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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Our nation's concern for the education of her people has played a great role in what historians have penned "The American Experience."

In attempting to define this American Experience, Bernard Fay stated:

There is no dominant or constant method; no fixed goal except to live and become greater; no unvaried formula except never to stop, whether times are good or bad, but to keep on, to be aggressive, to forge ahead.¹

Henry Steele Commager commented that this experience had little sense of the past and was not historical minded. Commager explained that the American inclination to experiment was deeply ingrained, and in defining the American character stated: "Except in law, tradition and precedent discouraged him, and whatever was novel was a challenge."² Fay added that this experience will never be understood by those "seeking for strict logic in its activities."³ Clearly then, this American experience was not given to us from our European heritage, but was

moulded more by the developmental struggle within the new land. From this struggle grew a feeling of optimism and success.

Emerging from within this experience came a great concern for education. Initially, this American concern for education resulted in the preparation of only the learned gentleman. Later, as Commager explained, the American expected education to prepare for life. This meant, increasingly, educational preparation for jobs and professions. Since the colonial days, this concern for education has had a broad base of citizen involvement. William McClure saw the educated peoples maintaining their power over the common man by continuing a policy of the ignorant citizen. Horace Mann saw public education necessary more for social cohesiveness than for individual enlightenment or job preparation. For some, it appeared better that each man work out his self-understanding of America as a "free soul" such as Mark Twain's Huck Finn. Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau praised the free individual. Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner saw the need for family responsibility in the education of children. For Spencer and Sumner, the public schools existed only to help the child adjust to an established society. William T. Harris tempered their position, somewhat, by asking the schools to assume some of the family responsibility. Lester Ward, William James, G. Stanley Hall, and John Dewey desired that schools aid men in individual betterment and society's betterment of life. Dewey believed that history is man-made and men should entertain new ideas. It would appear from the previous discussion that America has always had a minority of

---

\(^{4}\text{Commager, The American Mind, p. 10.}\)
her influential citizens shaping her thinking.

Often, when individual interest wavered, public interest took charge. Certain national and local priorities demanded legislative action. Some of the resultant actions taken by the government, as listed below, reflect the concern of the citizens and their government for the education of the American people.

1785 - Ordinance of 1785 set aside land in the Northwest Territory for schools.

1787 - Ordinance of 1787.

1819 - Dartmouth College decision established inviolability of charters of private colleges.

1862 - Morrill Act.

1887 - Hatch Act.

1890 - Second Morrill Act.

1914 - Smith-Lever Act.

1917 - Smith-Hughes Act provided federal funds for vocational education.

1918 - Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

1931 - National Advisory Committee on Education recommended federal aid.

1933 - School Lunch Program.


1944 - G. I. Bill, with federal subsidies for veterans' education.

1950 - National Science Foundation.


1963 - Vocational Education Act.
1965 - Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
1966 - Permanent G. I. Bill.
1967 - Amendments added to and time extended for a number of federal acts, such as: National Defense Education, National Vocational Student Loan Insurance and Higher Education.
1968 - Bill extending Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
1972 - Higher Education Bill creates a major new program of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEG).

Evidencing the aforementioned definition of the American Experience, these government acts did not result from a national plan. In the practical sense, these government actions were in response to the needs of the people. They reflect the philosophy of both the individual leaders as well as the demands made by the American people.

Emerging from within this American Experience, the country slowly developed what is now known as the American educational system. Beginning with the elementary school and continuing through the junior high school and high school, the American public system of education is capped by the state university and/or land-grant university.

Although each of the above institutions has a particular philosophy of education, the land-grant college is unique, in that its existence is due to the passage of a federal act. This act, the Morrill Act of 1862, was in response to an emerging public philosophy of higher education for practicality.

The Morrill Act of 1862 provided land-grant colleges with regular financial support from the national treasury in an effort to provide a practical education for all citizens. It was a positive attempt to
fulfill a philosophy stated in the Constitution of Indiana in 1816 "wherein tuition shall be gratis, and equally open to all." The college level was the highest stage in an educational system beginning with the local elementary school. The entire system was to be a free and open educational ladder in the true Jacksonian sense. The Morrill Act had a clear and distinct purpose of providing a college education for the rural citizen and the industrial classes of the urban areas. Courses in scientific agriculture, engineering, homemaking, and commerce were to be part of the curriculum. Later, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 further defined the state administration of the land-grant college and provided that federal funds must be matched by an equal amount of state funds. The Act further provided for a vocational education program.

Initially, the use of federal funds was looked upon as a raid upon the national treasury. The National Education Association economists are now of the opinion that approximately half of the national economic growth may be accounted for by the development of human talent through the availability of these federal funds.

Perhaps at this point it is necessary to further define the land-grant college and its philosophy in relation to the other institutions of higher education. As stated previously, the land-grant college was to provide a practical education for both the urban and rural citizen. This philosophy was a direct break with that of the existing state and private colleges and universities. The existing private and public institutions of higher education were still under the influence of the English and German universities. The English influence was that of producing the cultured man—the gentleman. The German
university was interested in research and scholarship. The land-grant college in contrast would provide service to the community, the state, and the nation.

With the Ordinance of 1785 the United States took a positive step toward federal and state involvement in the educative process. Education was seemingly assured for the frontier citizen. Land was not only to be set aside for schools, but the sale of land could provide operating funds. This Ordinance, coupled with the Dartmouth College Decision of 1819 which established the existence and inviolability of private college charters, insured higher education of the citizen through the private sector or the public sector.

Originally, the private sector controlled higher education and thus permitted only a select few to attend the colleges and universities. The only avenue left open for the public sector was to create a parallel path in higher education with public control. This thrust toward a public controlled higher education program placed the newly formed state institutions in clear competition with the sectarian and denominational colleges. Competition for federal funds was intense. By the time of the Dartmouth Decision in 1819, there existed nine state universities, and by the time of the Morrill Act in 1862, there existed twelve more state universities. Between the years 1819 and 1862, the private sector continued to increase its number of colleges with the majority of these institutions being supported by the various religions established in America.

It is interesting to note that the developing state universities resembled the private colleges and universities in the organization of
the curriculum. Both these private and public institutions were preparing students for the older professions such as law, the ministry, and medicine. The land-grant colleges brought about the major changes in the curriculum by preparing students for scientific agriculture, engineering, homemaking, and the growing industry and commerce of the country. In order for the state to accept federal monies through the Morrill Act, the state had to maintain, at least, one college where the leading object would be to teach branches of learning related to agriculture and the mechanical arts. The curriculum would not exclude scientific and classical studies and the teaching of military tactics. The intent of the land-grant curriculum was to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the professions of life.

Initially, the land-grant colleges grew slowly because advancing technical and vocational education demanded adequate preparation in arts, languages, mathematics, and sciences. The land-grant colleges lacked the qualified teachers, and time was needed to prepare them. As the land-grant colleges grew in student population, diversified curricula were demanded. The result was the addition of other colleges to the campuses. Colleges of law, business, medicine, dentistry, and education found a place with those of engineering, agriculture, and the arts. Because of the added colleges many land-grant colleges were now known as land-grant universities and, except for the practical science curriculum, resembled the existing private and state universities. Also, the land-grant universities emphasized the point of view that their graduates enter the newer professions as designated by the Morrill Act.
Although the philosophy of the individual land-grant university appeared to portray a united front, this was not true. The University of Wisconsin and The Ohio State University are representative of the struggle with the land-grant idea. The internal disagreements within these universities in attempting to reach a sense of balance between the practical and the classical are interesting. In his presidential address of 1874, President Edward Orton of The Ohio State University viewed the new university as an institution emphasizing the preparation of the gentleman first and the practical man second. Less than twenty years later in his baccalaureate address, President Charles Kendall Adams of the University of Wisconsin saw the university as providing practical service to the state. President Adams brought to Wisconsin the experiences acquired at Cornell University. Cornell had been struggling with the utilitarian concept of the university since 1868. Although this philosophical debate was new to the land-grant university The University of the City of New York in 1832 became embroiled with a similar issue with Yale. The Yale Report of 1828 defended the intellectual culture development of the mind as more important than a practical education.

While the land-grant universities and the other institutions of higher learning were debating these philosophical positions and directing their energies toward four-year programs, the vocational institutes and two-year colleges made their presence known. Looked upon, in their infancy, as nothing more than an extension of the high school, the vocational institutes and two-year colleges have matured into autonomous institutions. These institutions developed a
curriculum in response to local needs. They provided opportunities for learning new skills, upgrading present skills, and offering courses in general education.

Industrial and agricultural demands of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century asked for skilled labor and new programs to meet the needs of the growing nation. The conflicts of interest between The National Association of Manufacturers, The American Federation of Labor, and the Grange made the Federal Committee on Education in 1908 deliberate their respective demands upon education. The eventual passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 and the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 satisfied each interest by creating federally supported vocational education. The resulting vocational-technical schools grew rapidly and fulfilled the needs of a growing America not filled by the land-grant universities and their extensions.

The emergent two-year community colleges and vocational-technical schools appeared to create, or simply allow, social stratification. Whereas the land-grant university was open to all social classes and provided a varied curriculum in its colleges, the community colleges and vocational-technical schools were limited in curriculum offerings and thus appealed only to a narrow or defined social class. In most cases the curriculum was practical and students attending were of the same social class and thus possessed a similar value system.

The land-grant university encouraged the attendance of students with varied backgrounds. The social interaction was a positive outcome of the diversified student body. In the true spirit of John Dewey, a sharing of experience was the outcome and perhaps a sort of social
cohesiveness and understanding began to grow. Does not democracy prevail if more and more interests are shared among the many groups of society? Should not freer interaction be encouraged? As John Dewey said:

The things which are socially most fundamental, that is, which have to do with experience in which the widest groups share, are the essentials. The things which represent the needs of specialized groups and technical pursuits are secondary.\(^5\)

A similar idea comes from Lawrence Cremin who explained:

A democracy cannot flourish where there is narrowly utilitarian education for one class and broadly liberal education for another. It demands a universal education in the problems of living together, one broadly humane in outlook, "calculated to enhance social insight and interest."\(^6\)

**Statement of Problem**

The problem is to examine historically the land-grant philosophy as it relates to the Morrill Act and as it continues to develop and emerge in response to the needs of the nation.

Specifically, the problem is to determine if this emergent philosophy can be clearly defined, and then if the land-grant institutions are fulfilling this educational philosophy as defined through the American Experience.

**Methodology**

The methodology used by the writer is an historical examination of the American educational philosophy. Using history as a tool, the


The writer intends to clarify and substantiate emerging patterns and trends within American educational philosophy in general and within higher education in particular.

The writer has developed this approach in three steps.

(1) Examine historically how the land-grant philosophy emerged as a part of the American Experience, and ultimately resulted in the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862.

(2) Examine historically how the land-grant philosophy was more clearly defined as the land-grant institution increased in number in response to the needs of the people.

(3) Examine the recent trends within higher education as they relate to the land-grant philosophy and the related institutions.

Since the past cannot be reproduced in toto and lived again, this writer will examine the history of the American Experience as written by representative historians. Trends of change were selected and the material is sequentially ordered according to the direction of change defining the trend which was selected. Because history is, in part, people, politics, economics, sociology, literature, philosophy, art, science, religion, psychology, and anthropology, this writer will attempt to weave them all together to examine the land-grant philosophy.

**Overview**

In answering the question as to the "why" and "how" of the land-grant philosophy and the shaping of this philosophy through the American Experience, the work of Jacques Barzun, R. Freeman Butts, Ellwood P. Cubberly, Harry G. Good, and Frederick Rudolph will be examined. Their writings will basically shape chapter II and chapter III.
Chapter II will discuss the emergence of the land-grant philosophy and the resultant Morrill Act of 1862 through the historical work of Merle Curti, Bernard Mehl, Maxine Greene, George E. Peterson, and Edgar Bruce Welsey.

Chapter III will examine the expansion and growth of higher education in America since the Morrill Act. Specifically, the land-grant philosophy will be examined as it was more clearly defined through the growth of the land-grant universities. Chapter III will be developed through the work of Lawrence R. Veysey, Lawrence Cremin, Edward A. Krug, Allan Nevins, and Clarence J. Karier.

Chapter IV will examine the land-grant philosophy within the emergence of the community college and the vocational-technical schools. Their resultant effect upon the land-grant universities and colleges will also be analyzed. A further analysis of the present trends in higher education will also be examined. Along with the aforementioned historians, this researcher will relate to the work of David Riesman, Christopher Jencks, Joseph Gusfield, Zelda Gamson, and Russell I. Thackrey as well as the research submitted by the Junior College Directory, Higher Education Directory, and the U. S. Office of Education.

This researcher will seek to identify tendencies, themes, and patterns emerging from observations of the American scene by these historians and yet be aware of a common error existing within historical interpretation. Paul Nash stated this quite clearly.

One must not read back, must not interpret the past in contemporary terms, must not see the forms of an imperfect past as unfolding inexorably into the more nearly perfect forms of today,
and must not use history for missionary or propagandist purposes.7

Chapter V will include the summary, discussion, conclusions, and implications of the study.

CHAPTER II

THE EMERGENCE OF THE LAND-GRA NT PHILOSOPHY

Through my examination of the land-grant idea, it became quite clear to me that a philosophical position did not result in the land-grant idea nor did the idea result from varied philosophical positions. It appears as though the idea was the result of the American Experience, the American temperament, and that the idea was quite radical in principle.

Although the European concept of the university with its philosophical assumptions existed in early America, the people in America were organizing their own university without benefit of philosophical theory.

Discontent with religious and private control of higher education was evident in many quarters during the late colonial period. This private influence was waning and the development of secular interests was on the rise. Cubberly explained:

After the coming of nationality, there gradually grew up a widespread dissatisfaction with the colleges as then conducted, because they were aristocratic in tendency, because they devoted themselves so exclusively to the needs of a class, and because they failed to answer the needs of the States in the matter of higher education.1

---

With the spread of liberal philosophy of the Revolutionary period, the conviction was voiced that national prosperity must come first.

The initial thrust toward the use of land as a basis for the national support of universities, although awareness of this thrust was not clear at the time, emerged from a government contract with some New England speculators. In 1787 these New Englanders, known as the Ohio Company, contracted with the federal government for a grant of land in the Midwest and used this land to encourage settlers to build permanent settlements. Their belief in education resulted in land being set aside for Ohio University in Athens, Ohio (1807) and Miami University in Oxford, Ohio (1809). Thus the conviction of national prosperity was supported by developing the Ohio country and using some of the land to further education. In less than sixty years, educators could look back to this federal contract as the precursor to the land-grant idea.

As late as 1828, the American school system was in private hands, that is, the aristocracy. Education was the concern of religious groups and this reflected the lingering influence of Puritanism. The Puritans established Harvard with an aristocratic philosophy of education. Their idea was that providence had chosen the select for a special task and, therefore, education for the elite was most important. Not only were the earliest schools controlled by the church and dominated by the religious motive, but the right of the church to dictate the teaching in the schools was clearly recognized by the state. The state even assisted by donating land and money. At the close of the Colonial period there were nine colleges in the colonies. These with...
their founding dates, the colony founding them, and the religious denomination they chiefly represented, were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Harvard College</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Puritan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Yale College</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Congregational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Academy and College</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Non-denominational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Kings College</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Reformed Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Congregational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A religious purpose had been dominant in the founding of each institution and basically this was to educate a learned and Godly body of ministers. These men were the select, the elite, those appointed to give direction and guidance to maintain the good and just existence, they also needed to protect the colony from false views that could corrupt the truth. With the use of the pulpit and the classroom, the assigned task seemed quite possible. Now that their society was well protected and guided, it was seemingly a simple matter to carry on the everyday task of work. Very Platonic in nature, the colony maintained a well structured social class system based upon one's defined work. Each member of the society performed an assigned task and no one meddled in the affairs of each other's task. Farmers farmed and rulers ruled. This was the just and the good society.

By the middle 1700's the theocratic state established by the Puritans to point the way for a civilized people to live morally and do one's appointed work was losing its power. The theocracy, with its established truths, could not cope with the material aspects of life nor

---

deal with the expansion of territory or population. Their frugal living basic to the Calvinist belief brought increased wealth and the desire for mobility. Perhaps the Puritans themselves planted the seeds of destruction by maintaining the deep conviction that the moral superiority of man could overcome all situations, not just those things that involve the soul but also those that involve man's material existence. The Puritan Ethic prevailed and it appears as though the people did not have to wait for Benjamin Franklin to spirit man into the material world, Cotton Mather was quite capable of it himself.

John Lukacs explained:

We must cultivate well projected inventions. That would put the World in much better circumstances than it is in. We try for Machines to render the Wind as well as the Water Serviceable to us; and extend our Empire into all the Elements! Extend our Empire into all the Elements! This was written not by Benjamin Franklin but by Cotton Mather in 1723. (Puritanism, proclaimed people from Mencken and Clarence Darrow to Professor Hofstadter, was supposed to have been antiscientific, anti-intellectual, anti-progressive.) The very opposite was true.3

The Puritans were concerned about their material existence and yet they used the church and school to explain God's way for a moral man. Man's useful work had to be the concern of men outside the church and school. Tradesmen, shipbuilders, farmers, merchants, doctors, lawyers, and bankers had to promote their useful sciences outside formal education.

As Bernard Mehl cited:

These had need of a different type of knowledge from that obtained by the leisured gentry. The gentry jealously guarded its culture; if it pursued anything mundane, it did so as an interesting sidelong and not for practical use. The gentry could afford to be detached, but not the new middle class.

---

The latter's learning had to be direct, useful, and prescriptive. One did not learn double-entry bookkeeping in Homer's Iliad or Virgil's Aeneid, nor could the Scriptures reveal the secrets of trigonometry needed by the surveyor.4

Prosperity in the colonies grew rapidly and the Yankee ingenuity capitalized on it. The moral attitudes of the Puritans persisted in New England long after its sustaining religious conviction was gone; however, the growing secularization of life, apparent in the seventeenth century and greatly furthered in the eighteenth by the rise of a new commercial class and occasional struggles with England, partly modified the Puritan character of the schools.

The age of enlightenment marked a departure from the Puritan authoritarianism with its emphasis upon reason rather than authority and made man master of his fate and the hope of the universe. This attitude of mind, which dominated British intellectual life in the late seventeenth century and, therefore, affected intellectual and influential America, did much to destroy the Calvinistic conception of man and the universe. The American began to perceive a greater future for himself and new spirit of inquiry made inroads in replacing religious arguments based upon acceptance and faith. Bernard Mehl explained that the rising middle class found power in its creation and its new freedom, now that the Puritan yoke had been removed and men such as Washington, Lee and Jefferson found much in common with Benjamin Franklin with his pragmatic and utilitarian concept of life.5 For the most part, the


5 Mehl, "Education in American History," Foundations of Education.
enlightenment was confined to a limited number of highly educated persons. This coupled with the aforementioned Yankee ingenuity of the masses resulted in the go-getting "tradesman's attitude" of measuring a man's worth through a material success resulting from honest, hard work with Franklin a ready spokesman for the new order. Franklin found nothing wrong with success as long as it was honestly obtained and led to one's personal happiness and social well-being. In that Franklin was a deist, he put great value on the ethical and social issues as well as the religious. He firmly believed that "the most acceptable service to God is doing good to man" and noted, as such, in his autobiography. Franklin became the spokesman for the new order, the commercial-minded middle class and though the common laboring man often quoted his Poor Richard, the laboring man maintained a more emotional religious outlook.

With the ingenuity of the rising middle class and hard diligent work of the farmer and shopkeeper, the late eighteenth century found prosperity eliminating the "lower class." The practical education coupled with the formal also aided in this elimination and a "sort of" classless society found a beginning existence. The only possible exception to this society was that of the plantation life in existence in the South. And so, while the common man did not engage in the intellectual gymnastics of the enlightenment, he did extend his desire to get along in his society through a "common sense" attitude dependent upon a steady, productive, independent citizen.

Although Franklin saw a more practical education necessary for the developing states, as his plan for "the Education of Youth in
Pennsylvania" would indicate, Maxine Greene states that "he gave utilitarian training far more weight than middle class prejudices would allow, in spite of middle class need; and European formal training overcame the Franklin design." For many of the striving middle class and, of course, the aristocracy the formal, classical education was of much more importance and, therefore, they developed their own schools. Men of practical affairs developed utilitarian schools and furthered the system of apprenticeships, resulting in their abdication of the established formal schools and giving total control to the established and developing aristocracy. Thus the aristocracy again found themselves in control of the country through their social, economic and, now, educational power. This formal training through private schools enhanced their position. Thus the average citizen, and later the middle class, did not fully understand Jefferson's quest for free schools. Maxine Greene explains: "Thomas Jefferson was in advance of public opinion when he introduced his proposal for free schools in Virginia; and, because of the nature of the cultural matrix at the moment, his ideas aroused no response." 

Jefferson, a member of the aristocracy, saw the weakness of the lower classes to deal with the power structure because of the lack of a formal, belles-lettres, education. As early as 1779, Jefferson expressed his position on this issue when he introduced a bill in the
Virginia legislature asking for "a more general diffusion of knowledge" through a statewide system of schools. This idea was too radical at the time and thus the bill was defeated. Later, Jefferson used the power of the presidency to express his idea and, once again in 1814, as a board member of Albemarle Academy (University of Virginia), he was asking for selective education and free schools for all. Jefferson favored a democracy that depended on a literate populace and although the Bill of Rights failed to deal with the right to be educated at public expense, he championed the issue because it was "right."

Jefferson did not believe in the absolutely equal abilities of all men, but rather a "natural aristocracy" of talent and virtue. This talent, Jefferson considered, existed at every track of our democratic society and thus his educational system consequently provided for recruiting, from the masses, individuals exceptionally gifted for leadership. Jefferson's quest for genius among the people was far more democratic than anything that existed then, or was to exist for a long time. At least every poor child was to be offered an elementary schooling in an institution which did not bear the stigma of pauperism. Some of the less well-to-do would enjoy a secondary education and a few would go to college. The weakness in this plan was Jefferson's failure to make education compulsory. The ignorant would fail to take advantage of an academy, not even to mention a formal education. At best they could accept the apprentice system of education, but the aristocracy would maintain the status quo by providing their children with the formal education. Further weaknesses in the Jeffersonian plan is stated most clearly by Merle Curti:
To the extent that Jefferson wished to open the cultural riches of civilization to all children and to break down a false educational division between rich and poor, his emphasis on literary subjects was indeed democratic. But in failing to provide for such useful instruction as agriculture, a matter in which he was much concerned, his curriculum was scarcely designed to promote the economic well-being of the common people on which depended, in considerable measure, their political influence, their practical intelligence, and their social position. Moreover, the strict division that he made between those who, after passing the elementary years, were to labor and those who were to learn, would prevent all but a very few of the poorer folk from securing a broad cultural education.

At this point in the American Experience, it seems apparent that educational reform was in the making but it did not seem to be taking any significant direction. The diffused matrix of cultural life in American confused the issue and no central rallying point could seemingly be found. There was no doubt that some form of education was desired, but the form was diversified. There existed remnants of Puritanism (The Massachusetts School Law of 1647) demanding the teaching of the catechism, the capital laws, and the rudiments of a trade. The aristocracy with their belles-lettres education existed to perpetuate the social, political, and economic power. Political power, which was to be the common man's strength in the nineteenth century, was not to be feared at this moment in time. The Anglican in the South did much the same through a system to tutors for the rich and charity instruction for the poor (The Virginia Apprenticeship Laws). There also existed the strong and growing utilitarian form of education

---

as represented in Franklin's academy. It seems at this point that the varied forms of education in existence would give America strength by answering the economic demands made upon her citizens. No doubt the confused matrix of education did give strength, but it also allowed the continued control of the young states by the aristocracy. Their formal training through private schools enhanced their controlling position, and the masses, along with the rising middle class, gave up the responsibility of supporting a sectarian school system.

Even though the educational reform was not moving in any unified direction, it would appear that some patterns were making themselves known. The first pattern is one which developed from a reluctance to import European models of educational organization and practice, and resulted in a basically pragmatic-experimental schooling. Secondly, there seemed to be developing a colonial-based tradition of local control of the schools, but with some assurance of unity and consistency through state organization. Thirdly, there is the minor but yet significant manifestation of federal interest in educational development as shown by The Land Ordinance of 1785 and The Northwest Ordinance of 1787. The Land Ordinance provided lots in every township for a public school and selling them to support the school. Article III of The Northwest Ordinance gave encouragement for education as "being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind." This then was the situation as Horace Mann, the individual, saw America and the movement known as Jacksonianism was perceived.

Before discussing the period of American history known as Jacksonianism, it seems necessary to discuss briefly the political
philosophies of the Federalists and the Jeffersonians. There is little doubt that the clash between these two political positions gave strength to the Jacksonian movement and ultimately gave impetus to a free school movement.

The liberal enthusiasm of the American Revolution did not involve the whole of the American colonies. Many of the colonials sympathized with England and some remained loyal to England. For the most part, the wealthy were loyalists and if they favored revolution at all, it was for economic reasons. In New York, New Jersey, and Georgia, Loyalists formed the majority. Although seventy some thousand of these Loyalists fled the country during the war, enough remained at its conclusion to exert great pressure and thus influence the formation of the United States. This upper class movement, represented by Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, and John Marshall believed that God had made mankind physically and intellectually unequal. They generally agreed with Hobbes that man is naturally perverse and that any goodness in man results only because of necessity. To the Federalist, the government must be instituted to protect man from his own passions, and this strong central government must be led by the physically and intellectually strong. Obviously, men of property and wealth had proven their superiority, a strong central government would be too powerful to be defied by the masses, and the interest of the wealthy would be protected. Hamilton, representing the Federalists, was a follower of Locke. All men, said Locke, have not only a natural interest for life and liberty, as the revolution defined, but also for property. Further, Locke stated that the right of property is insured under the government.
Thus, Hamilton, representing the Federalists and being Secretary of the Treasury under President Washington, set about to help direct our national policy. There seems to be no doubt that the Federalists and their interpretation of the philosophy of Hobbes and Locke would soon clash with Jefferson and the agrarian movement tainted with the philosophy of Rousseau.

Whereas Hamilton saw the United States developing and prospering through industrial capitalism with a strong central government to protect it, Jefferson saw the government promoting the general welfare and developing an interest in an agrarian economy. This mercantile activity was contrary to man's nature, as defined by Rousseau, and Jefferson thought that "laborers in the earth" were much more disposed toward individual man's happiness and the happiness of society. It is, therefore, no surprise to read in the Declaration of Independence of a redefined Lockean philosophy of "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness." There was, no doubt, a need for some manufacturing to strengthen our relations with Europe, but certainly no more than that. This philosophy of life, coupled with the rule of the majority through the central government and economic opportunity for all, was basically the position held by the political party known as the Republican Party. It was, therefore, no surprise that the Republican Party was appalled at the Federalist move to develop a National Bank that would favor the wealthy and aid in exploiting the natural resources for the benefit of the few. It appeared as though a Federalist monarchy was going to replace the British monarchy. Jefferson had become the champion of the common people. The common people were good and Jefferson sensed that
only through popular participation in government could they protect themselves. This involvement in popular government meant education for all—not just the formal education in existence for the aristocracy. An enlightened citizen was needed to help promote the general welfare. Jefferson was demanding selective education and free schools for all.

For the most part the few schools in existence were supported by the wealthy in some form or another. The rich supported schools for their children directly and also contributed the majority of monies to church-controlled schools and "pauper schools." The government involved itself in supporting schools by the sale of land to establish a school fund as defined by the aforementioned Northwest Ordinance. Most of this support was only on the frontier. Jefferson lived to see little of the developing interest in free schools. His death in 1826 is often marked as the beginning of the earnest attempt by the newly formed states to promote the free school and, following directly on its heels, began the "age of the common man."

In 1828, Andrew Jackson ascended to the Presidency of the United States behind the power of the new Democratic Party. The Jacksonian cry of "Equal Rights for All, Special Privileges for None," echoed across the land. Curti described the scene:

The unruly mob that invaded the White House when Jackson was inaugurated in 1829 seemed to symbolize a new power. Labor troubles in the seaboard cities aroused resentment. Many among the privileged class called to mind the violence which had destroyed the old aristocracy in France and frankly confessed their own fears. They saw danger in the anti-rent wars, the attacks on the judiciary, and the repudiation of public and private debts, in the Dorr war and the Nat Turner slave insurrection, in the abolition mobs and the anti-Catholic riots. Men of position shuddered at the thought that they might be forced to see the overthrow of republican institutions
which had hitherto safeguarded their status.\textsuperscript{9}

This Jacksonian cry was really a revival of Jeffersonian democracy. The Jacksonians also viewed the propertied class as their enemy and an enlightened concept of labor rather than property as the government's concern. In actuality, Jacksonians failed in their attacks on the rich, through the banks and commerce, but their efforts were at least a check on an economy that was becoming one-sided. The Jacksonians' constant battle with the aristocracy and the government resulted in a unified party of the farmer and common laboring man. The failure could probably be attributed to the fact that finally industrial growth would benefit the common man more than farming, and the educational system for the enlightenment of the common man was not quite ready for the task at hand.

Using the Jacksonian movement to launch a full scale movement for free schools, Mann, then Secretary of the Board of Education of the State of Massachusetts, began by informing the people of that state about their dilapidated school system. Mann's enthusiasm for change spread to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Michigan, and Tennessee. Mann spoke of the absolute right of every man to receive an education because this right was an immutable principle of natural law and of divine origin. He addressed the upper and respectable middle class and told them of their duty to God to help the poor in their need for education. Later, he changed his approach to one of advocating the maintenance of public order and protection of private property from

the ignorant.

At first, the aristocracy and the rising middle class saw the common school movement of the 1830's and 1840's as a threat to their status. These established classes believed that the educated masses would soon recognize their plight and seek means to alleviate their condition, but Jackson's political power made them think twice about the proposed educational system. As Mehl pointed out: "Faced with an accomplished fact of wider distribution of political power into the hands of people whose interests were at odds with their own, the established classes looked to the school as the means for bringing these rude people into line." Each faction looked to the school for a solution, each having different ends in mind. The Jacksonians saw education as a means by which the people could force their participation in politics, economics, and social mobility, and the established aristocracy and middle class looked to the school as a stabilizing factor to quell the spirit of rapid political, economic and social change.

The lower classes did not respond to Mann's thesis immediately and in some instances it met resistance. The movement of the early 1830's gave hope, and they demanded decent public schools along with labor reform and easy credit. Maxine Greene elaborated on this point:

Equal educational opportunity had seemed to them a protection against class inequity; also, it had seemed to promise that their children, too, would be taught the disciplines of self-reliance and "a just disposition," as their resolutions said 'virtuous habits . . . a rational, self-governing character . . .'.

---

But the depression of 1837 intervened; and, by the time Horace Mann began addressing them, their confidence was eroded. The Workingmen's Association had already disintegrated; there seemed no point to them, once their members confronted the fact that they were fated to be mechanics and hired men after all. Nor did there seem to be any point to demands for public education—not if the schools were to serve only as training institutions, making docile citizens and workers out of children born to be journeymen.\footnote{Greene, The Public School and the Private Vision, pp. 19-20.}

Mann continued to have hope in the schools and believed they could create a feeling of independence among the working class. Schools could also allow students to share experiences and emerge with knowledge of other students, other families, and other occupations, a position soon to be thoroughly developed by John Dewey. The workers and farmers failed to respond as Mann had hoped.

With the increase of industry and manufacturing, the need for laboring men increased and Mann shifted ground. In the end, material advantages for the poor could be obtained by their labor. In his state of Massachusetts, it was exceedingly so and Mann continued his missionary work. Besides knowledge, he tried to convince the factory owners and the working families that disciplines for factory work could also be taught in school and that perhaps the school's "true business" should be identical with the "great interests of society." The "great interests of society" were being tested already in the 1830's with the coming of the immigrants. These people lived in low, damp and filthy rooms. Working conditions were terrible and then they had to fight the native-born working men for jobs.

Perhaps Mann was right. The interest of society must come first. Education could satisfy these interests. Education could
create a conscience for the society and it could control the unrestrained passions of men. They could Americanize the foreign born. Education could also develop a citizen for our growing industrial states. Mann was aware of the manufacturing plants increase in number in Massachusetts and knew that this development could make it possible for all men to lead better economic lives. Enlightened people were necessary to make this new industrial system function; Mann was fully aware of this. The people must go to school, perhaps a free school, supported by the very economic system the people were creating. The laboring class had to be convinced that education for their children must be compulsory. If the young did not go to school, the present industrial economic system would exploit the young and the material gains each family obtained would be at the sweat, blood and tears of their laboring children.

Neither the people nor the state responded to Mann's difficult undertaking—the free, the common school. The State of Massachusetts abdicated her responsibility of school supervision and when the towns and local districts refused to accept responsibility, the control of schools fell into the hands of individual men. With the loss of leadership, the schools floundered and without compulsory attendance, few children attended for any considerable length of time. Curti described the existent situation.

Moreover, the schools were incredibly deficient. Instructors often were unable to do simple sums in multiplication and division, and in 1837 some three hundred teachers were driven out of their schools by unruly and riotous pupils over whom, in spite of the prevalent use of the whip, they were unable to keep any semblance of order. Yet, Massachusetts led in
Mann knew the state had to take leadership or the free school movement would die. Most educators agreed. Individual control, religious control or control by the aristocracy would only defeat the cause.

Curti continued:

Of all the great questions with which education was to grapple, none was more important in Mann's eyes than that of democracy itself. Accepting political democracy as an inevitable and desirable development, he shared the views of all his fellow educators that it could succeed only if it were accompanied by educational and intellectual democracy, and hence pinned his faith to a free and universal school system. For the class system of education in which the children of the wealthy attended superior private schools he had only condemnation. The most effective remedy was to improve the public schools to such an extent that they equaled or surpassed private institutions.

Could America really establish a free and universal school system? Did this mean that our developing political democracy needed a system of higher education--also free? Could this higher education be free from individual control, free from religious control and free from the demands of the aristocracy? Could the citizen attend a university without the huge financial burden? At this point, the Jacksonians rallied to the Jeffersonian creed. Jefferson had no sympathy for the existing New England colleges. He recognized their catering to the aristocracy and was especially concerned with their effective means of capturing the best sons of the South and initiating them into the Puritan trinity of "toryism, fanaticism, and indifference to their own state." This learned elite only tended to swell

---


the ranks of the radical Federalist Party. Jefferson asked the state to provide not only free education for all children in elementary school but also scholarships for the talented secondary and university student.

In 1819 the Supreme Court ruled that the New Hampshire legislature could not interfere with the government of Dartmouth College. In 1816 the state legislature had succeeded in placing Dartmouth College under control of a board of trustees and designated the college as Dartmouth University. After a three-year legal battle, the Supreme Court issued its ruling and the Jacksonians immediately took up the battle cry. It is clearly evident that the court had sanctified the colleges as closed corporations, serving their own needs, benefiting their own aristocratic views of society. Peterson noted:

To another Jacksonian the court's decision was so astounding that he could only ask, with all the expletives of punctuation at his command, "Can corporations, then, the mere creatures of the law created not for themselves, but for the common good, claim rights superior to those of individuals, and above the reach of the legislative power?!!" Could colleges actually prosper in conscious scorn of the people's will?14

Actually the attempts to control private colleges in America had been attempted previously, the earliest being several years before the revolution. At that time the legislature of Connecticut asked for a change in the Yale charter of 1701 which would give the colonial government a greater measure of control over the affairs of the college. The proposals were so strenuously opposed

that no action was taken at that time. After the close of the war, the legislature demanded that either the charter granted by the state to the college be altered to give the state representation on the college board or that a new institution, under control of the state, be established. In 1792 a provision was made for a measure of state representation by making the governor, the lieutenant governor, and six state officials members ex officio of the corporation.

The desirability of founding a national university was in the minds of at least several members of the Constitutional Convention. Among the early presidents of the United States, Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and John Quincy Adams urged upon Congress the establishment of such an institution. Failure of Congress to act prompted the state governments to relate higher education more closely to the contemporary needs of a new era. Attempts were made, in varying degrees, to transform existing colleges into institutions that would be more responsive to these needs. In some cases, boards of trustees were to be appointed by the state officers or by the state legislature. In other instances, a board of overseers was to exercise control over the corporations. Pressure was also exerted by threatening to withhold the appropriations which a college received from the state or by expressing an interest in the establishment of a competing institution. Altogether six of the nine

15Edgar Bruce Welsey, Proposed: The University of the United States (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1936), pp. 8-10.
existing colleges founded during the colonial period were subjected to such external pressure. The previously mentioned Yale case was the first. The most outstanding and most publicized was the Dartmouth case. The others, following in order were:

- Academy and College of Pennsylvania
- Kings College (Columbia) in New York
- Harvard College in Massachusetts
- William and Mary College in Virginia

Cubberly, along with Edwards and Richey, discuss these cases as precursors to subsequent action taken by the Jacksonians to initiate changes in class controlled colleges by establishing state universities. Academy and College of Pennsylvania was founded under non-sectarian influence but later reflected politics of the Tory Party and religion of the Anglican Church. The state, in 1779, voided its charter and created a new corporation, "The Trustees of the University of the State of Pennsylvania." After a series of protests the original charter was reinstated, but the new institution and the old were merged under a single board in 1791.

King's College, rechristened Columbia, was reorganized in 1748 and again in 1787. In addition to its self-perpetuating board a newly created body was to give nominal supervision. This body was known as "The Regents of the University of the State of New York."

The Harvard Board of Overseers had included ex officio representatives of the government and thus was controlled somewhat

---


by the legislature. Attempts to make this body elective were defeated by the corporation because it violated rights under the Constitution of 1780. Later the Yale case was decided along similar lines.

William and Mary defeated attempts to make her a state institution because of the close alliance to the colonial government and the Established Church. Jefferson, seeing constitutional attempts fail to make William and Mary more responsive to the public will, further pursued his efforts to create a rival institution, The University of Virginia.

The Dartmouth case was the crowning blow to the Jacksonians in their cause of "Equal Rights for All, Special Privileges for None."

The Jeffersonians were equally upset. Tewksbury related Jefferson's letter, representing the liberal view, to Governor Plumer (1816):

> The idea that institutions established for the use of the nation, cannot be touched or modified, even to make them answer their end, because of rights gratuitously supposed in those employed to manage them in trust for the public, may, perhaps, be a salutary provision against the abuse of a monarch but it is most absurd against the nation itself. Yet our lawyers and priests generally inculcate this doctrine, and suppose that preceding generations held the earth more freely than we do; had a right to impose laws on us, unalterable by ourselves; and that we, in like manner, can make laws and impose burdens on future generations, which they will have no right to alter; in fine, that the earth belongs to the dead, and not to the living.  

Although the Supreme Court decision, as expressed by Chief Justice John Marshall, was a bitter defeat for the Jeffersonians and Jacksonians in their quest for universities devoted to changing

---

public needs, the decision was responsible for two momentous movements in higher education. Cubberly stated:

The effect of this decision manifested itself in two different ways. On the one hand it guaranteed the perpetuity of endowments, and the great period of private and denominational effort now followed. On the other hand, since the States could not change charters and transform old establishments, they began to turn to the creation of new state universities of their own. 19

Thus the future of private, non-sectarian, and religious schools were guaranteed a place in America's future. Edward Eddy relates further that the decision in the Dartmouth College case made clear that church institutions were to be free from state control and that state supported educational enterprises were to be immune from religious commitment. 20 The established principle of the separation of church and state found in the Constitution was, therefore, further clarified.

As the nation expanded in the east and moved westward, the sectarian and denominational colleges were in clear competition with state universities. Universities, indisputably, were the movement of the future. They represent the most direct influence on our present system of higher education.

At the time of Jackson's move to the presidency, the principles of Jeffersonian education and Jacksonian education were in conflict. Their temporary alliance in their attack on the established


colleges as being aristocratic and perpetuating a society of classes was at an end. The battle on this issue came to a close when it was clear that the government must keep its hands off private institutions and proceed to established state universities. The old yet new conflict was manifest in a growing belief that what democracy needed was not a ruling class of special talent and ability, as advocated by Jefferson, but an enlightened electorate, as expressed by Jackson, capable of a political sense to recognize civic competence when they saw it.

Jefferson's views were purely Platonic and placed little faith in the common man to regulate his society. Jefferson's plan, similar to Plato's *The Republic*, was to sift and uncover those children of the masses that possessed gifts of talent necessary to control and administer a society. Jackson placed his faith in an enlightened common man. This educated common man would prove quite capable of ruling himself without the dictates of a Philosopher-King. Surely, at least, the enlightened common man could select a Philosopher-King to assist him.

Slowly, the Jacksonian attitude took hold, and the latter two-thirds of the nineteenth century was an era of widening the sources of education and extending the instruments of political privilege to the masses of the American people. The public elementary and secondary school, locally controlled, supported by taxes levied against the general population, developed rapidly. Jefferson would surely not have anticipated such a trend in education.
In response to demands for free, public universities, twenty-one such institutions were established in twenty states between the end of the Revolutionary War and the Civil War. Eastern institutions, in general, evolved from state funds, while the newer western states were aided by federal grants.

Opposition to these new universities was strong. Religious groups fought for federal and state funds diverted to the new universities and in many instances prevented passage of laws establishing the new schools. In states that lacked the new universities, it was this very opposition that was a major responsibility. Religious denominations participated in the establishment of 116 out of the 182 permanent colleges founded by 1861. Most active were the Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Catholics, and Episcopalians. With this dominance of religious denominations it is clear that the state universities would have to wait until the stimulus of the Morrill Act of 1862 to fully gain their independence. At the outbreak of the Civil War there were only seventeen state institutions, although three or four private colleges had rather hazy state connections. These state institutions were supported by tuition, legislature appropriations and land endowments.

The American educational system now began to assume its character. The common school was clearly established and in most states, especially the northern and western, the high school had already begun to displace the academy as the people's secondary school. With the few state universities open to qualified graduates of the high school, the educational system appeared to be complete. A youngster
could attend the common school, the high school, and the university by paying little or no tuition. Granted, only a few attended high school and even fewer the university but Jefferson's concept of education reappeared again. The ladder system was established and only a matter of time was necessary for the Jacksonian principles to move again.

Summary

The American Experience in democracy, having been defined by the aristocracy, initially asked that they govern the majority as true representatives. Education was for the few who ruled, as the Puritans defined it, the "elect." This "elect" considered the masses naturally perverse in the Hobbesian sense. A government, the Federalists held, must be initiated to protect man from his own passions. Preparing one for the world of work was much different than one's trying to rule himself. Hamilton, Adams, and Marshall were representative of those that believed God made mankind physically and intellectually unequal. Rule by majority had to be controlled with checks and balances.

Jefferson's "check and balance" was one of enlightenment. There existed among the masses men capable of governing each other. Education could help reveal this "natural aristocracy." Open the schools and find them. Give each man an opportunity, for the established "elect" would always send their young to school.

Initially, the synthesis between rule of the "Puritan elect" and Jefferson's "natural aristocracy" solved the problem in dealing
with ignorant masses. There always existed the world of labor (busy hands) for the masses and if they so desired there was the western frontier to develop. If the established aristocracy saw any value in their support of the public schools, their position was defined by Mann. The school could be used as a stabilizing factor to quell the spirit of rapid political, economic, and social change.

It was perhaps Franklin's utilitarian philosophy of education that really gave impetus to the Jacksonian movement. With a sense of love for the practical, common man and ingrained respect for work, the westerner struggled with his environment and won some degree of prosperity and success. This westerner found he did not need the enlightened easterner nor did he want his help. He put faith in himself, in the common and natural man. He could work out his own destiny through the American Experience.

The temporary alliance between the Jeffersonians and Jacksonians ended in the common cause for universal education, when the government made it clear that the private could not control the public school nor could the public control the private school. This situation was true of the elementary school, the academies, and especially the college and universities. No longer could the colleges exist as aristocratic in nature and thus perpetuate class structure. What democracy needed was not a ruling class of special talent and ability, as advocated by Jefferson, but an enlightened electorate, as expressed by Jackson, capable of a political sense to recognize civic competence when they saw it. This new American began to ask why he could not govern himself while he provided for his daily bread.
This American, struggling with the concept of majority rule, demanded enlightenment, something more than just a practical form of education.

Thus, in this chapter, the researcher developed the position that the philosophy of a free and open system of education emerged from national concerns revolving around the following issues:

(1) Education to maintain the aristocracy, (2) education to maintain social control, (3) education to promote the general welfare through a literate population, (4) education for the practical to develop the new and growing nation.

The emerging school system tried satisfactorily to deal with all four issues. With the aristocracy maintaining their social, political, and economic position through the private schools, the general public created a parallel system of education. In higher education, the private colleges and universities survived federal attempts to control them. The Dartmouth Case decision guaranteed their private existence and continued growth.

In response to the entrenched private colleges, the government gave support to the state university. In the eastern states this support came from state funds. In the West the support came from federal grants of land. Now that the public universities found their existence secure, they could turn inward and examine more intently their philosophy of education.

In chapter III the researcher will describe the emergent land-grant college and its particular philosophy of education. The 'why and how' of the land-grant college will be examined historically as well as its developing philosophy. In particular, three institutions
will be examined. They are: The University of Wisconsin, Cornell University, and Harvard University. The researcher will further examine the land-grant philosophy as it emerges historically and seek to determine whether or not its definition is being fulfilled by the land-grant colleges and universities.
CHAPTER III

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE LAND-GRANT PHILOSOPHY

Private interest groups dominated higher education with religion playing a leading role until the Civil War. The state universities fought these interest groups continually for federal funds. Initially, the fight was one of competition, but when separation of church and state was clearly defined, the church affiliated universities and colleges tried to control legislation favoring the state universities. Private endowments still made it possible for Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Princeton to compete and give leadership within higher education and future private fortunes later established newer colleges and universities such as Johns Hopkins, Chicago, Stanford, and Cornell. Although it would finally take the Morrill Act of 1862 to truly allow the new state universities and land-grant colleges to give new leadership in higher education, at least the established state universities allowed her citizens to attend a school other than a private school and at less expense.

The failure of the established state universities and private colleges to provide a new curriculum to meet the temper of the times, as defined by the Jacksonian mood, was clearly evident and was of great concern. Laurence R. Veysey, in his analysis of the college,
Early in the nineteenth century, it had been possible to speak of the officers of an entire college—its president, its faculty, and its trustees—as being of one and the same mind. Later one could still speak of a campus such as Yale's or Princeton's as being noticeably friendly to a single educational outlook. Diverse persons might be hired to teach the novel subjects, but they were more or less interlopers to be tolerated.1

The election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 prompted many leading citizens to examine a new practical collegiate curriculum being offered at the University of London. This new college began its program in 1828 as a utilitarian institution. The friends of the future land-grant college were asking if this was the new curriculum needed for the new citizen in America. As a result of this thinking, the University of the City of New York opened in 1832 with parallel courses of study, one in the classical tradition and one in the practical course of study. The new course of study was doomed to failure, much like the earlier elective system established at the University of Virginia, when, at the opening of the university, the classical curriculum was referred to as being for those young men "whose inclinations might lead to a . . . more exalted measure of attainments" than would be achieved by those taking the practical curriculum. Years later, Dewey viewed this distinction of curricula as a crucial issue in both secondary education as well as college. For centuries this difference in a course of study determined culture and class. As Cremin explained Dewey's position:

For centuries culture had meant the possession of certain kinds of knowledge marking the knower as a member of a superior social group. From the time of the Greeks, it had been associated with wealth as opposed to poverty, with leisure as opposed to labor, with theory as opposed to practice. And in the school curriculum it had come to imply an emphasis on certain literary and historical studies, the knowledge of particular classical works, and the mastery of particular foreign languages.²

For Dewey as well as the Jacksonians, this distinction of curriculum helped to perpetuate the separation of the classes rather than their commonalities. The curriculum reform at the University of the City of New York failed, but the threat to the "old order" was recognized and, although it would take fifty years to create the new college, the movement began here.

The Yale Report of 1828 became a justification for the preservation of the old college and its classic curriculum. Reacting negatively to college reform, Jeremiah Day, president of Yale, led the faculty in defining the aim of a college course of study as that of "laying the foundation of a superior education" and this superior education was a mastery of "intellectual culture" development of the mind. In effect, the Yale faculty continued the basic philosophical position of Descartes in viewing man as a dualistic being, that is, mind and matter. Matter is controlled according to fixed mechanical laws but mind is spiritually independent of matter and capable of making free choices. Western education has been subject to this position and as Butts stated in _A Cultural History of Western Education_: "Education has often been viewed since then as being

²Cremin, _The Transformation of the School_, p. 124.
properly devoted to higher cultivation of the mind and soul rather than to the lower cultivation of the body.\textsuperscript{3} No doubt, the laboring class should continue to be trained in the workshop and in the field. Men of classical education would introduce them to what was most important. The Yale Report, in the true sense of the humanistic tradition, did attempt to free the college from the remnants of Puritanism, but as Frederick Rudolph asserted: "Behind it, the catalogue of Tusculum College in Tennessee would sound as if the only difference between Tusculum and Yale was a matter of geography."\textsuperscript{4}

The new curriculum demanded additional monies for equipment and a trained faculty, so that finances also became an issue—as always. The issue as to what the new colleges should really be was ever present. The farmer's son was not adequately prepared for college. Should the college prepare him or should the secondary school accept this task? What did the new college want to do with this new student? Should they graduate just improved mechanics and farmers or trained scientists? If trained scientists, the present curriculum would do. President Edward Orton of Ohio State in 1874 saw the new college more in the sense of the classical tradition. Prepare the man, the gentleman, first. His position was in direct conflict with the governor, Rutherford Hayes, who saw the college providing technical competence. Perhaps the latter was responding


to the popular man and his vote. The obvious answer, of course, would be to use an elective course system or a parallel curriculum as mentioned earlier. The final solution obviously could not be found as a universal solution. Each college had to solve the issue on an individual basis and "fight the battle" but there was little doubt that "on the whole," as Rudolph stated, "the tendency of the land-grant institution was to enthrone the practical and ignore the traditional."5

As early at 1848, reformers of the universities, led by Congressman J. S. Morrill of Vermont, asked the universities to reshape the English and German influence and "lop off a portion of the studies established centuries ago as the mark of European scholarship and replace the vacancy—if it is a vacancy—by those of a less antique and more practical value." Morrill's first bill proposed in 1857, asked for new education "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." The bill, vetoed by President Buchanan, was resubmitted and signed by President Lincoln in July, 1862. Morrill was fought at every turn while trying to promote his legislation and even resorted to convincing the agrarian society that his bill would ensure an interest in the agrarian life. To some extent this was accomplished, but as we now know, more than this resulted. Mass education was given more encouragement. Morrill must have felt much like Mann did earlier. The common people rejected the idea to
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5Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 257.
the insistence of the senator from Minnesota that "We want no fancy farmers; we want no fancy mechanics." Other Americans were unwilling to strengthen the artisan and laboring class in America. Much like Mann found to be true, the American aristocracy feared this strength in the hand of the common man. Nevertheless, the act passed. It stated that in every state the government would support one college "where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts." With the passing of the Hatch Act in 1887 and the second Morrill Act in 1890, regular annual appropriations were guaranteed. The Hatch Act promoted scientific research in affiliated agricultural experiment stations and the second Morrill Act denied funds to those colleges that prohibited admission on the basis of race unless separate but equal facilities were provided. Seventeen states created the "equal" facilities.

Obviously the support by the federal government allowed the land-grant philosophy of education to become entrenched within higher education. The land-grant idea however, still did not have full support of the people. Not only was the idea attacked by the common people for whom it was created, as mentioned earlier, but also professional educators questioned its existence. President Eliot of Harvard reflected the Puritan ethic still discussed today, stating that "Our ancestors well understood the principle that to make a people free and self-reliant, it is necessary to let them take care of themselves, even if they do not take quite as good care of
themselves as some superior power might." The controversy between the "classicists", who would allow for the new subjects to find their way into the curriculum and the "popularists" who wanted only practical technical education, was a rigorously debated issue.

Because financing is a central issue in every college's existence, the state and federal supported colleges had apparently gained the upper hand. The Morrill Act helped to develop a great network of institutions with a popular and practical orientation. Not only did the land-grant colleges increase in number, but also state universities, so long neglected, also increased in number and size. On the other hand, many spawning colleges died almost before they started because the state and federal governments had to withdraw their support in some instances to create the land-grant college and state university. Over 700 colleges died when the Morrill Act became a reality. For many people, this loss was no more than just.

Why should these colleges exist for the upper class at the expense of the common man? To perpetuate the growing loss of these colleges with the old traditional curriculum, the new universities were offering the practical curriculum and asking for practically no admission standards. Where some asked for one year of preparatory work beyond eighth grade, others simply opened their doors to all.

As the technical-vocational curriculum was popularized, some faculties warned of the personal and social nature of their students.

The battle now appeared to be whether the colleges and universities would provide only the practical, the technical, the materialistic. Perhaps Governor LaFollette of Wisconsin expressed
this growing position clearly when he stated: "The State welcomes the ever increasing tendency to make the university minister in a direct and practical way to the material interests of the state." Later it was possible for the friends of the University of Wisconsin to say, according to Howe, "The cow is one of the many by-products of higher education in Wisconsin." Where the Midwest and South saw a deep concern for rural America, the industrialized eastern states found a great need for technology. The economic industrialization of the large eastern urban areas demanded skilled and unskilled labor. With the farms unable to handle the economic burden of the eight million European immigrants, the large cities of the East were soon teeming with the uneducated masses. By 1880 half the population of the East existed in cities of over 4,000. No longer was Horace Greeley's advice "to go west" a reality. It was an economic impossibility. Whereas the farmer of the free and open West had been romanticized by Fredrick Jackson Turner in his *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*, men like Fisk, Gould, Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Vanderbilt became immortalized as the spirit of democracy.

The Civil War had insured the supremacy of industry and technology as the American Economy and federal support of this economic system was no longer a question. The Federalists' position

---


of a hundred years earlier was a reality and the agrarian society
took a back seat. Jefferson had indeed lost to Hamilton. The
"sweat shops" of the nation created millionaires, and sympathetic
politicians found their share in this wealth by aiding the industri-
alists. Weak presidents, beginning with Grant, insured the political
involvement from the top down.

Mann's philosophy of education, expressed earlier in the 1800's,
was again restored and the schools' concern still was to induct the
children of the laboring class into the society at large and create
in their minds the work ethic demanded by the industrialized society.
Horatio Alger's some 160 novels became the rage of the schools and
the McGuffey Readers that had been good enough for Mother and Dad
would certainly do for the youngsters. Spencer and Sumner stated
that the schools would be justified if they were capable of contri-
buting to the maintenance of public order. If education did anything
else, it should stress science. Science meant practical education
and anything else that was education was worthless. School adminis-
trations identified with business interests and this interest not
only invaded the elementary schools, the growing high schools, but
also the university itself. To make matters worse, the West was of
little concern to anyone but those who lived in the West. Maxine
Greene explained further:

Perhaps out of loyalty, perhaps out of intellectual bias,
the educational leaders ignored opportunities provided by
the Morrill Act of 1862, which called for land grants to
make possible the establishment of agricultural and
mechanical colleges and institutes. Indeed, they exerted
a minimum of pressure for the extension of the free school
systems in the Western and Midwestern states.  

Few influential men, according to Greene, were talking about the values of rural existence and inevitably, agrarian loyalties spoke for teaching that would be relevant to farming and to rural life. The emphasis appeared to be upon industrial demands and the agrarian interests lacked federal, labor union, and political power. The industrialized states and cities favored manual training and trade schools by a 2 to 1 majority. Labor objected to the ill-prepared workers emerging from the training schools. The fear that these schools would weaken the power base of labor and their practical apprenticeship system may have been the greater concern. When the National Association of Manufacturers, in 1896, approved a resolution supporting practical arts, industrial, manual training or other technical schools, labor's resistance stiffened. With Samuel Gomper's American Federation of Labor leadership, the battle lines were drawn. A Committee on Industrial Education, appointed in 1905, strengthened the position of the National Association of Manufacturers by depicting industrial America locked in combat with industrialized Europe. In 1908 a Federal Committee on Education accused labor and industry of advocating industrial education for the nation. What of rural America? It was to no avail. Public trade schools emerged as a "given." Federal, state, and private funds were made available. The issue now was the active involvement
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of labor and industry in the structure and operation of the schools.

During the late 1890's and early 1900's, it was apparent to rural America that industrialized America had gained sufficient power to dictate their demands not only to the manual training schools but also to the high schools and colleges. To make rural American demands known to state and federal governments, the Grange united with The Association of American Agriculture Colleges and Experiment Stations for a power base to exert necessary pressure. Their pressure was reasonably sufficient to combat industry, but The Association of American Agriculture Colleges feared that too much emphasis was being placed upon the secondary schools, trade schools and even elementary schools. The Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, in 1914, even recommended that aid be confined to public institutions other than colleges. Land-grant colleges now feared that such federal and state aid would weaken the emphasis previously given to them. Finally, the signing of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 by President Wilson guaranteed federal funds for vocational education in schools other than colleges. No doubt the land-grant colleges lost "something" with this federal legislation, but at least, the federal monies would be controlled.

In part the colleges were much to blame for the existence of this competition from labor, industry, and agriculture. Skilled labor was needed for industry and rural America did need the technology necessary to feed the fast growing urban areas. Colleges recognized the demands, but failed to take leadership. The general philosophy of the universities and colleges concerning
admission standards, curriculum development etc., were roadblocks for most students. Colleges and universities were asking questions about their very existence. Should admission be totally open? Can anyone enter higher education? Should colleges provide something for everyone? What about preparing the gentleman? Should students of the classics exist alongside the vocational students? Will higher education be "watered down" to something meaningless to everyone? Ultimately the question of mass education and mediocrity had to be considered. Professors of Latin were worried that they would be respected equally with the professor of agriculture. What about knowledge for knowledge's sake? Should colleges provide only for the practical? Even though the land-grant colleges were to provide instruction in agriculture and the mechanical arts, they soon found themselves embroiled in the issue that was at one time limited to older colleges and state universities. It appeared that land-grant colleges wanted "respectability" too! It was no wonder that interested citizens of vocational education circumvented the whole issue by developing their own non-college program. With the exception of Yale, Princeton, Clark, and Johns Hopkins among the major institutions, the majority of the older colleges, state universities and land-grant colleges found themselves embattled in this concern of democracy and higher education.

Lawrence R. Veysey considered this position of utility as dependent upon the definition of democracy:

1. Democracy often refers to the equality of all fields of learning.
2. Democracy might mean equality of treatment or condition among all the students who were attending a university at any one time.

3. Democracy was sometimes used with reference to the ease of admission to the university.

4. Democracy might be used when describing the university as an agency for individual success.

5. Democracy could refer to the desire for a wide diffusion of knowledge throughout society.

6. Democracy may mean that the university should take its orders directly from the non-academic mass of citizen. Depending upon the institution of higher learning, all or a few of the definitions of democracy could be found in operation. Lawrence Veysey further explained the temper of the times:

During the Progressive Era the concept of "democracy" as a naturally operative folk wisdom became ever more fashionable. Again, as with the diffusionist point of view, its plasticity helped it. Almost anyone of a reasonable persuasion could maintain that his views represented those of "the people"; no opinion polls existed to refute him. In practice, the results of this outlook were seldom as radical as the theory. The majority of the American public evidenced no truly profound discontent, and it was for this reason, among others, that university administration could so confidently appeal to a popular mandate.11

Three representative positions of the utilitarian university, in answering "the people," might be discussed here. These positions are those of Cornell, Harvard, and Wisconsin.

Cornell University appeared to display the first visible acts of the educational philosophy asked of the Morrill Act. Ezra Cornell wanted an institution that would provide instruction for anybody in

10 Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, pp. 63-64.

11 Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, p. 65.
any area. President Andrew D. White, of Cornell University, made it quite clear that four years of study in one direction are held equal to four years of study in another. He also spoke of combining scientific and industrial studies into the heart of the curriculum. In his inaugural address he stressed the idea of freedom of choice among courses of study. He also emphasized the equality among all such courses. With this philosophy in mind, White envisioned undergraduate courses in "History, Political and Social Science and General Jurisprudence" graduating in great numbers to promote his kind of philosophy of education and lead the world in that direction. His "group system" permitted students to choose from a series of groups that were quite structured within that "system." For this structure he was criticized as not being as open as he professed.

Harvard University, led by Charles W. Eliot, represents another movement quite similar to Cornell University, but perhaps a bit more permissive. Eliot was labeled a utilitarian, but was often accused of not being a humanitarian. His laissez-faire concept of human existence carried over into his apparent oppositions to free public elementary and secondary education. He initially disapproved of state universities and angered the laboring man by opposing unions. Men should live by making free choices and any institution that controls man is to be feared. Free education, controlled by the government, only made sense if children were taught to make free, but wise choices. It is free choice that gives dignity to man. His firm conviction of a "free will" thus shaped his thoughts on education. Freedom for the individual would destroy social control.
Universities were institutions that allowed men of various backgrounds to "give and take" and any degree of human inquiry was to have a place in Eliot's university. Eliot was well aware of the social problems that his university would create. The rich and the poor would bring their culture to the university. So too would the Jew, the Catholic, and the Negro. Each has his/her ways, his/her interests, but Eliot wanted them and did not intend to control their thoughts and behavior within his university. He wanted his students to be free to pursue their interests. Independent thinking was necessary. Eliot's only concern was that of intelligence. He despised ignorance and in a sense refuted "true" Jacksonianism for Jeffersonianism.

If White and Eliot differed greatly on their concept of higher education it would be on the degree of intelligence accepted and the faith in free choice by students. The intelligent student brought about the more technical and varied elective system at Harvard. At Cornell the consequence was a broad range of the liberal arts and basic sciences. Certainly the regional difference allowed for some of the differences and just how important regional differences are shall be evident in the third position of utilitarianism as represented by the "Wisconsin idea."

With Harvard and Cornell struggling with their developing utilitarian concept of the university since 1868, Wisconsin was a relative newcomer to the struggle. The University of Wisconsin was a land-grant university and, along with The University of Michigan, represented the midwestern concerns for higher education.
Charles Kendall Adams, who succeeded White as president of Cornell, moved on to Wisconsin in 1892 and brought with him all the experience thus acquired. It was Adam's baccalaureate address of 1896 that was to be the precursor for the "Wisconsin idea."

The university is not a party separate from the State. It is a part of the State—as much a part of the State as the Capital itself—as much (sic) as the brain and the hand are parts of the body.12

Following in the footsteps of Presidents John Bascom and Thomas Chamberlin, Adams was caught up in the Progressive movement led by Robert LaFollette. "Service to the state" was an emerging theme and Adams further developed the idea during his presidency. The university was encouraged to use its expertise in state government and further offer the expertise of professors through extension classes. This philosophy of education was at the heart of the Progressive ideal.

With the university administration of President Charles Van Hise, the "Wisconsin idea" was truly developed. His philosophy was made clear from the beginning at his inaugural address of 1904.

Be the choice of the sons and daughters of the state, language, literature, history, political economy, pure science, agriculture, engineering, architecture, sculpture, painting, or music, they should find at the state university ample opportunity for the pursuit of the chosen subject, even until they become creators in it. Nothing short of such opportunity is just, for each has an equal right to find at the state university the advanced intellectual life adapted to his need. Any narrower view is indefensible.13


13Inaugural address of President Charles Richard Van Hise, University of Wisconsin in Madison, 1904, p. 28.
Lawrence R. Veysey saw the Van Hise presidency as developing two concrete elements. The expert would be expected to enter into technical and social planning by the government, and the university would promote extension classes in every part of the state. Lawrence A. Cremin further explained the new administration: 

As Van Hise's administration progressed, it became apparent that "service to the state" would take two complementary directions; the provision of expert leadership in a great variety of spheres and the extension of new knowledge gained in the university's research programs to as large a segment of the population as possible. Neither activity was entirely new; both had flourished under the aegis of Van Hise's predecessors, John Bascom, Thomas Chamberlin, and Charles Kendall Adams, But Van Hise, acting in concert with the LaFollette administration, brought them to a pinnacle. Cooperation between university and capitol, between the two ends of State Street in Madison, became the heart of the Wisconsin experiment in progressivism.

It was this interplay between the university and the state that seemed to be the heart of the "Wisconsin idea." Governor LaFollette reiterated his position again in 1904, stating: "The State welcomes the ever increasing tendency to make the university minister in a direct and practical way to the material interests of the state." To temper the strong position of the governor on this issue the faculty at the university gave further support to President Van Hise and his program of continued research for new knowledge and his wishes for a concerted effort toward better teaching for the citizen in Wisconsin. Lincoln Steffens described the posture of the university
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In Wisconsin the university is as close to the intelligent farmer as his pig-pen or his tool-house; the university laboratories are part of the alert manufacturer's plant; to the worker, the university is drawing nearer than the school around the corner and is as much his as his union or his favorite saloon. Creeping into the minds of students with pure seed, into the debate of youth with pure facts, into the opinions of voters with impersonal, expert knowledge, the state university is coming to be a part of the citizen's own mind, just as the state is becoming a part of his will. And that's what this whole story means; the University of Wisconsin is a highly conscious lobe of the common community's mind of the state of the people of Wisconsin. 17

The University of Wisconsin now became a showcase for state institutions reflecting a new land-grant philosophy. With national recognition for their efforts in education reflected by Theodore Roosevelt, the university welcomed all officials to study their idea. True, this midwestern educational spirit had a rural taint within its movement, but the historian Frederick Jackson Turner saw it as the most complete embodiment of educational democracy. Regional lines did develop in defining the university and the lines appeared to be clear when one could speak of the Big Ten and the Ivy League. The state universities were looked upon to be distinct and separate from private institutions, but there were exceptions enough to cloud the issue. Some eastern state universities did reflect the orthodox college ideal, as the University of Vermont, but Cornell, as discussed earlier, maintained the utilitarian ideals. Stanford, in the West, also adopted the trend of the midwestern university. It was very

clear that regional differences made it necessary to develop different curricula. The Midwest developed agricultural training and the East became involved in commerce and manufacturing, but there did remain the idea of service to the citizens of the state.

It appears that this new emerging university, infused from its beginning with the spirit of Jacksonian democracy, and discussed through the representative philosophies of Cornell University, Harvard University and the University of Wisconsin, embraced a three point program: (1) teaching, (2) service, (3) research. The entire program is infused with a philosophy of utility and the availability of the program for all citizens. Service and research were to be available to the businessman, the farmer, as well as the mechanic and the doctor. Good teaching was to be available to everyone desiring instruction and this position necessitated the aforementioned philosophy of open enrollment. More about open enrollment and admission standards will be discussed later. First, the writer would like to briefly discuss the position of research and the resultant consideration of graduate schools in the land-grant institutions.

By the early twentieth century, most major colleges and universities had graduate schools in existence or in the process of development. With Hopkins leading the way in graduate work, the land-grant universities, with their deep interest in community service, established a pattern for all graduate schools in the desire and purpose for research. If schools perform research, should it not be for the benefit of the citizens? With the land-grant concept of open enrollment, the elective system and the desire for utilitarian
type course work, the universities were ripe to develop fully the
German University influence. The Germans had effectively used the
elective system for most of the nineteenth century within the
concept of basic research. They had revolutionized the institution
of higher learning. True, the German research revolved around
"pure research" within the "pure sciences," but the American mind
saw a different purpose. With the German influence, there was an
importance in linking book knowledge and practical science. Later
on the university would produce the researcher of the "ivory tower"
that Richard Hofstadter would describe in his book Anti-intellectualism
in American Life, but for the moment the researcher must "pay off."
Nonetheless, research in the American university produced two basic
changes in the nature of the university. Lawrence Veysey explained
them as:

Responsibility for the first change, a tendency toward ever
increasing specialization of knowledge, it shared with the
movement toward practicality. The second, the liberation of
intellect for its own sake, resulted more exclusively from
the climate of abstract investigations, although intellect
was eventually to owe a certain degree of its increasing
acceptance to advocates of liberal culture. 18

This trend slowly began to make allowances for the professor
that wanted freedom to search for truth, delve deeper into special-
ized areas, and bring graduate students into association with him.
Practical research still existed; teaching this new knowledge to the
citizen of the state was still a requirement of the university de-
demanded by the state for the betterment of the citizen. Nevertheless,

18Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, p. 142.
specialized research created a situation that all institutions of higher learning, then and today, have to consider. According to Veysey, "The most pronounced effect of the increasing emphasis upon specialized research was a tendency among scientifically minded professors to ignore the undergraduate college and to place low value upon their function as teachers."19 Within the land-grant university and the concept of open enrollment, teaching, and service, the professor involved in research found that "giving one's energy to immature and frequently mediocre students could easily seem as irritating irrelevance."20 Value in student intelligence and background now had to be considered. This view was always true in the "old college," but now the land-grant universities found them embroiled in the same issue, but for different reasons. The universities could not devote too much time and energy to helping the ill-prepared college student. Trade schools could best handle these students. The new American university resorted to three basic types of instruction: (1) the lecture, (2) the seminar, (3) the laboratory. None of these forms of instruction took into consideration the "immature and mediocre student." Open enrollment still existed in most universities, but the general rule for admission was that the ill-prepared student must "make up" academic weaknesses and compete with those that are prepared. Obviously, if university professors could not spend the time aiding students, something had
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to be done prior to university entrance. The "old college" had their prep-schools, but not so with the new university. It was quite clear something must be done with the secondary school.

Although some state legislatures had passed laws permitting the use of public funds for high schools, the laws were in question. Along with the private academies, the high schools offered more of the classical curriculum, and few students needed such courses for few went to college. In 1874 the questionable laws in the state of Michigan were ruled illegal by the State Supreme Court. The ruling handed down by the Court supported the right of school districts to tax citizens in the city of Kalamazoo for support of the local high school. In the Court's judgment, the high schools were necessary to complete a ladder system between state supported elementary schools and the state university. Using this case as a precedent, the states of Wisconsin and Minnesota also passed laws in 1875 and 1878 respectively. Eventually other states followed with laws of their own, but private school interests fought them all the way. By 1885 public enrollment in the secondary school surpassed the private sector and the United States Commissioner of Education stated that by the turn of the century the new high schools would dominate the scene.

Now that the public high school found a place in the ladder system of education, difficulties arose in the development of a uniform curriculum. Future college students faced conflicting entrance requirements. Some school programs did not allow for the non-college bound student.
Although the United States had to wait until 1918 for all states to pass compulsory attendance laws, the changing character of the high school student further complicated the work of various state and federal associations and committees concerned with curricula. By 1890 half the existing states had passed compulsory attendance laws. Massachusetts had done so in 1852 and Mississippi was last in 1918. Weakness in enforcement limited attendance further, but those that did attend posed a problem for the schools. Not only did the schools have to consider course offerings for all the students, but now there was the increased problem of maintaining order in the classroom. Concern for children laboring in the factories and fields of America resulted in their attendance even before some states passed compulsory attendance laws. With the passing of child labor laws the problem became even more acute. Cremin described the situation as follows:

Granted this, compulsory school attendance marked a new era in the history of American education. The crippled, the blind, the deaf, the sick, the slow-witted, and the needy arrived in growing numbers. Thousands of recalcitrants and incorrigibles who in former times might have dropped out of school now became public charges for a minimum period. And as the school-leaving age moved progressively upward, every problem was aggravated as youngsters became bigger, stronger, and more resourceful. The dreams of democratic idealists may have resided in compulsory-attendance laws, but so did the makings of the blackboard jungle.21

Educational leaders were trying to answer the needs of the farmer and argued that a good rural education would make a happy and contented farmer. The farm youth would remain in rural America and
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not add to the discontent in the crowded streets of the urban areas. Adding to the city problem was the constant flow of unskilled labor from Europe via immigration policies. As discussed earlier in the chapter, a considerable number of labor leaders and educators advocated trade schools and industrial education to alleviate some of the problems. Others wanted the new high schools to incorporate newer curricula. John Dewey reiterated time and time again his argument that industrial schools and trade schools if separated from others would only accentuate existing social differences. The Federation of Labor and the Knights of Labor did not agree totally with the curriculum of the new high schools. "Jealous of its control over the skilled labor market, it somewhat hesitantly approved industrial education in the public school system, and insisted that this instruction should not be controlled in the interests of employers." Labor wanted schools to increase their effectiveness and promote the value of labor as a method of bettering one's life. Then, there still existed the social Darwinists that asked the schools to preach social adjustment and let the elite "do their things." This position was counter-balanced by those like Dewey who charged the school with the remaking of society.

By July, 1892, the National Education Association established the Committee of Ten to examine the problem. The committee was composed of five college presidents, one college professor, three

secondary school principals, and the United States Commissioner of Education, William T. Harris. The chairman of the committee was Charles W. Eliot. After two years of study, the committee issued its report amid stormy criticisms. For purposes of this dissertation two positions in their report are of great significance. First, the committee argued, as Edward A. Krug stated, that "the secondary schools of the United States, taken as a whole, do not exist for the purpose of preparing boys and girls for colleges. Only an insignificant percentage of the graduates of these schools go to colleges or scientific schools." Although their suggested curriculum would be questioned today, in 1894 the courses offered were for terminal students as well as college bound students. The courses were classical, Latin, scientific, modern language, and English. Perhaps the saving factor involved here is that few students even attended high school in 1894. The second position reflected in the committee report, that will be considered, is the posture taken in regard to the existence of varied high schools for varied curricula. Rather than build different schools for different interests, the committee reflected a desire for the comprehensive high school. Their reasons may have been more economic than democratic, but this factor is still reflected today. The secondary schools have circumvented the issue somewhat by offering the multi-tract system to allow for terminal students and for those advancing to some post high school work including college.

The committee completed their work by challenging the institutions of higher learning in America to "accept for admission to appropriate courses of their instruction the attainments of any youth who has passed creditably through a good secondary school course, no matter to what group of subjects he may have mainly devoted himself in the secondary school." Further, in a true Jacksonian mood, the committee stated that "this close articulation between the secondary schools and higher institutions would be advantageous alike for the schools, the colleges, and the country."

At this point in time it appears quite clear that the majority of educators in America have fought against early vocational stratification by means of comprehensive high schools, state universities, and liberal land-grant colleges and by educating future lawyers, teachers, and physicians in the same schools and up to a point in the same classes. The Committee on College Entrance Requirements (1896) agreed with the Committee of Ten and opposed a totally different role for secondary schools, that of job preparation.

Even though the new public secondary school was now coming into its own, there still existed the trade schools and the development of new technical high schools with emphasis on vocational education. This was, in part, to meet the demands of the industrialized northeast and the desire for better farmers in the Midwest and South. However, the move toward the comprehensive high school was clear. Harry G. Good and James D. Teller described the movement:

The trend, however, was toward the general high school in which the manual training curriculum ran parallel to the
home economics, general, classical, and other curricula. The whole great movement towards activities had developed as the result of the convergence of many forces including the demands of a society that was rapidly becoming urban and industrial, the decline of apprenticeship, the introduction of science teaching, the kindergarten and child-study movement, and the growing high school enrollments of which manual training was partly cause, partly effect.  

The progressive movement in the early 1900's encouraged introducing vocational subjects in the secondary schools "not merely to build utilitarian skills, but," as Lawrence Cremin explained, "as points of departure for increasingly intellectualized ventures into the life and meaning of industrial society."  

John Dewey took the position a step further and explained that a democracy cannot grow where some students are provided a narrow utilitarian education and other students obtain a broad liberal education.  

The colleges and universities accepted the challenge of the Committee of Ten and soon formed associations to discuss college entrance requirements. The New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools was already in existence since 1885. Others were the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in the Middle States and Maryland (1892), the North Central (1894), the Southern (1895), the Northwest (1918), and the Western Association (1930). The North Central Association developed a

---


sixteen unit course requirement program for college admission and
soon, in conjunction with member colleges, regularly inspected
schools asking accreditation.

In 1901 the College Entrance Board was established from the
Association for the Middle States and Maryland was to become an
independent body giving annual college entrance exam across the
United States.

The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education
reported in 1918 under the title *Cardinal Principles of Secondary
Education*. In general, their report made it quite clear that high
schools should base their curriculum on the needs of society and
prepare the young for living. This emphasis differed somewhat from
the Committee of Ten in that there was little mention of college
preparation. In fact, the National Association of Secondary School
 Principals urged the secondary schools to inspect colleges and
determine whether or not colleges were prepared for high school
 graduates.

Open enrollment still existed in land-grant institutions
and the trend for elective courses continued along with the multi-
curriculum for varied student wishes, but now the high schools were
expected to adequately prepare the incoming freshmen. It was true
that the new college course offerings did not usually set such high
standards of admission as the classical courses demanded, but land-
grant institutions, state universities, and private colleges were
interested in admission policies. The high schools, on the other
hand, saw their role as preparing their graduates for other life
activities. With all states advocating compulsory education by 1918 and many increasing the minimum age for retainment, the secondary schools had the added burden of maintaining adequate curriculum for the diversified student body. Child labor laws, as mentioned earlier, prevented many high school students from dropping out because they could not find legal employment. Certainly, economic faction shaped this cultural phenomenon.

The American frontier and industrialization had previously demanded labor, but there were indicative signs of a changing trend in labor demands, that is, fewer laborers. Butts explained:

The road seemed easier in the twentieth century, for the public began to recognize the values of extended schooling. That this realization was actually not long in coming was actually shown by the phenomenal rise in public high school enrollments from about 500,000 in 1900 to 1,000,000 in 1910, 2,000,000 in 1920, over 4,000,000 in 1930, and approximately 7,000,000 in 1940.28

This trend forced many burdens upon the new and fast developing public high school.

This development was soon to have its effects upon the land-grant and state universities. Good and Teller related this new development:

High school principals long felt that their schools were tightly wedged in between the elementary schools, which directed the children for eight years and the colleges, which restricted the high school program through their entrance requirements. By developing the junior high school below the tenth grade and securing a very considerable degree of freedom from college control, the high school has carried out an area of secondary education that is reasonably free from external domination.29

28Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education, p. 542.

29Good and Teller, A History of Western Education, p. 531.
The resultant junior high has developed many problems within our ladder system and we are now dealing with this under the new title, middle school. Of more importance to this dissertation is the long term effect upon the universities. The philosophy behind the formation of the junior high school would soon be extended to the new junior college. With seemingly less pressure from the colleges, the high schools could answer other public requests of their existence. Other considerations were reduced costs in high school operation. An increased attendance for the junior high resulted because location of the schools were closer to the family units.

Developing parallel to the junior high school in the 1920's was the junior college. In part the junior colleges grew into existence for two basic reasons as discussed by Good and Teller.

"The first was that the university should not dissipate its strength in teaching the elementary subjects of the freshman and sophomore years, but should devote itself to advanced studies and graduate and professional works."\(^{30}\) This new philosophy was, perhaps, due to the high schools rearranging of objectives other than academic preparation for college. Certainly, economics again played a role. Also, could universities encompass all demanded curricula? Accessibility to the junior college would increase the enrollment as did the junior high school. Also, the junior college could be looked upon as an extension of community life and not as a large city high school or huge state university. Good and Teller

continued, "The second idea was that many high school graduates who
would not attend a college or university should have the opportunity
to do one or more years of work beyond the high school."\textsuperscript{31} Initially,
the junior college was established as an extension of the high school.
Because of this beginning, some states operate the college with low
tuition and open admission policies. The state of California operates
the junior college with the philosophy as being free and open, much
like the high school. President William Rainey Harper of The
University of Chicago initiated the junior college idea and urged
the college preparatory high schools to establish junior colleges.
Michigan initiated a similar policy in 1895. By 1910 the state of
California was the leader of the junior high school movement by
making the junior college at Fresno a public institution. Because
of the junior college heritage, the majority of the junior colleges
remain as public institutions with the facilities and staffs re-
sembling that of large high schools rather than universities.\textsuperscript{32}

By 1920 the unique American public educational system was
firmly established. It was now possible for a student to move from
the elementary school through the high school and, hence, to a
junior college and/or university all within the public domain.
The American Experience provided for the ladder system in the true
Jacksonian sense. Compulsory attendance laws and labor laws
demanded the need for schools. Certainly, the Jeffersonian phi-
losophy of education remained within the American Experience and

\textsuperscript{31}Good and Teller, \textit{A History of Western Education}, p. 532.

\textsuperscript{32}Good and Teller, \textit{A History of Western Education}, p. 532.
our concern for his natural aristocracy asked that other schools be created to aid those students that found this formal education difficult. These students, now known as "drop-outs," had to be prepared to enter the labor market. Many states continued to provide for the existence of vocational schools. Wisconsin, in 1911, established a detailed vocational school system soon to be emulated by other states. It was to be completely separate and distinct from the public schools with its own education departments.  

Finally, the establishment of a Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education in 1914 resulted in vocational education being a federal issue. This Commission recommended local, state, and federal matching funds for vocational schools. These funds would be available for secondary school programs and vocational schools. Cremin discussed this issue further:

Businessmen, trade unionists, and educators were now squarely behind the principle of Federal aid for vocational education; and the signing of the Smith-Lever Act, providing for a federally assisted agricultural extension program, had removed the opposition of the Association of American Agriculture Colleges and Experiment Stations.

The issue of vocational education in the 1920's was very similar to the trade school movement in the 1800's. The concerns of labor, management, and education remained the same. Good and Teller discussed the issue further:

Vocational education raised several problems that call for continued attention. The gulf between vocational and general


34 Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. 54.

35 Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. 56.
education was widened by the increased activity of the Federal Government which resulted from the Smith-Hughes Act (1917) and later acts with similar objects. The recent war-training and subsequent programs looked in the same general direction. The possibility that we are turning toward a national and state system of vocational education that will come into competition with the public school system, which has been built up by a century of thought and effort, is unfortunately real. Competition for funds is only one phase of this problem.36

Also, John Dewey's concern again comes into focus: "The things which are socially most fundamental, that is, which have to do with experience in which the widest groups share, are the essentials. The things which represent the needs of specialized groups and technical pursuits are secondary."37 Dewey continued to explain that a democracy will long endure if one class of citizens receive the broad and liberal education and another, the utilitarian,38 Of course, rugged individualists as William Graham Sumner and psychologists as Edward L. Thorndike argued against this position. In discussing Thorndike's position, Clarence J. Karier stated:

"Progress depended not on the extension of culture to the masses but rather on the education of the gifted elite. Repeatedly, he (Thorndike) argued against the upward extension of the compulsory education law on the grounds that such attempts at further education of the mentally unfit were doomed to failure."39 Laborers,

37Dewey, Democracy and Education, p. 231.
38Dewey, Democracy and Education, p. 231.
themselves, favored the general and academic courses along with the vocational in the expectation of upward mobility. White-collar occupations were their goal and yet during World War I the lack of trained mechanics was an apparent as the same problem later during World War II. 

A case in point, here, is the plight of the Negro in the American system of higher education. The passing of the Second Morrill Act in 1890 resulted in federal support for Negro colleges. In general "the act stipulated that no appropriations would go to states that denied admission to the colleges on the basis of race unless they also set up separate but equal facilities." Previ­ously, the United States Supreme Court in United States V. Stanley, 1883, decided:

That the Civil Rights Act of 1875 was unconstitutional on the grounds that Congress does not have the power to regulate the social relations of persons, but that states do have such authority when exercised with reasonable discretion.

Later, in 1896, the United States Supreme Court, in Plessy V. Ferguson, upheld the right of the state of Louisiana to allow segregated public conveyances. The Court decreed the state statute was not a violation of the 14th Amendment. As a result of the afore-mentioned decisions, the Negro land-grant institutions, generally titled Agriculture and Mechanical Colleges, became institutions of

40Good and Teller, A History of Western Education, chap. 20.
41Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 254.
42Karier, Man, Society and Education, p. 310.
43Karier, Man, Society and Education, p. 310.
preparation for technical competence for either industry or agriculture. The educational and political discussions that had been taking place, concerning the philosophy of land-grant institutions populated with white students, did not carry over into the Negro institution. Whereas the white laborer had many spokesmen proclaiming the weakness in this narrow form of utilitarian education, the Negro had few. This separate but equal doctrine for education that would produce a second class citizen had support not only of the white American but also of leading Negro citizens. Their reasons may have been different, but the support was there.

Led by the philosophy of Booker T. Washington, a Negro, and supported by affluent whites, Negro citizens saw agriculture and mechanical education as a solution to the plight of the Negro. His philosophical position was made clear to the American citizen when he spoke at the opening of the Cotton States Exposition in Atlanta in 1896. Curti described the speech as follows:

In the famous speech which Washington delivered on that occasion he translated his social philosophy into epigrammatic terms. The opportunity to earn a dollar, he declared, was more important to the Negro than the chance to spend it in the opera house. Pleading with the Negro to make himself useful to the South and with the white to cultivate a spirit of friendliness and fairness to the black in return for his economic contribution, Washington won great applause from the governing class for concluding that "in all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one has the hand in all things essential to mutual progress."

The practical education for the Negro, Washington believed, would help destroy racial prejudice and convince the white population

---

that the Negro could be self-sufficient. Curti continued:

In his effort to enlist the sympathy and co-operation of the white community in Tuskegee, Washington was surprisingly successful. His warning that white men, by holding blacks in the gutter, would have to stay there with them, was a compelling argument when it became clear that the whole community actually did profit by what was being done for the Negro. By providing skilled services and produce what Tuskegee needed, he broke down a great deal of the existing prejudice against Negro education.45

This new philosophy of education appeared to be that of Washington's past experience at Hampton and Tuskegee. In the spirit of Dewey, Washington's education at Hampton taught him that education was to be identical with living and that the social was as important as the book learning and by doing useful and co-operative tasks there had to be an involvement with the academic.46 This philosophical position carried over to his teaching at Tuskegee, but a few Negro leaders saw this position weighing heavily toward the practical, the useful and thus forcing the Negro into the laboring market. What of the intellectual world? Did not the Negro have a place there?

Leading the critics of Washington's philosophy was W. E. B. DuBois. DuBois was not vehemently opposed to industrial education, trade schools, or A and M colleges, but felt if this education guaranteed material prosperity at the expense of social and political advance, then he was opposed.

DuBois, although a Negro, was a product of the predominately white professional schools in America. In 1884 DuBois graduated from

Great Barrington High School in Vermont. After attending Fisk University, a Negro college in Nashville, Tennessee, he received his bachelor's degree cum laude in 1890, his M.A. in 1891 from Harvard. After two years of study at the University of Berlin, he completed the Ph.D. requirements at Harvard and graduated in 1895.\textsuperscript{47} Obviously, he was a Negro intellectual who saw value in the academic life and Washington's position developed a more efficient binding into attitudes of inferiority for the Negro.\textsuperscript{48} DuBois was committed to his Talented Tenth. This Negro minority, enriched with the best education, would lead the majority.\textsuperscript{49} Merle Curti added to this position:

\begin{quote}
If the Negro were to win equality with the white, he must equal the white in culture, in creative scholarship, and in the arts. He must prize the best in his racial heritage; he must hold his head high, and stop turning the other cheek; he must, in short, cast off the psychology of the slave.\textsuperscript{50}
\end{quote}

DuBois, however, did see some value in Washington's position because the Negro did need material success, but his continued analysis still saw this position forcing the Negro to a hopelessly inferior, subordinate status. The black man would have to wait fifty years to evaluate properly Washington and DuBois. Perhaps it would be fair to say that the conservative Washington adhered to a

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{48}Greene, The Public School and the Private Vision, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{50}Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators, p. 305.
\end{quote}
position of compromise with the white power structure and accepted opportunities offered in industrial and agricultural education. DuBois represented the position of academic achievement especially for potential Negro leaders and foreshadowed the civil rights movement in general and, within education, in particular.

No doubt the land-grant philosophy of utility existed with Negro colleges, but the stigma of inferiority continued and very little was done to discourage this concept. Perhaps the stigma remained within all land-grant colleges, but the predominately white populated land-grant colleges received more social, political, and economic support to continue the American dream of self-betterment. Lawrence Veysey described the American university:

By this time, in a social sense, the university had become strongly characteristic of its surroundings. It was supposed to be open to all (so said the state law in many areas); it was especially open, during this period, to children of northern European origin whose fathers did not work with their hands. Its relative accessibility fostered ambition, and although the university sought to reward all types of ambition, this term again possessed a more particular tacit meaning; it connoted a desire to rise competitively in ways which had been strongly stylized by the urban middle class.51

By the roaring twenties, the established and successful middle class found that the progression through the educational system was a sure way to continue their social status and, indeed, to better it. Existing forms of society were solidified and the success oriented middle class took advantage. Veysey continued:

Stylized social ambition, more than a quest of academic excellence, captured the new American university; indeed, excellence

51 Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, p. 440.
of inquiry or imagination was an attribute which few men knew in surefooted fashion how to recognize or define. It would only slightly caricature the situation to conclude that the most important function of the American professor lay in posing requirements sufficiently difficult to give college graduates a sense of pride, yet not so demanding as to deny the degree to anyone who pledged four years of his parents' resources and his own time in residence at an academic institution.\(^{52}\)

The American university was regarded as the guardian of popular values. Students were not taught, intently at least, independence. Tolerance of other than popular values existed unless there developed flagrant behavior and thinking that was threatening. The American public found faith in the university as long as there was moral soundness, faith in the American system and, again, promise of social and economic advancement. Carl Kaysen contributed further analysis of this new university:

> In the past, even as recently as the 1930's and certainly in earlier periods, science and scholarships were secondary activities in American colleges and universities. The transmission of culture, the education of the elite, and the training of a relatively small number of experts in a few traditional fields were their central concerns.\(^{53}\)

Of all the state and land-grant institutions in existence during the early 20th Century, six led the way, the six being Michigan, Cornell, Minnesota, Wisconsin, California, and Illinois.\(^{54}\) In addition to the abovementioned characteristics, the state and land-grant institutions possessed one that the student body requested. The land-grant student seldom asked what he could do for his university;

---

\(^{52}\) Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, p. 440.


he asked what the university could do for him. The demand produced
the professional schools. Nevins described the situation:

Many of them in the years 1890-1930 became primarily congeries
of professional schools, which they created to satisfy public
demand. The pattern of action followed in most instances was
simple and natural. A new vocation or new purpose would arise;
its adherents would say to themselves, "Why should we not have
a school of our own at the university?"; they would bring
appropriate pressures to bear; and lo, as a result of external
rather than internal initiative, the school would spring into
being.55

Obviously the land-grant and state universities became the prin-
cipal cradle of the new technological professions.

This new trend brought about the direct involvement of
government and business. The government, through federal and state
appropriations, supported the universities in new technologies and
also the training of citizens to fill the professional ranks
resulting from the new technologies. Nevins indicated that, "In
every case, support rested primarily on the utilitarian argument
that new knowledge was an essential input for the production of
some socially desirable good or service, and that only the Federal
Government could and would pay great costs involved."56 Research
for new knowledge demanded more government involvement and, more
often than not, the new knowledge led to more technology and thus
new jobs demanding skills both professional and non-professional.
Growth did indeed feed on growth. Modern technology required a
highly educated population and universities were called upon to

55Nevins, The State Universities and Democracy, p. 85.
56Nevins, The State Universities and Democracy, p. 23.
provide the trained intelligence. Junior colleges, community colleges, and vocational-technical schools responded to the desire of education beyond high school which was not academic or professional. The state and land-grant universities began their growth to what would soon be the gigantic institutions in existence today. The continued support of business and government fed the growth with enormous funds. From the depression years of the 1930's to World War II, the private fortunes supporting colleges and universities began to dry up and public funds had to come to the rescue. According to Rudolph, "Young men and women who had expected to pay and play their way through college were now working or being paid by federal funds, $93,000,000 of which went to the support of college and university students in the form of emergency assistance between 1935 and 1943." Butts indicated that although there was no bill for federal aid near the mid-twentieth century, the federal government did spend approximately $3.5 billion by 1950. During World War II, the government provided $500 million to some 12 million persons in vocational schools and universities. Following the war, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (G.I. Bill of Rights) provided $14 billion to 8 million veterans in colleges, universities, and vocational schools. This also included the

57 Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 463.
58 Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 469.
59 Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education, p. 530.
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Korean War veterans. By 1952 the federal government was spending $300 million for grants in science, technology, agriculture, industry, medicine, and public health. The interesting trend, very evident at this stage, was the increasing provision of federal funds for individual students which could be spent (with few exceptions) at any college, university, vocational school, etc., recognized by the government. Land-grant universities were still receiving funds from previous federal grants and acts, but now they were in competition for the funds provided to individuals. The government was now awarding federal and state monies to individual colleges and universities able to provide services for them. This involvement by the government using public monies could well be looked upon as the precursor to the voucher idea now in the experimental stage for the elementary schools and high schools.

Barzun summarized the situation:

The new university emerged then as the by-product of its own war effort. It was the Manhattan Project, the V-12 Program, the G. I. Bill of Rights, following close upon the participation of the academic community in the New Deal, that catapulted the university into its present headlong rush. To that momentum was added, after the war, the impetus of a world power that must continue to mobilize academic men for global advice and activity.

This faith in higher education placed heavy demands upon the university. Whereas elementary school and high school provided lunch program, driver education, medical, and dental care, the

---

61Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education, p. 533.
university found more demands for its service. Barzun described these demands as follows:

Again, every new skill or item of knowledge developed within the academy creates a new claim by the community. Knowledge in power and its possessor owes the public a prompt application, or at least diffusion through the training of others. It thus comes about that the School of Social Work aids the poor, the School of Architecture redesigns the slum, the School of Business advises the small tradesman, the School of Dentistry runs a free clinic, the School of Law gives legal aid, and the undergraduate college supplies volunteers to hospitals, recreation centers, and remedial schools.63

With the federal government now totally involved with higher education, a multitude of acts and bills flowed out of Washington providing millions of dollars for research and service to the nation. Spurred on by internal economic problems, social problems, national defense, and the ever present concern over technology, Congress debated and then passed a series of acts beginning in 1950 and continuing into the 1960s and 1970s. Some of the more important decisions handed down by Congress were:


63Barzun, The American University, p. 11.


These decisions and many others by the Congress have added to the wealth of funds available to institutions and men eager and able to use their expertise. The universities developed many departments to subscribe to these funds and provide the services requested by the government. All colleges within the universities sought these monies. The largeness of the land-grant and state universities were ready-made institutions for such an endeavor and the public expected, if not demanded, these resources. The universities created positions of professorship and graduate study to work with the government agencies to obtain federal grants. Universities and their staff spread throughout the country providing service to the community, state and nation. Teaching and research lost some degree of importance, in particular, the former. It is Jacques Barzun's contention that this trend has caused the university to lose its quasi monopoly of instruction and research. He stated, "The latter is now shared with independent institutes and big corporations; the former is shared with ordinary business firms, the Army and the communication media."

Barzun, The American University, p. 11.
Consultant work and workshops became a byword for the professor and his graduate student, perhaps at the expense of teaching more than research. This development reinforced the thinking of students and parents alike that perhaps the multiversity was at long last truly weak in teaching at the undergraduate level. This was not a new fear. It existed before, but the fear became real to many families considering education at the junior or community college and the various vocational-technical schools. This concern coupled with the universities' desire to obtain qualified students better abled the community colleges, junior colleges, and vocational-technical schools to grow in number. Proven students could transfer to the university at a later date.

Summary

The passing of the Morrill Act formally committed the federal government to fulfill the emerging philosophy of public supported higher education. With the few established state universities failing to provide a curriculum for the common man and, in general, differing from the private colleges only in geographical location, the land-grant college existence was just a matter of time. The land-grant colleges exerted pressure on the existing state universities and private colleges to allow for the common citizen. For some 700 colleges, the burden of change was too great and they were forced to close their doors. Available federal funds brought into existence more public colleges and universities, especially in the midwestern and western states.
The conclusion of the Civil War committed the national philosophy to one of industry and technology. Jefferson's dream of an agrarian society was soon to be reflected only in the South and West. Hamilton won in death.

Technology now demanded skilled and semiskilled labor and the millions of immigrants provided the hands. Trade schools came into existence and finally with the reluctant support of labor unions, they grew in number. The land-grant colleges of the East found themselves in competition with vocational schools and trade schools.

The midwestern states were more involved with agricultural education, and the Grange gave the cow colleges the same support that business and labor gave the schools and colleges in the East.

Both the western and eastern colleges found themselves competing with the technical-vocational and trade schools for public funds. The passing of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 demonstrated to the land-grant colleges and universities that vocational and trade schools were here to stay.

Educators were beginning to look at all fields of learning as equal. Admission standards dropped and universities and colleges not only accepted non-academic students, but also accepted more control from them and their state governments.

Land-grant colleges and universities absorbed at least three dominant philosophical educational positions from three prominent institutions of higher learning. Cornell provided the diverse curriculum concept; Harvard, the laissez-faire attitude of student choice in course selection and social involvement; Wisconsin, the
idea of service to the state and her citizens. Land-grant institutions were now known as universities committed to: (1) teaching for utility, (2) research for utility, (3) service for utility.

The establishment of high schools and junior high schools gave the colleges and universities cause to re-examine admission standards. Land-grant institutions had been committed to open admissions and low tuition, but the new high schools could provide the preparation for college that colleges handled through remedial programs or less demanding courses. The Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was formed along with the College Entrance Board.

High schools, working out their philosophy of education, could not accept the role of college preparation in totality. What about job preparation and social adjustment discussed by progressive educators? The conflict brought about more public involvement. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education recommended a curriculum designed for better living. The Committee of Ten combined the above suggestion with a curriculum for college preparation. The National Association of Secondary School Principals asked that they examine the colleges and universities and determine whether or not these institutions were prepared for high school graduates. With the states passing compulsory attendance laws, the above issues became more acute.

With the colleges and universities failing to develop curricula for students desiring nothing more than a one or two-year extension of high school work, the junior college and community college came
into existence. This movement, coupled with a national commitment to vocational-technical schools through the passage of Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, fully completed a ladder system of education uniquely American.

This ladder system was to be available to everyone, but in actuality the system was successful only to the established middle class. For most minority groups, the ladder ended with high school, trade schools or, at best, the junior college. The plight of the Negro American was a case in point. The classical debate between Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. DuBois represented the acceptance of skilled labor by Washington and the position of academic excellence for DuBois' Talented Tenth. The Second Morrill Act of 1890 stipulated that federal funds would be provided to states only if equal facilities were provided for land-grant colleges separated by race. This act, coupled with the United States V. Stanley, 1883, and Plessy V. Ferguson, 1896 guaranteed the existence of Negro colleges. The former court decision disallowed Congress to regulate social relationships of people. Only the states have this right. The latter case allowed the state of Louisiana to segregate public conveyances. The entire situation created the Negro land-grant colleges (Agriculture and Mechanical or Industrial) in some southern states.

World War I and World War II, separated by a depression, encouraged the federal and state governments to use all the nation's resources to save the nation. The land-grant colleges and universities became the cradle for new developments in technology and
especially for service to the country. Congress passed a series of acts and bills in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s involving education to deal with economic problems, social problems, national defense, and concern over technology. These federal acts and bills added to the wealth of funds available to higher education. The result was a commitment to the universities' idea of service. Instruction and research, for the moment, took a back seat or were taken over by business, the military, or the communications media.

The land-grant colleges and universities of the 1950s, the 1960s, and now the 1970s appeared to be institutions for the federal and state governments and not of the community or people. The Wisconsin idea was not being totally fulfilled. The vacuum would be filled by junior colleges, community colleges, and vocational-technical schools.

Chapter IV, then, will be a historical and current examination of the two-year colleges and vocational-technical schools. The researcher will examine these institutions in general and will examine specifically the institutions and their organization in the states of Wisconsin, New York, and California. The researcher will further examine the philosophy inherent in their existence and whether or not their existence fulfills the philosophy of education as developed by the land-grant institutions. Curricula will be examined, student types attending will be examined, and projected growth both in numbers of institutions and students will also be examined.

---
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CHAPTER IV

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, THE VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL
SCHOOLS AND THE LAND-GRANT PHILOSOPHY

The development of the junior college and the community college has as much a history as the development of the land-grant university. As discussed in the previous chapter, they began as extensions of high schools to meet the needs of local students desiring more education but, for varied reasons, not attending the university. Perhaps the major influence in the creation of the junior college came from the German model of higher education. With the German university devoted to graduate study, professional training and research, the gymnasia became their institution for lower-division instruction. The gymnasia was, in effect, an extended secondary school, which in the United States would be the two-year community college. These two-year colleges were never known as the land-grant college or state college but, because of local interest and support, were looked upon as a community school. Most public junior colleges are community colleges and are referred to as such by more and more of the general public and educators. The community college curricula, in response to local needs, provides opportunities for learning new skills, upgrading present skills and offering courses in general education. For students desiring course
credits to transfer to four-year institutions, the community college also provides such a curriculum. With lower academic standards, open admission, easy accessibility and low tuition, the community colleges are growing both in number and in student population. Easy accessibility to the community college, both in the rural and urban sections of the country, has given them the name—commuter colleges.

The local colleges evolved in part because the existing four-year institutions did not respond to the local needs. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman indicated that:

They have capitalized on the local backlash against national institutions and cosmopolitan values; on lower-middle and working class resentment against professional exclusiveness and social snobbery at the universities; and on adult anxiety about the increasing emancipation of the young from adult supervision on residential campuses.¹

It might also be added that parents believed the living costs would be reduced because of the commuter possibilities. Students living at home have their room and board furnished by their parents at reduced costs. Parents can also maintain their close supervision. Because land-grant universities and other public and private colleges and universities were sometimes looked upon more as national and state institutions, they did not seem to answer to local requests and feelings. Land-grant universities responded somewhat with extension schools but never in such numbers as to threaten the growing community colleges.

The community college grew from just a few, at the beginning of the twentieth century, to a hundred by World War I and two hundred by World War II. World War II veterans attended the university with the four-year programs or vocational-technical schools. The growth of the community college leveled off after 1950 and then began a growth in the 1960's and 1970's that has been phenomenal. In a period of ten years, from 1959 to 1969, the public community college more than doubled in number from 390 to 794. Enrollment increased from 551,760 to 2,051,493. In a period of twenty-five years, 1940-1965, a typical community college enrollment increased from 500 students to 2,500. By 1972 the average student body increased to 3,000 and the American Association of Junior Colleges in one study

2Jencks and Riesman, The Academic Revolution, p. 482.


Depending upon the research source, these figures will vary. The difference is due, in part, to the method of research, source of data, availability of data, definition of a part-time student and full-time student, and the definition of a community college. Some community colleges have vocational-technical programs and the data concerned are claimed by both vocational-technical schools and community colleges. Duplication also occurs because some vocational-technical schools are defined as community colleges and concerned data may be found listed in both the vocational-technical journals and in junior or community college journals. In that this writer is more concerned with trends, and most of the research indicates definite trends, this writer will use data basically from two concerned sources to maintain consistency in reporting. The source for community college data will be from the American Association of Junior Colleges. The source for vocational-technical schools will be from the Vocational and Technical Education Annual Report.
projects an average enrollment of 3,800 by 1980. The same study projects 1,228 community colleges by 1980 with an enrollment of 4,770,000. If four-year colleges and universities should make provisions for added facilities and curriculum, the student population could increase by one million.

The continued increase in enrollment can be attributed to population growth and, to some degree, the nature and definition of the student. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman described student groups:

These students fall into four principal groups: Those who do not want to go away to college; those who cannot afford to do so; those whose high school record bars them from a four-year college or, at least, from the public ones in their home state; and those who want less than four years of higher education. The relative size of these groups is a matter of some debate.

A study by Alexander Astin, Robert Panos, and John Creager, in the fall of 1966, found that a fifth of all community college students enrolled in terminal vocational and technical studies and that 77 per cent of the men and 65 per cent of the women hoped to attain a B.A. degree eventually. It may be true that the community college serves a potpourri of students from groups listed above, but it is

---


interesting to see that this student is much concerned with his curriculum of study. College study is preferred by both student and professor over the terminal vocational and technical study. The degree is still desired.\footnote{Jencks and Riesman, The Academic Revolution, p. 489.}

Jencks and Riesman indicated the following:

A comprehensive network of community colleges, for example, is supposed to increase the proportion of high school graduates who go to college. It does increase the proportion who enter college, but it does not appear to increase the proportion who earn B.A.s.\footnote{Jencks and Riesman, The Academic Revolution, p. 489.}

It is clear then, of the four-fifths that enter the community college hoping for their degree, change their study for the terminal vocational-technical program or drop out.

It appears clear at this point that the community college has allowed more students to enter college but the increase in degrees has not been great. In fact, the land-grant and state universities allow the community college to do the selection they once did during a freshman's college year. Land-grant and state universities now get the higher academic student and the student with impressive diligence. The time of faculty and staff needed to screen the freshman at the land-grant university can now be devoted to research and service. The community college, it appears, can be considered a part of the academic community. Jencks and Riesman concluded: "It is not primarily an alternative model for other colleges or an alternative path to the top for individuals, but rather a safety valve releasing
pressures that might otherwise disrupt the dominant system. The evolving purpose of the community college today is still in debate. Closely resembling the high school and university relationship in the early twentieth century, the community college is preparing the student academically for university admission. Some students are asking for academic standards and professors would like to consider their course instruction comparable to university instruction. Working relationships between many community colleges and universities are being developed to deal with this issue. Representative of this development is the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. On November 30, 1972 the Chancellor, Archie R. Dykes, asked that professors establish lines of communication with the community college and that the admissions office prepare a set of equivalency tables listing the credits a student may receive at the University of Tennessee for courses completed at each of Tennessee's community colleges. Land-grant and state universities are no longer interested in marginal students. The aforementioned safety valve is now the community college.

Because land-grant and state universities are now concerned with able academic freshman and community college transfers, the community college is becoming the haven for marginal students pursuing their dream of a college degree. Universities have become quite successful in conveying this idea to the general public and


the politician controlling appropriations. The university role of graduate study and research is generally accepted by the people. The people have always been aware of the selection process that occurs during the freshman year at the university. Now, with state approved limits on university enrollments, higher academic requirements and, thus, a general discern for open admission, the community college is the marginal student's hope. However, even here the admission and retention issue is much the same as it was at the university level. The community college becomes the measure of admission to the university degree. Jencks and Riesman continued in this train of thought in rendering the issue to one of efficiency:

Quick departures save the staff's time, the taxpayer's money and probably the student's psyche. The only constraint is that the student should stay long enough so that he feels he has had a fair shake and blames his failure on himself rather than on the system. (This is considerably more likely if he can be induced to drop out rather than being flunked out).14

Existing, parallel to the public community college, is the private or independent two-year college. These junior colleges exist for most of the same reasons the community colleges exist. The independent two-year college is also for the community, has a low student-faculty ratio, generally academic, and interested in the cultural and social. Prior to the rapid community college growth of the 1960's, the independent two-year college was often regarded as more academic and oriented toward the liberal arts, general education, and college preparation. Because of their

independence, the colleges can be selective by any criteria they choose. Since the growth of the community college, the independent college has been losing ground in number and enrollment is therefore very controlled. Existing independent colleges have increased their enrollment somewhat but not in appreciable numbers. While the public community colleges doubled in number during the decade, 1960-1969, the private independent colleges declined from 273 to 244 and enrollment rose from 94,000 to only 135,000. Enrollment increased approximately 2,000 by 1971 and the projection for 1975 is only 153,000. Using another projection formula, the same source reports a 1975 enrollment of 174,000 and a 1980 enrollment of 204,000. While the enrollment increases slightly, the number of private colleges projected will be reduced by 4 or 5 to a total of 239 or 242 in 1980. This general leveling off in number of institutions and the slight enrollment increase can, for the most part, be accounted for because of the financial crisis. Whereas the public college can ask for increased taxes and tuition to offset rising costs, the private college can only raise the tuition and ask for alumni financial support.

The advantages of attending a private college in previous years has been offset by the same advantages being offered by the


According to Jencks and Riesman, public colleges are caught in a vicious circle. Most have little to offer that public colleges do not offer at a lower price, except smallness, protectiveness, and sometimes piety. So they cannot raise tuition much above the public level and cannot get enough resources to offer a more appealing program than their public rivals. And so ad infinitum.¹⁸

Because of the lack in resources, the private college cannot take advantage of the one characteristic they do have and that is the freedom to innovate. Some have tried and have been very successful. With smaller student enrollment at each institution and yet having a diversified student body, the independent college can undertake experimental programs.¹⁹ With an average enrollment of 600 students compared to 3,000 students at the public community college, the tremendous possibilities are clear.²⁰ The nature of the smaller independent college also provides for a greater percentage of student body to remain in residence.

Although the growth of the independent college is not impressive, America has historically allowed and provided for its existence. The influence of the independent college has been overshadowed by the public institutions and by all projections, the private institutions will, at best, show little growth.²¹

---

Looking at the combined two-year college programs, we have the following statistics: Total two-year college enrollment increased at an average annual rate of 14 per cent during the ten-year period of 1959-1969.22 Projected enrollment for a ten-year period, 1971-1981, shows an average annual growth rate of 7 per cent.23 In actual numbers, the student enrollment at all two-year colleges (independent and public) is projected to be 3,643,000 in 1975 and 4,838,000 in 1980.24 Total opening fall enrollment in 1971 was 2,680,762.25 Total enrollment increased 308,958 in 1970 and 230,311 in 1971.26 Part-time student enrollment continues to be high. Of the total 1970 enrollment of 2,450,451, part-time student enrollment was 1,164,797 or, approximately, 47.5 per cent.27

Greater numbers of part-time students are enrolling in community colleges that provide vocational-technical programs along with the general academic. Those students definitely committed to a

27Junior College Directory, 1972, p. 90. (Examine for a complete breakdown by state and further analysis of enrollment for two-year colleges).
vocational-technical program generally attend the new and fast developing technical institutes. Institutes such as these are helping to satisfy the technological needs of the nation's demand for skilled manpower.

As discussed previously in chapter III, the vocational-technical schools have a history that is truly their own. Industrial and agricultural demands of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century asked for skilled labor and new programs to meet the needs of the growing nation. The National Association of Manufacturers and the American Federation of Labor conflicted in their ideas as to whom should provide training and leadership. In 1908 a Federal Committee on Education accused labor and industry of advocating industrial education at the expense of agriculture in rural America. With the formation of the Grange and The Association of American Agriculture Colleges and Experiment Stations, the farmer found a power base to combat unions and industry. The Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education in 1914 ensured the existence of federal funds for vocational-technical schools by supporting the eventual signing of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914. The Morrill Act of 1862 and 1890 provided money for the land-grant colleges, and the Smith-Lever Act provided money for agricultural extension programs. The Hatch Act of 1887 and the Adams Act of 1906 had previously provided aid to agricultural experiment stations. With the passing of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, the dual system of education was firmly entrenched. Roberts described requirements of the act as
Each state was required to prepare a state plan for vocational education and to agree, (1) that the Federally aided program of vocational education would be under public supervision and control, (2) that the controlling purpose would be to fit for useful employment, (3) that the vocational education would be of less than college grade and designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who had entered upon or who were preparing to enter the occupation for which, they were receiving training, and (4) that the state or local community or both would provide the necessary plant and equipment. 28

The resulting vocational-technical schools grew rapidly in a parallel course to the land-grant college, the agriculture and mechanical schools, and agriculture and industrial schools. Offering non-degree instruction, the vocational-technical schools filled the vacuum that developed from the land-grant idea but not fulfilled by the land-grant college or their extensions. From a meager enrollment of 164,186 in 1918, the figure rose to 858,456 by 1928, 1,810,082 by 1938, and the post World War II years total of 2,836,121 in 1948. 29 In the early years, the curriculum in the schools revolved around agriculture, home economics, and industrial trades. By the 1950's and 1960's, areas such as: Distributive education, health, office and technical education became an integral part of the school curriculum. Total enrollment increased to 3,768,149 by 1960 and then doubled nine years later to a 1969


The total number of schools offering vocational-technical programs reached a figure of 18,492 by 1969. Of that total, the regular or comprehensive secondary school accounted for 16,747 programs with the community college providing 504, vocational-technical schools (post secondary) 470, specialized secondary schools 400, and colleges and universities 130. It is very clear that the secondary schools provide the bulk of the training but that community colleges and vocational-technical schools (post secondary) project a figure doubling the 1969 figure by 1973 and tripling it by 1980. There will be a continuing shift of vocational-technical schools to the community college ranks as some states develop new educational systems and some vocational-technical schools seek to add the academic curriculum to their course offerings.

The most influential piece of federal legislation directly concerned with vocational-technical education was the Vocational Education Act of 1963, summarized by Roberts:

In 1963, Congress enacted legislation designed to (1) extend present programs and develop new programs of vocational education, (2) encourage research and experimentation, and (3) provide workstudy programs to enable youth to continue

---

vocational education. The 1963 Act also amended the Smith-
Hughes, George-Barden and NDEA Acts.\textsuperscript{33}

New programs were developed to aid people with special needs.
"This definition included: (1) those whose physical, emotional, or
mental handicaps retard personal achievement; and (2) those whose
environments and cultural background inhibit personal, social, and
economic advancement."\textsuperscript{34} As the result of this act, the percentage
of student enrollment increased the greatest in the area of special
needs but the largest enrollment was at the secondary level.\textsuperscript{35}

Special need students rose from 25,638 in 1965 to 143,420 in 1969.
Secondary level students increased from 2,819,250 in 1965 to 4,079,395
in 1969. Post secondary level students had the greatest percentage
of increase (113.4\%) between the years 1965-1966 with a total increase
from 207,201 in 1965 to 706,085 in 1969.\textsuperscript{36} Total enrollment in
vocational-technical programs increased from 5,430,611 in 1965 to
7,979,366 in 1969.\textsuperscript{37}

This increase in enrollment in the vocational-technical
schools was given further encouragement with the passing of the

\textsuperscript{33}Roberts, Vocational and Practical Arts Education, p. 136.

\textsuperscript{34}Vocational and Technical Education, Annual Report Fiscal
Year 1969, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{35}Vocational and Technical Education, Annual Report Fiscal
Year 1969, p. 2. (See table 4 of this dissertation).

\textsuperscript{36}Vocational and Technical Education, Annual Report Fiscal
Year 1969, p. 2. (See tables 4 and 5 of this dissertation).

\textsuperscript{37}Vocational and Technical Education, Annual Report Fiscal
Year 1969, p. 2. (See table 5 of this dissertation. For a complete
breakdown of total enrollment in vocational education class, by type
of program and by state, see table 6).
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Economic Development Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1967, and the Permanent G. I. Bill established in 1966. Now, with the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BOG) of 1972, enrollment will continue to rise. The existence of vocational-technical programs within community colleges has allowed thousands of students to continue their education beyond high school and yet not be forced into demanding and competitive programs. Highly technical courses do exist for able students desiring specific skills but not the baccalaureate degree. Upon completion of the program, an associate degree is usually awarded. For some, this is a terminal degree and, for others, it may mean transfer to a four-year university and the baccalaureate degree. Whether the vocational-technical school is an independent institution or a part of the community college, the school continues to act as a safety valve within the system of higher education. Admission and retention is even easier in the vocational-technical school than at the community college. Dropping out of a non-academic program is very similar to dropping out of the academic program of the community college. Failing in any school is most always looked upon as personal, not a weakness in the system. The vocational-technical schools, although attracting many capable students, allow for many more marginal students. Although this system appears to be operable, acceptable and reasonable, the system permits the land-grant universities and state universities
to become more exclusive. The state of Michigan offers a case in point. Oakland Community College, Oakland University, Wayne State University, and Monteith College plus Michigan State University were all involved in state and local planning to deal with the issue. Michigan State University conducted a study of the Oakland County area and decided to establish a new campus. With the opening of Oakland Community College nearby, the academic concerns of Michigan State University were no longer an issue. The new campus could maintain academic standards and programs as long as there exists an institution nearby to admit less qualified students. Citizens are becoming accustomed to the fact that the land-grant universities and state universities are more selective and further believe it should be so, as long as another institution admits them. Community colleges and vocational-technical schools are designed to admit them.

The types of post secondary institutions vary not only with their nomenclature but also in programs offered, years in attendance, and type of organization. These institutions are usually known as junior colleges, community colleges, extension centers and technical institutes. They offer one, two, or three-year programs without the baccalaureate degree. In general there are three basic types of

---


organization

The two-year extension of a four-year college or university through off-campus centers, as developed in Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

Regional institutions maintained by the state, as found in Oklahoma, Utah, Georgia, and New York.

Local public community colleges maintained and financed through local school districts, as typified in California.

From each of these basic types of organization, one state plan will be discussed. Included in this discussion will be a description of the community colleges, state university systems and land-grant university system. Representative of the three basis types of state organization will be Wisconsin, New York, and California.

The state of Wisconsin has established technical institutes, technical colleges, the University of Wisconsin Center System, Wisconsin State University System, and the University of Wisconsin, which is the land-grant university.

The Wisconsin system of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education was expanded so that all areas and persons in the state are placed in vocational, technical, and adult education districts. The districts operate: (1) two technical colleges, (2) thirteen technical institutes, (3) nineteen vocational-technical schools.

---

The University of Wisconsin Center System comprises seven campuses. Two of the seven were once in the extension system. Within this system, students can earn two years of transferable college work and an associate degree.

The Wisconsin State University System is comprised of twelve universities, four of which maintain two-year branch campuses. All credits from the two-year campuses may be transferred to four-year institutions.

The University of Wisconsin System is comprised of four universities. All offer the baccalaureate. Madison and Milwaukee have as their highest offering the doctorate. Madison also offers terminal occupational work. 43

Also in Wisconsin are one private junior college and twenty private colleges with the highest offering being the baccalaureate. Six private colleges have their highest offering as the master's degree and two grant the doctorate degree. 44

Notice that community college education is available at all levels and that the Wisconsin State University System has only two branch campuses offering two-year work and that the University of Wisconsin System has only one campus offering two-year work. Most of what we would call a community college is either (1) a technical college, (2) technical institute, (3) technical-vocational school

---


or (4) a part of the Center System.

The New York state legislature established a systems approach for continuing and higher education in 1948. This system, The State University of New York, SUNY, is governed by a Board of Trustees appointed by the governor. There are six agricultural and technical colleges controlled by SUNY. Known as the SUNY Agriculture and Technical Colleges, these institutions are regionally located to provide technical training as well as parallel programs in the sciences and arts for those not in a terminal program.\(^4^5\)

The existing community colleges, although supervised by SUNY, are controlled by local boards of trustees. There are five patterns, which are:

2. City of New York, Board of Higher Education sponsorship.
3. City of New York, Board of Education sponsorship.
4. Two-county sponsorship.
5. City-city sponsorship.\(^4^6\)

The community colleges basically offer liberal arts transfer courses and some career programs for those in terminal programs. These colleges may be found throughout the state and within commuting distance for the students. Also interspersed around the state are some sixteen private community colleges.


SUNY also controls some twenty colleges and state universities with the highest offering of the doctorate in some eight institutions.⁴⁷ Approximately ten offer the master's and two just the baccalaureate. Some of these SUNY institutions are old colleges that the system has absorbed and others are new. Much like the new campuses of the University of California, SUNY has been able to diversify, and program offerings are sometimes quite different at these various state universities along intellectual and pedagogic lines.

The City University of New York, CUNY, which is controlled locally, has twelve institutions within its system. Mount Sinai School of Medicine is the only one that does not offer the liberal arts and general curriculum along with the teacher preparatory program. Six of the CUNY institutions have the highest offering of the doctorate and four offer a master's program. Cornell University is the other designated land-grant university that has the highest offering as the doctorate.

The State of New York has approximately 145 private colleges and universities. Twenty-eight offer the doctorate, thirty-four have their highest offering as the master's, and forty-seven, the baccalaureate.⁴⁸ Even though New York has the greatest number of private institutions in the nation, the plight of these colleges and universities is representative of all. Enrollment is increasing slightly as more and more students seek admission to public schools.

⁴⁸ See table 7 of this dissertation.
The state of California in 1968 established the California Community College system. Controlled by the Board of Governors, the system had ninety-three community colleges in seventy-four community college districts by 1970 and is still growing.49 These colleges are financed basically from the districts with approximately 30 per cent coming from the state. The state has divided public higher education in three segments: The University of California, the California State Colleges and the public community colleges.50 California does not have any institutions that are designated as only vocational-technical schools. The state is the leader in a national movement to incorporate these schools into the community college. Most vocational-technical schools completed the transfer to community colleges in 1970. This movement has greatly simplified the problems of curriculum offerings, financial control and administration. In this respect, many states are looking to California for leadership. Because the community college is looked upon as extended secondary education with open enrollment and reduced fees, the state of California leads the nation in community college enrollment.51

The California State College system has nineteen colleges with additional institutions being considered. With the exception of San Diego State College and San Francisco State College, the


51 Junior College Directory, 1972, p. 90. (For comparative state enrollments in the community college).
highest degree offered is the master's degree. California State College at Los Angeles, Fresno State College, San Diego State College, San Francisco State College, and San Jose State College, all with large enrollments, are accredited in diversified programs of study. The remaining state colleges are basically liberal arts, general, teacher preparatory, and accredited in limited programs of study.

The rapidly expanding University of California system composes the land-grant universities. The main campuses have increased from those at Berkeley and Los Angeles to the new campuses at Davis, Irvine, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and San Francisco. The University of California, Hastings Law in San Francisco, offers the first professional degree of law and the University of California, San Francisco, is the medical center. The new campuses lack the accreditation in total program areas that exist at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Davis.  

The reduced program offerings at the new campuses could be an advantage. According to Riesman and others,

Under these conditions of altered educational climates, there are evident advantages in starting new colleges with support from existing institutions. On its three new campuses at San Diego, Santa Cruz, and Irvine, the University of California could enter bids along three quite different intellectual and pedagogic lives, in each case with the backing as well as the restraints of the overall University Administration.  

Both the land-grant system and state university system appear to be

52 Higher Education, Education Directory, pp. 45-47.

making some efforts in this direction. Perhaps increased enrollment may force the new colleges and universities to open their course accreditation.

The public community colleges have practically taken over the post secondary program in California, and with vocational-technical courses being offered in the colleges, total enrollment has increased rapidly. These community colleges permit some students to pursue an education in the vocational-technical area and yet take other accredited courses that can be transferred to a four-year institution and an alternate field of study.

Wisconsin appears to be making progress in this community college approach also. Although designated as technical institutes, these schools are considered community colleges and are listed as such in the Junior College Directory. These colleges offer courses other than those limited to the vocational-technical area. This arrangement, as established in California and Wisconsin, coupled with open admission, appears to encourage student enrollment in the community college. As discussed earlier, students prefer the colleges rather than technical institutes. In California there is no required tuition for state residents attending the community colleges. This fact alone accounts for much of the total enrollment in the community college system. As of 1971, California's ninety-nine community colleges enrolled 763,480 students compared to New York's total of 216,745 enrolled in sixty-one community colleges.54

54Junior College Directory, 1972, p. 90.
This can be accounted for, in part, because New York has a more extensive vocational-technical program in their secondary schools. In 1969, New York had 1,420 secondary schools offering such programs as compared to 719 secondary schools in California.\(^\text{55}\) It appears quite clear that California's community college system is providing for a greater number of students than New York and appears to be leading the nation in this method of post secondary education.

Using the states of Wisconsin, New York, and California as representative of the vocational-technical school and community college movement, it appears as though more and more post secondary enrollment will be encouraged. In fact, community college advocates see the time approaching when virtually all high school seniors will go to a community college. This would assign a new role for the high school it would appear and make the community college the screening device for the job market and/or admission to a college or university.

The Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BOG) bill, passed by Congress June 8, 1972, reshapes the federal aid program for students. Projections by the U.S. Office of Education and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education estimate college and university enrollment will increase from a 1970 figure of 8.5 million to 13.2 million by 1980.\(^\text{56}\) The bill will, no doubt, encourage

\(^{55}\)Junior College Directory, 1972, p. 90.

students from impoverished families to attend college. Estimates indicate that over a million will enter the community colleges across the country. Though the legislation will permit students to use the grants for vocational-technical preparation, most students see this as their secondary choice. In either case, with community colleges absorbing the technical schools, students will attend the two-year institutions.

Federal projections show enrollment in the community colleges increasing by 84 per cent in the decade 1970-1980. During the same period, the four-year institutions will see an enrollment increase of only 44 per cent.\(^57\) In actual numbers, the community college increase was 1,371,018 and the four-year institution increase was 2,758,833. The four-year institutions more than doubled the community colleges in this increase. Similar figures released by the U.S. Office of Education indicated an increase of 131 per cent for community colleges during a seven-year span 1965-1972.\(^58\) The next seven-year projection showed an increase of 50 per cent. Four-year institutions indicated a 50 per cent increase between 1965 and 1972, with only a projected 27 per cent increase during the next seven years. These figures clearly indicate that the community colleges are increasing in student enrollment at a faster rate, but that the four-year institutions still enroll the vast majority of students in higher education. These figures may fluctuate to some

\(^{57}\)The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 5. (See table 8 of this dissertation).

\(^{58}\)U. S. Office of Education. (See table 9 of this dissertation).
degree as community colleges increase slightly in number and four-year institutions experiment with new programs.

As we have seen, California has clearly assigned the community college the task of post secondary technical training or preparation for transfer to a college or university. California has further assigned the University of California the responsibility of research and graduate study. Undergraduate study, liberal education, and professional preparation are the tasks for state colleges. The high schools appear to be the junior high schools of yesterday.

Florida is experimenting with another approach to the use of the community college. Taking advantage of the community college role in lower division studies, Florida established the Florida Atlantic University as an upper division university using the community college as a feeder system. Whether Florida will enlarge this plan and whether other states follow suit are difficult to judge at this time. Florida Atlantic University is facing the present problem of students switching areas of study. Either they ask the student to return to the community college for the necessary lower division courses or they will have to provide them. 59

The University of Massachusetts is trying to define the role of the large state university. An organized committee of businessmen, educators, editors, and students asked that the university truly respond to the needs of students and society. The University of Massachusetts is the land-grant university. Riesman and others

described the situation as follows:

To that end, the committee's 127-page report calls for a re-ordering of priorities, designed to lead the University of Massachusetts away from such current preoccupations as post graduate study and faculty research and publishing. For one thing, the report states, the university must be made far more accessible to poor and non-white students by moving toward open-admissions policies, and by offering special remedial programs in reading, writing and other skills.60

The report may bring about changes within the university, but many concerns will enter into that decision. With land-grant and state universities looking more toward graduate programs and research, the pressure on professorial concentration on undergraduate teaching will be tremendous. Vernon R. Alden, the committee chairman, indicated that: "There are talented people, without Ph.D.s, from journalism, business, and the fine arts who would be valuable teachers."61 This, of course, has been the forte of the community colleges and the vocational-technical schools. With the emphasis on teaching, the two-year institutions sought those people with teaching skills whether or not they had acquired an earned degree.

Massachusetts will be examining the progress at the City University of New York (CUNY). In 1970 CUNY, with an enrollment of 207,000, opened its doors to city students with a high school diploma. Following this, the university imposed a three-semester moratorium on academic dismissals to aid those students weak in the academic areas. Of the total 1970 freshman enrollment, 56 per cent

60 "Mandate for Change," Newsweek, January 3, 1972, p. 34.
61 "Mandate for Change," Newsweek, p. 34.
had a reading level below the national average and in math, the figure was 59 per cent. \(^{62}\) Robert J. Kibbee, the new chancellor, stated that: "The quality of a university is measured more by the kind of student it turns out than the kind it takes in.\(^{63}\) The problems are enormous when one considers staffing, facilities, and remedial programs necessary to aid the less qualified students.

 Minority groups, mainly blacks and Puerto Ricans, increased their enrollment from 14 per cent in 1969 to 23 per cent in 1970. In 1971, the students from Benjamin Franklin High in East Harlem applied at the rate of 76 per cent compared to the rate of 10 per cent in 1969. \(^{64}\) These figures examined on a national census are revealing. A Ford Foundation report gave the following estimated composition of the actual 1970 freshman class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Group</th>
<th>Estimated Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Americans</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon total population, the 1970 freshman class distribution for these two minority groups would have reflected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Group</th>
<th>Estimated Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Americans</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To attain the latter figure, the black freshman enrollment would

---


\(^{63}\) "Fresh Face for CUNY," *Newsweek*, August 9, 1971, p. 72.


have to be increased by 89 per cent or an increase of 117,000 students. The Puerto Rican freshman would have to increase by 7,000 students or 88 per cent.\textsuperscript{67} The rate of growth for minorities has been great, but only because the base was very low. The black student is a case in point. The Ford Foundation Report, by Fred E. Crossland,\textsuperscript{68} reveals that at the turn of the twentieth century, 90 per cent of the black population lived in the South and attended the black colleges. The enrollment was approximately 700,000. By 1940, the black population in the South dropped to 77 per cent and college enrollment increased to 45,000-50,000 with all but an estimated thousand attending traditionally black colleges. Most of them were in the South. By 1970 the southern black population dropped to 52 per cent and total black collegiate enrollment jumped to 470,000. The traditionally black colleges tripled their enrollment to 160,000 by 1970. The black enrollment at other institutions reached 310,000 or 3.9 per cent of the total.\textsuperscript{69} It is interesting to note that of the 310,000 black students enrolled at the other than traditionally black institutions, 151,000 students enrolled at the two-year public institutions.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{69}Crossland, \textit{Minority Access to College: A Ford Foundation Report}, p. 34. (See table 12 of this dissertation).
\textsuperscript{70}Crossland, \textit{Minority Access to College: A Ford Foundation Report}, p. 34. (See table 12 of this dissertation).
Perhaps this change in enrollment can be examined through the program at City College of New York, CCNY. Colleges had been experimenting with the admission of "high-risk" students for only a short time when the issue of academic excellence became a concern. To avoid the entire issue, colleges redefined admission policies.

Fred Crossland stated:

There were other more significant results of the new "high-risk" admissions practices. For example, some institutions now began to look seriously and questioningly at long-established admission procedures, and greater flexibility was encouraged. Certain specified high school course requirements were dropped, admission test scores were interpreted less rigidly, and there was increased concern about so-called non-intellective factors that might be useful in predicting college success. All these issues had been the subject of polite discussion within the professional educational fraternity for years, but now the debate was public, and changes actually were occurring.

Colleges and universities soon initiated an admissions policy for these students and CCNY in 1970 admitted all city high school graduates and encouraged a policy of retention for at least three semesters.

In general there has been a lowering of admission standards across the nation. In most states, however, specified institutions are designated as the academic institution and others designated as the open undergraduate college and/or the community college. It is true that land-grant and state universities continue to accept their state high school graduates, but this is changing. As Jencks and Riesman stated: "Those state universities that continue to accept
high school grades at face value will inevitably continue to admit appreciable numbers of students whom the faculty doesn't want, including some who cannot survive the four-year course.\textsuperscript{72}

It appears that admission barriers will be reduced for minority students. High-risk students will attend more prestigious institutions, but if the Negro student is representative of the movement, the community college and vocational-technical schools will play an increasingly important role.

Summary

The growth of the public community college has been in the spirit of the land-grant philosophy. Initially the community colleges were private. Offering programs that were highly academic, these independent two-year colleges fulfilled a concept of the German gymnasium, in that they provided extended secondary education. This German model for higher education allowed the university to devote time to graduate work and research.

The advent of the land-grant college and the trade schools slowed the growth of the two-year colleges, but as the industrial and agricultural demands grew so did extended secondary education. Organized labor and business eventually supported the trade school movement and the Grange, speaking for the farmers, demanded more vocational-agricultural courses either as extended secondary education or through the land-grant colleges. The land-grant colleges

\textsuperscript{72}Jencks and Riesman, \textit{The Academic Revolution}, p. 283.
answered the request of industrial labor and of the farmer, but not sufficiently enough to provide adequately the skills demanded. With community colleges lacking the necessary resources to help in this national need, the vocational-technical school movement began in earnest.


Vocational-technical programs are to be found in three areas: (1) vocational-technical schools, (2) community colleges, (3) secondary schools.

The development of the land-grant university with open admission policies created pressures that led to the comprehensive high school. High schools now were asked to adequately prepare potential college students for admission as well as offer terminal programs for non-college students the community college alleviated the problem somewhat by assuming the role of a post secondary institution in preparing students for enrollment in four-year institutions. As the land-grant universities grew, they became more national and statewide in the citizen's perception and, therefore, less his university.
With a continued philosophy of reduced admission standards, the community college is relieving the pressure applied to the land-grant and state universities as the institutions for the marginal student. In fact, the community college has become the safety valve for the universities by offering terminal programs for the non-college bound student and assuming the new role of selecting potential college bound students.

Jencks and Riesman classified the community college student as generally falling into one of four groups: (1) those who do not wish to go away to college, (2) those with a poor high school record, (3) those unable to pay expenses at a university, (4) those desiring less than four years of college. Although secondary schools continue to enroll the most students in vocational-technical programs, community colleges are increasing their course offerings and are slowly absorbing the vocational-technical schools and thus becoming the post secondary institution in America. For the most part, community college students differ from vocational-technical school students in that the former anticipate transfer to a four-year college. A study by Astin, Panos, and Creager showed that only one-fifth of all community college students enroll in a terminal program. Most students envision achieving the baccalaureate instead of an associate degree, but the increase in the number of baccalaureate degrees is very slight. This point further demonstrates the role the community college is playing. The four-year institutions are permitting the community college to be the selection instrument, allowing the universities more time for
for research and service. In fact, an examination of various state systems demonstrates how the community college is becoming an integral part in the future plans for higher education. The states of Wisconsin, New York, and California have developed state systems of higher education that involve positive development of the two-year community college. California has been the major leader in this movement and has at present some 93 community colleges offering terminal programs or providing lower division work for eventual admission to the California State University or the University of California system.

New York has established the State University of New York system (SUNY) which controls regionally located technical colleges, community colleges and the state universities. The City University of New York (CUNY) controls some twelve institutions in a separate system to provide higher education for the inner city.

The state of Wisconsin has developed technical institutes and technical colleges within established districts. These technical institutions are being classified as community colleges that offer both terminal programs or lower division work for future transfer to the state university or University of Wisconsin system. Community college advocates in these three states see the time when all high school seniors will go to a community college.

The community college growth across the nation has been great, but does not appear ready to overtake the four-year institutions enrollment. The Chronicle of Higher Education sees a projected enrollment of 9,049,000 for the four-year institutions and
an enrollment of 3,001,000 in the community college by 1980.

Florida has established an upper division university, Florida Atlantic University, which will use the state community colleges as feeder colleges. This is representative of the growing idea of state planning in the use of the community college as the state's lower division college institution. The entire idea will have to be evaluated for a number of years, but this is indicative of the land-grant idea of open enrollment being transferred from the land-grant institution to the community college.

The University of Massachusetts, on the other hand, is considering remedial programs for marginal students enrolling at the land-grant institutions and, perhaps, less emphasis on research and graduate study. The concept of using talented people from the community to aid them in this endeavor is also being considered. This has always been the forte of the community college. This program will also need time for evaluation.

City University of New York (CUNY) is experimenting in an innovative open admission program for city minority groups. To give the program a chance for evaluation, the city is developing an extended plan of student retention.

Other institutions across the country are creating programs for "high risk" students. Coming from minority groups and classified as disadvantaged, these students are evaluated for college entrance by a reinterpreted scale of predicted success in college. At this date, the Negro college age group is growing at the highest rate, but not near the optimum rate. More than half of the Negro
students are enrolling at the two-year community colleges. Al­
though the lowering of entrance requirements is encouraging college
enrollment across the country, the retention rate is not increasing
in any appreciable numbers.
Summary

Initially, the American Experience in democracy was defined by the aristocracy. Educated, affluent, and, more often than not, believing themselves to be of the natural aristocracy, these early Americans were the young nation's leaders. This aristocracy, with a belles-lettres education, sought to perpetuate their social, political, and economic power. Represented by Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, and John Marshall, this upper class believed that God had made mankind physically and intellectually unequal. They generally agreed with Hobbes that man is naturally perverse, and that any goodness in man results only because of necessity. With the Federalist Party representing them politically, these men of property and wealth sought protection and development of their interests through a strong central government.

Opposing this Federalist quest for power was the Republican Party led by Thomas Jefferson. Understanding the philosophy of the Federalist Party, Jefferson sought for more political involvement by the common man. Only through popular participation in government could the common man protect himself. Envisioning leaders of the common man rising from their midst, Jefferson
sought to find these natural leaders through popular education. Education for the common man would reveal strong representative leaders, and the resultant enlightened citizen was needed to help promote the general welfare.

The Jeffersonian philosophy of political power through an enlightened citizenry was temporarily altered when the common man sought and won political power under the leadership of President Andrew Jackson in 1828. A government for the few was replaced by a government for the many, and Alexis DeTocqueville's tyranny of the majority became a real fear. Where previously the aristocracy feared an educated common man would seek power, now the established class would have to use education to keep these rude followers of Jackson in line. With Horace Mann providing leadership, the aristocracy and the established middle class could look to the school as a stabilizing factor to quell the spirit of rapid political, economic, and social change. Perhaps the schools could also develop the values of self-discipline, self-reliance, a just disposition, virtuous habits, and a rational, self-governing man.

After the depression of 1837 had temporarily slowed down the efforts of Horace Mann in his quest for mass education, the increase in manufacturing and the further opening of the Midwest only continued to thwart his efforts. Industry and farming had need of men. Material advantages for the poor could now be obtained through laboring for wages, and the common man needed his children working. There did not seem to be any need for public education unless it was to provide laboring skills. The
native-born families had jobs in the mill and on the farm. Only the immigrant from Europe suffered the lack of an education and a job. Neither the people nor the state responded to Mann's undertaking for a common school. Even in Mann's own state of Massachusetts, the responsibility of providing early schooling remained in the hands of the private citizen. In most cases, this private citizen was of the aristocracy, and if education was provided, it was provided for his children. It was now apparent that early schooling would remain, temporarily at least, in the hands of the private sector, much the same as higher education.

The early nine colonial colleges were all controlled or affiliated with a religious group. Government efforts at state control of these existing private colleges were finally defeated in a ruling concerning Dartmouth College. Known as the Dartmouth Case of 1819, the state legislature lost the legal battle in their efforts for public control of the college. It became clear to those of the Jacksonian philosophy that public efforts to control existing private colleges had lost. Even their continued efforts to create a relevant course of study for the common people would not succeed now. There was little doubt that these colleges were exclusive to the needs of a class.

Since the states could not change college charters, they turned to the creation of new state universities to further the needs of her citizens. They grew slowly at first, and by the time of the Civil War, twenty states responded to the cry for the public university by creating twenty-one institutions. The sectarian and
denominational colleges, their existence guaranteed because of the Dartmouth Case, increased at a faster pace. Unfortunately, the new state universities did not respond to the needs of society. In fact, they resembled the private colleges and their curriculum of classical studies. The only difference between the old and new universities was their geographical location.

It would take the Morrill Act of 1862 to create a college where the leading object would be to teach courses related to agriculture and mechanics, as well as the scientific and the classical. This act resulted in the struggle between the classicists and the popularists. The resultant land-grant colleges eventually satisfied both groups, but the popularists and their technical and scientific education clearly won the battle.

This development in higher education, coupled with the emerging common school, made it clear to the nation that education could be available to all. Always lacking proper public financing, the common school movement shifted West. By the 1850's and 1860's, the Middle West had established a system of levying taxes and organizing state departments of education. The ideal of equality of opportunity that played such a large part in the philosophy of the Midwesterner found its place in the public common school ideal of free education for all at public expense.

Secondary education, much like the early colleges, was basically the realm of the private citizen as late as 1870. Fearing total public support of the high school, the private academies fought every attempt at public control. The Kalamazoo Case in 1874
decided the issue. Schools could levy taxes for a high school with instruction in the classics and languages, and the practical curriculum could also be included. This State Supreme Court decision led the movement in all states to develop the public high school and thus complete the educational ladder. The public would no longer have to send her young to private schools and pay tuition just to prepare them for admission to a land-grant or state university. The Kalamazoo Case further developed the unique American system of education as being not only free and open to all citizens but perhaps compulsory for a specified age group. The demand for the secondary school was enormous, and by the turn of the century the high school had taken its place as the normal continuation of the elementary school. After high school the possibility of the university existed. Responding to the needs of the people and the nation, the land-grant university soon found its place in the ladder system.

Perhaps the greatest impetus to the land-grant idea of science and technology was the end of the Civil War and America's future in the realm of industry, manufacturing, and technology. The war put an end to the dream of an agrarian society. Jefferson's concept of the agrarian South, the university, and the gentleman died. America, always permitting the masses to forge ahead while allowing for the few to lead, found love for the practical common man and his ingrained respect for work. America wanted the man of action to carve out this new nation. A technological nation needed men with skills and ideas. A nation committed to such a purpose is
bound to furnish the citizen the means of discharging the duties imposed upon him.

Initially, the demand for the skilled laborer came from the reluctant alliance between labor and the manufacturer. Their demand was met by the creation of the trade school. Land-grant colleges and universities, devoted to technical studies and science, found themselves competing with the vocational-technical schools and trade schools for public funds. The passing of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 guaranteed the existence of the vocational-technical schools.

Land-grant institutions, committed to open admission and low tuition, responded to the vocational-technical schools by experimenting the three developmental areas. Cornell provided research in the diverse curriculum; Harvard, the laissez faire attitude of student choice in course selection and social involvement; Wisconsin, the idea of service to the state and the people. By the beginning of the twentieth century the land-grant institutions were known as universities committed to (1) teaching, (2) research, (3) service. It was clear that regional differences resulted in the degree of curriculum emphasis. The Midwest developed agricultural training, and the East was involved in commerce and manufacturing. The key function in all cases was one of service.

The successful establishment of the high school gave the colleges and universities cause to examine entrance requirements. Land-grant institutions, committed to open enrollment, had developed less demanding academic curriculum and had provided remedial courses
for the marginal student, but now this task could change. High schools could adequately prepare aspiring college students for admission. High schools responded to this assignment by declaring that their function was to place a greater degree of emphasis upon terminal programs for the non-college bound student. With state compulsory education laws asking for lengthy student retention, the issue became more acute. Four-year institutions of higher education failed to develop curricula for students desiring a simple extension of high school work. Local communities, seeing the universities disinterested and becoming more national in their outlook, responded to the further development of vocational-technical schools, and the latent idea of community colleges with their two-year programs.

The community college continued the land-grant philosophy of open admissions and, thus relieved the pressure applied to the land-grant and state university as the institution for the marginal student. In fact, the community college has become the safety valve for the university by offering terminal programs for the non-college bound student. As of late, the community college, and in some cases the vocational-technical school, has assumed the role of being the selecting agency for the four-year university. For the most part, community college students differ from vocational-technical school students in that the former students anticipate transfer to a four-year university. Only one-fifth of all community college students enroll in terminal programs. An analysis of selected state systems of education show the community college becoming an integral part of higher educational planning. These community colleges, with a
history of two-year terminal programs, now provide developed curricu-
culums in lower division work for eventual student admission to the
university. Thus the community college not only provides a selection
function for the university, but also provides the university time
for research and service.

The community colleges are increasing their course offerings
so that there now exists a balanced curriculum between the sciences,
technology, and liberal arts. These changes in the curriculum,
coupled with the projected absorption of the vocational-technical
schools, appear to make the community college the most rapid de-
veloping post secondary institution in America. The community
college is becoming not only the haven for the marginal student or
"high risk" student, but also the institution for those who do not
wish to go away to college or pay expenses at a large university.
In fact, an examination of various state systems demonstrates how
the community college is planned and developed to fulfill the
above criteria. Although their growth in numbers of institutions
and enrollment has been rapid, they will not replace the large
land-grant and state universities as the major institution for
student access to college. Universities are still institutions
for the middle class and the middle class will continue to use
community colleges as the means for upward mobility.

Conclusions

Through a historical examination of the land-grant philoso-
phy, it appears quite clear that this philosophy emerged and
developed as a part of the American Experience. Although no mention is made of any educational philosophy in the constitution, the nation has always regarded education as most important. Education is part of our tradition. The intrinsic reasons for an educated citizen are varied. Education for social control is as much a part of our American tradition as is education for enlightenment or education for the practical.

The gifted, the talented, and the affluent have always used formal education for their benefit. With the Jeffersonian concept of "the enlightened citizen for a better America" we have tried to provide the same education for all citizens. The states have even made it compulsory. Initially, education was obtained through the church. Later America developed the academies, the common school, college preparatory schools, high schools, and the colleges and universities.

America, wrestling with her social conscience, has tried time and again to deal with the problem of educating the "unqualified." Often reflected in ethnic cultures, nationalities, races, and just "disinterested" and "ignorant citizens," this struggle is American. Because of the American concept of equality, schools are often hesitant about prescribing students into preplanned programs. To direct a student arbitrarily into an unwanted curriculum of study just does not seem to be the "American way." Perhaps this is not efficient, but it is truly American. Reflecting the philosophy of the Puritan ethic, students generally accept failure in school as indicative of their ability. Even the challenge to
overcome one's social background by success in school is part of the American dream. This entire issue is reflected in the "open enrollment" concept. All public schools will open their doors for admission, but few schools really concern themselves with retention. Compulsory education guarantees, somewhat, retention during the elementary and secondary school years, but should it not be more than this?

It is very clear that after the Civil War America pursued technological growth. Technology demanded skilled labor and men of research ability. Technology would provide jobs, products, and service to the people. Partly in response to this endeavor, the nation created the land-grant college. From this land-grant concept slowly emerged the land-grant philosophy. Committed to a deep interest in teaching, research, and service along with the concept of open enrollment for the citizen, the land-grant college grew. Initially, the land-grant college developed remedial programs and less demanding courses for the poor student. Teaching was important in the open enrollment concept. As research and service to the state increased in function, teaching, to a degree, became less important. Public high schools could assume the task of preparing students for admission to the land-grant college. With land-grant college administrators, professors, and students seeking equal academic ranking with the older established universities, the liberal arts program became an important part of the college. This move was not really a violation of the Morrill Act. Although the intent of the Morrill Act was to create a college where
agriculture and the mechanical arts were to be an important part of the curriculum, the act did not exclude the scientific and classical studies. As stated previously, the original intent of the land-grant philosophy was to promote a more liberal and practical education of the agricultural and industrial classes in the professions of life. Although the scientific and classical studies have assumed a much more important role in the land-grant university, at least the land-grant philosophy has forced most colleges and universities to broaden the traditional college curriculum. Emphasis on the scientific and the practical has not been destroyed by the increased emphasis on liberal studies. However, stressing of the liberal studies has, in part, dictated a change in admission and retention policies of land-grant universities. With the desirability of a good academic background and less emphasis on teaching remedial courses, the land-grant universities are becoming more exclusive. Students from the lower social classes often lack the background to handle adequately the liberal arts courses demanded of them. These courses used as a measuring stick thus control admission and retention.

It appears now that even though some universities are experimenting with new teaching programs to deal with this problem, most universities including the land-grant university are placing emphasis on graduate research and service. Perhaps this is why the two-year community colleges and vocational-technical schools are thriving. Placing little or no emphasis on research and service, these two-year institutions are becoming known for their interest
in teaching. With a philosophy of open admission or, at least, low admission standards, these two-year institutions are appealing to students with poor academic backgrounds and are frequently from lower socio-economic backgrounds. One could say that these two-year institutions have assumed one historically determined philosophical role of the land-grant university, but it is really more than that. In that four-fifths of the students entering community colleges and vocational-technical schools intend to transfer to the university, these two-year colleges are thus a filtering agency for the university. They are also a safety valve for the university by offering terminal programs for the non-university bound student.

How this movement will affect the land-grant university is unclear because of its transitional nature. Since the philosophy of the land-grant institution is changing perhaps the two-year college is part of the land-grant institution. It would seem that continued examination of this philosophy will be necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, Auburn University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>University of Alaska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>University of Arizona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, University of Arkansas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>University of California at Berkeley, University of California at Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Colorado State University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>University of Connecticut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Delaware State College, University of Delaware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, University of Florida.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Fort Valley State College, University of Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>University of Hawaii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>University of Idaho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>University of Illinois.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Purdue University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa State University of Science and Technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky State College, University of Kentucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>University of Maine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>University of Maryland, Maryland State College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Massachusetts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>University of Minnesota.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>University/Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI - Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College.</td>
<td>Mississippi State University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI - Lincoln University.</td>
<td>University of Missouri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA - Montana State College.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA - University of Nebraska.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA - University of Nevada.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE - University of New Hampshire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY - Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO - New Mexico State University of Agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK - Cornell University.</td>
<td>State University of New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA - North Dakota Agricultural College.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA - Langston University.</td>
<td>Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON - Oregon State College.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA - Pennsylvania State University.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUERTO RICO - University of Puerto Rico.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND - University of Rhode Island.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA - Clemson Agricultural College.</td>
<td>South Carolina State College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA - South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE - Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University.</td>
<td>University of Tennessee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS - Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.</td>
<td>Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH - Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT - University of Vermont and State Agricultural College.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>Washington State University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>West Virginia University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>University of Wyoming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Distributive</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Trades and Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>7,979,366</td>
<td>650,705</td>
<td>563,431</td>
<td>175,101</td>
<td>2,449,052</td>
<td>1,835,124</td>
<td>315,311</td>
<td>1,720,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>7,533,936</td>
<td>851,158</td>
<td>574,785</td>
<td>140,987</td>
<td>2,263,338</td>
<td>1,735,997</td>
<td>269,832</td>
<td>1,628,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>7,047,501</td>
<td>935,170</td>
<td>481,034</td>
<td>115,109</td>
<td>2,186,992</td>
<td>1,572,335</td>
<td>266,054</td>
<td>1,490,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>6,070,059</td>
<td>507,354</td>
<td>420,426</td>
<td>83,677</td>
<td>1,897,670</td>
<td>1,238,043</td>
<td>253,838</td>
<td>1,269,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>5,430,611</td>
<td>887,529</td>
<td>333,342</td>
<td>66,772</td>
<td>2,098,520</td>
<td>730,904</td>
<td>225,737</td>
<td>1,087,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>4,566,390</td>
<td>860,605</td>
<td>334,126</td>
<td>59,006</td>
<td>2,022,138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>221,241</td>
<td>1,069,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>4,217,198</td>
<td>827,827</td>
<td>309,593</td>
<td>53,597</td>
<td>1,893,450</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>184,595</td>
<td>1,001,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>4,072,677</td>
<td>822,664</td>
<td>321,065</td>
<td>48,895</td>
<td>1,725,660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>148,920</td>
<td>1,005,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3,855,564</td>
<td>805,322</td>
<td>306,083</td>
<td>47,264</td>
<td>1,610,334</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122,952</td>
<td>963,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,768,149</td>
<td>796,237</td>
<td>303,784</td>
<td>40,250</td>
<td>1,588,109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101,279</td>
<td>938,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3,701,121</td>
<td>757,223</td>
<td>310,591</td>
<td>30,769</td>
<td>1,585,860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48,564</td>
<td>968,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3,629,339</td>
<td>775,892</td>
<td>282,558</td>
<td>27,423</td>
<td>1,559,822</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>983,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2,836,121</td>
<td>640,791</td>
<td>292,936</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,139,766</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>762,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1,810,082</td>
<td>460,876</td>
<td>36,008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>627,394</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>685,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>858,456</td>
<td>144,901</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175,944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>537,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>164,186</td>
<td>15,453</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,799</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Includes 69,783 enrolled in other classes, not classified by occupational category.
2/ Includes 2,053 enrolled in Fishery occupations.
3/ Includes 69,297 enrolled in other classes, not classified by occupational category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>College or University (Continued)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td>498</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>416</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>813</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>577</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>791</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>498</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>495</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>644</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td>668</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>459</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td>413</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>672</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>757</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>726</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>478</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>396</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Percentage Increase in Enrollment, by Levels, Vocational-technical Education: Fiscal Years 1965-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>113.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,430,611</td>
<td>6,070,059</td>
<td>7,047,501</td>
<td>7,533,936</td>
<td>7,979,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2,819,250</td>
<td>3,048,248</td>
<td>3,532,823</td>
<td>3,842,896</td>
<td>4,079,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary</td>
<td>207,201</td>
<td>442,097</td>
<td>499,906</td>
<td>592,970</td>
<td>706,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>2,378,522</td>
<td>2,530,712</td>
<td>2,941,109</td>
<td>2,987,070</td>
<td>3,050,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td>25,638</td>
<td>49,002</td>
<td>73,663</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>143,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. in Regular Programs</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>(53,154)</td>
<td>(92,925)</td>
<td>(107,942)</td>
<td>(144,274)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6: Total Enrollment in Vocational Education Classes, By Type of Program and By State, Fiscal Year 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>123,090</td>
<td>43,156</td>
<td>5,145</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>41,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>9,741</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>61,623</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>12,906</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>22,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>94,082</td>
<td>22,906</td>
<td>4,306</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>26,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>944,102</td>
<td>32,718</td>
<td>99,010</td>
<td>20,361</td>
<td>164,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>87,271</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>9,914</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>18,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>100,707</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>20,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>28,355</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>5,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>411,041</td>
<td>21,656</td>
<td>46,701</td>
<td>7,666</td>
<td>153,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>268,877</td>
<td>30,297</td>
<td>17,445</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>66,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>20,705</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>26,189</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>10,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>232,789</td>
<td>23,347</td>
<td>11,867</td>
<td>7,502</td>
<td>71,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>106,428</td>
<td>17,634</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>46,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>88,699</td>
<td>26,451</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>30,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>70,942</td>
<td>8,416</td>
<td>6,904</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>17,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>119,675</td>
<td>17,973</td>
<td>9,596</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>46,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>167,626</td>
<td>18,423</td>
<td>9,264</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>45,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>22,582</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>6,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>118,023</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>32,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>115,574</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>24,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>303,978</td>
<td>123,977</td>
<td>37,957</td>
<td>6,244</td>
<td>34,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>171,932</td>
<td>26,641</td>
<td>11,274</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>60,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>105,651</td>
<td>33,976</td>
<td>6,123</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>36,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>131,208</td>
<td>15,504</td>
<td>11,357</td>
<td>3,381</td>
<td>59,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>18,356</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>3,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>59,249</td>
<td>7,320</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>19,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>21,263</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>6,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>13,662</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>6,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>262,163</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>5,445</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>118,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>29,778</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>9,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>707,687</td>
<td>41,477</td>
<td>46,707</td>
<td>16,949</td>
<td>208,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>315,259</td>
<td>57,616</td>
<td>14,671</td>
<td>9,497</td>
<td>83,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>20,115</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>10,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>280,159</td>
<td>27,104</td>
<td>19,407</td>
<td>8,764</td>
<td>121,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>50,572</td>
<td>24,634</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>34,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>52,473</td>
<td>4,377</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>6,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>342,780</td>
<td>15,514</td>
<td>15,144</td>
<td>7,424</td>
<td>58,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>11,262</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>5,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>138,672</td>
<td>36,730</td>
<td>4,601</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>50,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>20,262</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>8,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>137,813</td>
<td>22,733</td>
<td>8,134</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>53,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>457,600</td>
<td>25,306</td>
<td>9,196</td>
<td>9,915</td>
<td>253,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>71,635</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>6,514</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>20,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>12,052</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>223,649</td>
<td>24,134</td>
<td>30,356</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>50,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>203,687</td>
<td>16,015</td>
<td>12,958</td>
<td>12,461</td>
<td>84,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>51,267</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>17,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>164,888</td>
<td>23,909</td>
<td>8,266</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>37,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>13,903</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>7,689</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>2,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>122,389</td>
<td>7,222</td>
<td>8,263</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>62,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Includes 20,000 cadets in off-farm occupations.
2/ Includes 2,000 cadets in fisheries occupations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE OR OUTLYING AREA</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Number of Institutions of Higher Education, by State or Other Area, Highest Level of Offering, and Institutional Control: 1970-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Outlying Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2 But Less Than 4 Years Beyond High School</th>
<th>4- or 5-Year Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>First-Professional Degree</th>
<th>Master's Degree But Less Than Doctorate</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Service Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlying Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Zone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Includes one graduate non-degree-granting institution.
2/ Includes one undergraduate non-degree-granting institution.

### Table 8: Higher Education, 1980: New Federal Projections for Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 1970</th>
<th>Fall 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>8,580,887</td>
<td>13,277,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6,428,134</td>
<td>10,952,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2,152,753</td>
<td>2,324,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree-credit</td>
<td>7,920,149</td>
<td>12,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5,800,089</td>
<td>9,762,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2,120,060</td>
<td>2,288,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>6,290,167</td>
<td>9,049,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>1,629,982</td>
<td>3,001,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4,636,641</td>
<td>6,587,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3,283,508</td>
<td>5,463,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>5,489,033</td>
<td>7,901,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2,431,116</td>
<td>4,149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st prof.</td>
<td>7,020,000</td>
<td>10,551,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident graduate</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,499,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree-credit</td>
<td>660,738</td>
<td>1,227,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Slower Growth Ahead in College Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1972 (est.)</th>
<th>1979 (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students registered in four-year colleges</td>
<td>4,685,000</td>
<td>7,036,000</td>
<td>8,948,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise in last 7 years:</td>
<td>2,351,000 students or 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise in next 7 years:</td>
<td>1,912,000 students or 27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students registered two-year colleges</td>
<td>841,000</td>
<td>1,945,000</td>
<td>2,919,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise in last 7 years:</td>
<td>1,104,000 students or 131%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise in next 7 years:</td>
<td>974,000 students or 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,526,000</td>
<td>8,981,000</td>
<td>11,867,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise in last 7 years:</td>
<td>3,455,000 students or 63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise in next 7 years:</td>
<td>2,886,000 students or 32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Office of Education.
Table 10: MINORITY FRESHMEN IN 1970

The estimated composition of the actual 1970 freshman class was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Americans</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Americans</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indians</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>160,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All others</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,840,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: MINORITY FRESHMEN IN 1970

The estimated composition of the 1970 freshman class reflecting the total population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Americans</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Americans</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indians</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>1,840,000</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,165,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12: Negro Access to College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Total Enrollment (est.)</th>
<th>Black Enrollment (est.)</th>
<th>Per cent Black (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditionally Black Institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 private senior</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>53,050</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 private two-year</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 public senior</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>102,025</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 public two-year</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Other Institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,150 private senior</td>
<td>1,720,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 private two-year</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 public senior</td>
<td>3,990,000</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 public two-year</td>
<td>1,922,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,882,000</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,050,000</td>
<td>470,000</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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