

EXPERIMENT AT SAN JOSE

A Paper Presented to the
1981 Conference on Alternative Higher Education
Evergreen State College, Olympia, Washington

by

Mervyn L. Cadwallader, Vice Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-Platteville

Experiment at San Jose

by

Mervyn L. Cadwallader
University of Wisconsin-Platteville

This essay opens with a short sketch of what Richard Jones in his Experiment At Evergreen calls the Mieklejohn-Tussman-Cadwallader curricular and pedagogic model and then tells in some detail the history of the Mieklejohn program I directed at San Jose State College from 1965-to 1969.¹

The San Jose program was based on the educational ideas of both Alexander Mieklejohn and Joseph Tussman, and the Tussman program that ran its course from 1965 to 1969 at Berkeley. In 1969 Robert Sluss and I moved the idea, somewhat modified by four years of experiment and experience, to the State University of New York at Old Westbury. One year later, after another cross-country exodus, the idea took up residence in Olympia, Washington, at what was to become The Evergreen State College. Richard Jones has just written an analysis of what happened to the concept at Evergreen, Joseph Tussman published an account of his program, Experiment At Berkeley, in 1969, and others have described and interpreted the Old Westbury experiment.² There is then no need for me to tell those stories, or to trace the migration of Mieklejohn's legacy from Madison to Berkeley, San Jose, Old Westbury, and then Evergreen in this paper. However, because neither my colleagues nor I ever published an account of the San Jose experiment, that story does need to be told along with an account of the many lessons that we learned. Finally, I will conclude with a proposal for continued reform and speculate on its prospects in the coming decade.

THE MIEKLEJOHN IDEA BECOMES A PROPOSAL AND
A PROGRAM AT BERKELEY AND AT SAN JOSE

Here is the deceptively simple idea that Joseph Tussman sketched out for me one November evening in 1963. Instead of a scattering of courses selected by the student according to a distribution formula, why not design a coherent and fully prescribed liberal course of study? Instead of unrelated fragments, why not offer an organic program organized around a theme? Instead of textbooks, lectures, and machine-graded tests, why not classics, discussions, and written essays? Tussman's plan took its inspiration from Alexander Micklejohn's short-lived and incandescent Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin during the 1920's. Tussman believed Micklejohn's experiment could be tried again at Berkeley and at San Jose.

On each campus we would seek out a team of five or six faculty and ask them to teach in a two-year program of liberal studies that would satisfy the usual general education or breadth requirements. The program of reading, discussing, and writing would be organized around a controlling theme, much as Micklejohn had organized his curriculum around the story of the birth and development of political democracy in classical Athens and colonial America. The faculty would be drawn from interested volunteers without regard for their academic disciplines because the experimental program was to be non-disciplinary. Teaching in the program would be the full responsibility, the one and only assignment, for each of the faculty for two whole years, and it would be collaborative teaching.

Approximately one hundred freshmen would be given the chance to volunteer for these experimental programs and with the exception of one outside course each semester, the program would be a full-time commitment for each student. At the end of their sophomore year they would have satisfied their general education requirements and be ready to select a major in the upper division.

Both faculty and students would be totally immersed. Instead of teaching or taking lots of different courses, with their competing demands on time and attention, the faculty and students could concentrate and focus on one thing at a time.

The design of the program and actual development of the theme were to be continuous, always in process. Because the faculty were bound to be specialists in something else and very much in need of a chance to get ready to lead seminars about books outside of their field, there would be a weekly faculty seminar to discuss the books that were going to be read, talked, and written about.

Finally, we would need a place, rooms of our own to give the program a home. An old house on the edge of the campus would be ideal. We would have to be able to develop our own weekly schedules without having to worry about space, bells and conflicts.

Joseph Tussman and I submitted proposals for our experimental programs in the fall of 1964, recruited faculty volunteers in the spring of 1965, and met our first students that fall. Alexander Micklejohn was, I believe, surprised and very pleased by this unexpected reincarnation of his Experimental College.

At San Jose the organizing theme that I selected for the two-year program was Four Crises in Western Civilization. Each of the four semesters was to be focused on a subtheme with the first to be Athens and the Peloponnesian War. The Rise of Science and the Modern State would give coherence to the second semester and the third would be about The Industrial and Social Revolutions of the 19th Century. The fourth subtheme was called Contemporary Democracy in America and I assumed that that final semester would be enriched by comparisons of democratic Athens confronted by the Peloponnesian War and democratic America enmeshed in Vietnam. I had some ideas about the books we should read and

had settled on the first semester reading list even before I had a faculty.

It was made up of the following paperback books:

Herodotus, The Histories

Homer, The Iliad and The Odyssey

Aeschylus, The Orestia

Sophocles, Three Theban Plays

Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War

Plutarch, Nine Greek Lives

Plato, The Republic, Apology, Crito, Protagoras

Aristophanes, The Complete Plays

Aristotle, Selections

Euripides, Four Tragedies

President Robert D. Clark persuaded six departments to release six faculty volunteers and so in the summer of 1965 we gathered together for luncheons and planning sessions.³ We picked a reading list for the second semester without really noticing that it was more a list of our favorite 16th and 17th Century titles than a list demanded by the theme. For the third semester we expected that the task of integrating some science into our program would be especially difficult and planned to try to do it by using James B. Conant's case history approach. The team did not plan the fourth semester that summer, perhaps because it seemed a long way away and perhaps because each of us wanted to pick our own books about contemporary America.⁴

The program opened in September, 1965, in an old residence owned by the college with one hundred and twelve students. It had been given faculty approval as a temporary experiment in general education and the program as a whole was to be worth forty-eight semester hours of credit and to substitute for all of the San Jose State breadth requirements (except for

two credits of physical education). Each faculty member was to assume responsibility for approximately twenty students each semester. We planned on four to six hours of seminar time each week for each student, a two to three-hour weekly assembly and at least one writing conference every other week.

Each member of the team had the responsibility of working out his own weekly seminar schedule and pattern of writing assignments. The weekly assemblies were to feature program or visiting faculty and were intended to augment the program but not to explain the books. We wanted our students to have a lot of time to read and reread the books, and a lot of time for discussion and writing. Most of us planned to assign nine or ten formal essays that first semester.

Each semester's work was the equivalent of the twelve semester units of course work and most of our students signed up for one additional course outside of the program. For both students and faculty the experience was to be one of nearly total immersion. We planned to award letter grades while actively discouraging the discussion of grades within the program. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, our weekly summer planning sessions turned into weekly faculty seminars. We met every Friday from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and soon adopted the procedure of first discussing the administrative problems associated with the operation of the program, and then, after lunching together, we turned to a discussion of the book we were reading with our students. Collegial lunches and real faculty seminars, we discovered, were the unanticipated high points of the program.

So much for the early dream, the eager planning, and the way we started. There was, it turned out, much to learn.

INTENTION AND DISCOVERY AT SAN JOSE

Underlying my commitment to the experiment were assumptions and convictions which, I came to realize, were not necessarily shared by my colleagues or my students. My intention was to offer an experimental liberal curriculum at San Jose State College and by that I meant an education in political morality, very broadly defined. It was to be the kind of education that a citizen of a democracy must have if he is to participate critically, creatively, and responsibly in the political process of self-government. The citizens of America need an education for freedom, and a reform of American education was needed in the interests of restoring, extending, and perfecting democracy. Both the Experimental Program at Berkeley and my program at San Jose were designed to teach young people to become intelligent, reasonable, and wise citizens. It was my assumption that the primary responsibility of a public college should be the liberal education of the public.

So much for my intention. I assumed that the idea of a liberal curriculum in political morality would be familiar to faculty because American teachers had paid lip-service to similar sounding goals for decades. The form or structure of the program, on the other hand, I expected to appear quite radical because it was designed as a two-year, integrated educational experience taught wholly without courses.⁵

It seemed absolutely essential to get rid of courses and especially elected courses for this particular experiment because I wanted the students to be totally immersed in one topic or issue at a time. The interaction of the specialized course and the elective system has left general education a shambles of unrelated bits and fragments. The usual curricular building block is the course, and educational reformers usually advocate new courses or new combinations of courses. But the course by its very nature fragments, splinters, and disintegrates. If it were not for the narrow focus of courses, students

might glimpse the organic wholeness of the real world, the whole world of the Athenian Republic, or at least the totality of Plato's Republic, before the specialists dismember those worlds into their specialized three-credit courses. The course may have its uses, but it is the enemy of wholeness and so the San Jose and Berkeley programs were to be two-year programs without any courses at all. I knew that a program without courses would run against familiar academic assumptions and settled professional habits, but I was to learn that I faced other obstacles that were to come as real surprises.

I recruited a faculty with an eye for the teacher who liked to teach and had been popular with students, who was dissatisfied with the narrow limitations of his own academic specialty and wanted to branch out, who wanted to join something experimental and especially a program that sought to restore excitement and adventure to learning and to teaching. I had to find five teachers who were willing to be cut loose from departments and courses for two years and who would be willing to teach and study the liberal arts. They were going to have to give up their disciplines, textbooks, lectures, scholarship, and research.

Certain great books were to be the heart of the program. I assumed that as the faculty selected the books semester by semester we would quite naturally create a liberal curriculum around the assumptions and propositions of Alexander Micklejohn's political philosophy of education. I assumed that the students would notice that the books were relevant to their own lives and to the world they were confronting in the 1960's.

I had been exposed to growing student political involvement in the early 1960's. The new breed of student was lively, and I liked that. I had been moved by the free speech demonstrators at Berkeley crying out for respect, for attention, and for affection ("please do not fold, mutilate or spindle"). I assumed that these lonely, pained, and angry students

would like my reforms and would count me on their side. But, as I was to discover, I did not really understand the student revolt against the university. I assumed that if students were given respect, attention, and affection, they would be excited by a required liberal curriculum if it was taught properly. After all, I was excited. What I did not understand was that the students did not want any requirements, let alone a completely required curriculum, no matter how brilliantly taught.

Let me emphasize that student discontent was always a side issue in my initial plans. I believed that educational reform should be carried on in behalf of the public welfare, for the body politic. It was to save America, not to pacify humiliated and angry students. I expected the students to go along because they would no longer be anonymous. They would no longer be asked to read dull textbooks, listen to dull lectures or take machine-graded objective examinations. Their attention would not be scattered by an assortment of unrelated courses. They would be reading classics, discussing important ideas in small groups, and learning to write with clarity and style--under the guidance of enthusiastic teachers. I expected the students to be wildly enthusiastic about the books, the ideas, the opportunity to talk and to write. I really did expect that. I thought that there would be no holding them back once we offered freedom from the academic busywork and senseless academic terror that they had been complaining about and reacting against. They just needed to be unleashed and then guided. I expected even the shy to catch fire when exposed to the excitement of their teachers.

So much for some of my assumptions about colleagues and students. My educational ideas, my plans for a liberal curriculum, were and are based on certain assumptions about my fellow citizens. I assume that citizens should be rational, that they should reason together, and that they should rule themselves. Furthermore, I assume that the people of the United States had agreed

to these principles in the late eighteenth century and that today we are still a nation trying to continue the fantastically difficult experiment of self-rule. Obviously we should learn to subordinate private self-interest to the public interest, we should learn to rule and to be ruled. The laws we frame, test, and obey should be wise and humane laws lest our democracy degenerate into hollow ritual and an ugly tyranny of the majority. The very possibility of a successful democracy hinges, it seems to me, on the quality of its citizens and that in turn depends upon the quality and content of their education, and very specifically their education for citizenship. If a community is to be self-governing, its citizens must receive an education for politics.

If America is to continue her great and ambitious experiment in democracy, then its public schools, especially its public colleges, must concentrate above all else on the political education of those who would become citizens. Unless a civics and U. S. history course in high school are enough, Americans need to continue their education for freedom in college. This means a curriculum in those liberal arts without which men and women cannot participate in the control of their own destiny. It does not mean history, political science, or the classics taught by scholars in the hope of training more scholars. It does mean the teaching of a liberal curriculum relevant to the urgent demands of a floundering democracy. Somewhere, it seemed to me, all young Americans must learn the political morality of democracy and the deliberative arts of the political forum. It was, then, to provide a coherent and relevant political education that I hoped to revive Alexander Micklejohn's Experimental College at San Jose State.⁶

But what were the students really like? What were their assumptions, wants and demands? Who were they? They were eighteen years old and from the suburbs south of San Francisco. These were the young adults that I had never known because I had been trying to turn them into sociologists.

When I got to know them, I discovered that they were not looking for a political education. They wanted a degree, or they wanted to satisfy the college's general education requirements as painlessly as possible, and my nice program seemed to be a means to that end. They did have a fantasy of what college might be and they assumed I understood their fantasy. I assumed they had understood mine; after all, they had volunteered for the program after reading a description of it.

As it turned out, neither of us knew the other's fantasy. Those students who responded to the words "new" and "experimental" in my first announcement assumed that by some miracle an adult had discovered what they thought was wrong with education and was actually going to do something about it. They did not have a clear idea of what they wanted, but they did know they wanted something different from high school. When they found themselves reading a lot, writing a lot, and being asked to discuss Plato and Hobbes, that did not seem to be different. Non-verbal communication, Yoga, polarity massage, or seminars on Zen would have been different. The would-be revolutionary and the radical wanted to read Marx and Malcolm X, not Plato and Hobbes. The hip wanted to drop acid and listen to Bob Dylan. For some of the others the program looked better than the regular lower division because they might not have to work as hard as regular students. In the end most of the volunteers liked the program because they liked the teachers; some fell in love with the program--because they fell in love with the teachers. That was not exactly what I had had in mind either.

As a handful of students and I became friends, I began to understand what it was that they were objecting to. I felt the alienation, the cynicism, the aimlessness, the identity crises, the boredom, the reaching, the testing, and the idealism of my students. I discovered that many of my young friends were deeply cynical about the baby-sitting apparatus called "school." Some were cynical about adults because they had never really found an adult they

could trust. Most did not want to be like their parents. There were those who did not want to rush into adulthood and those who did believe that there was significant work waiting for them. As different as they were, they shared a profoundly negative view of the state; politics seemed absurd and politicians corrupt. Military service was not a privilege, certainly not the moral obligation of the citizen; rather, it was involuntary servitude in an immoral cause. The shadow of Vietnam was everywhere, and the poison of racism. There was hunger for community and a distaste for competition.

These students were not convinced that a liberal curriculum with a big emphasis on political morality and on the arts of discourse, especially close reading, clear writing, and persuasive speaking, connected in any way with them, their lives, their problems, their needs. They were asking, in a hundred different ways, and incessantly, "Who are we and where do we fit in this big machine, and why can't we communicate with other human beings?" "How can we be honest with each other?" "Are all adults dishonest?" "Do we have to be dishonest?"

These questions opened up a host of problems that college professors were not used to thinking about, let alone talking about. Moreover, they were the questions of a generation that felt in its bones the decay of its own civilization and a generation that had turned its back on politics and politicians. Parents and college professors raised and schooled in the political and ideological 30's were simply bewildered by some of the answers the young of the 60's were creating out of their own experiences. Some of the solutions advanced in all seriousness were "pot, not politics," "make love, not war," and "do your own thing." A good many sons and daughters of the affluent white American middle class had weighed the Great Society and found it wanting. They asked why I was getting them ready to serve a greedy and hypocritical state. I tried to be candid and I had to admit that I did not have an easy answer. I kept asking myself whether America was so corrupt, lost, confused,

diseased, and arrogant that it was no longer the proper object of political loyalty, freely given. Were we the citizens of an America so hopelessly flawed that it could not be expected to continue to move toward its own founding ideals? Was there anything the young citizen could do to alter the drift of his own country's history? What kind of an education was appropriate for the citizens of the United States during the troubled '60's? And what of the coming decades?

My students finally forced me to face the fact that there was no point in my devising new techniques for seducing them into reading Homer, Aeschylus, Thucydides, Plato, the Bible, Hobbes, Shakespeare, Montaigne, Locke, Rousseau, Goethe, Jefferson, and de Tocqueville, unless I could establish the relevance of those books to their lives as they were living them in the America of Selma and Vietnam, Father Berrigan and Billy Graham.

My faculty finally forced me to face the fact that I could not have a coherent program unless we all subordinated our individual fantasies to one common, dominant idea, the idea of an education in political morality. Whatever the curriculum was to be called, whether the liberal arts, or the political arts, or the moral curriculum, a controlling vision had to be there, it had to dominate our every decision about what to include in or exclude from the program. I thought that the idea would sell itself but my faculty taught me, albeit inadvertently, that the dominant idea had to be sold, that faculty needed to be converted, that bringing individualistic college teachers together was going to take a lot of leadership.

I had wanted all of us to subordinate our academic idiosyncrasies, our professional individualities, our tender egos, to the idea of a common political curriculum. The common task was to be our investigation of the roots and rationale of our own social and political life. We were to organize our teaching around the old and ever new questions of authority, power, legitimacy, obliga-

tion, and responsibility. We were to ask about community, justice, loyalty, and obedience and we were to follow the questions wherever they led. We were going to study the past to understand the present and prepare for our uncertain future. From the Greek polis and the Roman civitas to the modern state we were going to be thinking, reading, talking, and writing about freedom and tyranny, peace and war, courage and cowardice, obligation and irresponsibility. Why? Because both teachers and students should have answers to certain persistent political questions: What should I do? What are my obligations? Should I join America? Should I obey? The political theme and personally relevant questions were to provide coherence, they were to provide a bright strong thread that would tie us together in a willing fellowship.

During my first two-year program the thematic thread never came through to the students. Most of the students told me at the end of the two years that they did not even know there was supposed to be an integrating theme. I thought it was obvious that we were reading and thinking about the individual, the state, and freedom as we studied four crises in western civilization. The common core of ethical questions seemed obvious. The theme seemed self-evident throughout the art and literature of 5th Century Athens and the story of the Greeks' attempt to create an ordered, just and democratic state. Surely it was obvious in the 17th Century English struggles and debates over law and order, freedom and authority, and it was absolutely central to 19th Century Europe confronted with the consequences of the industrial revolution. It all seemed so explicit. Clearly something had gone wrong.

My big mistake was to assume that the friends I had gathered around me for the staff of this first program had really accepted the curricular theme and could easily switch to collaborative teaching. Because none of us knew the first thing about collaborative teaching, the book lists and teaching that emerged from our democratic deliberations never came together in a truly

common effort. We worked well as a committee, but the theme was fuzzy and by the fourth semester it finally disappeared into very individualistic seminars. The curriculum fell apart because I had not recognized the necessity of convincing the faculty of the merits of teaching together as a team dedicated to a common theme, a common book list, and a common schedule.

ANOTHER ATTEMPT, THE 1967-69 PROGRAM

In the spring of 1967 as the first program ended I was already planning the next. I had lost my innocence but not my faith in the urgency and rightness of the cause. Campuses across the western world were being swept by an epidemic of student unrest, protest, and demands for relevance. I was still determined to offer a political education in the ethical dilemmas of citizenship. I felt certain that there was something missing in the student movements for educational reform and that there was something seriously wrong with the direction that most academic reforms were taking. In most, students and faculty ended up joined together to abolish all requirements in the lower division, in the name of freedom and choice! This final victory of Eliot's elective system seemed to me an educational disaster because the elective system insured the dominance of the discrete course taught by the narrow specialist. The complete victory of the elective system meant the end of any chance for a coherent liberal education. In the face of the centrifugal force of the academic free market in courses, could Tussman at Berkeley and Cadwallader at San Jose State make courseless and collaborative programs work?

I planned a few changes. I put the educational philosophy of the program in writing, discussed it with the prospective staff while recruiting them, and mailed it to prospective students. The faculty read Micklejohn over the summer (which my first faculty never did), and we talked about the integrating theme endlessly in staff seminars. That started us in the right

direction. The first semester we read and talked about 5th and 4th Century Athens and 20th Century America. We underscored the contemporary relevance of Athens by reading and discussing books in pairs: A Greek work and then something contemporary. Here are some of the paired titles:

Homer, The Odyssey with Kerouac, On the Road

Aeschylus, The Oresteia with Golding, Lord of the Flies

Sophocles, Three Tragedies with Kazantzakis, Zorba the Greek

Plutarch, The Lives of the Noble Greeks with Kennedy, Profiles in Courage

Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War with Fulbright, The Arrogance of Power

Plato, Apology, Crito, Phaedo with Hesse, Siddhartha⁷

While the contemporary titles varied somewhat from one faculty member to another, there was less resistance to keeping to a common schedule. We were collaborating at last and the curriculum had a theme that we were developing and teaching together. We were making progress.

Finally, midway into the second two-year program we became a little community.⁸ We were teaching, learning, reading, writing, and talking about political man, about our political problems and obligations, and doing it together. By the spring of 1969 I knew the program was working. We could all feel it despite our occasional moments of doubt or periods of depression. The turning point came during the semester that we tried a frankly political approach to the creation of a curriculum in science that we called political ecology. The political thread was very much there.

What made the difference? There were several additions to the experiment that helped. We opened each semester with a retreat to the mountains to talk about the theme of the program, and we rounded off the program with a final retreat. We stressed communal activities within the program, sent the students out in teams to study small agricultural communities, and got students involved

in planning our fourth semester. Finally, we encouraged informal writing and eliminated conventional grading. Let us look at some of these in more detail.

After two years of waiting for students to treat the experimental program as something more than just another class, I took the offensive. I believed that a community was essential and so this time I took measures to build it. The first week the faculty and students moved off campus to a campground in the Santa Cruz mountains to talk about the program, the theme, and the books we would read. We were trying to get acquainted. The retreat was part of the program, attendance was required, and so everyone was there. The first retreat was so worthwhile we opened every succeeding semester that way and even ended the program in the mountains. The retreats were important because they helped our faculty and students agree to be bound together by a common intellectual purpose for two years. Slowly little cliques broke down and a loose assortment of individuals became a band of brothers and sisters.

To help build our community, we required students and faculty to see good films together: Woman in the Dunes, Zorba, Red Desert, Black Orpheus, Marat-Sade, Ulysses, Chushingura, Winter Light, Gate of Hell. These were films about the moral issues that we were discussing in seminar. It was fun.⁹

Some of us began eating together regularly and only the lack of a dining hall prevented all of us taking a common meal together. By the second year we were meeting every Monday in a regular morning assembly in the college cafeteria so that we could be together, have coffee and breakfast together, and start the week together. The group became cohesive and as it did, everything improved; the seminars were better; we were doing more work together and enjoying it.

We asked small groups of eight and nine students to carry out anthropological surveys of several small agricultural towns in the Salinas Valley.

One of the teams produced a documentary with a portable video-tape recorder. Again the emphasis had shifted from independent study to cooperative study. These required studies of communities by student teams were much more successful than individual projects. Increasingly the students felt better about required work and required cooperation.

We experimented with a much greater variety of assignments. Students and faculty were required to keep journals and they filled them with informal writing about the books we were reading, the films we saw, reactions to each other, family crises, sex crises, and identity crises. We showed each other this informal writing and talked about form and content. Some made movies and did photographic essays. There was poetry, some fiction, and an occasional formal essay. If I asked my students to write, I wrote too and in so doing discovered the enormous educational power of reciprocity. This was probably as important a discovery as that of the faculty seminar.

Conventional grades were finally eliminated in favor of a pass-incomplete system. With one or two exceptions the students all expressed satisfaction with the new grading system. It was difficult to assess the consequences of eliminating conventional grades because so much else was different in this particular program. Grades seemed unnecessary as our students committed themselves to the requirements of the fellowship. Toward the end of the program the students were required to write periodic evaluations of their own seminars, and of the faculty. These were included along with faculty evaluations of the seminars in a weekly paper published by the students. This was constructive criticism that was accurate, responsible, and public. We had substituted critiques for quizzes, and the public display of real work for letter grades.

The mistakes made in the first program were clear now. There was too much committee and not enough commitment. Accustomed to academic sovereignty in the classroom, the first faculty team continued to cherish and exercise

that sovereignty despite the program. Someone was always spending an extra month on his favorite book while some books on the list were ignored and others added. We really did not want close collaboration.

The second time around we had a coherent program and a collegial faculty. The program had a clearly elucidated political theme and the theme was stated over and over again. The teachers collaborated as a team in the teaching of the theme all the way through the program, from beginning to end. The fact that the faculty had to plan and work together in a common educational enterprise, with a common book list, and on a common schedule was made clear in every discussion with every prospective teacher. It was never taken for granted. Each member of the faculty understood that he was a voluntary member of something that would become a fellowship, and that if he could not continue to accept the obligations of that fellowship, he must resign from it, rather than divide and destroy it.¹⁰

These were some of the essential conditions satisfied in the second experiment, conditions which must be satisfied if the kind of lower-division, liberal arts program that I have been describing is going to be political, coherent, and collaborative. In addition, a coherent and collegial program requires leadership and especially continuity of leadership. Someone must serve as keeper of the flame and always the most difficult problem will be to persuade the faculty to subordinate their customary individualistic teaching to the unusual collaboration demanded by the program. It takes tact, and a strong will. Someone has to think and live the program twenty-four hours a day. Someone has to power the program with vision, hope, and confidence.

An explicit theme and a committed faculty may ensure a coherent educational plan, but meeting these necessary conditions will not insure much of an educational experience for the students unless they too become active members of

the program. Somehow they must be persuaded to join, to give up their hallowed but hollow individualism, and to accept the obligations of a peculiar but rewarding fellowship.

I discovered that there was a lot to learn about winning over students, signing them up as members, getting them to make the necessary commitment. My students were constantly distracted by identity crises, family crises, sexual dilemmas and debacles, dates and drugs, beads and boots, cars, records, rock concerts, and even jobs, all more important than the books. The teacher is lucky if he is number ten on the list, and a successful antidote has to be more powerful than a pop quiz. I decided to use the moral pressure of a cohesive community--if I could just get the students to join. I hoped to conjoin the curriculum and the extracurriculum into a learning/living experience that would work powerfully. Back in 1965, at the start of my first experiment, I assumed that community would follow quite naturally from good discussion in seminar. I wanted my students to talk about ideas, the ideas of Sophocles or Goethe, Plato or Hobbes. Conversations were to have a beginning; someone, preferably a student, was to ask a question or locate a theme. The group was then to follow the question, develop the theme, explore implications, and make discoveries. The whole was to have an orchestrated quality, but with a minimum of direction from the teacher. The conversations were to be cooperative, creative, problem-solving.

What I wanted may have happened two or three times in the first year of my first program, but generally our discussions were unbelievably bad. Desperately I divided my group, and then redid it. We met in the daytime and then at night. We met on campus and off, with coffee and without, but nothing helped. Finally, at an angry session, a stubborn and hostile young lady spelled it out: "I never talk about anything important with people I don't like." That was it! Behind the dull, glazed, and occasionally hostile

look of my students was fear and antipathy. They just did not want to discuss anything cooperatively, or in any way, except perhaps destructively, as long as they did not like or trust each other or me. I learned the hard way that for them the essence of good communication was interacting without hostility and dishonesty. It was the experience of trusting and being trusted. Of course, hostility and dishonesty and mutual trust have no relevance for the traditional college course in which the professor lectures and the dutiful student-stenographers take it all down. But such considerations are at the heart of a program built on a sense of community, and I realized that reconciliation had to come first, and good conversation about Plato or de Tocqueville could only come later, if at all.

The 1967-69 experiment was different because we became intimate. We talked about ourselves and the group. We wrote about ourselves in journals instead of trying to write term papers. We had fun going to retreats and the movies together. We began to like, trust and respect each other, and so we could talk about important things and sometimes fairly well. We were communicating a little in their sense, and a little in mine. The interaction felt better because we were discovering the lost art of cooperative conversation and some of the long-lost pleasures of community.

Let me end the story of my two experimental programs at San Jose. The last year was the best of all. It all seemed a vindication of my faith in Alexander Micklejohn. Two teams of faculty had worked on the art of teaching. For four years we had experimented with ways of making the liberal arts come alive in the lives of our students. We had learned to show freshmen how to marry morality and imagination, intelligence and experience. The most difficult task of all had been to enlist our students in a collaborative enterprise that was both intellectual and personal. Some of them understood, agreed, and enlisted. They found themselves members of a tight little educa-

tional community, a community that shaped and changed their lives. And, of course, much to our surprise and delight we found our own lives shaped and changed by that community.

I believe even more today than in 1964 that most American colleges and universities are not providing the education that we must have if our democracy is to survive and flourish. I believe that we must have a revolution in American education and that is what I am working for. Most of the popular reforms, past and present, will not provide the education that will transform America as long as the reformers, whether faculty or students, insist that "each individual must generate his own most vital questions and program his own education."¹¹ An individualistic education that actually takes pride in letting everyone do his own thing cannot prepare future citizens to subordinate their private interests to the public need and the public good.

REFORMS AND EXPERIMENTS: PAST AND PRESENT

Gerald Grant and David Riesman in The Perpetual Dream undertook to describe and interpret a good many of the reform movements and experiments that worked their way through much of American higher education during the 1960's and early 1970's.¹² They launched that ambitious undertaking with a typology that distinguishes between two kinds of reforms--popular reforms, which have brought about more autonomy and freedom of choice for the student (and I might add more autonomy and freedom for the faculty), and telic reforms, which have sought to redefine the purposes of contemporary education and create radically new ways of educating. They admit that telic is an awkward label, and I agree, but rather than burden my readers with another typology of my own invention, I am going to use the Grant-Riesman categories.

According to Grant and Riesman, the fundamental differences that separate popular and telic reformers flow from their different attitudes toward the ideals and practices of the contemporary American research university. The popular reformers accept the ideals and ethos of the research university and want to make such universities more open and more comfortable for students by making them less competitive and more flexible. On the other hand, the telic reformers are opposed to many of the curricular and pedagogic practices of the research university and want to create something quite different, usually something radically different. Their concern is with preprofessional and pre-vocational undergraduate education, and the institution that they hope to change and save is the college. For the telic reformers the unwitting enemy of the college is the research university which now trains all of the faculty for the colleges, and has come to define the goals of the colleges, and control the very criteria of their success and failure. The opening paragraphs of Tussman's Experiment At Berkeley define the essential difference between the university and the college: "The university is the academic community organized for the pursuit of knowledge" while "the liberal arts college... cultivates the mind of the person, not the body of knowledge."¹³

Alexander Micklejohn's Experimental College at Madison, Tussman's experiment at Berkeley, and my own at San Jose were radical critiques of what we believed to be the dangerous distortion of undergraduate education by the research-oriented universities. Our reforms were telic reforms undertaken in the hope of returning to some of the lost ideals and goals, though not the exact content, nor the pedagogy, of the best of the American colonial colleges.

Grant and Riesman use St. John's College, after its transformation by Scott Buchanan and Stringfellow Barr, as an ideal example of what they call a neo-classical telic reform since it restored something like the classical curriculum. Each of the reforms inspired by Alexander Micklejohn, whether at St. John's, Berkeley, or San Jose, was animated by a similar and distinctive vision of the purposes of a liberal curriculum and the purposes of an undergraduate college. All sought to save the college by turning it into an educating community dominated by a moral vision of human society. All sought ways of cultivating intelligence, reasonableness, and understanding. The college, in this view, was not in competition with the university, whose business it was to pursue knowledge and train for the vocations. The proper business of the college was to cultivate wisdom, to shape character, and to prepare young adults for their political roles.

I, too, have joined those who have set themselves against the tide of popular reforms and against the consequences of the academic revolution that has almost completely transformed American higher education since the 1880's. But I want to emphasize that I am not advocating the destruction of the research-oriented universities. I am advocating instead the radical separation of the college and the university. They need to be separated, and to be seen as different, and to be honored for their very different and important missions by students, faculty, parents, and public officials.

If we as a people once had colleges that were closer to the ideal than our contemporary schools, what happened to them? Popular needs, translated into effective demands from students, parents and trustees, completely transformed the colonial colleges. The colonial college patterned on Oxford gave way to the utilitarian and research university, and the prescribed classical curriculum gave way to free student selection. Why? Because energetic and upwardly mobile Americans wanted it that way. Nevertheless, something important was lost or, better yet, thrown away in the course of the great academic revolution

that started around 1870 and continues to this day.¹⁴

The colonial colleges and denominational colleges of the early republic educated the whole human being. They were unabashedly concerned with shaping character. It is proper that we decry the narrow dogmatism of the curricula of the denominational colleges, but we should not be proud of having abandoned the responsibility for building character.

Let me digress for a moment. Few American academics seem to realize that one hundred years ago there were three ideas of what an academic institution of higher learning should be. One was the Anglo-Saxon model established and disseminated by Oxford and Cambridge. Another was the Scottish pioneered by Saint Andrews and then given a Calvinist cast by Edinburgh. The third was the German, especially as it took its peculiarly modern form at Berlin.

At Oxford the professor was both a moral and an intellectual teacher, a mentor for the sons of the ruling elite. The specific detail of what was taught was not as important as the teaching of mental discipline and the development of character. At Edinburgh many of the professors taught practical subjects and the Scots were proud of a literacy rate higher than that in England. Von Humboldt and the German professors committed themselves and their students to scientific research, even in theology, and their overarching goal became the expansion of knowledge through research. The German professor was primarily interested in teaching future scientists how to do research and how to publish the results of that research.

The first American colleges were mostly patterned on the Oxford-Cambridge model, but the Scottish emphasis on useful subject matter had an early and strong appeal in an increasingly utilitarian country. The Scottish ideal helped pave the way for the introduction of practical subjects by the older colleges; Henry Tappan's innovations at Michigan in the 1850's, the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862, and, of course, the founding of Cornell in 1868.

However, it was the lodestone of the German research university that attracted the attention of ever larger numbers of American teachers, and over 9,000 of them followed George Ticknor there in the course of the 19th Century. It was the ideal of the German university that gave rise to the first graduate schools and the eventual dominance of the research university in America. The rise of the research university coincided with and did much to cause the decline in the importance and vitality of the liberal college. With the decline of the college, concern for character gave way to concern for subject matter, and American university and college teachers facing toward Germany rather than England came to teach special subjects, not whole students. The rise of departments and disciplines and the adoption of the elective system meant that the liberal education of the whole student was increasingly left to chance.

It has been the mixing of these models and the mixing of a host of what seemed to be new and practical innovations, new and popular reforms, that have given us the kind of faculty and institutions that dominate American higher education today. The faculty is specialized and professional; the dominant institution is either the private research university with a departmentalized liberal arts college inside it or the conglomerate that Clark Kerr has called the multiversity. The new academic prestige structure is increasingly one-dimensional as colleges and universities all across the land, staffed by the same kind of faculty, line up and play follow the flagship. Now that the American academic revolution has run its course, colleges are the captives of the university ethos and the only faculty, other than occasional quixotic reformers, who still talk about building character without any embarrassment whatsoever are the coaches.

TELIC REFORMERS AND THE NEXT DECADE

What does the next decade hold in store for the telic reformers? What should we do? Why should we do it? What strategy should we use? Finally, what are our chances of success? Is there a future for the anti-university reform movements? I have put these questions bluntly because I believe that those of us who want to push against the prevailing mood in American higher education need to know what we are up against and whether or not we are likely to find any allies at all.

Grant and Riesman conclude that the only reforms of the 1960's to have had any lasting impact were the popular reforms, not the telic reforms. Only two out of the six neoclassical experiments they mention still exist--St. John's at Annapolis and Sante Fe and St. Mary's of California. The San Jose experiment became almost exclusively an experiment in pedagogy when I went to Old Westbury, and it closed down altogether two years later. Will neoclassical telic reforms do any better in the coming decade? I think that we must try. Moreover, as outrageous as this may seem, I think we may have a better chance in the 1980's than we had in the 1960's.

For most of us the decade of the 1980's already wears many forbidding faces: declining enrollments, shrinking budgets, demands for accountability from legislatures, tax revolts, layoffs, unionization, massive shifts in student demand, the end of geographical and vertical mobility for most faculty, and the grim prospect of intellectual stagnation for many of the campuses that survive. While the latter is, I think, one of the grimmest prospects of all, there may be in the midst of all this bad news opportunities to be seized, dark forces that we can turn to our advantage.

During the fantastic growth of American institutions of higher education between 1945 and 1970, the continuing academic revolution was marked by the

ascendancy of the disciplines and the death of the general education movement.¹⁵ The extension downward of the revolution into what had been teachers colleges and the acceptance throughout the academic world of the values of the departmentalized research university resulted in, among other consequences, an enormous amount of research and publishing, a proliferation of specialized courses, and an upgrading of undergraduate curricula in the university-certified disciplines. In 1970 the general or liberal studies were down and virtually out of the picture. The disciplines were riding high and at first glance seemed quite in control of the whole of the higher academic system. But by 1970 the canny observer should have been able to spot a significant quickening in the relative rate of growth of the practical, the instrumental majors--both in the older programs like engineering and in the somewhat newer ones like business and journalism. By 1980 there was no avoiding the fact that higher education was experiencing a massive shift in student enrollments away from the disciplines and into the instrumental programs, that is, the unabashedly vocational majors, at the very moment that many of the nation's universities and colleges approached the threshold of a massive decline in overall enrollments.

Part of the shift can be explained by the fact that increasing numbers of student consumers now believe that while taking a major in an arts and science discipline is important for success if the student wants to do more academic work at the graduate level, it is not if that student plans to enter the non-academic world of work. Increasingly, employers are turning away from queues of disciplinary bachelors to graduates who have specialized in instrumental majors with titles that sound like job titles--away from English majors to those who have specialized in agricultural communications,

away from psychology majors to personnel management majors. The employer's assumption is that classroom material taught in courses with titles that sound practical is relevant to job performance and long-term success on the job. The students have noticed that taking practical subjects will put them in much shorter and more specialized queues of job seekers. Students anxious about jobs are looking for shorter queues and so are moving into instrumental programs tied directly to the job market. Universities and colleges anxious about dwindling enrollments are creating instrumental programs in a desperate effort to try and stay one jump ahead of changing job categories in the marketplace. Surface mining picks up in Wyoming and the University of Wisconsin creates a new major in reclamation. Journalism spawns printing management, radio broadcasting, and television production, and no one shows up to take an English major. The academic revolution that brought the disciplines and the departments to power is being followed by a counterrevolution driven by the job market and the market power of students.

Businessmen, legislators, public officials, and a tax weary and increasingly restive public are likely to see the decline of the disciplines and the proliferation and growth of the instrumental programs as a return to common sense, as an indication that a college education can be useful. But for those of us who believe that neither the strictly disciplinary nor the strictly instrumental routes are best, for those of us who take the longer view, for those of us who believe that our nation needs citizens who are capable of continuing their intellectual, ethical, and emotional development, this movement is heading in the wrong direction. For our nation's employers who need employees capable of continuing their vocational development for forty or fifty years after they are picked for that first training opportunity, this recent movement is also heading in the wrong direction. For faculty trained in and committed to the traditional disciplines, this movement spells disaster, because the

market-spawned, market-directed programs (that is, the instrumental programs) with their majors, departments, and schools are drawing an ever higher proportion of the students, leaving the faculty in the traditional arts and sciences academic programs with fewer and fewer students who want to follow them into the disciplines. There is less and less for arts and sciences faculty to do except teach service courses to business, engineering, journalism and horticulture students. Beyond the service courses there is nothing left but bits and scraps of general education or perhaps a faint memory of the old classical curriculum.

If I am right and the instrumental majors and faculties are waxing and the disciplines are waning, then we are going to see thousands of letters and sciences faculty forced by circumstances to serve the popular, market-directed sector. In most cases this is not going to be what they dreamed of doing as professors of literature, physics, history and philosophy. This is the root of the coming crisis in faculty morale in the arts and sciences departments.

Here are some of the solutions that have been tossed about in conferences, committee meetings, planning seminars and workshops. Find relatively acceptable ways of eliminating or consolidating majors and of laying off tenured faculty. Find relatively inexpensive ways of retraining arts and sciences faculty for jobs in the instrumental programs. Encourage early retirement. Persuade some arts and sciences faculty to look for nonteaching jobs. Cut back the size of graduate programs until demand picks up.

None of these solutions will do anything for the thousands of unhappy arts and sciences faculty who will see themselves as stuck for life on campuses that have nothing much to offer beyond the repetitive teaching of required service courses and low-prestige general education courses. It is their lives and their work that I think we should and can do something about through telic reforms.

I am asserting that the decline of the disciplines will drain significance, satisfaction, stature and status out of the work and lives of arts and sciences faculty on hundreds of campuses across the country. I predict that the loss of majors and a reversion to teaching service courses and despised general education courses will leave those faculty inert, parochial, and bored, or bitter, paranoid, and hostile, or all of these. Finally, I am insisting that there is a way out of this mess and that is for a faculty to find ways of making the teaching of general education, or what I would rather call liberal learning, the most exciting, satisfying, and significant teaching on its campus. With the coming relative decline of the disciplines the action is going to be somewhere else, but it does not have to be restricted to the instrumental market-oriented departments insensitively cocky about their steady growth, high salaries, and audience appeal. While it certainly will not be in the disciplines, it can be in the lower division, and in the extra-curriculum.

I believe that we must challenge the dominant assumptions and practices of the research university, and it is my hope that we can take creative advantage of the coming crisis in higher education rather than simply succumb to it. The decline in enrollments and the search for ever larger numbers of students who will enroll in instrumental programs will force many campuses to make formal declarations of financial emergency and to lay off tenured faculty. That will be a bitter experience for any campus. The frantic creation of nothing but new instrumental programs will be the wrong kind of creative response to that looming crisis because it will cheat society and the student, complete the destruction of the college, and leech away the salt and savour of what should be a very rich and satisfying life for the college teacher.

The rediscovery and recreation of a liberating curriculum and a liberating pedagogy will be the right kind of creative response because it will cultivate the intelligence our society must have, recreate the college and make college teaching stimulating and profoundly satisfying.

We must do something about college teaching to prevent it from becoming a bore, mere employment, an avenue to on-the-job retirement, and as dull as it is secure. I used to appeal to teachers to sign on to Alexander Micklejohn's reform movement in order to save the souls of their students. My appeal now is for teachers to save their own souls and perhaps by doing so to serve their students and society.

During the decade of the 1980's there will be very few new faces, little new blood with new ideas, few young Turks to rattle old cages on many of our campuses. We will have only ourselves and that means we will have to discover and create new sources of intellectual growth and vitality through our own efforts. To keep from going stale, to keep from growing old and tired together, to keep growing intellectually and pedagogically, we are going to have to figure out ways of learning from each other. In a decade of enrollment decline, that is going to require an unusual kind of effort on the part of both faculty and administration. I know that it can happen, I think that it can happen on many, many campuses over the next decade, and I know one way to make it happen.

The excitement and satisfaction of following an exalted calling rather than just doing a job, the renewed vitality that comes from growing intellectually, the stimulus and fun that come from discovering new ways to teach, and the nurturing support that comes from being a part of a real community, all of these can be the consequence of collaborative teaching in a thematically organized program designed around the lessons learned at Madison, Black Mountain, St. John's, Chicago, Shimer, Berkeley, San Jose, Santa Cruz, Old Westbury

and Evergreen. Any college could become a tremendous place to teach and a memorable place to study simply through the adaptation and continuation of a Mieklejohn experiment. The overoptioned curriculum with its popular concessions to student and faculty individualism, to individual wants rather than social needs, will not have the same results.

In their 1932 report to the Faculty of Letters and Science at the University of Wisconsin, Mieklejohn and his faculty urged the reorganization of the lower half of the College of Letters and Science. Here are three of their concrete suggestions:

- (1) Student social life and student education might profit greatly if the thirty-six hundred freshmen and sophomores in the College of Letters and Science were divided into fifteen or twenty smaller colleges, each with its own social organization and social interests.
- (2) There would be very great gain if the teachers of the lower college could act, not only as one body, but also as fifteen or twenty smaller faculties, each considering the educational problem as a whole, each working out its own aims and methods in relative independence.
- (3) The experience of the Experimental College suggests a way in which college teachers might, much more satisfactorily than at present, be trained for the art of teaching.¹⁶

That was good advice in 1932; I think it is even better advice today, and I am not alone. Grant and Riesman return to the very same solution forty-six years later, in 1978. Here is their modest proposal:

In fact, one could argue that while the departments form a satisfactory community for groups of specialists and graduate students who choose to associate with them, they are not the best form of community for general undergraduate education. What, then, ought to be the basis of intellectual and social community for undergraduates? This is the heart of the debate that is being renewed with a gathering momentum.

We favor a pluralism of core programs or subcolleges of which the early Santa Cruz represents an appealing ideal....to serve as the basis of community, they should be integrating experiences, as was, for example, the early Cowell College at Santa Cruz or Mieklejohn's two-year Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin.¹⁷

There is something else that Grant and Riesman discovered: "A heightened sense of common purpose and common experiences are uniquely possible in such communities. Those who have taught in them have discovered that these experiences are as significant in the renewal of faculty as they are in fostering the growth of students."¹⁸

Richard Jones, after doing traditional teaching at Brandeis, Santa Cruz, and Harvard, and then collaborative teaching at Evergreen, urges traditional campuses to try the latter.

The condition that is more likely to invite further experimentation with the collaborative teaching model is...[that] teaching in a traditional college tends to be boring.

Much of this boredom stems, I think, not from the characters of the college professors, but from the conditions of their work, made inevitable by college teaching having become synonymous with having to teach courses. Having to teach courses contains the very ingredients of boredom; it is lonely, isolated, and repetitive.

It is impossible for the teaching that goes on in a program of coordinated study to be boring.¹⁹

As we look toward the inevitable crisis in higher education, I hope to persuade my reader that troubled times are times ripe for creative change. Moving the discipline-based departments out of the lower division and reorganizing the lower division into small, thematically based subcolleges would bring three very positive consequences: the return of extraordinary vitality and satisfaction to teaching in the lower division, the return of community for faculty, and the radical improvement of the intellectual and cultural ambiance of the campus. The liberal college would live again in what Tussman calls "first programs."²⁰ But given the kinds of risks that come with great dislocating crises, what are our chances of success? If telic reforms did not fare well during good times, can we expect anything better during bad times? Finally, what strategy should we try?

OBSTACLES AND ASSETS

David Riesman, reflecting on a lifetime of research and experience, remains skeptical about the chances for telic reforms "except in the handful of overapplied institutions that can afford to turn students away by making greater demands on them for greater coherence."²¹ Less naive today than in 1964, and much chastened by advances and setbacks at San Jose, Old Westbury, Evergreen, and the University of Wisconsin-Platteville, I still remain convinced that there is a way to plant reforms on unselective and under-applied campuses. But there are formidable obstacles, and there will be real resistance.

Today the power of the departments in all academic affairs is virtually absolute, and the departments are absolutely opposed to reforms that in any way threaten their sovereign power. The first line of resistance to Micklejohn's ideas has always been and will continue to be the departments because theme-based subcolleges really are substitutes for discipline-based departments. The peculiar academic institution of tenure is already adding a special intensity to the defensive strategies of the departments as enrollments decline in the disciplines, but the custom of tenure itself is not a central problem even though it reinforces departmental power and rewards faculty commitment to the ethos of the research university.

The most formidable barrier to telic reform is the compelling and pervasive ethos of the research university, accepted uncritically by increasingly specialized faculty organized into sovereign departments. That barrier is reinforced by systems of faculty governance that give political expression to the values and structures of the academic revolution. Faculties have created Byzantine forms of governance that make it easy to add courses and options that fit the popular trend and easy to block unpopular proposals that threaten departmental spheres of influence.

Coupled to faculty acceptance of the values of the research university, there is grudging reverence for the multiversity as an ideal and a willingness to follow particular flagship universities. Out of this there has emerged interacting and overlapping state, regional and national prestige structures with most faculty taking their cues from the same kind of universities, if not from the same few. Administrators, faculty, and accrediting associations are playing an intricate and deadly serious game of follow the leader, and it is going to be difficult to get some of them to step out of the procession.

The general acceptance of the multiversity is in itself an obstacle. The multiversity thrives on and thereby seems to give legitimacy to the overoptioned curriculum. The great multiversities can be anything and everything to anyone and everyone, and every campus in the land feels the pull of that ideal and the threat of a ruthlessly competitive struggle for students and for survival itself. Great expanding multiversities have been followed by coordinating councils and coordinating councils by centrally administered state systems of higher education -- all intended to eliminate expensive duplication and proliferation of courses, programs and degrees. However, neither the accountability backlash nor the proliferation of system administrations has stopped the multiplication of options nor the overcapitalization of the educational sector. These developments mean more administration at a distance and increased faculty alienation, paranoia, and defensiveness.

One unfortunate response to faculty alienation has been unionization. Faculty labor unions are concerned with collectively bargained contracts between employees and employers that insure more pay for less work, the formal adjudication of grievances, and the protection of seniority. The union leadership is not likely to fight for an unpopular curricular and pedagogical reform that depends upon the definition of teaching as a

calling, not a job. A calling may require more, not less work. Union leaders committed to protecting faculty against students, administrators, trustees and politicians can hardly be expected to embrace reforms that reconcile presidents and professors.

The recent decades of rapid growth have resulted in an overexpansion of faculties and facilities and have tied state institutions to enrollment funding formulas that threaten to leave them crestfallen captives of student-market-power. As enrollment declines and shifts become grim realities, many campuses may see no road to survival other than through abject concessions to job-market trends and student consumerism. There is no denying the fact that the expansion and multiplication of practical sounding instrumental programs like printing management or light building construction along with the collapse of the general education movement will impede efforts at telic reforms. Student-market-power, if unchallenged, will administer the coup de grace to any required coherent program of liberal studies that seems to get in the way of practical studies. Ironically, these very students will expect and accept a required curriculum in their instrumental program but not in their liberal program. The faculties will not hesitate to plan a required curriculum for them in elementary education or electrical engineering, but not in the moral curriculum.

As daunting as are these barriers and obstacles to telic reform, we should not give up. We simply must not capitulate to faculty specialization, defensive departments, state bureaucrats, self-serving unions, and market forces. Moreover, telic reformers do have resources with which to counter a host of impediments and obstacles.

Because there is no way of winning a head-to-head contest with the departments, the reformer will have to work around them while encouraging

them to go on doing what they do best. This may not be as difficult as it seems. While many faculty are teaching their specialties, an increasing number in arts and sciences departments are not. In fact, many are already spending most of their time teaching in the general education program anyway, and the inevitable growth of instrumental majors will relegate them more and more to a service function. This, in turn, will lead to an even greater degree of boredom, discontent, depression, and alienation. These feelings can be overcome through participation in first program teaching because of two very deeply seated qualities of faculty members. First, plain, unvarnished idealism is found in high concentrations on college and university campuses. Faculty idealism may be submerged, even laced with skepticism; nevertheless, it is there waiting to be mobilized and energized. There is an inner ambivalence and an inner tension about the present state of the academy and their jobs in the minds of many faculty and that means there are some out there waiting for a compelling vision of something better. I have known many college teachers who have a job, and tenure, but who want to feel called to something significant. Just teaching is not as exciting as being committed to a reform movement. It is exhilarating to stand with David against Goliath. Second, many faculty hunger for a kind of collegiality that is broader and deeper than anything provided by a department and its discipline. Many are ready for an education that they never had because they were so busy becoming chemists or sociologists. Many are ready for membership in an intellectually stimulating community of scholars, the kind of community so many of us dreamed of belonging to when we were graduate students. Such faculty would respond to the intellectual adventure and the close-knit community that are the givens of a successful first program. Anyone who resonates to the myth of a golden age that resembles, even though faintly, the "academical village" of Thomas Jefferson is a potential convert to our cause.

To know young American students is to discover that in addition to a lot of latent student idealism, these young men and women want and need community, too. Some students are already ready to admit to teachers that they feel a need for commitment, coherence, unity, and meaning. They want support for their curiosity, creativity, and seriousness. They would like someone to look up to, adult friends and teachers to depend upon. They would like adults to take their personal lives seriously enough to give them some good advice, models to follow, even outright leadership. Many need a halfway house on the way to adulthood and others are even ready to apprentice themselves to a master teacher, and I am talking about the job-serious students of the 1980's. Instead of trying to talk them out of their interest in instrumental majors, we must have the vision and the courage to tell them that they must take a required and faculty-designed first program first. If we are persuasive, they will listen; if we lead, they will follow.

Why not give students the chance for commitment and guide that commitment? Why not give them a chance to search for unity, coherence, synthesis alongside committed teachers? There is the potential power of youthful idealism just waiting to be used for good ends. There is the potential power of a community organized for a quest just waiting to be used. Fortunately, the American system of higher education still has a lot of variety in it, and that variety along with a desire to be different, to be better, will give some, even many, the opportunity and the courage to march to a different drummer.

Enough historical evidence is now available for us to pass judgment on the intentions and consequences of the academic revolution and the reforms opposed to it. Instead of drifting with the popular tide I believe that we should follow and build on the ideas and experiences of Alexander Micklejohn at Madison, Stringfellow Barr and Scott Buchanan at St. Johns, Robert Hutchens

at the University of Chicago, Joseph Tussman at Berkeley, and Richard Jones at Evergreen. Having said that, there is still the question of strategy.

Here, sketched in very broad strokes, is one suggestion for a grand strategy. Let us convert a few presidents and enough faculty on enough campuses to start a movement and make it visible. A lot of push from a president and a lot of work by a small band of enthusiastic faculty will make it possible to set up and operate one or two subcolleges on any campus. The coalition or alliance of the president and faculty enthusiasts is essential--neither can launch a program without the other. One president and five faculty could start a first program on almost any unselective campus in the land.

At this point I am going to narrow the focus of my analysis from all of American higher education to a particular sector, the public and private universities that are not at or near the top of the prestige ladder, the unselective secular institutions that serve so many Americans. I do this because these campuses need the excitement that comes with answering the call to do significant work, they should have a much more exalted view of themselves and their work, and they need to be protected against the fear and boredom that will cripple many a faculty over the next ten years. I am suggesting that the telic reformers should set up their experiments at places like Platteville and not Princeton; moreover, the chances of success are likely to be greater at Platteville than at Princeton.

We should concentrate our evangelical energy on the presidents and faculty of the unselective campuses and not waste our time on the colleges within the flagship universities or on the rich liberal arts colleges that are both likely to remain satisfied with what they are now doing and likely to weather the coming decade without too much difficulty. Let us leave the flagship institutions and their campfollowers to complete, refine, and enhance the academic revolution while some of us cut ourselves loose from that particular academic procession.

I think we should look for likely campuses and then get in touch with their presidents and likely faculty. We should publish and preach and start a missionary movement. Once we have converted a president and a few of his or her faculty, it will be up to them to try to start something on their own campus and we can move on.

We ought to have a demonstration campus to which we would invite interested presidents and faculty for short workshops. We ought to run model programs in the summer for teams of presidents, faculty, and students. We ought to persuade one or more foundations to support a traveling team made up of a small number of those who have taught in successful programs. This team of experienced first program teachers could visit campus after campus, traveling in a caravan of Airstream trailers as a mobile demonstration of what we are talking about. Before we dismiss these three schemes and others like them as too fanciful for the prosaic foundations, reflect for a moment on the millions of dollars that have been poured into the heady dreams of electronic teaching technology. We could put a demonstration program on the road for \$200,000 a year and visit 20 campuses a year. If I were to select a demonstration team right here on the spot it would be made up of teachers like Joseph Tussman, Richard Jones, Phil Camponeschi, Bill Spofford, Robert Sluss, Allen Scarborough and Richard Alexander. Of course I would want to go along.

Whether there is a team on the road or one that operates on a demonstration campus, someone must carry the message to presidents and faculty, to students and parents, to regents and politicians in a host of articles, news stories, and lectures. Someone must organize a society to sound the alarm and propagate the best ideas we can think of. There must be more meetings like this to which we will invite likely presidents and likely faculty.

If a few of us work at it, I believe that it will be possible to plant first program experiments on a good number of campuses during the decade of the

1980's. If this happens, I expect the programs to flourish and to form in the aggregate a significant telic reform movement that will help redefine the American undergraduate college and rescue hundreds of able teachers from a life embittered by boredom.

Postscript

I would like to acknowledge two intellectual debts. Alexander Micklejohn was over ninety when I first met him. Small, frail, and happily intense, he quite simply bowled me over. I then searched for and read two of his books, Political Freedom and Education Between Two Worlds, and have never been the same since because I had found my political and educational philosopher. Also, I feel enormous respect for James Conant; he inherited the Harvard of Charles W. Eliot and Abbot Lawrence Lowell and tried to do something with it.

Footnotes

1. Richard M. Jones, Experiment At Evergreen (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1980)
2. Joseph Tussman, Experiment At Berkeley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969). See Harris Woffard and Michael Novak for the Old Westbury story.
3. The volunteer staff of the 1965-67 program was made up of Gary L. Albright, Philosophy; Harold J. DeBey, Biochemistry; John A. Galm, English; David K. Newman, Psychology; Richard G. Tansey, Art History; and Mervyn L. Cadwallader, Sociology.
4. The Berkeley and San Jose reading lists were almost identical for the first semester and then diverged as the two programs developed in slightly different ways.
5. I was to discover that while teachers and students found a program without courses, lectures, and tests to be a bit unfamiliar, they were quicker to accept that than the wholly unfamiliar idea that the public college should be the democratic state's instrument for the liberal education of its citizens and that this should be a principal concern of the public college. Teachers, it turned out, were harder to educate in these matters than students.
6. The United States of America is a great and populous society, centralized and urban, secularized and industrial. For the purpose of this argument its most salient characteristic is that it is trying mightily, despite its size and complexity, to be a self-governing state, a political democracy. There is no crown and no established church and all citizens are urged, even expected, to play dual political roles at many different levels and on many different occasions. We the people are to be ruled and by turn to be rulers. We have resolved to rule ourselves and we are committed to trying to make self-government, even in a very large, very complex, urban and industrial society, actually work. Success will require minds that are civil, citizens that share an absolute commitment to the democratic process and have an understanding of their own political obligations. All would agree, I think, that we have found this self-imposed task extraordinarily difficult, and many suspect that at best the outcome will always be problematic.

There are at least three preconditions to successful and moral self-government, to the creation of a civil society and to its protection and enhancement: (1) A self-governing body politic must have compacts, agreements, rules, in short, law which is the mother and sustainer of civility. (2) Self-government requires that a time and place, a forum, be available to the citizens for the discussion of the issues that come before government. (3) The citizens who come together in the forum must know and be committed to the compact, that is, their own rules.

In our very large and complex society we require many, many opportunities to speak and listen, to participate in public discussion of public issues in order to understand and finally to act. Our ideal, of course, is a citizenry listening carefully and critically, speaking reasonably and eloquently, and acting morally and creatively. If our citizens are going to know how to behave in the forum, they must be properly educated for political discourse for their political roles, and that should be a primary responsibility of the schools and colleges.

7. The students were enthusiastic about the familiar contemporary titles on the book list but by the end of the program most agreed that the moderns just did not hold their own against the ancients. Later students in an Evergreen program were to ask me to eliminate the modern authors.
8. The word "community" is peculiarly susceptible to misunderstanding. I am using it to denote a group of individuals who come to share certain assumptions, values, understandings, and expectations because they have agreed to join the group, accepted its conditions of membership, worked together on common tasks, talked together about common experiences, and grown together for a considerable period of time. This kind of a community takes a lot of time and joint effort to crystalize. It cannot be decreed into existence. Wishful thinking and memos addressed "To the community:" will not do it. Encounter groups are not what I call communities.
9. If attendance had been voluntary, we would have been too busy to have done it together and there would have been less community.
10. Later I learned to ask for a written compact because tacit understandings all too easily turned into misunderstandings.
11. Catalogue of the Free University of Palo Alto. (Stanford, 1968)
12. Gerald Grant and David Riesman, The Perpetual Dream (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).
13. Tussman, Experiment At Berkeley, p. xiii.
14. "The college is everywhere in retreat, fighting a dispirited rearguard action against the triumphant university." Tussman, Experiment At Berkeley, p. xiv.
15. I am heavily and thankfully indebted to the stimulating ideas and analysis of Roger L. Geiger in "The College Curriculum and the Marketplace," Change, Nov./Dec., 1980.
16. Alexander Micklejohn, The Experimental College (New York: Arno Press, 1971), pp. 246-247.
17. Grant and Riesman, The Perpetual Dream, p. 369.
18. Ibid., p. 370.
19. Jones, Experiment At Evergreen, pp. 126, 127.
Micklejohn subcolleges were called coordinated studies programs at Evergreen.
20. For the definition of a first program see
Tussman, Experiment At Berkeley, pp. 18, 19.
21. David Riesman, On Higher Education (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980), p. 292.