

**LOOKING BACK, 25 YEARS AFTER KENT STATE:
DID HIGHER EDUCATION KILL THE SIXTIES?
A RADICAL STRUCTURALIST PERSPECTIVE**

John Milam

Purpose of Paper

The purpose of this paper is to present a sociological thesis about the evolution of higher education since the 1960's and the demise of the sixties movement. These ideas are prepared in the context of what Burrell and Morgan (1979) label as the radical structuralist paradigm. This paradigmatic lens for understanding social theory and social science departs from traditional, functionalist, and status quo sociology to focus on issues of oppression. Its key themes are radical change, structural conflict, modes of domination, contradiction, emancipation, deprivation, and potentiality. This paper is not intended to be read as an historical analysis in the functionalist tradition.

The protests and unrest of the 1960's marked the advent of a new era in higher education (Kerr, 1991). Forced to respond to criticisms over free speech, the curriculum, admissions, the military-industrial-university complex, and the nature of the educational process, institutions went through unprecedented changes. These changes paralleled shifts in the nature of the knowledge base of the disciplines, from physics to sociology, which opened up new paradigms of inquiry (Lincoln, 1989; Schwartz and Ogilvy, 1979).

Since the 1960's, the impact of the student movement has very often been described in caricature. Bloom (1987) in The Closing of the American Mind, D'Souza (1991) in Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus, and Sykes (1990) in The Hollow Men: Politics and Corruption in Higher Education are examples of one perspective which points to the 1960's as the root of the decline of excellence in higher education and the source of a new censorship of political correctness on campuses today. Sykes, for example, writes that "For those who lived through it, the campus revolution of the 1960's seemed in retrospect a phantasmagorical nightmare in which reasoned discourse, logic, and civility were reduced to what at times seemed one long shouted obscenity" (Sykes, 1990, p. 15). According to Sykes, this led to the politicization of academia, official ideologies of feminism and race, and the "attack on the west."

An alternative perspective, presented in this paper, suggests that the 1960's movement as it unfolded on college and university campuses represents a significant but often misunderstood paradigm shift in the role of higher education. While, at least in Sykes' mind, some of the ideas from the movement appear to have been implemented, the impact has been minimal at best. Studies by Astin et al. (1987), Hoge (1979), Levine (1980), and Yankelovich (1972, 1974) suggest that student attitudes have moved from liberal to conservative since the 1960's. Kerr (1991) admits that most of the reforms had little impact and were not maintained.

The specific focus of this paper will be to examine explanations about why the ideas and

ideals from the 1960's about higher education reform were not continued. The work of Kerr (1991) and Altbach and Cohen (1990) provide the standard interpretation, that there were flaws in the sixties movement which prevented it from having more effect. This paper presents an alternative thesis - that higher education is itself responsible for the failure to implement reform and for the demise of the sixties movement in America.

The 1960's Reform Movement in Higher Education

Numerous original sources are available from the time period to document student attitudes toward higher education. It is difficult, though, to separate ideas and actions about society which were discussed in the context of a higher education setting from ideas and actions to reform the university.

Stories and articles about the University of California at Berkeley and Columbia University provide two lenses or metaphors to explain part of what was going on across the country. Sources for these stories include Avorn et al.'s (1968) Up Against the Ivy Wall: A History of the Columbia Crisis, Katope and Zolbrod's (1966) Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook of Student Values, and Kitchell's (1990) video documentary Berkeley in the Sixties. A key text was Taylor's (1969) Students Without Teachers: The Crisis in the University. Other popular 1960's-era texts useful to this author's understanding of the issues include:

Buchanan and Devletoglou's (1970) Academia in Anarchy
 Eurich's (1968) Campus 1980: The Shape and Future in American Higher Education
 Goodman's (1964) The Community of Scholars
 Graubard and Ballotti's (1970) The Embattled University
 Henderson's (1970) The Innovative Spirit: Change in Higher Education
 Hersey's (1970) Letter to the Alumni
 Hook's (1970) Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy
 Lasch's (1969) The Agony of the American Left
 Lukas' (1971) Don't Shoot - We Are Your Children!
 Newman et al (1971) Report on Higher Education
 Nichol's (1970) Perspectives on Campus Tensions
 Roszak's (1968) The Dissenting Academy
 Roszak's (1969) The Making of a Counter Culture
 Runkel et al's (1969) The Changing College Classroom
 Sale's (1973) SDS
 Sanford's (1967) Why Colleges Fail
 Smith's (1971) New Teaching, New Learning: Current Issues in Higher Education, 1971

There are many contradictions in the student movement and in these texts. As the author found in his study of the emerging paradigm of Afrocentricity (Milam, 1992), contradictions may be valued for their contribution to an ongoing dialogue. The fact that many different and opposing attitudes about higher education were held by students in the 1960's does not make

these themes any less important to the discussion. Therefore, there is no attempt in this paper to ascertain whether certain ideas are the "essence" of the movement's attack on higher education or whether certain efforts for reform came from only fringe factions in the student movement. From a radical humanist paradigm perspective, these competing ideas are viewed as part of the fabric of consciousness of the time. There is no need to order and prioritize them, or to evaluate how committed students may have been to them.

Some of the social and political themes which were discussed in the context of a higher education setting include:

- the civil rights movement
- the Vietnam War
- women's rights
- the counterculture
- sensitivity to all forms of oppression, including race, sex, and class.
- lifestyles/sexuality
- the nature of consciousness
- the nature of knowledge/media/McLuhanism

Some of the specific themes which were presented about ways to reform higher education include:

- the free speech movement
- governance
- non-traditional learning
- alternative delivery systems/open classrooms
- educational experimentation
- attention to the whole person
- the role of faculty
- the military-industrial-university complex
- curricular change
- developing new programs in Black and women's studies
- academic freedom for students
- access and diversity
- the university's role in the social world

In using these themes to understand the changing nature of higher education, it is difficult to avoid using simplistic, dualistic descriptions as ideals of the student movement. The following statements are therefore offered only as metaphors to explain part of what students were trying to achieve in terms of higher education reform:

Free speech - Students should be able to exercise free speech on campus, to present unpopular and radical points of view in any kind of forum at any time as long as classes are not

disrupted.

Governance - Students should be involved at all levels of what should be a democratic method of governance. The student voice should be at least as important as that of governing boards, boards of trustees, administrators, and faculty.

Non-traditional learning - Educational philosophies such as those of John Dewey, progressive education, and Paulo Friere should guide the conduct of learning. Grades and degree structures are considered to be inherently oppressive. The lecture method should be exchanged for the discussion. Faculty should serve as facilitators and co-learners in the educational process.

Alternative delivery systems/open classrooms - Open classrooms, Universities Without Walls, and free universities should exist which break away from the hierarchical, essentialist tradition of higher education.

Educational experimentation - Institutions should continually experiment with new ways of teaching and learning, from individualized instruction to programmed learning to the creation of new types of campus learning environments, such as the University of California at Santa Cruz and Hampshire College. Institutions such as Goddard College, Franconia, Antioch, and Sarah Lawrence should serve as models of experimentation.

Attention to the whole person - Students are to be valued as individuals, not treated as numbers or raw material to be processed. The educational experience goes beyond academic learning. Learning must be relevant to contemporary issues, and must be socially and politically responsible. Educational experiences outside of the classroom, such as cooperative degree programs and internships, are as important as the traditional classroom experience. People's lives are integrally interwoven with what they are learning.

Role of faculty - The authoritarian, hierarchical role of faculty, in which scholars lecture to students as if they were impartial receptacles to be filled with knowledge, must be abandoned. Faculty must take on new roles and involvement in teaching. The tenure system is seen as class-based and oppressive.

The military-industrial-university complex - Universities have violated the integrity of their educational mission by conducting research for the government, the military, and the defense industry in exchange for sponsored research monies. Defense contracts, nuclear research, and ROTC programs have no place at institutions of higher education. The military-industrial-university complex must be dismantled.

Curricular change - The traditional general education curriculum is class-based, irrelevant, and does not address significant social issues. The teaching of western civilization fosters oppression. The entire curriculum needs to undergo a radical transformation. Sensitivity to oppression should be taught across the curriculum. New kinds of learning technologies must

be incorporated into the classroom.

Developing new programs in Black and Women's Studies - Money, resources, and administrative commitments must be given to burgeoning programs in Black (African-American) Studies, Women's Studies, and other ethnic/area studies programs. These kinds of courses should be an integral part of every student's curriculum.

Academic freedom for students - Students should not continue to be second class citizens when it comes to decision-making about their educational opportunities and choices. Admissions standards, course sequences for majors, and degree requirements should be dismantled. Students should be given complete academic freedom for planning their studies. Academic program planning should take place as part of shared governance. This is the difference between *Lehrfreiheit*, the academic freedom of faculty to teach, and *Lernfreiheit*, the academic freedom of students to, in Goodman's words, know "what they need to be taught" (Goodman, 1966, p. 78).

Access and diversity - The white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, male between the ages of 18 and 22 should not be the image of the traditional, undergraduate, college student. Institutions must offer complete access to the poor, women, and minorities. Colleges and universities should deliberately seek a mix of student types.

The university's role in the social world - The university must assume its implied role as a change agent in the social world. Despite arguments about the nature of research, higher education is not value free. Colleges and universities must recognize and act on their roles as leaders in shaping values in business, government, politics, the knowledge industry, and the social world.

Traditional, Functionalist Explanations for Why The 1960's Reforms Didn't Work

While there are a plethora of books analyzing the impact of the sixties on society, few focus on the institution of higher education. Several gatekeeper/scholars in the field of higher education have offered their retrospective analysis of the impact of the 1960's. These are used as metaphors for the traditional functionalist view of what happened to the higher education reform movement of the sixties.

Explanation #1

Clark Kerr (1991), in The Great Transformation in Higher Education: 1960-1980, writes "I know of no inventory of intentional academic changes of the 1960's that show their survival rate, but I would guess that in the vicinity of 90 percent were discontinued or so attenuated as to disappoint their authors" (Kerr, 1991, p. 147). Asked why this was the case, Kerr believes that faculty conservatism is one reason. This was:

abetted by the tendency to rely on consensus in making decisions and on the opinions of the older members of any academic group. Also, there are no rewards to the faculty members who seek academic innovation, only the burden of long, drawn-out, and often disappointing consultation. Most academic reforms are in fact initiated by students, who are notoriously inconstant in their efforts, partly because of their rapid turnover and their responsiveness to current fads; and by administrators who are usually, except in new endeavors, such as a new campus, restrained by convention and by faculty committees from participating actively in academic affairs. Also, adaptations over past decades and centuries may well have found the best way of doing things, the tried and true. More fundamentally, there often may be no best way, only different ways (pp. 147-148).

There are other reasons provided by Kerr as to "why the attempted changes of the 1960's largely failed" (p. 148).

- (1) "Many changes at that time in American history attracted faculty members and students who, by their nature - often disaffected and disenchanted as they were with academic life - would not let anything work well, particularly somebody else's attempted reform" (p. 148).
- (2) "...the changes of the 1960's moved mostly in directions that most faculty members by and large opposed. They often called for more time, often much more time, spent with students, and a broader coverage of subject matters in 'integrated programs" (p. 148).
- (3) "The attempted changes of the 1960's were oriented not so much toward the advancement of knowledge but more toward improved environments for students, usually in ways that cost faculty members in time and attention and emotion" (p. 148).
- (4) "The academic changes of the 1960's originated in student bull-sessions and in the minds and hearts of administrators who listened to students; they died in the faculty clubs" (p. 149).
- (5) Compared to the development of the research university in the 1870s, "The national thrusts of the 1960's, however, could be accommodated within the existing structures; they did not require such great changes" (p. 149).
- (6) "Some changes of the 1960's were based not on academic but on political concerns, and were forced into practice by student pressure, such as black studies and women's studies. White, male faculty members generally never liked them; in fact, barely tolerated them. Born in the passion of the student activists, they have mostly withered or at least wilted in the cold embrace of faculty committees" (p.

149).

- (7) There are "Limits to the Use of the College and University as a Direct Instrument of Social Reform" (p. 150). Social reforms through federal financial aid and faculty hiring of minorities and women are an appropriate use of the university, Kerr believes. Efforts to "reconstitute" society through political discussion, demonstration, and protest" were a "largely ineffective" student use of colleges and universities (pp. 151-152).
- (8) "Student interest in formal governance rose and fell very quickly; it did not endure. Some boards of trustees added students to their memberships but with little net impact; so also with faculty committees. The big radical impact has been, instead, at the informal level, particularly in the direction of Marcuse's 'repressive tolerance' - that there should be no tolerance for people with whom you disagree" (p. 153).

Explanation #2

Altbach and Cohen (1990), in "American Student Activism: The Post-Sixties Transformation," find six "Causes of Decline" for the "Legacy of the Sixties."

- (1) "The key motivating force for student activism, the war in Vietnam, gradually wound down during the early 1970s. The war was the factor that mobilized the largest number of students and generated the most dissent" (p. 33).
- (2) "The economic situation dramatically changed" with rapid inflation, oil scares, high unemployment, and a negative economy. "Students began to worry about the job market and how to fit into an uncertain economy" (p. 34).
- (3) "The fields that became increasingly popular - in the sciences and professions - were not fields that tend to contribute to activism. Many activists came from the social sciences, and these rapidly lost popularity during the 1970s" (p. 34).
- (4) "The tactics and to some extent the ideology of the student movement of the sixties, particularly in its later more militant and sometimes violent phases, did not lead to success... Thus, the movement sowed some of the seeds of its own destruction" (p. 34).
- (5) "Media attention was an important part of the student movement of the sixties, and when the mass media turned to other topics, the activist movement lost an important focus" (p. 34).
- (6) With the election of Nixon, on through the election of Reagan, the "changing

American political climate had a key influence on the decline of the student movement" (p. 34).

"There is no question," Altbach and Cohen write, "that student attitudes have become more conservative on many issues since the sixties" (p. 35). To explain this shift, they draw on the work of Levine and others to present a sequence of changing attitudes and ideas. Their thesis about the development of student attitudes contends that:

In the early 1970s students became more concerned about the economy and their place in it. The "me generation" took root, "characterized by student attitudes that place much greater stress on individual values and needs than did the socially conscious students of the 1960's" (p. 35). Students chose educational programs which led to higher paying jobs and better careers. The self-fulfillment movement grew, with interest in transpersonal psychology and new age ideas. Student activism was replaced with the "rebirth of student government organizations." These student lobbies rallied around protests of tuition increases and argued for student loan programs. The student actions that were "most successful in the 1970s and early 1980s were those that combined individual interests and social concerns" (p.38), including feminist studies, Black studies, and gay rights.

With the coming of the 1980s, economic problems decreased, oil supplies were more available, inflation was stemmed, and unemployment dropped. The "Reagan Revolution" brought a "rejuvenation of conservatism" which "inhibited progressive activism on the two key issues that traditionally had mobilized the student Left: peace and civil rights" (p. 39). Reagan's cold-war nationalism and the invasion of Grenada kept the conservative focus. The administration's "assault on affirmative action" "helped to stifle student activism on civil rights issues and stimulated a rash of campus-based racial incidents by decade's end" (p. 39). The anti-Apartheid movement in 1984-85 was a major departure from this, representing "a revolt against not only the President's foreign policy, but against the self-centered materialism of the Reagan era" (p. 41). Fears of the Reagan revolution "dissipated in the wake of the 1986 elections, which restored Democratic dominance in Congress and the Iran Contra scandal, which paralyzed the Reagan White House. With its two major enemies, university investments in South Africa and Ronald Reagan, now weakened, the student movement of the 1980s came to an end" (p. 46).

Explanation #3

Explaining the shift in student attitudes in the early 1970s, Yankelovich writes that "the vast majority of students - the 89 percent who do not identify with the New Left - have pressed forward in their search for a cultural revolution while taking a step backwards politically" (Yankelovich, 1974, p. 8). Hoge (1981) agrees that the "sexual revolution" with demands for "more sexual freedom and privacy in life" continued to grow, while the political revolution which kept students active in higher education reform waned. The essence of this kind of argument is that students became so interested in sex and drugs and rock and roll that they forgot about reforming higher education. The mood of despair and depression felt by students in the 1960's was dissipated by channeling these feelings away from worrying about political issues to

focusing on their own personal lives (i.e. the beginning of the “Me Decade”).

Yankelovich also argues that “People have a limited tolerance for frustration.” Students turned to less frustrating outlets. There was, according to Hersey, “disillusionment for the mass of the young with the notion of working within the system” (Hersey, 1970, p. 165).

Explanation #4

Grant and Riesman (1978), in their chapter entitled "Meritocratic Discontents and Popular Reforms" suggest a different analysis of why student radicalism did not have more of an impact. Dissecting the motives of 1960's students, they argue that "such widespread resonance" among both undergraduate and graduate students about "what were in fact comparatively loose" degree requirements is related to "a sequence of events that is not likely to recur" (Grant and Riesman, 1978, p. 191). The Baby Boom and higher educational attainment rates helped "double the number of undergraduates within a decade." High schools were putting much more pressure on students in the post-Sputnik era. There was a great deal of competition and challenge in higher education. In order to do well, male students had to "keep up a pace" while filled with anxieties about the draft. Women students had to justify themselves "to parents who saw their futures in terms of the sexist limitations of the past" (p. 191).

Picking up a "quasi-Marxist lingo," students began to speak "of themselves as an oppressed class" (p. 192). Some students in the "meritocracy" of the "multiversity," faced with increasing competition after success in high school, decided to "throw all this over for the heady comradery of the countercultural movement or by a pretended indifference to the curriculum [which] could allow them to maintain secret narcissistic fantasies of greatness along with a public posture of righteous indignation about unfair and demeaning competition" (p. 200).

Implicit in this analysis by Grant and Riesman is the suggestion that reforms born out of this kind of anxiety, false sense of oppression, and narcissism were doomed to failure. Only where one or more faculty or administrators were organized to implement a particular platform of reforms, usually in a small experimental program, did the reform movement of the 1960's actually take hold and have a possibility for survival.

Yankelovich argues that there was a simple, fundamental “misfit between New Left ideology and the American experience. Lacking essential relevance, the New Left is not likely to win enduring support among any large, significant group in the population - including the college student body itself” Yankelovich, 1974, p. 182).

The Marxism which is at the heart of the student rebellion, occurs because “Generation after generation of college students pick up, almost by osmosis, the compelling but false picture of our society generated by a vulgarized Marxism” (Yankelovich, 1974, p. 184). This “version of Marxism, as held by the mass of students and applied by them to our contemporary American society, is steeped in invincible ignorance and will neither yield productive insights nor produce effective programs for social change” (p. 184).

Hook (1970) also equates the students' Marxist view that "no significant educational change is possible without fundamental social and economic revolution in the larger public arena" as "a departure from more intelligent versions of Marxism which... acknowledge the presence of causal reciprocities among these factors and the relative autonomy of the modern university, especially in the democratic process" (Hook, 1970, p. 79).

Even Hersey (1970) contributes to this criticism, writing that "We need a new Marx; a theoretician of the scattering and redistribution of powers in a centralized, technological, twentieth-century state, There is something already fatally obsolete about the 'revolution' proposed by many student radical groups who base their ideologies on Marxism" (Hersey, 1970, p. 176).

Explanation #5

Analyzing the "Days of Death" at Kent State and Jackson State, Viorst (1979) suggests that "the 1960's ended with a thirteen-second fusillade in a small Ohio town." Student activism and the decade ended because:

the civil rights movement, which was responsible for its conception, no longer contributed the seed to enrich it. It ended because antiwar protest, discredited at Chicago, never regained popular approval. It ended because a consensus was reached that the country had blundered in entering the war, and because Americans accepted the government's assurances that only time was needed until the last soldiers came home. The 1960's ended because a society can function at a feverish emotional pitch for only so long, and Americans, after ten years of it, were tired...

At Kent State, the country seemed to announce that whoever among the young felt deeply enough to continue the practices of the 1960's had to be ready to die for them. On these terms, radicalism turned out to have a less committed following than had once been believed. Few were ready to die, and so the decade reached its end (Viorst, 1979, p. 543).

Perhaps it was the horror of Kent State and Jackson State which marked the end of student protest. Hersey (1970) acknowledges that "The sight of the pictures of those dead kids at Kent State and Jackson State brought home with all the force of direct identification the tragic waste of confrontational hysteria" (Hersey, 1970, p. 162).

The journal Vietnam Generation remembered Kent State in twenty-year collection of pictures, essays, and poems. In his essay "The Sixties, Kent State, and Historical Memory," Bills (1990) explains that:

“Kent State” was the guttural puncturing of myths - a thirteen second smoking gun that cleared away the wispy remnants of millenarian dreams. There would be no new morning, no cultural revolution on the wings of electric blue, no new world rising up from the Goodwill Stores of the old. There were instead the same, unyielding realities combined with a growing sense of despair that marshaling the forces would no longer avail the peacemakers. Despite the freshly minted martyrs, there arose little hope that their sacrifice could achieve any positive political end. The collective judgement of ex-activists, journalists, government officials, and historians has been remarkably consistent: the deaths at Kent State marked the end of the era of mass youth protest, the end of widely held aspirations for a rapid, substantive restructuring of society (Bills, 1990, p. 170).

Explanation #6

Jack Lindquist’s (1978) Strategies for Change is an excellent example of the change theory approach to higher education innovation and reform which emerged in the 1970s. Berman and McLaughlin (1975), Havelock (1970, 1973), Henderson (1970), Jarrett (1973), Lindquist (1978, 1980), Panetta (1973), Rogers and Floyd (1971), and others embodied a movement of organizational theory which propelled the idea that change, innovation, and reform will not occur unless a series of conditions are present. Lindquist’s “FLOOR” model, for example, suggests that force, linkages, openness, ownership, and rewards must be in place for change “agents to be successful. Attitudes, knowledge, and skills for change agents are discussed as prescriptions to help faculty and staff implement innovation.

The reforms of the 1960's didn't last, change theory would argue, because the role of change agent was not clarified and because the necessary conditions for creativity and innovation were not present. The student reform movement, these theorists would state, failed to understand the process of innovation and did not work as the right kind of change agent.

Explanation #7

In The Culture of Narcissism, Lasch suggests that the student movement in its “attack on the ideology of the university... embodied a militant anti-intellectualism of its own which corrupted and eventually absorbed it.” (Lasch, 1979, p. 257). Demands for the end of testing and grading were really “a desire for less work and a wish to avoid judgement on its quality” (p. 257). Efforts to make the curriculum more relevant were really an effort to make it undemanding. There was among student radicals “an inability to take an interest in anything beyond the immediate” (p. 258). In effect, students didn't really want reform, they wanted drugs, sex, and rock and roll.

An Alternative Explanation for Why The 1960's Reforms Didn't Work

Astin et al. (1987), Hoge (1979), Levine (1980), and Yankelovich (1974) use empirical

data to show that student attitudes have changed from liberal to conservative. What caused the change in attitudes? Was it students' response to fears about the economy and the need to become more career-oriented, or was it higher education's guidance to them about the "appropriate" choice of majors in the "management of ambition." This is similar to the question of why the efforts of affirmative action have not worked better to bring more women and minorities into science and engineering fields. Is it because women and minorities aren't interested in these careers, or is it because higher education fails to adequately make these career options open to them? Did students become disillusioned and turn away from political to lifestyle issues because they were not fully committed to radical change, or because institutions continually frustrated their every effort?

These are some of the questions which must be addressed in proposing alternatives to the functionalist explanations for the demise of the 1960's' reforms. This section of this paper will focus on a number of inter-related themes which help one understand these tensions and dynamics in higher education. These themes include:

- The Flood of Students, Faculty, and Resources
- Vocational Education and the Labor Market
- Maintaining Tiers of Institutions
- The Professionalization of the Issues
- Problems of Reform
- Experimental Campuses/Alternative Programs
- Stronger Governance and the Search for Democracy
- The Case for Bureaucracy and Management Theory
- The Mission and Goals of the University
- Teaching, Faculty, and Academic Gatekeepers
- The Student Assessment Movement
- Myths of Access and Diversity
- The Struggle for Accountability and Public Control
- The Military-Industrial-University Complex
- The Rise of Business, Engineering, and the Professional Schools

The Flood of Students, Faculty, and Resources

The Baby Boom provided higher education with all of the students it would ever want, regardless of whether it met any of their calls for reform. Still in the era of large legislative appropriations for public institutions and low tuition pricing, institutions did not have to be accountable to students in order to secure tuition revenues. Higher education did not have to respond to protests for reform in order to maintain financial stability.

A flood of increased graduate students and doctoral recipients provided institutions with cheap sources of labor. Institutions did not have to make accommodations to faculty when there were so many doctoral recipients to choose from. Unable to find positions in the same tier of prestigious institutions from which they graduated, more new Ph.D.s took positions at liberal arts

and community colleges. Here they perpetuated the traditional values about teaching and research with which they were inculcated in graduate school, instead of fulfilling an educational mission which focused on meeting student needs.

With swelling numbers of students, increasing state appropriations, and increasing amounts of sponsored research monies, institutions could throw money at a problem or at a new program without taking it seriously. Administrators could go through the motions of welcoming Black Studies or Women's Studies programs by providing faculty lines and limited resources, but these commitments were never institutionalized at the highest level. Later years of retrenchment and scrutinized resource allocation showed little commitment or reward structures for efforts outside the traditional service departments.

Maintaining Tiers of Institutions

The community college movement grew tremendously in the 1960's and 1970s, significantly increasing the number of students served by higher education. In the community colleges, students could find the kinds of courses they wanted in free universities and Universities Without Walls on topics ranging from organic gardening to meditation to anarchy. While offering this alternative source of course work and a focus on teaching as opposed to research, community colleges kept students outside of mainstream higher education.

Although community colleges responded eagerly to meeting the needs of non-traditional students, universities did not. The articulation agreements which became common in the late 1980s between community colleges and four-year institutions were not yet in place. The choice to complete a significant amount of course work in community colleges often cut students off from attending four-year institutions which better prepared them for graduate and professional school and better met their needs for upwardly mobile career planning. Due to the fact that the reward structures are not the same in community colleges as in doctoral institutions, the faculty available to community college students were better teachers but not necessarily better scholars. New models of awarding tenure based on scholarship relevant to college teaching have yet to be fully put in place at the university level.

There are five basic tiers of institutions which existed in the 1960's and still exist today. These are: (1) community/two-year colleges; (2) four-year institutions; (3) comprehensive institutions; (4) doctoral institutions; and (5) research institutions. Other classification schemes break out this nomenclature differently, but the tiers are the same. The tiers are used to help maintain a class-like hierarchy of academic rewards. It is very difficult for students and faculty in a lower tier to move higher. Higher education since the 1960's has reinforced this class structure and shifted the responsibility for dealing with reforms from the highest tier to the lowest. This pattern has not changed since the 1970s. According to Cross, by the 1980s, "The old ideals that sparked enthusiasm and the sense of common purpose in community colleges have receded, and new ideals have not yet emerged to take their place " (Cross, 1981, p. 2).

Karabel (1972) and others describe how the community college movement created a class-based system of higher education with inherently oppressive features. Citing Karabel in his

work on the "cooling out" function in higher education, Clark (1980) writes that community colleges are "seen as generally operating to maintain the social class system as it is," as a "class-based" "tracking system." "College standards are seen as a covert mechanism for excluding the poor and minorities" (Clark, 1980, p. 26).

The cooling out process described by Clark refers to how students are diverted from their intended goal to attend college for four years and drop out or transfer to another institution such as a community college. The community college plays a cooling out function by helping screen students and direct them to appropriate educational attainment. Karabel's criticism is that cooling out helps to "legitimate inequality by using academic standards in hidden ways to block the upward mobility of the poor and the minorities" (Clark, 1980, p. 26).

Vocational Education and the Labor Market

Brint and Karabel (1989) argue that vocational education programs in the community colleges were not initiated in response to mass demand because of a flooded labor market, but because community college administrators wanted to expand these programs. This took place despite "the resistance of junior college students (and their parents) to increased vocational training." The authors explain that:

Indeed, much of the discussion about vocational education in the junior college literature of this period was devoted precisely to the issue of how to expand these programs despite the lack of student interest in them. Indeed, the students' preferences - far from being sovereign, as in the consumer-choice model - thus became socially defined as a problem to be overcome (Brint and Karabel, 1989, p. 209).

This transformation of the community colleges was, according to Brint and Karabel, strongly supported by other types of institutions, helping to "channel students away" from the gates of the university and to "manage ambition." Vocational education helps manage ambition in a society which generates far more than it can satisfy. Vocational education tells students, in effect, to renounce their goal of higher occupational rungs in exchange for short-term mobility. The community colleges, Brint and Karabel argue, have made this into a secure market niche.

As the supply of college graduates began to outstrip demand, state coordinating bodies and bodies such as the Carnegie Foundation called for more expansion of vocational education. Liberal arts programs were forced to go on the defensive.

With the abrupt downturn in the labor market for college graduates, the cooling out function of community colleges managing ambition, the tier system of higher education, and the need to remain in higher education to avoid the draft, students were forced to accept a new value system. Because "Those disciplines with a ready market in industry and government are favored and fostered" (Salvio, 1966, p. 87), students were recruited into vocational programs which managed their ambition and kept them from becoming radicalized by their oppression.

Student activism and calls for reform were made barren by this forced herding of students into vocational training. This is the root of the “me decade.” The focus on self away from political action did not necessarily occur because students lost interest in political action. Rather, administrators frightened them into institutional tiers of career tracks, besieging students with a media frenzy about the flooded labor market and perpetuating self-fulfilling prophecies that students’ quality of life would decline if they did not heed institutional warnings.

The Professionalization of the Issues

The literature of higher education proliferated beginning in the early 1970s, partly in response to the growing dialogue about educational reforms which began in the 1960's. The problem with this literature, however, is that it professionalized the problems, analyzing them without any of the spirit in which the reforms were originally intended.

Some examples of this literature are three Jossey-Bass books out of its Series in Higher Education - Cross's (1971) Beyond the Open Door, Runkel, Harrison, and Runkel's (1969) The Changing College Classroom, and Smith's (1971) New Teaching New Learning: Current Issues in Higher Education: 1971. These works provide essays on everything from non-traditional students to academic freedom for faculty to resolving conflict through mediation. Eurich's (1968) book Campus 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Higher Education and Daniel Bell's (1968) The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia College Experience in Its National Setting are further examples of a dialogue about higher education which, while they mention the context of student protests, fail to make the paradigm shift to understanding the level of change which students were talking about. Eurich, in particular, visualizes a future which fails to address any of the students’ demands for reform.

This professionalization of higher education issues overwhelmed the fragile, contradictory reform language of the 1960's. Buried in a mass of administrative technology, the paradigm shift of reform was smothered. Higher education scholars and administrators failed to recognize how radical and far-reaching the 1960's reforms really were.

The advent of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems and the institutional research literature of the early 1970s on induced course load matrices, enrollment management, and cost of instruction models filled discussions of higher education issues with new terminologies, new reports, and new data sets - all very far away from addressing the student calls for reform.

The literature on student development also subsumed much of the professional discussion of student issues, placing students issues and demands for reform on an intellectual, cognitive, and affective developmental level. The work of Perry (1970), Kohlberg (1971), Chickering (1969), Sanford (1967), and Feldman and Newcomb (1969) ushered in an era of explanations for student behavior. If student activism is based on feelings of alienation, as Lasch (1969) describes, then higher education’s task is to empirically develop a causal model to explain these

feelings and look for interventions to prevent them from interfering with academic integration.

If interest in innovation and experimentation was evident in the higher education literature, it was theorized, not acted upon. Henderson's (1970) description of The Innovative Spirit, Lindquist's (1978) work on strategies for change, and Havelock's (1969, 1978) prescriptions for the dissemination and utilization of knowledge do not operate at the paradigm level of reform which was called for in the 1960's. With this growing body of literature on theories of innovation, the heart of the 1960's reforms were forgotten.

Problems of Reform

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in its 1973 report Priorities for Action seemed to be congratulating higher education for maintaining control during the shocks of the 1960's. "The miracle, however, is not that these shocks occurred in a nation where students have been viewed as 'apathetic' and campuses as 'autonomous,' but that higher education survived so well and with so few changes" (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, p. 53).

What was the true nature of the calls for student reform? At the beginning of this paper, 13 themes of reform were presented. What was the fullest expression of this movement and why did the best of these ideas die? Gardner (1968) wrote in his essay "Agenda for the Colleges and Universities: Higher Education in the Innovative Society" that "There is no doubt that the colleges and universities would like to do what the times demand of them. But what do the times demand of them?" (Gardner, 1968, p. 1). Gardner explains that reforms must: (1) restore the status of teaching; (2) improve the undergraduate curriculum; (3) improve procedures for university planning; (4) reexamine the college calendar and four-year degree pattern; (5) bring small liberal arts colleges back; (6) think more about continuing education and off-campus instruction; (7) cope with problems of the university's service role; and (8) think about "the internal health of our colleges and universities as functioning communities" (p. 3).

Gardner's assessment of what the times demanded of higher education is far different than the student calls for reform. Schwartz, a former president of the United States National Student Association, explains in his essay "Less Radical Programs, Militant Tactics" that:

Consequently, we encouraged students to challenge the social relations, the power relations, between the various factions of campus governance - faculty, administration, trustees. We challenged grades, tests, courses - all those arrangements which duplicate the competitive process of the corporation. We attacked the process, or lack of it, by which students determine their course of study as well as the curricula offered to students in making that determination. We attempted, in general, to open students to the notion that learning is self-development in interaction with other people, that communities can be created to sustain and enhance personal growth, that the university itself can be a resource to this process, rather than a competitor with it, or, at worst, a stifler of it. We envisaged not simply a free university in a free society, but a new, communal university, in a

new kind of society, with a drastically altered balance between private and public, competitive and cooperative, rational and affective values (Schwartz, 1970, p. 74).

Grant and Riesman (1978) discuss the nature of student calls for reform in The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College. They write that:

that the most widespread and significant impact of the educational upheaval of the sixties was to bring about a considerable greater degree of autonomy for students. They were free to plan their courses of study in a way they had never done before. The most important change was the virtual or complete abolition of fixed requirements in many departments and of mandatory distribution requirements, whether of breadth or depth, including class attendance and the time, mode, and kinds of credits needed to secure a baccalaureate degree (p. 188).

In Hoffman's (1970) essay for The Embattled University, he explains that two major problems of student calls for reform were that they tended to be more critical than constructive and that they were "more utopian and confused than consistent and realistic (a tendency for which it would be foolish to blame them)" (Hoffman, 1970, p. 178). Academics used these problems in the student reform movement to "evade the issues or have diverted them into narrower debates on discipline or on 'student power,' which provoke strange alignments of men deeply divided on all the other issues" (pp. 178-179).

What often occurred as a result of student demand for reforms was "academic tinkering." Panetta, in an essay entitled "Innovation Workshop," suggests that "Perhaps we have failed to approach reform in a systematic, holistic way, and our efforts have led not to institutional change but to academic tinkering" (Panetta, 1973, p. 425). This suggests that higher education was systematically unable to recognize that the reforms which students demanded required a fundamentally different paradigm, required a paradigm shift as it were.

Certainly, the educational philosophy and prescription for institutional transformation and the models for alternative and experimental structures were available to higher education at the end of the 1960's. Schwartz writes that:

At this point, the models are all there - from learning teams, to independent study programs, to the elimination of grades, to the creation of living-learning dormitory complexes, to the admission of a high percentage of Third World students, to the accordance of academic credit for action undertaken in the community, to the development of new decision-making structures in every area of university life, to university-wide councils to handle issues raised by the war in Vietnam, to the use of film and new media in instruction, to tutorials. The list of proposals and real programs is endless. The problem now is political: finding the willingness on the part of educational leadership to move toward this new kind of university... (Schwartz, 1970, p. 77).

Asking "If we were to act, what might we do?" Jerome (1970) writes that institutions

should:

(1) “Cut doing as much as we can. Cut requirements, hours, assignments, courses, committees - every program element that can be eliminated. Try to create a campus upon which meditation, serenity, reading, thought, and affability are possible.”

(2) “Admit everyone we can.”

(3) “Hire those as unlike ourselves as possible.”

(4) “Own the place; use the place. Much of our academic lives we act like French railway clerks, obsessed with the paperwork, following the rules of those above and imposing them upon those below. We ought to get together with the students and buy the college. Run it as a cooperative. Failing that, we might act as though we had done so.”

(5) “Get into the field. Seek alternatives to classroom learning, to book learning, in direct experience, in engagement with real issues. Work with students (and others) against poverty, disease, injustice, ignorance, instead of working against students on the battlefield of assignments, papers, and exams.”

(6) “Open the college to the community... Fill in the moat around the campus” (Jerome, 1970, p. 121).

Hersey (1970), in his Letter to the Alumni written as Master of Pierson College at Yale, asks “Where do we go from here?” Universities must look at the student reform movement, however “sloppy,” “self-indulgent,” and “short-winded,” and see the “terrible new future we are entering” (Hersey, 1970, p. 145). Of two futures, one was to “work in a big way within the system” (p. 162). If institutions did not see that the calls for reform were at the level of a paradigm shift, “Then there will be no liberation. There will be American repression” (p.169). In Hersey’s vernacular, higher education took the way of American repression because the “older generation” failed “to distinguish between bullshit and reality” (p. 168).

Experimental Campuses/Alternative Programs

Hoffman (1970), Henderson (1970), Hersey (1970), and others focus on the development of new institutions, alternative degree programs, and experimental campuses as an appropriate response for higher education to student calls for reform. Hersey finds that at free universities, experimental colleges, and universities without walls, despite “godawful problems with the adulteration of their curricula by their own political agenda,” anything is possible. “They may have found some clues to frightful puzzles of alienation” (Hersey, 1970, p. 145).

In his history of Students for a Democratic Society, Sale (1973) explains that “It was not

until after the Free Speech Movement's successful sit-in, with their spontaneous seminars on everything in sight, and the teach-ins of the following spring that the idea of *alternative*, rather than merely reformed, universities began to be taken seriously" (Sale, 1973, p. 265) By fall 1965, several free universities were open. Free universities were in ten cities by the spring of 1966. By 1970, there were five hundred operating.

These new structures "embodied a new and significant notion for the left. The free universities were alternatives to the established order, and opposed to it, independent of (at least some of) the pressures of the surrounding society" (Sale, 1973, p. 269). They were the beginning of the establishment of entirely new types of institutions such as underground newspapers, theater groups such as Bread and Puppet Theater, and political groupings like the Black Panther Party. "They all mark the decline of reformism, and the start of revolutionary alternatives" (p. 269).

Newman (1971), as chair of a special U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Task Force, discusses the idea of "New Educational Enterprises" in Report on Higher Education. "We believe that the foremost task for public policy is to create conditions under which new educational enterprises can be founded and endure" (Newman, 1971, p. 63). The Task Force understood the theory of innovation at the time, noting that "there is a tendency for existing institutions to co-opt any really different approach, gradually imposing constraints that restore a condition of sameness" (p. 63). Henderson (1970) noted in The Innovative Spirit that the best opportunities for innovation are in newly created schools or in those with exceptional resources.

Grant and Riesman (1978) focus on the development of alternative programs and experimental campuses in their book The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College. Their fieldwork, begun in 1970, brought together stories of 1960's and 1970s reforms about telic reforms, including neoclassic revival, communal-expressive impulses, and activist/radical impulses at institutions as diverse as St. Johns College and Kresge College at Santa Cruz.

The type of experiments depicted by Grant and Riesman are not the norm in higher education, nor are they widespread in influence. Most often, they were short-lived. They were begun by faculty and administrators who shared some aspect of the 1960's reform movement and made it their own. When financial exigency struck in the late 1970s, some of these experiments were the first to be eliminated in favor of helping traditional programs and departments meet their service obligations to the larger academic community. The experimental colleges never received the infusion of faculty and resources they expected.

Beginning in the late 1970s, other institutions found that alternatives such as adult degree programs, work internships, and small residential colleges designed around themes or areas of study were necessary, in part to maintain financial stability. It is ironic that the major impetus behind some private institutions meeting the needs of non-traditional students, such as adult learners, was to make the maximum use of space and generate more tuition revenue. With an ever-increasing adult student population and a decline in the number of high school graduates, it

became popular to talk about meeting the needs of adult learners. Adult development and adult learning theories were discussed.

While some of these efforts in community and four-year colleges were born of a genuine interest in offering the best kind of higher education experience possible, doctoral institutions were slow in approving even this limited sort of reform. Adult degree programs, for example, have little credibility among traditional university departments and are sometimes unable to guarantee their students access to classes outside of general education, despite years of work by CAEL, the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning (Forrest, 1977). The whole concept of earning credit for critical life experience is very troubling for traditional academics.

When concerned with reform in degree structures and the nature of the curriculum, the higher education community focused on an entirely different level of reform than that called for by the student movement. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's general report by Spurr (1970), entitled Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches; Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States, is a classic example of this paradox. Spurr looks at degree structures across the U.S. and in Europe, discussing nomenclature, titles, course sequences, and institutional histories. He fails to comprehend the level of reform proposed by alternative institutions such as Universities Without Walls, Goddard College, the Union Graduate School, and the New School for Social Research. Higher education had the opportunity, at this crossroads in its transformation, to develop a new set of degree structures which would break the mold of traditional, tier-based institutions. As Hersey (1970) would say, higher education failed to achieve the revolution.

A subtle thing happened as a result of the implementation of experimental colleges, free universities, adult degree programs, and universities without walls. Sale quotes SDS leader Carl Davidson's comment that free universities took many of the best student radicals away from the university, "enabling the existing university to function more smoothly, since the 'troublemakers' were gone." This vacuum of radicalism "gave liberal administrators the rhetoric, the analysis, and sometimes the manpower to co-opt their programs and establish elitist forms of 'experimental' colleges inside of, although quarantined from, the existing educational system" (Sale, 1973, p. 268).

Therefore, much of the momentum for reform was channeled away from the university into short-lived alternatives, allowing the status quo to be maintained without challenge. Also, the free universities often returned to their traditional roots because their original student and leaders graduated. Institutions such as the Free University of Pennsylvania, cut off from the mainstream of SDS as students left, began to be less radical (Sale, 1973).

The educational story of "The Struggle for Third College at UC San Diego" from 1969 to 1972 is told by Bareera (1974) and serves as a metaphor for what happened at many free universities and alternative colleges. Third College was supposed to be different and involve students in every stage of the administration. "It seemed to me to be the most exciting educational innovation at the university level that was going on anywhere in the U.S.," the author explains (Bareera, 1974, p. 64). But there "were a lot of problems" (p. 63). After peak years in

1969 and 1970, “the steam went out of the student movement” and “the way was opened for traditional course to move in, change the complexion of the college, and to change both the content and the process of the education at Third College” (p. 64).

Power was centralized in the hands of the provost, rather than the college’s board, which had faculty and student members. The college became more conventional and conservative through a process of student attrition and lack of resistance. After a conflict over faculty appointments, “it became clear that the majority of the students and faculty did not control the college. The administration was in control and was willing to do whatever was necessary to retain control of the college” (p. 67).

Stronger Governance and the Search for Democracy

A fundamental idea of the student movement was that students be “maximally involved in the governance of each college and university” (Schwartz, 1970, p. 66). Institutions knew little about how to meet this demand, even if they took it seriously. Many boards of trustees and faculty committees appointed student representatives as a result of reform efforts. However, these representatives are rarely voting members. They suffer from problems of yearly turnover and receive little of the educational process which legitimate members go through after their appointment. Theirs is too often a reporting role, reporting back to other representatives with the minutes of what occurred in board meetings and occasionally bringing the student government's ideas to the table (only to be tabled to a later subcommittee meeting and never brought forth in a public forum).

Analyzing “Paradoxes of Campus Power,” O’Neil (1971) writes that “Demands for democracy have often been deflected by a single, highly publicized (and minimally effective) change at the top, such as adding one student or faculty trustee. Concern with pressing inequalities at lower levels is thus diluted, and the reforming impetus unwisely spent” (O’Neil, 1971, p. 174).

Over time, many boards of trustees have strengthened their hold over governance. The role of the president has come under greater scrutiny and there is a tendency sometimes for boards to micro-manage the institution in areas of special interest. Given greater roles in fundraising, trustees are led to believe they literally make the institution what it will be tomorrow. Hoffman believes that “governing boards are theoretically the only bodies empowered to deal with the whole, but their composition, priorities, and fitful mode of operation - ‘absentee government’ - also made them less than effective” (Hoffman, 1970, p. 202).

The student government movement was shown by Altbach and Cohen (1990) to have grown considerably after the 1960's. Students were organized around issues of protesting tuition hikes, maintaining student loan programs, and later Apartheid. This "me generation" brand of "student consumerism" involved students only in certain issues, though, which never challenged the structure of institutions.

The dialogue between universities and students over these kinds of issues fostered a false sense of student participation in governance. Institutions made a point of visibly listening to students and taking their views into consideration. Students little realized that they were being systematically cut out of larger and more important behind-the-scenes discussions. They were token members of committees. Except for rare individuals, their involvement was superficial, though they were led to believe they were engaged in shared, democratic governance.

Students have never consistently been involved in the myriad of academic and student affairs decisions which are made each day on campuses throughout the country. Some suggest that students did not want to get involved because they were more interested in consumerism and me-ism. Rather, institutions failed to educate them about the realm of possibilities for shared governance. It has rarely occurred to students after the early 1970's to ask for more, and institutions foster this passivity.

Another possible reason for the failure of student reform efforts to promote shared governance is that there were no good models of democracy within the university to draw upon. Hoffman makes this case in his essay "Participation in Perspective." The university is a combination of three models - (1) "a mixture of yesterday's oligarchy (academic self-government);" (2) "yesterday's non-bureaucratic, church-like hierarchy (shown in the powerlessness of students and in the key role played by a small number of influentials...);" and (3) "today's bureaucratic hierarchy" (Hoffman, 1970, pp. 190-191).

Hoffman reviews three models of political democracy - participatory democracy, representative government, and the powerful executive. None of the three models is considered suitable. Regarding participatory democracy, competing political interests will lead to majority rule and the balancing of interests, destroying the university by "total politicization." Representative government will result in the "political game itself: the arcane intricacies of caucuses, elections, job-seeking, and bargaining, a mixture of ideological polarization and personal accommodations in which the basic issues will be lost" (p. 208). "Parliamentarianism has not worked well," and there would be too much government and innumerable conflicts without resolution (pp. 208-209). Reliance on an elected, powerful executive would promote "shrill demands for voice or accountability - especially as such a bureaucratic outcome would appear to thwart the hopes for democratization" (p. 209).

Too many argue, Hoffman continues, that "a university cannot and should not be a full democracy... But that assertion, by itself, does not consecrate the status quo" (p. 213). The author calls for the creation of temporary institutions that are flexible and open, with "a mix of limited direct democracy and limited representation" (pp. 214-215).

Some thought students weren't interested in experiments with democracy. Hook (1970) thought the rhetoric of SDS for participatory democracy was really the opposite, an effort to practice "manipulative democracy, skillfully imposing a predetermined position by the leaders of the moment on the large membership organization" (Hook, 1970, p. 53).

At the time of his untimely death, Jack Lindquist, who did much of the early work in the 1970's on planned change and was president of the experimental Goddard College for ten years, was at work on a book about democracy in higher education. Few answers to student demands for democracy have come from within higher education.

Given the press of issues, institutions never had to wrestle with what Hersey calls the “tense and exhausting and frightening work” of the “redistribution of power toward the smallest of circles” (Hersey, 1970, p. 172). In terms of this most vital of issues, that of democracy and the voice of dissent, Hersey recognized that “This revolution will not just happen. It will have to be achieved” (p. 179). In the extension of his analysis, higher education sat waiting for the sixties to end, doing nothing, and failed to help achieve the revolution. “Consider again the alternative : American repression: Take your pick” (p.179).

The Case for Bureaucracy and Management Theory

The proliferation of research and service activities in the university made the “faculty-ruled process of yesterday... more formidably complex and rigid..” The bureaucratic result “is frequently paralyzing” (Hoffman, 1970, p. 188). As a microcosm of society, universities “all tend to reduce politics to management, to concentrate decisions into the hands of ‘those who know,’ to neglect the definition of and choices among ends, and to reduce the selection of means to a choice of techniques” (p. 191).

With institutional reactions to the dissent and unrest of the 1960's, higher educational organizations became larger and more complex and the movement of management theory in higher education burgeoned. The rise of NCHEMS and the professional literature of organizational theory in higher education was discussed earlier. Clearly, institutions moved in the direction of professionalizing their operation. The heyday of the Society for College and University Planning and the Association for Institutional Research may have been during this time period.

Too often, the university administration at Berkeley was, from Glazer’s (1966) perspective, “rigid, as we all knew from experience - and fragile - as we discovered in the crisis raised by its attempt to change the *de facto* rules governing student political activity. For in the situation created first by reasonable student demands and secondly by new and radical student tactics, the administration showed itself incapable of consistent, decisive, or effective action” (Glazer, 1966, p. 57).

Writing about the Columbia crisis, Friedman (1968) says much the same thing. “On any given issue, whether it be the construction of a new gymnasium on public park land or the affiliation of the University with some outside organization, there is something inherently wrong with the method and process by which the action was taken, and most often something intrinsically wrong with the undertaking itself” (Friedman, 1968, p. 7).

The monograph Planning Techniques for University Management by Casasco (1970) was

published jointly by the American Council on Education with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education and is representative of widespread efforts to use systems theory in academic administration. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education published Casasco's (1970) monograph Corporate Planning Models for Higher Education the same year. Planning is often piecemeal, the author argues, and needs to be done from a systems approach using new, sophisticated analytical tools such as computer modeling.

Reading these trends in the development of the higher education literature and the emergence of new planning models, it appears that, from a radical structuralist perspective, higher education administrators failed to understand the nature of the bureaucratic crisis so criticized by students and faculty. Instead of addressing difficult reform issues of governance, institutions sought refuge in the application of new NCHEMS models for cost of instruction and induced course load matrices and in discussions of new kinds of management theory.

Discussing "Futurism as a Galvanizer of Education," Boulding (1973) explains that:

In general, the changes envisioned represent a freeing up of existing structures, but no real change in the conception of the university. Even the relatively radical statement "25 percent of colleges and universities [will be] governed by post-bureaucratic administrations of the type described by Warren Bennis," still assumes a recognizable campus structure. It is hard to get away from the banking conception of education, to use Friere's depositors. Even postbureaucratic administrations cannot administer co-intentional communities. The development on a large scale of learning collectives pursuing co-intentionality in education is not yet within our capacity to imagine (Boulding, 1973, p. 257).

It was this kind of postbureaucratic, co-intentional community which higher education was unable to realize. Students were particularly vocal about being treated as if they were second class citizens. Viorst (1979) quotes Mario Salvio's famous speech about the nature of student discontent:

We have an autocracy which runs this university... This is a firm, and if the Board of Regents are the board of directors, and if President Kerr in fact is the manager, then... the faculty are a bunch of employees and we're the raw material. But we're a bunch of raw material that don't mean... to be made into any product, don't mean to end up being bought by some clients of the university... We're human beings... And that brings me to civil disobedience. There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free the machine will be prevented from working at all (Viorst, 1979, pp. 294-295).

The Mission and Goals of the University

Lasch writes that “Instead of trying to hold the university to a more modest set of objectives, radical critics of higher education accepted the premise that education could solve every sort of social problem” (Lasch, 1979, p. 258). Misgivings about society were translated into the university (Luria, 1970). Students objected to the university’s detachment from social problems and its participation in the establishment. The hidden value system of higher education and the knowledge industry was shown to be rooted in establishmentarian interests of government, military, and business.

Many academics, Hoffman asserts, have clung to an idealized, Jacques Barzun (1959) model of the university of the past. “But precisely because of their attachment to the old ideal, they are sharply critical both of student demands for ‘relevance’... and of student claims for power” (Hoffman, 1970, p. 196). Much of the student movement and rebellions, Friedman (1968) explains in his introduction to Avorn’s Up Against the Ivy Wall, “had their roots in disillusionment not only with societies but with universities as institutions. It was disillusionment with illusion” (Friedman, 1968, p. 5).

The illusion was that the university could be the microcosm of society and embody humane values (i.e. civil rights, feminism, free speech, and opposition to the war in Vietnam) and still be the knowledge factory. But as Lasch states in The Agony of the American Left, “The dual nature of the university generates conflicts so deep that they can no longer be hidden, as so many conflicts in American society are hidden, under a mask of benevolence” (Lasch, 1968, p. 176).

It was in reaction to the changing nature of the mission and goals of the university that much of the student reform effort was directed. Critics argued that the solutions of the student movement were naive and too abstract (Katope and Zolbrod, 1966), that students did not understand the nature of higher education. How could they? How could students with very little professional knowledge about the nature and structure of higher education be expected to mount a level of critique which would rationally and dispassionately persuade the academic community to change course and reverse the status quo? As the discussion of the professional literature of higher education documented, there was little understanding of how much of a paradigm shift of reform the students were working for.

During much of this time, the university seemed adrift, with a loss of control over its own fate. There were no principles to guide its growth. The very structure, Hoffman argues, exhibits only “fragmented, low-level, instrumental ‘rationality,’ which usually consists of the rationalization of demands for more of everything, but no over-all rationality” (Hoffman, 1970, p. 190). Criticism failed to touch the university because many academics “elevate the university to a symbolic height at which compromises become degrading. Hence an unleashing of hyperbole and hysteria ensues whenever trouble begins...” (p. 199).

There were problems with undergraduate education and teaching, Hook (1966, 1970), Runkel et al. (1969), Bell (1968, 1970), and others argue. Hook (1966) even suggests that the irony of the situation is that students suffer more from the failure of the faculty to meet their individual needs than from any alleged suppression of their freedom of speech. “One unintended by-product of student disruption - unintended in that it was not on any program of student demands, negotiable or nonnegotiable - has been a greater concern about the art of teaching on the part of colleges, something that was shamefully neglected, in some places pridefully” (Hook, 1970, p. xii).

Taylor (1969) explains that:

The failure in the 1950s and 1960s was not only that the universities and colleges busied themselves so thoroughly with the problems of money, power, research, public influence, expansion, and organization that they had no time for education or students. The failure lay in not recognizing the complex of factors which made the students the living energy through which the university could recreate itself, and the major political, social, and cultural forces of the country revolved around their lives (Taylor, 1969, p. xi).

It was the teaching role of the university that become the issue of reform after 1970, not the university’s mission of social responsibility. The service role was conceptualized in terms of the growing military, industrial, (and later biomedical) university complex, without further scrutiny of implicit assumptions about support for the values of these complexes.

Teaching, Faculty, and Academic Gatekeepers

In an essay on “Arts for the Cultivation of Radical Sensitivity,” Peckham writes that there are endemic and epidemic sources of cultural stagnation in higher education. “The effect of the endemic faculty infection is that the social role of university of college faculty member, more than any other social role, destroys talent, innovation, and enterprise” (Peckham, 1973, p. 202). Since before the 1960's, new faculty in universities have been forced during the tenure process to adhere to the values of their academic gatekeepers. Rare are the pockets of radicalism where alternative ideas and non-traditional research projects or journals are supported in the reward structures of large, graduate departments. The tenure process continues the socialization and professionalization process begun in graduate school which forces faculty in a discipline to try and look, act, and write alike, perpetuating false dichotomies between teaching and research and between meeting the needs of students and earning tenure.

Holding the research university model up as the ideal, and in order to survive the publish or perish conundrum, faculty are not allowed to take teaching seriously at doctoral-granting institutions. Except for many community colleges and private four-year institutions, there was little focus on improving teaching in higher education until the assessment movement of the 1980s. Students were funneled through a system which discarded them if they were not being trained as future faculty. Truly, students are the “raw materials” which Salvio described in his speech about student discontent.

There are numerous accounts of the faculty perspective on the 1960's. Critics of faculty suggest that they failed to recognize the paradigmatic nature of student reform and legitimized the problems by not speaking out against them. According to Goodman (1966), the “supine history of American faculties in our sectarian and trustee-ridden colleges” and the “present extramural careerism of the important professors” made it necessary for students to lead the movement for change (Goodman, 1966, p. 79). Discussing Berkeley, Glazer (1966) admits that the faculty, “while complaining of the inaccessibility of the administration and its insensitivity to faculty needs, was not very responsive on its own part to student needs” (Glazer, 1966, p. 57). Friedman describes Columbia as a “loading station,” where students “drift in and out of the university,” while “faculty members who closet themselves with their research and latest book, have, by their abdication of any responsibility, left the security of the University precariously in the hands of its administrators” (Friedman, 1968, p. 7).

On the other hand, Lipset (1970) cites studies by the American Council on Education which showed that faculty directly stimulated or supported at least half of the 181 demonstrations which took place in 1967-68. In “11 percent they were among the leaders” (Lipset, 1970, pp. 85-86). “Probably no other matter has so divided the university, to cause the severing of social and intellectual relations, as the internal faculty controversy over student protest on a given campus” (p. 86).

Jerome (1970), who proposed “New Attitudes for Faculty” such as to stop acting “like French railway clerks,” believes that “the professor of the future will have to cease staking his psychic security on his role as an expert and become more comfortable with himself as a human being - a father, lover, friend, citizen - somehow equal to others when he doffs his academic gown” (Jerome, 1970, p. 122). In his essay on “Faculty Contributions to Tension, Dowd (1970) writes that “The arrogance of faculties lies precisely in their attitude that they know what is best for the university and, therefore, for the students” (Dowd, 1970, p. 128).

Greene (1973) discusses “involvement” as a radical way of teaching and learning. She believes that teachers should see the classroom:

as the first stage in the development of a “pedagogy of the oppressed.” Concerned as he [sic] must be to equip his students for transformations as well as unveilings, he may recognize a starting point in their rejection of established authorities, their refusal to accept hierarchies and specializations as “given.” They would not, after all, be present in the experimental class or seminar, were it not for *some* original restiveness with accustomed arrangements. But even if they were not fully

conscious of the system's way of bearing down upon them, there are approaches (as we have seen) which can at least unsettle them, help them to begin to be aware (Greene, 1973, pp. 232-233).

This kind of teaching ethic embodies the 1960's call for reform in the mission of higher education. It was what Postman and Weingartner (1969) did for K-12 in Teaching as a Subversive Activity and their lessons in "Crap Detecting." Without it, students are forced back into what Goodman (1966) views as "the strong American influences to prevent student maturation and independence. First, the career-drive, spurred by the anxiety of middle-class parents, leading to conformism, and willingness to submit to scheduled mis-education, credits, and grading, in order to get a diploma quick" (Goodman, 1966, p. 80).

In the late 1970's, after what little existed of the call for new kinds of teaching was almost dead, institutions used arguments of financial exigency to gain further control over the academic process. Coupled with demands for accountability to state legislatures and the public, program review was tied to how well departments met the traditional mission of the institution. The flood of doctoral recipients who became the swelling ranks of faculty in the early and mid-1970s became a watershed of the unemployed. Those who survived were those who maintained the standards of the gatekeepers. Universities could afford to hire only those who represented its ideals, while maintaining the myth of opportunity and managing ambition even at the graduate level.

The Student Assessment Movement

The student assessment movement which began in the 1980s in response to calls for accountability had within it the seeds of the progressive era and the 1960's when it first urged faculty and administrators to pay attention to the student as a "whole person." Although started with a heavy dose of standardized and biased testing, the assessment movement provided the only dialogue which took place on campuses about who students were, what they were learning, and "value-added outcomes."

Using models such as Alverno College, it appeared that alternative ways of looking at higher education might actually have a chance in traditional institutions. This was not to be the case. Assessment was used instead to ensure conformity to a new language of standards and program review. As assessment moved from university-wide planning to focus on departments and disciplines, the definitions and expectations became more rigid. Department chairpersons did not necessarily want to know what their students were learning, but that their students were meeting the expectations of external gatekeepers who controlled the rewards of the discipline. Certainly, some assessment programs now use portfolios of student work and have moved from quantitative to a handful of qualitative (but not interpretive or constructivist) methods of evaluation. But the motivation is still the same, to ensure that students meet minimum standards and that this can be documented to external persons who will essentially bless the department and allow it to compete for internal resource allocation.

Part of the problem in student assessment is that the results are rarely used to help faculty teach better. Assessment is an example of how the language but not the spirit of the 1960's reforms has been implemented in higher education. Despite a growing literature of student and adult development and learning, theory often is carried into practice only in student affairs programs. The work of academic affairs has failed to pay attention to the whole person.

The important early 1970's work on student development by Perry, Kohlberg, Chickering, and Feldman and Newcomb presented the opportunity for a paradigm shift in which institutions could take teaching and the educational process seriously by understanding their students. The mandate of assessment and the more recent "Student Right to Know Act" could have forced institutions to make significant changes in how they operate. Instead, these reporting and program review procedures have become elaborate rituals of self-justification for the status quo, describing how well institutions are meeting student needs and documenting graduation and retention rates as if they cared about students, not the loss of tuition dollars in an era of declining state appropriations.

Myths of Access and Diversity

In his monograph for the Pew Higher Education Research Program entitled Only the Appearance of Diversity: Higher Education and the Pluralist Ideal in the 1980s and 1990s, Daniels (1991) talks about a racial incident that occurred at the University of Massachusetts. After the baseball World Series, in a residential quadrangle, a mob of people formed which chased and attacked a group of Black students. Daniels writes "That such an incident could occur in the 1980s at any American college was shocking" (p. 1).

For Daniels, this incident is a symbol that racial issues on campuses have progressed little since the 1960's. The problem is "not merely a matter of confronting and vanquishing overt racist, sexist, and homophobic practices in academia. It is also one of determining who, in a time of wrenching economic and technological change, will be able to climb the ladder of upward mobility and share in a substantial way in society's resources" (p. 4).

Daniels labels the problem as "tokenism," or "the maintenance of white hegemony by what, in the American context, has passed for racial liberalism." "It requires, indeed, it demands only the appearance of diversity because the real purpose is not truly to include others, and certainly not to share power, but merely to satisfy concerns - both public and, often, from within one's self - about one's racial liberalism" (p. 4).

Beginning in the 1960's, minority students are often forced into ethnic enclaves that provide the level of community support they need yet further alienate them from the academic community. There remains a "chilly climate" for women and minorities in the classroom. The standard measures of minority achievement, degrees awarded and student retention, have since the 1960's been disproportionately low compared to larger, white cohorts. Institutions continue to create programs for minority student retention, affirmative action, and combating racism, sexism, and homophobia on campus, but these are mostly rhetoric, never involving substantive change in

institutional behaviors which subtly condone and legitimize racism, sexism, and homophobia. Asked how any given program has helped fight attrition or attracted minorities into the science and engineering pipeline, administrators admit an unwitting lack of success, or at least the lack of evaluation.

African-American, Chicano, Hispanic, and other ethnic studies programs were created in the 1960's and 1970's, often with few resources and without clear tenure-track lines for faculty. Lasch (1979) suggests that these were introduced solely to head off political discontent among students and faculty. These programs have never been part of the mainstream and often do not offer majors or minors, only certificates of study. They are criticized for lack of academic rigor and credentials and are forced to fight for resources at every opportunity.

The number of minority faculty members on predominantly white campuses has not increased significantly since the 1960's and is still far behind the percentage of minority students enrolled. There is little if any true reward system for minority faculty called upon to play two roles - that of traditional faculty member and that of mentor/advisor/role model. The invisible workload placed on these faculty members makes it almost impossible for them to survive the tenure process.

Cross (1971), in Beyond the Open Door, writes that everyone agrees on the need for reform in higher education, but not its direction. The main arguments, she sees, are about what to teach and how to teach. "The question of *whom* we shall teach in postsecondary programs has been answered; and the nation is moving, albeit awkwardly, to implement egalitarianism in the 1970's" (Cross, 1971, p. 163).

Cross' statement is a sharp contrast to that of Keniston (1970), who explained in "What's Bugging the Students?" that "If any one theme runs through the demands of the excluded, particularly black students, it is for an end to exclusion and for full citizenship, with respect and esteem, in the university and society" (Keniston, 1970, p. 55). In Free's (1968) monograph Revolution for the Hell of It, his "Advice to my Black Brothers" included "Plans for the Destruction of the Universities." "Our brothers and sisters are in the prisons of the universities. It is our duty to rescue them" (Free, 1968, pp. 156-158).

Despite all of the rhetoric about open access and diversity, no one rescued African-Americans or Latinos or Chicanos from the oppressive aspects of higher education. Colleges and universities have changed little since the end of the 1960's. Most affirmative action offices are substantially under-funded, overworked, and have little net impact on the issues. Popular analysts such as Sykes (1990) point to affirmative action programs as evidence of a new ideology of race which has permeated campuses since the 1960's. Instead, the structure of higher education embodies the ideology of equal opportunity and affirmative action, but reinforces the status quo (Brint and Karabel, 1989).

Little if anything may be left of federal and state policies for affirmative action after the 1996 presidential campaign, if the present course continues in the Congress and if the Republi-

cans are successful in defeating Clinton. The sensitivity to issues of oppression which came into national consciousness with the 1960's will be lost.

The Struggle for Accountability and Public Control

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's Final Report of 1973 entitled Priorities for Action makes a judgement about the 1960's and the struggle for accountability. "The great change of the past decade was not the vociferous rise of student power but the quiet increase in public power - by governors, by legislators, by coordinating councils. Some of higher education already has the status of a highly controlled utility" (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, p. 59). Although "more of higher education receives public support" and requires this level of accountability, public control has "intruded into higher education" because it "has also been, in effect, invited into higher education by disruption that calls for external intervention" (p. 59).

Beginning with the Reagan revolution and the decentralization of power to the states, higher education has had to rely on state legislatures instead of the federal government for increasing levels of support. Partly in response to society's general dissatisfaction with higher education and anger over images of student protest in the 1960's, state legislatures have held colleges and universities even more accountable. State coordinating boards have tried more and more to act like governing boards. Higher education has been forced to compete with roads and prisons for scarce resources.

The literature of the early 1970's predicted the issues of retrenchment which were to come. O'Neil (1971) writes that "As funds for supporting higher education become scarce and the competition of nonacademic claimants grows intense, appropriations are bound to carry new fiscal controls that will restrict governance options. Even where the constraints are not explicit, caution may seem the wiser course when financial stringency threatens" (O'Neil, 1971, p. 176).

Out of this move for accountability, whether it be for student assessment, financial control, or issues of faculty workload, has come a renewed conservatism about the role and mission of higher education. Using a language of consumerism, state legislatures and state boards have become much more intimately involved in the affairs of colleges and universities. Colleges and universities have increased their institutional support staff and worked consistently to meet state expectations in order to increase and, now in the mid-1990's, hopefully maintain funding. Brint and Karabel (1989) call this direction of institutional policies to curry favor with the state "anticipatory subordination."

States and institutions have returned to an outdated and outmoded image of the disciplines which does not take into consideration the paradigm shifts which have occurred in the knowledge base (Schwartz and Ogilvy, 1979; Lincoln, 1989). To compete for state funding and appease accountability motives of state legislatures, institutions have given up any remnant of 1960's-like reform. After the 1960's, the university became more and more like government and industry (Hoffman, 1970). With decreases in public funding, it was up to corporations to take

control. Killian (1970), in his article "University Research" which appeared in the Academy of Political Science's monograph The Corporation on Campus, urges that corporations need to:

understand the dangers to the nation in permitting the great resources that have been built to erode or be dispersed. There has never been a time when the private sources of support for universities and for research have never had a greater role to play in maintaining the continuing vigor and contribution of these scholarly activities. Let us not lose our nerve. We have hardly begun the great intellectual adventure of understanding nature and of controlling environment (Killian, 1970, p. 42).

The most experimental of the colleges which existed in this time period, including Franconia College and Goddard College, were either closed or reduced to a mere fragment of their original selves. As state institutions began to be more dependent on tuition revenues, students were educated away from alternatives to the "safer" traditional institution which catered to growing fears about the economy.

The Military-Industrial-University Complex

Another form of institutional growth which was allowed to go unchecked was the continued development of the military-industrial complex on campus. Few ROTC programs were removed because of student protests. This discussion captured student interests, though, because the programs were visible signs of the escalation of the Vietnam War. What most students and faculty failed to realize was the magnitude and extent of university involvement with government and industry, especially regarding the defense and nuclear industries.

A national project was begun in the late 1960's under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee which was called NARMIC (National Action/Research on the Military Industrial Complex). NARMIC prepared various publications, such as its Guide to Researching Institutional Portfolios (Westover, 1970) to help track the build-up of the military-industrial complex. The NARMIC guide explains that "It is well known that the Department of Defense (DoD) has connections with universities through research centers and professors who are contracted to do war-related studies. However, the intertwining has been more subtle and far more extensive through financial holdings and investments" (p. 1). Two types of action are suggested - trying to get institutions to give up their ties to defense contractors and trying to get universities to "use their investments as leverage to build a public consciousness and to pressure the companies into halting their DoD contracts" (p. 3).

Despite student efforts to the contrary, universities strengthened their ties with the government, the military, and industry. Business and large corporations rarely intervened in internal affairs of colleges and universities, Brint and Karabel (1989) explain. However, they have exerted considerable influence in the direction of the community college movement, controlling the development of its vocational education programs and therefore the capacity to help "manage ambition" and hire graduates. Only in the anti-Apartheid protests of the mid-

1980s were students successful in changing the business investment policies of institutions. Universities in 1995 are intimate partners with many levels of the military-industrial-biomedical complex. It is almost inconceivable that they should be otherwise and maintain their current size, complexity, and range of responsibilities.

One has only to look at the most visible signs of this complex to see that student protests of American involvement in Vietnam had no impact on higher education policy. Efforts to reform the university through divestment of defense contracts were never seriously entertained. It is almost laughable that institutions which had students gathering on their lawns marching in protest of the Vietnam War had their own huge arsenals of defense resources in nearby facilities.

The Rise of Business, Engineering, and the Professional Schools

Much is made by Levine (1980), Hoge (1979), and others about shift in student attitudes to careerism, me-ism, and consumerism in the 1970's and 1980s. Kerr (1991) suggests that student activism dropped off because fewer students studied the social sciences and more students went into the sciences and professions. While Kerr's data may be valid, his cause-effect logic needs to be questioned.

Since the 1960's, institutions have made significant increases in resource allocations to schools of business and engineering and to the professional schools of law and the health sciences. It may be argued that these increases were necessary to meet the needs of a society demanding careerism within the management of ambition. Yet who is to say that there is not a link between the emergence of the health care industry and the biomedical industry with significant increases in professional school resources and medical school graduates? Is there not a link between the emergence of a litigious society and significant increases in the number of law school graduates? Higher education is where the definition and development of these disciplines comes from. There is nothing new which is in the nature of these professions which does not originate and is not transmitted by higher education.

The rise in engineering school resources was not accompanied by a proportional increase in the number of women and minority engineering students. This is because the growth of engineering schools was not linked to any broader social agenda - solely to their own self interest. Left to grow, business, engineering, and professional schools grew to such a proportion as to take over the rest of the campus. While colleges of arts and sciences may be larger by virtue of being a conglomeration of unrelated disciplines, resource allocation decisions are disproportionately geared to the high technology fields.

Under the guise of meeting the career-oriented needs of students, business, engineering, and professional schools further fragmented the reform movement of the 1960's. Every reform which had been won, from new kinds of general education requirements to retention strategies to serious commitment for addressing the pipeline of minorities and women in science and engineering fields, was left to decay as institutions allowed the growth of these disciplines and

professional schools to go unchecked. .

Conclusions

It is ironic that, twenty-five years after the end of the 1960's, the University of California at Berkeley has taken the lead in dismantling affirmative action, one of the most hard-fought battles of the civil rights movement. Except for a handful of experimental colleges like Goddard, there is little left of the sixties movement in American higher education.

The sixties movement brought to light fundamental contradictions and conflicts which are embedded in the fabric of higher education. This struggle to articulate a student voice was a radical departure from the status quo. There was the potential for a fundamental and significant paradigm shift in democracy, educational theory, and the mission of the university. Most administrators, faculty, and students never recognized that the dialogue was taking place at the paradigm level.

The ideas which students fought for, however contradictory, inarticulate, utopian, or critical they may have been, are a powerful and compelling critique. Almost every call for reform is just as relevant today. Higher education has changed very little in the way it is conducted through a myriad of academic activities.

It was the student reform movement of the sixties, interwoven with the civil rights and women's movements, that challenged the oppressive nature of higher education. Higher education has failed to become sensitive to these issues. It was within higher education's power to become the central force for change in society's attitudes toward racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of discrimination. Colleges and universities have abdicated this role to the courts. One cannot help but imagine what a different world it would be for African-Americans, Latinos, gays, women, and the disabled if higher education had been truly committed to ending oppression.

There is a stark contrast between the nature of undergraduate and graduate education and the state of the art in the disciplines. With the emergence of new, post-modern, paradigms of inquiry and new technologies of scholarship, the traditional, reductionist approach to knowledge has been shown to be hopelessly inadequate. Yet higher education teaches its students, develops its curriculum, and maintains its degree structures as if it were still in the 1950's post-Sputnik call for science. Higher education has failed to keep pace with the nature of scholarship. Administrators and faculty operate within a myopic, dualistic, and out-dated model of higher education.

The parallels between the "emerging paradigms" of the disciplines and the sixties reform movement are very compelling. The 1960's urged higher education organizations to become more complex and heterarchic, what Boulding (1973, p.257) calls "learning collectives pursuing co-intentionality." The most basic assumptions about knowledge and curriculum were broken apart and considered from a perspective that was holographic and indeterminate, that abandoned linear causality and the cumulative assembly of scholarship, that tried on new psychedelic lenses

for conducting responsible research about social issues.

While the memories of Kent State are rekindled briefly in twenty-five year media retrospectives, many of the important lessons of Kent State, Jackson State, and the student movement have been lost. This paper is an effort to retrieve these lessons, to learn from them. For without what was the best of the the paradigm of the sixties, higher education is ill equipped to deal with the coming crises of the new millennium.

The stories, metaphors, and themes about the 1960's which are presented in this paper reinforce the radical sociological perspective that the structures of higher education create and legitimize conflict, contradiction, domination, and deprivation. The sixties reform movement offered a vision of emancipation and the potentiality of radical change. Viewing these themes with the lens of the radical structuralist paradigm, it appears that higher education is, in many ways, responsible for killing the sixties movement in America.

What is to come of the future of higher education and its current struggles to dismantle the last vestiges of reform? No paradigm shift appears imminent. Yet out of something so unrelated as the O.J. Simpson verdict, which brings to the surface the overwhelming contradiction of beliefs between African-Americans and whites about justice in America, there is hope. There is hope that the structural conflicts of society will again be laid bare. There is hope that the university, which Taylor calls "the central pivot around which a modern post-industrial society turns" (Taylor, 1969, p. xiii), will be held accountable for its failure to act in achieving the revolution.

Bibliography

Altbach, Philip G., and Cohen, Robert. "American Student Activism: The Post-Sixties Transformation." Journal of Higher Education, 61 (January/February 1990), pp.32-49.

Astin et al. The American Freshman: Twenty Year Trends, 1966-1985; Cooperative Institutional Research Program. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, Inc., 1987.

Avorn, Jerry L, et al. Up Against the Ivy Wall: A History of the Columbia Crisis. New York: Atheneum, 1969.

Barrera, Mario. "The Struggle for a Third College at UC San Diego." In Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education. Hayward, California: World Publications Inc., 1974, pp. 62-68.

Barzun, Jacques. The House of Intellect. New York: Harper Touchbooks, 1959.

Bell, Daniel. "Quo Warranto? - Notes on the Governance of Universities in the 1970s." In Graubard, Stephen R., and Balloti, Geno A., (eds.), The Embattled University. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1970, pp. 222-242..

Bell, Daniel. The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia College Experience in a National Setting. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968.

Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, Milbrey. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: The Findings in Review. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: 1975.

Bills, Scott L. "The Sixties, Kent State, and Historical Memory." In Erenrich, Susie, (ed.), Kent and Jackson State: 1970-1990: A Special Edition of Vietnam Generation. Silver Spring, MD: Vietnam Generation, 1990, pp. 166-173.

Bletchley, Bucks. The Early Development of the Open University: Report of the Vice Chancellor, January 1969-December 1970. London: Oxley Press, 1972.

Bloom, Allan. The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Brint, Steve, and Karabel, Jerome. The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Boulding, Elise. "Futurism as a Galvanizer of Education." In Shimahara, Nobuo, (ed.), Educational Reconstruction: Promise and Challenge. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973, pp. 245-263..

Buchanan, James M., and Devletoglou, Nicos E. Academia in Anarchy: An Economic Diagnosis. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970.

Burrell, G., and Morgan, Gareth. Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1979.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Casasco, Juan A. Corporate Planning Models for University Management. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Report 4. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.

Casasco, Juan A. Planning Techniques for University Management. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education/ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.

Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

Clark, Burton R. "The 'Cooling Out' Function Revisited." New Directions for Community Colleges 32 (1980), pp. 15-30.

Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc., 1971.

Free. Revolution for the Hell of It. New York: The Dial Press Inc., 1968.

Daniels, Lee A. "Only the Appearance of Diversity: Higher Education and the Pluralist Ideal in the 1980s and 1990s." Policy Perspectives: Papers. Philadelphia: Pew Higher Education Research Program, 1991.

Dowd, Douglas F. "Faculty Contributions to Tensions." In Nichols, David C., (ed.), Perspectives on Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970, pp. 126-129.

D'Souza, Dinesh. Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus. New York: The Free Press, 1991.

Erenrich, Susie, (ed.). Kent and Jackson State: 1970-1990: A Special Edition of Vietnamese Generation. Silver Spring, MD: Vietnam Generation, 1990.

Eurich, Alvin C., (ed.). Campus 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Higher Education. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Newcomb, Theodore M. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc, 1969.

Forrest, Aubrey. Assessing Prior Learning - A CAEL Student Guide. Princeton, NJ: Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning, 1977.

Friedman, Robert. "Introduction." In Avorn, Jerry L. et al., Up Against the Ivy Wall: A History of the Columbia Crisis. New York: Atheneum, 1969, pp. 1-22.

Gardner, John W. "Agenda for the Colleges and Universities: Higher Education in the Innovative Society." In Eurich, Alvin C., (ed.), Campus 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Higher Education. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1968, pp. 1-8.

Glazer, Nathan. "What Happened at Berkeley." In Katope, Christopher G., and Zolbrod, Paul G., (eds.), Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966, pp. 43-66.

Goodman, Paul. Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars. New York: Vintage Books, 1962, 1964.

Goodman, Paul. "Thoughts on Berkeley." In Katope, Christopher G., and Zolbrod, Paul G., (eds.), Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966, pp. 77-82.

Grant, Gerald, and Riesman, David. The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Graubard, Stephen R., and Balloti, Geno A., (eds.). The Embattled University. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1970.

Greene, Maxine. "Involvement: A Radical Way of Teaching and Learning." In Shimahara, Nobuo, (ed.), Educational Reconstruction: Promise and Challenge. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973, pp. 222-244..

Havelock, Ronald G. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1978

Havelock, Ronald G., et al. Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1969.

Henderson, Algo D. The Innovative Spirit: Change in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1970.

Hersey, John. Letter to the Alumni. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

Hoffman, Stanley. "Participation in Perspective?" In Graubard, Stephen R., and Balloti, Geno A., (eds.), The Embattled University. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1970, pp. 177-221..

Hoge, Dean R. "Changes in College Students Value Patterns in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s." Sociology of Education 49 (1979): pp. 155-163.

Hook, Sidney. Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy. New York: Cowles Book Company, Inc., 1970.

Hook, Sideny. "Academic Freedom and the Rights of Students." In Katope, Christopher G., and Zolbrod, Paul G., (eds.), Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966, pp. 67-77.

Howe, Irving. "Berkeley and Beyond." In Katope, Christopher G., and Zolbrod, Paul G., (eds.), Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966, pp. 131-139.

Jarrett, Jr., Herbert H. "Change Agent Qualities and Situation Feasibility in Higher Education." Liberal Education 59 (December 1973), pp 442-448.

Jerome, Judson. "New Attitudes for Faculty." In Nichols, David C., (ed.), Perspectives on Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970, pp. 119-125.

Kaplan, Samuel. "The Revolt of an Elite: Sources of the FSM Victory." In Katope, Christopher G., and Zolbrod, Paul G., (eds.), Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966, pp. 89-117.

Karabel, Jerome. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." Harvard Educational Review 42 (1972): pp. 521-562.

Katope, Christopher G., and Zolbrod, Paul G., (eds.). Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966.

Keniston, Kenneth. "What's Bugging the Students." In Nichols, David C., (ed.), Perspectives on Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970, pp. 47-67.

- Kerr, Clark. The Great Transformation in Higher Education: 1960-1980. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Killian, J.R., Jr. "University Research." In Connery, Robert H., (ed.), The Corporation and the Campus: Corporate Support of Higher Education in the 1970s. Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science, Vol. XXX, #1. New York: Academy of Political Science, 1970.
- Kitchell, Mark. Berkeley in the Sixties. Videorecording. San Francisco: California Newsreel, 1990.
- Kohlberg, L. "Stages of Moral Development." In Beck, C., Crittenden, B., and Sullivan, E., (eds.), Moral Education. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Lasch, Christopher. The Agony of the American Left. New York, Vintage Books, 1969.
- Lasch, Christopher. The Culture of Narcissism. New York: Warner Books, 1979.
- Levine, Arthur, and Weingart, John. Reform of Undergraduate Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.
- Levine, Arthur. When Dreams and Heroes Died: A Portrait of Today's College Student. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. "Trouble in the Land: The Paradigm Revolution in the Academic Disciplines." In Smart, John C., (ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research in Higher Education: Volume V. New York: Agathon Press, 1989, pp. 57-133.
- Lindquist, Jack, (ed.). Increasing the Impact. Battle Creek, Michigan: W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1980.
- Lindquist, Jack. Strategies for Change. Washington, D.C.: Council for Independent Colleges, 1978.
- Lipset, Seymour M. "The Politics of Academia." In Nichols, David C., (ed.), Perspectives on Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970, pp. 85-118.
- Lukas, J. Anthony. Don't Shoot - We Are Your Children! New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- Luria, S.E., and Luria, Zella. "The Role of the University: Ivory Tower, Service Station, or Frontier Post? In Graubard, Stephen R., and Balloti, Geno A., (eds.), The Embattled University. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1970. pp. 75-83.

McLuhan, Marshall, and Fiore, Quentin. The Medium is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1967.

Milam, John H., Jr. The Emerging Paradigm of Afrocentric Research Methods. Paper presented at 1992 conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education in Minneapolis. Washington, D.C.: ERIC, 1992..

Moore, Kathryn M. "The Cooling Out of Two-Year College Women." Personnel and Guidance Journal 53 (April 1975), pp. 578-583.

Nash, Paul. "Towards a Radical View of Authority Relationships in Education." In Shimahara, Nobuo, (ed.), Educational Reconstruction: Promise and Challenge. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973, pp. 342-361.

Newman, Frank, et al. Report on Higher Education. Report on Task Force, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Nichols, David C., (ed.). Perspectives on Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

O'Neil, Robert M. "Paradoxes of Campus Power." In Smith, G. Kerry, New Teaching, New Learning: Current Issues in Higher Education 1971. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc., 1971, pp. 172-178.

Panetta, Roger. "Innovation Workshop." Liberal Education 59 (December 1973), pp 424-432.

Peckham, Morse. "Arts for the Cultivation of Radical Sensitivity." In Shimahara, Nobuo, (ed.), Educational Reconstruction: Promise and Challenge. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973, pp. 201-221.

Perry, William R. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Postman, Neil, and Weingartner, Charles. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.

Raskin, A.H. "The Berkeley Affair: Mr. Kerr vs. Mr. Savio & Co." In Katope, Christopher G., and Zolbrod, Paul G., (eds.), Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966, pp. 28-43.

Rogers, Everett, and Shoemaker, F. Floyd. Communication for Innovation. New York: Free Press, 1971.

- Roszak, Theodore, (ed.). The Dissenting Academy. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
- Roszak, Theodore. The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1969.
- Runkel, Philip, Harrison, Roger, and Runkel, Margaret, (eds.). The Changing College Classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.
- Sale, Kirkpatrick. SDS. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.
- Sanford, Nevitt. Why Colleges Fail: A Student of the Student as a Person. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1967.
- Savio, Mario. "The Berkeley Student Rebellion of 1964." In Katope, Christopher G., and Zolbrod, Paul G., (eds.), Beyond Berkeley: A Sourcebook in Student Values. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966, pp. 83-89.
- Schrag, Peter. "Provide, Provide..." In Nichols, David C., (ed.). Perspectives on Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970, pp. 41-43.
- Schwartz, Edward. "Less Radical Programs, More Militant Tactics." In Nichols, David C., (ed.), Perspectives on Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970, pp. 73-77.
- Schwartz, Peter, and Ogilvy, James. The Emergent Paradigm: Changing Patterns of Thought and Belief. Menlo Park, California: SRI International, 1979.
- Spurr, Stephen H. Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches, Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States. Berkeley: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1970.
- Sykes, Charles J. The Hollow Men: Politics and Corruption in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Gateway, 1990.
- Taylor, Harold. Students Without Teachers: The Crisis in the University. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Trow, Martin. "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Education." In Graubard, Stephen R., and Balloti, Geno A., (eds.), The Embattled University. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1970, pp. 1-42..
- Viorst, Milton. Fire in the Streets: America in the 1960s. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979.
- Westover. Guide to Researching Institutional Portfolios. National Action/Research on the

Military Industrial Complex (NARMIC), 1970.

Yankelovitch, Daniel, Inc. The Changing Values on Campus: Political and Personal Attitudes of Today's College Students. New York: Washington Square Press, 1972.

Yankelovitch, Daniel. The New Morality: A Profile of American Youth in the 70's. New York: McGraw Hill Paperbacks, 1974.