects and things, the research on the minutiae of human behavior, the preoccupation with statistically valid but trivial investigations, ought to be extended to the other social science disciplines which in the attempt to make themselves methodologically hygenic have sapped their very vitality. Fortunately, some distinguished members of other disciplines. economics, political science, psychiatry, sociology, and anthropology, share Maslow's dissatisfaction with the intellectual barrenness and the human inconsequentiality of much current research and teaching. A distinguished British scholar and commentator on the present human condition has contributed his own acute observations on our failures in coming to grips with our contemporary social problems. Sir Geoffrey Vickers points out that:

> *Western culture bears many peculiarities and limitations which reflect the larger unintended influence of science. These arise largely from carrying over into the psycho-social field ideas derived from the physical sciences. Thus, our culture tends too readily to accept as a condition of knowing and learning that separation of observer from observed which has yielded such spectacular results in the physical sciences. This tends to obscure the fact that in the relations of men with men, which are the most important concern of men, the relation of observer and observed has little place, except in war. Men learn about each other and about themselves not by observing but by communicating. They change each other and themselves by the same process. The detachment which is a condition for the physical scientist is inconsistent with the participant relation of men with men. And although both attitudes have something to contribute, the predominance of the one tends to depreciate and obscure the role of the other.*
>
> *For the same reason, our science-based culture tends to take as its archetype of knowledge the kind of knowledge which the physical sciences acquire. This tends to depreciate and obscure that other process, already described, by which we build our knowledge of ourselves and each other. Until the rise of modern science, no one doubted that the knowledge which men had of men was both more important and more certain than any knowledge they could have of sticks or stones or stars, these being so much alien and so much less informative. This attitude has been so sharply reversed by the success of the physical sciences and their resulting prestige that the resulting picture of the natural order holds not only the centre of the stage but the whole stage, even though it does leave no room for the more interesting activities of scientists themselves.*[13]

Viktor Frankl, internationally renowned psychiatrist and humanistic philosopher, goes even further in condemning the limited scientific explanation of human actions. He dramatically describes

the potent evil consequences of a reductionism which treats beings as no more than physio-chemical systems when he says in his book, *The Doctor and the Soul*, that:

> *If we present a man with a concept of man which is not true, we may well corrupt him. When we present man as an automaton of reflexes, as a mind-machine, as a bundle of instincts, as a pawn of drives and reactions, as a mere product of instinct, heredity, and environment, we feed the nihilism to which modern man is, in any case, prone.*
>
> *I became acquainted with the last stage of that corruption in my second concentration camp, Auschwitz. The gas chambers of Auschwitz were the ultimate consequence of the theory that man is nothing but the product of heredity and environment — or, as the Nazis like to say, of "Blood and Soil." I am absolutely convinced that the gas chambers of Auschwitz, Treblinka, and Maidanek were ultimately prepared not in some ministry or other in Berlin, but rather at the desks and in the lecture halls of nihilistic scientists and philosophers.*[16]

Perhaps even more blameworthy for abandoning humanistic concerns for objectivistic scholarship are the representatives of the humanities. Scholars in such obviously humanistic fields as philosophy, English, and foreign languages, who in an earlier day knew and taught the great masterpieces of Western culture and discussed with undergraduates the age-old questions of the condition of man which the classics treated, also became victims of the mania for objectivistic, scientific, value-free research and the publish or perish disease. Concern about literary criticism, semantics, techniques of composition, and word counts diverted the efforts of many from the elucidation of great works. Their earlier concern with the relevance and the meaning of literary and philosophical masterpieces in the life of every man was replaced or overshadowed by a preoccupation with the technical aspects of scholarship. The disaffection from learning of many students in recent years stems from the fact that they can find little help with the overwhelming problems which beset their personal and social lives in the pedantic instruction they encounter in courses which by their description ought to be concerned with the relationship between life and learning.

In the humanities, as in the social sciences, there are, however, intellectual leaders of acknowledged professional stature who are calling for a return to a concern with the great issues and perplexing problems of our time. One of these, Abraham Kaplan, one-time professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan, in a penetrating analysis of the activities of professional philosophers, published under the title, *The Travesty of the Philosophers*, observes that:

> *The gap is widening in our time between professional philosophers and the philosophies men live by. If what is im-*

portant in life does not appear in professional work, or is brought in only to be negated, the work cannot have any place in the important contexts of life. Philosophy then becomes only an occupation, something incidental, while the life itself remains unexamined and thereby, as Socrates had it, not worth living. The gap between professed and lived philosophy makes action thoughtless and thought pointless.

. . . When we turn away from the things that are important on the face of it, we are not necessarily approaching fundamental matters, it might simply be that we are coming to occupy ourselves with trivialities.[12]

Maslow's and Kaplan's observations on the lack of the academic's concern about the value implications of his subject and the increasingly remote relationship between learning and life can be matched with a limited but spreading dissent among distinguished representatives of all the disciplines in the liberal arts colleges. In a keynote address before the membership of the American Council on Education, the influence of this school of thought and its politically powerful adherents in the academy was vividly if not tactfully set forth by William Arrowsmith, now professor of classics at Boston University On that occasion Arrowsmith contended that:

Teaching, I repeat is not honored among us neither because its function is grossly misconceived or its cultural value not understood. The reason is the overwhelming positivism of our technocratic society and the arrogance of scholarship. Behind the disregard for the teacher lies the transparent sickness of the humanities in the university and in American life generally. Indeed, nothing more vividly illustrates the myopia of academic humanism than its failure to realize that the fate of any true culture is revealed in the value it sets upon the teacher and the way it defines him. "The advancement of learning at the expense of man," *writes Nietsche,* "is the most pernicious thing in the world. The stunted man is a backward step for humanity, he casts his shadow over all time to come It debases conviction, the natural purpose of the particular field of learning, learning itself is finally destroyed. It is advanced, true, but its effect on life is nil and immoral."

I am suggesting what will doubtless seem paradox or treason — that there is no necessary link between scholarship and education, nor between research and culture, and that in actual practice scholarship is no longer a significant educational force. Scholars to be sure are unprecedentedly powerful, but their power is professional and technocratic, as educators they have been eagerly disqualifying themselves for more than a century, and their disqualification is now nearly total. The scholar has disowned the student — that is, the student who is not a potential scholar — and the student has

reasonably retaliated by abandoning the scholar. This, I believe, is the only natural reading of what I take to be a momentous event — the secession of the student from the institutions of higher learning on the grounds that they no longer educate and are therefore in his word, irrelevant. By making education the slave of scholarship, the university has renounced its responsibility to human culture and its old, proud claim to possess, as educator and molder of men, an ecumenical function. It has disowned in short what teaching has always meant; a care and concern for the future of man, a Platonic love of the species, not for what it is, but what it might be. It is a momentous refusal.[18]

As Arrowsmith contends, it is quite unlikely that the large universities which devote their human and material resources largely to research and advanced specialized teaching will voluntarily undertake or in the early future can be directed by society to initiate the necessary reforms. If the colleges of liberal arts have the nerve to retrieve their independence and reestablish their traditional functions of preparing youth to live an informed life committed to personal and civic fulfillment, they can restore values to a central position in undergraduate education and at the same time elevate the quality of our national life. No mission since the establishment of the universities at Bologna and Paris in the eleventh century could have so profound an influence on the well-being and destiny of Western culture.

VALUES AND THE DIVISIONS OF KNOWLEDGE

Even among those who reject a value-free conception of education, one of the most baffling questions is how to reinvest scholarship and teaching with a concern for the use of knowledge in the enhancement of the human enterprise. In academic gatherings, a commonly heard statement takes some such form as: "I recognize the disarray in our society and I acknowledge my responsibility as a teacher to participate in any promising effort to clarify our national and personal goals, but as far as my own intellectual discipline is concerned, I do not know how to proceed." In their disconcerting dilemma, some offer an appealing, simplistic proposal for dealing with this complex problem. Its appeal stems from the fact that, for most teachers, the problem of values could be disposed of without diverting their energies and interests from their present academic preoccupations which are in part the basis of our present difficulties. They suggest that the academic community place on certain departments — philosophy, religion, and psychology, for example — the responsibility to deal with value questions in such courses as ethics, comparative religion, or humanistic psychology.

The intensive study of ethics could, for example, reveal to students the various ideas of right or wrong as conceived by re-

flective minds from Plato to Dewey, which indeed the conventional course in ethics continues to do. Unless value considerations are treated within the framework of the ever expanding corpus of knowledge in the related fields of learning, however, and unless they are brought to bear on the complex problems of our time, they may remain mere intellectual exercises. As such, they would provide little help with the efforts to deal intelligently and ethically with these problems. The moral callousness of intellectually competent public officials who have had the advantages of such academic instruction suggests that they were never shown the relationship between the abstract treatment of ethics in the classroom and the moral situations which present themselves in their daily lives of responsibility as public servants.

This division of academic labor would permit those in other disciplines to continue their own specialized research and teaching adding to the mass of accumulated knowledge and disseminating it without concern for its bearing on the urgent problems of our time. This assignment of responsibilities among the members of the academic body on the assumption of a clear-cut specialization of function in dealing with values would, as far as the members of the academy generally are concerned, dispose of the most compelling issue in higher education.

Such a division of labor, however, would leave largely untreated the intimate relationships between the mass of knowledge in the many splintered units of instruction in the various disciplines and the exigent political, economic, social, and moral issues of contemporary life. Furthermore, the discussion of values and their personal and civic moral implications in the abstract without reference to the concrete human situations in which value issues must be decided only makes learning an exercise in the manipulation of cognitive materials, as indeed many of the activities of the classroom are today. As John Dewey contended long ago, learning is more meaningful and enduring when it is related to real-life situations with which the learner has already had experience. The significance of values can only be magnified when they are considered in terms of issues and problems treated in the several disciplines.

The Roman philosopher Seneca illuminated the necessary relationship in the learning process between facts and values when he said:

> *The mathematician teaches me how to lay out the dimensions of my estates; but I should rather he taught me how to lay out what is enough for a man to own. He teaches me to count, and adapts my fingers to avarice; but I should prefer him to teach me that there is no point in such calculations, and that one is none the happier for tiring out the bookkeepers with his possessions — or rather, how useless property is to any man who would find it the greatest misfortune if he should be required to reckon out, by his own wits, the amount of his holdings. What good is there for me in knowing how*

to parcel out a piece of land, if I know not how to share it with my brother?[19]

It is just such questions that students have raised in recent years about the relevance, the human implications, the usefulness, of their learning experiences in the various liberal arts disciplines. In a less sophisticated manner they only query the authenticity of the purposes, the content, and the processes of higher education posed by the leaders of the teaching profession like Maslow, Kaplan, Arrowsmith, and a swelling company of others. Some students' conceptions of relevance have been unquestionably superficial and pointless. It must be admitted, however, that most learning experiences have been more relevant to the sequence of abstract ideas and to the internal logic of the subject than to the value choices citizens will eventually have to make involving the pressing social, political, economic, racial, and international problems of their time. Since in the last analysis, solutions to all these problems will flow from decisions involving values, American youth ought to be applauded — not condemned — for their insistence that an institution of learning help them to understand and deal more effectively with the problems in their personal and in their public lives.

One thing is certain: value questions and their resolution are central factors in shaping the lives of individuals and of nations. Whether a society lives by the basic doctrines of revealed religion, as has been the case in Western societies for two thousand years; or more recently, by the various forms of *civic* religion in communistic Russia or China, the factors that have held societies together and given meaning and direction to the lives of their people have been a generally accepted system of values. These systems have, in varying degrees, explicitly embraced presuppositions or dogmas related to the moral behavior of their adherents. No human being can really understand the meaning of his own life or the infinitely complex world in which he lives or maintain any sense of order in his personal or social existence without a commitment to such a relatively stable set of values. As Lippmann pointed out, in our society only the institutions of higher education are capable of assuming the demanding and unavoidable responsibility of assisting their patrons in understanding the values by which they will live; and of all such American academic institutions, the liberal arts colleges, by their professed concern for the well-being of the individual and the quality of life in the larger society, can with the least justification absolve themselves of this responsibility. If they do so, they will nullify their reason for being. The task of resuming responsibility for the clarification of values and organizing the corpus of modern knowledge to illuminate them may be difficult, but it is essential to the preservation of a stable social order and a satisfying, meaningful personal life.

With an unswerving commitment to the task, the academic community can muster the creative imagination needed to deal

with the complex pedagogical problems involved. Many studies reveal a considerable sameness among a wide variety of social groups with respect to the aspects of life which they favor and the ultimate goals they wish to pursue. Milton Rokeach's extensive investigations of human values and his analysis of the views of other scholars have reduced hundreds of expressed life goals to a basic list of eighteen terminal and eighteen instrumental values. These categories, listed in the following table, are the irreducible residue of values derived by means of a sifting process based on Rokeach's understanding of the meaning of the term *value*. Rokeach's volume entitled, *The Nature of Human Values*, should be required reading for all candidates for the Ph.D degree regardless of their intellectual specialization. Not everyone who has systematically examined human values will agree with Rokeach's definitions, but they can serve to focus attention on the significance and ramifications of the subject in relation to higher education. Rokeach defines a value as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. A *value* system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance."[2]

TEST-RETEST RELIABILITIES OF 18 TERMINAL AND 18 INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Terminal Value	*r*	*Instrumental Value*	*r*
A comfortable life (a prosperous life)	.70	Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring)	.70
An exciting life (a stimulating, active life)	.73	Broadminded (open-minded)	.57
A sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution)	.51	Capable (competent, effective)	.51
A world at peace (free of war and conflict)	.67	Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)	.65
A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)	.66	Clean (neat, tidy)	.66
Equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)	.71	Courageous (standing up for your beliefs)	.52
Family security (taking care of loved ones)	.64	Forgiving (willing to pardon others)	.62
Freedom (independence, free choice)	.61	Helpful (working for the welfare of others)	.66
Happiness (contentedness)	.62	Honest (sincere, truthful)	.62
Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)	.65	Imaginative (daring, creative)	.69
Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)	.68	Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)	.60

Terminal Value	r	Instrumental Value	r
National security (protection from attack)	.67	Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)	.67
Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life)	.57	Logical (consistent, rational)	.57
Salvation (saved, eternal life)	.88	Loving (affectionate, tender)	.65
Self-respect (self-esteem)	.58	Obedient (dutiful, respectful)	.53
Social recognition (respect, admiration)	.65	Polite (courteous, well-mannered)	.53
True friendship (close companionship)	.59	Responsible (dependable, reliable)	.45
Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)	.60	Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)	.52

An examination of the figures in this list which indicate the relationships between repeated inquiries among the same persons as to their values will reveal a remarkable stability in the value declarations of these individuals. It will also suggest that in any real situation in which an individual or a whole society must make a decision some terminal values will reinforce or complement one another, while in different situations, other values will conflict with or nullify one another. Every human being has experiences in which he must make the most trying decisions requiring him to establish priorities; to choose one value over another. In fact, the primary factor in the human trait we call wisdom is the ability to make carefully reasoned, discriminating judgments among alternative courses of action in concrete life situations. If this be so, then the cultivation of those habits of mind and traits of personality which prepare the individual to make such value decisions ought to be a primary responsibility of education. It is obvious that the mere mastery of a massive body of reliable facts, however useful they may be in weighing alternatives, is not enough. The facts themselves in the absence of a relatively stable set of standards will not enable one to make value judgments; indeed, in the absence of terminal life goals, a plethora of data may only produce the neurotic indecision and vacillation so characteristic of life in the nations in which the opportunity for formal education is greatest.

The significant and the operational effects of values are most obvious in complex life situations where various alternative courses of action present themselves. They rarely come meaningfully into play in relationship to isolated facts or theories and they lose their vitality when they become mere pieces on the chessboard of abstract thinking. Values are the pulsing bloodflow of real life and without them a person becomes a dispassionate automaton. They involve emotional commitments to people and to institutions. When a human being recognizes that his values are at stake or under attack he comes nearest to grasping the reality and the meaning

of existence. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes summed up the significance of value commitments when he said, *"I think that as life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."*[22] The centrality of values in every life makes paradoxical the custom among academics of considering them at best the by-products of the intellectual enterprise. As long as this view prevails it will be extremely difficult to create a new synthesis of knowledge and value convictions without which learning will become increasingly sterile and life ever more aimless and frustrating. The disparate units of knowledge need to be reassembled in meaningful relationships to the wholeness of experience and illuminated by a generally acceptable set of life goals.

THE APPLICATION OF VALUE JUDGMENTS

A few examples will illustrate how a number of disciplines must interrelate their knowledge and intellectual procedures if they are to prepare students to deal with those manifest problems of the day which involve value judgments. Some of these matters concern their own lives; decisions which affect only themselves and a few immediate associates. Other decisions which they must make collectively with their fellow citizens involve domestic and international issues of the widest scope. Citizens today who have a sense of responsibility to their immediate associates and to the larger human enterprises of which they are a part will want to make socially defensible judgments about their own actions and the actions of their contemporaries. To make such appraisals and decisions, they will need to have a broad range of reliable knowledge relating to the nature of human beings and to the physical world in which they live, but only a clearly conceived and relatively stable set of values will enable them to put their knowledge to use in giving direction to their own lives and improving the human lot.

There are several misconceptions concerning the range and the kind of knowledge needed to make judgments on large public issues and about the nature of the human beings in whom, under our democratic system, such fateful power is reposed. These premises require critical scrutiny in terms of the kind of higher education needed to produce informed and just citizens dedicated to the common good.

First, the average citizen does not need to possess all of the vast body of specialized knowledge related to the decisions that have to be made. For example, one of the commanding public issues of recent years, not yet finally resolved, concerns the proportion of our productive capacity and our wealth we can in good conscience devote to the exploration of outer space. The technical knowledge required to determine the feasibility of such national endeavors is clearly beyond the comprehension of most well-educated citizens and there is no justifiable reason for attempting to inform them in such esoteric matters. The information

required to decide whether as a people we *ought* to spend the hundreds of billions of dollars involved in carrying out even the plans already envisaged by those concerned with the related projects in science and development embraces an entirely different set of issues of much greater human significance. The points of view of thoughtful persons concerned with the worth of these efforts seldom receive an adequate audience. The hearings in the Congress which encourage witnesses to dwell on the technical personnel and facilities required to carry the project they are advocating to completion often confuse rather than enlighten the general public and their legislative representatives as well. Willfully or not, these parties at interest create the impression that only they—the informed devotees of a particular national enterprise—are capable of understanding not only its feasibility but also its essentiality. The basic question of broad public policy, namely, whether the project should be undertaken at all is too often suffocated under arguments on feasibility, the need to sustain national prestige, and latterly the sheer necessity of providing employment even if the project has little intrinsic merit. When this kind of question is asked prior to the inquiries about feasibility and cost, the area of intelligible discussion can be opened to the thoughtful consideration of most citizens. Whether they will be able to understand the issues and reach socially defensible conclusions, however, will be determined in large part by the kind of education they have received.

To participate intelligently in the discussion of such issues what is required is a knowledge of the increasing and relentless impact of science and technology on the total human enterprise and the distortions occuring in our national goals by the imbalance which now exists in our choices. Understanding will not be acquired by reading learned technical treatises in science and technology or, for that matter, in philosophy and history. More relevant are discourses on the human values involved in spending huge public funds for such projects as space exploration or road building while a shameful percentage of our people are without adequate food, homes, or health care.

Another concrete case will illustrate the relevance of value considerations in these decisions on public policy. During the Eisenhower administration, a nationally comprehensive plan was designed to create a road system at an estimated expenditure from national tax funds of 100 billion dollars. At the time it was argued, and events later proved it to be true, that the *price* was obviously well within the capability of our economy to produce the essential funds. But the *cost* in terms of the impact on the quality of our national life through the displacement of people from ancestral homesteads, the destruction of irreplacable, age-old forests and recreational sites, the consequent injuries and deaths among the users of highspeed roads, the devastating consumption of our energy resources, the increased congestion of traffic in the urban centers, and the insidious health-destroying effects of noxious pollutants — all these and other human costs received too little

consideration in the hearings which eventuated in the enactment of our national highway legislation. Objective analyses of other legislation passed in the recent affluent years will reveal similar faulty confusions of price and cost. It has recently been reported that the price of involvement in Southeast Asia, for example, has been 165 billion dollars, not including veteran's benefits and other costs which will continue throughout the lives of all living citizens.

These and other equally dramatic illustrations reveal the special relevance of this discussion to the larger question of how the enterprise of higher education is to deal with human *values* that come into play in the choices we must make. Without any implication that the expenditures for space exploration or for road building are the sole or even the dominant cause of our inadequate support of other public services, it is now time to raise crucial questions concerning the relative worth of our public commitments. In the alternative expenditures proposed new scientific knowledge is usually produced, new technologies developed, national prestige established, a large company of professional and other workers employed, and other more personal benefits doubtless result. The compelling question, however, is this. When the costs and values are compared to those in other public enterprises which might have been supported by the same expenditures can the chosen projects be justified? There was a time not long ago when this kind of question was considered by some to be merely obstructive or trivial on the assumption that the potential resources of our economy were large enough to support all conceivably meritorious public services. In the face of a national debt of nearly 700 billion dollars and a prospective deficit of over sixty billion dollars in the national budget for fiscal year 1976, this school of thought enjoys less credence. Not only economic conservatives but committed supporters of liberal legislation calculated to enhance the lives of all citizens now realize that our public resources are not unlimited. Choices must be made.

The time has now incontestably arrived when distinctions among price, cost, and value must be clearly perceived, and when basic human values must be the instrument by which we measure the worth of alternative choices in our private lives and in the public domain. These choices run the entire gamut of potential services in all brances and at all levels of government as well as in our private and corporate activities. The most superficial analysis of these matters of public concern reveals two implications for the kind of education this generation will have to have to deal with them effectively. The first is the complexity of contemporary problems and hence the broad range of knowledge and intellectual skills required for their solution. The second springs from the recognition that all the decisions are inevitably invested with value considerations.

The problem of crime in this country will illustrate the relationship between knowledge and social amelioration based on value

commitments To get the essential and relevant facts bearing on the issues involved will, to be sure, require careful investigations by qualified scholars in a variety of related fields such as sociology, psychology, economics, penology, medicine, government, nutrition, and others. If, however, the average educated person is to understand the cause of crime and the various steps that society can take to reduce it, he obviously cannot be expected to take a sequence of specialized courses in each of the related disciplines. To do so with respect to all the matters of present public concern, to say nothing of those which will inevitably arise in a swiftly changing culture, would be impossible in a four-year college experience, or for that matter in forty years. The same can be said with regard to ecological and other issues. One has only to follow the controversial debates on public policy related to ecological matters to observe that although a large body of technical knowledge is usually involved the decisions rest on issues involving human values. After all the facts are presented, some intelligent persons will believe it more important to preserve for future generations the natural beauty of our forests, fields, and streams, while others will place a higher value on the immediate satisfaction of our energy needs at low cost through the practice of strip mining. Similar alternate categories of priorities could be made for each issue on which society must reach a decision. They would reveal the fact that as indispensable as it may be, factual knowledge is not enough. If all the decisions in the last analysis involve basic value choices, the broad instructional units related to the problems already described must incorporate considerations of the human consequences of various alternative courses of action, that is, choices based on the things in life we cherish most highly.

To design such new curricular patterns and reconstruct the present typical course offering will require unprecedented moral commitments and expenditures of energy. Some efforts to clarify the purposes and to reorganize the content of liberal arts education are already being made, but current innovations are often little more than tinkering with existing modes rather than fundamental reforms to meet the needs of our times. To make this reconstruction expeditiously possible, faculty members will, at least temporarily, have to devote large portions of their professional time and energy to this goal. If sufficient effort is to be made to achieve the necessary revisions in policy and practice faculty members will, for a period, have to be given large amounts of time freed from their regular responsibilities. Reconstructing the bridge from where we are in liberal education to where we ought to go cannot be done while the normal traffic continues to cross it.

If, however, the qualified representatives of the various disciplines undertook to bring together the facts essential to an illumination of each of these problems in meaningful relationships, units of instruction could be designed which would give all students in liberal arts colleges the basic facts, the intellectual skills, and the continuing sources of information needed to make sound judg-

ments. To organize such instructional units will, however, involve taxing efforts and highly creative imagination. As the curriculum of most colleges is presently organized, it will not provide this kind of broad experience for the non-major student, and the large majority of students served by most departments are non-majors. The efforts in the 1930's and the 1940's to provide a suitable general education for all college students to prepare them for personal fulfillment and enlightened citizenship aborted in the 1950s. A reascendance of specialism after the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957 caused a reversion to the old-fashioned distribution system--the dominant curricular structure today. Earlier attempts to make up general courses by assembling small units of subject matter from various disciplines were abandoned. They often consisted of a meaningless hodgepodge of unrelated elements. It should have surprised no one that if faculty members were unwilling or unable meaningfully to interrelate the subject matter of several disciplines, students were equally unsuccessful. Any attempt to revive these fruitless efforts to provide an adequate general education to deal with the problems of our time would be useless. This commanding task of curricular reconstruction requires a new, more radical approach.

Unlike the efforts of a quarter century ago, curricular reform should not begin with the subject interests of the faculty as represented in the present divisions of knowledge. The point of departure must be the human problems with which this and succeeding generations must deal—ecology, energy, crime, hunger, war, and the rest. Using these tangled situations in the human condition, scholars in the several fields of knowledge could bring together the relevant findings in their own disciplines. Working cooperatively with representatives of other divisions of knowledge, scholars could interrelate the subject matter of each in such ways as to illuminate the problems as they exist in the real-life situations of today's world. The rationale for such units of instruction would be found not in the internal logic of each subject but rather in the realities of existence in a complex society. If fifty percent of the experiences of a college student embraced such broad instructional units, he would still have ample opportunity for an intensive major and for some electives in satisfying degree requirements. This is the kind of revision of goals and articulated curricular reconstruction that now demands the committed effort of the higher education establishment. The liberal arts colleges could reestablish themselves as the heart of the academic organism by leading the way in these efforts.

Nearly twenty years ago the world of learning as well as outsiders with intellectual interests and sensitive social consciences were shocked by a report authored by Philip E. Jacob entitled, *Changing Values in College*. In a research project of his own, together with a review of the results of other investigations, Jacob concluded that though there were notable exceptions among some institutions and especially certain teachers, the values of students

were little influenced by the college experience. Even among the students in social science courses, the effect was minimal. As Jacob says:

> *The same negative conclusion applies to the general effect of social science courses. The values expressed by those who are most interested in social sciences are little different from those of other students. This is true not only of personal, moral and religious values, but also of attitudes towards social and political issues regarding which the social science students are presumably more concerned and better informed. Neither the students' interest nor their instruction in social science seems to assert a broad influence on their beliefs, or their judgments of conduct and policy.*[23]

In the intervening years these findings have been both confirmed and contested, and in the 1960s student demonstrations often reflected changed conceptions of what was "good" and "bad" in our culture. But there is some evidence that these attitudes arose more often out of personal experience and rap sessions among contempories than out of formal education—sometimes in actual reaction against it. In any event, that the value questions are still in the forefront of the thinking of many citizens is evident from the experience of one of America's oldest foundations. When it advertised the publication of the results of a small conference on values, it received thousands of letters of inquiry from persons in all walks of life. To be sure, social institutions other than colleges and universities must share the responsibility for dealing with the problem of values, but the latter because of their intellectual resources must take the initiative in these fateful efforts.

One of the projects sponsored by the Lilly Endowment at the University of Arizona has as its purpose a survey of the institutions of higher education to discover where all-encompassing efforts are being made to involve the entire academic community in a concern for values. Thus far, this inquiry reveals a number of institutions which express commitment to the idea that students ought to be introduced to various value systems, become accustomed to analyzing their origins and influence on human conduct, and finally enabled to work out for themselves a set of principles for the guidance of their own behavior and the appraisal of the ideas and conduct of others. Most of these efforts at present do not appear to meet most of the requirements set forth in the preceding pages.[24] Some are merely statements in new rhetoric of the traditional concern of church-related colleges for the moral and religious development of students. Even in these instances there seems to be little or no relationship between declarations of intent and the actual activities of the campus. In others, the problem is disposed of by requiring students to take certain courses in philosophy, religion, or other humanities studies which may or may not give serious consideration to values depending on the teacher's

dominant academic interests. Other institutions declare forthrightly that although they are aware of the problem, until now they have made no systematic and sustained attempt to introduce value considerations into the curriculum. A few replies imply that they do not consider values a matter of primary responsibility.

There are, to be sure, a few centers of research in the universities where serious investigations of values are being conducted with promising results. Kohlberg at Harvard, Ward at Michigan State, Sanford at Berkeley, Pace at UCLA, and Rokeach at Washington State, to mention a few, have already published reports with which faculties concerned with values ought to be familiar. One of the difficulties lies in communication. The representatives of the various disciplines do not become acquainted with the work that is going on in the research centers. The same problem exists in disseminating the results of practical experiences in individual liberal arts colleges. Some promising courses have been designed around value considerations, but again, these are individual efforts which often have little influence on their colleagues' practices to say nothing of faculty members in other institutions. The Endowment hopes through this project to accelerate the dissemination of relevant theoretical treatises on the subject as well as descriptions of going programs.

Two college's programs are here briefly described to illustrate the effort being made to deal with the various problems of modern man in which, because of the force of circumstances, he must either consciously or unconsciously make value choices. These institutions differ in this respect from others in that the entire faculty has become involved over a period of an academic year or more in a reappraisal of the entire college experience. In this restudy, the traditions of Western culture have been reviewed, the contribution of each discipline to the student's understanding of his own commitment and those of his society have been illuminated, and without indoctrination the student has been encouraged to identify the ethical principles which guide his own thinking and actions. No one associated with these innovations claims that they are the only or necessarily the most effective means to bring the vast bulk of modern learning to bear on the social, political, psychological, and moral problems of the day. They can serve, however, as examples of the kind of concern, dedication, and effort required to achieve the essential curricular, teaching, and social reforms. They suggest means to revitalize and make the college experience more effective in preparing this generation of youth to face up to the choices it will have to make in dealing with problems involving alternative values.

In order to present an accurate statement of the activities and plans now underway at these two institutions, a person primarily responsible for the development of the local programs has been asked to present a descriptive statement. The first is authored by Marshall Christensen, Professor of History and Academic Vice President at Warner Pacific College.

Values and the Culture of Western Man Program at Warner Pacific College

Warner Pacific College is a coeducational church-related liberal arts college in Portland, Oregon. Founded in 1937 by the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana) in the Northwest to prepare students for church-related vocations, the College has expanded its program to include the liberal arts — accredited in 1961 — and service-oriented careers.

Modern man is engulfed in a predicament. His problem is evident in 1) a culture absorbed by the fascination with and application of power; 2) the myth that modern man can, through science and technology, solve all of man's problems; and 3) the spiritual paucity that has left him without the faith and wisdom required to make the great promise of Western civilization a blessing. Erosion has begun, and it may be total without a conscious effort to maintain the standard upon which civilization was founded. The faculty of this College believe a student's consideration of values is fundamental in that the goal of learning, in sum, is human wholeness.

The study of the liberal arts alone is inadequate because its primary focus is man's intellect. The preparation for a vocation alone is inadequate because its function is essentially the training of man's technical skills. But combined with a significant encounter with the fundamental moral and spiritual values, the liberal arts are a key to understanding the meaning of life and career training is the avenue to stewardship. Thereby the individual finds sufficiency in faith and reality in commitment.

At Warner Pacific, these institutional priorities are highlighted in the Culture of Western Man program. It starts from the assumption that the accumulation of facts is not as important as facing the problems that all thinking men must consider.

For much too long, education has meant exposing students to specialized disciplines isolated from other course work and from human problems. The Culture of Western Man curriculum does not divide knowledge and intellectual skills along artificially determined disciplinary lines. In this two-year program, students receive their orientation to higher education by integrating the study of history, literature, philosophy, religion, science, psychology, sociology, political science, economics, and the arts.

By arranging subject material according to related topics rather than chronological progression, each of the significant problems of the human experience is addressed by each of the branches of the liberal arts faculty. Rather than wandering through a maze of isolated and often overlapping courses, Warner Pacific students integrate the consideration of values with scores of the great human questions. Examples include:

Is man free?
Is man morally bound?

What kind of progress is most important?
How have men perceived their destinies through the centuries?
Is the hero the product of his environment?
Should society tolerate the eccentric or social deviant?
What is obscenity?
What are the moral consequences of population control?
Should civil rights be guaranteed to the fetus?
Is it ethical to take the transplanted parts we need from the dead or near-dead?
How do human values affect economic choices?
Must rich nations be concerned with the ethics of buying cheap and selling dear?
Is war ever worth the price?
Can the machine take over?
Is freedom essential to creativity?
Do the arts affect values?
What is absolute and what is relative?
What is eternal?

The issues raised by such provocative questions serve to draw the academic disciplines together in a unifying examination of values.

The format of the Culture of Western Man program is designed not only to break down disciplinary barriers, but provide varied learning experiences as well. In a section of the program devoted to the study of Western lifestyles, for example, students spend one week on the topic question: What alternative life styles have proven most persuasive in the West? During that week, students first listen to lecturers from the philosophy and sociology departments who deal with specific aspects of the question. All participating faculty attend these lectures. Second, students read selections from widely recognized authors who have contributed to man's understanding of the issue. These classical readings are chosen by the faculty who also prepare a study guide in a student handbook. Third, they hear and view contemporary media resources chosen from available cassettes, slide and filmstrip series, and films. The handbook also provides a guide for the study of these media materials. Fourth, they respond in a personal journal to the readings and media resources. These writings are a means of stating one's reactions and also serve the faculty in tracing student development. And fifth, students discuss their observations and conclusions in a small group of their peers and one faculty leader.

The truly educated person is one with principles to rely upon as he earns his living and relates to his fellowman. This program is a great educational catalyst in that it (1) introduces students to the central issues of life and not to what is trivial, (2) requires that students answer the significant questions by constantly drawing from all facets of man's heritage, (3) stipulates close cooperation of all professors, (4) enhances the transfer of learning from one area of experience to another, and (5) inasmuch as Warner

Pacific is Christian in orientation and in reason for being, it integrates the Christian message and perspective of life with an understanding of everyday issues and problems.

The goal of Warner Pacific College and of the Culture of Western Man program is to provide an experience that places knowledge, thought, attitudes, and faith in meaningful relationship. The liberally educated person can think independently without demonstrating stubborn inflexibility. He is sensitive to the importance of new ideas and communicates his own convictions with imagination and clarity. He is aware of his cultural heritage and has learned to weigh contemporary concepts against those of the past. He has cultivated an intelligent loyalty to the principles of democracy. And his Christian perspective is a unifying factor helping him grasp the interrelatedness of all knowledge and God as the sources of truth .

The second curricular synopsis has been prepared by David L. Wee, Associate Professor of English and Assistant Dean at Saint Olaf College.

The St. Olaf Curriculum

I. St. Olaf College

St. Olaf College is a coeducational liberal arts college in Northfield, Minnesota. It was founded in 1874 by Norwegian-American Lutherans in order to provide a program of liberal studies to students preparing for careers in business, politics, the clergy, and other professions. Today the student body numbers 2,750, about sixty percent Lutheran, and seventy percent from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois. The College has a 4-1-4 calendar, an experimental Paracollege, an extensive program of international studies, an excellent faculty, and a world-famous choir. It has just completed an extensive self-evaluation, the recommendations of which it is beginning to implement during this centennial year.

II. The Goals of our Values Program

The educational goals of St. Olaf College have from its beginnings included the development of the intellect and, as it is characteristically expressed, the emotions and will in the context of Christian principles and the liberal arts. We propose a values-centered education as a contemporary affirmation of those objectives. Such an education will provide a special challenge to the student to understand through serious scholarly inquiry and to think critically and analytically about the value-laden issues that confront him/her — but also, inevitably and as part of the same process, to face and to decide upon his/her own position.

We aspire to an education that will inform the many crucial decisions that individuals and groups must make in today's

world of interdependence and technological change. Too often these decisions are made by default while "good men do nothing." Scholarly activity, no matter how rigorous, is by itself insufficient, while commitment without comprehension can be disastrous. The complexity of the problems facing us collectively and individually call for the best that liberal education has to offer. Consequently, we seek to create educational environments that will demand both serious academic preparation and personal engagement. The courses, symposia, workshops, and other features are designed to move toward this larger objective in five ways which constitute our specific goals. We seek to develop:

(1) an awarness of values
(2) a capacity for the clarification and analysis of values
(3) an understanding of the scope and limits of human choice.
(4) skill in defining issues in the context of crucial contemporary problems
(5) an enhanced scope for self-conscious and responsible decision-making

We expect our students to gain a heightened awareness of and sensitively to many value-defining points of view, such as aesthetic, moral, political, intellectual, educational, and social. We expect a student to become aware of his/her values in terms of their sources, implications, and changes. We believe that one way to accomplish this is through exposure to the values of other individuals, cultures, and traditions. We also expect our students to become more aware of the values which underlie the methodologies and applications of the liberal arts disciplines. We believe, however, that our students should go beyond simply becoming aware of the values within a particular issue or approach. We expect our students to ably define, clarify, and analyze values and value judgments. Rather than ending discussions by stating that the debate has reached the point where individuals are simply making conflicting value judgments, the student studying values will consider this supposed impasse to be the beginning point for clarifying and analyzing these conflicts. The clarification and analysis of values and value judgments requires a grounding in empirical topics such as value acquisition and change, the limits of human choice, and the relationship between behavior and values. It also requires a grounding in normative and conceptual issues such as the nature of values and value judgments, the justifiability of values claims, value relativity, and tolerance in a value-pluralistic society. Increased awareness of values and the ability to analyze values critically culminate in the examination of the value-laden issues such as the nature of art, the relationship of law to morality, directions for technological development, the conservation of energy, equality of opportunity, and the future of the family. Here also scholarly pursuits and

personal commitment combine. We will expect each student to relate his/her analysis of such issues to his/her own convictions about acceptable answers. Intellect and emotion will combine with will as the student takes responsibility for both the decision-making process and the decision.

III. Summary of the Values Program

Our program calls for faculty to prepare themselves for better teaching of value-laden issues in their present courses and in new courses. We propose that new values courses be inaugurated and then that St. Olaf adopt them into the permanent curriculum of the college. We propose to introduce a wide variety of interdisciplinary courses, a new development for the St. Olaf curriculum; values courses in every department, and new values units in revised courses. The concerns of the humanities will thus be raised not only within humanities departments, but in all departments and divisions of the College.

IV. Major Curricular Elements of the Program

A. Values Institute Courses

ID 30 Values Semester Seminar (up to five sections)
ID 32 Introduction to Values
ID 34 Values and Behavior
ID 36 Ways of Knowing
ID 38 Crucial Issues

B. Interdisciplinary, Departmental, and Divisional Values Courses

Here is our major curricular thrust, where we expect to adopt twenty-six new courses in all departments, plus the revision of numerous other courses. Subject matter will range from Ecological Ethics, Musical Aesthetics, Values in Contemporary Theatre, and Medical Ethics to the Philosophy of Sport, Law and Morality, The Starving Third World, and Freedom and Responsibility.

C. The Values Perspective on a Major

A new values focus, in which the student supplements studies in the major with at least four related values courses.

D. The Values Semester

A living-learning situation in which about fifteen students pursue common values courses for a semester and participate in a seminar focused on their shared experiences.

E. The Values-Focused Interim

A new plan whereby from ten to twenty courses in each January term will address themselves to a common value-laden topic, supplemented by convocations and a concluding sysposium with guest lecturers. Proposed topics are: 1976: Defining the USA; 1977: Growth vs Non-Growth; 1978; Aging and Death; 1979: Technology and Values; 1980: Human Habitations — Space and Living.

F. *The Summer Workshops*

Six-week workshops for St. Olaf faculty, to enable them to teach about values more explicitly and competently. The proposed topics. 1975: Values and the Educational System; 1976: Individual Freedom and the Common Good; 1977: Art and Values, 1978. Language and Values; 1979: Scientific Method and Values.

G. *The All-Faculty Fall Seminars*

Three-day seminars for the faculty at the opening of each school year. The proposed topics: 1975: Values Implicit in Classroom Behavior; 1976: The Pursuit of Happiness; 1977: Sexism and Racism in Education; 1978: Success and Failure; 1979: Elitism in Education.

V. *Administration and Evaluation of the Curriculum*

The whole values curriculum and related extra-curricular activities will be supervised by the Values Institute, which will be composed of a Director, an executive assistant or secretary, the Values Committee (the Director, six faculty, three students), and the faculty who teach the Values Institute courses. In addition to its work in curricular development, the Values Institute Committee will screen applicants for faculty development funds, advise students in the Values Perspective on a Major, promote convocations, films, etc., provide special resources, edit a periodical, help enrich continuing education, and share ideas and resources with other institutions. It will be responsible to the Dean of the College, and will work through appropriate College committees.

St. Olaf has an Office of Educational Research, which has already evaluated one of the 1973-74 pilot values courses, and has just completed an extensive study of St. Olaf's experimental Paracollege. We have proposed a three-fold evaluation process for the values curriculum, plus the creation of a new testing instrument related to the goals of this program.

THE PRACTICAL PROBLEMS OF SURVIVAL

The discussion thus far has properly been concerned with issues concerning the basic purposes of college education. The present practical preoccupations of those concerned with the well-being of colleges has been criticized as being out of place in the order of priorities. Urgent practical problems do, however, exist and must be dealt with expeditiously and effectively. These concerns are treated secondly, because they have in part been the consequences of the failure to deal first with purposes. They are means which must be considered in relation to prees-tablished ends.

II. WHAT PERCENTAGES OF YOUTH ARE CAPABLE OF A HIGHER EDUCATION?

One immediate practical problem for many institutions is how to attract enough students to remain viable. The answers which colleges give to questions concerning human educability at the higher levels will, to some degree, determine whether they can attract a sufficient clientele. As colleges shift their purposes toward an education more relevant to the activities of life common to all regardless of their occupation or special intellectual interests and place a less exclusive emphasis on instruction primarily preparatory for an academic career, they should be able to accept students with a broader range of latent abilities. If they provide effective teaching adjusted to the needs of the individual student, these colleges will not be lowering the level of intellectual performance of their clientele, they will be raising it on the average and at the same time enhancing their contribution to society at large. If, while lowering the standards of admission, students are given the individual attention and time they need to develop their intellectual capacities to the fullest, the results can be beneficial to the individual and society. The research done by Benjamin Bloom, James H Block, and some of their associates shows conclusively that students below the top levels of achievement on scholastic aptitude test scores, when taught properly and given adequate time to learn, can rise to high levels of academic achievement. The research of Bloom and his associates leads them to conclude that.

> *The use of aptitude tests for predictive purposes and the high correlations between such tests and achievement criteria have led many of us to the view that high levels of achievement are possible only for the most able students. From this, it is an easy step to some notion of a causal connection between aptitude and achievement. The simplest notion of causality is that the students with high levels of aptitude can learn the complex ideas of the subject while the students with low levels of aptitude can learn only the simplest ideas of the subject.*
>
> *Quite in contrast to this is Carroll's (1963) view that aptitude is the amount of time required by the learner tc attain mastery of a learning task. Implicit in this formulation is the assumption that, given enough time, all students can conceivably attain mastery of a learning task. If Carroll is right, then learning mastery is theoretically available to all, if we can find the means for helping each student. . . .*
>
> *We are convinced that the grade of A as an index of mastery of a subject can, under appropriate conditions, be achieved by up to 95 percent of the students in a class. . . .*
>
> *We believe that if every student had a very good tutor, most of them would be able to learn a particular subject to a high degree.*[5]

The growing dissatisfaction among reputable scholars in psychology and the other social sciences with the meaning of the Intelligent Quotent provides additional support for those who believe that young people with rather modest academic abilities as measured by culturally biased instruments can profitably be accommodated in colleges and universities. The recent CBS television program entitled, "The I.Q. Myth," so expertly done by Dan Rather, reveals the inequitable misuse of I.Q. scores in placing students in the academic scale and predestining many to lives of much lower accomplishment and self-realization than they would be capable of achieving. The unbiased observer of the accumulated evidence must come to the conclusion that colleges can admit students with much lower accomplishment levels as measured by conventional tests with assurance that they could succeed academically if given sufficient time and individualized attention. Large institutions with other dominant teaching and research interests, especially if their financial support from legislative bodies is calculated on a per capita basis may not be able or willing to provide the essential personalized treatment. The liberal arts colleges with the vision and the will are ideally equipped to do so.

A summary of research in a wide variety of human endeavor conducted at the American Testing Bureau in Iowa City also reveals that the relationship between grades and ultimate achievement in a wide variety of occupations is arrestingly low. After reviewing forty-six studies in business, teaching, engineering, medcine, scientific research, miscellaneous occupations, studies of eminence, and nonvocational accomplishments, Hoyt concluded that: *"Present evidence strongly suggests that college grades bear little or no relationship to any measures of adult accomplishment."*[26]

Anyone attempting to reexamine the services of American higher education in relation to the requirements of American society should approach this task by acquainting himself also with the pivotal inquiries of another one-time member of the American College Testing Staff, John L. Holland. His studies analyze the relationship betwen the abilities, interests, and previous activities of high school graduates and their success in college and in after life. The most striking findings in these studies is the inadequacy of admissions criteria limited solely to such academic qualifications as high school grades and entrance examinations. Holland and some of his collaborators found rather low intercorrelations between conventional measures of scholastic accomplishments and nonacamedic traits and activities. The results of these studies of human qualities indicate that scholastic aptitude test scores and high school grades *alone* leave unexposed a wide range of qualities of mind and personality which in fact bear significantly on later achievement. Hence, the application of limited academic criteria in the admissions process results in the rejection of many applicants who could predictably succeed in both a narrow range of scholastic exercises, and also in other life activities of equal social value.

Holland summarizes the significance of his research as follows:

> *. . . The results imply a need for a broader, or different, definition of both the nature of human talent and the nature of higher education. There are many kinds of human accomplishments, and each kind is likely to benefit from some type of higher education, although not necessarily a highly academic type. In other words, our results imply a need for a wide variety of colleges, many, if not most of them relatively unselective except on dimensions clearly relevant to their particular emphasis. Measures of academic and nonacademic accomplishment would then be used in selecting students for a single college.*[5]

A related but less controlled analysis[6] of the academic records of highly distinguished graduates of independent liberal arts colleges showed that though on the average they had above average records, many who had gained positions of high responsibility and leadership in all walks of life — science, government, medicine, academic life, the theater, and the church — were students with only average earlier records of achievement. The findings in none of these studies suggest that ability and diligence do not count either in college or in after life. They do indicate that with stimulating teaching, individual attention, and increased motivation, many youth now denied admission to college could graduate and sometimes with distinction.

Those colleges dedicated to the objective of enhancing their social value as well as assuring their continued existence, if they give proper weight to the practical implications of these findings, will reexamine their selection policies. As they reexamine these policies and the practices which stem from them, colleges will doubtless be led to conclude that they can accept freshmen who differ considerably from those admitted or rejected under the more restrictive and discriminating policies of recent years. Social justice and need justify a revision of these elitist policies.

THE POOL OF SUPERIOR STUDENTS IS NOT LARGE ENOUGH

Many colleges will also find this research useful in helping to solve their fiscal problems by increasing income from student fees. The fact is that during the years since the end of World War II elitist admission standards combined with rising fees have jeopardized the existence of many colleges. Humphrey Doermann, once a member of the admission staff at Harvard, several years ago examined the probable available pool of students in the years ahead. He classified the members of this pool of young people in terms of their previous academic records and scores on college entrance examinations. He then compared the resulting figures with the standards for admission among various types of colleges and universities.

Adding these data to others related to the students' ability to pay the rising costs of higher education, Doermann came to the irrefutable conclusion that there will not be enough students able to meet the academic requirements and expenses to sustain many of the colleges that now impose high admission standards. He concluded that the only way many colleges seeking additional enrollment may succeed in these efforts would be by opening their doors to students of a broader range of personal traits and abilities, and by offering increased amounts of student financial aid. As Doermann says:

> *The most worrisome find [in his study] is that the size of the national college-candidate pool which one might define as bright enough to do good work at selective-admission colleges and prosperous enough to pay their tuition and other costs (without additional financial aid) is much smaller than is generally imagined. The aptitude test score patterns for many colleges have risen much more rapidly than the supply of high-testing students.*
>
> *The effect of these latter trends in many of the most academically-demanding colleges has been to cutback the effective size of the potential candidate pool of non-scholarship students, as these colleges define that pool through their fee schedules and admission requirements. Meanwhile by competing successfully for students within this unexpectedly small portion of the market, these highly competitive colleges have had an increasingly severe effect — more than they imagined — upon the ability of the less competitive colleges to enroll relatively able and relatively prosperous students. These developments, in turn, mean that in many colleges, both financial plans and hopes for academic improvement face a more difficult future than these colleges have imagined.*[5]

These conclusions about the impact of a shrinking pool of students available under present admission standards on enrollments are incontestable. The observation that "hopes for academic improvement" may be difficult to realize needs careful examination. If it is assumed that academic improvement means a revision and broadening of the goals of higher education, many students who are now debarred from college, excluded after admission, or drop out because of discouragement and disillusionment, will be capable of earning degrees and of making highly significant contributions to society. In the light of recent knowledge, less rigidly narrow admissions policies can be inaugurated with the support of scholars of unassailable position, hence, the reputations of the colleges which attempt to serve a broader clientele may be enhanced rather than damaged. In any event, with the exception of a few select institutions with national drawing power, those who retain their excessively high barriers to admission may find themselves with such a small student body that they can no longer remain economically viable.

III. COLLEGE SIZE AND ECONOMIC VIABILITY

What a fiscally viable and educationally defensible student body is, remains an unresolved question. There are obvious advantages in the broad range of course offerings, professional programs, and research facilities that attract large numbers of students to large universities. The small college, on the other hand, can offer opportunities for close student-faculty relations, individual attention to background preparation and speed of learning, and easier access to student activities — especially to positions of leadership. The paucity of accurate devices for measuring changes in values, character, and personality traits resulting from different educational characteristics and lifestyles on campuses of various sizes makes comparisons of some of the most important outcomes of education difficult, if not impossible. Common sense suggests, however, that if the smaller institution determines to utilize to the fullest its intimate sense of community, it can have a more significant influence on the whole composite of human abilities, traits, and attitudes than the larger. Where the dividing line with regard to small and large falls, however, remains very hard to determine in respect to educational outcomes. Some very useful instruments have been devised for determining the impact of the total institutional life on students, as for example, the scale prepared by C. Robert Pace known as CUES. As institutions enter upon revisions of policies and programs designed to prepare students to come to grips with value problems, new instruments will have to be designed to assess institutional success in this area.

In the matter of economic health and survival probabilities, however, the evidence strongly suggests that an institution with fewer than a thousand students will be heading into serious financial problems. Some colleges with fewer than a thousand students have survived and provided high quality education, but they have had resources not generally available such as large income from endowment, considerable resources for student aid, or an economically selected clientele able to pay whatever charges may be necessary to keep the budget in balance. The other colleges which do not consistently draw at least a thousand full-time students will have to make every effort to do so. The attitudes of students today as they search for greater understanding of themselves and the conditions of contemporary life suggest that those institutions which try to assist students in this quest will attract a larger and steadier clientele.

IV. HOW MANY AND WHAT KIND OF COURSES ARE NEEDED?

Another step toward economic health which colleges can take relates to their curricular offerings. Reorientation of purpose toward coming to grips with overriding social problems and a renewed concern for the general education of the student rather than an attempt to anticipate the instruction of the graduate and profession-

al schools would make possible a long needed reconstruction of the curriculum. With education in the liberal arts and sciences reestablished as of worth in itself, undergraduate institutions could drop many advanced specialized courses which cater primarily to the interests of teachers rather than students. The time of faculty members thus released could profitably be used in the improvement of the more basic courses which should constitute the indispensable elements in a genuine liberal education and the essential prerequisites to the examined life.

With notable exceptions, colleges offer much more instruction than is needed for a liberal arts education. The relationship between the number of different courses taught and the number of students enrolled is not close. A decade ago, the author analyzed the curricular offerings of a number of liberal arts colleges of comparable national reputation. The results revealed that in the number of credit hours of instruction offered they varied from 1278 to 2131 — a difference of 853 hours. Since a course typically carried three semester hours' credit, these figures mean that one college offered 284 more courses (not sections) than another. More significantly, two colleges with almost identical enrollments varied widely in the range of their offerings. One with 785 students apparently believed that it could provide an adequate undergraduate education with only 1278 hours, while a college with only fifty-nine more students believed it had to schedule 2039 credit hours, 761 hours or—at least three semester hours per course—254 more courses than its sister institution. It is not surprising that the average class size in the college with the richer curricular menu was fifteen compared to the college with the leanest offering where the average class enrolled twenty-four students. The economic implications of these figures are obvious — the unit cost of instruction and therefore the cost of operation were indefensibly larger in the college with the extensive range of offerings.

Viewing these and other facts related to the needless expansion of the instructional offerings in colleges of arts and sciences over a decade ago, the author expressed the following opinion concerning the long-range deleterious results of this practice:

> *Severe financial problems related to the curriculum already exist in the independent liberal arts colleges. Indeed, their status in the structure of higher education and in the whole of American society now rests in the balance. The outcome will be determined very largely by the willingness of faculty members to view the entire life of the college objectively, including their own special interests. To the degree that they put the general welfare above departmental and personal considerations, the well-being of the liberal arts colleges will be maintained. If they do not do this, these institutions will languish as some have already begun to do. Moreover, if the crisis deepens without appropriate faculty action, the tradition of faculty control of the curriculum will necessarily*

be abrogated by those who have the legal and moral responsibility to preserve and advance the welfare of these colleges.[10]

Nevertheless, until the financial crises of the past several years, these institutions have generally extended their offerings. Because of an unprecedented inflow of additional students and other support, the consequences of these developments went unobserved, or more frequently were disregarded. Now the unhappy moment of truth has arrived. A more recent study of roughly comparable liberal arts colleges in Pennsylvania recorded similar wide variations in offerings and comparable variations in costs of operation. The median number of all courses offered and the median of history courses offered were as follows: 379 courses overall and twenty-seven courses in history. But the high and low figures are more significant. One college offered 439 courses with forty-three in history, while the college at the bottom of the scale offered an aggregate of 269 courses with only eighteen in history. The extravagant offerings exceed the more frugal by sixty-six percent overall and in history the larger exceeded the smaller by 138 percent.

The reasons for these anomalous contrasts in curricular offerings are many. The dominant cause, however, is the compulsion in departments and especially among individuals with highly specialized intellectual interests to duplicate the instruction offered by the graduate schools in the universities. If, as has been suggested, the liberal arts colleges would concentrate their efforts and their resources in providing a broad, high quality undergraduate education preparing students to meet the problems of our day, and in offering only that basic specialized instruction essential for those wishing to enter a graduate or professional school, they could remain economically viable. The sad aspect of the present financial plight of many colleges is that their deficits stem from their providing services at the upper levels of scholarship which should never have been instituted and which are often inferior to the same instruction properly offered in graduate schools. Polykarp Kusch, a Nobel Prize winner in Physics, addressing a gathering of representatives of liberal arts colleges at Bowdoin College a few years ago, told them that they ought to do the things which they could do well: provide a broad liberal education for all students regardless of their major but not undertake to offer the advanced specialized instruction of graduate character. Kusch's status in science and the world of learning in general gives the following statement special significance.

I really do believe that an imperative need of our society is for liberally educated men. As a scientist I think it is an important enterprise to learn what can be learned about nature and to speculate what man may or can do with his present knowledge and the knowledge that looms on the horizon. As an amateur humanist I assert that thought about what man ought to do, where the definition of ought depends on a view of man's purpose and destiny, is quite as important. A gradu-

ate program, as this is currently understood, emphasizes the role of the specialist, in my case, the scientist. I cannot but believe that this emphasis colors the entire institution in which a strong graduate program exists. The undergraduate program should serve to educate a student in a very broad way and, at its best, should be a great civilizing and humanizing experience. I really do think that the traditional liberal arts colleges do have the opportunity of offering a liberal arts education at its best. That is their opportunity—their task. My own view is that these colleges should do their utmost to perform that task superlatively well. A multifaceted culture needs many varieties of education. If we need an increasing number of scientists, we also need a much increased body of men and women who see science in the context of the totality of human experience, knowledge, and aspiration. I do not think that the liberal arts colleges have, on the whole, been particularly imaginative about ways of giving an undergraduate education. They should, I think, use the kind of creative energy of which they are clearly capable in giving new vitality and meaning to a liberal arts education."

Perhaps the most significant part of this statement is that referring to the failure of the liberal arts colleges in imaginatively devising "ways of giving an undergraduate education." Among the faculties of liberal arts colleges, the intellectual resources and the creative energy required to perform the momentous task of reform exists in abundance. It is of the greatest national importance that these resources and these energies be put to immediate and effective use.

V. LOBBYING FOR PUBLIC SUPPORT

Thus far the discussion has been concentrated largely on internal academic matters: the purposes of liberal education, the kinds of students who can profit from such instruction, the necessity to raise and sustain enrollments at economically viable levels, and the types and range of courses required to provide both the essential breadth and specialized concentration essential to a creditable liberal arts college. The changes in policy and practice proposed have been motivated by a desire to preserve in these institutions educational standards of high quality while at the same time making maximum use of their potentially available financial resources.

Even if colleges of liberal arts accept the proposed modifications of internal policies and practice and even if they exert every possible effort to increase their income from all private sources in addition to student fees: such as endowment, personal and corporate gifts, and alumni giving many will still fall short of the financial resources they will need to survive as reputable institutions of learning. The only other major source of additional support is the public treasury.

Many institutions, especially members of the boards of trustees, have firmly resisted any proposal that public funds be solicited either in the form of grants directly to the institution or indirectly through financial aid to prospective students. A few colleges have declared unmistakably that they will accept no such assistance. The private branch of the academic establishment has over the years opposed federal and state aid for several reasons. Many trustees drawn from the highest levels of the business community and stoutly committed to the free enterprise system have contended that it is wrong in principle to undermine it by asking governments to provide support which individuals and corporations ought to supply themselves. They genuinely fear the steadily growing involvement of the government in all phases of American life, not only because of constantly swelling public taxes and the public debt, but because of the consequent devitalization of personal initiative and responsibility.

For another reason, others, particularly those inside the academic profession, are apprehensive about government aid to private colleges and universities. They believe that regardless of any declarations to the contrary in the enabling legislation and any watchfulness on the part of the recipients and citizens generally control of academic policies and the freedom essential to true teaching and learning will irresistably follow public grants into private institutions. There is evidence, especially since World War II, that even in the absence of willful and arbitrary interference on the part of officers of government the sheer weight of government support of certain types of higher education—the natural sciences, for example—has disturbed the equitable equilibrium among academic disciplines with the result that the purposes and the direction of the total educational effort have been distorted if not subverted.

The third, and to the author the greatest danger in government aid, springs from less culpable and yet perhaps more insidiously destructive foces. It is necessary only to reiterate at this point what has already been said about the demise of diversity in the academic establishment and to point to the sameness in foreign university systems largely supported and controlled by officials of the government. In England, a group of top-ranking professors from the world-renowned British universities—Oxford, Cambridge, London, for example—have undertaken to establish a new university at Buckingham which will accept no funds from the government. Instead it will attempt to support its activities of research and teaching exclusively from fees and private donations as has been the custom in the United States since the beginning. The Britishers concerned have taken this step to free Buckingham from the interference of government, not only in the crucial matter of academic freedom, but from the distortions and misdirections which they believe have accompanied large reliance on government support.

All these negative arguments, and others too, are too involved to be fully discussed and appraised within the scope of this paper. There is an ample and still growing literature on the subject with which those in the colleges who must make the decisions on the question of seeking or accepting government aid ought to be fully informed.

The author himself after years of mulling over the pros and cons has come to the conclusion that only by accepting, and indeed sedulously seeking, financial support from the state and federal governments will a number of private liberal arts colleges be able to remain alive and healthy. Hence, both financial prudence and civic equity seem to dictate that substantial public financial aid be provided to the private educational enterprise directly and indirectly through tuition grants and long-term, low-interest-bearing loans to students. A number of states have already enacted such grant-in-aid programs, but the appropriations are not as yet adequate.

For three reasons it is in the public interest to provide ample financial assistance:

1. Government assistance is the only remaining visible device to preserve our dual system of higher education. The special contributions of the private sector to American society needs no further documentation. They are obvious to any unbiased observer. As one long-time president of a Midwest state university observed some years ago, even the public institutions would be adversely affected by the disappearance of the private colleges and universities.

2. Without public help, paradoxically, the religious influence in higher education will be minimized because some of the colleges with a religious commitment are in the gravest danger. One of the arresting developmets of our time is the widespread establishment and rapid growth of courses in religion in the state universities. One of the anomalies of our constitutional system is the denial of public aid to colleges with even the remotest relation to a church and with no evidences of indoctrination or proselytization while so-called secular departments of religion now flourish with the support of tax dollars.

3. Most importantly, to spend millions in state funds to increase the facilities and offerings in public institutions while the same resources stand idle in their private counterparts is an uneconomical and an unwise public policy. Now that the squeeze is on the public purse, citizens generally ought to be made aware of the folly of duplicating facilities and services which already exist. State educational authorities, legislative bodies, and the courts would do well to recognize this hard fact of life and take advantage of the vast reservoir of facilities and services of high quality already available in the private sector of higher education. Lawmakers will embrace the facilities and the services of

the latter in the total system of higher education more rapidly, however, if all those interested in the institutions hitherto sustained exclusively by private funds will join their efforts in promoting legislation in the state and national capitals designed to aid the private institutions.

Constitutents of the hitherto privately supported colleges and universities in some states have been markedly successful in persuading legislatures to enact bills that provide financial support directly to insitutions or indirectly to them through grants to their students. In Texas, county organizations were formed to this end composed of trustees, alumni, and students supported by college administrators and factulty members. In the state of Florida a similar organization of trustees and administartors was equally effective. Without such political support on a broad scale counterforces in education and among citizens at large can effectively block such legislation. Lobbying may be considered beneath the dignity of some friends of the independent liberal arts college, but they should recognize that the truthful presentation of the case of such institutions before legislative bodies is quite in keeping with the proper exercise of responsible citizenship.

Normally, the subject of government support of private colleges would have deserved and would have received fuller treatment than it does here. Fortunately, however, a comprehensive discussion of all aspects of this subject has only within the past several months been reported by a task force of the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities.[12] Those interested in learning about the need for and the means of obtaining federal and state aid for private higher education will find a mine of useful information in this well-reasoned document. All that can be added here is one person's view that only through the informed and public-spirited efforts of the adherents of the private liberal arts college can the needed public support be obtained. There is no time to waste and anyone who throws his loyalty and his support into so-called lobbying activities for these ends can feel that he is acting in the highest public interest.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary it can be agreed that the private liberal arts colleges as a group are existing in a social climate different from that of recent years. The enormous sums of money which both public bodies and private donors have provided in ever increasing annual amounts will for a period of years at best approach a steady state. The past decade has witnessed a growing concern among students about the character and quality of their higher education The members of this generation appear to be more interested in getting an education than a degree. The supporting public has become more concerned about how institutions spend the money they receive from taxes, fees, and gifts. Unlike earlier periods in our nation's history, institutions of higher education are not being

afflicted with a wave of irrational anti-intellectualism. To the contrary, in controversial fields like economics, sociology, psychology, and political science thoughtful citizens generally are looking to the scholars in these fields to lead them out of the trackless social wilderness in which they now find themselves.

To reestablish a sense of direction in our private and public lives will, however, require something more than the vast quantities of knowledge assembled over recent decades through the unrelated research activities of scholars. It will require the integration of the facts and theories in a variety of disciplines that bear on the problems the human enterprise now faces. It will require bringing together again the varied elements of which the complex world is composed which have necessarily been separated so they could be systematically studied and analyzed. This synthesis or reintegration of the substance of learning is necessary if those who have had the opportunity for advanced education are to make valid decisions on alternatives in public policy and private life. More importantly, these decisions must be illuminated by value considerations related to the nature and destiny of man. The difference between being well-informed in the facts and theories of economics and making decisions involving the knowledge in that field but undergirded by philosophical commitments is clearly brought out by Walter Heller, former economic adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, when he says that:

> *What the public perceives as a clash of economic concepts and findings is in fact a clash of human goals and ideals . . . . Outsiders can be excused for slipping into the fallacy of association, of attributing economists' differences of opinion to our unresolved analytical conflicts rather than to divergent evaluations of social priorities and competing philosophies of government. The economist owes it to the public to identify which is which — which of his conclusions and recommendations came from his head and which from his heart.*[37]

Any academician worthy of his salt, especially in the fields of social science and the humanities, will not fail to educe from his scholarly findings the alternative human courses of action which remain open to the thoughtful citizen especially after he has acquired the relevant knowledge that bears on the problem at hand. For the teachers in the undergraduate liberal arts college, this extension of his professional responsibilities beyond the normal bounds of research and the advanced specialized instruction of the professional schools is a moral obligation.

The external activities designed to improve the lot of the colleges through more vigorous recruiting efforts, through intensified campaigns for additional financial support, through more sophisticated marketing techniques, and the internal efforts to improve operational and management efficiency will help the liberal arts colleges to survive. Innovations in the substance and the process

of education will also make these institutions more attractive to students and prospective benefactors. The key to survival and continued well-being, however, lies not in tinkering with established policy and practice but rather in basic reform of the purposes and services of liberal education. Only by maintaining their individual distinctiveness within the framework of their common social goals will they be able to survive in the inevitably intensified competition of the years ahead. It is essential to the well-being of the people and the welfare of our nation that the liberal arts colleges assume these fateful responsibilities. It is also the moral obligation of all citizens to give unreserved and unwavering support to those colleges which do so.

REFERENCES AND COMMENT

[1]"Private Colleges That Have Closed, Merged, or 'Gone Public' in the '70's," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 8, No. 39 (1974), 5.

[2]*Uniform Crime Reports for the United States,* Department of Justice; Federal Bureau of Investigation (1973 ed.; U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974), p. 1.

[3]Jerry I. Reitman and Jon S. Greene, eds., *Standard Education Almanac* (Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, 1973-74), p. 9.

[4]W. Vance Grant and C. George Lind, *Digest of Educational Statistics,* U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1974 ed.; U. S. Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 23.

[5]A notable exception worthy of widespread imitation was the Invitational Conference of the Educational Testing Service on November 2, 1974. The proceedings of this meeting published under the title, *Moral Development,* contain penetrating articles by some of the best minds in the profession which ought to be read by faculties and administrators throughout the country.

[6]C. Robert Pace, *The Demise of Diversity? A Comparative Profile of Eight Types of Institutions* (Berkeley: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1974).

[7]Talcott Parsons, "The Strange Case of Academic Organization," *The Journal of Higher Education,* 42, No. 6 (1971), 489.

[8]Walter Lippmann, "The University," *The New Republic,* 154, No. 22 (1966), 17.

[9]Renè Dubos, *Beast or Angel?* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974), pp. 203-4.

[10]Frederic Lilge, *The Abuse of Learning* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), pp. 82-3.

[11]Abraham H. Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature* (New York: The Viking Press, 1971).

[12]Rene Dubos, *Reason Awake; Science for Man* (New York; Columbia University Press, 1970), pp. 69-70.

[13]Abraham H. Maslow, "Peak Experiences in Education and Art," *The Humanist,* 30, No. 5 (1970), 29-30.

[14]Abraham H. Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature,* pp. 169, 178-79.

[15]Geoffrey Vickers, *Freedom in a Rocking Boat: Changing Values in an Unstable Society* (London: Penguin Press, 1970), pp. 111-12.

[16]Viktor Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), p. xii.

[17]Abraham Kaplan, "The Travesty of the Philosophers," *Change,* 2, No. 1 (1970), 12-3.

[18]William A. Arrowsmith, "The Future of Teaching" (keynote address at the meeting of the American Council on Education, New Orleans, Louisiana, October 13, 1966).

[19]Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales,* trans. by Richard M. Gummere, II (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 355.

[20]Milton Rokeach, *The Nature of Human Values* (New York: The Free Press, 1973), p. 5.

[21]Milton Rokeach, *The Nature of Human Values*, p. 28.

[22]Mark DeWolfe Howe, ed., *The Occasional Speeches of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press, 1962), pp. 6-7.

[23]Philip E. Jacob, *Changing Values in College* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1957), p. 6.

[24]The author did not have access to information at every educational institution in the United States where research in values might be in progress and does not claim that other exciting programs or concepts for dealing with the issue of values are nonexistent. If the reader knows of such endeavors, the author would welcome having them brought to his attention at the *Program in Liberal Studies*, University of Arizona 85721.

[25]Benjamin Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," *Evaluation Comment*, 1, No. 2 (1968).

[26]Donald P. Hoyt, *The Relationship Between College Grades and Adult Achievement* (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1968), p. 1.

[27]J. M. Richards, Jr., J. L. Holland, and S. W. Lutz, *Predictions of Student Accomplishment in College*, Research Report, No. 13 (Iowa City. American College Testing Program, 1966), pp. 353-54.

[28]Earl J. McGrath, "Profiles of Distinguished Alumni," *Liberal Education*, 57, No. 3 (1971), 337-43.

[29]Humphrey Doermann, "The Student Market for Private Colleges," *Crosscurrents in College Admission* (New York: Teachers College Press of Columbia University, 1970), pp. 292-93.

[30]Earl J. McGrath, *Memo to a College Faculty Member* (New York: Teachers College Press of Columbia University, 1961), p. vi.

[31]Polykarp Kusch, "Is Graduate Work in Small Colleges Realistic?" *The Development of Doctoral Programs by the Small Liberal Arts College: Proceedings of a Symposium at Bowdoin College, April 21-22, 1967* (Brunswick, Maine: Bowdoin College, 1967), pp. 22-3.

[32]*A National Policy for Private Higher Education: The Report of a Task Force of the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974).

[33]Walter W. Heller, "Why Can't Those Economists Ever Agree?" (St. Paul, Minnesota) *TWA Ambassador*, 8, No. 5 (1975), p. 14.

SUMMARY COMMENTS
CONTINUING CONFERENCE FOR THE LIBERAL ARTS
HILTON HEAD ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA
JUNE 22, 1975

EARL J. McGRATH
SENIOR ADVISOR FOR EDUCATION
LILLY ENDOWMENT, INC.

Before I comment on the results of the Conference, I want to express my own deep satisfaction and pleasure in being here. These days have been filled with intellectual excitement, pleasurable company, and comfortable living accommodations. Moreover, the results have been richly rewarding. Since I had little or nothing to do with the taxing efforts and the creative imagination which went into the planning and management of the conference, it is not inappropriate for me to say that the staff members of the Endowment deserve our unreserved gratitude. I'm sure you would want me to express for you our special thanks to that intellectual leader, that skillful and effective manager, that human power plant that seems to be fed by nuclear energy, that warm and unaffected companion, Jim Holderman, for whom my affection would be even greater if he didn't inflict me with such assignments as making summarizing comments at a conference which cannot be summarized. These meetings have been very largely the product of Dr. Holderman's creative imagination. The results already indicate that they will have a profound influence not only in the participating institutions, but in the larger company of American colleges and universities as well.

When I began to try to review and summarize the ideas that have been expressed here since last Wednesday, I experienced a sensation I had some time ago when examining the offerings in a college catalogue, I ran across one course entitled *The History of the World,* three semester hours. At least that teacher had access to the available relevant material, but no one at this meeting could have gathered together all the ideas, opinion, and factual information presented, because at many times various groups were meeting simultaneously. Hence, it would be impossible, even if not presumptuous, to try to identify the points of view on a consensus had been reached. That seems to me, however, not to depreciate the value of this conference. On the contrary, I should be concerned if we had attempted to reach agreement on such involved subjects as the nature of human values and the responsibility of institutions of higher education to cultivate such human traits in their patrons, or the responsibility of colleges to prescribe narrowly specific instruction as the proper preparation for immediate entry to a given vocation or for advanced professional training. If we had tried to come to these and other definitive conclusions at this and earlier conferences, I for one should be disturbed.

In the first place, no group in academic life, however high its academic status, is as yet qualified to reach lasting decisions on, career education and values, the two topics that have engaged the attention of the Lilly Endowment since it initiated the Continuing Conference. As far as the liberal arts college is concerned, the first, preparation for work, has been a subject of spirited and at time acrimonious debate for decades. The issues are on the way to clearer definition and resolution, and we hope and believe that the Continuing Conference has been of assistance in these efforts. The second, values, has for so long been a subject *disregarded* or *deliberately* rejected as a proper function of the profession that only a major effort will even restore the subject to the center of the academic forum.

The *more compelling* reason, however, for not attempting to reach *premature* agreement on policies and practices in these two areas of concern rests on broad principles of social policy. Here I speak only for myself. It is no less improper for foundations than for the government to impose a philosophy of education on independent institutions, or to do the same thing by organizing a group of itutions to achieve extra-murally predetermined ends. In these

days of economic stress, such subtle pressure might alter internal policies and practices, but it would violate the basic concepts on which our system of education has operated, and vitiate its proper functions.

Secondly, even if not improper it would be self-defeating. The vitality of an educational institution depends on creative imagination, the capacity for continuous self-renewal, and the unrestricted play of ideas in the institution's policy making processes. The general education movement, in which I was a vigorous participant several decades ago, aborted in large part because foundations, other external bodies, and over-zealous or dictatorial administrators attempted to make changes in curricular content and teaching procedures for which neither faculties nor students were ready. In brief, the time was not ripe. Today, the evidence is available on all sides that the consumers, the general public and students, as well as a growing company of academics eagerly want colleges and universities to be more intensively concerned with values and career education than they have been in recent times. A simple announcement in *Harpers* magazine that the Rockefeller Foundation had held a meeting of a dozen educators on the subject of American values and had produced a brief report on the subject brought forty-seven thousand unsolicited requests for a copy of the document. A propitious time has come to deal with these matters. But as far as the institutions of higher education are concerned, no lasting reforms will be accomplished by pressure from outside without the full cooperation of the members of the academy.

I have taken what some may feel is an inordinate amount of time to deal with the major purposes of these conferences because some have expressed the opinion that the conferees at these meetings, if not the Lilly staff itself, ought to give more definitive answers to questions which at present are not being answered within the institutions themselves. Such activity would not only be improper, it would be fruitless. In my view, foundations have the responsibility to identify the urgent problems of the day, assemble persons who appear to be well qualified to illuminate them and suggest solutions, set the stage for appropriate action, sometimes supply the props, and then let the director, actors, and the local personnel put on the production. Hopefully, exciting themes, plots, and productions, will eventuate some of which will be worthy of transfer to other campuses.

Nevertheless, in spite of our unwillingness to expound a doctrine or advocate specific action, this meeting in my judgment has achieved some very substantial results. I want briefly to express some impressions — not firm conclusions, with respect to what has happened over the past few days. From the opening address, by the Honorable Edith Green, through the other general sessions, in the smaller group discussions, in the simulation exercises, and most importantly in the casual but concerned conversations in the halls, on the beach, and in the dining room, discussions of the topics of the meeting have been vigorous, serious, and from my personal observation, rewarding. It seems to me that these goals have been achieved:

1. We have made progress in defining the variously used term "values" and considered ways in which values can be treated in the classroom and in institutional life generally. It is no indication of failure that we have not completely resolved the conceptual and practical differences among informed professionals, who, as Rokeach clearly shows, may for a time slow the tempo of developments in this field. Only prolonged dialogue on the subject will identify the means which individual institutions can use in dealing with the complex problem of revising the goals, contents, and practices of education related to values.

2. We have demonstrated that a satisfactory resolution of many of the major current problems related to values education and career preparation will require the combined and dedicated efforts of all groups of persons involved in the academic establishment — trustees, administrators, faculty, students — and I suspect, alumni and other educational consumers. When Jim Holderman and I put up our feet on the porch railing at French Lick in June, 1973, and began to explore the advantages of a Continuing Conference we had some ideas that experience may have caused us to modify. However, the experiences in these meetings have proved beyond any question the validity of the concept of the broad participation of the various foregoing groups. To be specific, I for one, feel that the generation of students that began to come in the early seventies (represented here) unlike their predecessors of the sixties has calmly, rationally, and sincerely raised perceptive questions rather than giving undebatable answers about the character and quality of their education. The one section which I chaired and the general discussions on Friday and Saturday confirmed this view.
3. As valuable as these conferences are, and we expect will continue to be, fundamental changes in policy, practice, and programs will occur in your institutions, and we hope elsewhere, only if the kind of dialogue we have engaged in here continued indefinitely on and among the campuses. Moreover, getting anything significant done on these major problems locally will not be accomplished under what we used to call in the Navy, *Temporary Additional Duty*. I reaffirm that all members of the academic community will have to be involved. For periods of several months at a time a few will have to spend most of their time and energy in prolonged discussions, research, and planning. It would be my hope, therefore, that outside money could be used in considerable part to free a corps of willing persons from their regular duties so that by diligent leg work and head work their efforts could be concentrated on these responsibilities instead of their regular classroom assignments.
4. The discussions suggest to me that many of you and your colleagues elsewhere would welcome two kinds of assistance. Everyone who recognizes the ambiguity of the various meanings attached to the term values would like to lay their hands on books, articles, faculty reports, and other forms of literature illuminating this complex subject. Since I taught psychology and assisted in philosophy for some years, I thought I knew the type and range of material available and that it was relatively limited. A search during the past few months proved I was wrong on both counts. There is an inexhaustible mine of reading material. Moreover it is sometimes remotely related and fugitive, and in spite of imposing titles it is sometimes of lower quality than Aristotle's, Spinoza's and Kant's treatises on Ethics. Accordingly, under a grant from the Lilly Endowment, at the University of Arizona, Richard Neese and I are attempting to review over a thousand items with the purpose of issuing a critically selected bibliography of a hundred items or so. This list should be available soon after the college year begins.

Second, one of the major purposes of these conferences is to accelerate the exchange of ideas and practical experiences. You who have read by modest monograph (and that statement represents no false modesty) will have observed that it included descriptions of two college programs emphasizing value considerations. These were selected not only because of their intrinsic merits, but because they seemed to be undergirded by a thoughtful, unreserved commitment and involvement of the entire faculty, or at least as large a percentage of it as one can realistically expect. A few other programs could have been chosen, but if the responses (below 50 percent) of a letter to 150 statistically selected institutions requesting information about their related efforts are any indication, the order of

the day as far as values are concerned is business as usual. Some correspondents seemed mystified by the questions. Perhaps we made two mistakes. We sent the letters to administrators rather than faculty members and the letterhead bore the name of the University of Arizona rather than the Lilly Endowment. In any event, we are pursuing the search and expect within the next six months to put together and make generally available a volume recapitulating what is being done in this field around the country. Those who are interested in these brief descriptions can then solicit fuller information directly from the institution concerned. We seek your help in identifying any projects of this type that come to your attention.

In spite of the confusion and disarray in the enterprise of higher education today, which only reflect the circumambient social conditions, and in spite of my acknowledged perils in prediction, I consider the present questionings and doubts inside and outside the profession to be the harbingers of basic educational reforms that will improve the quality of American life beginning especially for those now in the student age group. There have been only a few genuinely revolutionary changes in American higher education since the founding of Harvard in 1636. The first occurred in the middle of the 19th century when the rigid, universally accepted classical curriculum began to break up and finally virtually disappeared. A second eventuated in the years following 1862 when President Lincoln signed the Land-Grant Act democratizing the opportunity for higher education and accelerating the introduction of new kinds of instruction. And third, the so-called G.I. Bill of Rights following World War II not only economically opened the doors of colleges and universities to millions of service men and women, but also established the habit of college-going among families and classes who in an earlier day never even considered advanced education as a possibility.

We are now in the initial stages of such a period of fundamental change. In this connection, I will not risk specific predictions, but rather express a credo. I believe that what someone has called "the knowledge industry" will skirt its main efforts from a producer of intellectual goods to an agency serving the enduring needs of a humane culture. I *do not* believe that research and technology and the dissemination of specialized knowledge will, should, or could be halted. I *do* believe that a larger portion of our money, personnel, time and efforts in the academic enterprise will be devoted to the improvement of the quality of life through a better understanding and fuller satisfaction of the individual's and society's needs. I believe that the enterprise of education will, therefore, be more concerned as Plato was with the ultimate character of the *good* and the *just* life in the *good* and *just* society. I believe with Rene Dubos that the good life will not be found in more creature comforts and further technological conveniences, but rather in the reestablishment of a humane community in which human dignity, respect for our fellowmen, and compassionate concern for the welfare of all will prevail. I believe with Toynbee and Mumford that the destiny of humanity is in the balance, as I believe with Walter Lippman that only the centers of higher learning can tip the scales in favor of survival under conditions which make survival worthwhile. This is the momentous task before us. It is an arresting responsibility: Micawber-like optimism or Cassandra-like pessimism will get us nowhere. Realistic optimism and dedication to a hard job may win the day for our culture, for us in education and gain the plaudits of a *grateful people*. At basis these are the important things I believe we have been talking about these past few days, and this is why I hope you will agree with me that this Lilly Conference has been singularly successful.